

BIBLE EXAMINER.

"PROVE ALL THINGS, HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD."

VOL. IV.

PHILADELPHIA, JANUARY, 1849.

No. 1.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

JOHN T. WALSH, ASSOCIATE EDITOR.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 18 CHESTER STREET,
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, fifty cents; five copies, \$2; eight copies, \$3; or thirteen copies, \$5; ALWAYS IN ADVANCE.

☞ This paper is subject to newspaper postage only.

DOES THE SOUL OUT-LIVE THE BODY?

REPLY TO J. T. WALSH.

My Dear Sir,—Though I find not a few misapprehensions of my views, in your last, I am disposed to pass them, and dismiss the philosophical questions, and come directly to this question, in the light of the Bible:

Does the soul, or mind of man, exist in a conscious state, after the death of the body, till the resurrection?

This is a plain question, and I suppose we are fairly at issue upon it. In your last, you admit, that man possesses no such "substance," or "entity," as mind, to which we can refer mental and moral phenomena, *distinct* from the body; and of course, the death, or dissolution of the body, involves, by a necessity which Omnipotence cannot avert, the end, or cessation of consciousness and thought, till the body is reorganized. This I deny, and join issue.

I referred, simply, to the fact that man was created in the image of God. This has drawn forth from you such a criticism, as makes it necessary for me to refer to your views, and press that argument upon your notice.

You define *Elohim* "holy ones, or *angels*," and hence declare, that man was created in the image of *angels*! This new criticism and theology, stand or fall together. I will, at this time, attempt no further refutation than to put your definition in the place of the word defined, in Gen. 1: 1—"In the beginning, *Elohim* (holy ones, or *angels*,) created the heaven and the earth."

I dismiss this point till you more fully develop your views, and hasten to press the argument.

Man was created in the image of God—Gen. 1: 26, "And God said, let us make man in our image, and after our likeness." 1: 27—"So God created man in his *own* image, in the image of God created he him." Gen. 9: 6—"Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed; for in the image of God created he man." These passages, so plain that comment darkens them, fully sustain the position taken.

That it was the *nature* of man that was in the image of God, and not moral character, is clear; first, because moral character cannot be created; and secondly, because fallen and sinful man is *still* the image of God. Gen. 9: 6.

God being "a spirit," neither living nor lifeless, organized or unorganized *matter*, can be in the

image or likeness of a spirit God. Here, leaving this matter, introduced into the discussion at this point, by mere chance, I proceed to the passage already introduced from Matt. 10: 28—"And fear not them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell."

I find nothing in your remarks upon this passage that I care to notice; you leave all I have said untouched.

1. Let the candid reader carefully observe, that soul is not put in contrast with life, but body; and therefore means that conscious, thinking part of man sometimes called mind.

If man has no soul distinct from the body, this text can never be made to harmonize with truth.

"Body" has a definite meaning, and can we believe "soul" to refer to nothing now positively existing, but to the *future* life of the *body*? 2. The soul is spoken of as now existing, and while man can "kill the body," it is declared he "cannot kill the soul."

Did Christ mean to say, fear not them that can kill the body in the present existence, but cannot kill the *body* in the future? 3. The distinction is kept up in the last clause of the passage—"but rather fear him who can destroy both *soul* and *body* in hell." If by *soul* here, we are not to understand any part of man's nature, now existing, but his future being after the resurrection, then, by *body*, we are to understand *present* existence, and not his physical nature; and then the text would read, "fear him who is able to destroy both the future life and the present life in hell."

4. But the absurdity of this, appears from the consideration, that to "destroy in hell," and cast "into hell," are parallel phrases, and refer to a punishment after death; and as the death of the body is the destruction of the *present* life, the future and present life cannot both be destroyed in hell, as that would imply the destruction of what was already destroyed.

Notwithstanding your *denial*, I reaffirm that Christ declares the spirit to be born again, and not the flesh. The controversy is not about the *nature* of the change, but upon what is it wrought—flesh or spirit?

2 Cor. 12: 2, 3—Paul here declares, he knew a *man* caught up to the third heavens, but whether in the body, or out of the body, he could not tell. Now he does not call the body the *man*, for while that which constitutes the *true* man was carried to heaven, the body might not have been.

And he clearly indicates, that what he calls the *man* may leave the body, and exist out of it.

2 Cor. 5: 1—"For we know, that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." The body is called a house, in which the true man, viz. the soul resides, and is contrasted with the residence of the soul after the dissolution of the body. This is

earthly, that heavenly; this perishing—'made with hands,'—that eternal."

Also the 6th and 8th: "Therefore, we are always confident, knowing that whilst we are at home, in the body, we are absent from the Lord."

"We are confident, *I say*, and willing rather to be absent from the *body*, and present with the Lord."

I hardly know how to give more clearness and force to these passages. Still the figure is kept up. The body is still regarded as the "house," or residence of the soul—the person proper, which implies absence from God. But Paul contemplates with joy, "absence from the body"—that "this earthly house" should be dissolved, for then he should be present with the Lord. In another place he contemplates death with delight, because *when read*—as to the body—when it was "dissolved," he would "be with Christ."

Paul regarded dying as a departure to Christ, and hence to be desired, above life. To leave *this* body, to have it dissolved, was only to enter into a heavenly residence—to be present with God. Such were his glorious hopes. Such are mine.

"Death is the gate to endless joy," with heaven opening on my eyes:—the music of angels sounding in my ears, "I mount, I fly; O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?"

Respectfully,
WM. H. BREWSTER.

REPLY TO MR. BREWSTER.

Dear Sir: I am pleased to see, that as this discussion progresses, it increases in interest; and I hope our readers may all be edified in its perusal.

In your last, you state the following question for discussion: "*Does the soul, or mind of man, exist in a conscious state, after the death of the body, till the resurrection?*"

In reference to this you say, "I suppose we are fairly at issue." Yes, Sir, upon this question, "we are fairly" and fully "at issue." You affirm, and I deny. And now to your arguments.

1. In my last response, I stated that man was made in the image of the Elohim, whom I defined to be the holy ones, or angels. This you characterize as a "new criticism and theology." Be it so; the *truth* contained in it, is as old as the creation of man. This I shall prove, during this discussion, if necessary. It being, however, in itself, a digression, I shall only give it this passing notice at present.

But, I affirm that man was not made in the image of "the invisible God." And you say, this image was "not moral character," but "the nature of man."

Now, for the sake of argument, I will suppose that "man was created in the image" of him, "who dwells in light inaccessible;" and that this image was a similarity of "natures." What then is the consequence? What was the "nature" of man? for, upon a solution of this question, depends the consequence. The "nature" of man is organized: Ergo: God is organized. The "nature" of man is compound: Ergo: God is compound. The "nature" of man, according to your theory, is mortal and immortal: Ergo: God is mortal and immortal! Thus it is reduced to an absurdity.

Elohim is a name not only bestowed on angels, but also on orders of men. See Psalm xcvi. 7.

Heb. i. 6. Psalm viii. 5. Ps. lxxxii. 6. But, as I stated, I shall reserve my arguments on this point, to a future time.

Man was created in the "image" or "likeness" —*form*—of the Elohim. Angels, or the Elohim, have appeared to men, and were found to be "in fashion as men;" not so with him "who dwells in light inaccessible, whom no man hath seen, nor can see."

You say, "God," (the Everlasting Father,) "being a spirit, neither living nor lifeless, organized or unorganized matter, can be in the image or likeness of a spirit—God." This is true; but it is not true in reference to the Elohim.

2. Upon my remarks on Matthew x. 28, you say, "I find nothing I care to notice." Perhaps you might not "care" to notice an argument? But, be this as it may, I will now try and give you something which you will "care to notice."

In my remarks on the passage referred to, I observed that the word translated "kill," in the first instance used, signified to "murder," "to put to death" with an evil purpose. Well, Jesus says, "Fear not them who 'murder' the body, but are not able to 'murder' the soul." And what is the reason they "are not able to 'murder,' 'dismiss,' or 'extinguish' the 'soul,' or life?" Before giving the answer, I will remark, that the term soul, (*Psyche*) means breath, life, principle of life, &c., and that it is used with reference to the life to come, as we shall presently see. Why, then, I ask again, could they not "murder," or "extinguish" the *Psyche*?

1st. Because it was an *attribute*, and not an *entity*, as Mr. B. supposes. Attributes are not said to be "murdered."

2d. Because Jesus is "the resurrection and the life; the prince and author of life;" and inasmuch as the "life" of his disciples is "hid with him in God," they could not "dismiss them from life," in the sense of not living again.

3. The word "destroy," in this passage, is not the same in the original, where it is rendered "kill." This word "destroy," is used in reference to both "body" and "soul;" that is, the "body," and its *attribute* "life." God can "extinguish" both in *gehenna*, in the sense of the "second death"—a "death ending in death," as Paul expresses it.

In further proof of the correctness of this exposition, at the 39th verse, in the same chapter, and in the same connection, and in the same discourse, we have the following: "He that findeth (saveth) his life, (*Psyche*) shall lose it; and he that loseth his life (*Psyche*) for my sake, shall find (save) it."

Here we are taught that those who, for the sake of their lives, rejected, or denied the Messiah, "shall lose it." Lose what? Lose the *Psyche*—life. They save it here, but lose it in the age to come, by a "second death." While, on the other hand, those who "lose the life," or *Psyche*, in the present age, for "Christ's sake," shall "find," or save it in the future age, by a resurrection to eternal life.

I have more than fifty proofs of this interpretation, but for the want of room, must not introduce them. They will be presented in the course of this discussion.

3. I shall give your re-affirmation, concerning the new birth, the go by; because that is not the subject of discussion, but a digression from it. I am satisfied the change is wrought upon the *man*.

4th. You base an argument on Paul's vision, found in 2 Cor. xii. 2, 3, 4. I will now examine it.

