BIBLE EXAMINER.

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

VOL. IX. NEW YORK, JUNE 1, 1854. NO. II.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY

At No. 130 Fulton-street.

TERMS---One Dollar for the Year:

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

ÆTERNITAS REVIEWED.

BY REV. WM. G. MONCRIEF.

"ÆTERNITAS: *or. Glimpses of the Future Destinies of Man*: By WM. BATHGATE."

[Continued from page 179, Vol. 8.]

In concluding our last notice of Mr. Bathgate's work, we left for the consideration of our readers a long extract, which we respectfully urge them to re-peruse, as it seems unnecessary to quote it on this occasion. The extract contains Mr. B,'s *solitary* direct argument from Scripture in behalf of universal human immortality, or rather of human souls. We remarked on the former time, "That the passage was given by Mr. Bathgate to demonstrate the immortality of the human soul, and the word *soul* is not in it!" an alarming fact for his argumentation, and one we shall carefully keep in mind. It is disgraceful, and we write this with pain, to build up a pretended argument for the immortality of the soul on a passage that has no reference, at least, direct reference, to souls of any kind. This is conduct that would not be tolerated in the ranks of science for a day, and it ought to be excluded from religious controversy.

Further, we remark, that supposing our Lord in his address to the Sadducees, when he says, "*neither can they die any more*," refers to the *whole* of the resurrected human race, this would still leave Mr. B. destitute of valid proof of human immortality. Reflect a moment, and this comes out as demonstration. Mark, then, our Master says, "neither can they die any more," and the no more death in the future is necessarily to be determined as to its meaning, by the death that has happened to the resurrected in the past; just in the same way as if one were to tell a poor man he would on no after occaion feel the want of money, he would know what, according to this promise, he was never to re-experience, by what he had endured in bye-gone days. "Neither can they die any more,"—how had they died previously? It was by death they had become fit subjects for a resurrection,—in what sense had they died? This is the piercing question, —one that we must have answered before our author can be permitted to hoist the flag of victory. Overlooking this question entirely, his deductions, no doubt, are rather plausible; but the moment it is taken into consideration, we find his great proof to be destitute of strength. His friends expected an irrefragable, heresy-defying, and heresy-demolishing argument, and lo, it can be easily manifested, there comes up again but the old *assumption* of man's immortality in a new dress, and on a new stage. Here is the evidence of this strong assertion. And for the better elucidation of it, let us suppose a man is before us after the resurrection has taken place; he consists, as Mr. B. assures us, of two parts at least,—body and soul. Now, let us further imagine this person to ask, "Am I IMMORTAL?" Mr. B. would respond, of course, "yes," and his main consideration for the questioner's satisfaction would be the words of the blessed Redeemer, "Neither can they die any more." Now, here, as already stated, we have a death spoken of which the party is supposed to have undergone, and with which he is well acquainted from experience. The death already endured is the key to the death never to be tasted afresh. Well, then, what was the ante-resurrection death? This man had died, but it is to be borne in mind that *he had never lost consciousness*, for, according to Mr. B.'s theory, his soul—substantially himself, our author being judge,—had alway been alive, and endowed with pleasing or painful experience in heaven or hell, as the case might be; in fact, as this man had only in his death been *disembodied*, expelled for the time from a fleshly tabernacle, the words "neither can they die any more," could only intimate to him at best that he will never again be *disembodied* in any after period of his new or resurrected career. He is not to die,—that is, be disembodied—any more! So Mr. B, understands death: in this sense he believes our Lord to have used the word "die," when on other occasions he referred to that event. Had our author contended for a universal resurrection to immortal existence, and freely admitted that death was not a transition to another state of conscious being, but the entire, though temporary, loss of conscious being itself, he might have argued as he has done; but understanding death to be simple disembodiment, the consolation he gives to an inquiring mind on the point in hand is utterly worthless. The resurrected person before us is supposed to inquire if he is immortal,—Mr. B. tells him, he will never be anew disembodied, and leaves him in the dark as to how long this conscious re-embodied existence shall last. The man asked bread and he has got a stone: he wished hope of unending being, and a reed that has neither length nor breadth is put into his hand. What though he shall never be disembodied, may he not cease to exist? The thing is possible,—and may not a soul go out of conscious existence *in* a body, as well as out of it? Mr. B., then, by his reply to the man's

awful query, "Am I immortal?" might just as wisely respond to him, you will never need food again,—or clothing,—you will never again be subject to diseases you bore on earth, as to say, "you cannot die anew," i, e., enter afresh on *disembodied* existence. All that may be certain, but still comes up the tremendous demand, "May I not, while embodied, cease to be?" To that question our author gives no reply. Supposing that he is sound as to the universality of the reference to the words,—"neither can they die any more;" had he accepted death in its natural and common-sense meaning,—in the meaning in which he is showing that men are to be exempt eternally from dissolution, as here affirmed in the promise, he might have gloried in being able to give such a decided and unequivocal answer to our imaginary resurrected querist; but he cannot get the benefit of a meaning in the reply of our Lord, which he does not admit to be contained in the question he is understood to be solving and settling. Can they die any more? is the question which Mr. B. understands the Savior chiefly to answer, but he uses the word die in the question, not as it is employed by Jesus, in his deliverance. The value of the Savior's words to Mr. B.'s purpose is in this, that Jesus delivers the doctrine of the deathlessness of the resurrected, and makes no reference whatever to disembodiment; whereas, but when the writer understands death as only disembodiment, all that he can reverentially imagine the Savior to promise consistently, was something in harmony with the supposed need or wish, an exemption from another disembodiment, which of course is in itself no security against entire subsequent destruction of being. He supposes Jesus to reply to a question in harmony with the popular theory as to man's dissolution, in a sense fitting to a question in accordance with our views of the human constitution and death. This cannot be allowed our author. He must be consistent, and consistency is the death of his argumentation.

We might now logically deliver over Mr. B.'s vaunted solitary argument for universal human immortality to its fate, and pass on to examine other paragraphs of his volume. But we can afford to be generous to our readers, as well as faithful to the writer. We shall consider the passage in Luke more fully, as well as some of the reasoning in this work regarding it, which has not yet attracted our notice. It is a mass of forced argumenting from first to last, and serves the purpose of showing how strained an effort is needed to give a rather plain passage a meaning which it never can contain, with a view to keep up a system of crumbling orthodoxy.

With a design to give Mr. B. the fullest advantage of his reasoning, we shall in the meantime assume that there is no invalidating weakness in the word "die," as he understands it; in other words, that the promise, "neither can they die any more," expresses the absolute idea of immortality; and now proceed for a while to determine who are those pledged with endless existence. The weakness of his argument, we have discovered, consists in this, that the Savior's declaration, so often quoted, must employ the term "die" in its natural sense, as loss of being, if it is to be of any service in the grand controvery, is man according to Scripture, an heir of immortality? and which Mr. B. asserts in the promising words, to be decided in the affirmative; and this being the sense of the word "die," when it is promised that the event will never happen again, it must be so understood in the past history of each of the resurrected, being in the history of each of them an event which has happened once when they passad into the silence of the tomb: but in this sense during the ante-resurrection period, Mr. B. does not understand death, for he holds it to be simply disembodiment involving no actual loss of conscious experience. If the death referred to by Jesus was such a death as Mr. B. understands to happen to every son of Adam when he expires, then he only promises in the post-resurrection future exemption from such a death as the parties spoken of had undergone in this state, i. e., an exemption from disembodiment. But let us suppose the death undergone to be the same as the death from which exemption is promised, i. e., literal death, or death in the sense in which the words "neither can they die any more," must be held if they are to express immortality of being, and proceed to search for an answer to the question to whom is this prospect opened up? Who are to live for ever? Mr. B. says *all;* we humbly think that even here he fails again, for the more natural interpretation is that which confines it to a class, viz., the righteous. The extension of the words before us to the *ungodly*, whatever they essentially import, is something almost new in the annals of interpretation, and a procedure that should have been defended by clearer reasons than those adduced before such a hazardous assertion was made. To whom, then, is the promise delivered, "neither can they die any more?"

We have tried to view the whole passage from the side of Mr. B. and his friends, but confess that the longer we have thus beheld it, the more we have been astonished at the vision of those who assert it clearly announces by its signs universal immortality. They see what we cannot find;—we suspect they discover what their theory leads them to wish may be there. The reasoning by which the passage is claimed for the popular side appears to us forced and vain. Overlooking the grand difficulty we have presented, every nerve is strung to pull it over to the help of the orthodoxy: but it stands in its own place, and we feel sure it cannot be moved. We must now quote a few sentences from Mr. B. in confirmation of what we have just declared as to the character of his reasoning; and as matter for some future observation, he says:—

"The first clause requiring elucidation is in verse 35:—'They which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead,' &c. By those who say that the righteous only are meant in these words, it is maintained that the term *accounted worthy* necessarily implies that the persons entering the future world and raised from the dead, have a virtuous moral character, on account of which the destiny *here mentioned* is awarded, or that entrance on the future world, and the resurrection from the dead, are peculiar favors conferred on the good. The phrase *accounted worthy*, does not necessarily bind us to think either of moral desert or moral fitness. Evidently none but God can judge as to the pro-

priety of drawing out men's lives beyond the present scene. May not God deem the human race, as such, apart from virtuous features of moral character, worthy of the destiny here indicated? We think he does. So far as human knowledge extends, God has not deemed the brute creation worthy of a resurrection, or future life. But that he has deemed the human body worthy of a resurrection, and the human soul worthy of a future life, irrespective of the moral condition of the departed, is matter of no revelation. 'There shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust.' 'The hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation.' Most explicitly do those verses teach us that God shall deem it proper to summon all bodies from the grave, and all souls to the future world. Thus we are told *who* shall be deemed worthy of such a destiny. The ground of the destiny of *a* resurrection, or a future life, is not stated. Probably it lies in the nature of man, as a rational and responsible being. There is then the clearest evidence that all men shall be raised from the dead, and shall enter the great futurity. Next follows the emphatic deliverance, that all the resuscitated,—all those who enter the future world, are immortal.—'Neither can they die any any more.'"—pp. 65, 66.

