

BIBLE EXAMINER.

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

VOL. V.

PHILADELPHIA, JANUARY, 1850.

No. 1.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

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

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, one dollar; six copies, \$5; thirteen copies, \$10; ALWAYS IN ADVANCE.

☞ This paper is subject to newspaper postage only.

EARTH, NOT HEAVEN, MAN'S HOME.

We intend giving, from time to time, a few extracts from the writings of believers in the personal advent and reign of Christ upon this earth, yet future. The following is from the work of GERARD T. NOEL, A. M., of England.

EXTRACT NO. I.

It has been amongst the arguments derived from analogy in favour of a future state that, otherwise, the disorders and inequalities of human condition, the calamities of virtue, and the successes of vice, would seem to cast a shade upon the moral government of God. But while this idea has pressed closely upon the thoughtful, it has been their habit to look out for the *adjustment* of these disorders, not in the scene in which they have existed, but in a scene which has never exhibited a single trace of the same disaster. But is this habit of thought consistent either with our *natural expectations* or with the *real statements of revelation*?

Is it consistent with our *natural expectations*? The circumstances which will approach nearest to our own, are those of a race of men, connected with a wide dominion of which they form but a part, who should have thrown off the allegiance which they owed to their sovereign, and who are now occupied with speculations and pursuits entirely their own, independent of the will, and subversive of the laws of the monarch to whom they were subject. Let it be supposed that the monarch is just, forbearing, kind, and powerful. He looks with indignation and sorrow upon that province of his empire, wasted by discord, impoverished by vice, ravaged by cruelty, oppressed by force, and wretched through crime. He contemplates the struggle with a keen and cautious eye—and resolves to undertake the vindication of his insulted authority.

Two modes of action might present themselves to his mind. He might send a special commission into the land—he might accompany this commission with an overwhelming force, before which all the resources of the rebellious must at once be annihilated. He might arrest the daring and the guilty, and by a judicial process arrange the scale of punishment, and assign to each the just expiation of his crime—he might collect the loyal, and acquaint himself with all their claims upon his regard—he might then transfer them, with all their possessions,

to the peaceful regions of his empire—he might chase to some inhospitable climate the guilty thousands who had taken arms against his authority; and having cleared the land of its inhabitants, he might lay waste its dwellings; destroy by fire and violence the fertility of its fields; give up its beauty to neglect and oblivion; blot out its name from the titles of his crown, and consign it, in its ruined condition, to be a lasting memorial of the folly of rebellion.

Or he might send a commission, not to annihilate, but to repair—not to crush by violence, but to restore by wisdom—not to erase a title from his brows, but to recover allegiance to his laws. He might evidence the severity of justice, and the clemency of compassion—he might educate, enlighten, protect, and reward—he might bring into exercise the latent sympathies of the misguided and the ignorant—he might bring to bear upon the hitherto degraded and unhappy, the nobler motives, to human action, and he might succeed in the high and generous effort, of converting a moral wilderness into a scene of culture, fertility, and concord. Rejecting the theory of the stern

"Ubi solitudinem faciunt, pacem appellant,"

he might prefer the nobler trophy, of enmity removed—of rebellion crushed—of anarchy displaced—and of a land obedient to the sceptre which it had once refused.

I ask whether our natural feelings would not confirm the preference which the monarch had made.

But let it further be asked, is this vindication of the power of the moral government of God, by the destruction of the world, the real statement of REVELATION? Has God indeed declared that this material earth shall be a memorial of wrath, but not of mercy? Is it the recorded purpose of his immutable will that the scene and place of redemption shall be separated from the people to be redeemed? That the earth with all its variety of garniture and beauty, once fitted to be the birth-place of their happiness, and given to them as the patrimony and sovereignty of their race, shall be torn away from their possession, and given up to the avenging flame? Is it indeed the verdict of Revelation, that this earth, on which the Redeemer walked and communed with men, in the hour of his humiliation, shall never be the scene of his fellowship with them in the day of his power and his glory? Did he "as a wayfaring man tarry with them only for a night," and ascend but to return only in the vengeance of insulted majesty, to annihilate the scene on which he endured this dishonor?

Is it, I would ask, without a distinct and adequate reason that the Lord Jesus Christ is called "the second Adam?" Surely the expression comprises a fuller meaning than that generally assigned to it. It implies indeed a similarity of relation between Adam and his descendants, and the Lord and his redeemed: a similarity of federal connection between

themselves, and the persons dependant upon their actions. "As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive." The transmission of life is by the one, the transmission of death by the other. *This is a great truth, momentous in all its consequences; but is it the whole truth? Is not Christ the anti-type of Adam in another and very important sense? To Adam this material world was given as an inheritance; an empire over which he was to exercise a kingly power. The Mosaic record is expressed in these terms:—So God created man in his own image; in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And God blessed them; and God said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living that moveth upon the earth."*

This original grant to Adam is referred to in after times by David, in the eighth Psalm; and the dominion of which he there speaks is by the apostle Paul ascribed in its full extent to Christ (Heb. ii.) as the second Adam. The creation of Adam after the IMAGE of God implies, therefore, the *sovereignty* to which he was heir. The image of God has been too exclusively limited to the idea of moral rectitude: but it comprises dominion as well as rectitude; hence in the renovated world, the saints are described as "kings" equally with "priests unto God." Both these blessings, rectitude and dominion, Adam forfeited by his transgressions. Satan, the terrific prince of darkness, subtle in his counsel, as well as mighty in his strength, immediately usurped the crown as it fell from Adam's head, and seized the dominion over the earth which Adam had forfeited. From that time he has maintained a despotic sway over mankind, and by our Lord himself is admitted to be the King, though an *usurper*, over the present world: for when our Lord entered into personal conflict with Satan, it was in that character that he regarded him. Satan pointed out to him "the kingdoms of the world," and expressed his willingness to yield him a delegated sovereignty, if he would allow him the claim of superiority. "All these will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me." Our Lord abhorred the blasphemy, but did not deny the usurpation. This usurpation is allowed by the inspired apostle, when he declared to the Corinthians that idolaters "sacrifice to devils, and not to God." Sacrifice is the loftiest homage which one being can pay to another; it is the highest token of submission, the last acknowledgement of supreme power.

But this period of usurpation is limited. In reference to the short duration of this unrighteous dominion, the Saviour declared, "Now is the judgment of this world, now shall the prince of this world be cast out;" "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." Adam was formed after the IMAGE of God. And who is this image? We are told by the apostle (Heb. i.) "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in times past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken to us by his Son; whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds; who being the brightness of his glory, and the express IMAGE of his person and upholding all things by the word of his power—when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the majesty on high." Adam was but the type of Christ. His creation of the dust of the earth, after the divine

image of purity and dominion, appears to have had special reference to this pattern. He represented Christ the true and only image of God. The dominion, therefore, granted to Adam, is in fact the dominion granted to Emmanuel, the Christ, the anointed "Ruler in Israel," "whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting." "And this man shall be the peace, though the 'mystic' Assyrian be come into our land." Micah v. 1—5.

The past ages of mankind have exhibited the misrule and misery of usurped power. The dominion has been in satanic hands; and the successive schemes of human authority, their policy, art, and strength, have been the developments of his wisdom, in order to maintain, if possible, his full possession of the earth. But through all these dark periods of time, the plans of a mightier One are prepared in silence for their completion. The world belongs to Christ: the course of human things cannot therefore be at rest; the decree is gone forth, "And thou profane, wicked prince, whose day is come, when iniquity shall have an end, thus saith the Lord God; REMOVE the DIADEM, and take off the CROWN; exalt him that is low, and abase him that is high. I will OVERTURN, OVERTURN, OVERTURN IT; and it shall be no more, until HE COME whose RIGHT it is, and I will GIVE it HIM." (Ezek. xxi. 25—27.) Then, it would appear, will the earth be at rest, and the original grant of dominion to Adam be realized. Then will his redeemed church, rescued to share his glory in actual sovereignty, and perfect felicity, "REIGN with him upon the earth."

The contrary supposition appears to me at least to displace the consistency of the scheme of Revelation. If, according to the prevalent opinion, this material world be doomed to destruction, and not to renovation; if Christ shall come only as a mighty judge, to hold a last assize, to separate the righteous from the wicked, and then to annihilate the globe on which the career of guilt has been achieved, will the measure of revealed promise to the world be actually filled up?