Paul says, "I will come to *visions and revelations* of the Lord. I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago, (whether in the body, I cannot tell; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell; God knoweth.) Such an one caught up (or away) to the third heaven. And I knew such a man (whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell; God knoweth,) that he was caught up (away) to Paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful (possible) to utter."

On this I remark:

1. That Paul calls it a "*vision*." What is a "*vision*?" It is a *supernatural representation of future things*. Paul received "*revelations*."

2. Paul did not know the state he was in at the time, and intimates that God only knew; but our opponents will have it that *they know*, and confidently tell us he was "out of his body!"

3. James tells us, "that the body, without the spirit, is dead;" therefore, if Paul was "out of his body," in a literal sense, his body was dead!

4. Paul was caught away, as the word should be rendered, to the third heaven—to Paradise, which is to be displayed on the earth, during the age to come. He had "*visions and revelations*" of the future.

5. I conceive the meaning of the apostle to be, that he did not know whether he was literally, or bodily caught away, as Philip was when found at Azotus; or whether he was mentally caught away. That God only could tell whether he was really caught away, or whether he was abstracted, absorbed, enraptured, and caught, or carried away by the things presented to him.

In Rev. iv. 5, John says: "After this I looked, and behold a door was opened in heaven; and the first voice I heard, was as it were of a trumpet talking with me, which said, come up hither, and I will show thee things which must be hereafter. And immediately I was in the spirit," &c. Does any one suppose that John really went up to heaven? No: so far from it, he received those revelations "in the isle that is called Patmos;" but when the angel said "come up hither," he was "immediately in the spirit," and was doubtless caught away as Paul was. He was so filled with the spirit of God, as to be totally taken up, and absorbed by the scenes before him—the things he saw and heard. He was wrapt in visions of the future, wrought up into an ecstasy, enraptured and ravished by the things presented to him. I have already referred to the case of Philip, as an instance of being bodily caught away. The case of Ezekiel is another. But in the case of Paul, he did not know whether he was thus bodily caught away, or whether it was mental.

6. Your next proof is 2 Cor. v. 1, &c. I will proceed to analyze it.

"For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God; a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." This verse stands related to the last verse of the preceding chapter, where Paul contrasts "things seen and unseen, temporal and eternal." And then, speaking of those "temporal" things, which constitute our "earthly house of dwelling," he says, "if this tabernacle were dissolved," as Peter taught it would be, "we have a building of God, a house not made with hands,

eternal in the heavens." Not beyond the skies, but in the "new heavens and earth." A "city whose builder and maker is God;" for which Abraham, and all those ancient worthies looked.

"For in this" dwelling place, "we groan earnestly, desiring to be clothed," or invested, "with our house," or building, "which is from heaven: if so be that being clothed," invested, "we shall not be found naked," or destitute.

This "house," "building," dwelling place, or "tabernacle," is said to be "from heaven," just as the New Jerusalem is said to be; and because every "good gift comes from above."

"For we that are in this tabernacle," or dwelling place, "do groan, being burdened: not because we would be unclothed," naked, or destitute, "but clothed," or invested with an "eternal" dwelling place, "a building of God," "not made with" human "hands"—"that mortality might be swallowed up by life."

In Rom. viii. 22, 23, Paul speaks of this "*groaning*," and "waiting for the adoption—the redemption," or resurrection "of the body." Now Paul did not wish to be "unclothed," "naked," or destitute; but he wished to be invested with that "tabernacle," or dwelling place, into which he would be introduced when "mortality is swallowed up by life."

"Now," says he, "he that hath wrought us for this same thing," a resurrection to life, "is God, who also hath given to us the earnest of the spirit." "Therefore," because we have the "earnest of the spirit," we are always confident; knowing that, while we are at home in the "*mortal*" body, we are absent from the Lord: (for we walk by faith, not by sight.) We are confident, I say, and willing, rather to be absent from the "*mortal* body," in the sense of having it "swallowed up by life," "and to be present with the Lord. Wherefore we labour, that whether present" with the Lord, "or absent" from him, "we may be accepted by him," when he shall come. "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things *in body*, according to what he hath done, whether good or bad." If the reader will keep in mind the two important points in this quotation, viz.: *the resurrection and judgment*; together with the fact, that "*we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; THAT,*" or in order that "*every one may receive IN BODY, according to what he hath done, whether good or bad,*" he will be able to understand and appreciate our view. There are no rewards between death and the resurrection. Rewards are to be received "in body," after an "appearance at the judgment seat of Christ."

7. Your final proof is a reference to Philipians 1: 20, 21, 22, 23, 24.

In this chapter Paul is speaking of "his bonds," and "the things which happened to" him, which he tells the Philipians had "fallen out rather to the furtherance of the gospel." He then adverts to the fact, that "some indeed preach Christ, even from envy and strife," "supposing to add affliction to my bonds." But, "notwithstanding," says he, "I therein rejoice, yes, and will rejoice. For I know that this will turn to my salvation through your prayer, and the supply of the spirit of Jesus Christ, according to my earnest expectation and hope, that in nothing I shall be ashamed, but that with all boldness, as always, so now also, *Christ*

will be magnified in my body, whether by life, or by death." This is one point, to which special attention will be called.

"For to me to live is Christ,"—Christ will be "magnified" if I live—"and to die is gain," not to me personally, but to "Christ;" "the gospel will be furthered thereby;" "Christ will be magnified by my death." But if I live in the *flesh*—this mortal state, "*this is the fruit of my labour,*" "bonds and imprisonments await me,"—"yet what I shall choose I know not. For I am in a strait betwixt two, *having*" AN EARNEST DESIRE FOR THE RETURNING *and being with Christ.* "Paul did not write the words imputed to him" in the common version. "He did not pen the sentiment attributed to him. The advocate of immortal-soulism would never have appealed to this text, if it had been faithfully translated. His words are, *teen apithumian echoon eis to analusai. kai sun Christos einai*—having an earnest desire for the returning and being with Christ." This criticism is not original with me, but I adopt it as my own, on account of its superiority over every other interpretation. The same word, *analousai*, in Luke xii. 36, is properly rendered *return*, in connection with the same topic Paul was discoursing on.

Thus I have fully and "fairly" met all your arguments, and our readers must judge of its merits.

8. You mistake the "hope" of Paul. His hope had reference to his Lord's "*returning,*" at which time he expected to be invested with a "crown." I am sorry your "hope" differs from his. You raise a shout of "victory" by far too soon! "Death is" not "the gate to endless joy," but rather "the gate" to *hades—sheol*—the grave—the house appointed for the living. When we die, death gains a *temporary* "victory;" hence I said, you raised the shout of "victory" too soon. Read the 15th Cor. and you will see, that the time when this shout of victory will be raised is when the "dead shall be raised incorruptible," at the "*returning*" of the Lord Jesus from heaven. And the prophets teach the same doctrine.

"Heaven" does not "open on" the "eyes" at death; but the "eyes" are shut, closed, sealed to all the universe, and "the music of angels" does not "sound" in the "ears" of the *dead!* There is no "mounting," nor "flying," when men descend into the grave! No, my good sir, there is no shout of victory then; but all is sadness, weeping, mourning, and lamentation on the part of the living; and corruption, death, silence and darkness on the part of the dead.

My good sir, let me urge you to fix your hopes on the *resurrection* of the dead, instead of placing them at the *gloomy point* of death! The Lord will soon be here; he brings "his rewards with him;" O! let us fix our hopes upon that glorious event: "for, to them that look for him, he will appear the second time, without a sin offering, in order to salvation." May you and I stand undismayed in his presence, is the prayer of your friend, and obedient servant,
J. T. WALSH.

TO CORRESPONDENTS AND FRIENDS.—The crowded state of our columns, compels us to lay over nearly all the letters, questions, &c., we have received, besides the greater part of our own scribbles. We intended to give one, in this number. "On the Perfection of Adam, or his Holiness and Knowledge." Br. Walsh's "Scriptural Psychology, No. 2," is also crowded out.

THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

By RICHARD WHATELY, D. D.,

LORD ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN.

LECTURE III.

Reasons for supposing the Intermediate State one of Consciousness.

It appears to have been a belief or suspicion entertained by several of the earliest Christians that the end of the world was just at hand; which opinion was probably founded on a misinterpretation of our Lord's prophecies respecting the judgment about to be executed on Jerusalem; which, in a certain sense, was called "the coming of the Lord;" and which "coming" they confounded with his final coming to judge the world; a mistake the more natural, because He himself did at the same time prophecy concerning his final coming likewise; so that what related to the one and to the other of these two events, was in some degree mixed and blended together.*

The Thessalonians, moreover, seem to have had an idea, that some advantages would be possessed by those of them who should be alive at the coming of Jesus Christ, over those who had died before it; and that these would be admitted to some higher privileges; which of course increased their sorrow for their friends who were departed. This occasioned the Apostle Paul to assure them, that all Christians who had continued in the faith and fear of God, should be partakers of the same blessings, whether they should be living or dead, when the day of judgment should arrive, and should enter upon the enjoyment of those blessings at the very same time; that those "who are alive shall not prevent" (that is, precede or be beforehand with) those of the faithful who are in the grave; but that "the dead in Christ shall rise first;" that is, the *first thing* in order of time will be, that the *dead* in Christ shall rise, and shall be admitted into the presence of the Lord, together with those that are still living.

This is sufficient to afford comfort to all who have a lively faith in God's promises; both of the Thessalonians and of all other Christians in every age and country: with this the Apostle is contented; it being generally the practice of the Sacred Writers to reveal that the most distinctly which it is of the greatest practical importance to know; and to speak less frequently and more obscurely of matters, on which, however interesting to our curiosity, we may safely remain in ignorance or in doubt, during our time of trial here on earth.

The Apostle accordingly, though he has said enough to encourage his disciples not to sorrow as men without hope for their deceased brethren, gives no account of the intermediate state which was alluded to in my last Lecture; that state, in which men remain from death till the final resurrection. He merely tells them, that as "Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with Him."