There is a point in the passage from Luke which Mr. B. has entirely neglected, and one which it is not convenient for truth or our argument that it should be ignored. This is it; the Savior's words, "the resurrection from the dead," are more literally, the resurrection *from among the dead*. It is the same resurrection that Paul was striving to obtain. "If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead,"—Philippians 3: 2. The verse, as it stands thus, is only fitted to perplex ordinary readers, since they will naturally wonder what was the design of any striving on Paul's part to reach what, on common christian consent, he was sure of, whether he strove for it or no,—a resurrection from the dead. The Greek is plain; it is a resurrection *from among* the dead he was laboring to attain unto. He wanted to rise in the first awakening; not to sleep on till the wicked, the heirs of condemnation, would be summoned from the dust. It was the resurrection here spoken of by the Savior that the Apostle was thristing for, and no wonder, since its heirs are to die no more, and to be as the angels of God in heaven. The very language of the Savior, then, obviously limits the reference in the promise "neither can they die any more," to those who have had, because they were deemed worthy of it, a resurrection out from among the dead, or the corpses. Moreover, the remarks on the words, "they which shall be accounted worthy," we deem very poor and far-fetched. What Mr. White says in his reply to the Rev. John Hinton's criticism on this passage, is worthy of perusal: "Mr. Hinton," says Mr. White, "is obliged by the exigencies of his argument, to attempt to get rid of the idea of moral desert or holy character, which is suggested by the verb of which the words (be accounted worthy) are a translation. His attempt appears to me, if I may say so without offence, to be a signal failure; for it is notorious that the *most obvious* rendering of the verb, and of the whole phrase, does involve the notion of peculiar personal qualification. While, therefore, he professes himself content to follow the critical guidance of Schleusner (who seems to have shared in the author's desire to discover the immortality of mankind in the passage before us), and of the elegant Castalio, I must profess myself content to follow the guidance of nearly all critics and commentators of chief repute, and of our venerable translators, re-echoing the rendering of Wicliff, Tyndale, Cranmer, and the versions of Geneva and Rheims, in retaining the common translation of the entire passage, which indisputably supports the opinion that our Savior referred in his answer to the righteous alone. 'The exigency of the passage, and general considerations, decide its meaning.'" They who are in the eye of the Judge worthy of a resurrection from among the dead,—i.e., the first resurrection,—shall by and by come forth, and having put on incorruptibility, they shall die no more. Having striven, like Paul, for such a resurrection, it shall be their portion. With a view still further to extend the bearing of the words to the whole race, "neither can they die any more," our author handles the expressions "equal unto the angels" are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection, in a manner similar to his treatment of the phrase, "accounted worthy." To consider his expositions at great length, would not tend to edification. Equal to the angels, he makes as if it had run, all angels; whereas in another place we find it was the "angels of God in heaven," (Matt. 22: 30), to whom our Lord made reference. If there is any meaning in words, it could be no great comfort to tell the resurrected as a security of their deathlessness, that they would be equal to angels, "fallen," when they are like their leader, destined to perdition. "The children of God," being "the children of the resurrection," is another part of our Lord's speech which is plundered of beauty to serve a purpose. They are children of God, it seems, whether saints or sinners, in the same sense as we would affix to the words "we are his offspring;" being resurrected from the dead by divine power, is supposed to afford a title to this designation, analogous to that which is involved in original creation. That any person will naturally assign these cold and barren senses to the expressions under notice, we can scarcely believe; and hence there is less need for a special effort to redeem them from any injury they have sustained from the hands of a few, who have found it necessary to put forth some reckless efforts by their agency, to save a sinking theology from utter submersion.

As far as we have gone in the consideration of our Lord's reply to the question of the Sadducees, we may learn four things:—1st. That there it to be a resurrection from among the dead; 2nd. That moral worthiness is to be the ground of it; 3rd. That its heirs are not to marry, or be given in marriage; 4th. They are to die no more, for they shall be eqal to the angels of God in heaven. All these points are closely connected, and have a direct bearing on the case presented to our Lord by

his Sadducean adversaries. They proposed the question, "in the resurrection whose wife of them (i.e., of the seven brethren) is she? for seven had her to wife?" The authoritative reply is, that the resurrected he refers to, are neither to marry nor to be given in marriage; and the other points, they are to die no more,—they are to equal the angels of God in heaven, bear out the idea—dimly we grant, but still as clearly as it can now probably be made,—that a new order of things shall then be founded, and the sons of this resurrection will be differently constituted from what is found in this mortal and soulish period of the history of man. So far the Sadducees were amply replied to—there was to be no marrying, for things would be quite different in that world, or age, from what we see now. The Sadducees imagined that the resurrection would produce an entire identity with the condition of men *before death*; our Lord shows them otherwise, and turns aside a difficulty that may have sprung up and fastened itself upon his doctrine of resurrection.

At this point it may be wise to advert to another consideration that has been brought forward in favor of the universal reference of the words, "neither can they die any more." It is the very question of the Sadducees, involving all the parties who had been husbands to this daughter of Abraham, as well as the woman herself. The Sadducees say nothing about the righteous, we are told, among her husbands, they appear to make their question quite general; and the exposition of the reply of our Lord, which confines it to righteous parties, represents him, it is added, as not meeting his questioners fairly and candidly. We answer, there is no reason whatever, for supposing that the Sadducees did not refer to all the husbands, and to the woman herself as righteous characters. Indeed, in connection with what other character could they think the question they proposed, worth raising for solution? Jesus taught a resurrection, and it was his doctrine that excited their speculative curiosity. But, if it was his doctrine, then, as we believe, they must have understood him to teach, that if the righteous rose to live, the wicked ascended from the dust to die. He spoke of them as being burned in "unquenchable fire," which was just a strong manner of expressing their entire consumption in Gehenna. Here was no need then for referring to any but holy characters,—those who would gain, as he taught, the resurrection to everlasting life. And would the Sadducees understand this? We answer, the end of the wicked is as clearly taught as the doctrine of the resurrection; and we are bound to admit, that they equally apprehended both. Let it be observed, we affirm not that they approved the Savior's doctrine about the future destinies of men; all we insist upon is this, that they had as good opportunities for learning what he delivered about the end of the resurrected wicked, as about the fact that he disclosed the doctrine of a resurrection at all. When this is taken into consideration, and there is not, as far as we see, the shadow of a reason why it ought even to be questioned, the reference of Jesus in his answer, to the extent we have considered it, is to the resurrection brought forward for his consideration, viz., the resurrection of the righteous, for it was only to his doctrine regarding them, that the question, "whose wife shall she be?"—could sanely be propounded, inasmuch as the condemned could not have time for any fresh alliances like the one specified, their doom being to perish in their sins, and that without any delay. The longer we consider the passage it seems, therefore, wise, nay imperiously demanded by the necessities of the case, to restrict the reference of the grand words, "neither can they die any more," to the righteous alone.

THE CROSS—A REVIEW.

BY HENRY GREW.

Our respected friend, Mr. Ham, quotes the words of Paul, expressing his desire to "fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for his body's sake, which is the church." After giving Mr. Barnes' exposition of the passage, Mr. Ham affirms, "In his view they ('Christ's sufferings') were *exemplary, not* expiatory." I am assured that he will allow me to do Mr. Barnes the justice of correcting this inference. On reference to Mr. B.'s comments on Rom. 3: 25, he will find the following plain and positive declaration:—"It means that God has publicly exhibited Jesus Christ *as a propitiatory sacrifice* for the sins of men." "In what sense," asks Mr. B., "is he declared to be a propitiation?" He answers (1) "The *main idea*, in regard to the cover of the ark, called the mercy-seat, was that of God's being *reconciled* to his people; this is the main idea in regard to the Lord Jesus, whom 'God hath set forth.' (2.) This reconciliation was effected *then* by the sprinkling of the blood on the mercy seat. Lev. 16: 15. The same is true of the Lord Jesus—by blood. (3.) In the former case it was the blood of atonement; the offering of the bullock on the great day of atonement, that the reconciliation was effected. Lev. 16: 17, 18. In the case of the Lord Jesus it was also by blood; by the blood of atonement. But it was by his *own* blood. This the apostle distinctly states in this verse. (4.) In the former case there was a *sacrifice*, or *expiatory* offering; and so it is in reconciliation by the Lord Jesus. In the former, the mercy-seat was the visible, declared place where God would express his reconciliation with his people. So in the latter, the offering of the Lord Jesus is the manifest and open way by which God will be reconciled to men. (5.) In the former, there was joined the idea of *a sacrifice for sin*. Lev. 16. So in the latter, and hence *the main* idea of the apostle here is to convey the idea of a sacrifice for sin; or to set forth the Lord Jesus as such a sacrifice. Hence the word "propitiation" in the original may express the idea of a *propitiatory sacrifice*, as well as the cover to the ark. This meaning accords also with its elastic meaning to denote a *propitiatory offering*, or an offering to produce reconciliation. Christ is thus represented, not *as a mercy-seat*, which would be unintelligible; but as the medium, the offering, the EXPIATION, by which reconciliation is produced between God and man."