It may confirm the view here given of the future, to inquire into the *nature of that felicity* which our Lord himself has taught us in our prayers to expect. It would be natural to suppose, that in the selection of blessings, which he condescended to make the subject of our prayers to God, the consummation of his own work of mercy would find a marked place. The supposition is consistent with the fact. He has concentrated a prayer for the completion of his own work, in the two remarkable expressions, "Thy kingdom come," "thy will be done on EARTH as in heaven." Can we refuse to admit that our Lord here bounds our view to this scene of earth? In heaven, that is, in the other regions of the universe of God, his will is already done: but here we are surrounded with a scene of rebellion, anarchy, and sorrow. Does he then teach us to pray for a translation from this *unquiet land* to another and distant orb? He puts no such request within our lips; he directs us to pray for the establishment of his kingdom, and this kingdom appears to belong exclusively to this material earth. "Thy will be done on earth, as in heaven." Is not the inference twofold: first, that the earth is the theatre of his kingdom; and secondly, that conformity to his will is the absolute enjoyment of heaven? and that no loftier supplication can be associated with our thoughts, than that the hallowed sceptre should be replaced in human hands,

even in the hands of the mighty Antitype, "the second Adam, the Lord from Heaven."

I ask then the Christian reader, if it be not desirable to call away our minds from human opinions; from the influence even of great names; from popular belief, however ancient; from theories, however venerable; from the prescriptive applause of centuries; from the vague and indistinct ritual of education; and to take our firm, courageous, and patient stand upon the plain, grammatical, and unwarped text of scripture?

That wondrous volume, the charter of human hope, the anchor of human faith, affords instructions on this subject, to my mind more *definite*, and expectations more *precise*. Surely the Lord Jesus Christ is linked to our world by ties less fragile than those which the received theology has framed. He will COME AGAIN, and exhibit those ties in all their beauty and strength.

PERSONAL COMING OF CHRIST.

It is easy to show, that the prophecies which related to the first advent of our Lord had a literal accomplishment in the most minute particulars. If, then, God has given us no other rule for interpreting the prophecies that relate to the second advent, we are bound to give them the same literal construction; to depart from it, is to be wise above what is written. Of the multitude of texts, in the Old and New Testaments, that speak of the second advent, we can notice only a few.

First, those of the Old Testament that speak of the reign of Christ: Ps. 72: 7-11; "In his days shall the righteous flourish; and abundance of peace so long as the moon endureth. He shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth. They that dwell in the wilderness shall bow before him; and his enemies shall lick the dust. The kings of Tarshish and of the isles shall bring presents; the kings of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts. Yea, all kings shall fall down before him: all nations shall serve him." Here is a prophecy clearly future, and, on the principle already established, to be literally fulfilled in the personal reign of Christ on the earth. Jer. 23: 5. "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth." Here is the same truth: and it is expressly said, in the next verse, that "his name whereby he shall be called," is "THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS." Here then can be no mistake. Daniel, in vision, saw this King come, "with the clouds of heaven; and there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." Dan. 7: 14.

The New Testament presents our Lord at his first advent, with this remarkable prophecy, by the angel Gabriel, Luke 1: 32, 33, "He shall be great, and shall be called The Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: And he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end." From all the prophecies that had gone before, we find that the general impression was that Messiah would set up and establish his king-

dom immediately. To correct this erroneous opinion our Lord spake a parable, Luke 19: 11, "And as they heard these things, he added and spake a parable, because he was nigh to Jerusalem, and because they thought that the kingdom of God should immediately appear." Here we see the error was not about the *fact* that such a kingdom was to "appear" as they looked for, but it was an error of *time*. To correct this error, "He said therefore, a certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return." None can doubt but that our Lord represented himself by this "nobleman." So certainly, then, as he went *personally* away into a far country, he will *personally* and *literally* return. Any other construction of his language would be as absurd as to suppose the nobleman, by whose case he illustrated his own, might go and receive a kingdom, but never *personally* come back to take possession: and if the servants of such nobleman were to conclude that they were never to look for his personal return, but only for some agent of his, or letters from him to be sent them, they would act a similar part to those who conclude we are not to look for our Lord's *personal* return and reign upon this earth, "from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth."

The next text to which we call attention is that remarkable one in Acts 1: 9-11. We must, however, before coming directly to the subject of it, notice the preceding circumstances. Our Lord had not only accomplished his ministry among his disciples prior to his crucifixion, but after his resurrection he was with them "forty days," instructing them in "the things pertaining to the kingdom of God;" and, "he opened their understanding that they might understand the scriptures." After all this, "When they therefore were come together, they asked of him, Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" Acts 1: 6. Let it be recollected that this question immediately preceded his ascension into heaven, and after the full instruction he had given them about the kingdom. It is not to be supposed, therefore, that they were mistaken about the *matter* of the kingdom; and if they were, it is not likely our Lord would have left them in that mistake. They knew the kingdom was to be given to Christ, not only from the prophecies already noticed in the Old Testament, but from a still more remarkable one in Ezekiel 21: 27, where God, speaking of the kingdom, says, "I will overturn, overturn, overturn it: and it shall be no more, until he come whose right it is: and I will give it him." The disciples wished to know whether our Lord intended "at *this time*" to fulfil that prophecy. With respect to the *matter* of the kingdom they were right; with respect to the *time* our Lord told them it was *not* for them "to know the times and the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power." In these circumstances, and at that moment, "When he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven, as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." Acts 1: 9-11.

Now imagine you stand there with the apostles, with your eyes uplifted to heaven, seeing your blessed Lord as he goes up, till your sight is intercepted by the clouds. Would you doubt but that it was the real person of your Lord? While the mind is thus absorbed, two shining ones address you, and say—"THIS SAME Jesus shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." We ask, could you understand any thing else than just what the words express, viz: That the same identical person, in his visible form, would "return" again to the earth? Would you have ever dreamed that you were to understand only a spiritual coming of your blessed Lord? Impossible. If there ever was a spiritual coming it must have been on the day of Pentecost, when the Holy Ghost fell upon the disciples. Did they understand this to be their Lord so coming in like manner as he went into heaven? Let Peter instruct us, Acts 2: 32, 33; "This same Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses. Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear." This language is explicit. It was not our Lord coming, "in like manner," &c. No—he was "exalted," and in his state of exaltation he had "received" that which "He hath shed forth." Surely, he did not receive himself, and shed forth himself. That this was not the fact Peter tells us distinctly, chap. 3: 20, 21, when he says, God "shall send Jesus Christ, whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all the holy prophets, since the world began." Those times have not yet arrived; therefore, "this same Jesus" has "not" yet, "so come in like manner" as he went "up into heaven." Hence, any spiritual application of this coming of our Lord is a "wresting the Scriptures;" and we fear some may do it to "their own destruction."

This point established, that the first chapter of Acts teaches a *literal* and *personal* coming of our Lord, we must understand the apostles, in every instance where they speak of the coming of our Lord, after he was taken up from them, as referring to that coming of which they were informed when their Lord had just been received out of their sight. The events of that moment could never have been absent from their minds. They lived, they wrote, they spoke, with that glorious event ever in their thoughts. We have no right to put any other construction upon their words than the *literal*, obvious one, unless they, themselves, distinctly inform us that they mean something else; this, however, they never do when speaking of the coming of Christ.

Peter, who with James and John witnessed the transfiguration of our Lord, and saw the "vision" of his glory, says, 2 Peter 1: 16-18, "For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye witnesses of his majesty. For he received from God the Father honor and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory. This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. And this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount." Peter here gives us to understand that the coming of our Lord in his "power and majesty" is a thing to be witnessed with our eyes, and is no "fable," or fancy.

John, another witness of the transfiguration, tells us, 1 John 3: 2, "It doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for, WE SHALL SEE HIM AS HE IS."

Paul assures us, 1 Thess. 1: 16, "The Lord HIMSELF shall descend from heaven—and the dead in Christ shall rise," at that time. Not the "dead in sins;" but, "the dead in Christ;" showing that this coming of Christ is at the "resurrection in the last day." Paul also tells us, 2 Thess. 2: 8, that the Lord "shall destroy the man of sin with the brightness of his coming;" and that the "Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." 2 Thess. 1: 7, 8.

These testimonies of the apostles might be multiplied to almost any extent; but these samples will suffice to show that the inspired servants of the Lord looked for the real, literal, personal coming of our Lord Jesus Christ again to this earth, at which time there would be a resurrection of those who sleep in Jesus, and a change to immortality of the saints who are alive and remain unto that day. Shall we stand on that original faith, or turn aside to follow the "fable" of a merely spiritual coming? "Watch, for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of man cometh."

IMMORTALITY.

THE TESTIMONY OF JESUS CHRIST RESPECTING IT.

BRO. STORRS:—Will you allow me to state in your columns what I regard as the true doctrine of Jesus respecting the great subject of Immortal Life. To a sober mind, there cannot be a more solemn and interesting subject of reflection. And surely, there is the strongest probability that, on this point, the revelations of the great Teacher would be free from ambiguity. During the preceding ages, the greatest and most cultivated minds had been intently occupied with the subject; but they could not rend the veil which hung between time and eternity. The world, in its wisdom, could no more fathom the mystery of the finite than of the infinite. Hence the necessity of a revelation from God. The great God and Father has spoken by his Son. Immortality has been brought to light, and the most difficult problem of our nature and existence has been solved. "And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life; and this life is in his Son."

