BIBLE EXAMINER.

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

VOL. IX. NEW YORK, JUNE 15, 1854. NO. 12.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY

At No. 140 Fulton-street.

TERMS---One Dollar for the Year:

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CROSS.

THE CROSS—THE ATONEMENT FOR SIN.

BY J. PANTON HAM.

[Concluded from page 150.]

In view of the remarks made under the preceding section, the reader will experience no difficulty, but, on the contrary, will perceive a peculiar propriety and force in those Scripture expressions which attribute to the blood of Christ a morally cleansing virtue. Thus, "The blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth us from all sin;" "How much more the blood of Christ, . . purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God;" "These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb," &c. Under the Levitical dispensation, blood as well as water was a symbolical instrument of purification, —when sprinkled, whether on persons or the sacred utensils of the sanctuary, it denoted sanctification, or purification: and this analogy between the old and new dispensation is marked by the Apostolic writers, when, in their native Judaic rhetoric, they speak of "the blood of sprinkling," and "the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ;" obviously denoting the great idea of personal purification, through the moral influence of the blood of Christ.

The blood of Christ has a moral influence on the conscience and heart of mankind, because it expresses the great sacrifice which he made in their behalf. It was shed by violent hands while he was engaged in the merciful work of revealing God to men, and laboring to instruct and reform them, that they might be personally fitted for the salvation of an endless life. It is therefore an appeal to the universal heart, and adapted to awaken a universal echo of responsive gratitude. It is the voice of perfect love, claiming its recognition, and provoking a return, When seen as the sacrifice of love,—the love, not only of Him who bled, but of *Him who was imaged* in the bleeding humanity of the Christ, that heart must be callous indeed which is not stirred to its lowest depths, and does not offer itself a whole burnt offering on the high altar of its faith. In the presence of such a sacrifice the hardest heart should be propitiated, and the most determined enmity atoned or reconciled to God. It is because the blood of Christ is the manifestation of Divine love, that the sin of men is so great, and their punishment so deserved, when, by despising its touching utterance, they have virtually "trodden under foot the blood of Christ, . . , and done despite to the spirit of grace." For such, obviously, "there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries," because there is no greater sacrifice to be made,—no higher expression of Divine love to be given. "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." And as God has condescended to express his love to us through the mediation or medium of a man, he can only express even his own infinite emotion through such a finite medium. We are accustomed to regard the sacrifice of life as the greatest which one man can make in behalf of another; we always accept it as the most perfect evidence of a perfect love. If then such a sacrifice fails to convince the heart, and take it captive for God, then no other more potent sacrifice for the destruction of the heart's sins can be made,—"there remaineth (in the nature of things) no more sacrifice for (the conquest of) sins." The highest agency,—the most perfect and powerful means, has been put into operation, and if without effect, nothing more can be done. Christ pre-eminently is "the power of God for salvation," and if in the case of any he proves powerless, salvation is impossible,—the judgment of a just wrath must await the indurated soul, which has destroyed its natural instincts and holy sensibilities by sin. Are we wrong in surmising that herein lies the unpardonable sin,—the sin against the Holy Spirit of God,—breathing itself in beneficent fulness on the barren soul of the blasphemer of his love? No doubt the denial of the Divine love in the blood of Christ is *a* "blasphemy against the Holy Spirit," and its final perseverance *an* "unpardonable sin." For surely no greater offence can be given to God than to give the lie to this declaration of his love, after the revelations he has made concerning it; and no condition can be more hopeless than that which fails to feel the force of love, uttered with so much significant intensity.

If love cannot convert the heart to God, no other power can. Severity does but make the sinful soul still more stubborn in its sinfulness. If the Lamb of God taketh not away the sin of the world, no lion energy will do the mighty work. If the blood of Christ cleanseth not from all sin, every drop must be drained from the sinner's veins in vain. God knows humanity better than it knows itself, and he has declared his knowledge, that the true cleansing power, which can wash away all sin, is

Love. Hence he put this mighty moral force in operation when he "so loved the world as to give his only begotten Son" for it, and when it pleased him that his Son should be bruised for the purification of our iniquities, for "by his stripes we are healed," if healed at all of our spiritual disease;—we have "washed our robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb," if the "robes" of our righteousness are really "washed" and "made white." Christ on the cross, because the full expression of the love of God is the true "Fountain opened for sin and uncleanness." Have we known by blessed experience the purifying and healing virtue of this "Fountain?" Have its sanctifying waters flowed in their purging course upon our consciences and lives,—destroying within us the sense and service of sin? Then indeed may we unite with the ransomed Church, in ascribing all the praise and glory "unto him that loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood."

Such being the moral significance and power of the Cross, or, which is the same thing, the blood, or death of Christ, it is apparent how it has become pre-eminently *the Atonement for Sin.* The word atonement,—it ought to be carefully remembered by all who would have clear and just views of this great subject,—is a word which, when employed by our translators of the English Bible, was used as the equivalent of the word *reconciliation,* as its etymology, as well as its usage in the New Testament, clearly establishes. It has now another, and widely different signification,—that of making amends for any thing, or any person,—a sense which it has derived through the much lamented prevalence of a most false and vicious scheme of theology in the Christian Churches. The literature of the word atonement will abundantly testify to the truth of our statement, when we affirm that it ought to be understood, in its New Testament use, as equivalent to Reconciliation. In the Old Testament it is the translation of a word which means to *cover*:—hence the phrase "to make atonement," is literally to *cover.* The idea is that of covering over sins by a gratuitous forgiveness, on certain conditions, which God represented by means of those sacred symbols of sacrifice which he instituted for the instruction of his ancient church. In Leviticus, chap. 17: 11, we read, "It is the *blood* that maketh an atonement for the soul,—literally, it is the blood that maketh a *covering* for the soul or person of the sinner. In New Testament phraseology we should read it thus: "It is the blood that maketh *reconciliation* for the soul or person." Understanding, then, the blood to be that of Christ, we have already seen how it operates as a moral drawing power on the heart of man, binding him in grateful allegiance to Christ, and through Christ, to God, so establishing a reconciliation, or at-one-ment, between man and God. Herein is the true reconciliation, or atonement, effected by the cross:—a reconciliation, be it carefully observed, *not of God to man,* but of *man to God.*

It is often overlooked that a very marked precision distinguishes the language of the sacred writers on the subject. They uniformly exhibit the reconciliation as looking towards *man,* and no towards God. It is *man* who needs to be reconciled or atoned, *not* God. "If when *we were enemies,*" writes an Apostle, "*we* were reconciled to God by the death of his Son." "And having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him *to reconcile* all things *unto himself.* And *you,* who were sometimes *alienated,* and *enemies in your mind,* by wicked works, yet now hath he *reconciled,*" (i. e. "*you.*") "That he might *reconcile both unto God* in one body by the cross, having *slain the enmity thereby,*" (i. e. *man's enmity to God.*) "All things are of God, who hath reconciled us unto himself by Jesus Christ." "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself." "For if the casting away of the Jews be the reconciling of the world." "We pray you in Christ's stead, (for this was Christ's mission,) be ye reconciled to God."

In all these texts which we have quoted, to make apparent our statement, it will be observed that it is uniformly said that it is *man* who is at enmity with God, and who needs to be reconciled; and therefore it is in keeping with this representation that the Apostle Paul, in the *only* verse where the word atonement occurs in the New Testament, says that it is *man,* and *not* God, who has received the atonement. "And not only so, but we also joy in God, through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom WE *have now received the atonement,*" or reconciliation. The atonement of the Bible, then, is not the doing something to God as a compensation or satisfaction, but a doing something for man as a means of propitiating or reconciling him to his Maker. As represented in Scripture, it is the practical energy of a powerful persuasion,—an eloquent and heart-stirring appeal made by Christ, in the name of God, to mankind. It is atonement, not as a judicial satisfaction to God, but as a moral propitiation of man. It is the assault of a powerful love on the hearts of aliens and "enemies to God by wicked works." The heart that yields is reconciled, or atoned to God, and for that reason is the receiver of the atonement, or reconciliation. Thus Christ is "the propitiation for (or on account of) our sins." He propitiates *not* God, but *us,* because of our sins, which cause us to be at enmity with God. In order to accomplish our reconciliation, the Apostle Paul tells us that "God hath set Christ forth to be a propitiation, *through faith in his blood.*" He who has faith in Christ's blood,—who believes it to be the expression of his own and his Father's love for man, feels the power of that blood,—is conscious of its moral influence on his heart as a propitiating agency,—and by the eloquence of its condescending utterance, returns propitiated and penitent to his Father's house, saying, "Father I have sinned against heaven and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy son." Shall we not say with the beloved Apostle, in the contemplation of this wonderful scheme of atonement, or reconciliation, by the propitiatory blood of Christ, "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins."