Our friend will perceive, from the above quota-

tions, that so far from Mr. Barnes considering the sufferings of Christ "not expiatory," he considered this "the main idea" of the apostle in Rom. 3 : 25, 26. He also makes this general remark, "When therefore *the blood of Christ* is spoken of in the New Testament, it means the offering of his life as a sacrifice, or his *death* as an EXPIATION." Mr. B. indeed truly affirms that the apostle desired "*to be just like Christ:* alike in moral character, in suffering, and in destiny:" *i. e.*, I apprehend, holy in character, patient in suffering, and to share in his Master's sufferings, and in the glory which is to follow. Mr. Ham may as well infer that these words of Mr. Barnes exclude the truth, that Jesus Christ is the Head of the Church and King in Zion, because he says the apostle desired to be "*in destiny*" "just like Christ," as to infer that his words exclude *expiation* because he says the apostle desired to be "*in suffering*" "just like Christ."

Our friend remarks, "The Cross of the 'orthodox' churches is the symbol of ideas exclusively identified with Christ as the fulfiller in behalf of the human race, of a mission, which the moral government demanded, and which they could not fulfil themselves. It symbolizes the competency to do and suffer, what divine justice made indispensable to the forgiveness of men's sins and their acceptance with God, but for which mankind are wholly incompetent."

Whether or not the Cross was that "which the moral government demanded," the reader may determine for himself by reference to Rom. 3 : 25, 26; Heb. 9 : 22, &c. If the gracious fact, that the saved are "reconciled to God by the death of his Son," does not teach that fallen man is "wholly incompetent" to reconcile himself to God, does it not necessarily follow, that his agonizing death, *for this purpose*, was nugatory and superfluous?

It is objected that "according to Christ's teaching—man himself must *have a Cross*—and take up his cross," &c.; but according to the "orthodox" view, "Christ alone can touch the Cross—he alone can 'take up' the cross, because he alone can express its significance and fulfill its conditions."—What is the argument here? It is this, if the disciple cannot bear a cross *in all respects* as his Master, he cannot bear any cross *at all*. I ask our intelligent friend if this is sound reasoning? I ask him to take a more enlarged view of "Christ's teaching." The dear Savior indeed has taught that every true disciple "takes up" his cross and "bears" it; but when, I ask, for the holy truth's sake, did he ever teach that any disciple must take up *his* cross, or "shed" *his* "blood—FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS," as he taught respecting his own Cross? Certainly, for the honor of the Son of the Blessed, we maintain that, in this sense, "Christ alone can touch the cross—he alone can express its significance and fulfill its conditions." We do say, in reference to this point, to men and angels, to cherubim and seraphim, "stand off," presume not to share an iota of the honor of the Son of God as "the propitiation—for the sins of the whole world." 1 John 2 : 2. Penitent and believing sinners have indeed a precious and glorious "*inheritance*" in the Cross, but "the christianity of the New Testament," while it recognizes some important similarity between the Cross of the Master and that of his disciple, recognizes also an important distinction. This I have proved by the Savior's own words above quoted, and by numerous other passages. This, I submit, proves the fallacy of our friend's inference from the passages relative to the disciple bearing the cross, that "the idea of *expiation* cannot enter into its doctrinal significance" in respect to the Cross of Christ.

Phil. 3 : 10, it is asked, "If Christ's 'sufferings' and 'death' were *expiatory*, how could Paul suppose that his sufferings could be in fellowship with those of Christ, and *his* death be conformable to, or resemble, Christ's death?" I reply that they could not be so *in all respects*, but that they could be so *in various respects*. I respectfully submit to Mr. Ham, whether or not the oversight of this important distinction is not an error interwoven with his eloquent writings. Paul's sufferings were "in fellowship with those of Christ," inasmuch as they were endured in the *same* holy warfare with the powers of darkness, and for the manifestation of the *same* holy truth, In this important sense *his* death was conformable or resembled that of his divine Master. As Mr, H. himself remarks, "The experience of Christ and his disciples is one in principle, when they suffer for righteousness' sake, and one in actual fact, when, like their Master, their uncompromising fidelity costs them their life's blood. Then they drink of the cup that he drank of and are baptized with the baptism wherewith he was baptized." In this respect, they had "*a common experience* with Christ," but this is no proof that Christ had no other experience in which they could not participate.

The General of an army, with his subordinate officers and all his soldiers, have "a common experience;" engaged in the same cause, exposed to similar dangers, toils, and sufferings, they have a a common fellowship. Yet there is an important distinction. The General occupies a "*unique*" position: on him devolves the authority and responsibility of supreme command. In this, not a man in the entire army can participate. Many may fall on the sanguinary field, but the death of the General may be attended with consequences which attach to none other. So the Captain of Salvation and his followers are engaged in the same warfare, and have fellowship in its toils and sufferings, and final glorious victory, the passage to which is through the same gate of death. Yet the death of the former may involve consequences to which the death of the latter may have no claim. As the "one Lord," "Mediator," "Head," and "King," he stands "*unique*" in unrivalled glory.

Our talented friend must yet unite with us "in the new song, saying, Thou art worthy—for thou wast slain, and has redeemed us to God BY THY BLOOD out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation."

"THE DOCTRINE OF THE CROSS."—The *concluding* article of Br. HAM on this subject will appear in our next. The amount of original matter on hand seemed to make it necessary to lay it over this time. We trust this question can be as calmly discussed as any other. Till a writer denies Bible *authority*, we do not judge him out of our christian sympathy if his tempers and life are in harmony with Jesus.—[EDITOR.

A TEST APPLIED.

Br. Storrs—The Rev. R. S. Foster, of your city, in his work on Holiness or Christian Purity, as taught by the Methodists, has some excellent remarks in reply to objections made against that doctrine by its opponents. I should like to call attention to those remarks when applied to the doctrine of the non-immortality of man. Under the head of objections considered, chapter 4th, he says:—

"To the doctrine taught in the foregoing chapters, it is admitted there are some seeming objections; and to what truths are there not? Nor would we account them insignificant. They are apparently weighty and serious; and however clear and conclusive we may think the reasonings upon which the doctrine is based, it is by no means complete until these objections are candidly and completely answered. The work is but half done, when what we conceive to be a clear chain of scriptural and argumentative proofs is presented to the reader. Opposite proofs are presented by antagonists equally respectable for numbers, talents, and piety with ourselves, to disprove our views, and no dogmatism, no assurance, no attenuated chain of reasoning, will meet the case, if there are grave objections unanswered. Errorists declaim much about evidence—make great show of proof—adduce long lists of arguments—flourish trumpets of reasoning; but they avoid the rencontre with objections—they find no heart for this.

"The reason is apparent: much that is plausible may be said in favor of any proposition, but a real objection is difficult to answer, and unanswered must create doubt, if it does not prove fatal. One valid objection is fatal to a million proofs. Truth has no real objections, error has many. Nor would we, in meeting objections, present them in a weak and impaired, aspect. Let us contemplate them in all their strength—in their utmost force. This because it is our interest to know the truth and nothing less, nothing else. We have no interest to dissemble in favor of any theory, however cherished. It is truth alone that we are concerned to know. What, then, are the difficulties encompassing the doctrine for which we contend? Why should we give it a questioning reception, and not at once, with warm cordiality, welcome it into the chamber of our confidence? There are a number of seeming reasons: I say seeming reasons because I hope to show, however plausible, they are not real. They are of sufficient importance to cause to closely examine our ground, but not sufficiently invincible, as I hope, to cause us to abandon it or leave our opposers without excuse.

"1st. The first objection offered is this: The doctrine cannot be true because many Christians do not receive it,—the most learned and excellent divines in great numbers do not receive it, it is not now, and it has not been the belief of the majority of the Church. Many, with undoubted ability and sincerity, have studied the Scriptures for a whole life time, have never found this doctrine therein taught; but an opposite and antagonistic doctrine? How is this to be explained? Were these men, the majority, in error? Were they not equal in ability to arrive at the truth with their opposers? Were they not as candid and sincere? Why then must we believe they were in error? This is no trifling objection. He would be rashly indiscreet, foolishly self-assured, who could turn away from it without consideration.