I shall confine myself, in this article, to the testimony of the true and faithful witness, as recorded by the apostle John in his gospel. References will be made to other portions of scripture, in order to ascertain the meaning of words, and to illustrate one portion of divine truth by another. I begin with John 3: 14-16. "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up: That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life. For God so loved the world," etc. The design of God, in giving his Son, is here revealed,—it was, that those who believe in him might not perish, but have everlasting life. To live for ever is antithetic of perishing. Now what is it to perish? Walker says; to die, to be lost. Cobb says; to die, to be

destroyed, to decay. So Johnson. When applied to animated beings, the primary idea of perishing evidently is, a cessation of life. That this is the primary scriptural signification of the word, will appear from a reference to a few passages.

John 6: 27. "Labor not for the meat that perisheth," etc. "The meat which perisheth." This may be interpreted to mean that our natural food is, in its nature, corruptible; if kept too long it decays or perishes. Or, it may mean that the life and strength which are maintained by eating this food are only transient; they will soon cease to be. Whether we apply the word to the food itself, or to the natural life which it supports, the idea of utter destruction is plainly implied.

1 Cor. 15: 18. "Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." "If Christ be not raised" from the dead "your faith is vain." Ye have no reason to expect any future life or any resurrection. They that have died in hope of a resurrection were deceived; they have utterly and for ever ceased to be. Plainly, the word "*perished*" denotes here the utter extinction of life, without any future restoration.

2 Cor. 4: 16. "For which cause we faint not, but though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day." The body sinks beneath its toils and sufferings, and infirmities; at last it will die, and be decomposed. As an organism it will cease to exist; though the material of which it is composed will remain. Here "*perish*" evidently means to decay, die, cease to be.

2 Peter 2: 12, "But these as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed, speak evil of the things which they understand not; and shall utterly perish in their own corruption." Here a point of resemblance is indicated, between wicked men and natural brute beasts. What is it? Is it the conduct specified? Surely none would explain the text so as to make it mean that natural brute beasts speak evil of the things which they do not understand. Evidently it is not the beasts, but the wicked men spoken of who do this. Where then is the point of resemblance? I answer, it is in the final end of brute beasts and wicked men. Natural brute beasts shall be destroyed; shall cease to exist; and in the same absolute sense the apostle teaches shall wicked men perish in their own corruption.

In all these passages the idea of cessation of life is plainly involved in the word *perish*. And if the reader will take a concordance, and refer to all the passages in the New Testament where the word occurs, he will see at once that when it is applied to inanimate things, it means either their corruptibility or destruction. When applied to a nation, as in John 11: 50, it means the destruction of nationality; and when applied to brutes and to men in the flesh, it means death. And when applied to the future state, its plain common signification is evidently to my mind the true one, i. e., extinction of being—cessation of life forever.

We are now prepared to return to the passage first introduced. "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." The great world of moral beings was full of sin; and in consequence of sin it was under sentence of death. "For the soul that sinneth it shall die." But notwithstanding the dreadful fact that man was a rebel against the divine government, still God had a kind regard for him. He had no pleasure in

extinguishing the existence of the creatures of his goodness and power. He therefore commissioned his Son to come to earth, and bring the message of infinite mercy to man. Jesus came, and poured out his heart's warm sympathies, and shed his holy tears over a dying world. He shed his blood, and purchased redemption from the curse of the law. He both purchased life, and revealed it. He looked over the dark world of mortals, and spread out his hands as if to embrace the whole, and cried, Come to me; come to me; and live, *live* forever. Ye need not die. For as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, before the dying Israelites, so that they might see and live, so must I be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in me, may have eternal life. Oh! how glorious the Saviour thus appears, as the messenger of infinite love—the destroyer of death, and the donor of immortality to them that believe.

John 5: 24–29. Let the reader turn to the reference, as it is too long to be quoted. I feel compelled to understand the word "*life*" in these passages, in its simple primary sense of conscious existence. Every attempt to make it here mean *happiness*, appears to me a lamentable case of "handling the word of God deceitfully." Look at verse 26. Who would interpret it to mean: For as the Father hath happiness in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have happiness in himself. The Savior plainly teaches that the life of the Father is unoriginated and independent life. And if we take the passage in connexion with the context, we see that the self-existent Father, has given a divine plenitude of life to the Son, that he might communicate of his fulness of life to others. Accordingly, Jesus intimates the fact, that he would shortly quicken and raise the dead. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live." In perfect keeping with this statement, we find him reanimating the dead bodies of Jairus' daughter, the widow's son, and his friend Lazarus. The dead heard his voice and came to life. When his hearers heard him affirm, that in a short time he would raise and quicken the dead, they were astonished at the announcement. But said he, "Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in which ALL that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of LIFE, and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation;" i. e. condemnation. Here the subjects of this general resurrection, are divided into two classes, according to their previous character. As in time their characters were the opposite of each other, so now they come forth to opposite destinies; the righteous to life, the wicked to condemnation. Now if the word "*life*," when used in reference to the Father and Son, in verse 26, has its simple primary signification, and also in verse 25, when used in reference to Lazarus and others, with what propriety can we interpret it to mean *happiness* in verse 29? That those who shall be raised to life, will be happy, is an undisputed truth; but that the primary idea of the word "*life*," in this verse is that of happiness, is contrary to the general import of the context, and is wholly without foundation.

As Jesus is invested with the glorious prerogative, of bestowing life on them who believe in him, so is he also invested with the grand prerogative

of executing judgment on the wicked. The Father "hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man." This is found in connection with his declaration, that he would raise up *all* the dead from the grave. See Matt. 25: 14—16. The resurrection of the wicked is necessary, in order that the great design of the divine government may be accomplished, and the honor of God be vindicated before the universe. They will be raised to be judged; and when judged they will be found guilty, and condemned. When Jesus first came to earth, it was not to condemn our race but save it. John 3: 17 and 12: 47. But millions during the dispensation of mercy, would not be saved from the curse of the law. They would not go to Christ that they might have *life*. But when he shall come again, and sit in judgment on those who despised and rejected *life*, the law must take its course. The penalty must fall with crushing weight upon the damned. The soul that sinneth (and would not accept of pardon,) it shall die. Ezk. 18: 4. For "as many as have sinned without law, shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law, shall be judged by the law." Rom. 2: 12. "For the wages of sin is death." Rom. 6: 23.

There is no reason to suppose, that the death of the wicked will immediately follow their condemnation. How long they will remain alive, to suffer the torments which will precede their utter destruction, we know not. Doubtless this term of life, will vary in the case of different individuals. The terms "*tribulation and anguish*," as well as the terms "*perish, death, destruction*," are used to describe the future portion of unbelievers. Now unless we garble God's revelation, and explain some parts of it, by explaining *away* other parts, we are "shut up" to this view of the subject;—that the wicked will suffer intensely, during such a period as the allwise and just God shall determine; and then they shall "die," "be utterly consumed," they shall "perish" forever.

I will now refer to the 6th chapter of John's gospel. Let the reader carefully peruse it. It is full of the subject of life; and states how it may be obtained, and who shall possess it. After feeding a vast multitude miraculously with bread, Jesus withdrew himself from them and departed into a mountain alone. But the people followed him, and found him; and on that occasion he again instructed them, on the grand subject of immortality. He charged them with seeking him from a low motive, *i. e.* for the sake of bread. But said he "labor not for the meat that perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of man shall give unto you," etc. Verse 27. Do not make it your chief object to obtain perishable food for the body, but rather seek that bread which cometh from heaven, that you may receive a life, which shall be prolonged to eternity. This I take to be the meaning of the Saviour's words as the context shows. In verse 49, he says, "Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness and are dead." Now surely he did not mean that they were all miserable in a hell of fire, but in the common primary sense of the word, they were *dead*. And in connection with this statement he says, "I am that bread of life. This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die.—If any man eat of this bread he shall live forever." Here to live forever is

placed in contrast—not with eternal sinfulness, or eternal misery—but with natural death; the death of the Israelitish fathers in the wilderness. This determines the sense of the words, "he shall live forever." As manna, or ordinary food, can only support life for a short period, we are directed not to be over anxious about it; but as the bread which came from heaven will perpetuate life to eternity, we are to seek it in preference to all other things.

