BIBLE EXAMINER.

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

VOL. IX. NEW YORK, JANUARY 15, 1854. NO. 2.

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 FACTS AND PHENOMENA OF THE DEATH OF CHRIST.

BY REV. J. PANTON HAM.

Continued from page 181, *Vol.* 8.]

BESIDES the voice of prayer, the cry of bitter complaint breaks upon our ear from the great Sufferer on the cross. In the anguish of approaching dissolution the dying Jesus exclaims, "My God! My God! why hast thou forsaken me?" and this exclamation has been supposed to imply that at that moment God was judicially restraining his "consolatory support, so that the consolations might not take off any part of the keen edge of his passion; and this was necessary to make his sufferings meritorious." So surmises Dr. Adam Clark, for he cannot admit that there was such an actual forsaking on the part of God as to leave Christ destitute of the presence of Divinity in some sense, for that "would deprive his sacrifice of its *infinite merit*, and consequently leave the sin of the world without an atonement. Take *deity* away," he writes, "from any redeeming act of Christ, and redemption is ruined." He suggests but with evident misgivings, that the words might be translated, "My God! My God! to what sort of persons hast thou left me?" The language of this complaint, though popularly employed to prove that Christ on the cross was the object of his Father's wrath, was clearly seen by the learned commentator to involve considerable critical difficulties on that theory, and he leaves the subject, as he does many others, burdened sufficiently with learned criticism, but without reflecting any light on its acknowledged obscurity. To us, this cry of anguish seems eminently natural under the circumstances of Christ as previously explained. The complaint that he was *forsaken* by his Father, must be shut up indeed to the necessity of a rendering, to oblige the belief that he was *judicially* forsaken. The reader is requested to bear in mind, that it is an integrant part of the common doctrine, that the Lord Jesus Christ came into the world for the specific purpose of expiating the world's sins, by bearing its punishment, and giving a full moral satisfaction to the claims of Divine justice. To die on the cross was, in the popular apprehension, the grand reason of his incarnation and mission. Theological writers and preachers of the so-called orthodox school, affirm that Christ's expiatory death was the subject of stipulation between him and his Father; that it was previously arranged and settled in the eternal counsels; and that it constitutes both the reason and righteousness of human redemption. In the view of this theory, then, Christ's interrogatory complaint on the cross, so far from illustrating and confirming it, presents a phenomenon altogether discordant and inexplicable. We have said on an earlier page, that if the popular interpretation of the last sufferings and death of our Lord be the true one, it will appear to be borne out by all the historic circumstances of the crucifixion, that everything said and done on that awful event, especially by our Lord himself, if it do not decidedly indicate its judicial character, will at least not tend to obscure its terrible significance by investing it with an altogether different aspect. But hitherto, we have been unable to penetrate the vail of circumstances which congregate around the cross, so as to discover such a significance in the sufferings of the dying Jesus, which the "churches" assure us those sufferings had. To us it is a most unaccountable phenomenon, that the evangelical portraiture of Christ on the cross exhibits a strange *unconsciousness* in him, that he was the subject of his Father's judicial displeasure, and that, he was bearing the burden, for expiation's sake, of the world's punishment. Is it not an additional argument to what we have hitherto advanced against the *popular* cross as the true representation of the cross of Christ, that, in the agony of dissolution, when he seemed to be bearing the severest burden of his mortal anguish, he should exclaim, "My God! My God! *why hast thou forsaken me?*" Here is the language of most painful surprise. The great Sufferer was conscious of an unusual loneliness, as if his Father, who had so graciously sent an angel to strengthen him in a former extremity, were now leaving him to bear this mortal anguish alone; and he asks in the language of evident astonishment, the reason of this terrible solitude, "My God! My God! WHY hast thou forsaken me?" Now, according to the general opinion concerning the death of Christ, we should not have expected to hear such language from the cross. Are we to suppose, that he, who came into the world specially to bear the world's punishment, and give a satisfaction

for sins by the sufferings on the cross, *did not know why* he was forsaken of his Father? If it were a fact, that God was angry with his Son as the criminal representative of our guilty race, and that Christ *knew* this, then *why did he ask the reason of this displeasure?* Was not such a question, at such a time, adapted to obscure the alleged judicial significance of the sufferings on the cross? According to the popular theology, it is of first consequence that the expiatory nature of those sufferings should be distinctly recognized as the only ground of acceptance with God, and yet *the historic account of those sufferings represents Christ himself as an entire stranger to any such significance!* Surely, if the sufferings of Christ had been for such a purpose as is popularly believed, it would not be unreasonable to expect that on such a question being asked by our Lord, a voice would come from heaven declaring, in distinct terms, the reason why God had then forsaken his Son. A supernatural voice distinguished Jesus at his baptism, and on the occasion of his transfiguration: was it a less important occasion when hanging on the cross he called aloud for an explanation of his desertion in death? If the popular notions of Christ's crucifixion be correct, then this was beyond all the most important moment of his history, and this question one of deepest and most indispensable interest. More especially important does this dying query of our Lord become, because it represents *him* as a *stranger* to the cause of his conscious desertion of God. Yet no explanatory voice responds to the mysterious complaint,—no messenger from heaven challenges the world's audience while he unravels the awful mystery, that the crucified One was judicially forsaken by God, because he was then in the attitude of the sinner's substitute, and enduring the merited desert of the sinner's guilt. Without presumption, we may venture to say, that as the Bible nowhere expressly states that Christ *expiated* the sins of men on the cross,—that he bore their *punishment*,—and gave for them a *judicial satisfaction*;—as neither the prophets,—nor our Lord himself,—nor his apostles ever say anything of this kind, then it was the more to be expected that some clear declaration would be given on the occasion of the crucifixion itself, if these purposes were really answered by that solemn event. That Christ should *express astonishment* in the endurance of his great sufferings,—that he should *ask the reason* of his desertion,—and that no *response* should be made, is to us an additional testimony against the construction which the popular theology puts on the sufferings of the crucifixion.

In our view of the history of Christ, there never was a moment's interruption of that profoundly pure harmony which subsisted from the first between Him and his Father. The scheme of theology which represents Christ as the subject of an artificial arrangement, in accordance with which he should take upon himself all the personal responsibilities, not of one individual, but of a world of individuals, and form a compact with them for a mutual transfer of character and consequences on certain conditions, seems to us to be neither true in reason, nor taught in revelation. As we read the Sacred History, and the doctrinal writings of the Apostles of Christianity, we find not the faintest allusion to any such fiction as this. We never meet with a single indication of displeasure on the part of the Father towards his well-beloved Son, in whom he always appears to us to be "well pleased." Not even does this complaint on the cross—this obvious sense of desertion by his Father, necessitate our belief that Christ was deserted in displeasure even representatively. We may not be able to explain the nature of that experience, and those painful emotions which stimulated the suffering One so to expostulate with his Father; but the very fact that he should expostulate—that he should ask "*why*"—"*why* hast thou forsaken me?" is itself a proof that between Jesus and his Father even then there was the closest and most blessed intimacy. We ask our readers to realize the circumstances of the dying Jesus. His disciples had all "forsook him and fled;" none will doubt that he was as sensible as the most sensitive to this abandonment by his disciples, who had been his constant friends and companions. The intense humanity of Christ, allowed nothing to be indifferent to him which was not indifferent to others of the human family. If it is natural to be pained at the desertion of beloved friends, then was Christ pained when his disciples left him to suffer and die alone. He looked forward to this act of desertion, and spoke of it, when he said to his disciples on the evening of his betrayal, "all ye shall be offended because of me this night—for it is written, (even prophecy had foretold it), I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered." Bearing in mind that the sense of desertion by his followers was among the painful experiences of Christ's dying hour, and that no extraordinary manifestations of the presence of his Father were given then as in Gethsemane, the complaint of Christ has a most touching and natural significance. It is as if he had said, "though my disciples have forsaken me, this I can bear, for I know the spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak; but that *Thou*, O my Father, shouldst give no manifestation of thy presence—that *Thou* shouldst leave me, as any other of thy children, to bear this bitter burden so consciously alone, it is this I feel so keenly—'My God! My God! *why* hast THOU forsaken me?'" That sense of his Father's desertion appears to us a most natural experience; for if Christ had been supported throughout his sufferings by extraordinary, supernatural aids, he would not have known the common experience of mankind, and could not on account of such common experience, have been "touched with the feeling of our infirmities." In being left to the natural experience of painful sufferings—and to know the bitter loneliness of death, he has "*borne our griefs and carried our sorrows.*" He, no more than others of the human family, has been

exempted from the painful contingencies of mortality; nay, he has known more of them, for his life was a more comprehensive one, it took into its wonderful circumference a greater circle of human experiences, and hence his greater qualifications as the exemplar and succorer of our race.