And this (the intermediate state) is a point on which, I think nothing is so clearly revealed in any part of Scripture, as to allow us to pronounce positively that such and such a belief respecting it is

*See Hinds's "History of the Rise and Early Progress of Christianity," for some remarks on the prophecies of our Lord; and also his "Catechist's Manual," on the same subject.

to be held as an essential part of the Christian faith; since, if such had been the design of the Almighty, I cannot but think there would have been some explicit and decisive revelation given on that point.

One thing, however, (I remarked to you) is perfectly clear and certain respecting what that intermediate state is *not*; namely, that it is *not* a state of trial and probation,—a state in which anything can take place (through any prayers or pretended sacrifices offered up by survivors) to affect a man's final condition; since we are plainly taught in Scriptures that this present life is the *whole* of our state of trial, and that we shall be judged at the last day according to our conduct here on earth.

Since, then, the intermediate state is not one of trial, it must be either one of enjoyment and suffering according to each man's character (that is, a state of reward and punishment,) or else a state of utter insensibility and unconsciousness; either of which opinions may, I think, be safely entertained (though only one of them can be true,) without failing in any part of the faith which it is essential for a Christian to hold.

It may be interesting, however, to lay before you some of the reasons which are urged in behalf of each of these opinions; that you may be prepared to do justice to the maintainers both of the one and the other, and that you may perceive how perfectly each supposition accords with what are the essential parts of our faith on this point; namely, a due sense of the immense value of this life considered as a preparation for eternity,—and the fullest confidence in the promises and threatenings of God with respect to the life to come.

Those then, who believe that the soul, when separated from the body by death, retains its activity, and consciousness, and sensibility to pleasure and pain, and that it enters immediately on a state of enjoyment or of suffering, appeal to several passages of Scripture, which appear to favour this doctrine, though without expressly declaring it: among which is the parable of the rich man and Lazarus; the former of whom is represented as being in a state of torment: although the end of the world is plainly supposed not to have arrived, since he is described as entreating Lazarus to warn his surviving brethren, "lest they also come into this place of torment." And if all that is here told were to be considered as a narrative of a matter of fact which actually took place, it would be perfectly decisive. But all allow that the narrative is a *parable*, that is, a fictitious tale framed in order to teach or illustrate some doctrine: and although such a tale *may* chance to agree in every point with matter of fact,—with events which actually take place,—there is no necessity that it should. The only truth that is essential in a parable, is the truth of the moral or doctrine conveyed by it. Many accordingly of our Lord's parables are not, although many are, exactly correspondent with facts which actually occur. For instance, in the parable of the sower, the account of the different success of the seed which fell on the trodden way-side, in the rocky ground, among thorns, and on good land, agrees literally with what actually takes place daily; though no particular sower is intended, even here: the object is to illustrate the different reception of the gospel by men of different characters. On the other hand, in the parable of the good Samaritan,—in that of the king who destroyed the ungrateful guests who refused to come

to his feast,—of the husbandmen who killed the servants and the son of the lord of the vineyard,—and in many others,—there is no reason to believe that any such events did ever actually take place; it is enough for the object of the parable, that it is *conceivable* they *might* take place; and that we should be able to derive instruction from considering how men *would be likely* to act, or how they *ought* to act, *supposing* such circumstances *should* actually occur.

The parable therefore of the rich man and Lazarus, is not, I think, decisive of the point in question. It seems to imply, indeed, very plainly, that there is a future state of reward and punishment (a doctrine, however, which most of Christ's hearers had no doubt of;) and also that those who have been devoted to the good things and enjoyments of this world, will have no share in those of the world to come, and will regret, when it is too late, their not having "laid up for themselves treasure in heaven."* This appears to have been the general moral design of the parable; in the detail of which, many things are spoken figuratively, to give force and liveliness to the description, which are plain enough *when figuratively* understood, but could not have been meant, of course, to be taken literally; as, for instance, when the rich man is represented as holding discourse with Abraham, and entreating a drop of water to cool his tongue, because he is tormented in flames: which is a lively figurative description of the future misery of the wicked, and is so employed by our Lord in other places: all of which corresponds exactly with what *would be said* and done *supposing* such circumstances actually and literally to occur; but does not imply that the fact is literally such as the parable describes. Indeed, the very circumstance of the torturing *flames*, implies, literally, the presence of the *body*; and therefore cannot be literally true of a state in which the soul is *separate* from the body.

It may be said that as our Lord must have known what is the actual state of the departed, He might have been expected on such an occasion as this, to reveal it. That He did not, however, in fact, give a literally true account of this state, is plain from what has been just said; nor does it appear to have been his design, generally, to reveal all that He was able to reveal.

The same view, I think, may be taken of the vision presented to the Apostle John (in the Revelations) of the souls of those who had suffered martyrdom for the Christian faith, calling upon God to avenge his Church, even as the blood of Abel is said, in Genesis, to cry to the Lord. We may collect from this, that a notice was intended to be given to John of the severe and bloody persecutions of the Christians, which took place not very long after,—and an assurance that God would give deliverance to His Church, and that those who had suffered in the cause of Christ should be highly exalted and everlastingly rewarded by Him. But many of the circumstances of the vision are evi-

*It has been supposed, and I have no doubt with reason, that there is also another meaning, more appropriate to the Gospel-scheme, in this parable: that the rich man represents the Jews, originally God's "peculiar people," and Lazarus, the despised Gentiles, who were afterwards admitted to "sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven." This however does not concern the present question.

dently such as can only be understood figuratively; such as the *white robes* of the martyrs, which denote their being justified and accounted pure before God through the blood of Christ. So that I think we cannot from this passage conclude with any certainty that these martyrs, or any other Christians, enter into a state of reward or punishment immediately after death. Indeed, if it were but recollected that nothing but *material, bodily, substance* can be an object of *sight*, it would be plain that all the passages in which a departed soul is spoken of as *appearing to the eyes*, so far from proving even the existence of the soul in a *separate state* from the body, and unconnected with any *material substance*, would, if they were to be understood literally, prove the direct contrary,—that the persons so spoken of as visibly appearing, actually *had* bodies at the time.*

Again, the transfiguration on the mount, in which Moses and Elias appear talking with Jesus, may be brought forward as an argument for the supposition of a state of sense and consciousness after death before the final resurrection; Moses and Elias having been dead long before. But nothing generally decisive can be concluded from any case which is manifestly an *exception* to general rules; as this was, in every respect. The prophet Elijah (or Elias,) we know, did not die at all; but was visibly, in his bodily state, taken from the earth; and in the case of Moses also, a prophet still more highly favoured of God, there appears to have been something peculiar as to his departure; for we are told indeed that he died, and was buried in the land of Moab, but that "*no man knew of his sepulchre.*" Whether he also, like Elijah, and like Enoch, was permitted to forstall the general resurrection, we cannot tell; but it seems clear (as I lately observed to you) that the soul separate from the body is not an object of *sight*, (since, at a man's death, all that was formerly visible of him,

*It is remarkable that a great part of mankind, and those not least, who profess to hold, not only the distinct nature of the soul from any material substance, but even its power of continuing active and conscious when disunited from matter, are nevertheless altogether *materialists*, and mean by a *spirit* only some thin and delicate kind of matter, like a cloud, or a ray of light, &c., which is an object of the senses, but not of *all* the senses. This is plainly the case, not only with those who believe in the common stories of ghosts (that is, spirits) *appearing* and speaking, but also with those who, though they disbelieve these accounts, yet perceive nothing *contradictory* and inconceivable in the idea of the *appearing of a spirit*; which of course would be to them mere words without meaning, if they understood by "*spirit*" something which does not consist of matter, and consequently cannot have (as a visible object must) shape, height, colour, &c.

Whatever is actually seen, or presented to any of the senses, whether naturally or supernaturally, must of course be material; but a like *effect* may be produced on the *mind* (as we experience in the case of imagination and dreaming, and, as we read, in the case of visions) without the presence (as far as we know) of any material object. And the inaccuracy of common language, when we are speaking of such things, perhaps tends to confuse our thoughts. Thus we say, indifferently, "*I saw in my sleep this or that,*" or "*I dreamed that I saw it.*" the former expression, interpreted literally, would imply the presence of a material object; the latter, not.

remains before our eyes in the corpse;) so that nothing can be inferred respecting a *separate* state of the soul, from the *visible* appearance of Moses and Elias, which the eyes of the Apostles witnessed.

It is to be observed also, that there can be little doubt the appearance of Moses and Elias on this occasion was designed to represent "*the law*" (delivered by Moses) "*and the prophets,*" of whom Elias was especially venerated; and that their appearing in friendly communing with Jesus, denoted the agreement of his Gospel with the Law and the Prophets, which He "*came not to destroy, but to fulfil.*" This was the lesson which the appearance conveyed to the disciples; and the *appearance* alone is all that concerned them, or that concerns us. The actual condition of the persons themselves, is a point which did not concern them. Every thing, indeed, that is recorded in the Gospel-history, is to be considered in reference to the *instruction* it was designed to convey to the disciples: "*this voice,*" said our Lord (of that which then came from heaven, announcing Him as the "*Beloved Son of God,*") "*came not because of me, but for your sakes.*"

The promise of our Lord to the thief on the Cross, "*This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise,*" has been urged with more reason, in favour of the opinion that man passes from death at once into a state of enjoyment or of suffering. But this also is a very peculiar case; and therefore can hardly be regarded as decisive as to what shall be the lot of other men. I mean, supposing the promise to be understood in the literal sense of the word *to-day*; which as I shall show hereafter, is not absolutely necessary. I shall dwell at large in another Lecture (the 11th) on the remarkable circumstances (often overlooked) which made the dying thief's profession of faith most distinguished and eminent;—his acknowledging as his *King, that Jesus* who was at the very moment expiring on the Cross, when all his own disciples had fled in despair; his being the *first*, probably, who ever perceived and acknowledged the true nature of Christ's kingdom, as being one into which He should enter *by suffering*;—his being the *only* one who ever did confess this faith before the resurrection. His faith, therefore, was most peculiar and pre-eminent. And so also was the period of his death, at the very time of the mighty sacrifice of the Son of God; which was accompanied with many miraculous circumstances, and, among others, by the resurrection (as the Evangelists inform us) of the bodies of several holy men, who came out of their graves, and "*entered into the holy city (Jerusalem) after the resurrection, and appeared unto many.*" a kind of event which no one expects will take place with Christians in general before the day of judgment.