That this is the meaning of the word "*life*," as used by the Saviour, is evident from verse 57. "As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me." Who would ever think of making this mean—As the happy Father hath sent me, and I am happy by the Father; so he that eateth me, even he shall be happy by me. This is, beyond all doubt, *true*, but none, I think, will contend that this is the meaning of the passage. In the Comprehensive Commentary, I find the following remarks on this text—"We shall *live* eternally *by him*, as our bodies live by our food. As the living Father, etc. God, as the living Father, hath life in and of himself. I AM THAT I AM, is his name for ever. Jesus Christ, as Mediator, lives by the Father. He has life in Himself, but He has it from the Father. He that sent him, not only qualified Him with that life which was necessary to so great an undertaking, but constituted Him the Treasury of divine life to us; he breathed into the second Adam the breath of spiritual lives, as into the first Adam the breath of natural lives." The Commentator gives the plain meaning of the passage. The Father is an unoriginated and independent Being; the Mediator derives his life from the Father, and also a divine fullness of life, to bestow on them who believe in him. How simple, and beautiful, the doctrine of Jesus appears, when viewed in contrast with a bewildering, *human* theology.

To eat the flesh, and drink the blood, of the Son of Man, is explained by himself to mean, "coming to him," "believing on him." See verses 29, 35, 40, 47. "He that believeth on me hath everlasting life." "Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life." We are thus taught, that faith in the Mediator is an essential condition of our immortality.

In verse 54, believers are represented as *having* eternal life. Now the Saviour could not mean that they had, within the limits of the then present moment, an eternity of life, because that was impossible in the nature of things. He evidently meant, that it was secured to them by the divine purpose, through his mediation. By faith in Christ they became children of God. And if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ. Rom. 8: 17. Writing to the Corinthians, Paul said, "All things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come, all are yours." 1 Cor. 3: 22. Here the Corinthians are said to possess "*things to come*." Glorious things in the remote ages of eternity were theirs, not by actual possession at the time, but in the purpose of God; by promise and heirship. So in the case before us: believers have immortality, not by actual present possession, but by the pledged word of an ever faithful God, and their joint-heirship with Jesus Christ.

Let us now see how the Saviour will fulfil his promise, to bestow eternal life on believers. He who carefully reads the chapter now under con-

sideration, will perceive, that eternal life is intimately associated with the resurrection from the dead. "He that eateth of this bread shall live forever," says Jesus; and four times in this chapter he plainly identifies the gift of eternal life with the resurrection. "And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life; and I will raise him up at the last day:" 54. See also 39 and 44. Here Christ "is his own interpreter;" he teaches us it is the Father's will, that believers should live for ever; and that the will of God concerning them shall be accomplished, for he (Christ) will raise them up at the last day. Thus Jesus teaches that the resurrection is essential to the reception of that immortality of being, which is pledged to all, who eat his flesh and drink his blood.

In support of this view of the subject, I may allude to the fact, that the wicked are never represented as being raised to life. *Incorruptibility and spirituality, and immortality, are no where affirmed of them in the resurrection state.* But how will it be with the righteous? Of them it is said, "Neither can they die any more, for they are equal unto the angels, and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection." Luke 20: 36. At the end of the chapter, Dr. Clarke says: "The justice of God is as much concerned in the resurrection of the dead, as either his power or mercy. To be freed from earthly incumbrances, earthly passions, bodily infirmities, sickness and death, to be brought into a state of conscious existence with a refined body, and a sublime soul, both immortal, and both ineffably happy; how glorious the privilege. But of this, who shall be counted worthy in that day? Only those who have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb; and who, by patient continuing in *well doing*, have sought for glory, and honor, and immortality." According to the Doctor, the righteous *only*, in the resurrection state, will be free from "bodily infirmities, sickness and death." It follows, then, that in the resurrection state the wicked will be corruptible, and will finally die. How often are good men compelled, in spite of educational biases, sects and creeds, to give utterance to the simple doctrine of Jesus Christ.

Now, if we turn to 1 Cor. 15, what do we find there? Much about bodies which are raised to a state of celestial beauty and glory. They are *incorruptible, glorious, powerful, spiritual and immortal.* But whose bodies are those? Why the bodies of such as will "bear the image of the heavenly"—such as will triumph over death, and who "know their labor is not in vain in the Lord." While immortality is abundantly affirmed of the righteous, it is not once in the whole Bible affirmed of the wicked. On the contrary, we read that their end is "to be burned"—they shall be punished with everlasting destruction—and to them is "reserved the blackness of darkness forever."

I should like to have examined other passages, but my article is already longer than I intended it to be. If spared, I may write you again.

Yours, in hope of eternal life,

JOHN TATE.

West Brewster, Mass, Nov. 14th, 1849.

MIND.—Such is the power of the mind, there is scarcely a passion which has not, by excess of ac-

tion, terminated existence. Love has done it; anger has done it; and also joy. But there is one mental emotion, which in our experience, never struck the human body with a fatal blow: it is HOPE. Hope, when well grounded, never creates evil; is a true anchor. The other passions may agitate the soul, as the angel did Bethesda's waters, but Hope rather resembles the healing influence that the angel left behind.—*Selected.*

WHO WAS MELCHISEDEK?

On this many have speculated; but I have never seen any reply that was satisfactory till recently the subject opened while exploring the local centre of prophecy. Let it go out for what it is worth.—If true, it will stand. If not, it ought to perish.

"Melchisedek" is the same person as Melchisedek, King of righteousness and 'king of Peace.' Melchi signifies king. Tsedek, means righteousness. "Salem" was a proper name, though it signifies "peace;" therefore, "by interpretation" the Melchi-Salem signifies "king of peace," and Melchisedek, "king of righteousness." Here is a *person* and a *place*. The "interpretation" of terms, according to their primary import, does not dissipate either person or place. Note several facts, which is all my time will now allow.

1. "Salem" was the ancient name of Jerusalem. Ps. 76: 2. This "Salem" was known in the age of Abraham. It had a king. This king was also a "priest of the most High God." As a "Priest," he met Abraham and blessed him.

2. All these references and facts apply to "Shem," the son of Noah,—"*the heir of promise*," in that age; and the channel of promise and blessing to the future. Shem was cotemporary with Abraham; and yet, his *superior*—his predecessor in the possession of all the promises, and all the honors and privileges of the Priesthood, and patriarchal dominion.

3. The Aaronic Priesthood was obtained by their pedigree. The Levites were entitled to the priesthood from their "father and mother"—their "descent." They *began* and *ended* their official work as priests at a *certain age*, but

4. The "Melchisedek" Priesthood was not so.—He was "*made like unto the Son of God*"—"abideth a priest continually." He was "*like*" to the son of God; and a priest *all his life*. He was a type of Messiah; for

5. Jesus is "the son of God—a priest *forever* after the *order (similitude)* of Melchisedek. The sum of all, is this. Shem was priest, not temporary, not adapted to one dispensation, "not counted from his descent." Shem was a priest-king, according to the *original promise and purpose of God*. He worshipped God with no Mediator. He was a Patriarchal Priest possessor of the promises, with no one to govern him, but God Almighty. He was

subject to none but his father—had all from the purpose and promise of God.

Jesus Christ is the end of that line of promise—"the seed"—"the son of God." He is a Priest of that "order"—receiving all direct from God's original purpose and promise. J. B. Cook.

New Bedford, Mass., Sept. 24th, 1849.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, JANUARY, 1850.

"IMMORTALITY."—The article under this head, in the Examiner, is the commencement of a series of articles on that and kindred subjects by Br. Tate, who is a Wesleyan Methodist Minister. We doubt not our readers will be pleased and instructed by his communications. Br. Lee, of the True Wesleyan, will have another chance to try his hand in purging the Wesleyan church from the "unchristian doctrine," as he is pleased to call our views on the doctrine of Life and Death. Do you "give it up," Luther? Remember—"The blood of martyrs is the seed of the church."

ALL ARTICLES in the Examiner, not credited to other sources, are written by the Editor, whether led or not. We do not hold ourself responsible for the sentiments of any of our correspondents—they alone bear that.

THE EXAMINER for '48 and '49, bound in one volume, is now ready for delivery. Price \$1.25 per copy; or five copies for \$5. Those who wish this work should apply for it at once, as we can supply only a very limited number for both years. Bound volumes for 1849 can be had for 75 cents.

"ANASTASIS."—The articles on this subject—viz. the resurrection, by Br. Walsh, will be continued for several months, with our responses to them. After his position is presented in regular order, and our replies have followed them, he will, if he chooses, have liberty to reply in the Examiner in a reasonable space. We foresaw that the discussion would be endless unless some limits were fixed as to the space occupied by each of his articles, with the liberty however for him to extend them to any number he judged necessary to give his views a full exhibition. If he thinks this an unreasonable limitation we could not help it, unless we gave our paper entirely up to this discussion.

