BIBLE EXAMINER.

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

VOL. IX. NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 15, 1854. NO. 4.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY
At No. 140 Fulton-street.
TERMS.---One Dollar for the Year;
Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

"UNITY OF MAN."

OR, REVIEW OF REV. LUTHER LEE.

BY ANTHROPAS.

[Never before published in the Examiner.]

In Mr. Lee's article No. 12, he bases an argument on the doctrine of what he is pleased to call "the primitive church" or the "Apostolic Fathers." He says—"In an investigation like the one in which we are engaged, it is of the *utmost importance* to understand what was the doctrine of the early Christians, who received their instructions from the Apostles, and those who immediately succeeded them."

As a preliminary question, I would ask, What do we understand by "*the primitive church?*" and "the early Christians?" I understand what Mr. Lee means, but, I apprehend, he is utterly wrong in his hypothesis. "The primitive church," in point of fact, was the first church established by the Apostles; and this will carry us back to Jerusalem, the locality of the first Christian Congregation. "The early Christians" are those who first received the Gospel of Christ, and obeyed it. And, in this view of the subject, I grant that "it is of the *utmost importance* to understand what their doctrine was; but I do not suppose it possible to determine this point by an appeal to those who have been termed "Apostolic Fathers." But, why appeal to these "Fathers" at all? Mr. Lee's doctrine was either taught by the Apostles, or it was not; if it was, surely he can make it appear from their writings; but, if it was not taught, why appeal to the Fathers to prove that which is *false?*

That must be a bad cause which requires such testimony to sustain it, in the absence of all scriptural evidence!

But in reference to these Fathers, I will remark, that their writings are not to be relied upon. The five Fathers who flourished in the first century, were Barnabas, Hermas, Clement of Rome, Ignatius, and Polycarp.

The first of these quoted by Mr. Lee is St. Clement. This Clement, if I mistake not, is claimed as one of the *Popes* of Rome, by Catholic authority. They place *Peter* in the chair first, then *Linus*, who transferred it to *Anacletus*, then CLEMENT. EUSEBIUS, book iii, chap. 2, page 82; chap. 13, page 100.

Speaking of the writings of Clement, Du Pin, who is regarded as an authentic Roman Catholic historian, proves them to be spurious; because, first, "The second epistle of St Clement directed to St. James, speaks of the *Ostiarii* or door-keepers, arch-deacons, and other ecclesiastical officers, *that were not then introduced into the church;*" 2d, "This letter mentions *sub*-deacons, an order not then established in the church." p. 584.

But, in relation to all, or most, of these writings of the Apostolic Fathers, I will again refer to Du Pin. "Criticism is a kind of torch, that lights and conducts us, in the obscure tracts of antiquity, by making us able to distinguish *truth* from *falsehood*, *history* from *fable*, and *antiquity* from novelty. 'T is by this means, that in our times we have disengaged ourselves from an infinite number of very common errors into which our fathers fell for want of examining things by the rules of true criticism. *For it is a surprising thing to consider how many* SPURIOUS BOOKS *we find in antiquity; nay, even* IN THE FIRST AGES OF THE CHURCH." He then proceeds to give the reasons which prompted persons thus to publish "Spurious Books," the first of which is, "the malice of heretics; who, to give the greater reputation to their heresies, composed several books, which they attributed to persons of great reputation." &c.. "And thus the first heretics devised *false Gospels, false Acts, and false Epistles of the Apostles, and their Disciples*," &c.

Mr. Hinton says of these Fathers, that "There are no writings of the venerable men that can be safely relied on as the productions of their pens, except perhaps, the epistle of Clement; and the reader has seen the disposition we make of his writings. Furthermore, he says—"Indeed, such was the state both of literature and morals, in the fourth and subsequent centuries, that the favorite occupation of the Monks of those days, seems to have been first to write the most ridiculous nonsense by way of indicating their literary taste; and then fraudulently to attach to it the name of some eminent Father of the first or second century, by way of proving the high state of their moral sensibility."

Mosheim says—"The epistle of Barnabas was the production of some Jew," &c. "The 'Shepherd of Hermas,' was composed in the second century by Hermes, who was brother of Pius, bishop of Rome."

But, after all, it seems to me that Mr. Lee has

rather *forced* Polycarp to testify in favor of his hypothesis, than otherwise, and that the quotation made does not *legitimately* prove it. But, be this as it may, there is little or no reliance to be placed on any of these reputed Epistles, as we have already seen.

But, I would have the reader remember, that even in the Apostles' day, the "mystery of iniquity" began to work, and to develope itself. Many errors, and among them, I apprehend, that advocated by Mr. Lee himself, were quite prevalent; even in the Apostolic Age. Of this class were Hymeneus and Philetus, who, by advocating the opinion now taught by Mr. Lee, Mr. Brewster, Dr. Bush and others, denied the proper resurrection of the body, and "overthrew the faith of some." If a man puts on his "resurrection body" when he dies, then the resurrection of the body at the coming of Christ is a nullity and a fable! This view obtained before the death of the Apostles; no marvel, therefore, that we should find traces of it in the first and second centuries, and down to the present time.

What doctrine, I ask, has not been proved by the testimony of the Fathers? Mr. Lee goes to them to prove the "immateriality" (*the nothingness*) of the soul: the Pædobaptist to prove Infant sprinkling; the Baptist to prove immersion; the Catholic to prove that Peter was the first Pope, the truth of the doctrine of Purgatory, the invocation of saints, Apostolic succession, &c., &c. Mr. Lee says—"It is of the utmost importance to understand what was the doctrine of the early Christians, who received their instructions from the Apostles, and those who immediately succeeded them." Let *him*, then, be *honest* to them, and to himself, and believe *all* they taught! But, I apprehend, he would not be willing to endorse the sentiments of even all the extracts he has made! And I am sure that their testimony is not necessary, except to sustain a *rotten* cause!

But, in order to rebut all the *remaining* force of Mr. Lee's argument, I will introduce a passage from *Justin Martyr*, who was born A. D. 89, and suffered death for Christ A. D. 163. He tells Trypho, the Jew, "that some indeed called Christians, are in fact atheists (*atheai*—without God) and impious heretics, because in every way, they teach blasphemy, impiety and folly." He gives proof of his own sincerity, and protests that he was "determined to follow no men, nor human authority, but God and the doctrine taught by him;" adding "should you happen upon some who are called Christians indeed, and yet are far from holding these sentiments, but even *dare* to assail the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob with blasphemy and say, *'there is no resurrection of the dead; but instantly when they die, are received up into heaven, do not count these among Christians*, even as they are not Jews, if accurately considered, who are called Sadducees, and the like sects of Genistar, Meristar, Galileans, *Hellinists, Pharisees*, Baptists, (a sect that followed John the Baptist) and others: but under the name of Jews and sons of Abraham, they worship God, as he accuses them, with their lips only, while their heart is far from him. But I, and all who are sound in the Christian faith, are acquainted with the resurrection of the body, and the 1000 years in Jerusalem, that shall be rebuilt, adorned, and enlarged, as the Prophets Ezekiel, Isaiah, and others declare." Brooks on Prophecy, page 52; also Duffield's work. Justin Martyr himself affirms that he was contemporary with the Apostle John, who wrote the Revelation, in which mention is made of the 1000 years five times, in connexion with the universal subjugation of evil, the resurrection from the dust of the sleeping saints, and their reign with Christ.

Here, then, we have a clear and distinct expression of sentiment, in relation to this point; while Mr. Lee has to *infer* from the language he quotes, that such was the view of the authors he cites. Justin Martyr distinctly tells Trypho, that he was not to "count those as Christians" who believed the, *now*, popular doctrine! Mr. Brooks says—"Irenæus ranks these professors, in his work against Heresies (book v.) as among the heretical; and the testimony of the church is uniform on this point (if we except some questionable passages in Cyprian) down into Popish times; and, indeed, it was the general opinion of the Greek and Latin churches down to the Council of Florence, held under Pope Eugenius IV., A. D. 1439."

Bishop Taylor, in his work on the 'Liberty of Prophesying' (viii.) sets this in a clear light. He says—"It is a plain recession from antiquity which was determined by the council of Florence—*That the souls of the pious, being purified, are immediately received into heaven and behold clearly the Triune Jehovah just as he is;* for those who please to try, may see it resolved dogmatically to the contrary by Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Origen, Chrysostome, Theodoret, Arethas Cæsariensis, and Euthymius, who may answer for the Greek church. And it it is plain that it was the opinion of the Greek church by that great difficulty the Romans had of bringing the Greeks to subscribe to the Florentine Council, where the Latins acted their master piece of wit and stratagem—the greatest that hath been till the famous Council of Trent. And for the Latin church, Tertullian, Ambrose, Austin, Hilary, Prudentius, Lactantius, Victorinus, and Bernard, are known to be of opinion, that the souls of the saints are *in abditis receptaculis et exterioribus atriis*—in unseen receptacles and outer darkness—where they expect the resurrection," &c.