The reader, who may have accompanied us with some degree of distrust and anxiety in the outset of our inquiry into the proper scriptural significance of the cross of Christ, will, we presume, by

this time, see that we had no design to lower the appreciation of this great fact of Christian doctrine, but, on the contrary, to extricate it, so far as our abilities enable us, from that irrational and irreligious confusion by which it is enveloped in the popular faith. We cannot understand Christianity without the *cross*:—deprive it of this, and you dislocate the whole system of revealed truth, and render Christianity an imperfect and powerless thing. "Christ must *needs* have suffered and risen from the dead." He must "needs have suffered" for the perfection of his own example, and for the power of that persuasive eloquence which the cross pre-eminently possesses. Hence, we add to, rather than diminish, the force of our Lord's emphasis, when, after his resurrection, he said to his disciples, "Thus it is written, and thus it *behoved* Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day."

In our view of the nature of the cross, and its value in the Christian system, it is an indispensable fact, inasmuch as it gathers to itself the highest practical influence of Christianity The cross, as we apprehend it, is a mighty moral power, indeed, *the* power which takes the heart captive, and trains it for the enjoyment and service of God. It is not a thing to tremble before in the paralysis of a sin-stricken fear, but a fact to feel grateful for, and whence to derive the inspiration of a generous faithfulness. On this account we need a cross in our notions of Christianity: we need, not only a Christ, but a "Christ *crucified*." A Christ without a cross might possibly be a human creation, but it could not possibly be the creation of God. It "must needs" be that Christ should have a cross,—in the very nature of things it could not be otherwise. It may be a "stumbling block" to the religious Jew, and "foolishness" to the philosophical Greek, because they know not the nature of highest virtue, and how it ever fares in our world; they know neither the perfection nor the omnipotence of love. But to God, and also "to them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ is the power of God, and the wisdom of God."

But we must not dismiss this grand subject without saying a word or two on the relation of the cross to the Forgiveness of Sins. In the popular scheme of theology, the cross of Christ was a judicial arrangement to make the forgiveness of sins possible, by transferring the punitive deserts of sin to a substitute. We pause not to expose what must be apparent on the least reflection,—the contradiction involved in the statement that sin is both punished and pardoned at the same time. We shall merely declare what, in our judgment, is the true relative position of the cross to the forgiveness of sins, and this may be set forth in very few words. As we apprehend the cross of the New Testament, it is the agency by which God effects the repentance and reformation of sinful men. It is a moral energy for subduing the heart's enmity, not an artificial equivalent to satisfy certain imaginary demands of inflexible law. The cross, if we understand its moral significance, does not *purchase* the sinner's pardon, but *prepares* him personally for it, by transforming his character, and making him the subject of holy dispositions and desires. Forgiveness is a gratuity on the simple conditions of faith and repentance,—faith in the message and mission of Christ as the necessary preliminary to repentance. It is a strange doctrine which represents forgiveness as impossible to God, and asserts his obligation to take vengeance on all sin, as well repented of, as not repented of. It is strange both to our moral sentiments and practice, and we think also strange to the Christianity of the Bible. God is not satisfied by taking vengeance on our sins, so much as by turning us away from the paths of vice. The cross was a satisfaction to him,—in it he was well pleased, because it possesses that power of persuasion which effectually redeems the sinner from the love and service of sin, and fits him to appreciate and profit by the grace of a free forgiveness. And thus the Apostle tells us that "according to the good pleasure of his will he hath made us accepted in the beloved; in whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace."

Our view of the cross of Christ unites it indissolubly with the grace of forgiveness, for it makes faith in Christ, and, of course, in his cross, a prerequisite to being morally influenced thereby, so as to discover our own sinfulness, and need of salvation. Until we believe in Christ we do not place ourselves in that sympathetic relation to him which enables him to act upon us as "The fountain opened for sin and uncleanness." But as soon as we believe the heart-stirring facts of his mission, and the sacrifice he made in fulfilling it, those healing waters flow in upon our moral consciousness,—"His stripes," endured in our behalf, heal us of our sinful diseases,—his "blood" shed for us, "cleanses us from all sin." Thus the forgiveness of our sins, as well as every other Gospel blessing, is through the medial agency of the Lord Jesus Christ, who is both the bearer of this heavenly grace, and the begetter within us of that repentance which is the indispensable condition of its enjoyment. In the view of this two-fold relation of Christ, to the forgiveness of sins, a very considerable emphasis is imparted to the memorable words of the Forerunner of our Lord, "Behold the Lamb of God that *taketh away* the sin of the world."

Finally, the doctrine of the Atonement, as we have represented it, is no longer a dry speculative dogma of scholasticism, and a professional theology, but a practical matter of immense personal concernment. Instead of being a subject for occasional discourse, as among the abstruser mysteries of the Christian doctrine, it is brought forward into fore-ground prominence, as the grand burden of the Christian ministry, to all who are unreconciled to God. So at least Paul viewed it. He calls the Christian ministry the "ministry of atonement." The term "reconciliation," which, as we have before observed, is the same in meaning as atonement, may be used interchangeably with that word. It occurs in its verbal and nominal forms in 2 Cor. 5: 18–20, and the same Greek word is used there as in Romans 5: 11, where it is translated "atonement." By substituting the word "atonement" in the passage first mentioned, the

force of our remark about the practical prominence of the doctrine of atonement in the Christian ministry will be apparent. Paul there says "All things are of God, who hath *atoned* us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given unto us *the ministry of atonement*, namely, that God was in Christ *atoning* the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them, and hath committed unto us *the word* [doctrine] *of atonement*. Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us; we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye *atoned* to God." "For," to paraphrase his words which are so extensively misunderstood, "God hath given him, who committed no sin, to be set forth a propitiatory offering for us, that we, being propitiated by him, might, through his moral agency, become workers of the righteousness of God." The true Christian preacher persuades men to be reconciled to God, by representing to them the greatness of the Divine love to sinners, of which the cross of Christ is the highest expression. He shows how

> God's beseeching voice is here,
> Bidding hence all servile fear;
> Breathing forth its tenderest strains,
> In words of blood, in dying pains.

And when sinners so interpret the high significance of the cross,—when it is to them "as though God did *beseech* them" by the soul-stirring eloquence of blood, shed to serve and save them,—and when yielding to this eloquent appeal, their sinful hostility is subdued, and they become humble suppliants at the footstool of mercy,—*then* is the atonement, or reconciliation accomplished,—*then* is it actually made for the individual sinner. Its historic occurrence is *then*, when the sinner yields to the moral power of the cross, and, repenting of his sins, becomes reconciled or atoned to God. To us there is no mystery in the atonement, other than its own intrinsic mystery of love. And other than this we know of no Christian atonement. The Gordian knot of the "extent of the atonement," as it is theologically phrased, is easily untied by the simple theory which we advocate. It extends just so far as it is effectual in reconciling sinners to God through Christ. Every addition to the true church of repenting sinners is a new extension of the atonement, and when sinners cease to be recovered and reconciled to God, the atonement halts in its Divine work of conciliation, and awaits a further extension among men.

Would that the preachers of Christianity knew that the "ministry of atonement" was committed to them, and, instead of disputing about the extent of a fancied satisfaction, sought to extend the atoning agency of Christ, by proclaiming that "God was in Christ atoning the world to himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them!" Would that, throwing aside the false and mischievous speculations which they mistakenly designate the atonement, they would startle the slumbering sinner, by assuring him that as yet no atonement has been made between him and his Maker!—that the cross of Christ is ever seeking to effect that atonement,—and that unless atoned now, while the day of grace surrounds him with its golden sun-light, he must die un-atoned, and share the destruction of those who perish everlastingly!

Men know not that the bleeding Christ is the image of a beseeching God,—that the cross is the loud cry of Almighty compassion. The atonement in its sublimest and most powerful ministry, is not yet administered but on a very limited scale. Now that the world has almost lived its Christian history, and the signs of the times indicate that the Son of Man is nigh at hand, even at the doors,—theological men are beginning to discover this long lost ministry of love, and beginning to apply it! But it is as yet a mooted point: the popular churches have not yet recognized it, and the few that have are cast out as reprobates and heretics! Before we can hope to see "the ministry of atonement" in active operation in the churches of our land, it must pass into favor with the spiritual sanhedrim, and receive the broad seal of authority of the high priests and scribes of Christendom. More than eighteen hundred years ago, Christ sealed it with his own blood, and nearly as long ago the Apostles published to the world that God had committed unto them "the word or doctrine of atonement," to preach as the grand burden of their Christian ministry to all who were still unreconciled to God. And now the churches deny this trust, and instead of preaching an atonement that has power to woo the heart, and work the reformation of the life, they teach mankind a theological tradition, which shocks the moral sentiments, and has no influence, save a detrimental one, on the masses of society. Christ, when he expired on the cross, kindled a fire in the world to burn up its enmities, and bend the iron stubbornness of the soul into a grateful and willing service; but religious men have cooled it down by their crude conceits till now it is at the very zero of spiritual efficiency. The cross, which is the most wonderful illustration, among the wonderful works of God, of his skill in bringing good out of evil, and making the wrath of man to minister to his praise, has been distorted by the theology of the popular churches, into the most awful tragedy which the world has ever been called to gaze on,—a tragedy in which the benignant Father himself is represented in the most revolting character,—a character which we cannot love,—which neither our instincts nor the principles of the religion of Christ will permit us to love. The cross, which, in the theology of the New Testament, is so unequivocally proclaimed to be "the power of God" for the conversion of men, is, through the theology of the churches, their greatest perplexity. That which was designed to reconcile us to God has been perverted into an instrument to repel men from one another,—to foment prejudice, party-feeling, and even violent persecution! Of what wrongs and wickedness has not the cross been made the symbol and servant! When it was erected into a power, it was made the power of violence, and bloodshed, and murderous wars; and now that the traditions of men have made it almost "of none effect" for evoking the heart's repentance and reverence towards God, it stands as the dry-rot of the church, nourishing nothing but the decay of the church's vitality, and Christian broth-

erhood. God grant that the cross of our corrupt Christendom may perish, that *the cross of Christ* may yet again be lifted up before men, and the voices of thousands of grateful hearts ascribe "grace, grace unto it!"