Whether the immediate admission into *Paradise** of the penitent thief, supposing this to be under-

*There was something remarkable and seemingly peculiar in the very promise itself which was made to this man. The full purport of it, we cannot, I think, positively determine. If the "*Paradise,*" into which he was promised immediate admittance, be the place in which "*just men made perfect,*" will, after the day of judgment, dwell for "*ever with the Lord,*"—or if it be the place or state into which good Christians pass immediately after death,—it is remarkable that the word *Paradise* is not the one commonly used in Scripture to convey either of those meanings.

stood literally, is to be regarded as one of the miraculous and extraordinary circumstances of that awful period, and consequently different from what takes place in other cases, or whether the same will be the lot of all Christ's faithful servants immediately on their departing this life, we are not, I think, authorized by that portion of the sacred history positively to pronounce. (See note A. at the end of this Lecture.)

The passage in the first Epistle of Peter, about our Lord's "preaching to the spirits in prison," has been supposed to allude not only to the conscious state of departed spirits, but even to Christ's having visited, in the interval between his death and resurrection, the souls of those who perished in Noah's flood. But this seems to me a very unlikely interpretation. The passage is indeed extremely obscure; and I have seen no explanation of it that is free from objection; but I will subjoin that which seems to me the most probable. (See note B. at the end of this Lecture.)

I shall resume the consideration of the general question in a future Lecture; in which, though I may not be able to set before you anything decisively convincing and satisfactory as to the point now immediately before us (which is certainly interesting to our curiosity, though not essential to a saving faith,) yet I shall not have occupied your time unprofitably, if I shall but have drawn off your thoughts in any degree from the cares and concerns of the world in which we live; which being present, and the object of our senses, generally occupies far the greater part of our attention; though in comparison of that world to come, which can be viewed only with the eye of faith, it is but as a grain of sand placed beside a mountain; "For the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal."

Note A.—The passage (Matt. x: 28,) "fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul," &c., I had not adverted to, from not supposing it to have any connexion with the present subject; nor can I now perceive any; but as the learned Whitby, in his extreme anxiety to prove from Scriptures a separate state of consciousness, has in his Commentary so applied this text, it is due to such an authority briefly to mention it. He does not seem, however, to have written in this place with his usual judgment.

The expression of Jesus to his disciples was manifestly intended to remind them that their enemies could only inflict temporal death,—could only put an end to a man's life in this world; whereas God's power extends to the whole of our existence,—to all eternity:—in the next world as well as in this. The question about the intermediate condition between death and the resurrection, evidently was not at all in his mind. But Whitby imagines Him to imply that the soul never can be in an unconscious state, because then it would be killed; "for," says he, "'tis not easie to perceive how an intelligible, thinking, and perceiving Being can be more killed than by depriving it of all sensation, thought, and perception." He did not recollect that it is a thing of every day's occurrence for a man to receive, for instance, a stunning blow, which for some minutes deprives him of all sensation, &c., though he afterwards recovers; yet we should not say that the person inflicting such a blow had killed the other's soul, any more than to leave him in the dark for some time would be the same thing as to destroy his eyes. But Whitby does not in general reason in this manner.

Note B.—"By the power of which Divine Spirit of His, long before His manifestation in the flesh, he came to the old world; and by the mouth of Noah, that 'preacher of righteousness,' spake to them whose spirits are now fast prisoned in hell; which were in their lifetime wicked and disobedient to His holy counsels: when the patient long-suffering of God gave a large respite to them for their repentance and conversion, even all the while the ark was preparing by Noah."—*Bp. Hall.*

"The spirits in prison,' to whom St. Peter saith, that Christ 'by His Spirit preached,' he saith also were those 'which were disobedient when the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah.' And therefore Christ's 'preaching to them by His Spirit' probably means, His exciting by His Spirit, which 'strove' with them for a time, Gen. vi. 3, that patriarch to be 'a preacher of righteousness' among them, as the same Apostle in his other Epistle calls him, 2 Pet. ii. 5. But not hearkening to him *then*, they are *now* in prison, reserved for the sentence of the last day."—*Abp. Secker.*

"The plain interpretation of this passage is the true one, namely, that Christ did preach unto those men who lived before the flood even while they lived, and consequently that He was before it. For though this was not done by an immediate act of the Son of God, as if He personally had appeared on earth, and actually preached to that old world; but by the ministry of a Prophet, by the sending of Noah, a 'preacher of righteousness;' yet to do anything by another, not able to perform it without Him, as much demonstrates the existence of the principal cause, as if He did it of Himself without any intervening instrument."—*Bp. Pearson.*

REBUILDING OF THE TEMPLE.—The Jews, both here and in Europe, are just now making great efforts to raise subscriptions for the rebuilding of the Temple of Jerusalem—permission to that effect having recently been given them by the Turkish Government. The subject has been in agitation in this city, of late, and at the Hebrew Festival, the other evening, at the Coliseum, it was prominently discussed. Among the guests there, not mentioned in our report of proceedings, was a Greek Rabbi, who comes here specially commissioned to raise money for the enterprise in question; and we are told his errand, thus far, has been pretty liberally rewarded. The Rabbi goes, next, South, we are told, and, before going back to Europe, will visit the Eastern States. However chimerical this new movement may appear, we confess to us there seems a sublimity of purpose about it which must claim the respect at least, if not the sympathy, of all Christendom.—*N. Y. Express.*

JERUSALEM.—The number of Israelites having greatly increased in the holy city, they have been induced to enlarge and rebuild the Synagogue Beth El, and we have received an appeal from the chiefs of the congregation for aid.—*Occident.*

EUROPE.—The emancipation of the Jews in various States is progressing; though it had not yet been pronounced universally through Germany at late accounts. Several Jewish deputies were elected for the Austrian and Prussian Diets, in addition to those who were chosen for the German Parliament in Frankfort. Dr. Fishhoff was appointed President of the Austrian Diet, if we understand aright a paragraph in the Orient. The

celebrated preacher, Dr. Isaac Noah Mannheimer, of Vienna, is also a member; he sits for Brody in Galicia, and was appointed Vice President at the first meeting of the house. Another delegate is Dr. Goldmark. A writer in the Orient remarks it as singular, that a Jew is President of an assembly in a city where a relative, should he come to see him, has to pay a personal Jew-tax for the privilege of sojourning there a few days. Such are some of the inconsistencies of the present state of Austria, which we hope may soon yield to more sensible counsels. In Berlin, Dr. Kosh and Dr. John Jacob are prominent members of the Diet, and the former had well nigh been appointed minister of public worship, only that the change from a total exclusion from all office to that of superintendent of Church affairs was too great, even in the democratic changes of the present year. But office-holding is no object, so only that no exclusion is permitted.—*Ibid.*

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, JAN., 1849.

ARE THE WICKED IMMORTAL?

"The soul that sinneth it shall die."—*Bible.*

BIBLE EXAMINER.—We present our monthly visitor once more before those who have furnished us the means: to others we should be glad to do it also; but our circumstances forbid it, and we submit. We doubt not our patrons will do the best they can to increase the number of our subscribers the present year. The five dollar shares, by which we were helped last year, have been pledged, this year, by only one or two out of this city: here some eight or ten have renewed their pledges. We will only say—we need all the help our friends can afford us.

All articles furnished by our *Associate* will bear his signature or initials. Each Editor is responsible for his own articles, and no more, unless he endorse them. We wish it distinctly understood, that inserting the article of a correspondent without note or comment is *not* endorsing it. All articles without a signature, not credited as *selected*, are from the pen of the senior Editor. Let these things be borne in mind and we shall not need to repeat them.

Those who receive this number of the Examiner will consider it a receipt in full for Vol. 4, unless they find in the margin a sum marked less than 50 cents: thus—25—signifies that 25 cents only are credited you for the present volume.

All letters should be directed—**GEO. STORRS, PHILADELPHIA, PA.**

TO OUR READERS.—We wish you all a happy new year; and to that end, we hope you may grow in grace and in knowledge; but, especially that you may have a large increase of that *love* without which

knowledge is vain, and will only aggravate our guilt before Him who so loved us as to send His Son to manifest that glorious attribute of his nature;—for, "God is Love:" and, "he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him." Love is the element in which the pure in heart dwell: it is the soil in which all other Christian graces grow and flourish, and without which no other trait of Christian character can be manifested. It must be like the love of our blessed Lord Jesus Christ. His was not a *party* love: it embraced friends and foes: it prayed for his murderers: it led him even to die for his enemies. It pre-eminently embraces now *all his church*. It is not a Methodist love—a Baptist love—a Presbyterian love—an Adventist's love;—but, it is the love of the *head for the body*—for *all* the body; not one member to the exclusion of any other member, but love of the whole: it was a love that bore the sins of the body—that made those sins his own—that suffered on account of them. If our love is like his, it will lead us to be like minded: never shall we rejoice at discovering sins or errors in our worst enemies; much more shall we not take pleasure in finding or spreading abroad the sins or faults of any who have named the name of Christ. Their sins are *our* sins—they are the sins of *the body* of Christ: and can one member sin or suffer and not the whole body partake with it? We believe not: and we mourn that a more lively sense of this truth has not always pressed upon our mind as we now see it. Oh, that the conductors of this paper and all its readers may be filled with that love which filled the Saviour's heart—then will it be a happy year, indeed. We shall contend earnestly for what we believe is truth on all subjects that come before us; especially on that of *no life—no immortality* but *IN Christ*: and we shall do it, because, we believe no *one* subject is more calculated to honor Christ, and manifest the love of God; which manifestation is vastly important to draw out love to God and men, and give it permanence in our minds.