The early Reformers maintained the *primitive* faith on this point, plainly perceiving *that the object of the Papists was to help forward the doctrine of purgatory and invocation of saints.* Thus *Tyndal*, disputing with the Papists, says, "*If the souls be in heaven, tell me why they be not in as good case as the angels be? And then, what cause of the resurrection?*"

And, again, in reply to Sir Thomas More, who

objects against *Luther*—that his doctrine encouraged the sinner to continue in sin, seeing it so long postponed the ultimate judgment, *Tyndal* says, "*Christ* and his *apostles* taught no other, but warned to look for Christ's coming again every hour; which coming again, *because ye believe it will never be*, therefore have ye *feigned that* other merchandise"—of the instantaneous translation of souls to heaven at death!

Calvin also, in his *Psycopannuchia*, replies thus to another objection against this doctrine:—"I answer, that Christ is our head, whose kingdom and glory have not yet appeared. If the members were to go (to heaven) before their head (comes) the order of things would be inverted and preposterous. But we shall follow our Prince then, when he shall come in the glory of his Father, and sit upon the throne of his majesty, p. 255 .It is greatly to be lamented, that the Protestant Church of a latter period should have fallen into the errors of the Papists on this subject (abating the distinct acknowledgment of Purgatory)—errors, the adoption of which has done more than any other thing, perhaps, toward withdrawing from the church the lively expectation of Christ's Advent." This doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul, being pagan in its origin, was incorporated with Christianity, and constituted the grand work of the Apostacy. Upon it was built the doctrine of Purgatory, invocation of saints, &c. When *Martin Luther* first commenced his crusade against "the Mother of Harlots and abominations of the earth," he repudiated the doctrine in question, as a part of the strong delusion of the wicked One.

D'Aubigne says—"Duke George of Saxony, who would neither connect himself with Rome nor with Wittemberg, had written, as early as the 15th October, 1521, to Duke John the Elector's brother, to induce him to side with those who opposed the progress of the Reformation. 'Some,' wrote he, 'deny the immortality of the soul, and these Friars too, drag the Relics of St. Anthony through the streets, and through them into the gutters. All this comes of Luther's teaching.'"

The following is an extract from Audlin's Life of Luther, which will prove that Luther rejected the pagan dogma of an immortal soul in the animal Man. "He is speaking of the bad principle of every one construing Scripture to suit himself, and adduces the Italians as illustrative of its evil tendency, which practice, says he, was first introduced by Martin Luther. Thus he writes:—'These were new lights, who came to announce, that they had discovered an irresistible argument against the Mass, Purgatory, and Prayer to the saints. This was simply to deny the Immortality of the soul, an idea that had been hatched in the brains of some Italian refugees, who were publicly laughed at. They left Wittemberg and went to Geneva, where we find them in 1561, sustaining in a crowded school, and in printed *theses*, that all which has been said about the Immortality of the soul was invented by Antichrist for the purpose of making the Pope's pot boil. *Purgatorium cum missa et pontifice romano melius abolere possumus, quam si dicamus simul anima cum corpore extingui. Quidquid animarum habetur immortalitate, ab Antichristo ad statuendam suam culinam excogitatum est.* This proposition was really maintained in Geneva, not however in General Assembly as Prateolus relates in Elench. voce. p. 72, but by some Italian exiles, who published their *theses*, and maintained them in full school.'—*Boyle, Art. Luther.*

"They quoted Luther, who had said, 'It is idle to trouble ourselves with endeavoring to prove that the soul is produced by propagation, or that it is infused into the body at the moment of creation. I maintain with the poet, *that the child follows its parent. Op. Luther, t.* xi; *Boyle, Art. Luther.* They misunderstood the passage." *Audlin, pp.* 192, 193.

The doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul, is the foundation on which the Harlot Mother sits; and, as she is the mother of harlots, all her daughters have drank deeply of her spiritual fornication! The whole Protestant world is tinctured with this subtile heresy; and in vain do they oppose the Mass, Purgatory, and the invocation of saints, whose very existence depends upon the popular dogma of immortality, while they maintain, uphold and defend this foundation! If the popular doctrine be true, what argument can you bring against Purgatory? What against the invocation of saints? None, so effective as the one we oppose to those false and delusive dogmas.

Men, Brethren and Fathers! be *Protestants* indeed, and renounce every relic—the last vestige of Catholicism, or cease to call yourselves such! We are now grappling with the great City of Pago-papal Babylon; come, and with us lay hold of the mighty lever of truth, that the superstructure may fall, and, like a millstone cast into the deep, be found no more at all!

THE CROSS—A REVIEW.

BY HENRY GREW.

[*Concluded from page* 31.]]

That "the parable of the wicked husbandmen," and other passages, fully show that "the crucifixion" of our blessed Redeemer "was the highest expression of human wickedness," is no subject of our present controversy. It is to the inference deduced, by our respected author, from this obvious truth that I demur. The inference is, that it could not have been "for any purpose connected with his (God's) own righteous government," &c. We may as well infer from the fact of Joseph's brethren delivering "with wicked hands" their brother to the Ishmaelites to go down to Egypt, that God did *not* send him there "to preserve a posterity in the earth and to save (their) lives by

a great deliverance." Gen. 45: 7. So fully is the divine purpose recognized in the affair, that it was affirmed by Joseph to his brethren (to be understood of course in a qualified sense) "So now it was not you that sent me hither, but God." verse 8. It is a glorious truth, both rational and spiritual, that the Ruler of the Universe causes "the wrath of man to praise him." What man does for evil, God overrules for good. The word, which we declare to be "the only rule of faith," as positively declares the crucifixion of the Lord of glory to have been according "to the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God," as that it was done "with wicked hands." Acts 2: 23; 4: 27, 28. Their voluntary wickedness was indeed, as Mr. Ham observes, "the proximate cause" of the atrocious act. The purpose of God was the *remote* cause, operating in some manner, inscrutable to finite minds, in perfect harmony with the moral agency of men. "The stern logic of common sense" must admit, that the ways of an infinite being may, in some respects, be "past finding out" by finite minds.

Mr. H. argues, "that as Satan was the prime instigator of that deed (the death of the Lord Jesus) Satan must have given the satisfaction," *i. e.* "for sins."

For the phrase "satisfaction for sins," being unscriptural, I do not contend. The argument however is, that Satan must have done the good which the death of Christ did. If so, it follows that as Satan instigated Joseph's brethren to sell him to go into Egypt, Satan must have the credit of saving many "lives by a great deliverance!" Satan indeed did, in both cases, instigate that to be done which was *the occasion* of great good by God's overruling wisdom. But, as he meant that for evil which God meant for good, he is justly condemned; and to God belongs the glory. A murderer may aim the fatal ball at my head, it may pass me and enter that of a wild beast, who is ready to tear me to pieces and thus save my life. This alters not the murderer's guilt. It does, however, according to Mr. D'Israeli's logic.

Again, it is argued that if "the justice of God was maintained and magnified by the death of the Lord Jesus Christ, then it follows, from the New Testament representations of the causes of Christ's death, that God's justice was maintained and magnified by the highest injustice and wickedness of men." The truth that Jehovah thus causes the wrath of man to praise him is established and illustrated by various scriptural facts. The history of Joseph, already considered, presents one of these facts. The justice of God was maintained and magnified by the wickedness of the King of Assyria, who was the sword of the Lord's anger against Israel for their sins. It was not in the heart of the proud monarch to fulfil the divine purpose; his object was the gratification of his own selfish ambition, he was therefore justly punished. Isaiah 10: 12. Wicked men are God's sword. The Philistines, &c., were such. Modern wars are exhibitions of the same. Wicked nations are the executioners of God's righteous judgments against other wicked nations; "for God hath put in their hearts to fulfil his will." Rev. 17: 17.

It is also inferred from the supposition that the death of Christ is "the reason why God forgives sin," that "the world's guilt was purified by the foulest guilt the world ever perpetrated," &c. The abstract contemplation of this atrocious act, independently of other aspects, in which the Spirit of truth has taught us to view it, may indeed excite the exclamation, "Marvellous conclusions!" We shall however demand of "the stern logic of common sense" that it shall suspend its decisions until *all* the divine testimonies relative to the subject are considered. By quotations from these testimonies I have shown that "whatsoever" "wicked hands" did in this case was what God's "counsel determined a fore to be done," "to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins," &c. Acts 2: 23; 4: 27, 28; Romans 3: 25, 26; &c., &c. "It pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed," &c. Isaiah 53d chapter. "Marvellous conclusions" indeed of divine wisdom and love, which "the angels desire to look into," transcending probably, in some respects, their perceptive powers as they do ours.

In connection with the atrocity of the Jews, we must consider the fact of the voluntary sacrifice of the Son of God who "died for our sins;" ("I lay down my life of myself," said the friend of sinners. "I lay down my life for my sheep,") as well as the fact above stated that, "It pleased the Lord to bruise him" and to "make his soul (life) an offering for sin." What, I ask, has "the stern logic of common sense" to object against the principle, that a being of infinite perfections should overrule evil for good, the greatest evil for the greatest good?