ÆTERNITAS REVIEWED.

BY REV. WM. G. MONCRIEF.

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

[Continued from page 164.]

And while thus obliged to restrict the bearings of the words, "neither can they die any more," to the regenerated,—to them they are replete with immense consolation. In our judgment, and we are not ignorant of this great question in its divers bearings, it is the strongest assertion of their future deathlessness, delivered in that word on which we rest our highest expectations. This is our fortress of immovable stability; it is ground to stand upon that no earthquake can disturb. They can die no more. It is not even said they will die no more; the "can" gives a power to the affirmation that ought to excite our boundless gratitude to Him who brought light and immortality to light through the Gospel. One can scarcely leave the expression, for it refreshes like the smitten rock in the wilderness. It irradiates the distant future as with rosy beams, and flings towards us its illuminations as we journey towards the sepulchre, among the ruins of mortality. As we contemplate the time-future, its blackness of oblivion seems every hour about to descend on us, and at any moment it may; but imagine yourself, O faithful disciple, on yonder side the grave; look down the valley of futurity then, and it is all cloudless; while ever and anon you may hear from the spangled firmament over your head, as if an archangel tuned his harp, the words of triumphant jubilee, of which in the incorruptibility of your resurrected frame, you have at once the meaning and the proof, "neither can they die any more."

Thus we have endeavored to meet and overthrow those lines of reasoning brought forth by Mr. Bathgate in defence of his position that the passage from Luke affirms a universal human immortality. We have made great concessions to our author for the sake of doing justice to his teaching, and after all we are compelled to declare that his argumentation is as destitute of vigor as the whole system he upholds is of satisfactory proof. And we must now bring back to memory the fact that the verses we have found him commenting upon, and whence he would evolve evidence of the deathlessness of all human souls, has not one word about souls from its commencement to its close. To prove his point he might have quoted with equal propriety, "Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them."

The more that the reader understands the true doctrine of soul, as already partially developed in one of this series of papers, he will the more readily endorse our assertions concerning the imbecility and absolute worthlessness of the argument in "Æternitas," on behalf of the common dogma of human immortality, derived from the conversation of our Lord with the Sadducees. One, yes *one*, though only one passage was promised us about man's immortality, as our author delivers it; and lo, the one is an empty vessel,—a hollow delusion. He builds up a plea, and an infant's hand might pull it down, for it is only an erection of cards. And in such a fabric poor old orthodoxy was to find shelter from the storms of indignation at his position. The writer ought to have been more considerate, unless, which is not to be imagined, he had had some evil design of exposing the hoary deceiver to a tempest in which it was foreseen he would totter and expire. Many long for that hour, for he has practiced his cunning arts before the church and the nations so long and so well, as nearly to eclipse the glory of Him who is the revealer of immortality, and at the same time the resurrection and the life. It is time he were dead,—we don't mean disembodied,—but literally defunct, and consigned to the grave.

Though not logically necessitated to examine the 37th and 38th verses of the chapter before us, whence the "one" passage for immortality was promised us, it may be useful to glance at them for a little, as they are misunderstood by the author, and by very many along with him. Perhaps the simplest plan is to present a brief exposition of them, taking up any difficulties as we go along, either suggested by Mr. B., or others, with whose writings we happen to be acquainted. And first let us again quote the verses, that they may lie before the reader's view.

Ver. 37. Now that the dead are raised even Moses showed at the bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.

Ver. 38. For he is not the God of the dead, but of the living; for all live unto Him.

We begin by remarking upon the 37th verse. It will be observed, then, in the 36th verse our Lord had asserted that resurrection was not merely possible, but something yet actually to happen, at any rate to parties therein described by their moral qualities. Its reality depends, up to that stage in his reply to the Sadducees, on his authority alone, and, of course, with all who admit him to be the Messiah, that is a sufficient basis for it to be placed upon. But as he was not conversing with those who allowed his claims, it was important to meet their objections in a way more fitted to gain their consent. Personal authority with them could go for little when they were not believers in Jesus; but they might see the force of an argument drawn from Moses, in whose testimony they had confidence. From Jesus, therefore, the question is carried to the Hebrew legislator, —the question is fair, and the tribunal is acknowledged. "Now that the dead are raised, even Moses showed at the bush," or the words which Moses affirms he heard from the bush, proved the dead are raised, or that there is to be a resurrection of the dead. The Sadducees, we are informed, denied "any resurrection;" they also rejected the existence of angels and spirits. They were not atheists, but while they had faith in God they

were believers in the unity and materiality of man, they also held that at death it is over with each human agent forever. That the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground,—that in death there is no remembrance of God, or any one else—that the dead know not anything, was their creed in reference to humanity, and it would be difficult to prove they were anti-scriptural on these points. They erred in this, however: they not merely affirmed that in death remembrance was gone, but that it was gone forever: in short, that a man, when once prostrated by the king of terrors, could never live again. They rejected the future life altogether, seeing, as far as their eye reached, no evidence of resurrection, and perhaps deeming it speculatively an impossibility that life could ever be restored to the children of corruption. They had no faith in intermediate states, purgatories, limbos, or any such localities, with their attenuated denizens. With them death was a palpable and terrible reality,—a going out of the lamp,—a snapping of the thread of life; the lamp never to be re-kindled, the thread never again to be re-joined. Our Lord purposes to prove to these men that existence could be restored, and that even in the Scriptures which they revered,—the writings of Moses,—it was prophetically intimated in language which was not too dark for an ordinary apprehension. As soon as he pointed out the argument, the effect of it was acknowledged by those who were auditors of the dispute. "When the multitude heard this, they were astonished at his doctrine."—Matt. 22: 33. "The scribes answering said, "Master thou hast well said."—Luke 20: 39; and the very Sadducees themselves were put to silence.—Matt. 22: 34.

It has been said, though the Sadducees believed in the entire destruction of man in death, there is no need to suppose that our Lord had the same idea in his mind concerning the deceased, when he uttered the words, "Now that the dead are raised." In other words, it is affirmed, that our Lord held it was only of "bodies" that a resurrection could be predicated,—souls not needing it, being in themselves incapable of extinction. But our Lord says nothing, either here or anywhere else, about souls being exempt from mortality. Moreover, the universal teaching of Scripture is, that the soul of a man is just the man himself, whom the Lord God originally formed of the dust of the ground. Further, he says, "Now that the dead,"—not dead bodies, but the dead, i, e., dead men, are raised. They are dead, and they are dead as men. He is to prove not that men never die, but that dead, extinct men shall live anew by the power of God; he has already answered who are to be incapable of death a second time, beyond the resurrection hour; he now simply grapples with the Sadducean error that resurrection would not,—could not possibly take place. It even matters little whether many or few are to rise; let resurrection be proven as a thing destined by God to happen, and the removal of objections to the resurrection of one carries away difficulties from the mind of a Sadducee as to the resurrection of any number who may be appointed to resume consciousness activity.

Once more, the present tense is in this clause employed for the future,—a figure of speech with which we are familiar in the sacred writings.—"The dead are raised," i. e., are to be raised, or will rise. Our Lord is not to prove that the resurrection of the dead has taken place, but that they will rise at a future time. Some are of opinion, like the Swedenborgians, that the resurrection occurs at death, or that the going away of the "soul" or "spirit" from its fleshly abode is the resurrection of Scripture; and, of course, they hold that when this disembodiment and translation happens men are done with materiality and its experiences forever afterwards. This, we can only afford time to observe, is just the popular idea very slightly modified, and perhaps exhibited in a more consistent form than we are accustomed to find in the volumes of the self-styled orthodox: and it is a doctrine which can be no more received by the man who understands the Bible doctrine that the "soul" is just the human being himself,—that his "spirit" is the life-breath which animates his form, than the common theory, or any conceivable modification of it.