We may be permitted to suggest a few thoughts, with the view of explaining some of the probable causes of our Lord's sense of desertion by his Father.

The Evangelist informs us, that "about the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani? that is to say, My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me?" and that "when he had cried again with a loud voice he yielded up the ghost." It was therefore, in the last extremity, just as he was about to expire, that this cry of distress was uttered. "The sorrows of death compassed him, and the pains of Sheol gat hold upon him," and in the unutterable bitterness of that moment's experience, he felt as if forsaken by his Father. For the time being, it was an actual forsaking of him by God, not in displeasure, nor for any judicial purpose; but because God would leave his well-beloved Son, as all his other sons, to the consequences of their fidelity, painful as those consequences might be. He would not interrupt the course of painful events—his Son, as well as the race he came to restore, should be "perfected through sufferings." God left his Son to die, and that holy Son felt that he was so left, and the agony of that experience extorted the bitter cry, "My God! My God! why hast thou forsaken me?" Such an exclamation is, in our opinion, a testimony to the fellowship of Christ with his Father even to the last. That he should address his Father not in the vocative of a cold distance, but with the possessive pronoun of endeared relationship indicates this, "*My* God! *My* God!" &c. It is, moreover, a testimony to his purity, for the surprise expressed in his language implies that his terrible experience was not merited on his own account, and that in submitting to it, he had yielded to a painful contingence of his mission as the exemplifier of a perfect righteousness in a sinful and death-doomed world. He "was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." "Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered; and being made perfect, (through suffering,) he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him." He has shown mankind how to suffer, as the recompense, in this world, of obedience to God. He has taught them how "to resist unto blood, striving against sin,"—and thus, "Once in the end of the world hath he appeared, to put away sin (not as a *charge* against mankind, but as a quality of their personal *character*) by the sacrifice of himself."

It would be presumptuous to endeavor to analyze the painful consciousness of the dying Saviour at this awful moment of his sufferings; but we may well conceive that those sufferings were what they could not be to any other being but himself. To know something of the "curse' character of death, belongs to all our mortal race. To shrink from it as an "enemy" is our common experience, and natural to our life-loving instincts. But in Christ how intense must have been the emotions of horror and aversion with which he would sink under the hateful power of death! The Psalmist expresses these emotions, when speaking in the name of his royal Son, he says, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in Sheol!" So, too, that touching communication to the disciples, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death,"—and especially that agonizing scene in Gethsemane, when he exclaimed, "O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me," and when "his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down upon the ground." Paul explained the phenomenon when he tells us that Christ "in the days of his flesh offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears to him that was able to save him from *death*." The Lord Jesus Christ "knew no sin," and death is "the wages of sin;"—how natural then, that *he* should shrink with an unusual horror from its actual experience. Death to him would be peculiarly hateful in this aspect. As "the Holy One of God," Christ would experience in death what no human being can now understand, much less participate in. Viewed in connection with sin, to which death is indissolubly allied, the mortal anguish of Christ must have been peculiarly and inconceivably intense; in itself sufficient to account for that agonizing complaint, "My God! My God! why hast thou forsaken me?"

Add to this that Christ is emphatically "the Life,"—that it is his mysterious prerogative to declare, "I am he that liveth, and was dead, and behold I am alive again for evermore;"—that before he came into our world he lived in the communion of the life of God;—what then must have been the strength of *his* life sympathies,—and with what peculiarly painful emotions would *he* feel the powerful grasp of grim Death. If *our* life instincts are so strong, what must Christ's be? If *we* shrink with so much horror from death, with how much greater horror would he? The death of Christ was not the death of an ordinary being. As "that holy thing" which was begotten miraculously of God, and as the "quickening" or life-giving "Spirit," his death, like his birth, is involved in profoundest mystery. Other men have met death in some of its most terrific and excruciating forms with a firmness more than human, while Christ, in a less agonizing death than theirs, expressed, both in its anticipation and experience, the most insufferable anguish. But the *form* of death, we may be permitted to suppose, was less a concern to Christ than the *fact* of death. Had the means of death been even more torturing than they were, probably *no more* emotion would have expressed itself, the index of an equally intense suffering in the conscious experience of the dying Christ. In our opinion, it was *death itself*, without so much regard to its *form*, that occasioned the chief anguish in the sufferings of

the crucifixion;—which explains the remarkable dread with which Christ looked forward to, and endured it; and which stimulated the expiring cry, "My God! My God! why hast thou forsaken me?" Others we know, have considered this manifest dread as the evidence that Christ was shrinking from the awful experience of his voluntary substitution,—as the representative of sinners, and their proxy for the endurance of their punishment; but in the face of so many irreconcilable facts, we cannot accept this theory, and find no occasion to resort to it for the explanation of this additional phenomenon on the cross. Taking into consideration *who* Christ was, and that he was in the *act of dying*, we find no difficulty, and certainly no discrepancy with our theory, in the utterance of his expiring complaint, "My God! My God! why hast thou forsaken me?"

[*To be Continued.*]

WHAT IS THE SOUL?

BY ELD. E. R. PINNEY.

[*Continued from page* 14.]

Our second argument is from

GOD'S PLAN OF REDEMPTION.

Aside from the plain declarations of the word already presented, the truth that the blood is the soul may be further demonstrated from God's plan for the redemption of man, as revealed in his Word. Man, in consequence of disobedience, was brought under the condemnation of the law. The penalty of that law was death—death of the entire man. How readest thou? "In the day THOU eatest thereof (Marg. and Heb.) dying THOU SHALT DIE." (Gen. 2: 17). In the text it reads, "Thou shalt surely die," but this is man's gloss, and is not true. For it is certain that Adam did not die in the day that he ate of the forbidden fruit; and it is equally certain, that not only 'in the day,' but the very moment he ate, he was in a dying, corruptible state—he began to die, and, in process of time, died. Hence, I understand the expression, "Dying thou shalt die," as follows:—That by eating of the forbidden tree, Adam would introduce into his system (which was created pure and incorruptible, *i. e.* having no seeds of corruption in itself) seeds of corruption and decay; the effect of which would be to place him in a decaying and dying condition, which condition would result in certain death.

That the Hebrew text, and this view of it is correct, is evident from God's own interpretation of the penalty, and the Bible history of the facts in the case. Proof, Gen. 3: 19. "In the sweat of thy face shalt *thou* eat bread, TILL THOU return unto the ground, for out of it wast *thou* taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." Gen. 6: 5. "And all the days that Adam lived were nine hundred and thirty years; and HE DIED."

This interpretation, and result as given in the Word, is however, very different from the teachings of the orthodoxy of these last days. And I will give this text, and the other two, in which are contained the law-penalty, in contrast, that you may perceive the difference as they read in the text, and are interpreted by our teachers of the present day.

Bible.	*Orthodoxy.*
"In the day that thou eatest thereof, dying thou shalt die." Gen. 2: 17.	"In the day that thou eatest thereof dying thou shalt never die.
"The soul that sinneth, IT shall die." Ezekiel 18: 4.	The soul that sinneth it shall live forever, and be tormented in a lake that burneth with fire and brimstone.
"The wages of sin is death." Romans 6: 23.	The wages of sin is eternal life in misery.

Hence, we are told that men do not actually die, but the righteous at death go into happiness, and the wicked into misery, awaiting the judgments. But to return to our subject.

Again, God said to Adam, "Dying THOU shalt die"—"If THOU eat"—"In the sweat of thy face shalt THOU eat"—"From dust THOU art," &c. Now, I ask, does not the *thou* include the whole man? If not, what part is exempt? Do you say, the soul? Then I would ask you a few questions. Can a man without a soul eat? Can he be a living, conscious, intelligent, and accountable being, without a soul? If you answer affirmatively, then I ask, if the soul does not impart life, nor consciousness, nor intelligence, nor accountability, what is the use of having a soul? If you answer negatively, then you yield the whole ground, and the *soul* is included in the *thou* that was to die; hence, the soul dies. For man at this time had a soul. God had pronounced him "a living soul." (See Gen. 2: 7). He was an intelligent, accountable being on probation; for it was on the condition of his eating that the penalty of death was to be inflicted.

The law recognizes the *soul* as guilty, and requires its death as necessary to satisfy its claims. Proof: "Behold, all souls are mine, as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine: the *soul that sinneth* IT (the soul) SHALL DIE." Ezek. 18: 4. The law knows no mercy. Its claims must be met. Justice will and must be satisfied. Man could not redeem himself, God therefore gave his Son, who came to suffer for us. He satisfied the claims of the law, or as Paul says, (Gal. 3: 13,) "Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us." If so, then Christ's SOUL DIED, for the curse of the law resting upon us, was the death of the soul. Hence, if Christ's *soul* did not die, the law is not satisfied—our hopes of salvation are vain—we must suffer the penalty—our souls must die.