"But what then have we to weigh against this objection to break its force? An array of other great names, an equal amount of learning and respectability, and candor, and application? No. This might balance, but not settle the difficulty. We meet it with the word of the Lord! One '*Thus saith the Lord*' is more powerful than all the opinions of all the men the world ever contained. The objection is apparently strong, but really feeble. Feeble, because it carries the doctrine to an improper tribunal. It brings incompetent evidence. It is not a question dependent on human opinions, however respectable and worthy of credit; it appeals to one, single, and transcendently higher umpire—*the Word of God*. But what then? Who shall judge what the word of God is? Let every man examine for himself, as he must give an account, and so judge. If he finds the doctrine therein let him embrace it; if not, let him reject it! This is all—this is plain."

Now, if all the array of objections enumerated above are "feeble, without force, and falacious,—are incompetent evidencs, and not worthy of credit, because it carries the doctrine to an improper tribunal, and the only tribunal or umpire is the Word of God," the subject is brought down to a very narrow compass; as "the Scriptures authorize the doctrine, and this in a great variety of methods, with great clearness and frequency, it is not readily to be credited that the same inspired authority teaches another doctrine contrary to this so explicitly inculcated."

The soundness of the above rule will be admitted by every fair and candid mind, and I should really like to have Br. Foster apply the rule to the "one thus saith the Lord," and the one objection which I have to submit:—

1 Tim. 6: 15, 16, "Which in his times he shall show, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the KING of Kings, and LORD of Lords; who *only hath immortality*, dwelling in the light which no man hath seen nor can see: to whom be honor and power everlasting. Amen."

The objection is, the term *immortal* or *immortality*, is not applied to man, in the Old or New Testaments, only as an object to be sought after and to be obtained, as the gift of God, through Jesus Christ alone.

If it were necessary I might multiply texts and objections to the doctrine of inherent immortality, almost without number, but I think the above sufficient.

JEFFERSON MAYELL.

Albany, N. Y., April 22, 1854.

IS THIS INFIDELITY?

BY N. DABB.

The advocates of the soul's immortality, the consciousness of the dead, and the eternal torments of the wicked, frequently prefer the charge of infidelity against those who differ from them on these points. Perhaps they find it easier to do this than to answer their arguments. To show the utter groundlessness of this charge, we submit the following for your consideration :—

Is it infidelity to believe that the Scriptures are the *only* and *all-sufficient* standard, both of faith and practice; and that all religious questions should be submitted to its supreme authority *alone*? "To the law and to the testimony," &c.—Isa. 8 : 20.

Is it infidelity to believe that "The Lord God formed MAN," not a part of him—not his *body* merely, but MAN, the ENTIRE MAN,—"of the dust of the ground?"—Gen. 2 : 7. Observe, he was a *Man* before he lived; then God "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and *Man* became a living soul,"—not an *ever-living* soul, but a "living soul," or creature, or person, as the Hebrew word *nephesh* signifies. This language evidently means no more than that this "breath of life," simply caused the lifeless *Man* to live—to become conscious. He was made *alive* by being made to breathe.

Is it infidelity to believe, that taking away this breath constitutes the DEATH threatened in Gen. 2 : 17? "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die:" Heb., "dying, thou shalt die." We believe this to have been the case; and the true explanation of this text is given by God himself in Gen. 3 : 19 : "Till thou *return* unto the ground, for *out of it wast* THOU *taken*; for *dust* THOU *art*, and *unto dust shalt* THOU *return*." Observe, God says, "dust *thou*,"—not a part of thee, but "dust *thou* art," &c. We believe that the same breath that caused Adam to *live*, inspired all animals with *life*. Hence "they have ALL one breath."—Ecc. 3 : 19. Gen. 7 : 22, "All in whose nostrils was the *breath of life*, [Heb., the breath of the spirit of life,] of all that was in the dry land *died*." Also Gen. 6 : 17. This "breath of the spirit of life," passing through the lungs, and coming in contact with the blood, vitalizes it, and gives it life; hence how appropriate the language, Lev. 17 : 11, "For the *life* of the flesh is in the *blood*." 14 v., "Ye shall eat the blood of no manner of flesh, for *the life of all flesh is the blood thereof*." Also Gen. 9 : 4. These and numerous other passages affirm the blood is the life. Theologians affirm that the life resides in an "immaterial and immortal soul." "Let God be true, but every man a liar;" so said Paul, and so say we. The breath contains the spirit, (or principle of life diffused in the atmosphere.) This principle of life vitalizes the blood, and this, in its turn, gives life to the *flesh*, or entire creature. This spirit is no more a part of the creature, than it was part of Adam before he lived; but it is *essential* to the developement of the functions of life. This breath, or spirit of life, is in God's hands; and is entirely at his disposal. Dan. 6 : 23, "The God in whose hand thy *breath* is." Ps. 104 : 29, "Thon takest away their *breath*; they die, and return to the dust." Ps. 146 : 4, "His *breath* goeth forth, he returneth to his earth, *in that very day his thoughts perish*." Job 34 ; 14, 15, "If he gather unto himself his spirit, and his breath, (i.e., God's spirit, and God's breath,) *all flesh* shall perish together, and *man* shall turn again to dust." Job 27 : 3, "All the while my *breath* is in me, and the *spirit of God* is in my nostrils."

Is it infidelity to believe, that man was created neither mortal nor immortal, but with a capacity for either; his future and final condition being left to be determined by his own obedience or disobedience? Immortality was the great privilege offered to him on the one hand, and death (literal extinction of being,) the penalty on the other.

Is it infidelity to believe, that to this death all the race is doomed through Adam's sin? "By one man sin entered into the world, and *death* by sin, and so death passed upon all men."—Rom. 5 : 12.

Is it infidelity to believe God's word, Hosea 13 : 14, "I will redeem them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from *death*; O death I will be thy plagues; O grave I will be thy destruction." The redeeming plan was introduced to counteract this curse of death. As man had forfeited his privilege of immortality, and become subject to *death*, Christ came, and suffered death for him; that he might have the opportunity of recovering through Christ, what he had lost in Adam.

Is it infidelity to believe that immortality is ONLY to be obtained through faith in Christ? "He that believeth on the Son hath *everlasting life*, but he that believeth not the Son, shall not see *life*." John 3 : 36.

Is it infidelity to believe, that a man cannot be dead and alive at the same time?—that the state of death is a state of unconsciousness? and that "the dead know not anything?" Ecc. : 9 : 5.

Is it infidelity to believe that, for a future existence, man is dependent entirely upon a resurrection from the dead? "For if the dead rise not . . . . then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished."—1 Cor. 15 : 16–18. Our Lord, and his Apostles *invariably* directed their hearers and readers to this, as the great and supreme object of the Christian's hope. "I will raise him up at the last day."—John 6 : 54. "If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection from the dead."—Phil. 3 : 11.

Is it infidelity to believe, that men will neither go to reward nor punishment, until they shall have passed the ordeal of the judgment? "It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this [not heaven or hell, and *then* the judgment, but] the judgment."—Heb. 9 : 27.

Is it infidelity to believe that the second advent of Christ will be pre-millennial, and not post-millennial, as is now generally taught? "For as in the days that were before the flood, they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noe entered into the ark, and knew not until the flood came and took them all away, so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be."—Matt. 24 : 38, 39. In the primitive church the second coming of Christ, and its associated

doctrine, the resurrection from the dead, seemed to occupy the very *first* place in their theology. They were always dwelling upon it : it seemed to be ever present to their minds. This must be evident to all who carefully read Paul's sermons and epistles. But in modern theology, these doctrines occupy a very subordinate position, and are regarded as things of *comparatively* small importance. How is this ? Does it not arise from teaching the unscriptural doctrine, that men go to heaven or hell immediately at death ? for, in that case, what importance can men attach to the advent of Christ and a resurrection ? But if men can have no future existence without a resurrection, and without Christ's coming to raise them, then we see at once why the early christians attached so much importance to them.

Is it infidelity to believe this glorious event is now near, " even at the doors ?"—Matt. 24 : 33.

Is it infidelity to believe, that this earth renovated, and purified from sin, will be the eternal dwelling place of the saints ? and that Christ will here sit upon the throne of his father David, and reign for ever and ever ? Dan. 7 : 27, " And the kingdom, and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom *under* the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High." Ps. 37 : 9 : Matt. 5 : 5. Luke 1 : 32, 33, " And the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David : and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever, and of his kindom there shall be no end." Dan. 7 : 14.

Is it infidelity to believe, that God meant what he said, Ezek. 18 : 20, " The soul that sinneth IT shall die," in a literal, and not in a figurative sense ? Through the whole bible, LIFE and DEATH run together like parallel lines ; and what right have men to alter the plain meaning of God's words ? " I set before you *life* and *death*."—Deut. 30 : 19. " If ye live after the flesh ye shall *die*, but if ye through the spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live."—Rom. 8 : 13. There is not a word in the scriptures about eternal *misery* for the sinner. *Men* use the words very freely, but the bible never. Nor is there one passage, which, if fairly interpreted, gives countenance to the idea. The wicked are threatened with *death, destruction*, and words of like import, but never *once* with eternal, conscious suffering. O that men would be content to take the words of God, as they find them, and not subvert and destroy their meaning, for no other purpose than to support their man-made theories.