TOUR TO HARTFORD, CONN.—We left our home, November 23d, for Hartford, where we were invited

some months since to give a course of lectures on the Scripture Doctrine of Life and Death. Our visit to that city had now one heavy drawback on the pleasure we would otherwise have felt. We saw and felt the absence of one who had been the glory of her family, and the animating counsellor and friend of such as were inquiring after truth, and who had made her home a cheerful resting place for those who were engaged in proclaiming the coming again of her Lord and Saviour, and the interesting truth of immortality *only* through Christ. We refer to the beloved wife of Dr. David Crary. Truly she was a "mother in Israel"—and her decease is an irreparable loss to her husband—to the church, and to many friends. But though we sorrow for her sudden dissolution, we "sorrow not as those who have no hope." She "sleeps in Jesus." So sure as God brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus Christ, that great Shepherd of the sheep, so certain will he bring up all those that sleep in him "at the last trump;" for, "the trumpet shall sound," and they "shall be raised incorruptible" to die no more—death shall have no more dominion over them.

On our way to Hartford, we employed our time, in the cars, in reading "Lord's Exposition of the Apocalypse;" a large octavo volume of over 500 pages. His "laws of symbolical representation," for the most part, we were well pleased with; though we think he is sometimes straitened and embarrassed in his exposition, by his constant effort to set up the claim that Jesus Christ is the "Self-Existent God." The very first verse in the Apocalypse refutes that assumption. "The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to show," &c. Did the "Self-Existent God" give himself a Revelation? Or did *one-third part* of the Self-Existent God give another *third part* of himself a Revelation? The self contradiction of such a thing is sufficient to stamp it with the unmistakable sign of error; and Mr. Lord is himself often embarrassed with it.

His belief in the immortal-soul theory is another source of embarrassment to him. His law of symbols very justly led him to regard "*the souls*," Rev. 20: 4, as *symbols* of the saints in their resurrection state; but he has to frame another law to fit immortal-soulism, or disembodied-spiritism; and hence he makes "*the souls*"—the very same phrase as Rev. 20—under the fifth seal, to symbolize *themselves*. Passing a few things of analogous character, we read his exposition with pleasure, and we trust with profit; though some parts of it, we think, incorrect at least, far from satisfactory to our mind. We intend, however, to give extracts from those parts which we think may interest our readers.

When we arrived at Hartford, we found the

notice of our intended lectures had been extensively circulated, and some interest had been excited on the question by means of "Dobney on Future Punishment" having been put into the hands of some ministers in that city; one of whom had taken occasion to preach against "Dobney and his Followers." That is what we desire. Let our opponents not fear to meet our views openly: if we are in error we shall be glad to be convinced of it. But if they are in error, how are they to know it by keeping silent? We cannot blame them for their belief that we are promulgating a dangerous error, whilst they have no more light than now shines on their minds on the subject: nor do we blame them, nor any one else, for not coming at once to the same conclusion on the subject that we have—sudden conversions are seldom to be relied upon. Let every man count the cost, and search carefully and prayerfully for the truth, and then, when he finds it, he will know how to prize it.

We commenced our labor in the City Hall, Sabbath, Nov. 25th, to very large and deeply attentive congregations. We cannot doubt, from the attention and solemnity which prevailed throughout the day and evening, but that an impression was made that will prove "a savor of life unto life" to some, if not to many, that heard. We continued our lectures throughout the week, and three times on Sabbath, Dec. 2d. The last day the interest was apparently much increased; and in our final discourse, the deep solemnity manifested gave us encouragement that we should find some seals of our ministry from Hartford in the day of the Lord Jesus.

"OLD EXPLODED HERESY:"—During the week we were at Hartford, the Christian Secretary, Baptist paper of that city, came out in a chapter on the "Progress of Error." Among other things, it said—

"The prominent subject now before the Millerites in this city, is the doctrine of the annihilation of the wicked. George Storrs, the leader in this old exploded heresy, is now here striving to make proselytes."

As the Secretary gave no reasons for calling our views "heresy," we conclude it had none. Men generally use such weapons as they have. The Quaker said to a dog, with which he became offended—"I will not *kill* thee, nor *hurt* thee, but I will give thee a *bad name*:" and so he commenced to cry "*mad dog—MAD DOG*." Poor Tray was very soon slaughtered. The Secretary cries—"Old Exploded heresy;" not with quite as much success, however, as the Quaker.

We stated in our discourse Sabbath morning following, that the sense of the term "heretic," in

these days, is—"The man don't think as I do." So that whether a person is a heretic or orthodox, depends upon who is the speaker. If he be a Roman Catholic, then all Protestants are heretics; and so on through all the sects. We admitted that the Secretary spoke truth in saying, that our views were "*old*;" for the first account we have of them is in Gen. 2: 17, "*Thou shalt SURELY DIE*." We admitted also that a certain *animal* "*exploded*" it in the minds of our first parents; and that the *explosion* well nigh blew up the world.—"*Thou shalt not surely die*," said his serpentship—"Ye are immortal." Such was the first, and such is the *only* witness for natural immortality, in the entire Scriptures. If such a witness is to be relied on, our theory is "*exploded*." We denied that we preached "annihilation." We do not believe in the annihilation of any thing; but we believe its specific form may be destroyed; and that every created object may, if its Creator *will*, be reduced to its original elements, whatever they were. We stated that we were not aware that we were in Hartford to preach to "Millerites" more than to other citizens. And if we are to judge from the hundreds that came out to hear us, a very large portion were not of that class of people, or else "Millerism" is a great way off from being "*dead*" in that city.

To the following sentiment with which the Secretary closed its chapter of "heresies," we give our full assent, *viz*:—

"The heresies that have arisen in the church have done more towards checking the progress of truth, than the combined opposition of an unbelieving world. Let the truth be everywhere proclaimed in its purity, as it was by the apostles, and pure and undefiled religion will everywhere prevail."

We spent the morning hour, the 2d Sabbath we were in Hartford, in showing what the "truth" is on the destiny of wicked men, as held "*by the apostle*" Paul; and trust our very large audience were fully convinced who the "heretics" are; for not one solitary expression can be found in all Paul's preaching or writing that favors the common notion of endless torments—but *destruction*. Our remarks we may give at another time. We should have been glad if the Editor of the Secretary could have been present; but, *no*—he "would not come."

PILATE AND HEROD FRIENDS: Or "*Lee on the Soul*." The True Wesleyan says—"All denominations agree in commending it [Lee's book] as a valuable addition to religious literature." It then proceeds to give "*Notices from the Religious Press*." Among those notices we see three "*Episcopal Methodist*" papers. Against *Episcopal* methodism Br. Lee and his associates have kept up a tremen-

dous war from the outset of *Wesleyan* methodism: nothing hardly could be worse and more despotic than *Episcopacy* or "Bishops," in their opinion. But it seems *Dagon*, or immortal-soul-ism, is in danger; and hated *Episcopacy* is invoked to commend a work in its defence. Very well; we have no objection. You perceive, Luther, "*The use of Episcopacy*" may be seen in more than one case. One of these invoked "Bishops," says of Br. Lee's book, "especial attention is given to the refutation of the doctrine of the annihilation of the wicked," &c. It adds—"the subject is thoroughly treated, presenting a perfect antidote to the false teaching of Storrs and his disciples." Surely we are gone for it now! "A PERFECT ANTIDOTE!! That is—A perfect remedy! How perfectly harmless—the false teaching of Storrs" is now! Why, *Episcopacy* has discovered "the tree of life;" for "Lee on the soul" is "a perfect antidote." Well, Luther, probably you may get a "Cardinal's hat" sent you yet for this labor; for, if immortal-soulism falls, the "*mother of harlots*" falls along with it: and if you have really found the "*patent*" remedy—the "perfect antidote"—for the doctrine we advocate, the Pope cannot be far behind the lesser Bishops in acknowledging the service you have rendered him. We shall keep our eye on Rome.

Though we gave Luther a copy of "Dobney on Future Punishment" at the time he commenced his work "on the soul," he never gave it so much as an editorial notice, nor referred to it in his "22" articles. And though he was reviewed by Dr. Walsh, in the *Examiner*, he never deigned to notice him, not so much as Goliath did the stripling David. "A perfect antidote!" Gentlemen, will you read Walsh's review of Lee on the Soul, and see which is the "Perfect Antidote." In our judgement the Episcopal commendation was very much like the judge who after hearing evidence on one side refused to hear the other, because, he said—"It is no use—he has got his case."

We invite all to get a copy of Walsh's Review of Lee, and see which is the "perfect antidote." We do not endorse every sentiment in the Review; but there is enough of it, after making some abatement, to explode the pagan dogma for which "Lee on the soul" contends.

Price, 25 cents per copy; or five copies for \$1.00, in paper covers.

P. S. If any wish to see "Storrs' teaching," let them procure our "Six Sermons," quarto or octavo. See the advertisements of them in this paper.

"THAT EMINENT METHODIST MINISTER.—Rev. George Storrs, in his *Bible Examiner*, some time since made the following announcement.

"The doctrines you advocate are taking root, more extensively than you may be aware. So writes an

eminent Methodist Minister to us, whose name, at present we are not at liberty to give."