The question then arises, Did Christ's soul die? On this hangs all our hope of salvation—"To the law and the testimony: for if we speak not according to this word it is because there is no light in us." Jesus says, (Math. 20: 28.) "The Son of Man came * * * to give his SOUL (Psuche) a ranson for many." Isaiah 53: 12, "He (Christ) POURED OUT HIS SOUL UNTO DEATH;" then his soul died. Again, tenth verse, "Thou (God) shalt make his (Christ's) SOUL an offering for sin." Psalms 16: 10,

"Thou wilt not leave my SOUL in *sheol*, (the grave) neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one to see corruption." Peter in his comments on this passage, in Acts 2: 30, 31, says it refers to Christ and was fulfilled in his resurrection from the dead. For "God had sworn with an oath to David, that of the fruit of his loins according to the flesh he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne. He seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his SOUL was not left in the grave (Hades*) neither his FLESH did see corruption." How could his soul be left in the grave if it never went there?

Again, "But God will redeem my SOUL from the power of the grave." Psalm 49: 15. What is the power of the grave? Death. How could Christ's soul (for David here personifies Christ) be delivered from the power of death unless it had first died? It could not; therefore Christ's soul died and went into the grave with his flesh or body. But God raised him from the dead, and by his resurrection hath begotten us again unto a hope of life, and a kingdom. For, inasmuch, as there is no mercy in the law, but for the resurrection, death would (as the French infidels proclaimed) be an "eternal sleep!" And thus Paul reasons when he says, "If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain, ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which have FALLEN ASLEEP IN CHRIST ARE PERISHED." Query, How can this be, if (as we are told by many) when the body dies, the soul—the man proper—goes direct into heaven, where he has more life, and intelligence, &c., than ever? Please answer.

Again the apostle says, "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable." Hence, he adds (verse 32), "What advantageth it me if the dead rise not? Let us eat and drink (i. e. make the best we can of this world) for to-morrow we die;" and that ends the matter. But "thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." God "laid help upon one who was mighty," even the Lion of the tribe of Judah, who through his resurrection prevailed, and "brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." He lives, and ever lives; and because he lives we shall live also, and reign with him in glory, forever. Amen.

From the foregoing array of Scripture, it is evident that Christ has satisfied the demands of the law, thereby making reconciliation for iniquity, and purchasing man's redemption. Now I ask, What was it that satisfied the claims of the law—what paid the price of our redemption? Whatever it was, determines what the soul is; for the penalty of the law was the death of the soul. The prophet says, (Isaiah 53: 10, 12) the SOUL was offered to atone for sin. "His SOUL was *poured out* unto death." What was it that was poured out—that atoned? I answer, It was the blood of Christ. Proof: "Forasmuch as ye know that we were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, * * * but with the precious BLOOD OF CHRIST." 1 Peter 1: 18. Again, "Thou art worthy to take the book and open the seals thereof, for thou wast slain, and hast REDEEMED us to God by thy BLOOD." Rev. 5: 9. "For without shedding of BLOOD there is no remission of sins." Heb. 9: 22. "In Christ we have REDEMPTION through his BLOOD." Eph. 1: 7. "THE BLOOD OF JESUS CHRIST HIS SON CLEANSETH US from all sin." 1 John 1: 7. "Unto Him who loved us and washed us from our sins in his OWN BLOOD, to Him be glory and dominion forever and ever. Amen." Rev. 1: 5, 6. Hence the necessity of Christ's coming by BLOOD as well as by water, and John's particularity in repeating it. "This is he that came by water and BLOOD, even Jesus Christ; not by water only, but by water and BLOOD." 1 John 5: 6. "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and BLOOD, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil." Heb. 2: 14.

More evidence might be given upon this point, but this will suffice to the believer in God's Word, and more would not convince the skeptic. Paul said, in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word shall be established. Here are eight. And now I ask in all candor, if we can desire any thing to be revealed in plainer terms than the following points?

1st. That the blood is the soul.

2nd. That Christ by his blood atoned for sin and purchased our redemption.

3d. That consequently Christ's soul died, which alone could release us from the claims of the Law; consequently, the soul is mortal as well as the body.

These are solemn and glorious truths. And it is time they were understood and believed and confessed, that men may see that in Christ alone is redemption THROUGH HIS BLOOD. My impenitent friend, be entreated to flee to Christ, and trust in his blood, which alone can cleanse you from the guilt of sin, and present you faultless before the throne of God. Believe, O, believe that Christ is able, and willing, and will save you, that you may rejoice with a joy unspeakable and full of glory, through the hope wrought

---

* The Greek term *Hades*, and the corresponding Hebrew term sheol, are invariably used to represent the place of the dead—the grave. Neither word has the first shade of the idea of misery or torment connected with it. So also our English word 'HELL' has no idea of misery attached to it. Dr. Clark says, *hell* comes from the Saxon verb '*helan*', to cover or hide; hence the tiling or slating of a house is called in Cornwall, (England), *heling*, to this day; and in Lancashire the *covers* of books are so called. The translators of our Bible doubtless meant by HELL, a covered or unseen place; the grave, or place of the dead; making it synonymous with *hades* and *sheol*: never intending it to represent a place of conscious suffering. That is an idea attached by the false teachers of these days, and for which there is no authority but theological.

in you by faith unto eternal life, and glory and a kingdom. Amen.

Lastly, this truth is clearly set forth in the types. Christ was "a Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." Rev. 13: 8. This fact appears to have been understood from the beginning, which probably may account for the skins with which God clothed our first parents. Be that as it may, Paul says, "Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain." Why? Because, in his offering a firstling of his flock, the necessity of blood was acknowledged, and faith manifested in a coming Saviour whose shed blood was to atone for sin. From the beginning we find sacrifices and oblations were made, and for this Noah made provision by taking of clean beasts by sevens into the Ark. During the entire typical dispensation, for more than two thousand years, this truth was clearly set forth, and constantly held up by the church in the types. For it was the BLOOD that was annually taken within the holiest of all by the Jewish high priest to atone for sin.

Purposing brevity, I shall on this point simply give Paul's argument as written to the Hebrews, and rest the case. "But into the second (tabernacle) went the high priest alone once every year, (But mark!) ☞ NOT WITHOUT BLOOD, which he offered for himself and for the errors of the people, * * which was a FIGURE for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience; which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings and carnal ordinances imposed on them until the time of reformation. But CHRIST being come an HIGH PRIEST of GOOD THINGS TO COME, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by HIS OWN BLOOD he entered in ONCE into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer, sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh: how much more shall THE BLOOD OF CHRIST, who through the eternal spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?" Heb. 9: 7, 9—14. And the apostle in pursuing the argument, shows that all things had to be purified with blood in the types, so also in the antitype the same necessity existed. But the point of difference was, that Christ had to make but one offering, once for all, instead of annually. Hence he says: "And almost all things are by the law purged with BLOOD; and without shedding of BLOOD is no remission. It was necessary therefore that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; (i. e. with the blood of bulls and goats), but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these, (i. e. with the blood of Christ). For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the FIGURES of the true; but into HEAVEN itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us; * * * so Christ was ONCE OFFERED to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin (or sin offering] unto salvation." Heb. 9: 22, 24, 28. Query, for those who believe men at death go into heaven in any form. Was the instance ever known of any person's entering the most holy place while the high priest was in officiating? If this should not satisfy, turn and read John 3: 13, where Christ says, "No man hath ascended up to HEAVEN, but he, [i. e. the son of man] that came down from heaven." So Peter also, on the day of pentecost, said: "David is not ascended into the heavens." Then if the types have any force, no man can go to heaven until Christ shall come forth to bless and save his people; and if Christ's words be true, no man had ever entered there before his coming to suffer.

In the above argument, Paul has clearly set forth the typical service of the Jewish church. In it we have clearly demonstrated, that the blood of Christ satisfied the demands of the law, and purchased eternal redemption for men. Now, inasmuch as we have heretofore shown that the demand of the law was the death of the SOUL, and that Christ "made his SOUL an offering for sin," which he "*poured out unto death*," and also that it was his BLOOD that was offered for, and redeemed us, without which there could be "no remission" for sin; it follows conclusively, beyond all contradiction, that "THE BLOOD IS THE SOUL OF ALL FLESH."