I would ask the intelligent writer, in view of what I have stated above, whether the representation, that "it follows" from the doctrine of vicarious suffering, "that the greatest sin which was ever committed is the reasonable cause why God should forgive all other sins," is not too limited and partial? Must not the voluntary offering of the matchless Son of God, who is the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of his person, be involved in "the reasonable cause" of God's forgiving the sins of the penitent believer? That there is something pertaining to this wondrous transaction which transcends human reason is freely admitted.

How our respected author can maintain his views consistently with his avowed determination "to appeal first and last to the law and the testimony for the rule of our faith," I cannot possibly conceive.

It is remarked that "men must and will reason." Certainly. But what has reason to offer in objection to the proposition that a being of infinite wisdom can overrule evil for good? What has reason to show that the voluntary offering of the Son of God, may not so "mag-

nify" and make "honorable" his violated law, that he may now "be just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus?" Admit however, that the subject transcends the compass of human reason, I affirm that it is both reasonable and scriptural to admit also, that the ways of the infinite Jehovah should, in some respects, be "unsearchable" and "past finding out." The candid and talented writer well remarks, that "it is both wise and Christian to compare notes." He will admit, that proving some of the popular views of the doctrine of atonement, or reconciliation, to be wrong, is not proving his own views to be altogether *right*. It is indeed absurb, and palpably false in fact, to suppose that our blessed Lord suffered the entire penalty of the law for sinners; for this penalty is the *eternal* death of all who have sinned; whereas the Saviour does not die eternally even for one sinner. This, however, is no proof that his death was in *no sense* vicarious, or that he did *not* die "*for us* according to the Scriptures."

The prayer of the Saviour, "Father, forgive them," is indeed incompatible with the supposition, that he has given entire satisfaction, *in the sense of paying the Father our whole debt.* This, however, does not prove that his death was, *in no sense*, a judicial transaction; or that it was *not* necessary that God "might be just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." The divine wisdom has seen that this sacrifice was needed, that "mercy and truth," "righteousness, and peace" may embrace each other in the wondrous plan of our salvation. It may be supposed that forgiveness, in this view of the subject, cannot be entirely *free* on the part of the Father. I reply, that neither Scripture or reason require any such freedom in the case, as shall subvert the truth, that "God for Christ's sake hath forgiven" us. Eph. 4: 32. "God is Love." To this infinite source, we must trace the entire system of our redemption from sin and death, both in respect to means and end. Yet "the oneness of Christ and his Father," in this glorious work, is, as our author represents, perfect. There is indeed a theory which seems to imply that "the compassion is—all on Christ's side." This involves the absurdity that there is a being in the universe more merciful than "the Father of Mercies." The scriptural truth that God will "declare his righteousness" as well as his *mercy* in the forgiveness of sin, implies no such degrading incongruity.

"Now unto Him who is able to" unite us in truth and love, and "to present us faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy; to the only wise God our Saviour be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever. Amen.

Bound Volumes of the Examiner can be had for '50 and '51; also, for '52 and '53: the two years in one volume: price $1.50 per vol.

Expositor of Life and Immortality (Scotland), for February, just received.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CROSS.

The Facts and Phenomena of the Death of Christ.

BY REV. J. PANTON HAM.

[*Continued from page* 20.]

The incidents of the closing scenes of our Lord's life, as they present themselves to our mind, abundantly confirm the views we have already expressed of the causes and characteristics of his death on the cross. Guided by the light of Christ's own teaching, and the manner in which he was wont to speak of his own death, we have read the historic facts of the crucifixion from a new standing point, and have obtained altogether new and more intelligible impressions as to the real moral significance of that stupendous event. To investigate the manner in which Christ alluded to his death, and the moral aspect in which he was accustomed to place it, may, to some of our readers, be a new direction of inquiry; but the reasonableness of such a course will at once commend itself; for who ought to be supposed to know best the nature and objects of the crucifixion than the Crucified One himself? It seemed to us when first examining this subject, that the best expounder of the doctrine of the Cross would be Christ himself, and we took for certain, that an event of so much magnitude in his own personal history, would not fail to be fully expounded by him. Our anxiety to know the truth of this matter, and determination, by God's help, to pursue it, were favorable to a successful inquiry. We had studied, to some extent, the history of doctrinal development in the Churches, from the earliest ages down to the present time; and that study did much towards setting us free from our earlier confidence in the necessary perfectibility of popular and so called "evangelical" opinions. We had seen the various misapplication and abuse of the holy term "evangelical"—how it had been made to patronize the most conflicting and, ultimately, exploded opinions—and that, like a throne or national diadem—it had been seized upon and worn by one usurper after another—the strongest party, for the time being, claiming it exclusively as their own. The assumption of the title "evangelical," by one party of religionists, is akin to that impertinent conceit in the commercial world which claims to be the sole manufacturer and vender of a certain article of trade; and when the assumption is allowed, what is it but a popular patent, or charter of monopoly, which *may* have been granted by popular imbecility and ignorance, as well as by popular intelligence. The "traditions of the elders," in the course of our inquiry, relaxed their ancient hold upon our conscience and confidence, and set us free to sit at the feet of the great Teacher. Before this revolution in our mental experience, we never thought of asking the Lord Jesus Christ the meaning of his last sufferings and death; we thought we understood this and all other first principles of the Christian faith. But when we did ask this question, we got but one unvarying answer from

his lips. His crucifixion, he tells us, was an act of highest impiety and cruel wrong;—a manifestation of godless hostility to the holy laws and purposes of the Most High; and meriting the severest marks of the Divine displeasure. He says no more. His parable of the wicked husbandmen explains the causes, and describes the real character, of this awful event. It was no display of God's righteousness, but of man's unrighteousness: it did not set forth the rectitude of the Divine law and government, but was a more emphatic rejection of that law and rebellion against that government. Hence the enquiry, "What, therefore, shall the lord of the vineyard do unto those husbandmen?" and the just and natural reply, "He will miserably destroy those wicked men, and will let out his vineyard to other husbandmen, who shall render him the fruits in their seasons." And this description we have found to accord with the several incidents of the crucifixion. All the facts and phenomena of our Lord's last sufferings and death, support, and only support, the view which he gives of the moral turpitude of that event. He ever described it as a wrong; and when he suffered, he suffered as one consciously enduring a wrong. He stated of the active agents in his death, that they were impelled by wicked—even Satanic influences; and when they execute their foul deed, he prays for them as men needing pardon for their great sin. He betrayed no consciousness of any interruption of filial intercourse with his Father: he never acted or spoke as one who was sensible that he was enduring the Divine wrath; his whole demeanor is at the farthest possible remove from any such conviction as that he was sustaining a part in a great *judicial* tragedy, and especially that part which is commonly assigned him. The candid inquirer must, we think, be struck with such phenomena as the historic incidents of the cross develop: he cannot but marvel, that the theory of the common theology is so entirely discrepant with the actual facts of the case. We do not think that we have unduly treated those facts, nor in the least distorted their natural and obvious significance. To us it seems reasonable that *the alleged theory should be borne out by the historic facts*, and if not so borne out, that the *theory*, and not the facts, should be discarded. On this reasonable principle we have acted, and by it we feel bound to abide.

The last illustration of this part of our argument, which we would introduce to the notice of our readers, will, we think, add additional weight to those which have preceded. It is furnished in the dying words of our Lord, when he said, "Father, into thy hands I commit my spirit," and bowed his head and expired.

How natural is this language in the lips of the dying Christ, on the supposition that he was conscious, at this time, of no other than an endeared filial relationship towards his Divine Father; and how *un*natural, on the supposition that he was conscious of being in the attitude of an imputed criminal, expiating a world's offences by suffering the penalty due to those offences. We lay great stress on the oft repeated statement, that we cannot discover in the phenomena of the crucifixion any evidence of that peculiar consciousness which Christ must have had, and must have expressed, had he been enduring the weight of God's judicial wrath against sin. The dying Jesus expresses the consciousness of a different experience. His is not the attitude of one "stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted;"—and we "esteem" him wrongly when we so interpret the cause of his grief; on the contrary, it is the attitude of one who was "despised and rejected of men,"—whom he came to serve and to save, and whose ingratitude and impiety pierced his loving heart. Surely, this act of self-commendation to his Father betrays no consciousness of that vast distance between himself and his Father, which, for the time being, at least, would have been possessed, had he been, in the eyes of the Holy One, but as the incarnation of a world's guilt. Here is no standing far off from God, as the Avenger of sin, but a drawing nigh to him, in filial confidence, as a Son to a Father. The Lord Jesus, at this time, was only conscious of a *Father's* presence, and a *Father's* sympathy; hence he addresses him as "Father," and commends himself to his care. "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit."