Is it infidelity to believe, that when both sin and the sinner shall have been destroyed, the universe shall become " one solid temple of pure good ?" Rev. 5 , 13, " And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever. Amen."

If believing these things constitutes infidelity, then, be it known unto you, men and brethren,—I AM AN INFIDEL.

☞ The foregoing will be issued in a *Tract* in a few days. Price 60 cts. per 100 ; $5 per 1000.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, JUNE 1, 1854.

PROPITIATORY DEATH OF CHRIST.

EDWARD WHITE—author of that excellent work " *Life in Christ*,"—has favored us with a communication on the topic at the head of these remarks. We have long desired that Br. White, Br. Dobney, and others on the other side of the Atlantic, who are with us on the great fact of LIFE ETERNAL *only* through Jesus Christ, might feel themselves at full liberty to express themselves in the BIBLE EXAMINER on other topics connected with this theme, though they might take a different view from us on some points. We are gratified, therefore, that Br. White has given us something from his pen. We shall be pleased to " give " him " the opportunity " he speaks of, in the conclusion of his letter. Anything that exalts our Redeemer, and the love of his Father, in giving us such a Deliverer from *sin and death*, is in harmony with the feelings of our heart—especially if scripturally sustained. On this great subject we have only one desire—one wish : and that is, *to be in exact harmony with the mind of God*. Any doctrine that shall in the least degree lessen in the mind the value or importance of Christ's great work, as God's appointed Deliverer, can have no place in our mind, if we see its tendency is in that direction. The extremes on this—and all other topics —we hope, through the mercy of God, to avoid. Without the *death* of Christ we see no way for man's redemption. If he would lift us up from death he must go where we are to be found.—Death had passed upon all our race, in the sentence, and in its process of execution. Jesus " both died and rose, and revived, that he might be *Lord both of the dead* and living." By his death he has obtained the right to deliver the dead from death : and in his resurrection he brought up the " *keys of death and hades*." But for his death a deliverer never would have entered *hades* or invaded successfully the dominions of death. Christ went down under death that he might *abolish* its power ; for it was " *impossible* " for death to hold one who had not sinned, and upon whom therefore it had no claim ; and especially had it no claim upon, nor could it hold one who had manifested a perfect harmony with the will of God. Such was the fact in Jesus' case. His death became necessary by the entrance of sin into the world, and man's subjection to the power of death in consequence of sin. God subjected the race of Adam to death *in hope*. What is that hope ? It is the hope of the resur-

rection to life eternal. Hence "the Lord Jesus Christ" is "*our hope.*" He is "the Resurrection and the Life." His death—the shedding of his blood—was the price he paid for the right to redeem, or deliver, us from sin and *death.* Not in the sense of dying "*in our room and stead,*" or in the sense of "*paying our debts,*" but that by descending to the lowest condition to which we were subjected, he might lift us up by his life-reviving power: he *touched* our dead condition, and became united to his dead members—all true believers who fall asleep in him—and by virtue of that union God will, by Christ, "at the last day," as certainly raise up to life eternal all such, as that he raised up Christ himself from the dead. In this *special* work of redemption Christ has no partners, nor helpers. He, *alone,* of all that ever dwelt in flesh, died for us—for our redemption—as none other ever did or ever can. To him, and to him *alone,* be all the glory of human redemption; but to God his Father, and our Father, be all the glory of a full and *free* pardon of sins, of his own unbought and boundless mercy, but under the administration of His Son, whom He has given power over all flesh that he might give Eternal Life to as many as God the Father has given him. But we must not detain our readers longer from Br. White's communication.

—

To the Editor of the Bible Examiner:—*My Dear Sir*—On the doctrine of the propitiatory death of Christ, the case, I believe, may be fairly stated thus: Mr. Ham supposes that because the crucifixion of Christ is denounced in the scriptures as an act of wickedness on the part of the perpetrators, it cannot have been in accordance with the will of God, with a view to the expiation of the sin of the word: and, chiefly, if not altogether, on this foundation, he proceeds to explode the doctrine that the death of Christ "answered a great judicial purpose in the moral government of God."

If there be any difficulty in reconciling the wickedness of the crucifiers with the purpose of God in this event, I submit that Mr. Ham must bear the burden of it along with those whom he calls "the priests of a popular prejudice." He maintains that "the obedience unto death of Christ is set forth for our imitation." Obedience implies an authority to whom it is rendered. What was the authority to which Christ rendered obedience unto death?" Clearly it was the authority of God. Christ came into the world to do the will of God. It was then the will of God that Christ should be "obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." God willed that Christ should die. How will Mr. Ham reconcile this with the position that the crucifixion was a "wicked act," an "act uncalled for," an "act most displeasing and offensive to God." It seems, however, that Mr. Ham knows how to regard the crucifixion of Christ in one point or view as a sinful act on the part of men, yet as designed by God to subserve a moral purpose in the administration of the divine government. That purpose he believes to be to afford a pattern for our imitation. He distinctly says that God was not surprised by the crucifixion; that he had foreseen it, and that God "sent Christ into the world" to "set us a perfect example of holy obedience," that being an obedience unto death. Very well. Then, if the crucifixion of Christ, however wicked an act on the part of the Jews, "subserved" one "moral purpose" under the divine government, it may, for anything that appears by this argument, have subserved another. If it were intended by God as an example for our imitation, it may have been intended as an expiatory sacrifice "for the sin of the world." If the wickedness of the act on the side of man forbids us to think that God could have been consenting to the death of Christ in the character of an expiatory sacrifice, that same wickedness must forbid us to think that God could have been consenting to his death in the character of an example of holy obedience. But Mr. Ham maintains that it *was* according to his will that Christ should be obedient unto death as a pattern; and therefore he is prevented, in my judgment, from using the consideration of the wickedness of the crucifiers as an argument to prove that the crucifixion cannot have been "designed to subserve any great judicial purpose in the administration of God." "Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and with wicked hands have crucified and slain." "It pleased the Lord to bruise him; He hath put him to grief." "God commendeth his his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us."

I venture humbly to think that, with all respect for Mr. Ham's superior learning, piety and sagacity, a few considerations on the method of God's dealings with evil will set in a clearer light the fact that there is no inconsistency in the two propositions, that the act of the crucifiers was an enormous crime on their part, while yet the death of Christ was designed by the Almighty Controller of the Universe as a sacrifice for the sin of the world.

It is in the dark sphere of evil that it has pleased the Deity especially to unfold the attributes of

His own perfect and eternal nature; and all the forces and issues of evil have been comprehended within the vast circle of His designs. Sin, being in every case a transgression of law, must be considered as rebellion against the will of God, in one sense of that phrase: but since God has chosen to permit the existence of rebellion, there is another sense in which it is also true that God has willed the existence of that which is contrary to his will. This verbal paradox will not trouble the understandings of any who remember, that in the one case the term *Will* stands for the moral law which God has commanded the creation to obey; in the other it stands for the determination of the Almighty with respect to the results of the free-agency of those who were commanded to obey him.

All evil or sin is the work of sinners, the action of disobediant wills following the promptings of inflamed passion, in opposition to the suggestions of the spirit of God. God has nothing to do with the production of sin. "All that is in the world, the lusts of the flesh, of the eye, and the pride of life, are not of the Father, but of the world." "God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth He any man." But God foresees all sin, the evil acts of evil agents, in the same manner as Christ foresaw Peter's three-fold denial on the night of the crucifixion. How God foresees in all cases, without predestinating the sin, we do not understand. It is one of the mysteries of the Infinite Mind. But even we can see that a person habitually accustomed to any course of thought and feeling will certainly act in a particular manner under pressing circumstances of temptation. And since a fallen nature unrenewed by divine grace, is certain to act according to the inward law of sin and death, a law nearly as regular in its operations as any law of holiness and life in heaven, it is not difficult to conceive that the Omniscient God can trace an indefinite series of motives and passions to their practical results, and foretell with infallible precision the deeds which "wicked hands" will be ready to do.

Further, it is demonstrable from the history of divine revelation, that God, by His omnipotence, limits and restrains the manifestations of wickedness. This He does sometimes for the honor of His own character as Governor of the world, sometimes for the welfare of his obedient servants who might otherwise be overwhelmed by the violence of evil, and sometimes out of compassion to the evil agents themselves. God from his inaccessible throne of glory thus exercises a supreme dominion not only over all the righteous powers of heaven and earth, but also over all the permitted forces of evil present and foreseen: and weaving the whole sum of events into the web of universal providence, He employs all agencies, evil and good, in working out the counsel of His own will;—that highest will which includes for wise, but to us unaccountable, purposes, the temporary permission of evil itself: so that the blind victims of rebellion are yoked along with saints and cherubim, and obliged to draw along the chariot of the many-handed Omnipotence.