Other arguments might be given, but as we consider the point fully established by the word, and our object being simply to give the Bible view, I leave it for the brethren to judge how well we have succeeded. I have no controversy with those who cannot see as I do, I have only to ask that it may be tested by the word before rejected. Objections will naturally arise in the mind. I did not expect to present a view free from objections, even though I should be so fortunate as to present the Bible view perfectly. My Saviour could not, [or did not,] even to the intelligent Nicodemus, who cried out, "How can these things be?" Nor do I account myself able to remove satisfactory to all, at first, every objection that may be raised; but this I can say, I have held this view about five years, during which time I have presented it to hundreds [and among the number many intelligent ministers] and no valid objection, in my own mind, has ever been raised. It might be well to recollect, that objections against a theory do not disprove it. The plain declarations of the word must and will abide. One fact should not be forgotten connected with this view, that is, that God has repeatedly declared in his word that "THE BLOOD IS THE SOUL," in terms the most plain, literal, and positive that can possibly be given; but has no where said any other part of, or that the whole man is *the soul*. And why is it—in the absence of all proof, that any other part is the soul—God is not to be believed when he says that the *blood* is?

This truth has given me much light on the

Scriptures—removed the last fog and darkness from the great life and death doctrine—harmonized and made plain scores of passages previously obscure, and illuminated the whole plan of redemption as by a sunbeam of light from the throne, presenting it in new robes of beauty, simplicity and glory.

I leave the subject with you my brethren for consideration, praying that the spirit may guide us into all truth, and sanctify, and save us in the Kingdom of God, through Jesus Christ His Son. Amen. E. R. PINNEY.

Seneca Falls, N. Y. Oct. 14, 1853.

CAN THE SOUL BE KILLED?

"Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear Him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell."—MATTHEW 10: 28.

These words are commonly supposed to teach that the essential nature of man resides in his soul, which is said to be a subsistence quite distinct from the body, which is only, we are told, a machine, constructed for the purpose of enabling the soul to live in, and hold intercourse with, this material world. They are further asserted to imply the indestructibility and deathlessness of the soul, which, it is affirmed, is altogether beyond the reach of any mortal injury, and that the utmost man can do is to destroy the material machine, or body, and effect its separation from the soul, which soars away to some new place, and in a new condition of existence.

Now I ask the candid and intelligent reader on what authority does he suppose that the soul is a distinct subsistence—a complete organization in itself—and constituting the human personality, apart from the body? Is this extensively prevalent notion derived from the Bible? Will the reader pause to recal any portion of the Sacred Scriptures where the soul is so described as containing *in itself* the essential properties of the human being, and capable of a separate state of existence? These, the popular ideas about the soul, are the doctrines which were first taught by the heathen philosophers Pythagoras and Plato, and which have been perpetuated to the present time, through the influence of the most eminent of the so-called Christian Fathers, who, before their conversion to Christianity, were professors of the Platonic philosophy, The modern opinions about the soul are, therefore, purely *heathen*, and not scriptural. They have laid the foundations of the most corrupt and mischievous doctrines, both among Protestants and Papists. The Protestant has been led by his heathen notions of the human soul to believe in a state of life *in* death and before the resurrection, and that the wicked shall endure *eternal torments* in hell. The Papist has, yet more corruptly, been led to believe, besides what the Protestant believes, in Purgatory, Indulgences, the worship of the Virgin Mary, and deceased Apostles and Saints. Such are some of the many evils which Plato's doctrine of the Immortality and Separate State of the Soul has introduced into the Christian Church.

If, then, we are not to hold the popular opinions about the human soul, what does our text mean? In reply to this question, I request the reader to examine the parallel passage as recorded in Luke's Gospel, chap. 12, v. 4, 5: "I say unto you, my friends, be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have *no more* that they can do; but I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear: fear Him who, after He hath killed, hath power to cast into hell." In this version of our Lord's words, the word 'soul' does not occur; and instead of '*are not able to kill the soul*,' we have the words '*have no more that they can do*.' The meaning then is clearly the following: Although wicked men are able to kill the Lord's people, they can do no more than this—they have no power to keep them dead,—they cannot destroy the soul or life which the Lord has promised to give his people, by raising them from the dead to die no more.

The word 'soul' is to be understood in this passage as the same in meaning with the word *life:* in proof of which I ask the reader's consideration of the following pasages which occur in Matthew, chap. 16, v. 25, 26: "Whosoever will save his *life* shall lose it, and whosoever will lose his *life* for my sake shall find it: For what is a man profited if he gain the whole world and lose his own *soul*, or what shall a man give in exchange for his *soul?*" Now the word translated '*life*' twice in the 25th verse, and '*soul*' twice in the 26th verse, is *one and the same Greek word in all four places.* Why should one word receive different translations in two such closely connected and current texts? The answer is plain. The translators of the Bible held the popular heathen notions about the human soul, and therefore to have used the word *soul* in the 25th verse would have grated upon their ears. "Whosoever will save his *soul* shall *lose it* [*!*], and whosoever will *lose his soul* [*!*], for my sake shall find it." Hence they employed the word '*life*' in this verse, and the word '*soul*' in the verse following! But there is evidently no good reason why one Greek word, occurring as it does in this passage, four times consecutively, should be translated by two different English words. If the reader will substitute the word '*life*' in the 26th verse for the word '*soul*,' as is done in the previous verse, he will find a natural, and as I believe, the strictly correct meaning of our Lord's words, "Whosoever will save his *life* shall lose it, and whosoever will lose his *life* for my sake shall find it: For what is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own *life*, or what shall a man give in exchange for his *life?*" What our Lord says here is very plain; "Whosoever will save his life [in this world at the expense of his duty to me] shall lose it [in the world to come], And whosoever will lose his life [in this world] for my sake shall find it [in the world to come]. For what is a man profited if he shall gain the

whole [present] world and lose his own life [in the world to come]; or what shall a man give in exchange for his [future and everlasting] life?" To *lose the soul* then, does not mean that the soul as a separate being, without a body, goes away to be everlastingly tormented; but means to *lose the blessed privilege of endless life.* When the *soul is lost*, the *man himself*, in his entire and complete nature, is lost, or cast away from conscious and endless existence, as Luke, in the parallel passage to that we are now considering, most clearly represents. "For what is a man advantaged if he gain the whole world, and *lose himself*, or be *cast away?*" Chap. 9: v. 25.

The text at the head of this tract is but partially and imperfectly understood by those who quote it with so much assurance in proof that the soul, as a separate being, cannot, and will not, be ever destroyed. What our Lord says is, that *man* is not able to kill the soul, or destroy the life which He will give his people; but He Himself *is able* to kill the soul, and cut off the wicked from having endless life. "Fear Him who *is able* to DESTROY BOTH SOUL and BODY IN HELL." And as our Lord warns mankind to fear Him as having the power to DESTROY THE WHOLE MAN in the ALL-CONSUMING fires of Hell, he evidently implies that *such is the punishment* which he will visit upon the wicked. The miserable subjects of the future punishment will not be perpetuated in conscious sin and suffering, but shall be 'burnt up' as 'chaff' or 'stubble' in the 'lake of fire' which shall flow around the burning world. "The heavens and the earth which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment, and PERDITION OF UNGODLY MEN." 2 Peter, chap. 3, v. 7.—*Rev. J. Panton Ham.*

INQUIRY.—I would like to hear your opinion on John 10:18. How had Christ *power* when he was dead to raise himself? and if this was not the power, what was it? F. B.

The original word here translated *power* is *exousian.* It has the sense not only of power, but of *authority, right, liberty, privilege*, &c. Thus John 1: 12, "But to as many as received him, to them gave he *power* [the right, or *privilege*] to become the sons of God," &c. Again, Heb. 13: 10, "We have an altar, whereof they have no *right—exousian*—to eat," &c. Christ received power, right, authority, *privilege*, to lay down his life and to take it again, from his Father; and the uniform testimony of all the apostles is, that "*God* raised up *Christ* from the dead." Christ voluntarily laid down his life: God had promised to *raise him up*, and to do it *early*, before corruption should set in. In view of that promise Christ, when expiring, *committed his life* to his Father, and his Father restored him to life the third day. There is nothing in the Bible to warrant the idea that Christ raised *himself* from the dead. Such a view is a virtual *denial of his death.*

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, JANUARY 15, 1854.

OUR TERMS.—*One dollar* pays for the Examiner for *this year only.* Such payment will give no claim *beyond* December next. We wish this distinctly understood. The subscriber may receive the back numbers from January first, or not, as he pleases; but *no abatement* can be made in the subscription price if he does not. Payment *in advance* is our *invariable* rule. *No agent* is authorized to receive subscriptions upon any other terms. The money may be sent by mail at *our risk, post paid*, if carefully enclosed, and directed "GEORGE STORRS, *New York.*" Any Preacher, if truly poor—and most are—shall have the paper without charge, provided he will do the best he can to procure subscribers for us, and remit the money. But to receive the paper a whole year, and then tell us they could not obtain a subscriber, is to say they have no influence, or have felt no interest in the Examiner.