Will Bro. Storrs tell us what that eminent Methodist Minister thinks about the matter now. Now, George, will you not give it up, that the human mind is spirit, on the ground that matter could not turn so short a corner without breaking the pieces."

We clipt the above from the *True Wesleyan* of Nov. 24th. We are not acquainted with the present thoughts of the minister above referred to. But we rather "think" that he will have good occasion to say in the day of judgment, to somebody—"I was hungry and ye gave me no meat." Just think of "Providence," Luther. If you think "the human mind is spirit, on the ground that matter could not turn so short a corner without breaking to pieces," we think it must be matter, if we judge from the hardness of some of those minds that forced a brother to "turn" a "short corner." Wait patiently a little while, and you will see how much *Wesleyans* gain by persecuting one of their most worthy ministers out of their church. We did think they had learned the lesson of toleration; but we see from their course towards "that eminent minister" that we were mistaken, and we "give it up."

"IT IS INFIDELITY."

What is infidelity? Why—to believe that "the wicked shall be as the fat of lambs," and that "they shall consume—into smoke shall they consume away:" Psa. 37: 20. Br. I. E. Jones, Brooklyn, N. Y., in his article, to which we referred in our last, has more than intimated, that, the doctrine of man's non-immortality by creation, and non-liability to endless torture, is not productive of the awakening of sinners. We have heard this from various quarters, more than once, and we know that the statement is not correct. Br. Z. Campbell, in replying to Br. Jones, in the *Advent Harbinger*, of Dec. 1, gives the following interesting account. He says—

"In a single country town in the State of Maine, where I resided a while, the infidels boasted themselves of being something like three hundred strong, out of a population of less than three thousand. I was one of that unhappy number, and was personally acquainted with most of them, and well know the ground we took to prove the Bible false. We invariably took the popular doctrine of the day, viz: the immortality of the soul, endless misery in fire and brimstone, the conscious state of the dead, and double being of man, all of which we were early taught to believe were Bible doctrines, and which we were in the habit of comparing with certain plain texts of scripture, and found plain contradictions. No wonder then we denied our Bibles, and who would not deny such a Bible as that? If you expect a man to believe it who is in the habit of doing his own thinking, you must first make it a

self consistent whole, and this Bro. J. has not done, nor can he do it till he rejects the Duplicate Entity of Man, and represents the creature as *dead* when God says he is *dead*. This is but one instance of the evil tendencies of the popular doctrines; and no small evil is it truly, for the greater part of this number were heads of families. I do not *now* recollect of one exception. The effect, then, has been not only to confirm hundreds of infidels in our little town, but to poison the children of perhaps a hundred and fifty families with the same supposed contradictions in the Bible, which have a direct tendency to bring it into disrepute.

Now how are these infidels to be "awakened?" Surely, not by preaching to them the double being of man. Well, how then? I can answer for one; by preaching the truth; this, and this only *can*, and *has* convinced infidels that the word of God does not contradict itself; this first convinced *me* that the Bible means what it says, and says nothing in one place that it contradicts in another. I was first led to see its self-consistency, its beauty and harmony, its plainness and simplicity; and by the blessing of God, I was next led to believe it. This showed me at once my own lost condition, which led me to throw myself at the feet of that same Jesus I had rejected, and seek for mercy: and blessed be his name, I have reason to-day to believe I obtained it. Yes, ask and ye *shall* receive. I thank God for what I have received; for I received it from him through his word, and not through the false doctrines of men. I have seen the effects of preaching the double being and fire and brimstone doctrine, till I am satisfied that it does *far more* hurt than good. It is true that revivals sometimes follow it, and it is equally as true that infidelity follows close to the heels of such revivals. And one thing is generally true of the converts in such revivals; they are quite too much like Pennsylvania coal; they burn well and give a great heat with little light, as long as they are blown upon with a *hot blast*; but when the blowing ceases, they cease to burn, and lie dormant until converted again by the next *hot blast* from Pluto's fiery region. If any doubt this, let him follow eighteen months behind these "awakenings," and count the converts, and then the infidels. I do not mean to be understood that sinners are never converted under such circumstances; God sometimes brings good out of evil. What then? shall we do evil that good may come? God forbid. Thus far I have said, that Bro. J., and others of his belief, may be on their guard, and not become instruments in the hands of Satan to Tom-Paine the Bible.'

This account of Br. Campbell is worthy to be pondered well: he has put the Infidel Makers where they belong. They are the immortal-soul theorists. They have blasphemed God, their Maker, with their endless torment preaching, till sinners have become harder than "Pennsylvania coal;" so that nearly all the "revivals" that have been got up by such preaching have died away, and men have become so hardened under such representations of God that all the "blasts" the Maffits, Knapps, and other kindred spirits can puff, from the smoke of their furnaces, cease to affect them, and infidelity is the inevitable result.

"God is Love," and "he that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him;" and "out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." If the "goodness of God" will not lead men "to repentance," we are sure there is no hope for them. It is the exhibition of the love and compassion of God that truly turns men from the love and practice of sin. "God so loved the world," &c. Men are perishing; God sent his son to save them. His love interposed; and if men perish it is because they slight God's love.

ANASTASIS—NO. I.

THE QUESTION AT ISSUE STATED.

The question is not one of *power*, but of *truth*—of *fact*—of *revelation*. It is not whether God can raise the wicked from the dead, but *will he raise them?* Will the wicked be raised in a literal sense? Will they have any sort of life, physical, moral, or eternal? I deny that they will: I deny their resurrection, and demand the proof. So far, therefore, as this question goes, I occupy a *negative* position; and the burden of proof will rest with those who assert the resurrection of all. But the question may be stated in this form, *viz*: *The resurrection is conditional*; and then I occupy an *affirmative* position. The reader, therefore, will perceive that in one part of this discussion, I shall occupy a *negative*, and in the other a *positive* position; and my proofs will be arranged according to this plan.

I shall make free use of all Br. Storrs has written, especially his "Six Sermons;" for I find many things there which I regard as true.

I shall also refer occasionally to the works of Dr. Thomas, Mr. Dobney, and Mr. Hinton.

I desire to present the subject fully, and so far as I can, to anticipate and remove all objections. It is, however, impossible in the nature of the case, that I can foresee all the objections which may be urged against the view I present. And therefore I shall claim the privilege of replying to any person who may respond to this series of articles. The following subjects will come under consideration in the discussion of our question, *viz*: The penalty of the law—the Death of Christ—the Judgment—the Second Death—the First Resurrection, &c., &c. I shall examine all the passages that speak, or are supposed to speak, of the final destiny of sinners; and introduce such criticisms and authority as the case may call for. And I pray the reader to ponder well, and without prejudice, the arguments, reasons, truths, and facts presented. Remember that the question involved is the most important one ever submitted to the consideration of men. It was propounded more than four thousand years ago in the land of Idumea, by that venerable saint and patriarch, Job—"IF A MAN DIE, SHALL HE LIVE AGAIN?" May the bright light of God's holy word shine into our minds, and shed its influence upon our hearts, that we may answer this great question aright.

THE PENALTY OF THE LAW.

I call attention, in the first place, to the *ultimate*, or *final* penalty of sin. Let the reader remember, that in this *definition* I make no allusion to the *manner of dying*, the *pain of dying*, nor to the

simple act of *dying*, but to the *final end of sin*. Neither am I now speaking of those *personal* and *national* penalties which God has *superadded* to the last and final penalty. Of these I shall speak hereafter, when I come to treat of the judgments of the ages and of nations. I now enquire, 1st. *What is the final penalty of sin?* And I remark, first, that it is not the act of *dying*. *Death* is not *dying*. The phrase *dying* expresses the transition from life to death; and where *dying* terminates *death* emphatically begins. If to *die* or *dying* were the penalty of the law, then the very moment the process of dying is completed, the man would have the right to demand a restoration to life again; having paid all the demands of the law, thenceforth it could have no claim upon him.

In the second place, I observe, that the penalty of the law is not the *pain* of dying. If the pain of dying were the penalty, all the claims of the law could be satisfied by the *pain, torture, or torment* of dying; and the subject, having suffered these pains, would thereby have paid the penalty, and consequently be free from all subsequent obligation. In the third place, I remark, that the penalty of the law is not the *manner* of dying. It may be by famine, pestilence, fire, or sword; but the *manner* is not the penalty. I observe in the fourth place, that the penalty of the law is not to die a *second time*. If it were to die again, or to die a second time, all persons, dying a second time, pay the full penalty of the law. Upon this point I say no more at present, as I shall have occasion to make additional remarks on it when I come to speak of the "second death." These are negative points; but I now state the question affirmatively, *viz: The full and final penalty of sin, is the dominion of death*. Or, if any one prefers, *Death is the penalty of the law*.

But what is *death*? Br. Storrs defines it to be "the extinction of life." See "Six Sermons," p. 12. I define it to be "the extinction or suspension of life."