The application of these statements to the crucifixion of Christ is, I think, at once easy and just. Into the fabric of the world's evil history the God of love has, from the beginning, woven the shining pattern of the system of redemption. Be has woven, I say, the beautiful threads of his mercy to sinners into the substance of the woof and the weft of the cross purposes of good and sinful agents here below. The foreknowledge of God casting a steady illumination over the boundless future, His foreknowledge of all wicked men, with their tendencies and temptations, was accompanied by a parallel running line of "determinate counsel," as to the manner in which he would cause them to execute his designs. The developement, therefore, of the natural characters of the actors in the condemnation of Jesus, and they included specimens of every variety of wickedness, was made to fit into a different but correspondent series of events and developements in the life and the teaching of Jesus our Lord; as that the "wicked hands" embrued in that "precious blood," without ceasing to be at all the less wicked (since it is the motive that constitutes the sin), actually accomplished the death of Christ, which, viewed on the divine side of the event, was God's method for the redemption of the world. Since "it behoved the Christ to suffer," that event might have been brought about by a direct infliction from the hand of Heaven; but for wise reasons God appointed that sinful men should be the sacrificers of that sacred Lamb, who thus "gave his life for the life of the world," and as "a ransom for many." The Lord sitteth above the water floods! Above the flaming surges of that fiery sea of human and diabolic passion, the Lord sitteth King for ever! He taketh the wise in their own craftiness. The deceived and the deceiver are his. "The things which had before been written, God did so fulfill," and evil, raging in a storm against the monarchy of God, was permitted to strike the blow which has riven the edifice of Satan's dominion down to its foundations. "Through death Christ has destroyed him that had the power of death, that is the Devil, and

delivered them who through fear of death were all their life time subject to bondage."

I do think that these considerations are sufficient to prove that the evil character of the crucifiers is no bar in the way of believing that a judicial moral design was contemplated by God in the death of Christ. That such a judicial moral design *was* contemplated in it, is to be proved by other evidence—the evidence of scripture; and I have no hesitation in saying, that if you will give me the opportunity, I will make it appear that it is impossible to do greater violence to the scriptures than to attempt to expel from them the doctrine of the propitiatory death of our Redeemer, as understood by the Baptist and Congregational churches of our country. I remain, my dear sir, yours sincerely and respectfully. EDWARD WHITE.

THE DISCUSSION.

"DOES THE BIBLE TEACH THAT THE CREATURE MAN—WHICH THE LORD GOD FORMED OF THE DUST OF THE GROUND—HAS A SUPERADDED ENTITY CALLED THE SOUL?"

The Affirmative by Prof. Mattison.

Mr. Editor—I am seeking no advantage over you in the statement of a question. All I ask is, that we may get at the true issue and discuss it. I affirm that we are compound beings, consisting of a material *body*, and an immaterial *spirit*—that the spirit of man *leaves the body at death*, and has a *separate* and *conscious* existence between death and the resurrection. All this you deny. I offer to discuss it, and submit a question fairly involving, as I think, all these points; you decline, but submit in its stead a question which, if rigidly adhered to, might confine us to the composition of Adam alone, and exclude not only all others of our race, but also your own most cherished doctrine of the death of the soul. Besides, I cannot "affirm" that the body of Adam, which returned to dust again ages since, now *has* a soul in connection with it, in the grave. This may be your doctrine, but it is not mine. But that "the creature man—formed of dust *had* a distinct entity called the soul,"—once "superadded," but now separate from it,—I am ready to affirm. And this is precisely what you deny, and what I suppose you wish to deny by taking the negative of the question.

If this is what you mean I am ready to proceed; but I shall not affirm that the body of Adam "has" *now* a soul in the grave, "superadded" to that body.

If, therefore, you wish to confine yourself and me to the composition of Adam, as he *was*, as he walked in Eden before he died; you had better substitute the past tense *had* for the present "has" of your proposition. This done, we shall understand each other, and I shall not be called upon to affirm what I do not believe.

With this slight, amendment, then, which I think will commend itself to your approval, I shall proceed to show that the creature man, which God formed of dust, had, subsequently, a superadded entity called the soul.

But to go to the "root" of the subject, (for which I am no less anxious than yourself,) it will be necessary to show first that there is such a thing as *spirit* in the universe—an essence entirely distinct from matter—and that there are beings or entities composed wholly of spirit. If I can establish this point it will then be in time to show that Adam consisted in part of such an "entity" "superadded" to his body.

My first argument, then, in proof of the existence of spirits, is the existence of a God, who is a spirit. "GOD IS A SPIRIT"—John 4: 24. That God is a pure spirit, immaterial, uncompounded, and indivisible; and unconnected with bodily form or organs I shall not attempt further to prove, unless you deny it. He is "A SPIRIT;" and Christ says expressly, Luke 24: 39, "a spirit *hath not flesh and bones* as ye see me have." Upon the authority of Christ, then, as above cited, I affirm that in God himself we have a glorious specimen of spiritual immaterial existence—a being, thinking, creating, upholding, governing, &c., without a body or material organs. Though he has at times manifested himself to the bodily senses of men, as a flame, a dove, a human form or voice, yet is he the invisible God, whom no man hath seen or can see.—Col. 1: 15; 1 Tim. 1: 17; Heb. 11: 27. Now as the spiritual nature of God is a fundamental point, at the very "root" of the subject, I place it here in the foreground, clearly and distinctly, that you may as distinctly admit, or deny and controvert it. And I will here advertise you that the fact that God is a spirit is a point upon which I shall depend not a little in proving the spirituality and two-fold nature of man. If, therefore, you design to controvert it at all, now is the time to do it. And as you have intimated that our space must be limited in the present number, I pause for you to define your position in regard to this my first argument, and to bring forth your strong reasons. H. MATTISON.

Response by the Editor.

We regret that the question for discussion, as stated by us, should have led Prof. MATTISON to

think there was danger of "confining us to the composition of Adam alone and exclude all others of our race." We really do not suppose there is any material difference between the "composition of Adam" and his posterity; hence we conclude if his composition or constituent parts can be accurately defined, we shall be informed equally as to "all others of our race;" especially, as Paul saith, 1 Cor. 15: "The *first man* Adam was made a living soul; . . . the first man *is of the earth*, earthy; . . . as is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy." We certainly did not expect our friend Mattison to "affirm that the body of Adam . . . *now* has a soul in connection with it, in the grave." Really we did not once suspect our proposition embraced any such idea. Our word "*has*," on which our friend stumbled, was of course designed to embrace the *living race*, or posterity of Adam, who all have their "foundation in the dust" as well as Adam. We have no occasion, therefore to "substitute the past tense, *had*, for the present, 'has.'" We think our readers will understand the matter. By "the creature man, formed of the dust of the ground," we mean any man—every man of the race of Adam.

The Professor's first point is to show, "that there is such a thing as *spirit*—an essence entirely distinct from matter—and that there are beings, or entities, composed wholly of spirit." "Composed," we suppose, here means "*formed*." It can, therefore, have a relation only to *created* beings. An "argument," then, drawn from the nature of the *uncreated* God, we submit, is irrelevant to the question at issue. That "God is a spirit" we do not deny; but because a spirit hath not "flesh and bones" that is no evidence it is "unconnected with" matter in some form. Air has not "flesh and bones," but is matter nevertheless. The same may be said of electricity, and a thousand other things. Jesus did not say that a spirit was destitute of materiality, but only that it possessed not that specific form of it possessed by man, *viz.*: "flesh and bones." Infinite forms of vitalized, or living matter may be in existence, for all we know, without possessing flesh and bones. But whatever is true, or not true, in this direction, the argument drawn from the *uncreated* cannot bear on a *created* being. Whether God is "immaterial" or not we shall not stop to dispute; we have only to say, *It is a pure assumption*, without a particle of scripture authority. "The spiritual nature of God" is not questioned by us, and therefore Bro. M. need not to waste time nor fill space to prove that point. Whether the Prof.'s *notion* of a spiritual nature is true or not, is another point entirely. That he needs to start at such an infinite distance from man is ominous that he is aware there is no *direct* testimony in the Bible in support of the theological notion of a distinct entity superadded to the man of dust, called the soul. How did the Lord God form *man*? He "*formed man of the dust of the ground*."—Bible. Did the Lord God form a distinct entity, called *the soul*, and place it in this man, or any other man? "*Yes*," saith my friend. Well—where is the *testimony* to the fact, if it be a fact? Is there a plain "Thus saith the Lord" for it? We answer, *No*. If there was, our friend would not need to travel up to the *infinite* to get a starting point. But we shall see, as he proceeds, whether he can *descend* from the lofty *ascent* without affirming, "Ye shall be as gods."

IS THE SOUL A DISTINCT ENTITY?

Dear Br. Storrs:—In your remarks in the EXAMINER of April 15th, upon my letter, you state very fairly the previous question which must be settled before our view respecting the nature of the soul, and the intermediate state, can be harmonized, viz.: "Has the creature man, which the Lord God formed of the dust of the ground, a distinct entity, above and besides, called the soul?" What is meant by the phrase "above and besides," I do not quite understand, since no one can suppose that the *mere* body constitutes the man. And if it is urged that the *living or vivified* body makes the man, that simply puts the question in a new form, viz.—Is the *life*, or the *vital power*, a distinct entity? And again, are the *life* and the *soul* the same, or are they different things? These are very important in some respects, and in other respects very unimportant.

Unimportant, because they are questions of philosophy about which we may hold the most varying opinions without harm to our christian faith, and without losing faith in the power of God. And yet important, because they may be connected with our system of faith, to prevent our christian harmony, or to present occasion of scepticism to those who are not christians.