The proof of resurrection is,—"Moses showed at the bush that the dead are raised," when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, &c. The Sadducees had already appealed to Moses (v. 28,) and the Savior leads them again to their own favorite authority, as we have already observed. The common opinion, approved by our author, is that these renowned patriarchs were not dead, but at that hour, when the dispute took place, as truly in consciousness as when they were pilgrims on the face of the globe. But the Savior classes Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob among the "dead;" and, indeed, if they were not dead, what need had they of a resurrection? The Sadducees affirmed that men, once lifeless, would never be revived by Divine power; and our Lord's intention was to show that the very doctrine rejected by them was indirectly announced by the voice that Moses heard at the bush. They could not be dead and alive at the same time,—needing a resurrection, and yet not requiring it; in heaven and in the grave at the same moment! Save the Bible from such absurdities, and fill creeds and commentaries with them to the brim, if you please. The patriarchs must be held to be dead in the plain sense of the term. Their spirit—their life-breath had gone forth. They had returned to their dust, and in that very day their thoughts had perished: they had joined the great company of the silent and the unconscious in the land of darkness:—they were as if they had never been. What do we read of their decease? Does it countenance the delusion that death had been to them a "blissful friend," or a relentless foe? How sound the records? "Then Abraham gave up the ghost,"—expired, "and *died* in a good old age, and full of years; and was gathered to his people. And his sons Isaac and Ishmael *buried him* in the cave of Macpelah, in the field of Ephron, the son of Zohar, the Hittite."—Gen. 25: 7, 8. "These all [Abraham, &c.] died in faith, NOT HAVING RECEIVED THE PROMISES, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and con-

fessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth." "These all, having obtained a good report through faith, RECEIVED NOT THE PROMISE, God having provided some better thing for us, THAT THEY WITHOUT US SHOULD NOT BE MADE PERFECT."—Heb. 11 : 13, 39, 40. It seems then most proper to use the words of Peter about David with application to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. "They are not ascended into the heavens," —"They are both dead and buried, and their sepulchres are with us unto this day." Here, then, are men in the exact position whence the Sadducees affirmed they never would, or need be taken. Shall these dead men live anew? Yes, for God is still their God. "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac," &c. What is it to be a God to them? How does the intimation he is yet their God evolve the Savior's position, that they would yet be resurrected from the arms of the grave?

TRUTH ADVANCING.—The following *Response* by the Editor of the *Christian Advocate*—organ of the Methodist E. Church, in this city—to a correspondent in that paper May 4th, we hail as a *return* to the Bible, which is cheering, and indicates an abandonment of pagan philosophy for the only source of information in relation to a future life. The Bible is where we have ever desired to meet the opposers of the doctrine of immortality and eternal life *only* through Jesus Christ as a *gift* of God to the *holy alone*, and conferred at the resurrection of the just, in the last day.

The Editor of the Christian Advocate—DR. BOND—speaks thus:—

We have deeply felt the importance of the subjects to which our correspondent refers: "The relations of the spiritual to the material world, and the disposition made of the soul on its separation from the body." We have consulted philosophy and philosophers in regard to these subjects with no success. Philosophy, applied to spiritual things, constitutes what is called natural theology, and from natural theology is derived what is called natural religion. Now natural theology must be derived from natural phenomena; that is, from the works of creation, as they are exhibited to our senses, and from the providential government and superintendence manifested in these works. Both in antiquity and modern times men of the greatest ability, and most patient industry, have inquired of the phenomena of nature and providence, and have ended in nothing but vain speculations in respect to spiritual things. Their theories are vain imaginations, unsupported by proof which carries conviction to the judgment, or satisfaction to the longings of human nature after sure and certain hope in respect to the future.

At the very threshold of the temple of knowledge, the philosophers of both ancient and modern times have met with an insurmountable obstacle to their progress. They could not proceed a single step without answering the inquiry, Has man an immaterial spirit in him—something distinct from, and capable of existing independently of matter? They found the opinion everywhere prevalent that he had; but how did it originate? Tradition had handed down the belief from the earliest ages, but mixed up with the most puerile conceits, and absurd superstitions. Could it stand the test of philosophical inquiry? One thing was perceived at the outset. The question as to the existence of spirit could not be subjected to ordinary philosophical tests. Philosophy examined matter, its qualities and laws, as it was presented to the senses; but spirit was neither tangible nor visible—was not cognizant of any sense. How, then, could its existence be demonstrated? If any attempted to demonstrate the existence of spirit by the operations of mind, the argument was met by the objection that no one was so well and accurately acquainted with the powers of which matrial organization was capable, as to be assured that no peculiarity of organization was competent to perform functions attributed to the mind. It was not more inscrutable than the *thinking* of subordinate animals, and the functions which are performed by what is called life in vegetables. It excelled these in degree, but so might human organization excel in degree all other forms of life.

But if philosophy could not demonstrate the existence of an immaterial spirit in man, it could not assure us of a future state of existence, and consequently could not reconcile the existence of moral and physical evil in the world with the omnipotence and Goodness of God; for it was evident that a good man, possessed of omnipotence, would not have made a world like this, where no degree of excellence could exempt a man from the evils of life—from pestilence, famine, oppression, pain, bereavments, and death. It was true, then, as Paul declared in his day, that "the world by wisdom (i. e., philosophy) knew not God," and it is true still. They could not assure themselves of his unity, much less of his omnipotence and moral attributes comprehended in the word *goodness*. On the contrary, when they contemplated the moral and physical evil existing in the world, and viewed the apparently unjust administration of providence, they could come to no other conclusion than that there existed both good and evil deities, mutually counteracting each other in the government of the world. True, they could not contemplate the phenomena of creation without perceiving evidence of *intelligence* and *power* in the works and in the government of creation. These attributes were evident—everywhere seen. They were apparent in the movements of the heavenly bodies by fixed and invariable laws, and the structure of the smallest insect testified to the same intelligence and power by the adaptation of its organization to the purposes of its economy. But whether this intelligence and power resided in one God, or in many gods, philosophy could not decide. And, indeed, had it decided on unity as a divine attribute, the other attributes of intelligence and power would have afforded no basis for religion, as they would have taught nothing which could direct man how to worship and serve the Creator so as to procure his favor.

With these views we renounce, wholly, all reliance upon metaphysical theology, and consequent-

ly upon natural religion, and betake ourself solely and exclusively to revealed theology and religion, as found in the Holy Scriptures. We have settled the only question which remained to be answered after philosophy failed us; namely, Are the Scriptures true? Do they contain a revelation from God to man? We find their truth attested by evidence which our judgment cannot resist;—demonstration as satisfactory as the Q. E. D. of Euclid; "They have God for their author, salvation for their end, and truth, without any mixture of error, for their matter. Here, then, we rest our faith and our hope, in all spiritual concerns. Our only business now is to inquire, What has God said? what does he require? what does he promise? what does he threaten? With John Wesley, we are *homo unius libri*,—"a man of one book"—in regard to the interests of the soul for time and eternity; and, "looking into the perfect law of liberty, and continuing therein, not being a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, we are happy in our deed."

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, JUNE 15, 1854.

THE DEATH OF CHRIST.—As Br. Ham's articles on "*The Cross of Christ*" have now all appeared in the BIBLE EXAMINER, and as considerable controversy has arisen and more may arise, we deem it our duty to say a few words more on the subject.

We do not endorse all the positions of either side in this controversy. We believe *the death* of Christ was *necessary* to deliver dying men from sin and *death*: that without it the world would not have had a *Deliverer*, and all would have perished without hope. But we do not believe that his death by *crucifixion* was either planned by God, approved by Him, or necessary to redeem man. Nor do we believe the Son of God died one moment sooner for being *nailed to the cross*. By causing him to be crucified the Jews displayed their malice and wickedness, and were justly chargable with being his betrayers and murderers, as the *design* and *intention* constitutes the crime. But the Jews did not actually take away his life, nor was it in their power to do so, any more than they could hold him in the tomb when buried.

In support of our position we have first the testimony of Jesus himself—"No man taketh my life from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." When hung upon the cross, it is evident that his death was not caused by the crucifixion. Pilate marvelled that he was so soon dead. He dismissed himself from life. The hour of his death was to be the hour of offering the *Possover* lamb; that was the hour for the glorious anti-type to offer himself up in death for our redemption. Till then his "hour" had "not come;" then it had come; and then he would have died even if no "wicked hands" had been there. But God suffered wicked men to manifest their wickedness on the occasion, and thereby his death was notorious to all, and his resurrection made the more certain by the pains his enemies took to prevent his disciples from "stealing him away."

Jesus' *death*, then, was a necessary event, and he would most certainly have died without any human intervention; as no such intervention did or could take away his life. He laid it down of *himself*. The *crucifixion* was not necessary: it was not planned of God, nor required as an act to constitute Jesus such a Deliverer as perishing men needed. The crucifixion was a wicked act, and all concerned in it were wicked men who committed the foulest crime. The act was never approved of God, and of course never made necessary for the redemption of men. The fact that prophecy foretold the death of Christ by acts of wicked men, no more proves that God planned His Son's death by crucifixion than that He planned and designed the abomination, called Papacy, because prophecy foretold it.

Jesus *died*; that is a glorious truth. Jesus *rose* from the dead is another glorious truth. But wicked men no more *actually* killed Christ, than good men actually raised him from the dead. Wicked men disclosed their murderous hearts in nailing him to the cross—but they had no power to take away his life. Jesus himself has forever set that fact at rest—"No man taketh my life from me, but I lay it down of myself." He reached our lost estate by descending under death where we all lay, and by his resurrection brought life and immortality to light: thanks, eternal thanks to God and the Lamb.