BOUND EXAMINERS.—We have the Bible Examiner for 1850 and '51 bound in one volume; also 1852 and '53 in one. Price $1.50 each. Those who may wish them sent by mail can have it done, but the postage will be 30 cents per volume if pre-paid, or 45 if paid on delivery.

We can furnish the Examiner in *sheets* for '49, '50, '51, '52, and '53. Price for either of those years 50 cents; or, the five years together for $2. We have only a few of '49 left, and none of '48. These works will be found to contain much, and various matter, on the Immortality question, having gathered in them from all quarters on this theme.

ENCOURAGING.—It seems our voice, in the last Examiner, has awakened the "*True Wesleyan.*" We are right glad to see its face once more, now edited by "LUCIUS C. MATLACK," at *Syracuse, N. Y.*" We thank Br. M. for his notice that the Bible Examiner is now published *twice* each month, instead of *monthly*, as formerly. The Wesleyan may be assured we meant nothing *un-*"*complimentary*" in our remarks on its "*exit*

from this city," or its long silence as an "*exchange.*" But we did wish it to act *brotherly*, and not refuse to let us see its face, because we believe the wicked will be "annihilated." Surely, Br. Wesleyan, is there anything more wicked than a lack of *love?* Paul saith—"Though I speak with the tongues of men and angels and have *not love*, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal. And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge, and have not *love*, I am nothing."

Now, neither the Wesleyan or Examiner are entitled to the "character" of the *righteous* if the apostolic characteristic—*love*—is lacking.—And it certainly looks like being wanting if we refuse an *exchange* because we differ in opinion. But we have learned to forgive on the first appearance of repentance. Repentance is not a profession, but a *real turning about.* The evidence of it in the Wesleyan is manifest in its visits to us once more. May its light continue to shine.

Zion's Herald, also, now visits us regularly: in which fact we rejoice. We are glad to see the faces of these old friends. Each of the other papers, named in our last, still keep dark. Perhaps they think their light will do us no good. Possibly it may be so; yet they would manifest a *brotherly* heart by a different course. They may think we are unworthy of a brotherly manifestation, because we differ from them in opinion as to the true source of immortality, and the end of the wicked; but one thing is perfectly clear to our mind, that they must meet the question of man's natural immortality, and of endless sin and suffering as they have never met it yet. When such men as PROF. MAURICE, of King's College, England, and PRES. BEECHER, of this country, are themselves so aroused, and arousing others, to think of the terrible reproach cast on the character of God, our Maker, by the horrible doctrine of endless sin and suffering, it is not likely that any of the sectarian "organs" can keep quite still, or deal in such barren arguments as have heretofore been used to sustain such a theory.

A prominent Presbyterian Minister, from Ohio, called on us a few days since to procure "*Bible vs. Tradition:*" and said he wished to understand our sentiments, that if we were in error he could the better guard the people against it; at the same time declared, it would be a "great *emancipation*" if he could be satisfied we were correct. He also informed us, that a Hebrew and Greek scholar, in the west, had embraced our views and written an Essay in defence, which is soon to be published. This person, our informant says, had spent several days with him and read him his essay; since which time the writer of the essay had been "*decapitated*" by the powers in church. He is, however, undismayed.

"*The Conflict of Ages,*" by Pres. Beecher, shows that a revolution is going on, and the doctrine of endless sin and suffering is destined to fall. Universalism and Restorationism both being, to our mind, clearly unscriptural, the only refuge of any, if they adhere to the Bible, is that "Immortality and Endless Life are only through Jesus Christ, and by a Resurrection from the Dead at the last day:" and the resurrection to immortality is only to those who are *now* "*made partakers of the divine nature;*" or have the indwelling of the Holy Spirit of God, which is both the divine life in man and the living power by which the incorruptible resurrection is effected.

"EXIST AS LONG AS GOD ENDURES."—What shall? "*Man!*" Who saith so? "Professor Harkey, D. D., of the Illinois State University," at Springfield, in his address "Before the Young Men's Christian Association," at that place. We quote the following from that address.

"What is it to be great? Dr. Harkey said that he would not talk of battles, of conquests, or of noble blood. Greatness consists in a true appreciation of ourselves,—a true estimate of and a proper regard for our own intellectual natures. Man was endowed with an immortal spirit, which shall exist as long as God endures. He is not, therefore, a bubble cast up by the ocean of eternity to float a while upon the surface of and then disappear forever. * * * No; he will forever live, blooming in the Paradise of God; or eternally withering, not dying, in the regions of despair."

Thus speaks a D. D.; but thus speaketh not the voice of God, nor His prophets, Jesus Christ nor his apostles: and "Dr. Harkey" had better *hearken* to these teachers of God's will, and learn, "*The soul that sinneth it shall die.*"—"The enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs; they shall *consume*, into smoke shall they consume away;" not be "eternally withering, not dying, in the regions of despair." No,

Dr. Harkey; the Psalmist, the prophet Ezekiel, as well as Paul, and the whole Bible stamps your *assumption* of man's immortality as a fable and a falsehood. Not one solitary text is there in that entire volume that affirms man is immortal, or that he has either an immortal spirit or soul. If Dr. Harkey can produce one such text in the Bible, except Gen. 3: 4. "Ye shall not surely die"—we will travel all the way to Illinois on our knees to ask his pardon for this notice of him; and will pledge ourself to procure a Cardinal's hat from Rome, immediately. A greater service he could not do the Pope.

"PROVISIONARY COMMITTEE."—As some take the Examiner who did not last year, we would say, that this Committee associated together, last March, with the *one only object* to spread light on the *Life Theme;* and to this end, to offer *help*, so far as in our power, to those preachers who might be found able and willing to give their time to this work; leaving them at perfect liberty to preach on all other points of Bible truth according to their own convictions of truth and duty. If we are to be believed, we have never proposed to *restrict* such preachers from preaching the "*whole truth*" on any subject which they considered the Bible taught.—The insinuations, therefore, in the Advent Harbinger, to the contrary, so often uttered, we regard not in the light of *friendship*, to say nothing more. We shall not, however, stop to explain nor complain, but keep about *our own work.*—Not one of the *Prov. Com.* charge or receive one cent for their services; and all of them have contributed something to the funds. A faithful report of receipts and expenditures show from what places we receive funds and how they are appropriated; tho' the names of the individual donors are not made public. Nearly all the *labor* of the Committee falls on the Editor of the Examiner, who is the Treasurer, and keeps up the correspondence with the preachers assisted. If any wish to aid *him, personally*, it should not be directed "*for the Prov. Com.*," as he will not appropriate any such funds to himself.

Shall the work in which we are engaged go on? If it does, funds will be necessary. Near $400 have been paid in, since we first commenced; and something over that sum has been paid out by the Treasury. Some $200 more have been subscribed to the funds, through the labors of Br. Blain; which, we doubt not, will be paid soon. We wish to aid several other preachers, who are ready to work, whose names have not yet appeared in the Examiner. All communications should be addressed, "*George Storrs*, New York."

HENRY A. CHITTENDEN,
HENRY F. JOHNSON,
GEO. STORRS. } *Prov. Com.*

NEW YORK, January, 1854.

RECEIPTS since last Report, Jan. 1st. From a friend in New Bedford, Mass., $3. A friend at Bergen Point, $10. A friend in New York city, $5. Through Br. Garbutt, from friends in Somerset, N. Y., $8; and Orangeport, N. Y., $2. Through Br. C. F. Sweet, various collections, $16 25. By Br. Jacob Blain, from friends in Buffalo, N. Y., $7; South Butler, $2,50; Clyde, $2; Victor, $5; a friend in New York city, $20. Total—$80,75.

DISBURSEMENTS during same time: To C. F. Sweet, $16,25. To T. Garbutt, $10. To J. Blain, 36,50. Total—$62,75.

Treasury overdrawn at last report, $30, 65. Still overdrawn, $12,65.

FROM THOMAS GARBUTT.

Orangeport, N. Y., Jan. 2, 1854.

Br. Storrs:—December—the second month of my labor under the patronage of the Provisionary Committee, is past; and the year '53 is gone. I feel thankful to God for past favors. My health has been good. I have enjoyed some very sweet seasons in meeting with His saints; meetings long to be remembered, I think, by all who have attended. I have nothing of a discouraging character to send you, though I have had some long and cold rides and walks; sometimes a dark cloud has past over me, but I feel encouraged. It appears to me that I have accomplished more in the two months past than in any previous two months of my life for the advancement of the cause of truth. I have dared to launch out in a wider field; new places are opening, &c. I have visited another Christian church, since I wrote to you last, in Lyndon, Orleans Co. I expect to meet with them for a time every Sunday morning, and in Somerset every Sunday evening. The interest in Somerset is increasing. Last evening every seat was occupied. Eld. Hathaway was with me in the morning; it was truly good to be there. The brethren in these places love God and the truth. I design to spend my week-day evenings around in various places, regularly, every two weeks, and see what can be accomplished in that way.