THE LIKENESS AND SKETCH OF BR. WALSH, in this number of the Examiner, have been furnished by our request, and without employing any of the funds of the Examiner for the object. It may seem strange that we have never seen our Associate Editor, but such is the fact. We thought our readers might be pleased, as well as ourself, to see something of the kind we now furnish through the agency of a friend of Br. Walsh. A wood cut likeness is always, at best, imperfect, as it cannot give the shade of the countenance. We take pleasure in saying, that we think no man can execute engraving on wood better than Mr. Mumford, of this city, who executed that from which the impression before us is made, from a Daguerreotype likeness.



A SKETCH, &c.

MR. J. T. WALSH, the subject of this sketch, was born in Hanover County, Va., on the 15th of February, 1815, consequently he is now in the 34th year of his age. His parents were Methodists, and he was trained up in the doctrines peculiar to that denomination. At the age of 18 he united himself to that church, and very soon commenced public speaking. Being possessed, however, of an enquiring mind, he soon discovered not only the incorrectness of his religious faith, but, also, his practice. He, therefore, demanded baptism at the hand of a Baptist minister, and was accordingly immersed. Subsequently to this, he became identified with the *Reform-Baptists*, better known as "*Reformers.*" He was afterwards expelled from this church, for holding the sentiments he now advocates. He positively refused to hold them in abeyance. In 1843 a work by Geo. Storrs, entitled "*An Enquiry: Are the Wicked Immortal?*" fell into his hands, and, for the first time, his attention was directed to the question of IMMORTALITY. This gave a new direction to his enquiries, which resulted, as I have already stated, in his expulsion from Mr. Campbell's communion, and the occupying of his present position. Mr. Walsh has been steadily advancing in Biblical knowledge. Being nurtured in the school of adversity, he has learned "*to suffer and be quiet,*" as Longfellow expresses it.

I here take the liberty of introducing some remarks by Dr. Wooster, descriptive of Mr. Walsh. He says: "Our attention is first directed to a monstrous large brain, mounted on a pedestal of moderate size, but sound and elastic in every particular; having, constitutionally, good digestive, respiratory, and circulatory systems." Again he says: "His mind will have an endless variety of exercises, many

of which will never see the light, as it is of such an order as will not be idle. His principles are liberal in every particular, not swayed by any thing but reason: and no matter how dearly and long cherished, he will listen to the voice of reason and change his views just so often as he can change them for the better; and always be ready to render a reason for the hope that is in him. He will adopt no ridiculous dogmas, to please the multitude, but be governed by his own judgment in all he can investigate."

Again, speaking of him as an Editor, he says: "He is adapted by nature to his business: as a writer, he will be racy, unequivocal, and bold; expressing his sentiments in a comprehensible and comprehensive manner; condensing the pith of his subject to the smallest compass, but, at the same time, not obscuring the sense from his readers. He will excel in examining and explaining "*what is;*" in meeting sophistry with reasoning, in dispelling error and presenting truth. Mr. Walsh is a good listener; comprehends remarkably quick, and dilates upon the subject at once with feeling and cogency. His mind is clear, comprehensive, and able to grapple with the most abstruse subjects; and to mature them well, and give them out satisfactorily. He is fond of polemics, and always ready for a tilt with a reputable competitor; and he has the faculty of meeting arguments without dismay, and giving the triumph of reason. He would sooner encounter a storm, than endure the monotony of a calm."

Thus much it was deemed necessary to say, as an accompaniment of Mr. Walsh's likeness; both of which have been furnished by special request for the Bible Examiner. W. M. W.

STATE OF THE DEAD.—END OF THE WICKED.—

Since the close of our last volume, we have received several new works from England. We have heard it intimated that no Trinitarian held the views on the final destiny of the ungodly that we advocate. The works we have received abundantly disprove this; for *Dobney* is a Trinitarian; so is Bishop *Whately*, whose "*Scripture Revelations on a Future State*" is among the works above named, and from which we give a "*Chapter*" in this number of the Examiner. "*Edward White*, minister of the Congregational Church," is also a Trinitarian. His "*LIFE IN CHRIST;*" or "*Immortality is the Peculiar Privilege of the Regenerate*"—"Being the substance of Lectures delivered at Hereford, in the year 1845," is among the valuable works we have just received. This work contains much valuable matter, from which we intend to draw largely for our columns. "*Reginald Courtenay*, M. A., Rector of Thornton Watlass, Yorkshire," is likewise a Trinitarian. His work on "*The Future State, their Evidences and Nature considered on Principles*

Physical, Moral and Scriptural," is a production of much value, so far as we have examined it. He maintains the unconscious state of *souls* after death, in a masterly manner.

We commence our extracts from these writings in this number of the Examiner, viz. from Dobney and Bishop Whately, with the design of continuing them in future numbers. It will be seen, in the course of the extracts, that these writers consider the intermediate state as one about which the Scriptures are not decisive; but both of them evidently favour the idea of its being one of unconsciousness. It is for the friends of these truths to say whether they shall be widely scattered by the Examiner; and the number of new paying subscribers you send us must determine that soon, as we shall only print a limited number, unless ordered immediately.

AN APOLOGY.—In noticing the "Lectures of J. W. Bonham, on the Eternal Punishment of the Wicked not Annihilation," in one of the last Examiners, we used the following expression:—"We may give our readers a specimen of the double-faced character of that *abortion*." We intended nothing disrespectful of *Br. Bonham*. Our remark was designed to apply simply to the *work*; still, we did not express ourself as cautiously as we ought to have done. We should have been contented in saying,—"In our mind, the lectures are a most singular failure," and *contradictory in themselves*.

THE AGES—NO. I.

WAS THE FLOOD UNIVERSAL?

In the presentation of this subject, I may, perchance, tread upon unexplored territory; and, in the estimation of some, advance some very novel views: but I trust they will be weighed in the light of God's testimony, and then, if found wanting, let them be rejected; but if found to accord with reason and revelation, let them be received. Now to our subject.

We pass over the *Adamic age*, if it may be so called, and attend to an event which marked the *patriarchal age*, viz. THE FLOOD. Our reason for introducing this question, is the use made of it by the apostle Peter. 2 Peter iii. 5, 6, 7. "For this they willingly are ignorant of, that by," (or according to) "the word of God the heavens were of old, and the *earth* standing out of the water and in the water; by which the *world* that then was, being overflowed with water, perished. But the *heavens* and the *earth* which are now, by" (or according to) "the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men." This paragraph has been applied by some *world-burners* to the time yet future, when the Lord shall come to reign on the throne of his father David; but it will be seen, before we close these articles, that it has no such application.

In the 2d chapter of this Epistle, 5th verse, allusion is also made to this subject: "And spared not the *old world*, but saved Noah the eighth person, a preacher of righteousness, bringing the flood upon

the *WORLD OF THE UNGODLY*." Let us now turn to the account given of the flood by that divine historian Moses. "God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth," and He said, "I will destroy man whom I have created, *from the face of the earth*, both man and beast, and the creeping animal, and the fowls of the air." Again, He says—"The end of all flesh is come before me; for the earth is filled with violence through them: and behold, I will destroy them from the earth." Once more He says—"And behold, I, even I do bring a flood of waters upon the earth, to destroy all flesh, in which is the breath of life, from under heaven: and every thing that is on the earth shall die." These references may be found in the 6th chapter of Genesis.

In order to understand this subject fully, we must,

1st. Attend to the meaning of the terms *earth* and *world*, and learn their signification.

2. We must know the *purpose* of God in sending the flood.

Now the Greek word *ge, earth*, has the following meanings: the land, the earth, the world, the inhabitants of the earth, a land, region, tract, country, territory, Canaan or Palestine, a city, the inhabitants of any region or country: land which may be tilled, soil, field; the fruit or produce of the earth; the ground, i. e. to be inferior, imperfect, transient, perishable.

And just here, I will remark, that this word is, comparatively, but seldom applied to the whole globe in the scriptures. It is generally used in a limited sense, as the context in any given case will abundantly show. I hope to prove this in reference to the flood.

The word *Kosmos*, world, signifies order, regularity, regular disposition; ornament, decoration, embellishment; the world, universe, the earth, globe, a region, country, Palestine, the inhabitants of the earth, human race; the many, multitude, public; a multitude of things, vast collection or aggregate; from the Hebrew the present world, or age, or period of the world, as marked by imperfection, wickedness and vice. The men of this world, as imperfect, ignorant and vicious; the things of this age or world, as being frail, transient, &c.

I shall first attend to the term *earth*, as used by Moses and Peter.

Does the term *earth*, used by Moses, mean the globe, or *only* that extent of its surface which was then populated?

We have already given you the meanings of the original word, by which it is manifest that we are supported in the limited use of the word. And now the question arises, Was it necessary, in order to accomplish the purpose of God, to envelope the whole globe in water?

It is evident to my mind that the term *earth*, in reference to the flood, imports no more than the land, country, or territory then inhabited. This view is sustained by Peter when he speaks of God "*bringing in the flood upon the world of the UNGODLY*." If the question, then, be asked, upon what world did God bring the flood? the answer is, in the language of Peter, "*upon the world of the ungodly*." This limits the flood to that portion of the "earth" which was then populated; which, perhaps, was not more than one fourth of the globe.

The purpose of God was to "destroy the world

of the ungodly;" and to say that He could not do this, without enveloping the whole globe with water, is to limit his power. A large portion of the globe is, at the present time, under a "flood," but the whole globe is not.