"THE WORLD OF WOE."

The American Messenger, published by the Am. Tract Soc., for May, makes the following remarks:—

"*The Justice of Endless Punishment*, for the sins of time, is often denied by men, because they reject the testimony of the Bible as to the evil of sin against an infinitely holy and just God, and because they think only of the sins of time. But man will go on sinning through eternity, and will deserve to be punished through eternity. In the world of woe, man will be freed from all the restraints that here keep him back from sin, and will be forever given up to all evil passions and influences, and therefore will never cease to sin, It is evident that as long as a sinner continues to add to his sins, God's justice will require his continued,

his *endless* punishment. Shall we presume to say that God's standard and sentence are not just? How much wiser to acknowledge the justice of our condemnation, and looks to *Christ* for pardon."

The Scriptures teach us that men are to "receive," when "the Son of Man shall come in his glory, according to their works, . . . *in the body.*" Compare Matt. 16 : 27, with 2 Corth. 5 : 10. To talk about men being punished for sins under a system of government where they cannot avoid sinning—shut up to the necessity of wickedness—is to represent the inflictor of the punishment as the most outrageous tyrant and monster conceivable : and, besides, there is not a single "Thus saith the Lord," to support such a monstrous sentiment, found in the Bible : it is a pure *assumption* and "fable."

The same paper, in another article, says, "No mere apprehension of danger ever effectually leads to holiness. Men cannot be frightened out of their sins."

That is truth : and not only so, but threatening a punishment, manifestly opposed to reason—as endless misery is—is the most *effectual* way to harden men in sin, and engender *hatred* instead of *love.* The natural result of the doctrine contained in the foregoing defence of "*endless woe*" is to make thinking men abhor the being who is supposed to design such a punishment for sin.

The same number of the *Messenger* has in it a story of a "*cruel boy,*" that began his career by tormenting and killing flies and little animals : and asks, "Was he not very cruel?" At length he arrived at such a pitch of love for cruelty, that "He enjoyed cruel sports of all kinds; and the groans and sufferings of his fellow creatures afforded him rich entertainment."

What better is the *Demon*—for we will not say *God*—of the "endless woe" of the *American Messenger?* We fearlessly reply that "*Nero*" was a saint to him. For Nero *killed* his victims in the end ; but the *Demon* of "endless woe" is supposed to have the power and the disposition to protract the life of his victim to unending ages, and to be constantly increasing the anguish of the sufferer : and no sorrow or pain of the miserable being is ever to move the demon-god to relax, or show pity.

No wonder "Nero's subjects grew weary of him, and condemned him to be thrown from the Tarpeian rock and dashed to pieces." Such was a deserved fate.

But we rejoice to know that the view taken of endless punishment, in the *Messenger,* is totally unsustained by the Bible, and the God of the Bible is not to be charged with such blasphemous teaching.

Again the *Messenger* says—speaking of "Repentance unto Life,"—"He who will not be won by love, cannot be saved." That is truth. Why then attempt to win men by the blasphemous teaching of "endless woe?" It never did and never can win a soul of man to repentance, or draw them to God.

In the article about the "cruel boy," the *Messenger* inquires, "Does any child think that the great God, whose tender mercies are over all his works, and who watches the dying sparrows, will not be very angry with all those who in any way abuse his creatures?"

Truly! But how irreconcilable is the last view of God with the previous one, which represents the same God as inflicting "endless woe," on the "creatures" He has made; and under circumstances, too, where it is impossible for them to reform ; or, if they should, He would in no case liberate them from their pains?

Must not that "God, whose tender mercies are over all his works . . . be angry with those who in any way" represent Him as giving life to innumerable beings whom He determines to make immeasurably and eternally wretched and miserable?

QUESTIONS.

Br. Storrs :—I wish to ask you a few questions, and should be glad to have you answer them. 1. What was it that was closed up and sealed till the time of the end? 2. What was it the wise shall understand? 3. What are the periods of time in the Bible for, if we are to know nothing about the time of Christ's coming? There is so many different opinions that I want to know yours. Some think the church is now in the wilderness, and the signs have none of them appeared. Yours, in love, looking for immortality in Jesus Christ,

Lisbon, N. H. IRA QUIMBY.

REPLY OF THE EDITOR.—1. That which "was closed up and sealed till the time of the end" was the "*words*" which related to "*the end* of these things" which had been the subject of the previous prophecy.

2. "The wise shall understand" the "*words*" spoken of, when the "time of the end" shall arrive.

3. "The poriods of time in the Bible" relate to events of which we can "know" something ; but it remains yet to be proved that any *symbolic* period relates to the *precise time* of Christ's "coming." We are not convinced by anything that we have ever yet seen that there is any evidence of a symbolic period—"day for a year"—being given

us for the second coming of Christ. We believe, from the best light we have, at present, that the 1290 and 1335 days of Daniel 12th are *literal* days, and yet in the future. Our reasons for that belief we stated in the Examiner several years since. They are briefly these : Daniel 10th, 11th and 12th is one chain of *historic* prophecy, not *symbolic*. Hence there is no reason for regarding the "days" in the 12th chapter as symbols of years. Besides, the original term for days in that chapter is the same as that used in the 10th, where the personage that appeared to Daniel—after he had fasted "*three* full weeks"—said, "The Prince of the kingdom of Persia withstood me *one and twenty days*." Here no one doubts that literal days are meant. Why, then, in the same discourse, shall we suppose the same term is employed to signify *years* ? and that too when no other part of that discourse is symbolical ? and especially as the word translated *days* is not the same that is used Dan. 8th, "2300 days."

We are at present decidedly of the opinion, that the time in Dan. 12th relates to the period of a personal Anti-Christ, yet to be developed, who will constitute "the abomination that astonisheth," and continue in his glory for the number of literal days spoken of in that chapter. Then may "the wise understand" even the *time* of their deliverance, and will more earnestly long for it than has ever yet been realized by any previous saints. Dr. Kitto, under the head of "*Anti-Christ*," says :—

"*Justin Martyr*, in his *Dialogues with Trypho*, describes him as exercising his wrath against christians with special fury in the period immediately preceding the Second Advent. *Cyril* of Jerusalem repsesents him as reigning *three years and six months* preparatory to the entire destruction of his dominion at the second coming of Christ ; and says, he will deceive both Jews and Gentiles ; the former, by representing himself as the Messiah ; the latter by his magical arts and incantations. St. Chrysostom observes, on 2 Thes. 2 : that Anti-Christ will not lead men to idolatory, but will rather abolish the worship of false gods, as well as that of the true God, commanding the world to worship *himself alone* as the only Deity."

We are inclined to the view that the developement of the real Anti-Christ will be Atheism enthroned, perhaps in all the governments of earth, and possibly the Papal head will take that form. The Prince of the power of the air has tried all forms of religion to cheat and destroy men—paganism, with all its forms of idolatry till they were exhausted in their popularity—then he transformed paganism into Papacy, and has used that till it has become an abhorrence to all reasoning men ; and his last dying efforts will be to enthrone Atheism ; or a rejection of "all that is called God, or that is worshipped." Papacy hitherto has not answered this description, though it has shadowed it forth and prepared the way for it. "*The* Anti-Christ" is clearly described by John in his First Epistle, chap. 2, verse 22 ; "He is [*the*] anti-christ that denieth the Father and the Son." The emphatic "*the*" is in the original. There are and have been, "many anti-christs ;" but there is to be revealed *one* who is emphatically "*the* anti-christ ;" and John clearly designates him as a denier of "*the Father and the Son*." Such has not been, hitherto, the character of Papacy : it may possibly yet assume it, to adapt itself to the spirit of Atheism that is now spreading in Europe with awful power.

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 :—Granting you every thing you desire in the statement of the question, I proceed at once with the argument.

To prove that man has a spirit, distinct from his body, I have proposed to show first that such entities as spirits exist ; and to show that there are spirits in the universe, unconnected with material forms or organs, I allege, upon the authority of the Bible, that God is such a spirit. Of the relevancy of this argument our readers must judge. I am talking of GOD the ETERNAL SPIRIT, as you must have known ; and if you choose to run off upon the term "composed" to write about a *created* spirit, while I am writing about JEHOVAH, our readers will doubtless infer the true reason.

But let me call you back to my argument. I affirm that "God is a *pure spirit*, immaterial, uncompounded, and indivisible ; and unconnected with bodily form or organs." My scripture proof is John 4 : 24, "GOD IS A SPIRIT." I affirm that this point is vital to my argument, and invite you to either admit it, or deny and controvert it. And you respond that it is "irrelevant." Strange that the question whether spirit ever exists separate from matter has no bearing upon the question of man's spiritual nature. If God is a spirit immaterial and uncompounded, then there is at least *one* purely spiritual being in the universe ; and the question of the possibility of the existence of a spirit, conscious, intelligent, and active, without connection with matter, is settled beyond all cavil. Besides, the determination of this point will settle the question as to the *nature* of spirit. Please, then, to meet my argument frankly and fairly or leave it to its legitimate office in the discussion.