GEO. T. ADAMS, 167 Hanover-st., Boston, Mass., keeps constantly on hand the "*Bible vs. Tradition;*" and it can be had of him, and at the same price as at our office: viz., 75 cents single, or ten copies for $5.

PERSONAL IDENTITY.

BY ELD. J. S. WHITE.

"*It is I myself.*"—Luke 24: 39.

Our Saviour, after his resurrection, gave abundant proof of his identity and personality. "He shewed himself alive by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God." Acts 1: 1–6. He was not only seen of the apostles, at different times, but he was seen at one time of "above five hundred brethren." See 1 Cor. 15: 1–8. On the day of his resurrection he appeared to two of his disciples on the way to Emmaus, and after a long conversation he made himself known to them in breaking of bread.—They immediately repaired to Jerusalem, and finding the eleven gathered together with others, related what they had seen. "And as they thus spake Jesus himself stood in the midst of them, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you. But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit." They did not suppose that they saw a man, but a spirit, or something that looked like a man, an apparition, or ghost. The Saviour, to convince them of their mistake, showed them the difference between a *man* and a spectre. In doing this he proved to them that it was he himself. What did he say to convince them of his personality and identity? He said, "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself, handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." In this he referred to their knowledge of him before his crucifixion. Christ was now immortal, for death was to have no more dominion over him. He gave them the same evidence of his identity in the one state as in the other, namely, that he had *flesh* and *bones*. He appealed to their senses, sight and touch. They could *see* his hands and feet, and they could *handle* them and ascertain that it was he himself.

Why should not this be the evidence of his personality? That it was, from the cradle to the cross, is admitted by all. He was taken from the cross and laid in the sepulchre, hands and feet, flesh and bones. On the third day he arose, left the tomb, and appeared to the disciples; was with them at different times for forty days. He was received up into heaven, the declaration following.—"This *same Jesus* shall so come, in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." When he returns then, he will have flesh and bones, else it will not be that same Jesus—the I myself. If our Saviour does not possess these marks of personality, we have no evidence of his existence. To believe in a Saviour who has no hands and feet composed of flesh and bones, is to believe in no Saviour.—For such a Saviour would not be the one who said, "It is I myself."

The evidence Christ gave of his own being, is true in its application to man. Man without a body does not exist. The Bible everywhere speaks of him as existing in this form, whether dead or alive. When God made the body he made the man. The body was the man. God breathed into the man the breath of life. The breath was not the man, but that which made the man live. Man sinned and died, and went to dust. The compact form which God made, has been distributed into dust, not annihilated. The body is there in the form of dust. And there is man, else he is nowhere, and the word of the Lord has failed; for the Lord said to the *man*, "Dust *thou* art and unto dust shalt *thou* return." "*Man* lieth *down* and riseth not till the heavens be no more."

Said Jacob to Joseph—"*Bury me with my fathers in the cave*, that is in the field of Ephron the Hittite. There they buried Abraham and Sarah, his wife; and there they buried Isaac and Rebekah his wife; and there they buried Leah." They did not bury their *remains*, and let their persons escape to go somewhere else. If what was buried in that field had gone to nothing, then has Abraham gone to nothing, for he was buried there. Their persons went down to the grave with flesh and bones, and they will come up with flesh and bones, else they will not be the ones who died. "Thy dead men shall live. Awake and sing; ye that dwell in the dust. Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake. I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness. I will raise him up at the last day. The dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and come forth. Stephen fell on sleep. They that sleep in Jesus shall rise first."

In these passages, and others of the same import, it is the *man* that sleeps, dies, is dead, in the grave, in dust. And it is the *same* man that is to be raised from the dead. As man, this side of death, does not exist without bodily organs, so neither does he exist the other side of death without these organs. Or if he does we have no evidence that he he is the man who lived here. Man without substance.—flesh and bones, that can be seen and handled, we know nothing about. If there are such men, they are outside of the Bible. The Bible contemplates man as a literal, material being. As such he was made; as such he lives and dies; and as such he will live in the future state or not live at all.

FROM DR. JOHN HOWELL.

Lewiston, Me., Dec. 26, 1853.

Br. Storrs:—I am happy to see where I travel an increasing interest in the subject of Life and Immortality through Christ alone.—The more I reflect and preach upon the subject, the more satisfied am I that a correct understanding of it is necessary in order to the reception of other truths, the importance of which is but faintly perceived without it. The resurrection of the dead, literally from the grave, is the hope of the church, and the literal resurrection of Christ is not only the foundation of that hope, but also of the Christian system.

Now what fact in the whole system of revealed truth so beautifully developes the importance of that event, as that the dead sleep in their graves, whither they go, Ecc. 9: 10, till it occurs? They "know not anything," is a truth presented on almost every page of the Bible, and yet what an effort is made by theologians of every name to prove they do. Not content with the declarations of Jehovah, they seem to feel themselves necessitated to make the above expression and others like it void. And indeed the support of their theological systems is the only thing that can create such a necessity.—God abideth faithful—his word will endure for ever—and by Solomon he has said, in Eccl. 3: 19, 20, that man and beast have "*one breath*, and *all go unto one place*,"—the reason of which is, that "*all* are *of* the dust, and *all* turn to dust again." In direct opposition to this, says Scholastic theology, in death one man goes directly to hell, another to heaven, and the beast to the earth, which makes three places. Preposterous! When will men be willing that God should speak what he means, and mean what he speaks? Again, said David, Ps. 92: 7, "When the wicked spring as the grass, and when *all* the workers of iniquity do flourish: it is that they shall be *destroyed for ever*." In all this the love of God is clearly manifested. Rather than exert his power to perpetuate the sinner's life in the fires of an orthodox hell for ever, causing "his fiery indignation to kindle, and his incensed fury to feed the flame of their torment," as said Mr. Benson in his sermon on "The Future Misery of the Wicked," he causes them to "be as though they had not been." Obad. 16 v. How much more lovely does the character of God appear, when he is considered as inflicting a penalty upon the sinner, according to the literal import of the terms used to define it, as "the *soul* that sinneth it shall die," than by torturing our intellects, and bringing into requisition all the powers of imagination to originate terms as the definitions of '*die*,' sufficiently strong to answer a miserable lifeless theology, and produce in the mind of the sinner such a picture of horror, as to exclude the possibility of loving the author of such a scheme. If such be gospel, mercy grant that we may have another edition, more favorable to the character of its author.—Thanks be to God that the gospel of his grace declares the sinner shall die, and that eternal life is obtained only through Christ.

Bro. S. S. Brewer and myself are delivering a course of lectures on this subject in this place (Lewiston). The interest up to last evening increases at every lecture, and we hope to see a good result. Br. Brewer has been lecturing ten miles below here, in Durham, on this and kindred subjects, at which place a deep interest was manifested by almost the entire community, and especially those belonging to the Universalist Society. Commenced by invitation in the Baptist meeting house; it being refused after the first lecture, the Universalists kindly opened theirs, when their entire congregation, with the exception of about twenty, repaired to listen to the truth. The result of which was, that a number of them embraced the doctrine of immortality through Christ alone, and his speedy coming, among whom was one of the main pillars of the society. We think of returning there, and presenting something further on the subject. The Lord bless you in presenting the truth, is the prayer of your brother in the faith.

From Daniel Morris.

Rushville, N. Y.

Geo. Storrs:—Dear Sir.—I have been a regular reader of the Bible Examiner since you were at this place, in 1851, and am constrained to admit the truthfulness of its matter.

Some months prior to your coming to our place I had embraced Christianity, and entered, as I hoped, upon the performance of religious duties. I had ever yielded a nominal assent to the popular theory of the day, not doubting the truth of what the orthodox clergy taught. I was urged for my own safety to unite with the church, and had concluded to do so. Still I thought I would examine the foundation of my faith; as also the truth of the church creed as tested by Revelation. Strange to say, as I examined, I grew, for the first time in my life, skeptical. It alarmed me—I attributed it to the evil one. I prayed God to enlighten my dark understanding. Yet the more I examined the evidence, the further was I from the orthodox creed. I compared opinions with a friend who had embraced Christianity at the same time I did. He was embarrassed in the same way;—for he, as myself, had concluded to adopt the enquiry—What saith the Scripture? rather than what saith the creed?