We can scarcely imagine any more unsuitable language for the holy Sufferer to employ, than that of *a personal commendation of himself to God as a Father*, on the supposition that he was the substitute for a criminal world at that time, and that then was the hour of his judicial execution. This language is highly inconsistent with the alleged circumstances;—another class of emotions, and other speech than such as indicate a filial and confiding consciousness, would certainly have more accorded with the supposed circumstances. So far from addressing God as a *Father*, we should have expected language from the dying One which recognized, pre-eminently and exclusively, the *Rectoral* and *Judicial* character of God; and instead of *commending himself*, in death, to the care of God, as his Almighty Parent, language betokening a sense of the most distressing rejection by God, as the Punisher of sin, would have been more suitable to the tragic scene. It should be borne in mind, that the popular theology recognizes in Christ on the cross, *an imputed criminal*, and affirms that such was his personal consciousness, and the light in which he was regarded by God. Is it not then, highly proper that we should confront this theory with the actual incidents of the crucifixion, and expect an agreement between those historic incidents and their theological explanation? Is it not natural that we should express surprise, that One sustaining the part of a Substitute for criminals, and therefore a criminal by imputation, should be found *commending himself*, in his dying moments, to the Sovereign whom, by his substitutionary attitude, he is supposed to have wronged?

If, instead of the substitute, the sinners themselves should suffer the wrath, which, it is said, God is morally obliged to inflict on the violators

of his law, can we imagine any language more unsuitable and offensive to the Majesty of God, than that which expressed the personal commendation of a world of sinners to Him? Christ is said to have endured what, in the sinners' experience, would have been the terrible hell punishment; if, then, the *Substitute* could "commend" himself to God, so, too, it would appear, might the *sinners* themselves, whom he was then representing. But conceive the offensive idea of sinners in hell *commending* themselves to God, in the language of confiding self-complacency!

It is not the wont of a criminal, in the act of dying under capital punishment, to "*commend*" himself to the state or society he has wronged. Such commendation would be loathed as most execrable, and regarded as an additional offence to the state. The consciousness suitable to such a season, is that of painful repudiation; but Christ exhibits *no such consciousness* in the hour of his death; his is the consciousness of a calm and consoling communion; his, the sense of the recovered presence of his heavenly Father —of which, in a brief, dark season of despondency, he had felt himself bereft. The dying Christ fell asleep in the bosom of a Father—not under the judicial wrath of an Omnipotent Executioner. His was the death of the beloved Son of God, not of the bruised and broken substitute for sinners. Throughout, his was the intercourse of a Son with a Father. We discover nothing of fear and trembling, of groaning under a sense of oppressive wrath, but filial tenderness and Divine affection, and solacing heart-communion with his Father in heaven. Such, too, was the impression received by the actual spectators of the crucifixion. "Truly," said one, "this was a *righteous* man!" "Truly," exclaimed others, "this was the *Son* of God!"

The traditions of the historic Church have preserved another theory of the death of Christ, than that which Christ and the facts and phenomena of the crucifixion give. They have distilled, out of this dark human depravity, a doctrinal significance of a most opposite character. This ostensible vice, according to the dominant theology, is the casket of purest virtue. From the dense blackness of human guilt, a light is conceived to break forth, which envelopes the throne of God in a halo of brightest holiness. This guilt of man is thus made to involve God's greatest glory. Such offence to the understanding and moral sense of mankind, is perpetrated by the traditionary theology of the dominant Churches.

Christ, however, dissipates this darkness, by a purer doctrine. No such amalgam of offensive absurdities can be found in his teaching. The crucifixion was, in his judgment, a crime against truth and justice, followed by a merited curse on its guilty perpetrators—the curse of a national blasting, and world-wide banishment. These shreds of savage sinfulness are never woven, by *his* hands, into a robe of righteousness, to conceal the guilty nakedness of human character, and render our race more estimable in God's sight—they demonstrated, on the contrary, the deep depravity of the human heart, and the wonderful lengths to which human wickedness can go. And with this teaching agree the *historic incidents* of the crucifixion. The phenomena of this tragic sequel of the Saviour's life verify the judgment which his own lips had passed on it. We see the great Sufferer succoured by his sympathizing Father; praying for the pardon of his murderers; astonished at his sense of desertion by God, and, finally, commending himself to that Father, who, from first to last, sustained no other than a Parental attitude towards the Son in whom he was well pleased. Nothing is expressed by Christ on the cross, which indicates his consciousness of being a substitute for a guilty world; expiating its sins by the endurance of its judicial deserts. Throughout, we discover only the consciousness of the holy Son of God—bearing, meekly, the wrath and rejection of men, to exemplify the perfection of an obedience unto death. It has remained for a scholastic theology to discover a theory of judicial expiation in the Cross of Christ—a theory which transforms wrong into right—human wickedness, into a manifestation of Divine rectitude; and which asserts the possibility of what the prophet so confidently challenges, when he asks, "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?"

[*To be Continued.*]

Good Advice.—Dr. Taylor, Norwich, England, at the close of one of his works says:—

"If in perusing this book you have discovered any truth you did not before understand, it is my earnest request, you would rather lay it up in your heart for your own use, than make it the subject of contention and strife, the fuel of party zeal, or the occasion of despising or censuring those who do not yet see it. And if you would enter into discourse about it, let it be with all moderation and coolness on your part; in the spirit of peace and mutual forbearance. Therefore never converse upon this, or any other point, with an *angry* man. Passion and heat blind the judgment: nor with a *Bigot*, who is determined for a scheme, and resolved to open his eyes to no further evidence. Whenever *anger* and *bigotry* appear in a conversation already begun, break it off; for, you cannot proceed to any good purpose, and will be in danger of catching a spirit which is quite contrary to the Gospel. *Hold the Truth in Love.* Fear God, and keep his commandments—despise [set light by] earthly things—restrain and regulate your passions—be constant in reading the Scriptures; fervent in prayer to God; kind and compassionate to all men; punctual and cheerful in every duty; humble in all your deportment; upright and honest in all your dealings; temperate and sober in all your enjoyments; patient under all afflictions; zealous in every good work; then with joy look for the coming of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, for he will assuredly appear to your everlasting salvation."

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW-YORK, FEBRUARY 15, 1854.

ETERNAL TORMENTS.

Or, an Examination of Rev. 14: 9 to 14.

BY THE EDITOR.

"If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead or his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb; and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever, and they have no rest day nor night who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name."

It is maintained, with great assurance, that this text teaches, that "eternity of eternities" is the period of the torments of all wicked men; and, therefore, proves them immortal.

In order to make this text available to our opponents, they must prove *three things*. *First*—That it is spoken of ALL wicked men. *Second*—That it relates to their punishment beyond this life. And, *Third*—That the term "for ever and ever" is used in its primary and absolute sense of *endless*. Neither of these points have they ever proved, and we are persuaded they never can. It is not enough for a man to *affirm* all these points: let them *be proved*. We say again, it never has been done and never can be.

1. *Is this language used in reference to all wicked men?*

We answer, *no*. It is a specified class, viz: "If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand." This is the *class* spoken of and threatened; and it comes almost infinitely short of embracing *all* the wicked.

Let us examine the connection and see when the "beast and his image" arose. The previous chapter shows that they did not come into existence till after the Christian era; nor indeed till the old Roman empire was in its *divided* state—as the ten horns clearly show—which could not have been earlier than the fourth or fifth century after Christ. Hence, the wicked spoken of in the text under consideration, did not embrace any that lived *before* the Christian era, nor any that lived for three or four hundred years after. Here, then, is a large exception of the wicked. But we shall probably find a still larger exception, by an inquiry as to *which* beast is spoken of; for two are mentioned, *viz:* a *ten* horned beast, and a *two* horned one: and nearly all commentators are agreed that the two horned one came up at a much later period than the other; and some doubt if it has even appeared yet. If the two horned beast is the one spoken of in the text under consideration, then an exception must be made of the wicked during the centuries that elapsed from the rise of the first to that of the second beast. Hence here is another large number of the wicked, who are not embraced in the threatening. That it is the worshippers of the two horned beast, who are threatened, seems likely from the fact, that it is that beast that causes the *image* to the first to be made. Thus another period must elapse, after the second beast arose, before men could "worship *his image;*" and hence many other wicked would not be embraced in the judgment denounced in the text we are examining. Then we must inquire *who* or *what* power this "beast and his image" represent. Protestants, quite generally, say, it symbolizes *Papacy*. If that be so, then *no Protestant sinners* are included in the text; so that none of them need fear the threatening, whatever it embraces, unless they turn Papists. Possibly the Papist might say, the beast, &c., is Protestantism. If so, then all Catholic sinners escape. Thus, we see, it is a mere *assumption* to say, "The punishment foreshown, Rev. 14: 9 to 11" is "*precisely*" that to which "*all the wicked* will be subjected," as "*D. N. Lord*" said, in his review of Dobney on Future Punishment, *Theological Journal* for 1850, p. 416.

The dynasty of rulers symbolized by this beast and his image are of late origin, if yet in existence; hence it is impossible that more than a small portion of the race of Adam can come under the threatening of chapter 14. This fact alone shows the absurdity of our opposers quoting it in support of their theory, which is, that *all* wicked men will be involved in endless torment.

2. *Does the judgment threatened in this text relate to wicked men beyond this life?*

Can our opposers prove that it does? They can *assume* it; but assumptions do not pass for evidence in these days of investigation. Have they any evidence of their position? If so, what is it? and where is it found? But as

they have none, we proceed to affirm, that those inflictions, on the worshippers of the beast and his image, relate to judgments in this life, "*on the earth,*" and not in some fancy hell in another world.