But you seem, after all, to feel the force of this "irrelevant" fact. And to escape it you virtually deny it. This you do when you affirm that the

doctrine of the immateriality of God "*is a pure assumption*, without a particle of Scripture authority;" and also where you speak of "the Pof.'s *notion* of a spiritual nature" as something that you do not believe. For you well know what my "notion" of the spiritual nature of God is, viz: that he is a *pure spirit*, unconnected with a material form or organs. And by controverting this "notion," so distinctly and fully avowed, you take the position that God is a material being.

This is what I expected. For whoever denies that consciousness, thought and intelligence can exist separate from a material organization, must either deny that God is a conscious and intelligent being, or deny his pure spirituality, and invest him with material organs. You adopt the latter alternative; and in the face of one of the most direct, explicit, and unequivocal statements in all the Bible, going to show that God is a spirit, you controvert this "notion," and avow your belief that he is matter! And you even assert that the Bible does not teach the contrary!! Pray, then, tell me what is the meaning of the declaration, "*God is a* SPIRIT." Are spirit and matter the same? And will you assert that God is a *material being*, in the face of the declaration of Christ that he is a "SPIRIT?"

Leaving you to meet my first argument as you best can, I affirm—

2. *That the "holy angels," so often spoken of in the Bible, are spirits, and not material beings.* "Who maketh his angels SPIRITS," Psa. 104: 4. "Are they not all ministering SPIRITS," Heb. 1: 14. These passages as plainly assert that the holy angels are spirits as human language could do. As God is a spirit, and is so revealed to us, so the angels are revealed to us as spirits also. In this respect God and angels are alike, as purely spiritual entities, unconnected with bodily forms or organs.

Here, then, we have, not a solitary specimen of purely spiritual existence, but "legions of angels," yea, "ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands."

3. *The fallen angels or devils of the Bible are still spiritual entities, without material bodies.* It will not be denied that their most common designation in the New Testament is "spirits," "unclean spirits," &c. And these spirits, (which are also designated as devils,) not only "possessed" and dwelt in the bodies of men and women, but they talked through their lips, and otherwise controled their bodies, grievously tormenting them. Moreover, they were often "cast out" of the human bodies they had usurped, by Christ and his disciples; and in one instance they entered by permission, into the bodies of a herd of swine.

That these malign beings that could dwell in human bodies, and think and speak, and go in and out, and from one body to another, were really *spirits* as the scriptures declare them to be, requires no further proof. If they were material bodies, then all spirits may be bodies, even the Eternal Spirit himself. And besides: If they were bodies, then we have two bodies occupying the same space, at the same time, which is impossible.

I submit, then, as my first argument, in proof of the *existence* of spiitual entities, the existence of a GOD who is a spirit, and of holy angels and devils, who are also spirits. H. MATTISON.

Response by the Editor.

We regret that Prof. Mattison did *not* "proceed at once with the argument," and not leave it in an attempt to discuss the nature of God. We submit to our readers whether that item is embraced in the question at issue. We will not discuss the nature of God with any man. "I AM THAT I AM," and "He that cometh to God must believe that HE IS" [that He exists,] "and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him." His essential nature He has never seen fit to reveal; and, in our judgment, it is the height of presumption to attempt to scan it. He "is a Spirit." What do men know of the properties of spirit; especially of the Eternal and Uncreated Spirit? Just nothing at all: and we neither affirm nor deny in that matter, and our friend can spare himself the pains of asserting what we believe on that point.

Suppose it were admitted that God is immaterial, uncompounded, &c., will that prove that *created* beings might be so too? No more than the fact that God is *uncreated* proves that there may be other uncreated beings: one position is just as inadmissible as the other. We might oppose to the Prof.'s assumption of the nature of God, that He showed His "*back* parts" to Moses, and that He "*eat*" of Abraham's "fatted calf," &c., which looks quite as though He may be some how connected with *materiality*. But we think both the Prof. and ourself had better stand off from such "holy ground" as the discussion of the nature of God, and attend to the question at issue.

The Prof. next descends to angels, who, he says, are "not material beings," and are "unconnected with bodily forms or organs." This is another pure *assumption*. It is assuming that because some beings are called "spirits" that they must answer to *his definition* of spirit. Now that his definition of spirit, when applied to angels, is an assumption is evident, to our mind, from the fact that those beings often appeared to men and *eat* with them, of bread, meat and milk—see the case of Abraham, Lot, and others. Strange work, that for beings "unconnected with bodily form or organs!" They did eat or they did not. If they did not, then they were *hypocrites*, for they pretended to eat. If they did eat, then they had "organs" and were connected with materiality in some form. And the Psalmist saith "man did eat angels food," when manna was eaten in the wilderness. But the question of the precise nature of angels,

whether good or bad, we will not discuss at this time. It will be time enough to take up that when we have settled the question at issue, which the Prof. has not yet *touched:* we hope he will in his next article. One topic *at a time,* Professor. We shall not consent to be drawn into more than *one at a time.* Please do us the favor to read the question for discussion, and keep to it if you intend to meet it. Let it be remembered we do not deny that there are spiritual beings, but their nature is not the subject of discussion now. It is not even what is the *nature* of "the soul," if the Prof, should reach that point; but "Has an *entity* called the *soul*" been "*superadded*" to "the *creature* man which the LORD GOD *formed* of the dust of the ground?" The Prof. "*affirms*" there has been, but has not yet brought the first item in proof of his affirmation. Did the Lord God form *man* of the dust of the ground? Yes: the Bible affirms it in unequivocal language. Did the Lord God *superadd* to that man, or any man, an entity called the soul? *No*: there is not a text in the Bible that saith so; if there was our Prof. would bring it forth: but instead of that he drives off into the *nature* of God and angels. Pray come down from your towering heights, Br. M., and give us one "Thus saith the Lord" on the affirmative of the question at issue, or own, honestly, there is none. *We know there is not one.*

"MAN'S FIRST SIN."—Such is the head of an article in "*The Congregationalist,*" Boston, Mass., of April 28th. We give some extracts from it accompanied with remarks in *notes.* The writer says:

Respecting man's origin and primal condition, we have no reliable information, except in the Bible. What this volume contains is not only our sole authority, but to every genuine believer in inspiration, it is absolute authority. (1.)

Man is a creature. He is not self-existent, but *made,* formed in part from dust. His outer being is material. What of him is material, however, constitutes but the exterior of a complex personage. Within is a spirit, the soul, without which he would be a mere brute. (2.) The account given in the Bible of man's origin, is brief, but distinct. Nothing in it is irrational or mystified. Human language does not contain more definite statements. God makes man, and man is made. (3.) . . . God stamped his own image on man. What was that image? The Scriptures do not specifically inform us; do not state in direct terms what it was; yet by implication and various hints, they doubtless reveal its nature in part, at least. God is a perfect being. He always has been so. Man was created perfect; not perfect as is God, nor as is an angel, but as a man. He was perfectly adapted to the sphere for which he was designed. God could not improve him. (4.) Among all the millions that might succeed the first man, not one could succeed him in any of the attributes of a man. This image included perfect holinesss. So the Scriptures teach. Adam and Eve were as holy when they were first created, as Jehovah himself is holy. (5.) Their natures were as free from moral stain as his. (6.) . . . Man was created a moral agent. Man's moral agency was as perfect in its sphere as God's in His. We do not believe that man was any more *compelled* to sin by the laws of his free agency than God is by the exercise of *His* free agency. Man was created to rule all the orders of beings inferior to himself, while he was to be amenable to God, and fidelity to Him was to be tested by a single interdict. The fruit of a certain tree must not be eaten. . . . The tree was selected by God as a test of obedience. Scripture gives no intimation that man could have been placed in more favorable circumstances for *standing* than he was. If he must be tried at all, he probably enjoyed as good an opportunity as he could himself desire. Nor is it to be supposed that Adam or Eve objected to the testing of their fidelity. *Probation* doubtless met their joyful approval. Laws have penalties; are useless without them. Divine interdicts must be regarded, or consequences of a penal nature will follow a disregard. *Death* was the penalty threatened. (7.) . . . On the day of their disobedience, the first sinners began to experience the penalty threatened. They died as God had declared; died before the earth had revolved again on its axis. (8.) In a moment they were dead in sin; at once they became mortal; immediately they went under the *sentence* of *eternal* death; banishment from the favor of their Father in heaven. (9.)

NOTES BY EDITOR OF EXAMINER.—(1.) In this sentiment we fully concur.

(2.) Where in "our sole authority" does this writer find such an account of man's creation as he has assmed in these remarks? Surely, there is none in the Book of Genesis.

(3.) Here is truth distinctly uttered. Now let him find, in these "definite statements" of man's creation, that God *added* "the soul" to the creature He formed of the dust of the ground. He "breathed into his nostrils the *breath* of life, and *man became* a living soul." Here is no addition to him of anything save the "breath of life:" that same breath by which every living creature is sustained in life as well as man.