And because they are *prima facie* unimportant, I wish it understood that I do not present my views upon them for the purpose of insisting upon them, though I deem them most scriptural and reasonable. Rather, I deprecate the extended discussion of this subject in a religious journal, for I have seen, and the history of the church is full of, the ill effects of nice questions about our relations to matter, and to the various *forms* and *methods*

of existence. These questions may be very fair and proper in themselves; but an undue love of them begets a habit of mind that is un-moral, and our philosophy (we must have philosophy) comes to be an anatomy of virtue, rather than a love and practice of it. "There is but one way," says Dr. Arnold, "that men of speculative minds can be safe from scepticism: they must pray, and visit the poor." Matter is not inherently evil, as the Manichæans supposed; but both matter and spirit become evil to us, when we discuss the mere nature of either, and our relation to God is forgotten.

But these questions do become important when a doctrine of our relation to matter is proposed with a "Thus saith the Lord" for its voucher. Then, if not before, we must resort to the law and the testimony. The Bible, then, must decide whether the proposed view shall be an article of our christian faith, or a useful or indispensable weapon of our christian warfare. And so, without further prelude, let us come to this question of the distinct and un-material nature of the soul.

One word of definition. By *matter* I mean that kind of substance which is subject to physical laws. By *spirit* I mean that kind of substance which is not subject to physical laws. If any one objects that all substance is of course material, that is saying that my distinction is an idle one, and it implies also that God is material; for the Divine Being is certainly substance, and not mere quality or attribute. If my friend chooses to say, nevertheless, that substance is matter, he is welcome to his definition; only let us understand each other, so we may not talk at cross-purposes. I prefer my definition, which is certainly harmless, as it proves nothing, though it will be convenient if there should appear to be a difference corresponding to my distinction.

And now to the testimony. Does the Bible nowhere state, or intimate, a distinction between the soul and the body? Are they inseparable? If inseparable, are they *mutually* dependent, so that *neither* can subsist without the other? Or, is *one* dependent, and the other capable, under God, of a separate existence? And if one can survive the other, is that survivance, either by the Bible, or by reason, any proof of its immortality? These are fair questions upon which the Bible may throw some light. Or if the Bible, as a revelation of moral duty and of final destiny, gives no *accurate* reply to these questions, then we may form our opinions upon the rational and the possible, and if we avoid dogmatism, no one shall charge us with impiety, or with unbelief.

"Man became a living soul." And because the same man was "formed of the dust of the ground," it is inferred that the body and the soul are, somehow, the same thing, or they are at least uni-fied in the one being, the MAN. And if I say anything about the "breath of life," which was infused into the shapen clay, it is replied that we are not told of this breath becoming the living soul,—but it was the MAN that became a living soul. And it is urged that God "formed man of *matter*—made him a *material* being; and the apostle declares, 'The first man is of *the earth*, earthy.' And Jesus our Lord declares, in the most solemn manner, 'That which is born of the flesh is flesh;' hence . . . till we are *begotten* again by the Spirit of God, men, any man, all men, are animal, material and only such."

Such is the argument. It was *matter* that became a living soul, and therefore man is only material. Let us try the argument and see what it will prove. "THE WORD BECAME FLESH." Now the clothing of the Word with flesh could no more change its nature than the inspiring of the clay with vital breath could change its nature. And certainly the essential Word was not *transmuted* into material and created flesh. What then? Why, by the same method of reasoning as above, our Lord and Savior, in his incarnation, was Logos, Word, "*and only such.*" His body was either no part of his being, or it was so absorbed in his being as to be no longer distinct and material; and we are driven, in spite of ourselves, to the doctrine of the Docetæ, who began in the very age of the apostles to deny our Lord's humanity, and to whom allusion is made in 1 John 4: 1–3.

I will only add, that word "became" is full of meaning, and hard to understand, in all human languages. To me the second chapter of Genesis appears to prove, not that man is simply material, but the very opposite. This inference will bring upon me a clamor of questions from various quarters, respecting man as compared with the brute, the argument for his immortality, &c., which, with Bible help, I will try to answer soon.

Yours, truly, C. F. HUDSON.

RESPONSE TO BR. HUDSON, BY BR. GREW.

Dear Br. Storrs:—I cheerfully comply with your request to make a few remarks on Br. Hudson's letter.

Our design, I apprehend, is not to enter upon the "questions of philosophy," important or "unimportant," which have no bearing on our Father's revealed truth in the New Testament of his love in Jesus Christ. We would prefer to comply with

"Dr. Arnold's" suggestion, to "pray and visit the poor." These important duties, however, we suppose to be properly consistent with the free discussion of any philosophy which presumes to nullify any part of "The doctrine of the Lord," which abideth forever. Such philosophy the inspired apostle has well denominated "oppositions of science falsely so called."—1 Tim. 6 : 20. Br. Hudson accords with us, in the solemn obligations to obey the divine injunction, "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men—and not after Christ."—Col. 2 : 8. Any and every philosophical dogma which denies the divine testimony, that fallen man is "MORTAL,"—Job 4 : 17 ; that "the wages of sin is DEATH,"—Rom. 6 : 23 ; that in the very day of death man's "*thoughts* perish," also his *love, knowledge*, with all mental powers ; Ps. 146 : 4 ; Eccles. 9 : 5, 6, 10 ;—any and every philosophical dogma which predicates human immortality, or eternal life, on man's inherent nature, and not on the gratuitous "gift of God through Jesus Christ our Lord,"—Rom. 6 : 23 ; we assign to the category of the wisdom which "is foolishness with God."

Nor is this all our objection to the popular theory of the nature of MAN. This theory, while it annuls the decree that he, the guilty *man*, shall return to dust, and invests him with an indestructible element which bids defiance to the power of death ; divests and robs the doctrine of the Resurrection of MAN of all its truth and glory. What does that theory assign to be resurrected? The MAN, whom the voice of inspiration has declared has PERISHED, if there be no resurrection ?—1 Cor. 15 : 18. Nay, verily ; but a mere appendage, unessential to his vitality and glory. The theory, so far from admitting the scriptural testimony, that death introduced *man* into a state where "there is neither knowledge or device," assures us, that it is the very hour in which he is "made perfect in holiness," and in which he shall "immediately enter into glory."

We ask Br. Hudson if these divine testimonies do not necessarily involve a negative answer to the question "Is the soul a distinct entity" from the material organism? The question is not, whether or not there is *any distinction* between body, soul and spirit. The question is, whether or not, after the Creater had "formed MAN of the dust of the ground," he created and imparted to the *man* thus formed, any spirit, or substance, any thing whatever, capable of vital conscious existence independent of the man formed of the dust of the ground? What is the addition, in the divine testimony, to the declaration that God formed MAN of the dust of the ground? Simply, that he "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." Is it possible that our intelligent brother can suppose that such a declaration is an adequate basis for the popular theory of a "distinct" independent, indestructible "entity?" Must he not perceive that the foundation of his superstructure "is in the dust?" We ask him to put this declaration, together with the injunction, "Cease from man *whose breath is in his nostrils*," into his metaphysical crucible, and see if it is possible to transmute them, so as to sustain the affirmative of the question at issue. Is not the latter passage of eternal truth a complete refutation of the popular exposition of the former?

It pertains to our respected brother, who at present, we understand, adopts the affirmative of the question at issue, to sustain it by scriptural proof. Hoping that, by the grace of God, truth is our object, we ask him to do so. We thank him for his proposal to "try" to do it. In the letter before us, we find but little argument directly bearing on the question. It is not necessary to the determination of the question of "a distinct entity," to ascertain accurately the properties either of matter or spirit. These indeed transcend, in some respects, the powers of the most acute philosopher. The question is to be determined by the word of the Lord, in which not a single declaration is found that man, *in the general*, or that ever a single man, *by nature*, is immortal.

We ask our brother to favor us with answers, from the Sacred Scriptures, to the "fair questions," proposed in his letter. He refers to the arguments of opponents, but does not, in his first communication, attempt to show their fallacy, with the exception of one or two. In reference to the proposition that "it was matter that became a living soul, and therefore man is only material," Bro. H. remarks, "Let us take the argument and see what it will prove. 'The Word became flesh.' Now the clothing of the Word with flesh could no more change its nature than the inspiring of the clay with vital breath could change its nature."

I understand that the incarnation of the Son of God *did* constitute some change in the nature of his entire person, which then additionally consisted of the "body prepared," *not before assumed*. So also the vital breath changed the nature of the *inanimate* man ; by this he 'became a living soul,' or person, which previously he was not. The vital breath did not change the *materiality* of the organic man, neither did the incarnation change the *spirituality* of the Son of God, but in both cases

there was a change in the persons. Adam became a *living* man, and our blessed Lord became the Logos, or Word '*made flesh*.'