If death be "the extinction of life," as Br. Storrs maintains, in all cases, then death precludes the resurrection of all—both saints and sinners! Hence I hold that "the extinction or suspension of life" is a just distinction between the destiny of the righteous and the wicked. In the one case life is *extinct*; but in the other it is only *suspended* for a time. In the one case "the life is hid with Christ in God;" in the other case it is hid no where—but, as Mr. Storrs says, is "extinct."

Mr. Storrs takes the position, that *death* is the punishment of the wicked; and in this, I apprehend, we are agreed. He also takes the position that *pain* is not an essential idea of punishment. The following is his language, which the reader will find in the Appendix to his "Six Sermons," page 83.

"What is the Scripture argument that the righteous and the wicked are not equally immortal? The Bible expressly declares that the righteous put on '*immortality*'—that they have '*eternal life*,' and it as expressly declares that Christ will '*burn up the wicked*,' yea, that the Lord of Hosts '*shall burn them up*,' so that they shall be left '*neither root nor branch*,'—that they shall *die*—be destroyed for ever—perish—utterly perish, &c.

"The notion that *pain* and punishment are inseparable is erroneous. If pain were essential, in

order to constitute punishment, then our laws inflict the lightest punishment, or penalty, on the greatest offenders. But our civil laws are based on the principle that life is a blessing, and the deprivation of that life, an evil, loss, penalty or punishment. If the deprivation of life, which is a blessing, is a punishment, then an eternal deprivation of it will be an eternal punishment. But some think that people cannot be punished unless they are *conscious* of the fact, but the laws of the land do not so regard punishment, or death would be only a momentary punishment, for the law does not look into the future. Besides, you may take a being whose life is the most wretched imaginable, and yet the law would regard the deprivation of that miserable life, even if the individual were a Christian, as the highest penalty it can inflict. It is the deprivation of the life itself—not the pain inflicted, or the pain which God may inflict after death, to which the law looks. Hence the deprivation of a blessing, whether the individual remains sensible of it or not, is punishment, and if that deprivation is eternal, *the punishment is eternal*. If Gabriel were to transgress, and to be instantly, *without a single pang*, blotted eternally out of existence, would it not be to him an **ETERNAL PUNISHMENT**?"

In this extract Mr. Storrs fully endorses my definition of the final penalty of the law; for he says, "it is the deprivation of the life itself—not the *pain inflicted*, or the pain which God may inflict after death, to which the law looks."

Again, he says, "If Gabriel were to transgress, and to be instantly, *without a single pang*, blotted out of existence, would it not be to him an **ETERNAL PUNISHMENT**?"

I am happy, then, in having an endorser of my definition of death, of the penalty of the law, and of punishment, in the person of Br. Storrs.

But, just at this point, I will remark further, that the penalty of the law is not the *torment* which precedes death, but death itself; and to this point I will now direct the reader's attention while I adduce the testimony. And here, to save time, I will quote from my Review of Mr. Lee, p. 102.

"1. The penalty of Adam's sin is thus expressed: '*Thou shalt surely die*.' This penalty is subsequently explained by the Lord, thus: 'In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou shalt return to the ground; FOR OUT OF IT WAST THOU TAKEN: FOR DUST THOU ART, AND TO DUST SHALT THOU RETURN.'

"I wish it fully, distinctly and indelibly, impressed on the reader's mind, that the penalty of Adam's sin was not 'eternal torments,' but *death*—a death unbroken by a resurrection—a death perpetual in its *dominion*, unless some means were devised for his *redemption*.

"Death, then, was and is the penalty of the law. Paul, in his letter to the Romans, presents this subject very lucidly, chap. v. 12, &c. 'Wherefore as by one man (Adam) sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.'

"Here we are taught that by *sin, death*, THANATOS, came into the world, or *kosmon*; and this by the sin of one man,—*Adam*. No man can doubt but this death was the penalty of the law, and that but for this violation of law, death would not have entered the world. This fixes the meaning of the penalty, and shows it to be literal death. But 'death passed upon all men, in *whom*'—i. e., in

Adam—'all have sinned.' The word *dierchomai*, here rendered 'passed' signifies to *pass through*, to *pass over*, to be *propagated*. Death, therefore, was *propagated* to the race. Adam, himself, being cut off from the tree of life; and the whole race being in his loins at the time, in *him* they sinned—i. e., became '*subject to vanity*,' and with *him* they came under the law of death.

"We shall have occasion to refer to this chapter again, and will, therefore, for the present, say no more on its contents.

"In vi. chap. 23d verse, Paul states the principle we have presented—'THE WAGES OF SIN IS DEATH.' This is a general principle—a universal law, running through the Oracles of God.

"There are many other proofs of this position, but these must now suffice. I regard the point as established, then, that *death*, and not the *manner of dying*, is the penalty of the law—that the penalty is *one* and not *many*."

I shall present additional evidence on this point, when I come to speak on the "Hereditary Law of death," and the "Death of Christ." The reader, then, will please observe, that the dominion of death is the penalty of sin; and, that, therefore, the sin of Adam brought him under the power of death, and left him there, without any prospect of deliverance in, and of, himself. There was in him no *resurrection-germ*, which at some subsequent time might spring forth into new life. There was no innate power in him, by which he could revive and live again. But, having once closed his eyes in *death*, there he must remain through the long dark night of the endless succession of ages, unless restored—ransomed, and redeemed by Jehovah. And I maintain, as the sequel will show, that all the redemption through Christ is *conditional*—that the resurrection, the life, the immortality, the kingdom of God, and all the glory and honor appertaining to it, are one and all absolutely conditional. And, that, by consequence, no son of man can ever attain to so glorious a destiny, without complying with the terms of the new institution.

J. T. WALSH.

REPLY BY THE EDITOR.

It will be seen by the foregoing, that Br. Walsh has commenced a series of articles intended to prove that there never will be a resurrection of the wicked—that *once* dead they are dead forever. We regret that he has been led to such a conclusion, and it is painful to be under the necessity of taking the position of an opponent to him; but "he that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me," said the Savior; and believing, as we do, that Br. W. is in error, we feel bound to reply to his articles. It may be asked, why admit such a discussion into the Examiner? Answer. Our motto is—"Prove all things, hold fast that which is good." While, therefore, any one maintains a reverence for the Scriptures, and is willing to be tested by their teaching, we feel bound to let them speak in our columns, provided they occupy reasonable limits. With these remarks we come direct to the work of replying.

Br. W. says—"I deny the resurrection of the wicked, and demand the proof." He asks—"Will the wicked be raised in a literal sense?"

We answer, *they will*: and the "proof," in part, is—The Son of God has positively affirmed it, John 5: 28, 29: "ALL that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and SHALL COME FORTH; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life; and they that have DONE EVIL unto the RESURRECTION of damnation." An exposition of this text, so far as it needs any, we shall reserve till we come to Br. W.'s attempt to harmonize it with his present position.

He says—"The resurrection is conditional." At present we will only say, The resurrection which restores from the consequences of Adam's one "offence" is *not* conditional; but the resurrection to immortality, *eternal life*, is conditional. Let the reader keep this distinction in mind in the following discussion, and it will save him from much confusion.

Br. W. speaks of the "ultimate, or final penalty of sin;" and he admits there are "penalties which God has superadded to the last and final penalty." Let this admission be kept in mind, as we may find there is "tribulation and anguish" *superadded* between the time that wicked men hear Christ's voice and "COME FORTH" from the grave, and the period of their final extinction.

He asks—"What is the *final* penalty of sin?" What he has said, negatively, viz., that the penalty is not the pain of dying, may be true without at all affecting the question at issue; for though the pain of dying is not the "*final* penalty," it may be "*superadded*." The penalty of Adam's one offence was death; but, there was superadded "*sorrow all the days of thy life*," &c. See Gen. 3: 16—19. So, prior to the "*final* penalty of sin," in the case of the wicked, there may be sorrow, fitly described by that figure of speech called—"Weeping, wailing and gnashing of teeth."

Br. W. says—"The penalty of the law is not to die a *second* time." The only reply we make at present is—It is the "Second death." What the meaning of that phrase is, we shall perhaps see more clearly when we come to meet his position on that point.

His definition of the "*final* penalty of sin" we let pass at present; but in his definition of death he seems to desire to convey the impression that our view is defective, in our "Six Sermons, page 12." He says—"Br. Storrs defines death to be extinction of life." Let the reader turn to that page of our Sermons, and he will find it to read thus.—"The *primary* meaning of the term death is, the extinction of life." We, of course, defined it in reference to its proper sense and the "*final*" result. It was quite an *assumption* for him to insinuate that "in

all cases, Br. Storrs maintains death is the *extinction* of life." We do not in the place he refers to; and we never assumed any other position than the one he contends for; *viz.*—"That death is the suspension, or extinction of life;" yet, in its *primary* sense, it is extinction. As to the distinction Br. W. has introduced, between the returning to the dust of the righteous and the wicked—*viz.*, that in one case it is extinction and in the other suspension—we consider it to be without foundation. "There is," in this respect, "one event to the righteous and to the wicked."