(4.) Here is a strange mixture of truth and error. That man "was perfectly adapted to the sphere for which he was designed" is true; but to say that "God could not improve him" is going beyond "our sole authority." It is evident God has *improved* many of the race under a system of discipline.

(5.) Where do the "Scriptures teach" any such doctrine? We affirm it is nowhere to be found in

our s ole authority :" let it be produced if it can be.

(6.) That is true : not however because they were *created holy*, but because no *trial* had yet developed "moral " character. Holiness is not a *creation* but a *development* in circumstances of trial, so far as created beings are concerned. Man, and every other creature which the "Lord God made, was *very good ;*" so saith "our sole authority ;" but to be *holy* is entirely another matter, and depends on other things, *viz :* 1st. Intelligence enough to enable the creature to understand the claims and terms of law. 2d. That he be placed under such law. 3d. Conformity to it. We can conceive of no other way for a creature to be holy.

(7.) In these last remarks we agree with the writer.

(8.) If they "died as God had *declared*, before the earth had revolved again on its axis," then they not only "*began* to experience the penalty threatened," but it was *finished* during *the same* revolving of the earth on its axis ; so that there could not be any room for another and different death than what the words of threatening expressed.

(9.) Here is a group of unfounded assumptions. We do not object to some of the phraseology provided it was not evident that the writer intended to include all these assumptions under the penalty, "*Thou shalt surely die.*" To say, that was a death in sin, is without a solitary text in "the law and the testimony," by Moses or the Prophets, to sustain it. If any man sins, he is a sinner ; but to call that fact the penalty of the law is to confound language. The penalty was *death* as opposed to the *life* God had given the man. Now if the writer can show, from "our sole authority," that God endowed man with spiritual life, or moral life, and with eternal life, then it will be time enough to talk of taking away *such* life. But the most unwarrantable part of the assumption is, the explanation the writer gives, that "*eternal* death" is "*banishment* from the favor of their Father in heaven ;" as if "banishment" and "death" were synonymous terms. Thus the writer strives to make the impression that *death*—as employed in the threatening—in addition to a great many other things — means endless suffering : for he saith, further on in his article—"the lost sinner will *eternally suffer* ;" which is another pure assumption, and the more remarkable from the fact that he says, man, after he sinned, "at once became *mortal.*" If mortal—which is true—how can he eternally suffer ? It will take some labor to make out such a position ; yet, if man is immortal he cannot suffer : immortality is just as incapable of suffering as of death ; else, immortality would cease to be immortality. Let him prove the contrary who can.

"Mr. Storrs' Book."—Under this head "*A Baptist*" pretends to review our Six Sermons, in the Michigan *Christian Herald.* The occasion of his undertaking this work is thus stated by himself at the opening of his review :—

"*Editor of the Herald*—Your readers, at least that portion of them resident in the south-west part of this State, are aware that a female preacher, teaching certain peculiar opinions, is now holding forth in that section, and with considerable success, having made many converts, a number of them from the Baptist church. The novelty of hearing a woman preach of course attracts many, and as she possesses all the volubility of her sex, and is, moreover, perfect in her lesson, she produces something of a sensation, and seems to have quite turned the heads of some of our stanch brethren, from whom we should have expected better things."

"A female preacher . . . seems to have quite turned the heads of some of our stanch brethren !" Now, is not that provoking ? What ! are "our stanch" Baptist "brethren" to be turned to believe that there is no immortality for man except as a gift of God, through Jesus Christ ? And this done, too, by "a female preacher !" Will not "a baptist" be justified in making war upon *her* at once ? Let us hear him. He says :—

"I feel inclined, my dear sir, to review the doctrine put forth by this lady, but as it might be deemed *ungallant* to attack one of the gentler sex in so new a position, and as, moreover, her peculiar tenets are based entirely on a work by Mr. G. Storrs, her sermons being frequently a mere repetition of his discourses, I shall present the reader with a review of the said work, as brief and concise as justice to the subject will permit."

So it seems our "Baptist" friend is to be very "*gallant*" in his "attack" on "Mr. Storrs' Book." Whether he means to be "*brave ;* high spirited ; bold ; civil ; or polite," in his review, we do not know ; but one thing we do know, he does not possess common honesty or else is profoundly ignorant of the "book" he pretends to review. Speaking of our argument in reply to those who assert all men possess immortality because "all men *desire* immortality," he says :—

"This is admitted by our author, who admits further, that 'it is implanted in us by the Author of our being :' but thinks it a sufficient answer to say, that 'this avails nothing unless we can prove that what men desire they will possess. All men desire happiness, but does it follow, therefore, that all men *obtain happiness* ? Certainly not.' Now does Mr. S. mean to deny that men *do* obtain hap-

piness? He talks of God's benevolence and love. How is it possible to prove that God is good, but by the happiness, the general, universal happiness of his creatures? Nothing could exhibit the Creator in a more unenviable light than the supposition that he gives desires to the being he has made, without the opportunity of gratification. Can Mr. S. exhibit a single instance, even among brutes, where God has given a natural desire for that which does not naturally exist? This single admission of Mr. S. is sufficient to demonstrate his whole theory false, let his proof from Scripture be what it might; for, to mention a single instance of a natural desire for that which does not naturally exist, is impossible. To assert it is to libel the Creator; to believe it is to believe a palpable absurdity. All men desire happiness, and all men attain happiness. To be sure, some men, who fancy they have no souls, possess very degraded notions of happiness, thinking it to consist in eating, drinking, and mere sensual gratification; but they reap that they have sown; they enjoy happiness, such as it is, a very low, beastly species indeed, but their desires are gratified. Yet in fact the cases are not parallel. Men desire happiness, and there is a happiness for them to attain, whether they attain it or not; but, *Men desire immortality when there is no immortality for them to attain, according to Mr. S.'s theory.*"

This last remark—which we have italicised—is an ignorant misrepresentation or a willful falsehood. He misquotes our language in the first part of this extract by substituting the words "obtain happiness" for our words "will be happy;" thus making us speak in the *present* tense when we employed the *future;* and we did so in special reference to a future state, in which the "orthodox" advocates of natural immortality maintain many "will be" unhappy, or miserable without a mixture of enjoyment. Such, we believed, could feel the force of our argument, and so would "a baptist" if he had not first perverted and *altered* our words.

Then he raises a false issue, by an inexcusable, if not a willful misstatement of our sentiments. He represents us as holding that the "Creator gives desires to the being he has made, without the opportunity of gratification." Nothing can exceed this statement in barefaced misrepresentation. In the very paragraph from which he quotes our admission of the truth, that "all men desire immortality," we say, "That desire is, without doubt, a strong principle [implanted in us by the Author of our being,] to excite us to a course of living that shall secure that invaluable blessing, which He designed to bestow upon man, if he would walk in obedience to the law of his God."

"A Baptist" quoted from this sentence, in our Six Sermons, only the words in brackets; and then proceeds to the wonderful conclusion that 'This single admission of Mr. S. is sufficient to demonstrate his whole theory false, let his proof from Scripture be what it might."

Whether our "theory" be true or "false," his representation of it *is false;* and is as palpably so as the shining of the sun in a cloudless day.

His own argument inevitably lands him in universal salvation; and perhaps this is his faith, though pretending to be "a baptist," We never uttered such a sentiment as that attributed to us in the closing lines of this extract. Nor can "a baptist" find such a sentiment in anything we ever wrote or spoke. Till he does find it, or show himself an honest man by confessing his mistake or falsehood, we shall take no further notice of him; he has debased himself too low to be admitted into a discussion with honest men; nor would we have given even this notice but from the fact a "*Christian* Herald," published by the "Baptist Convention of the State of Michigan," gave place to the falsehood in its columns. We are always happy to see reviews of our sentiments when they are conducted with Christian honesty; but if our opposers cannot refute us without resorting to "*Papal lying*," they may calculate we shall have a short conflict: they show themselves already routed.

"The Church not in Darkness, *or, The Duties of the Times.* By H. L. Hastings." This is a neat 12 mo. pamphlet of 24 pages, with covers. Price 6 cents, or $4 per 100. For sale by the author at Peacedale, R. I.; by R. T. Young, 140 Fulton st., New York; and at the *Advent Watchman* Office, 26 State st., Hartford, Conn.

It is a very interesting work, written in Br. Hastings' best and most attractive style. It may be read by all with profit.

From Dr. B. B. Schenck, Plainville, N. Y.

Br. Storrs:—I appreciate your efforts in the cause of proclaiming immortality through Christ alone. It is also my ground of hope. I understand that the Scriptures propose Christ as the *resurrection*, also. If so, and *wicked* men are raised, will they be, thereby, the children of God? The children of the resurrection, Christ says, are the children of God—or, "They are the Children of God, being the children of the resurrection." If that Spirit dwell in you which "raised up Christ from the dead, *it* shall *quicken* your mortal body." Now if that Spirit do not dwell in a man, will that untenanted body be quickened? He that hath wrought us for this self-same thing is God, who also hath given us the earnest of His Spirit. What same thing? Why, the resurrection. Why given the earnest or pledge of his Spirit? Mani-

festly to dwell in you, and finally to *quicken*. *I* do not read the resurrection of the *wicked*.