The previous chapter gave us an account not only of the beast and his image, but the threatening of the beast, "that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be *killed ;*" verse 15. To counteract this, God caused an angel to make the terrible threatening in the text; and its appropriateness to deter men from obeying the beast is apparent.

The chapter following the text opens thus—"I saw another sign in heaven, great and marvellous, seven angels having the seven *last* plagues ; and in them is *filled up* the wrath of God." The original is, "In them was completed the wrath of God."

Mark well, these plagues are *the last* on somebody; and they are to have a *completion;* hence it is impossible that they can be eternal, or *endless.* Now observe, verses 7 and 8, it is said, "One of the four vital beings gave unto the seven angels seven golden vials full of the wrath of God," &c. "And the temple was filled with smoke from the glory of God, and from his power ; and *no man* was able to enter into the temple, *till* the seven plagues of the seven angels *were fulfilled,*" *or completed.*

Let it be distinctly noted, these plagues are THE LAST, and that they COMPLETE *the wrath of God* on the power to be visited; and *also* that NO MAN can enter into the *temple of God* till they are COMPLETED. Now what follows—If these plagues, or any part of them, fall on the wicked spoken of in chap. 14: 9—11, then either no man ever can enter the temple of God, or the wrath spoken of will have been completed, or finished. Now listen—"I heard a great voice out of the temple, saying to the seven angels, Go your ways, and pour out the vials of the wrath of God [*where?*] UPON THE EARTH :" not in hell, nor the moon, nor any other fancy location. "And the first went and poured out his vial *upon the earth.*" Well, what happened? "And there fell a *noisome and grievous sore* upon *the men* which had THE MARK OF THE BEAST, and upon them which WORSHIPPED HIS IMAGE."

Here is the commencement of the exact fulfillment of the threatening in chap. 14. *There* we find the *threatening ; here* the wrath in a course of *accomplishment,* and it has not missed the persons threatened. These plagues are *all* to fall on men upon the earth ; chap. 16: 1 ; they are the "filling up of the wrath of God"—and they are "*the last :*" and till they are filled up and completed, no man can enter the temple of God: then what becomes of "*the eternity of eternities*" of their torment? It has passed away, like other *fancies of mere theorists.*

The judgments embraced in these seven last plagues are fully developed in the 16th, 17th, 18th, and 19th chapters, and result in the entire destruction of "*Babylon the great*"—which seems to be only another symbol of the beast. Babylon is judged, condemned, thrown down, burned with fire, and to "*be found no more at all,*" chap. 19: 21. The terrible torments inflicted on her, and her devotees, as set forth in the chapters named, is a full and perfect fulfillment of chap. 14: 9 to 11 ; and it is seen to be "*on the earth ;*" and no support or countenance is given to the assumption of endless sin and torment.

As we have shown that the threatened wrath is to be "upon the earth," and that it must have a *completion,* or no man can ever enter the "*temple in heaven,*" it is unnecessary to spend time to prove that the term, forever and ever, in the text, is used, as often elsewhere, to signify no more than a protracted period, without defining its exact length. We might greatly extend our remarks on this subject; but we trust we have said enough to convince all candid inquirers, and more would not avail with bigots, and dealers in mere assumptions.

"BEARING THE CROSS."

BY THE EDITOR.

Much is said, among professed Christians, about "bearing the cross;" but we fear little is understood or really practised in this manner. Some seem to think *speaking in meeting* is the cross they must bear; and when they have done that they think little more about the cross. We apprehend that is a very small item in bearing the cross. Men are all naturally in love with this present world. To this world we must become *crucified.* Crucifixion is a *hard death ;* but few persons are willing to die such a death; there is, however, no other way of entering into the kingdom of God. We must be "crucified unto the world, and the world unto" us. Most professed Christians, it is to be feared, have made a covenant with the world, not to part with it; and the tempter satisfies them if they speak in meeting some times, and give

something to support the gospel, they may keep their covenant with the world: but, "If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him." 1 John 2: 15.

How then are we to be separated from the love of the world, and be crucified unto it? *First*—By a believing view of the Lord Jesus Christ, who became poor—was despised of men—a man of sorrow, acquainted with grief—endured reproach—resisted temptation, though he "*suffered*, being tempted"—when he was reviled, reviled not again—*murmured not*, though wounded, bruised, put to grief, and his soul made an offering for sin, scourged, spit upon, his hands and feet pierced with nails, his *soul in agony*—all this he bore, and no lisp of *impatience* ever escaped him. Would you be crucified unto the world, go learn of him; contemplate his poverty—his life—his sufferings—his resignation—his patience—his loving and forgiving spirit, till the whole mind is humbled within you: and then realize this truth—"If so be we *suffer* with him, that we may be also glorified together." Rom. 8: 17. Do you ask what it is to suffer with him? We answer—To suffer with the same meek, patient, forgiving, resigned spirit that he had. This leads us to say—

Second—If you would bear your cross and be crucified unto the world, REMEMBER, every trial of your life—whether *temporal* or *spiritual*, *personal* or *family*, from *friends* or *enemies*, *direct* or *indirect*, *great* or *small*, of *short continuance*, or *long*, or *whatever* be the nature or character of it, is by the *appointment* or *permission* of that God who willeth not the death of the sinner, but who is seeking by all these trials to crucify you unto the world, and fit you to be glorified with his Son Jesus Christ. How shall this design of our heavenly Father be accomplished? It cannot be, unless you "*bear your cross.*" Do you ask again—What is it to bear my cross? We answer—It is to suffer all the trials, of which we have spoken, *patiently*. You are not to quarrel with the *instrumentality* God may employ, nor indulge in *fretfulness* under it. If you do you do *not* "*bear the cross.*" And though you should speak like an angel in meeting, yet if you *fret* and *complain* under any of the trials of life, by which God is seeking to crucify you unto the world, it is *hypocrisy* for you to talk about your "bearing the cross"—you are but deceiving your own soul. God has assured us, "*all things work together* for good to them that love him;" Rom. 8: 28; yet, you can *murmur*, *fret*, and *complain* at those things which God has permitted or appointed!! Alas, *alas!* Do not dream you are ripening for the kingdom of God while this is the case. No, you are ripening for death—for perdition. Saith our Saviour—"In your PATIENCE *possess ye your souls.*" We shall learn soon, or when it is too late, that those words are words of solemn and awful import. If you indulge in murmuring, complaining, or *impatience* at any trials, insults, sufferings, or injuries, from whatever instrumentality they may come, and that spirit is *increasing* upon you, you are just as surely traveling in the road to perdition as God has said—"*The soul that sinneth it shall die.*" We speak not now of one "overtaken in a fault," to which all are *liable* in the hour of temptation, but we speak of him upon whom this spirit is not *abating* but increasing—and it is increasing, except we bear our cross *daily:* for *every day* will bring some cross, in some form. Happy the soul who is constantly looking to God for grace to bear every cross. We may pray to have the cross removed; but we may not pray for it only in submission to the will of God. "If it be possible let this cup pass from me; nevertheless, not my will but thine be done." That is our *example;* and we cannot safely follow any other. "My grace is sufficient for thee," will often be the answer; and did we know *now* what we *shall know hereafter*, we should praise God for every trial and every cross we have to bear: yea, a *living faith* will praise God even now, that he does not leave us to our own way, lest we should be like the children of Israel, whose impatient murmurings were answered by giving them "flesh," but "leanness" was "sent into their souls." "*Be patient in all things:*" that is *bearing thy cross;* then, when Christ appears, you shall have A CROWN.

"WHY SERVE THE LORD?"—The following article was published in the Examiner, August, 1846. We publish it just as it was written then; not to show how true were our forebodings, but because we wish again to impress the minds of all with the importance of serving God from *principle*. At the time this article was written there was a movement on definite time for the Advent in 1847, as there is now in some parts of this country for it this year, 1854.

WHY SERVE THE LORD?

According to my observations, all, or nearly all the exhortations of professed "Adventists," to saints and sinners, to serve God, are based upon this one thing—"Do it, for the Lord is coming—You will perish then if you do not serve him."

Such exhortations are proper enough in their place: but to make *them the burden* of our message to saints and sinners, in my judgment, is nothing more than an appeal to the *selfishness* of the human heart. It seems to say—If the Lord was not coming so *soon*, you need not be so particular to serve him!!