But Br. Hudson's question is not, Is man *only* material? It is, "Is the soul a *distinct entity?*" Man may be, and is, a compound being, although his component parts are incapable of distinct and independent vital entity, We do not affirm, *unqualifiedly*, that man is *only* material. The Creator has endowed the material organism with understanding, will, and affection. The question is, do these powers pertain inseparably to the material organism, or to a distinct independent entity? We can find no authority, in either reason or scripture, to deny the former. Our reason requires no denial of the power of God to endow matter with thought. It involves no contradiction. Scripture affirms the cessation of thought with the cessation of animal life.—Ps. 146 : 4. If thought, memory, and affection, prove a "distinct entity in *man*," they prove the same in brutes. If this *is* proved, it constitutes no proof of *immortality*, either for soul or body. This depends on the will of the Creator. On Him every thing is dependent. "He can create and he can destroy." We will wait for our brother's proofs.

HENRY GREW.

To Prof. H. Mattison.

Dear Sir—You are reported in the BIBLE EXAMINER to have said that "the immortality of the soul had not been called in question since the days of our Savior till within the last ten years."

I was amazed at this statement. The following facts are an indication that "Professors," even, *can* be mistaken; and further that it is dangerous to profess acquaintance with that of which we are ignorant.

In the time of Origen, about two hundred years after Christ, a body of men in Arabia asserted that "the human soul, as long as the present state of the world existed, perished at death and died with the body, but that it would be raised again with the body at the time of the resurrection."—Eusebius' Eccl. Hist., Book VI.. Chap. 37.

Read it for yourself—a Professor should read Eusebius and *remember* it too.

About 170 years after Christ, lived a man named Tatian: you may have heard of him. Will you tell me what these words, found in his Oration against the Greeks (c. 13), signify? "*Ouk estin athanatos e psuke kath eauten.*" As you are a *Professor* you do not need to have this translated, and as in your judgment there is not *one* among the believers of this doctrine capable of translating it, I leave it to you, with the bare hint that a *Professor* might be expected to find in it a very distinct intimation shat the soul was *not immortal of itself*.

For your further information, I will give you the words of Dr. A. Clarke, who was as well acquainted with such matters as most Professors, and as this is in plain English it does, not need a translation. Giving Tatian's opinion, he says that the "*Soul cannot be immortal* without union with the Holy Spirit; but partaking of the nature of the flesh *while living without God, dies with the body!*"—Clarke's Succession of Sacred Literature, page 98.

Other "fathers" held an opinion somewhat similar. Justin Martyr and Theophilous, as well as Tatian, "from various reasons, supposed the existence of a soul, which, though *mortal in itself*, or at least indifferent in relation to mortality and immortality, either acquired immortality as a *promised reward*, by its union with the spirit and the right use of liberty; or, in the opposite case, *perishes with the body*."—Hagenbach Hist. of Doctrines, vol. 1, p. 162.

Irænius Adv. Hær. ii., 64, speaks of an immortality which is given to man, which is "*Non enim ex nobis, neque, ex nostra natura vita est, sed secundum gratiam Dei datur.*"

Arnobius, who lived about A. D. 306, propounded the idea of the "total annihilation" of the wicked.—Hagenbach, vol. 1, p. 241.

Lactantius, about the same time, when the immortality of the soul was generally believed, "did not regard it as the natural property of the soul, but as the reward of virtue."

I cannot linger longer here. Platonism, heathenism, and other similar systems, made fearful havoc with the truth. Origen—the great defender of the doctrine of natural immortality linked with it the preexistence of the soul, and taught that we might believe in Christ without believing the resurrection, provided we believed firmly the natural immortality of the soul. The Gnostics denied a future resurrection, and taught that the souls of the just ascended immediately to heaven; which doctrine, after being termed *heresy* for near one thousand years, was decreed to be *truth* by the *Roman Church* (at the Council of Florence, I think), and has since been "orthodox" enough—for the majority of those who claim to be the orthodox party—only when hard pressed by our arguments. Then they find it very convenient to take another position.

In 1170, we find among the Jews, Maimonides, called by Dr. Clarke "the most philosophic and intelligent of all the later Jews," declaring the punishment of "excision," or cuttiug off, mentioned in the Law of Moses, "to be restricted to the future life only, and to consist in the total annihilation of the intellectual soul."—See his Com. on the *Mischna*, tr. Sanhedrim, chap. ix. and xi., and *Yad Hachazaka*, vol. 1. *Hilcoth Teshubah*, chap. viii., sec. 1, 5.

Averhoes, an Arabian philosopher who died (according to Leo. Africanus, c. 20), A. D. 1206, denied the distinct existence and immortality of the human soul. He was the most celebrated of all the Arabian philosophers and physicians.

In later times, Luther wrote (Jan. 13, 1522), "It is probable, in my opinion, that with very few exceptions, indeed, THE DEAD SLEEP IN UTTER INSENSIBILITY TILL THE DAY OF JUDGMENT." And you must know that in the twenty-seventh proposition of his defence he reckons the immortality of

the soul with other monstrous opinions found in the Roman dung-hill of decretals.

Cardinal du Perron charges Luther with believing and teaching the mortality of the soul, thereby opposing purgatory. No one has ever been able to contradict successfully that charge, from the fact that we have the statement in Luther's own words. See his letter to Amsdorf.

Sir Thomas More, in his attack on Luther, charges him with teaching that man should, "after this life, feel neither good nor evil in body or soul, till the day of doom:" and Tyndale, the first translator of the Bible into English, so far from denying it to be the teaching of Luther, affirms it to be the very doctrine of Christ and his Apostles. —See Tyndale's answer, Book 4, chap. 9.

In 1530, Wm. Tracy, in his will, committed himself to God, "trusting without any doubt or mistrust, that by his grace and the merits of Jesus Christ, and by virtue of his passion, and of his resurrection, I have and shall have remission of my sins, and RESURRECTION OF BODY AND SOUL, according as it is written (Job 19), I believe that my Redeemer liveth, and that in the last day I shall rise out of the earth, and in my flesh shall see my Savior."

I might add a large number of names to the list I have produced, but I leave these *facts* to combat your *assertion* that the immortality of the soul has not been denied since the time of Christ. Such is not the fact, and if you care as much for truth, as an honest man ought, you will be willing to confess your mistake.

Will you allow your hearers to believe and report that no one since the days of Christ, but a few men within the last ten years, have denied the immortality of the soul?

This is not a matter of argument but of *fact*. Are you willing that men should know *the truth*, or are you determined to imitate the policy of Rome, whose infallible *decrees* have done more to sustain the doctrine of natural immortality than all the writings of holy men of old?

I trust you are an honest man; I do not suspect that you would misrepresent—I regard your statement only as an evidence of lack of knowledge and too great confidence in your position.

I have a dilemma here: I must believe that you did not understand the subject you were talking about, and hence you stated things for truth, of which you had *no evidence*, or else I must assume that you knew the facts, but contradicted them by your statements. As lack of information is more pardonable than falsity, I accept the former alternative, remembering, too, that you will, in your own estimation at least, be equal to those men who "*know nothing of Hebrew or Greek*," and who, consequently, are not to be trusted in their expositions of scripture.

I might cite other authors that have written on this subject, but perhaps these few hints will lead you to look for yourself. I trust the result may be for the glory of our common Lord.

I close with disclaiming any feeling of unkindness or animosity toward you,—wishing you success in the investigation of truth, I remain,

Very truly yours, H. L. HASTINGS.

THE DISCUSSION,—The Question—"*Does the Bible teach that the creature man—which the Lord God formed of the dust of the ground—has a superadded entity called the soul?*" has now two able advocates of the *affirmative* side, who have taken up the question so near at the same time, that we have judged best to let BR. HENRY GREW follow BR. HUDSON in the argument, while we give our attention to PROFESSOR MATTISON. With these two able champions on the affirmative we doubt not the best that can be said will be forthcoming. Others on the *negative* of the question might possibly do better than Br. Grew or ourself, but we shall neither of us admit that others can excel us in desires to know exactly what the Lord saith on this question; nor in a readiness to confess, if we find ourselves in error. The EDITOR of the EXAMINER takes no responsibility for Br. Grew's sentiments in responding to Br. Hudson, nor does he expect Br. G. to be at all responsible for any sentiments the Editor may advance: the discussion will be conducted in the language which each writer, as an independent man, shall think right to employ. Our prayer is, that God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, may shine into all our hearts, that truth may be elicited; and that all of us, engaged in this discussion, may sit at Jesus' feet, and solemnly listen to, and learn the truth at the mouth of God; and may the readers be profited both by the matter and spirit of this discussion. The commencement of the Argument will be found following Br. White's communication.

LETTERS.—We have been obliged to withhold several letters intended for this number. Our friends have continued to express their sympathy for us, and their kind words deeply draw upon our affection for them. We learn that numbers of those who have aided us have themselves sustained severe losses within a short time past. The time will soon come, beloved, when all our losses and trials will cease in the kingdom of God, if we endure patiently unto the end, We, doubtless, shall find there has been a "*need be*" for every trial and loss that has attended our pilgrimage here.

☞ BR. WALTER PRATT'S Post Office address is Windsor, Conn.

DONATIONS since May 15th: Geo. Pease, $1; Peterson & Lenfest, $1; Isaac Dimmick, $2,55; additional from friends in Philadelphia, $20; Catharine Colver, $1; Roswell Hart, $3; Sarah Porter, $1; Joseph J. Ely, $1; F. A. Bronson, $5.