Peter, speaking of the "scoffers" of his day, says: "For this they *willingly* are ignorant of, that, according to the word of God, the heavens were of old, and the earth standing *out of* the water and *in* the water: by which (water) the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished." The earth still stands '*out of* the water and *in* the water:' and it would be a comparatively easy matter to deluge any single country on the globe by upheaving the earth beneath the vast deep, and causing the waters to flow over the land. This could be done without producing a universal flood. It could be accomplished by convulsions of the earth—a principle by which numerous islands have been formed in the Pacific, and other Oceans. In many places on the globe these physical changes, on a small scale, are continually taking place. In some the ocean recedes from the shore, thus increasing the *quantum* of land or earth; in others it encroaches upon the land. In some cases the earth is elevated for miles in extent, in others depressed. These are practical examples, and display the philosophy of the subject.

In the first chapter of Genesis we have this account: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep." In this place the earth is represented as being *covered* with water. At the 9th verse we read: "And God said, Let the waters under the heavens be gathered into one place, and let the dry land appear." In the 2d chapter we read of a river which "went out of Eden to *water* the garden;" this was divided into four "heads." "The name of the first is Pison;" the second "Gihon;" the third "Hiddekel;" the fourth "Euphrates." Thus we find the earth, it is presumed, at the flood; for we have no indication of any physical changes in the earth before the flood. There is no proof that it rained before the deluge, the earth, at that time, being in this respect like the land of Egypt. Egypt is watered by the Nile; Eden was watered by a river divided into four streams; and, in addition to that, in as much as "the Lord had not caused it to rain upon the earth, there went up a mist" which settled in the form of dew upon the earth and the productions of the earth.

It is objected to my view of this matter, that the whole globe bears marks of having been once *covered* with water. This position is freely granted; but it does not in the least degree militate against the truth of my position. I have already shown, by reference to Genesis, that the earth originally was entirely enveloped with water; but it does not follow, therefore, that it was so at the flood. This is quite another question. There is a geological page in God's Book of Nature which teaches us that the fossil remains which are found on the earth's surface, as well as deeply imbedded in the bowels, are much older than the flood; yes, as old as the creation! Besides, water is not the agent by which bones, shells, wood, &c., &c., become petrified. Heat, caloric, electricity—this is the wonder working agent in these productions. There is no doubt but the centre of the earth is filled with liquid fire; and being thus pent up in the bowels

of the earth, the volcanoes are only so many safety valves through which the super-abundant heat may escape.

As our object, in these articles, is more to call attention to the subject than to elaborate it, we will briefly state the reasons on which our view of this case is based:

1. The terms "earth" and "world" are more frequently than otherwise used in a limited sense. Examples of this may be found in the predictions concerning Babylon, Ninevah, Edom and Jerusalem, to which, however, we shall refer again.

2. The purpose of God did not require the complete deluge of the globe, it being merely to destroy "the world of the ungodly;" which "world" did not embrace the globe.

3. The ark, though large, could not have contained "sevens," or "pairs" of all the animals on the globe, and the fowls of heaven. It would have been a physical impossibility.

4. Mount Ararat is said to rise 12,000 feet above the level of the sea, and Moses states that the waters prevailed "fifteen cubits upwards." We suppose, then, that the waters covered Mount Ararat about 28 feet. This would not cover the highest mountains on the globe.

5. A distinguished philosopher has calculated that there is not water enough on the globe, including the vapor of the atmosphere, to cover the earth, with its present size, more than an inch in depth.

6. If a sufficient quantity of water could be collected on the earth's surface to envelope the globe, and cover the highest mountains, its increased gravity would be such as to disturb the harmony of the Solar System.

7. In this case, the motion of the earth on its axis, from west to east, would have produced such a current in the waters *westward*, that, instead of the ark resting on Mount Ararat, it would have been carried to the Western Continent. This current would absolutely have been irresistible! Like a mighty tornado it would have swept every thing before it.

8. As proof that the earth itself was not destroyed, as some suppose, the dove, sent forth by Noah, finally returned with an "olive leaf plucked off," thus showing that trees were yet standing. And modern travellers inform us that, there are trees in Mexico and France, the yearly growth of which is clearly indicated by their external appearance; and that these indications prove them to be much older than the flood.

Thus we have given the *heads* of the reasons on which we rely in this matter; and, if we have not proven our position, we have, at least, furnished a subject for examination and reflection.

In our next article we shall make a very important application of the view we have now presented; and we hope our readers will follow us in this investigation, and see whether we present the truth or not.

J. T. W.

☞ VOL. III.—We can supply any who may wish it the entire volume of the Examiner for 1848 bound or unbound as they like. They will be furnished at the subscription price, adding, when ordered bound, 25 cts. for each copy for binding. We find we *cannot* put four copies bound at \$2, as we stated in a previous number. The cost of binding is more than we expected. We prefer to furnish them unbound, which is the only way they can be sent by mail.

FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

THE SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE.

BY H. H. DOBNEY.

CHAPTER I.—SECOND PART.

"Whoever is afraid of submitting any question, civil or religious, to the test of free discussion, seems to me to be more in love with his own opinion than with truth."—BISHOP WATSON.

It is with feelings of deep and even painful anxiety that I approach that part of our subject which is now before us. With the preceding chapters my brethren will for the most part agree, and may possibly accept them as some little service rendered to the common cause. Here, however the approval of many will terminate, and with not a few will be exchanged for something worse than the opposite. Still I must proceed, for Truth, as I believe, beckons me on. Let me reverently follow. Yet how can I be insensible to the fact that the direction in which my guide is leading me, is scarcely that in which many of my brethren affirm Truth to lead? Beyond a doubt the opinions of wise and good men are entitled to respectful attention, and it is a grave consideration that the majority of christian people have adopted views which I find myself bound to reject; how then shall I not be sensitively alive to the circumstances of my position? Have so many of the wisest and best of men been left in error, men too whom God has signally honored? Have they been for the most part mistaking the voice of the oracle, and misinterpreting the counsels of heaven on this solemn subject? Painfully and oppressively do I feel this *argumentum ad vericundiam*.

But, on the other hand, are not the best of men fallible? And have not many of the wisest given strange proof of their fallibility? Did not nearly all the wise and good once believe, with Pascal and Fenelon, in transubstantiation and all the other dogmas of the Romish church? Did even the mighty Luther, did the Reformers, achieve their perfect emancipation from all forms of error, and leave no work of reformation for their successors? What shall we say to the consubstantiation of the former, and to the dark doctrine of reprobation so tenaciously held in the stern and iron age that Geneva, Scotland, and even England knew? Why to this day it is Church of England orthodoxy to believe that no one can be saved who doubts the Athanasian creed;* and fifteen thousand clergymen now living have solemnly sworn their assent and consent to that perilous assertion. Is it true? Nor is it so long since it was held sound doctrine among many of the evangelical dissenters that God had provided no Saviour for mankind at large, but only for a little flock, a chosen few; and it was heresy to maintain that there were glad tidings for every creature. And still the innumerable controversies, which are maintained with a spirit which only too well justifies the current phrase, *odium theologicum*, shows how marvellously small is every man's belief in another's infallibility, and may keep the writer in countenance in replying to any who shall

*Most readers will remember that the Athanasian creed professes to set forth the "Catholick faith," but in reality is chiefly occupied with a sort of philosophy, falsely so called, of the divine essence, unintelligible and contradictory, of which it daringly affirms, "Which faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly!"

unreasonably press the opinions of individuals or communities, 'Jesus I know, and Paul I know, but who are ye?'

Besides, is it not our protestant boast, too often indeed a mere empty boast, *vox æ præteræ nihil*, that 'the bible, and the bible alone &c.,' and have we not for this aphorism, admirable if only it were true, complacently decreed the apotheosis of the author of so gratifying a period? Let it not then be deemed *quite* an unpardonable sin if we venture to construe the assertion literally, and so, pushing our way through all that look infallibility, exercise our right of sitting at the feet of the great teacher, whose words—Call no man your father on earth, no man your master, for one is your master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren,—were spoken not to be eulogised on holiday occasions, or when they may serve a turn, but to be recognised as a daily rule of life; "He is our master in abstract speculation—our master in religious belief—our master in morals, and in the ordering of every day's affairs."

Again, is not theology a science? Is not the word of God better understood now than in any age since the apostolic? And if no one competently informed will dispute this, let us ask ourselves whether we have reached the *Ultima Thule* of religious truth, so that in the ages to come, those glorious ages! there will be no discoveries to reward the diligent, and all the people of God will have nothing to do but re-publish and stereotype for all time the theological works of the present day! Believe it who can. Rather is the book of revelation perfect. In those unutterably more glorious eras that are in reserve for the church, there will be no other bible than our own to exercise the loftier powers of our happier successors to the end of the world. Nor needs it. Even in the latest age of all, the wise householder shall bring out thereof 'things both new and old;' and that prayer of the psalmist shall never be in vain, Open thou my eyes that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law. And just as we have been compelled somewhat to modify the theology of a former day, deeming ourselves more favored than our honored forefathers, so will the holy men of a coming age take leave to consider some of the things most surely believed amongst us, not proven, while they will also bring into luminous prominence some mighty truths which the popular theology of the nineteenth century dooms to unwise neglect.

There is still another consolation. Truth can stand any test. The words of the Lord are pure words, as silver tried in a furnace of earth, and purified seven times. No weapon formed there-against shall prosper. This is my comfort. And if the popular doctrine of the real eternity (not of punishment but) of torment be of God, it cannot be overthrown. It will be the more plainly demonstrated the more it is examined, and will stand out in the bolder relief from the feebleness of the opposing arguments. The orthodox have nothing to fear. Let them put their confidence in truth, and in the God of truth. They have beside almost all christendom, ostensibly, at all events, on their part. They can well afford therefore to be calm and fair and temperate and just; they might well afford even more than this.