Every child of man on earth is under just as much obligation to serve God, *with all his heart*, if Christ was not coming these hundred years, as if he was coming to-day. The obligation to serve God lies much higher than the mere fact that the day is most over. This appeal to any man will seldom, if ever, produce

genuine preparation to meet God. The *reaction* that will take place if '46 and '47 pass by as they *may*, without witnessing the advent, will be disastrous beyond all conception. Experience proves this—I mean the experience of '43 and '44. Where are the great majority of those now who, professedly, were "aroused to serve God" as *they ought* by that cry of *time* for the Lord's coming? And *echo* says—WHERE!!! Scarcely one in ten of them are now found walking so as to honor their Christian profession. *Why not?* They were stimulated by *wrong motives*. Their *selfishness* was the principal thing appealed to and excited. They were just like the sinner who thinks himself nigh to death on a sick bed or in a storm at sea. If he *must die*, he will become a *Christian*. If he knew he was out of danger, he would be as indifferent as ever. Repentance under such circumstances is always of a doubtful character; and, where the person has survived, has almost invariably proved a *delusion*. Why is it so? Because their *selfishness* was all that was moved. There was no deep sorrow for the dishonor done to God by a life of sin; or abhorrence of sin on that account. No: if they could escape the dreadful consequences which they *fear* for their sins, no penitence would be seen in them; they would still "roll sin as a sweet morsel under their tongues." Just so the preaching of *definite time* for the advent, and urging sinners to get ready, *because* the Lord was coming so soon, and they would be destroyed if not ready, has been *demonstrated*, in general, to have had no other effect upon saint or sinner than to move their *selfish* feelings. The cause of excitement failing, they are the same careless souls as ever, or seeking *new* fancies to keep up their excited minds, which must result, if repeated disappointments occur, in deep disaster if not in ultimate ruin. Not a few have already passed into that state of mind that must, without an extraordinary exertion of the grace of God, land them in endless ruin.

For what are Christ's disciples left *in* this world? Is it just to get safe *out of it?* Or, is it to *glorify* God and the Lamb upon earth? Or, which is the same thing, it is, that they may be *lights in the world:* yea, "THE LIGHT OF *the world*"—that they may "let" their "light so shine before men that *they* may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven." Who has God to glorify him on earth? The Son of God is not here to do it. He was here, and said, when about to leave,—"*I have finished the work* Thou *gavest me* to do." He is not here now to glorify God before men. Angels *cannot* do that work on earth: wicked men *will not* do it. Who then shall do it? *The followers of Christ.* Are they under any more obligation to do it if their Lord is to return to-day than if he was not coming for a hundred years? Certainly not. To show a greater concern to do so on that account, manifests too much the spirit of an eye-servant. He thinks the master is soon coming—the day is nearly ended—he will be all engaged in the work just at that moment!! He has been sluggish all the day—has taken little or no interest in his master's cause, and would have done nothing only he was "afraid." Efforts have been made to rouse him to his duty to his employer—all has been unavailing till he is told that employer is coming: he is then aroused and outstrips all the other laborers in activity and zeal!! Is it love to his employer and his service that has thus aroused him? Not at all. His course is perfectly hypocritical. He thinks to secure the master's favor by his present extraordinary exertions, and perhaps is ready to condemn those who have kept constantly engaged in their work all the day long, because they do not just now manifest the same zeal and activity that he does. He is now all activity, I repeat it, not from love to the work or the master; but, the *reckoning time is so near;* and he has just cause to fear condemnation for his past neglect. Watch that man carefully. The report that the master was coming at that particular time proves to be erroneous, and it is now uncertain when he will come. What do we now see? Ten chances to one if you do not see that same zealous *do-every-thing*, when he thought the master was right upon him, now slack off—grow weary—lay down—fall asleep, and perhaps never wake again till the cry—"*The master is here.*"

Let us work while it is day—and *all* the day; and work too, because—We have a good Master, who has loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood. Let gratitude to him stimulate us to do all in our power to promote his honor or glory in the earth. Have we no concern for the glory of God and the Lamb? Have we any too much time to do this work in? Shall we wish, like the eye-servant, the day was gone? If so, do we not discover *more* concern for *rest*, or *wages*, than we do to have accomplished *much* for God and our Lord Jesus Christ? Should we not be as ready and cheerful to labor and suffer too, to promote the glory of God in a wicked world, as to reap the promised reward? And should we not rejoice, if we are accounted worthy to be continued longer in the field, that we may sow and reap a larger crop for our blessed, loving Lord and Master? Why this haste to have our labors and suffering for Christ ended? Should we not rather desire that we may be able to do and suffer *much* for him who has done and suffered *so much* for us? Oh, my brother, let us leave the "times and the seasons" for the coming of the Son of God where he taught us to leave them, viz. "in the Father's own power," Acts 1: 6, 7, and go to our work in the *love of it*, that *we* may glorify God on the earth and finish the work he has given *us* to do; then we need have no fear but that when he comes, however sudden or unexpected it may be, he will give us the "*crown of life.*" Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, soul, mind, and strength, and thy neighbor as thyself, is just as obliga

tory, on us all, at any period of life, or any age of the world, as the day the Lord will come: and no period, or time of the world, can change, alter, abate, or increase that obligation. To suppose it can, it appears to me, is a delusion. The Bible injunction—"Whether ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, *do all to the glory of God*," is unalterable, and depends not upon circumstances or times. Under this unalterable principle Enoch walked with God 300 years—Noah at least 120 years—Abraham many years—Samuel over 90 years: and many other worthies for long periods. It is our duty, as well as exalted calling, to begin our life in the service of God, and spend *all* our days in this soul ennobling work of bringing glory to God and the Lamb in this benighted world. May the Lord forgive us all our sins and follies past, and give us grace for time to come: and may *his glory*, not our own, be the *ruling principle* of our minds.

—

In the same Examiner with the foregoing we published the following:

HAS IT COME TO THIS?

The following paragraph is taken from the "Voice of Truth"* of the 12th ult.—

"We are glad to see our brethren in many places waking up on the *time* of the second advent of Christ. It is a fundamental doctrine in the inspired articles of our faith. It will not do to strike that article from our infallible creed, nor become unbelieving in its immutable truths."

I agree with the *Voice* that the *Bible* is an "*infallible creed*." But, is the interpretation he and his correspondents give that "*creed*," on the subject of definite *time* for the second advent "*infallible?*" *Time*, more than once, has shown that *it is not:* and "my faith is very strong" that the same teacher will show them again that *they* are *fallible*, and of "*like passions*" with other men. There is an "appearance of evil" in the paragraph quoted above from the Voice. It seems to say—"*We* are *infallible* on this point: and those who do not receive the theory that *we* have, do *strike articles* from the Bible." Our Brother of the Voice cannot *mean* any such thing; though his language seems to imply it. But I think I know him too well to believe he would intentionally do any such thing. Yet, his strong attachment to his theory of *time* may have led him wide, in this matter, of his usual charity. He says, in the quotation above—"The *time* of the second advent of Christ is a *fundamental* doctrine in the inspired articles of our faith"—the Bible. What is a "fundamental doctrine?" It is an "*essential*" doctrine. Does the Voice mean to say the *time* doctrine is essential to the *truth of the Bible?* or, essential to *his theory?* or, essential to *salvation?* If he means the first or the last I must dissent from him. The truth of the Bible rests not upon the interpretation of fallible men. Our salvation rests not upon the belief of any man's interpretation of the Bible; but upon *faith* in Christ as the only Saviour—the Son of God; and in *obedience* to him. Let all beware of reviving again the *positive* spirit that characterized the "10th day movement" of '44. A doctrine that is "fundamental," or essential to salvation must be received, or the man is lost. Shall any man *decide* what is essential to the salvation of his brother in matters that have no higher authority than the *opinion* of fallible man? The Voice or any one else has a right to an opinion that definite time for the second advent is revealed in the Bible. If they really have the evidence clear to their minds it is revealed, then the belief of it is essential to *their* salvation. Because the disbelief of it, under such circumstances, would show in their hearts a want of reliance on what God has said. To him that thinketh it is sin, not to believe in definite time for the advent, *to him* it is sin; not because it is sin *in itself*, but because he believes the Bible clearly teaches it; hence not to believe it would be to reject the Bible itself. *I* do not believe the Bible teaches any such doctrine; but, that it teaches just the opposite, *viz.*, that the time is *not* revealed and cannot be known by any prophetic numbers; and that our Lord has taught us it should not be *thus* known. To *me*, then, with my present light, it would be sin to advocate the same theory that the Voice says is "a fundamental doctrine." Shall I sin to please men? Shall I fear any denunciation that man can hurl against me? "In every nation he that *feareth God* and worketh righteousness is accepted of him." Thus found when he shall appear all will be well, however sudden he shall come.

* Now the Advent Harbinger.

PERSONALITY OF CHRIST.

BY J. PANTON HAM.