We were thus examining, doubting, and again struggling to accommodate and reconcile theology and the Scripture, when you came to our place. I heard your first sermon. For the first time I heard it,—you raised the question—"*Is man immortal?*" My doubts vanished—the mystery was solved, the Scriptures were no longer a revealed book. I had started wrong—I had affirmed what was untrue, and was trying to accommodate the Scripture to my erroneous assumption. I now have no difficulty in understanding the *Word*.

From Benjamin Coddington.

Lafayette, Ind.

Br Storrs:—I rejoice to say to you that the truth of God is beginning to find way into the minds of quite a number in this place. Some young men of character and intelligence have come out and embraced the truth of the Bible. This has caused some of our orthodox ministers to come down on the doctrines, and denounce those who advocate them as a class of refined infidels, who (as a Methodist minister said, last Sabbath evening) are trying to pervert the truth

of the Bible in order to have a covering for their sins.

If we are to be called by hard names, and persecuted for truth's sake, ought we not in meekness rather to rejoice?

Bro Richmond was with us last summer, and also this winter, and spent two Sabbaths at each visit. I am happy to say, that his labors have not been in vain in the Lord. There is a manifest disposition among the people to look into these things. May the Lord guide their minds into all truth.

I must say in conclusion that I have been thankful to God, many times, that your Six Sermons ever fell into my hands. I consider them the great key that unlocks the mind to a proper understanding of the Scriptures, and exposes the superstitions and traditions of men.—When I look upon the great and solemn truths of the Holy Bible, I marvel that there is so little practical piety among the people. When I look out upon the mass of my fellow countrymen and see how little effort is made to seek for that glory which is of God, and that honor and immortality which none but God can give, I ask, Who shall be able to stand at his coming and kingdom? My prayer is that the spirit of God may lead me into His will in all things.

From Orange Hitchcock.

China, N. Y.

Br. Storrs:—The error that it is the purpose of God to hold his creatures in eternal torments, for sins unrepented of, which they commit in this world, lays the foundation of other errors, and makes the whole plan of redemption dark, intricate, and bewildering to those who upon this principle try to understand it. Is the idea a rational one that an infinitely holy and wise being would ever form a plan whereby he could save those who have broken his laws, and his principles of justice remain untarnished, without making it plain, clear, and comprehensible to all his accountable creatures? I think not. And this is a strong argument against the so-called orthodox theory.

Is it too much to say that not one individual who has embraced the doctrine, that there is no immortality for any one only through Christ, but what will admit that they see a simplicity, a consistency, and glory in the gospel which they never saw while believers in the common theory? There may be one, but it does not seem possible to me.

For one, I feel to praise God for the light which was first thrown upon my mind by your Six Sermons, which was the means of leading me from the mazes of darkness and error into the light and clear channel of truth.

I read and reflected, studied and examined the Word of God to see if that which seemed to be light was really so, until about six months had past away, when I expressed my belief openly that the common theory of the endless torment of the finally impenitent was not taught in the Word of God, and was contrary to reason.—Whether I have the truth upon this subject or not, I think I never can see differently until I can be made to believe that light is darkness and darkness is light.

One thing which my experience has helped me to learn is this, when I meet with those who cannot be persuaded to read anything upon the subject—which I frequently do—not to suffer any feeling of condemnation to arise in my breast, when sympathy, love, and a strong desire they might see and embrace the truth, should be permitted to dwell there unmolested.

From John Lindsey.

Milo, Me.

Br. Storrs:—I will give you some parts of my experience since March last, when I was in Boston, and heard the course of lectures that you delivered in that city, at that time. I also subscribed for the Examiner, and procured some other works on the theory of life and death, which, to me, before that, was unknown; but those works, together with your arguments at your lectures, and a careful reading of the Bible, have set my mind at ease in regard to man's destiny after death. I believe that man has no immortality except through Christ. He only will give eternal life, and that at the resurrection. I have had some trials to contend with. I have been set aside from the church to which I belonged, called infidel; and when they were not able to answer my questions, they have used ridicule. But all this does not make me doubt in the least; for I believe that the popular doctrine of an endless existence in conscious torment will not long find support in enquiring minds. I know not as there is one person within the circle of fifty miles of me that I can confer with on this theory. I feel alone, at times, in this respect; but I try to have my trust in God, not caring who is against me if my ways are accepted by him.

From James Battersby.

Springfield, Ill., Nov. 28, 1853.

Br. Storrs:—In a few weeks I shall remove to Fort Smith, Ark.; a growing town on the junction of the State of Arkansas, the Cherokee, Choctaw, and Creek Nations. I wish you would call attention to my spending the winter and spring there; and if there be any in that region of country desiring my services, you can say, I am their servant for Christ's sake.

We hope Br. Battersby will find a good opening to preach the *Word of Life* in Arkansas.—There labor is needed, we are sure: and we trust our brother will show himself a workman in that field.—Editor.

THE CROSS.—A REVIEW.

Philadelphia, Dec. 2, 1853.

DEAR BRO. STORRS:—As you nobly remark, "The freedom of thought and expression of thought, we will maintain for ourselves and *concede to others*," I send for publication in your valuable periodical, a few strictures on Mr. Ham's articles "on the Doctrine of the Cross."

Yours, in Ch. love,

HENRY GREW.

In Mr. Ham's very interesting articles on "The Doctrine of the Cross," there are a few remarks which I beg leave to review "in love."

Not only do I most cordially unite with our talented friend in rejecting the "theory which professes to explain the Christ of the Scriptures by placing him on the category of mere humanity only;" but as cordially do I respond to all his representations of Him who is "the image of the invisible God," with a single exception.—He remarks—"And if we were to analyze this deeper feeling, shall we not find it to be akin to that hallowed feeling with which we venerate the Supreme God himself?" To this no objection can be justly made, for the word of divine inspiration teaches us that, as the Father has committed all judgment to the Son, he is to be honored, *in some sense*, even as we honor the Father. John 5: 22, 23.

But the writer adds,—"Nay, more: can our analysis show that the feeling is not really identical?" I reply, it is, as the writer himself says, "*akin*," but not "*identical*." The latter involves the important error, of giving that glory of absolute supremacy and independency to another, which the Father exclusively possesses, and which he declares he "will not give to another."

"The Greek, in John's Gospel, translated '*with* God,' is '*pros ton Theon*.' The idea of the preposition *pros* is that of *nearness*, bordering upon, yet not absolute *identity; likeness* without *sameness*." The representation of Philo Judæus, who was contemporary with our Lord, quoted also by the writer from Dr. Pye Smith, that the Son is "*fixed the nearest, there being no intervening existence*, to the Only One, who is self-existent," is also incompatible with identity. The Father is *self-existent* and *independent*. The Son, though in respect to all created beings, he has the pre-eminence, is "*begotten*" and *dependent*. His own testimony is, "I live by the Father." Our feelings of adoration, &c., should be in accordance with Truth. The Father is to be worshipped with feelings of adoration, &c., in harmony with the great truth that he is, as Jesus Christ, "the faithful Witness," declares, "the only true God." John 17: 3. The Son is to be worshipped with feelings corresponding with the truth that he is the "first begotten of the Father;" the very "image of the invisible God," and the only Name by whom we must be saved from everlasting death. These feelings, truly analyzed, cannot be "really identical."

The intelligent writer remarks—

"In the view of the parable of the wicked husbandman, which sets forth the morality of our Lord's treatment, and the estimation in which God, as the Lord of the vineyard, regarded his Son's rejection, it will not be doubted that the crucifixion of Christ, so far from being acceptable to God, or demanded by any principle of his perfect moral government, was altogether a guilty violation of his holy will, and a daring defiance of his law authority."

Now, I ask not whether or not this representation of the death of the Son of God, will stand the test of any "scheme of popular Christianity." I ask, will it or will it not stand the test of the Word which abideth forever? Let us see.

That the rejection and crucifixion of the Son of the Blessed, was, *in respect to the Jews*, "a guilty violation of (God's) holy will," *revealed as the standard of their duty*, is no question of controversy. They did so "with *wicked* hands." This truth, however, must be received in a sense which will not invalidate other divine testimonies relative to the same subject, which are equally plain and positive.

Whether or not the act was or was not, *in any respect*, "acceptable to God," the following declarations of the Eternal Spirit will determine.

"*It pleased* the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief, when thou shalt make his soul (life) an offering for sin, he shall see his seed," &c. "That he *by the grace of God* should taste death for every man." "Awake, O Lord, against my Shepherd, against the man, my fellow, saith the Lord of hosts:" "Jesus Christ, *whom God hath set forth* to be a propitiation for sin, through faith in his blood," &c. "Him being delivered *by the determinate counsel* and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain." "For of a truth, against thy only child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate with the Gentiles and people of Israel, were gathered together, for to do whatever thy hand and thy counsel *determined* before to be done." When Peter objected to the crucifixion of our blessed Lord, Jesus said, "Thou savorest not the things *which be of God*," *&c.*

Whether or not the inspired writers "allude to the crucifixion of Christ as being designed to satisfy any judicial demands of the law of God; or to secure the moral efficiency of the divine government," the following passages will determine.

"Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation (mercy seat) through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past through the forbearance of God; to declare at this time his righteousness; *that he might be just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus*." "He hath made him to be sin (i. e., a sin offering) for us—that we may be made the righteousness of God in

him." "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, cursed is every one who hangeth on a tree." "Christ *died for our sins* according to the Scriptures."—"Washed us *from our sins in his own blood*." "In whom we have redemption *through his blood*." "And for this cause he is the Mediator of the New Testament, that *by means of death for the redemption of the transgression*, that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." "Once in the end of the world (age or state) hath he appeared *to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself*."—"For if, when we were enemies, *we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son*," &c.—"This man, after he had offered *one sacrifice for sins*," &c. "He was wounded *for our transgression*, he was bruised *for our iniquities*," &c. "The Lord hath laid on him the iniquities of us all," &c. "He shall bear their iniquities."—"Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God." "Gave himself for our sins." Other similar passages might be adduced.

If it was no part of the divine wisdom to make the life of him, our blessed Saviour, "an offering for sin"—if it did *not* please "the Lord to bruise him," where, I ask, is to be found the import of the former sacrifices, "That could not make him that did the service perfect," being only "imposed on them until the time of reformation?" Where shall we find the true solution of that important declaration, "Without the shedding of blood, there is no remission," if it is not found in the announcement of the harbinger of the Son of the Blessed, "Behold the LAMB of God, *which taketh away the sin of the world*?"

Whether or not these divine testimonies can possibly be reconciled with the unqualified denial that the death of the Son of God was "demanded by any principle of his (God's) perfect moral government," is submitted to the intelligent reader. I ask what language could the inspired writer have employed to teach such a sentiment, which would be plainer or more appropriate, than the declaration that the design of the God of Salvation, in this transcendant transaction was. "*that he might be just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus?*"—Rom. 3: 26.

If the above, and other kindred passages, do not teach some important connection between the death of the Son of God, and the righteousness of the divine government in the forgiveness of sin—if they do not teach that our Lord's obedience unto the death of the Cross, was, in some important sense, *vicarious*, I despair of learning any thing from the sacred volume.

None of these passages declare that the innocent Saviour was *punished;* neither do they necessarily imply, that he has so paid our debt to the Father, as to exclude the plain and important scriptural doctrine of the Father's mercy and forgiveness.

[*To be Continued.*]

INQUIRY.—"Permit me to ask an exposition of Isaiah 57: 1, 2. It seems to carry the idea of walking and resting at the same time. I get along with it by making it a double assurance that they shall rest in their bed (or graves) and also enter into peace; but I don't know *when* the walking in their uprightness *is declared* to be. But I do believe I am authorized to make an inference in harmony with the positive declarations that "The dead know not anything," "The dead praise not the Lord," &c. It is one of those passages at which the immortal-soulists catch, as a drowning man does at a straw."

A. A. B.

ANS.—All obscurity is at once removed from this text by the Septuagint, which reads the two verses as follows:—

"See how the just man has perished, and no man lays it to heart; and righteous men are taken away, and no one considers: for the righteous has been removed out of the way of injustice. His burial shall be in peace: he has been removed out of the way."

Judgments were to fall on the wicked *idolators* next spoken of, but the upright who rested in the grave, were "out of the way," having been "buried in peace." The text affords not even the support of a "*straw*" to the "immortal-soulists." Truly they "feed on wind" when they try to press this text into their service.

A NEW TRACT.

I propose publishing a tract in which will be given a clear, and irrefutable Bible answer to the question

WHAT IS THE SOUL?

1st. By the plain declarations of the word.
2d. By the plan of redemption as revealed in the gospel.
3d. By the plan of redemption as set forth in the types.

PART II.

Eight objections to the doctrine considered.

PART III.

Application to the doctrines of the Bible as held by the church.

The pamphlet will be 18 mo, 48 or 64 pages, with paper covers. Price not to exceed $4 per hundred; and, if it can be afforded at, $3; for considering the truth presented important, I desire for it as a primary object a wide circulation. As a secondary, a small advance to aid in the support of myself and family. It will be published as soon as returns can be obtained of the number wanted. Address me at Seneca Falls, Seneca Co., N. Y. E. R. PINNEY.

Jan. 7, 1854.

To Our Patrons.—The remainder of our Discourse on "*Obedience to God*" is deferred till February to make room for Br. Grew and others. The articles in this number will give ample matter for two weeks' consideration. Let them be pondered well, and not passed over slightly. We issue the Examiner *to be read.* If you do not read it carefully, you may as well not have it. These are days in which minds are stirred, and we shall all be carried some where: there is no avoiding it. Let us then examine well and thoroughly the way we travel, and see that we are on the *right track.* Old stereotyped theological dogmas, forced on our minds in childhood, have now to pass a fiery trial. If they are "*gold*" they will stand the test; if "*wood and stubble*" they will be burned up. He that is afraid, or shrinks from having his theological views tried, gives sad evidence that he loves *ease* more than *truth.* One thing we are perfectly assured of, that the old "*theological hell,*" of *endless sin and suffering,* is destined to go to the "moles and to the bats." But what is coming in its place? To those who still maintain that man has an immortal soul, *final restoration* is the inevitable *substitute.* We have *facts* on that point among the ministers, even in this city, that assure us we are not mistaken in the tendency of "orthodox" preachers to *restorationism.* They cannot longer make themselves nor others believe that there is any possible way to reconcile endless sin and suffering with the attributes of God; but holding still to the immortality of a soul in man—they are falling into the wake of the German divines, and that of Bishop Newton, who in his "*Dissertation,*" "*On the final state and condition of men,*" after a labored effort to show that "*everlasting*" means only as long as their wicked character should continue, says:

"Repentance, therefore, is not impossible in hell; but yet you may ask—What reason is there to think it possible? and I answer—Because *it is impossible for any creature to live in eternal torments.* Who among us can dwell with the devouring fire? who among us can dwell with everlasting burnings? * * * Nothing can be more contrary to the divine nature and attributes than for a God all-wise, all-powerful, all-good, all-perfect, to bestow existence on any beings, whose destiny, he foresees and foreknows, must terminate in wretchedness and misery, without recovery or remedy, without respite or end. * * * 'God is love,' and he would rather have not given life, than render that life a torment and curse to all eternity. * * * Imagine a creature, nay, imagine numberless creatures produced out of nothing * * * delivered over to torments of endless ages, without the least hope or possibility of relaxation or redemption. *Imagine if you may, but you can never seriously believe it,* nor reconcile it to God and goodness. * * God * * could never make any [creature] whose end he foreknew would be misery everlasting. * * The *letter* of Scripture may indeed sound forth everlasting punishments, but the *spirit* of Scripture intimates the contrary."

Satisfy these men that there is no immortality in man; and that it can only be realized as a *gift* of God, through Jesus Christ, and by the resurrection at the last day, and they will discover that the clear and full testimony of the Scriptures to the *utter destruction* of the wicked needs no theological twattle to do away its plain utterance on the question—"All the wicked will God destroy." "The enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs: they shall consume, into smoke shall they consume away." Psalm 37, 20; and 145, 20. Also Psalm 101, 8, "I will early *annihilate* all the wicked of the land; that I may *annihilate* all wicked doers from the city of the Lord." In this last text we have given the literal translation of the original word according to Professor Pick, in his "Bible Student's Concordance." No truth is more clearly stated, in the Bible, than the total, entire, and "everlasting destruction" of the enemies of God: and nothing hinders any man from seeing it so except the *tradition* of an immortal soul in man. We say "*tradition,*" because there is not one solitary text from Genesis to Revelation that affirms any such doctrine. Let those find it who suppose it is there, if they can.

Let the "*Bible vs. Tradition*" continue to be scattered; under God it will uproot the last remnant of that pernicious fable. Price 75 cents, or ten copies for $5.

The Life Theme in New York.—A meeting has been opened in this city, where this *theme* is to be made *prominent,* at *Mechanics' Hall,* 472 Broadway, above Grand Street. None of the funds appropriated to the disposal of the Prov. Com., are applied to sustain this meeting; yet some of this Committee contribute largely to the support of it. *Br. H. L. Hastings,* lately preaching at Plymouth, Mass., is mainly to preach and conduct the meetings at the Hall, tho' the Editor of the Examiner will preach there occasionally. Social meetings in the morning, and preaching afternoon and evening, is the order of services every Sunday.