On the other hand, if the prevailing notion be of man;—if it be some not much examined doctrine that has come down to us from the darker ages, some unpurged-away result of the former univer-

sality of a system to which the largest inventable amount of terror was indispensable;—if, from various circumstances, the religious world have adopted it with far less of rigid investigation than they have been compelled to give to other doctrines;—if it cannot be maintained by the fair application of those sound hermeneutical principles which are the support of the rest of the evangelical system;—and if the same sort of reasoning by which this notion is elicited from a few texts would, to a great extent, subvert the very system of which it is made a part; if all, or only some of this be so, then, whatever of obloquy may be heaped upon me, or however forgetful some of my brethren may be of the law of kindness and the higher law of truth, it will ultimately be seen that no disservice, but the contrary, has been done to the great cause of evangelical religion, which I would a thousand times rather die than injure.

But not to prolong these introductory observations, let us pass on to a necessary but brief remark concerning

THE BURDEN OF PROOF.

“It is a point of great importance to decide in each case, at the outset, in your own mind, and clearly to point out to the hearer, as occasion may serve, on which side the presumption lies, and to which belongs the [onus probandi] *Burden of Proof*. For though it may often be expedient to bring forward more proofs than can fairly be demanded of you, it is always desirable when this is the case that it should be *known*, and that the strength of the cause should be estimated accordingly.”*

The eminent writer from whom this just remark is quoted, and to whom the present age owe so large a debt of obligation, has however laid down a principle from which, though with great diffidence, I must profess my entire dissent; namely, that the *onus* lies with him who calls in question any received doctrine. Surely he who affirms a thing is bound to make good his assertion. Till proved, it is nothing but his mere *ipsi dixit*; and I am not to be called on to believe it, or else be held bound to disprove it. I await the proof; when furnished, if sufficient, I believe; but not till then. Instead, however, of my attempting here what is already done to hand for us, and by a writer of no ordinary acuteness, the reader will pardon my referring him to a work in which this point is already argued, and to my mind decided.†

The burden of proof then lies with those who assert that never-ending torment is in reserve for multitudes of God's intelligent, but alas! rebellious creatures. If they affirm this appalling idea, they are bound to make it good. They must bring forth their strong reasons. If it be the doctrine of revelation the proof lies at hand, and can be easily produced. Till this is done, not merely is no man bound to believe it; he ought not to believe; he must wait for the evidence. Let us therefore recognise

THE KIND OF EVIDENCE DEMANDED.

As a burden of proof as a whole lies with the asserters of the popular doctrine; so does it at every stage of the argument. They must make good

their footing step by step from the beginning to the end. With mathematical precision must they advance, till in the face of all men they are entitled to crown their work with the letters it has often been so delightful to pronounce—Q. E. D. I have never seen this done yet. To my mind there has been a serious flaw in all evidence hitherto presented; and I am sometimes lost in astonishment that in so solemn an argument, one so overwhelmingly awful, evidence should be admitted as satisfactory, of a kind which would never be employed on behalf of the grand truths of the gospel; and for this reason, that the great evangelical verities are so abundantly proved, that the believer feels that he can afford to cast away everything that is even but slightly doubtful. For the divinity of Christ, for example, we would not sigh if enlightened criticism deprived us of fifty texts which it may have been the custom to quote in its defence. We would exult rather to be disencumbered of all that could be fairly questioned, though ever so slightly. We deem the great mystery of godliness to be like the name wrought in the shield of Phidias; and we can be calm and just and kind to an opponent. But how is it with the doctrine in question? Where is that generosity towards an ingenuous enquirer, who is in doubt, which confidence in the abundance, the variety, the force of evidence so notoriously inspires.

Assuredly, if it be the doctrine of scripture, it is plainly taught in our sacred records, and in various ways. We shall not be shut up to an equivocal word or two in a comparatively few texts; but it will somehow or other be involved in different lines of argument, the logical force of which will necessitate our understanding it just so.* But what is the fact of the present case? Take away the proof sought to be derived from the phrase ‘everlasting punishment’ (which we shall not find on a candid examination to necessitate belief) and a few similar expressions, which may be opposed by expressions of an opposite character, and what is left? Where are the lines of argument, the trains of reasoning adopted in the scriptures, which only give out a fair meaning when this doctrine is deduced? like an elaborate lock which will open only by the application of the proper key, so that the key is thereby authenticated as genuine. I submit therefore—

1. That it is not enough for any party to bring forward passages of scripture, and cast them before us in their baldness, as foreclosing all discussion. For there are other classes of texts which would not be allowed to prove anything if produced in the same bald manner. If the universalist, for example, should adduce, as proving his theory, such texts as these—‘the restitution of all things;’ ‘I if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me;’ ‘God will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth;’ ‘He retaineth not his anger for ever, because he delighted in mercy;’—then the orthodox would promptly and properly demand that all such passages should be examined in their connection, that the precise value of each

*In argument with ‘the common people’ how do we substantiate the views we present on the great leading truths? Assuredly not by philological niceties, nor by laying the stress on mere words that look to teach a certain doctrine, but by masses of arguments from scripture that demonstrate the indispensableness of just such or such a view.

*Dr. Whately's Rhetoric, part I. chap. iii. § 2.

†Baptism, in its Mode and Subjects, by Alexander Carson, L. L. D. Chapter I.

should be separately ascertained, that they should be compared with and, if necessary, modified by other statements. But the principle which is sound to-day against one view, is sound to-morrow even if it make against another view, and sound every day. So that,—

2. Prior to any investigation of the proper force of terms employed by the inspired writers, the mere assertion of 'everlasting punishment,' and the like, on the one hand, is sufficiently met, on the other, by the assertion that the wicked 'shall be punished with everlasting destruction,' that they shall 'utterly perish,' and similar declarations. If the phrase *everlasting destruction* is not allowed to settle the entire question at once, so neither can the phrase *everlasting punishment*. If one party hold up the one text as decisive, another party may as fairly hold up the other as decisive. But certainly prior to investigating the proper force of terms, there would, to say the least, be an equilibrium established; or rather, since destruction would be punishment, and everlasting destruction would be therefore everlasting punishment, the balance (more especially considering that both texts are thus interpreted by one and the same principle) would incline against the notion of an eternity of misery.

3. In order, then, satisfactorily to place with the truths which have a right to be most surely believed among us, the doctrine of a real eternity of conscious torment, the preachers thereof must show from scripture,—

That when Christ stands forth, not merely as the deliverer from woe and blank despair and second death, but also as the giver of eternal life to his followers, this magnificent promise cannot possibly be understood literally, but must of necessity be interpreted metaphorically. To the honor which he seems so frequently to assume, as the dispenser of immortality, it must be shown that he has no title; so that those who have bent the knee to him for this unutterable grand endowment, which more than any other makes us partakers of the divine nature, must recall that portion of the homage which we have rendered to him as emphatically, 'Christ our Life;' for that while we derive our happiness from him, we wear our crown of immortality quite independently of him, and thus the Prince of Life, who has 'upon his head many crowns,' has in reality one less than his words had led us to believe. And then they must show,—

That when the God of truth threatens the sinner with *destruction*, in many mutually consistent passages, the terms employed cannot be understood literally, but must be understood metaphorically. Which must be either because man is necessarily indestructible; or, because the Judge will not exert the power he possesses to destroy; or, will exert his power to prevent the sinner naturally dying out of existence, and so will by an act of omnipotence keep him alive for ever and ever in order to torment him! And in reference to this last idea the remark may be suffered, That the sinner is either necessarily immortal, (which will scarcely be affirmed) or else he is immortal only by the will and conservation of God. So that the above awful inference is just (and truth can rejoice in undisguised phraseology) that God will, of his own free act, uphold in life for ever and ever the unhappy sinner, for no other purpose than to punish him.

Verily the evidence for this had need be strong.

It is not metaphysical subtleties, nor even philological niceties (invaluable in their place) that must build the height of this great argument; but mighty masses of obvious truth must be piled upon a mountain base, to raise this everlasting pyramid of infinitely more than sepulchral gloom, which is for ever and for evermore to throw its dark and appalling shadow across the universe of God.

We know indeed from the oracles of truth 'that it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.' And knowing 'the terrors of the Lord' we daily beseech our fellows to flee from the wrath to come. But while we scruple never to use any language which the Most High has employed in his revelation of mercy, and ascribe to him all the titles that he claims—Father—Lawgiver—Judge,—we nowhere find him set forth as purposely prolonging the existence of his wretched victims—drawing it out, of his own free will, a greater age, to all eternity, in order that he may fill and saturate it with most exquisite and unutterable and unceasing misery.

We say that a theory like this, which presents the righteous God under such a terrific aspect—which secures the never-ending existence of sin and suffering in a universe presided over by wisdom and justice and love and mercy,—which if really credited by any of us (in the present state at all events) might well make reason more than totter on her throne, and convert all christendom into one mighty maniac cell, where, in the grasp of the demon of terror, the most benevolent would be the most hopelessly afflicted,—we say that such an appalling theory, pregnant with horrors which no created being can by any means represent to his mind (far the vastest conceptions which the mightiest intelligences form of eternity is of necessity short of the true idea by a whole infinity) had need be sustained by evidence proportionately strong.

Assuredly if it be a truth it is second to none on the page of revelation; eclipsed by none more momentous; but rather does itself overtop and overshadow almost every other. Surely the disciple of Christ who is ardently solicitous to see the universal spread of vital christianity, will in an answerable degree be concerned, as, on the one hand, not to diminish aught from that salutary amount of terror which the infinite wisdom has exhibited, so, on the other, not to overlay and burden the gospel revelation with more of the terrific than its blessed author—the only wise God—has seen fit to embody therein.

And as every word that God has uttered must be true, and every decision of his will the dictate of the profoundest wisdom, the exact truth that lies in the volume of revelation, whatever that may be, must be precisely that which above all human computation is the most admirably adapted to produce the largest amount of varied good, if only it can be discovered and brought to bear on the consciences and judgments and affections of men. The purer the truth we exhibit, the mightier and more extensive its blessed results. And in proportion to the magnitude of any truth, and its bearing on the character of God, on the honor of his government and the welfare of man, will generally be its evidence; the more important, the more clearly will it stand revealed. What christian wishes to blink the question of the genuineness and authenticity of the scriptures? Who turns pale with

fear, and entreats men to hush and drop the subject, when the Creatorship of the Son of God, or the fact of an atonement for sin, or of justification by faith, or of a benign and heavenly influence exerted on the minds and hearts of men, is spoken of? Or which of the subjects, that we are intelligently confident are taught in scripture, do we pray and plot to have tabooed? Or what man living deprecates the most searching investigation into anything he thoroughly believes? And the more important it is, and the more abundant and clear its evidences, the more calmly and rejoicingly do we court inquiry. We christians care, or at least profess to care, for nothing but truth. Let us have it at whatever cost, and as pure as may be, fresh welling up from the sacred fount.