1 Epistle Tim. iii., 16.

"And openly it is a great sacrament of piety that thing that was showed in flesh."—*Wiclif's Translation.* "And without nay great is that mystery of godliness, God was showed in the flesh."—*Tyndale.* "And without doubt great is that mystery of godliness God was showed in the flesh."—*Cranmer.* "And without nay great is the mystery of godliness, God is showed in the flesh."—*Geneva Version.* "And manifestly it is a great sacrament of piety which was manifested in flesh."—*Rheimish Version.* "And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness, God was manifest in the flesh."—*Common Version.* "And confessedly great is the mystery of religion, God was made visible in flesh."—*New Translation.*

A primary official distinction of the Lord Jesus Christ is, that he is the Medium or Mediator by whom we obtain the most perfect knowledge of God. "The Word became flesh," that he might embody and express in a human form and life the character and perfections of

the invisible Jehovah. His mission is that of a Representative and Deputy charged to communicate through the medium of his own personality the actual moral attitude and purposes of God in relation to mankind. He is God's Plenipotentiary, for in him dwelleth all the fulness of the God-head bodily; he is God's Viceroy, for all power is given to him in heaven and in earth; and he is God's Personal Representative, for he is "the image of the invisible God," —the "express image of his person." As such, it is evident that Christ came into the world, not so much to attract attention to himself as a personality distinct from God, but through himself to lead up the thoughts, affections, and servitude of mankind to his God and our God, to his Father and our Father. Hence the peculiarity of those frequent expressions,— "the words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself, but the Father that dwelleth in me he doeth the works." "My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me." "I can of mine own self do nothing." To regard the personal nature of Christ, then, as a primary question of Christian investigation, and to insist upon the profession of a definite opinion thereon, appears to us to be losing sight of the primary purpose of Christ's manifestation, and to be converting into a metaphysical problem for the exercise of the speculative faculty, that which was was never intended to stand before the scalpel of the intellect at all, but to be the medium of the divine manifestation,—the most perfect of all the theophanies of Jehovah, for the purpose of rejoicing and reforming the heart. We cannot, therefore, for our own part, take a dogmatic position on this question of the Saviour's personality. We can neither accept the Trinitarian nor the Unitarian dogma. Both of these extremes appear to us to be wide of the truth, which occupies, as we think, some undefinable stand point between the two. We say, undefinable, because we accept the authority of him whose individuality is the subject of debate, and who has said, with unequivocal plainness, "*No man knoweth who the Son is but the Father.*" In our judgment this declaration of Christ's puts a veto upon the inquiry, and ought to have sufficed to prevent its ever becoming an inquiry at all.

We have said thus much before in an earlier paper on "the Doctrine of the Cross," and we have repeated it again, because we are anxious to divert our readers' attention from that unprofitable controversy about the personality of Christ, which has been so fruitful, in its past history, of "envy, hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness." At best it is but a metaphysical speculation of no important practical issues. What religious advantage does either the Unitarian or the Trinitarian dogma bring to its possessor? It may be said in reply,—Is that to be considered a mere question of speculative metaphysics, and of no practical religious concernment, which ascribes divine honors to one who, however high in the scale of humanity, is after all, but human? But he who would ask this question elevates to a paramount lordship of his life and conscience that very being to whom he cannot, with the Trinitarian, ascribe divine honor. And is not He, who is Lord of life and conscience, who is the Master of the moral manhood,—the present moral Governor, and future Judge—virtually holding a divine relation, exercising divine authority, and so far fulfilling divine functions? Practically, even to the denier of Christ's divinity, Christ is divine. And such being the case, what has the Trinitarian to boast of above his Unitarian brother? He *does* no more than give himself up, like his fellow Christian of the opposite speculative faith, to the rule and authority of Christ. But he has a different *theory* about Christ. True, he has, but he had better say little about his theory, for it is not absolutely proof against texts and logic. If both have yielded themselves up to Christ to be directed and saved by him, then why not agree to differ in the speculative aspect of the question, when, with all their difference, they so substantially agree? *Sic itur ad astra*, may be said of both and what more is needed?

We presume to think that our stand-point is just that point where both these extremes of opinion may find a common meeting place, and mutual recognition. To some extent it satisfies both speculative theologies, supplies a common phraseology, and serves the common spiritual want. The Unitarian may hold his theory about the personality of Christ, and the Trinitarian his, but did they both recognize Christ as the medial manifestation of God,—the mirror for the reflection of the divine glory,—the representative and image of the invisible God, then they would meet at a common centre, meet practically, meet to worship. Their speech would not so easily offend one another,—they could scarcely do other than both speak the same thing. All they hear and see in Christ would be as if they heard and saw God. His virtue would be the manifestation of God's virtue,— his love, of God's love, his condescension and forbearance, the reflection of God's,—his power, God's—his words, God's—all God's, he in God, and God in him,—"God manifest in the flesh." We think that this is the true idea of Christ, the idea given of him in the Scriptures of truth. In our apprehension he is the Model of God, the last and most perfect manifestation of God, superseding the Shekinah, and all other special manifestations of the Blessed Invisible.

Man has ever been forbidden at high penalties to make a graven image of God, because man would make an image after his own imperfect ideal of the Divine. But was there not another reason for this prohibition? The fact has shown that God himself intended to meet this felt want of humanity,—the want of a visible concentration of the object of worship, by providing his own image in the person of him who is "the image of the invisible God, the express image of His person." Let us not, then, abuse this "unspeakable Gift" of God, by speculating on the profound mystery of his personality, but

receive it for the rejoicing of our hearts, and the reformation of our life; and thus show, by a living and fruitful faith, that, however our intellectual judgments may differ, "God hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." —*Christian Examiner.*

From Daniel Hull.

Plymouth, Ind.

Br. Storrs:—I wish to make a suggestion or two which may be profitable to some of your readers.

Ministers in commenting on Ezekiel, 18: 4, say, the passage "means a banishment from God's presence." Yet they say—and many of their D. D.'s, agree with them in saying—that "God himself is to be present at the torment of the wicked, to see that the punishment is properly administered." Now, how is it possible for the wicked to be banished from the presence of the Lord, and yet the Lord himself, in person, be present with them? I know that I will be accused of "prying into matters too deep" for me; and I fear it is rather too deep to get an answer from the friends of the dogma; yet I consider it my privilege, as well as my duty, to examine the Word of God with the traditions of men, and if their constructions are unreasonable, I do not consider it my duty to adopt them, though I may be called an "infidel."

Yours in hope of immortality at the coming of Christ.

From E. M. Smith.

Batavia, N. Y.

Br. Storrs:—I am glad that you make the Life and Death theme the object and end of your valuable sheet. Men are selfish, and so long as you contribute to their interest all is well; but when you deviate from that, you are wicked, abominable, and should be shunned as an errorist. The Examiner is calculated, under God, to do a great work in this nineteenth century of error, superstition, and false religion; and I would to God, that many more such sheets, breathing their healthful, invigorating, and life-giving influence, might start up in different localities, in opposition to this popular, but heathen dogma, from the Platonic school, that man has inherent immortality; and show from the Bible that God alone hath immortality; and if man would have it he must seek for it by patiently continuing in well doing. We must comply with the condition God has given and revealed unto us in His Word. Says the Saviour, "I am the way, the truth, and the Life." Again, "I am the door of the sheepfold, He that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber." It is alone through Christ that we get immortality or eternal life. He is the only medium, or door, through which we can enter; and he emphatically declares, that he is "the resurrection and the life;" and he that believeth on him notwithstanding he may be dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth (by this process) shall never die. There is no doctrine more fully taught in all the Scriptures than the one you advocate, that the resurrection of man to life and immortality, from the dead, is alone through Christ our Life-giver. May God's blessing rest upon you in this effort of disseminating truth: and may He preserve you blameless unto His coming and kingdom, is the prayer of your friend who is in the hope of the gospel.

From E. T. Harding.

Rensselaer, Indiana, Feb. 1, 1854.

Br. Storrs:—I am happy to send you a few more subscribers to your valuable paper. I think one year ago you had but one here; now you have eleven. Your "Six Sermons" have spoken for themselves; but we could not do much till we had Brother and Sister Mansfield, and they opened the door and a great many have embraced the doctrine. I do wish we could have a preacher come this way and revive the people. "Truly the harvest is great, but the laborers are few." My prayer is that you may prosper with your paper and have your reward. I should be sorry to see it published less than once every two weeks, and should be glad to see its face every week. I hope the time is not far distant when it will be issued every week; and I shall ever be ready to send you a subscriber. Wm. Webster, who took your paper from this place, is dead. The old man was here all alone in the faith, and while he was sick Br. Mansfield came here, but the old man died without hearing them; but you have no idea how we made derision of his belief; we thought him worse than an infidel. All I wish is, that he might have lived to see so many as there is here in the faith.

ANCIENT HEATHENS AND IMMORTALITY.

The same may be said of the ancient heathens, they did but conjecture, without proof, of a future state. And there is this remarkable circumstance to be noticed in addition, that those who taught the doctrine (as the ancient heathen lawgivers themselves did, from a persuasion of its importance for man's conduct), do not seem themselves to have *believed* what they taught, but to have thought merely of the expediency of inculcating this belief on the vulgar.

It does not appear, however, that they had much success in impressing their doctrine on the mass of the people; for though a state of future rewards and punishments was commonly talked of among them, it seems to have been regarded as little more than an *amusing fable.* It does not appear, from the account of their own writers, that men's lives were ever influenced by any such belief. On the contrary, we

find them, in speeches publicly delivered and now extant, *ridiculing the very notion of any one's seriously* believing the doctrine.