—

From Isaac Dimmick, Vermillionville, Ill.

Br. Storrs:— . . . The books, heretofore rereived from you, upon the natural immortality of the soul and other kindred doctrines, I have faithfully kept in circulation—and there is evident tokens of their usefulness. Already several have expressed their full belief in the final destruction of the wicked. I hope soon to be able to give you some cheering accounts of the progress of truth, here, in relation to this subject May God long continue to bless you, in your labors of love.

—

From Catharine Colver, Alford, Mass.

Br. Storrs:—My desire for the truth of God's word causes me to do what I can toward spreading it; therefore I cast in my mite. You know the widow's mite counted more than all the rest: so I pity you one dollar for the loss you sustained; also one dollar from a new subscriber. I wish I could do more. It is hard sailing against wind and tide; but no danger if Jesus is in the vessel. I think the prospect is more favorable to have occasionally a new comer. I find some Nicodemuses now and then: they own the truth but dare not show themselves; it is so dreadful to be called an infidel, and lose our reputation. Oh, how revolting! Why, it is equal to having the "Romans come and take away our place and nation." Oh, bless the Lord, His word stands fast forever; so that all who will come to him shall have life, and he will raise them up the last day; so there is no danger if our life is hid with Christ in God; for the name of the Lord is a strong tower into which the righteous run and are safe. We need not therefore fear if we have only the armour on, and are under the banner of Jesus; for there we may stand fast forever. Amen.

—

From Dr. J. F. Lee, Meltonsville, N. C.

My much esteemed brother, Geo. Storrs:—Will you please to accept the enclosed? Your loss invites, commands the gift. The invitation and the command, both, are quite agreeable and pleasing to the heart of a Christian. I would not be destitute of the emotions of benevolence and Christian sympathy for all the treasures of the earth. And if there is one thing that would induce me to acquire riches, it is the desire for employing them for such purposes as God requires.

I know not what a day may bring forth, but, without the interposition of mercy, it seems from the exigencies of coming events as well as those of the present moment, that there are great difficulties to encounter—great obstacles to overcome; but I most sincerely trust, that through all God will be my guide, protector, and deliverer. His grace is sufficient for me. His strength is made perfect in weakness. I cannot say what I may do this year. If I realize my expectations, I may visit the North. But should I not, you will be apt to hear from me in the course of three months.

How anxiously I wish to see you, it would be difficult to express. I have often intended to communicate many things to you, by letter; but I have as often declined from feelings, whether true or false, that led me to hope, I should have the pleasure of seeing you, when such cummuication would be more agreeable.

I sincerely wish and fervently implore that God, for his Son's sake, may aid, assist, and preserve you; that you may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works. Grace be with you. Amen.

—

From John C. Kennon, Hanover, Conn.

Dear Brother:—I have, through a lover of truth, had the opportunity of examining a few numbers of the BIBLE EXAMINER, and have become interested in the truth, Those have opened my eyes to a new light, as one who knows that sanctification is attained through the truth. I feel as though your labor of love, through your paper, is the means of causing the true light to arise, and I will be gratified if you will send it me. I feel that the truth will prevail amidst whatever opposition. I do not fear for you at all. It is my constant payer that not only you, but all, may know the truth and walk in it. Yours in love, and in hope of immortality through Jesus Christ.

—

From H. H. Nottingham, Franciscoville, Mich.

Br. Storrs:—Though unacquainted with you, yet as you appear to be public property, I thought I would address you as one of like precious faith; for, I must acknowledge that through the instrumentality of your writings, and others, I learned that I had no immortality out of Christ—that eternal happiness was not the grand object of of Christ's mission into the world; but as the Scriptures declare, he came that we might have life, and that more abundantly. Oh, that each one, that professes to believe the gospel of Christ, would purify themselves by that form of doctrine given them in the scriptures; for they are able to make us wise unto salvation, as the Apostle declares. I might give scope to my thoughts, yet I feel that I have not the ability to give light, but my heart is in the work. Be assured, my dear brother, of my kindest regard; praying that you yet may be the instrument, in the hands of our heavenly Father, of converting many souls (persons) from heathenish philosophy, and the traditions and commandments of men. Now that the God of all grace may keep us unto eternal life at the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, is the prayer of your Brother, in hope of eternal life at the resurrection of the Just.

SHEOL.—This word most commonly signifies the grave, or the place or state of the dead. Jacob says, Gen. 37: 35, "I will go down into the grave," or into hell, "to my son mourning." *I will die with grief, I will never leave mourning till I die.* So in Gen. 42: 38, "If mischief befall Benjamin, then shall ye bring down my gray hairs with sorrow to the grave," or to hell. *You will make me, who am worn away already, to die with grief.* The conspirators Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, were swallowed up in the earth, and descended quick into hell, or the grave; *they were buried alive*, Num. 16: 30, 31.—*Cruden's Concordance, word Hell.*

REMOVAL.—Circumstances, over which we had no control, have made it necessary for us to *remove* to 140 Fulton street (second floor), in R. T. Young's Book Store, where our friends will find us, usually, from 8 o'clock A. M. till 5 P. M.

We will simply say—The circumstances referred to have placed us under financial embarrassment which it is impossible for us to meet unless our friends will increase the number of our paying subscribers. We can supply four or five hundred more with the EXAMINER from the commencement of the year; and if that number were immediately added to our list it would give us the aid we need. We have on hand about one hundred *sets* of the EXAMINER for 1853 (last year.) We will give *one set* of that to any person who will send us $2 for two new subscribers for this year, till they are exhausted. Or, if they prefer a set of '49, '50, '51, or '52, they shall have it till they are exhausted. Of the last-named years we have but a few sets left.

Once more:—For $5 we will send *seven* copies of the EXAMINER for *this* year to any names given us; or, for $10 *fifteen*.

These offers are made in view of our necessities, and are not to be considered a precedent to any future subscriptions.

All money sent for the EXAMINER is at *our risk;* and no one who owes for the paper should wait for an agent to call for their money, but send it *direct* to us. Address "GEO. STORRS, *Bible Examiner Office*, New York."

EDITOR'S RESPONSIBILITY.—Some seem to suppose that we endorse all the sentiments contained in articles we publish; especially if they are *selected*. We do not so regard it. It often happens that sentiments are contained in excellent articles that, to us, are unsound; but the general character is such that we esteem them valuable, and deem it best to let the defects pass unnoticed, trusting the good sense of our readers to make the discrimination. To sit watching to make notes on every thought that differs from our own, in a selected or original article, it seems to us, is to suspect our readers of an incapacity to discriminate truth from error.

We do not, therefore, regard ourself as endorsing anything in the columns of the EXAMINER unless we expressly so state it: our silence is not to be construed into an endorsement. We often see remarks in articles we publish from the writings of others that we do not approve, but think best to let them pass without note or comment, as that generally provokes a reply, and perhaps leads to a fruitless controversy.

IRREGULAR ISSUES.—It has become utterly impossible to issue the EXAMINER regularly on the *first* and *fifteenth* of each month. We can set it up in time, but having no Press that we can control, we are obliged to wait till we can find one vacant, which sometimes keeps our form standing several days after it is ready for the Press. We have no means of remedying this evil; and our patrons will bear with the delays that will sometimes occur in consequence of it. Every Press in New York seems to be crowded night and day with work; we will endeavor, however, to send out our paper as regularly as possible.

BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, &c.—We keep the following works constantly on hand, viz.: *Bible vs. Tradition*, 75 cts.:—*Dobney Abridged*, or "Part Second" of Dobney on Future Punishment, 25 cts.:—*Unity of Man*, being a Reply to Luther Lee, by Anthropos, 15 cts.:—*Six Sermons*, 18 mo., 15 cts.:—*Moncrieff's Dialogues* on Future Punishment, 10 cents.

The following works can only be supplied for a short time:—*Storrs' Miscellany;* a few copies only left; 50 cts: No more will be printed. A few copies of *The Generations, Gathered and Gathering;* and also *Life and Death*, by J. Panton Ham, 10 cts. each. Very few left, and there will not be another issue of them in this cheap form, if at all. A few hundreds of the *Bible Examiner Extra*—or the Six Sermons in the quarto form—are still left, 5 cents single copy; 25 copies for $1. Bible Examiner for 1852 and '53, bound in one volume, $1,50.

We have just issued three new *Tracts* of four octavo pages each, written by Br. Nicholas Dabb, late a Minister in the Methodist E. Church. Nothing better than these has been issued, as tracts, to gain attention to the immortality question, and to show the folly of the common sentiments on the subject. They are entitled

AN APPEAL TO MEN OF REASON AND COMMON SENSE:

THE CONRAST: OR MAN'S WORD VS. GOD'S WORD:

IS THIS INFIDELITY?

PRICE—Sixty cents per 100 copies: $5 per 1000.

DONATIONS since June 1st.—Jas. Battersby $1; J. W. Snyder, $2; Dr. J. F. Lee, $4; Peter Davey, $1,50.