Yes, if the doctrine of never-ending torment for innumerable myriads of God's creatures be indeed contained in scripture, beyond a doubt it will be found repeated over and over again, with every variety of phrase and of diligently sought illustration. It will be indissolubly entwined in numerous arguments; will be the only fair result to which various lines of apostolic reasoning conduct. Concede text after text, it will still remain. Such a portentous truth cannot be dimly set forth. We ask then for the massive arguments to be produced; and we almost venture to ask for that manly and christian bearing in the discussion which the holders of divine truth so naturally exhibit.

And let it be pardoned the writer if he add, that it is not the misrepresentation of our views and arguments—not angry protestations against universalism—nor insinuations against our orthodoxy—nor unworthy assertions that our doctrine is all delectable to the sinner—nor presumptuous declamation that, if we be correct, then “the death of Christ was too costly an atonement,” and that “another Saviour is provided for the sinner,” and that “God was cruel to his Son,”—it is not exactly this kind of thing (of which there has been no lack) that so grave an argument demands, or by which the sacred cause of truth can be advanced. Let not the weapons of our warfare be thus carnal, lest the Master reproves us saying, “Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of.”

REASON AND ITS USE.

“Come now let us REASON together saith the Lord.”

Isa. 1, 18. Our reasoning faculties are those mental powers by which we are enabled to judge—weigh—compare, and determine in regard to those objects or principles that are presented to our minds. This power is given us to distinguish truth from falsehood; and good from evil. To be destitute of reason is to be an idiot or insane. To possess it and not exercise it is fanaticism. Such persons are governed by feelings, and are the sport of any deception that may arouse their feelings, or excite them.

Many religionists scout reason; but it always happens to be when reason is against them; for, they will reason as hard as any one while there is any reason for their opinions or practices; when reason fails them they turn from it in anger, and settle down under their feelings, superstition, or bigotry, which they mis-call faith. Such persons

often strive to hide the absurdity of their theories by pleading their *experience* [i. e. feelings] or the parrot cry of “mystery.” That there is both experience and mystery we do not doubt; but, both must be brought to the test of reason; if they give the lie to that, they are themselves liars. If God is himself the author of our reasoning powers there can be nothing true that plainly contradicts reason. Jehovah has placed his sanction on the exercise of this power in the text at the head of this article. Only bigots or fanatics wish to reverse God's decision on that point. It is to justify their present absurd principles or practices that makes men attempt to cry down reason; such persons are always to be suspected; there is no trusting them. Some eminent men have done justice in their acknowledgments on this subject, whatever their own practice may have been.

ARCHBISHOP TILLOTSON says—“When we say God hath revealed anything, we must be ready to prove it, or else we say nothing. If we turn off reason here, we level the best religion in the world with the wildest and most absurd enthusiasms. And it does not alter the case much to give reason ill names, to call it *blind* and *carnal* reason.—For our parts we apprehend no manner of inconvenience in having reason on our side; nor need we desire a better evidence, that any man is in the wrong, than to hear him declare against reason, and thereby to acknowledge that reason is against him. Some men seem to think, that they oblige God mightily by believing plain contradictions; but the matter is quite otherwise. God never offers anything to any man's belief, that plainly contradicts the natural and essential notions of his mind; because this would be for God to destroy his own workmanship, and to impose that upon the understanding of man, which, whilst it remains what it is, it cannot possibly admit.”

BISHOP WATSON said—“It will not be easy for missionaries of any nation to make much impression on the pagans of any country; because missionaries in general, instead of teaching a simple system of Christianity, have perplexed their hearers with unintelligible doctrines not expressly delivered in scripture, but fabricated from the conceits, passions, and prejudices of men. Christianity is a rational religion.”

ROBERT HALL says—“The light of revelation, it should be remembered, is not opposite to the *light of reason*; the former presupposes the latter; they are both emanations from the same source; and the discoveries of the Bible, however supernatural, are addressed to the *understanding*, [reason,] the only medium of information whether human or divine. Revealed religion is not a cloud that overshadows reason: it is a superior illumination, designed to perfect its exercise, and supply its deficiencies.” That is—It brings to view things which reason unaided could never find out; yet, they do not contradict reason, but have a beautiful agreement with it.

DR. ADAM CLARKE says—“The doctrine which cannot stand the test of rational investigation cannot be true. We have gone too far when we have said, such and such doctrines should not be sub-

jected to rational investigation, being doctrines of pure revelation. I know of no such doctrine in the Bible. The doctrines of this book are doctrines of *eternal reason*, and they are revealed because they are such."

JOHN WESLEY said—"In the earliest times there were not wanting well-meaning men, who, not having much reason themselves, imagined that reason was of no use in religion: yea, rather that it was a hindrance to it. And there has not been wanting a succession of men, who have believed and asserted the same thing. But never was there a greater number of these in the Christian church, at least in Britain, than at this day."

We might multiply testimony from worthy and eminent men to the use and importance of reason, but the foregoing must suffice for the present. We have endeavored to use the reason our Creator has given us without suffering it to be trammelled by sects—parties—or previous prejudices, in searching after truth in the Bible and in the works of God. *Our reason* has pronounced the doctrine of an immortal soul in man a fable, unsupported by revelation; and the doctrine of an immortal soul in endless torments an *unmixed lie*.

The Bible doctrine in regard to man's destiny is *Life or Death*: this is the contrast everywhere presented. Here reason and revelation are in harmony. Men are taught that they are dying. Not only reason and revelation unite in this truth, but experience comes in to confirm it. Man being found in this situation, *Revelation* comes to his aid and comfort with the *Proclamation, or Good News of LIFE—ETERNAL LIFE*. Men may refuse this gospel offer, because they are free agents, or moral beings; but they need not—they may live. Here then we take our stand, that—*The Gospel PROCLAMATION and the Gospel PROMISE is, pre-eminently, LIFE*. This proposition we shall hereafter enlarge upon; and we trust to make the beauty and glory of the gospel of the favor of God stand out in its true glory, stript of "the abomination of desolation"—endless torments for immortal souls—which has so long disgraced Christianity, and driven men into universalism and infidelity. We conclude these remarks in the language of God by the prophet: "Say unto them, As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the *death* of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live; turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways, for *why* will you die?" what *reason* can you give why you will die?

"*LIFE IN CHRIST*."—Edward White, Congregational minister, Hereford, England, at the close of his discourses, in which he has shown most triumphantly that the wicked are to be destroyed, and have no immortality, because "Immortality is the Peculiar Privilege of the Regenerate;" adds the following note:

"The English reader who may desire to enter upon a further investigation of the general subject of these discourses will consult with advantage, I. On the question of the IMMORTALITY of the soul, Enfield's compendium of Brucker's History of Philosophy, in which he will discover how very far the ancient heathen were from a general adoption of that tenet as a dictate of common sense; and Dodwell's controversy with Clark and Chishull, with the continuation ascribed to Earberry, in which he will also discover the unanimity of the primitive Christians in rejecting the doctrine of man's natural eternity. The translation of Justin Martyr's dialogue with Trypho, published by Mr. Bickersteth in his volume of the "Christian Fathers," will likewise afford matter for much interesting reflection for those who may desire to know *when* the common opinion first took root in the Church. The Church was surrounded on all hands by believers in the pre-existence and natural immortality of souls, Platonists and Pharisees. In the early part of his Christian life, Justin, a Platonist, taught the common view in his "Apologies;" afterwards, he adopted the *Christian doctrine, and published it in his "Dialogue."* The Platonic notion, however, steadily gained ground in the Church, favouring, as it did, both human vanity, and the terrific sway of spiritual despotism; until, at length, the last clear vestiges of the truth are found in the pages of Arnobius, A. D. 290, who argues, at great length, on the principles of the present Discourses. It is remarkable that from that time the doctrine of *Purgatory* waxed stronger and stronger, perhaps as the natural alleviation invented by afflicted humanity groaning under the burden of the prevalent tremendous belief. II. On the subject of *FUTURE PUNISHMENT* the following works may be recommended to the reader in support of the preceding arguments:—*Laws Theory of Religion*; Whately's Lectures on Future Life; Fortaine on the Immortality of the Wicked; Storrs' Sermons on Eternal Punishment, a cheap and useful publication; an anonymous pamphlet on "Eternal Torments," published at Bristol in 1845: and lastly, the recent *NOTES on Future Punishment*, (now in the second edition, Ward, 1846, of Mr. DOBNEY, to whom belongs the credit of having opened for the last time, with equal courage, intelligence and pious feeling a controversy which it is to be hoped will not again be contemptuously dismissed from before the public eye, until the energies of a numerous band of fellow-labourers have at least urged it upon the attention of all the Churches of the country."

FUTURE PUNISHMENT, BY H. H. DOBNEY, [a Baptist minister of England] This work, noticed in our last, and one chapter from which is found in the present number of the Examiner, is to be immediately *re-published*. It will be published just as received from England, 278 pages 12 mo. The price will be 50 cents in paper covers, or 75 cents bound. One third discount to wholesale purchasers. Send us your orders immediately.

NOTICES.—Adam Dixon. Bundle sent by Express. E. T. Bussell. Money received, and 7 copies of Vol. 3 sent as directed, and six new subscribers for Vol. 4 entered on our books. Thank you. N. M. Catlin. All right.

To all our Correspondents we say—If you receive from us what you send for, that is evidence that your letters are received.