It may be thought, however, by some, that the wisest of the heathen philosophers, though they did not hold the notions of the vulgar as to the particulars of a future state of rewards and punishments, yet had convinced themselves (as in their writings they profess) of the immortality of the soul. And it is true that they had, in a certain sense; but in such a sense as in fact makes the doctrine amount to nothing at all. They imagined that the souls of men, and *of all other animals*, were not created by God, but were themselves parts of the divine mind, from which they were separated when united with bodies, and to which they would return and be re-united on quitting those bodies; so that the soul, according to this notion, was immortal both ways; that is, not only was to have *no end*, but had *no beginning*, and was to return after death into the same condition in which it was before our birth,—a state without any distinct personal existence or consciousness. It was the *substance of which the soul is composed*, that (according to this doctrine) was eternal rather than the soul itself, which as a distinct being, was swallowed up and put an end to. Now it would be ridiculous to speak of any consolation, or any moral restraint, or any other effect whatever, springing from the belief of *such* a future state as this, which consists in becoming after death, the same as we were before birth. To all practical purposes, it is the same thing as annihilation.

Accordingly the apostle Paul, when speaking to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xv.) of some persons who denied the "*Resurrection* of the dead," (teaching, perhaps, some such doctrine as that I have just been speaking of) declares, in that case his "preaching would have been vain." To deny the "*Resurrection*," is, according to him, to represent Christians as "having hope *in this life* only," and those "who have fallen asleep in Christ, as having *perished*" (verse 18, 19). As for any such future existence as the ancient philosophers described, he does not consider it worth a thought.

Such was the boasted discovery of the heathen sages! which has misled many inattentive readers of their works; who, finding them often profess the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, and not being aware what sort of immortality it was that they meant, have hastily concluded that they had discovered something approaching to the truth: or, at least, that the doctrine was one which might have some practical effect on the feelings and conduct, which it is plain it never could. And such, very nearly, is said to be the belief entertained now by the learned among the East-Indian Bramins, though they teach a different doctrine to the vulgar.—*Archbishop Whately.*

PICK'S BIBLE STUDENT'S CONCORDANCE can be had on the terms named in the Ex. for Jan. 1.

PAMPHLETS, PERIODICALS, &c.—We have received various communications of this kind recently, but have hardly had time to examine any of them.

"WHO IS THE MESSIAH? *In two parts: showing the Past and Future Events in the prophetic chain of his Messiahship:* By Eld. Z. Campbell."

This work seems to be well arranged, and we should think must be interesting. The author says, "In presenting" this work "it is not the writer's intention to teach what he believes, or what somebody else believes; but what the Scriptures say, in plain terms, Messiah will *do*, *suffer*, or cause to be done; whether anybody believes it or not; and, in presenting his prophetic chain, the object is, to show how many links are in the past, and how many are future." The work is a neat 12 mo. pamphlet, of 108 pages, published by J. G. Arthur, Hartford, Conn.; also for sale by R. T. Young, 140 Fulton street, New York.

—

"THE AGE OF GOSPEL LIGHT; *to which is added* THE NARROW ESCAPE; or, *Immortality only through Jesus Christ;*" is an 18 mo. pamphlet of 96 pages, by the same author, and for sale as above. So far as we have been able to examine it, it is interesting; and the Narrow Escape is quite an amusing Dialogue between a *Literalist* Elder and a *Spiritualist* "Deacon." Success to it, on its mission.

—

"THE APOSTOLIC MINISTRY: A Discourse delivered in Rochester before the New York Baptist Union for Ministerial Education, July 12, 1853, by FRANCIS WAYLAND, President of Brown University"—"REVIEWED BY J. B. COOK."

This is a neat 18 mo pamphlet of 72 pages. The *Reviewer* endeavors to show that Dr. Wayland is too "superficial, circumscribed, and suggestive of essential error—that of relying, at least, too much, on an arm of flesh;" and that "the essentials of Gospel Truth seem wanting." We presume the Dr. is *wanting*, and that his divinity may be *sick*, and we dare say Elder Cook has shown it.

—

"HISTORY OF NEW AMSTERDAM; OR, NEW YORK AS IT WAS, *in the days of the* DUTCH GOVERNORS. *Together with papers on events Connected with the American Revolution: and on Philadelphia in the times of William Penn.* BY PROFESSOR A. DAVIS, Corresponding Member of the New York Historical Society, Hon-

orary member of the New York Society of Letters, and formerly Chaplain of the New York Senate. Six fine illustrations. R. T. Young, Publisher, 140 Fulton street, New York."

This is a bound volume of 240 pages, 18 mo. and very interesting, but *much too brief*. That is a good failing.

"THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER, *Edited by J. Panton Ham, Minister of the Congregational Free Church*, Bristol," England, for January, has come to hand. It is very interesting.

OUR FRIENDS have sent us various newspapers with articles to notice. Some of them may be worthy of attention, but we cannot say how soon we shall find time to look at them all.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS,

FOR SALE AT THE OFFICE OF BIBLE EXAMINER.

We affix to each work the rate of postage when prepaid.

"BIBLE VS. TRADITION."—A thorough refutation of the doctrine of natural immortality, and of endless sin and suffering. A most searching work of 312 pages, 12 mo. Price 75 cents: or ten copies for $5. Postage 15 cents.

"SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE OF FUTURE PUNISHMENT, by H. H. Dobney, Baptist Minister, England." A calm, clear and convincing argument, showing that the wages of sin is *death; not life* in misery. We have the "*Second Part*" only on hand, at present, and that in paper covers. This part contains over 200 pages, and is extremely interesting. Sold at the very low price of 25 cents: or six copies for $1. Postage 6 cents.

"THE UNITY OF MAN, OR LIFE AND DEATH REALITIES. A REPLY TO REV. LUTHER LEE, by *Anthropos*." This is a thorough refutation of Mr. Lee's position of the natural immortality of the soul. It contains 122 pages, 18 mo., in paper covers. Price 15 cents, or *ten* copies for $1. Postage *one* cent.

"SIX SERMONS, by *Geo. Storrs*: An inquiry. *Are the wicked Immortal?*" to which is *added* a dissertation on the "State of the Dead;" and *prefixed* Archbishop Whately's remarks on "*The Second Death!*" About one hundred thousand copies of the Six Sermons have been sold since first preached in 1842. The work will speak for itself. It has 128 pages, 18 mo. Price 15 cents in paper covers: or *ten* copies for $1. Postage *one* cent.

"STORRS' MISCELLANY." It contains the *two* foregoing works, with various Tracts, bound in one volume. Price 50 cents, or *six* copies for $2. Postage *nine cents*.

"DIALOGUES ON FUTURE PUNISHMENT, by Rev. Wm. Glen Moncrieff," Scotland. A most valuable and convincing work, which ought to be in the hands of every person where the gospel is preached. It is a pamphlet of 60 pages, 12mo., Price *ten* cents: or 14 copies for $1. Postage *one* cent.

"DEATH NOT LIFE; *or the Theological Hell and Endless Misery Disproved;* and the Doctrine of Destruction Established, by a collection and explanation of all passages on future punishment; also metaphysical arguments for the immortality of the wicked exploded; by Jacob Blain, Baptist Minister." 120 pages, 12 mo. Price 25 cents in paper covers.

Postage 4 cents: or we will send *five* copies for $1, and prepay the postage.

Br. Moncrieff, in his Expositor, Edinburgh, Scotland, thus speaks of this work:—

We could not, perhaps, better characterize this work than by saying that it is, in the fullest sense of the expression, all that its title professes it to be. Every passage of Scripture, bearing on the momentous doctrine of future punishment, is brought forth and examined; and their invariable testimony is shown to be, that the final doom of the lost is an utter and everlasting destruction. Every objection is manfully met, and successfully overthrown,—every stronghold of the heathenish dogma of immortal-soulism falls, broken to pieces beneath the ponderous sledge-hammer of the author's reasoning. To every diligent Bible-student, we cordially recommend this able little treatise. Across the wide ocean we bid its author God speed. We feel assured that in the wide Continent of America, a rich harvest waits on his earnest and pious labors.

"LIFE AND DEATH; or, The Theology of the Bible in Relation to Human Immortality; by Rev. J. Panton Ham," Bristol, England. Also, "THE GENERATIONS GATHERED AND GATHERING; or, The Scripture Doctrine Concerning Man in Death," by the same author.

These works are each published in a double Examiner, with covers. Price, *ten cents* single copy: or $7 per hundred. Without charge to all *Preachers* who will read them. Let them continue to be scattered. Postage *one* cent.

"THEOLOGY OF PAUL; or, *The Christian Doctrine of Future Punishment as Taught in the Epistles of Paul;* by H. L. Hastings." A pamphlet of 48 pages, 12 mo. Price, *six cents* single; or $4 per 100. Postage *one* cent.

"OUR ISRAELITISH ORIGIN, or *Lectures on Ancient Israel*, by J. Wilson," England. This work has no connection with the others in the foregoing list, but is designed to show that the modern inhabitants of Europe, and the people of the United States, are the literal descendants of Jacob, and of the lost tribes of Israel. It is deeply interesting. Price 75 cents bound, or 50 in paper covers, with a liberal discount to wholesale purchasers, *for cash*. Postage 14 cents bound, and *nine* cents in paper covers.

All works sent at the expense of the purchaser. But if the amount for postage is remitted us, with the price of the work ordered, we will see it *pre-paid*.

Address GEORGE STORRS, *New York*.