Br. W. says, in the extract he takes from our Six Sermons, "Mr. Storrs fully endorses my definition of the final penalty of the law."

This is a new way of getting an *endorsement*, to take the sentiments of an author that wrote long before us, and say, that he endorses *our* sentiments. He might have said, he endorsed or adopted Mr. Storrs' sentiments. Br. W., and all others, will understand that we are no "endorser" of his "definition of the penalty of the law;" if he chooses to endorse or adopt ours we have no objection.

His reiterating the sentiment that "the penalty of the law is not the *torment* which precedes death, but death itself," amounts to nothing, unless he can prove that God has not threatened to "super-add" to death, or precede it with "few" or "many stripes." His saying that "the penalty is *one* and not *many*" is subject to the same stricture. Let him show, if he can, that while the "final penalty is *one*," there is not "superadded" *many* "sorrows" and "stripes" to precede that "final penalty." What he says of the "*dominion* of death" being the "penalty of sin," alters nothing, so long as he himself admits, in the case of Adam, that by some means that dominion might be broken; and if by one means, for aught any can say, it may be by some other, unless the Scriptures say otherwise. The idea, however, that "the penalty of sin is the *dominion* of death," is, in our mind, an unwarrantable assumption. If this be true, Adam and Eve, at least, never can have a resurrection upon any terms, or by any means: it is placed out of the power of the Creator himself to restore them to life; for such revival destroys "the dominion of death," and they escape the penalty which their Creator said should "SURELY" come upon them: and, as the death threatened to Adam "passed through upon" all his posterity, not one of the race can have a resurrection. If Br. W.'s definition be the correct one, it is useless to talk of a "*ransom*" from such a penalty—there is no ransom—there can be none, in the very nature of the case. The fact is, "*death* is the wages of sin," Its "*dominion*" is another matter entirely; and that depends on the will of the Law-Maker. The transgressor has no

claim for deliverance; death may or may not continue its dominion, as the Creator may see best, or as He may choose. In the case of Adam, He did not say the death threatened should continue its dominion, but left Himself at liberty to restore man to life if He chose; thus leaving the way open for his redemption; whereas redemption would have been impossible, if "the *dominion* of death," and not death itself, had been the penalty. The punishment for personal sins, under the dispensation of grace, is *eternal*, and therefore precludes redemption; not because the penalty is "the dominion of death," but because the Redeemer has expressed his *will* that the rejection of *eternal* life shall be followed with "eternal punishment;" and, of course, in that case, the dominion of death is eternal, and precludes the possibility of the redemption of the subjects of it; and it would have been equally impossible to have redeemed Adam, or any of his race, if the original penalty had been the "*dominion* of death."

When Br. W. says, "that all the redemption through Christ is *conditional*," we think he assumes what he will find hard to prove. We shall probably find there is a redemption *antecedent*, and a redemption *consequent*; or a deliverance which is *unconditional*, and may be turned by man's perversity into an insupportable curse, and end in death; and there is a deliverance *consequent* upon the improvement of antecedent blessings. That "no son of man can ever attain to so glorious a destiny" as that of a "resurrection" to *eternal* "life," "immortality, the kingdom of God," &c., without "absolutely" complying with the conditions upon which *those* glories are promised, is true.

FROM ENGLAND.—We have received from the other side of the Atlantic, we presume from our fair friend "Ellen Tanner," a copy of the "Gospel Banner and Biblical Treasury." From it we copy the following Letter and Reply.

THE PRESENT STATE OF THE DEAD.

March 17, 1849.

MADAM,—I duly received your favor, and take the liberty of saying, that the passages you quote refer to the *body*, not the *soul*. To receive them in any other sense would be to reject a host of other passages which are equally true, and which are without doubt, reconcilable with them. For instance, Christ and the thief *went to paradise* the day they were crucified. "*In hades* the rich man *lifted up his eyes, being in torments.*" [Hades cannot, therefore, mean the grave.] Paul tells us, that "to depart" was "*to be with Christ*," which was "far better," than even to live and labor, abounding in the gifts of the Spirit, in revelations, and in seals to his ministry.

Sheol and hades, in the originals, *never* mean either *hell* (Gehenna) or the *grave*, as they have been translated. It is, therefore, not possible for you, without an understanding of the originals, to

investigate what the Scriptures say respecting the separate state, from our translation, unaided. I, therefore, again *press upon you* to get and to study Gavett on Hades, who examines almost all the passages you refer to. One thing is certain, that unless you can explain away the meaning of Hades, Sheol, Abaddon, Paradise, and show there are no such places, and that these terms, as well as "the bottomless pit," (which is only another name for "Abaddon" or Destruction,) *mean nothing more than the grave*, your system must fall to the ground—that is, if I am correct in supposing that you do not believe in "the separate state." As an impartial seeker after truth, I trust you will not rest satisfied till you have examined the Scriptures respecting the *souls* of the departed as well as their *bodies*, and endeavor to discover how the various passages are to be reconciled.

Praying the Lord may assist and direct your investigations, and show you wondrous things out of his word,

I remain, Madam, most respectfully yours,

O.

P.S.—You quote Ps. xlix. 15, "But God will redeem my *soul* from the power of the grave." The word here translated "soul" is in the Hebrew "Nepesh," and is often translated "body" and "dead body," as in Numbers ix. 6, 7, in both of which verses Nepesh is translated "dead body." I therefore understand the Psalmist to say, "But God will redeem my *dead body* from the power of the grave"—NOT MY SOUL. From your note I perceive that you do not believe that "to depart is to be with Christ, which is far better." Surely, then, to slumber as inanimate matter! in the prospect of which you seem to take pleasure!

REPLY TO "O."

April 10, 1849.

SIR,—I received your note some time since, and feel obliged by your polite attention in giving me your ideas of the present state of the dead.

With respect to Christ and the thief going to Paradise "the day they were crucified," Christ himself said, "As Jonah was three days and three nights in the whale, the Son of man should be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." Matt. xii. 40. And Christ at his resurrection said to Mary, "touch me not, for I am *not yet ascended*." Jchn xii. 17. And Christ remained on the earth forty days, "speaking of the things relating to the kingdom of God." Acts i. 3. Nor did Christ ascend till he went up in a cloud, *when his disciples saw him going up*. Acts i. 9.

The thief was doubtless cast into Gehenna, where malefactors were then thrown.

The thief's prayer was, "Lord, remember me when thou *comest* into thy kingdom," (not when thou *goest*,) or as it reads in some old versions, "Lord, remember me in the day of thy coming." Christ replied, "Verily I say unto thee, to-day thou shalt be with me in Paradise. Luke xxiii. 43. Paradise was *not* in heaven, but *on earth*, it was lost by the first Adam, and will be restored by the second Adam.

The kingdom is *not yet come*, but we pray, "Thy kingdom come." The kingdom is *not* in heaven where Christ now is; nor is Christ *now* a King, but a Priest, to make intercession. Heb. vii. 25. Nor is Christ *now* seated on his own throne. See Rev. iii. 24. But Christ is to sit on his father David's throne, which was *not* in heaven. Luke i. 32.

Christ's kingdom will be *under* the whole heaven. Dan. vii. 27. Not ABOVE nor IN heaven, but UNDER the whole heaven, on the *new earth*. 2 Pet. iii. 13. Then shall the meek inherit the *earth*, (not heaven.) Matt. v. 5 *When the Son of man comes* in the clouds, *then* shall he sit on the throne of his glory, and say, "Come, inherit the kingdom." Matt. xxv. 34. *Then* will the *thief*, with the saints, possess the kingdom. See Dan. vii. 18.

You next refer to the rich man and Lazarus, which is only a *parable*, and *not a fact*. No parable can be *taken* literally. The kingdom of heaven (or present dispensation) is like unto a *net*, for instance, and all parables were spoken to illustrate some point.

The parable of the rich man could not refer to a disembodied state, as "he lifts up his eyes," (a spirit not having eyes)—"dip the finger"—"cool the tongue"—("a spirit has *not* flesh and bones." Luke xxiv. 39.) At the close of this parable, Christ referred to the unbelief of the Jews, saying, they would not believe Moses and the Prophets, (or the Old Testament account of Christ,) neither would they believe though one rose from the dead, (or, the *New Testament* account of Christ.) It is written in John iii. 13, "*No man hath ascended into heaven*." In Acts ii. 34, "David is *not* ascended;" "and whither I go ye *CANNOT* come," John xiii. 33, and John xiv. 3, "I will come *AGAIN* and *RECEIVE* you." "When *Christ*, who is our life, *SHALL* appear, *THEN* (and not at death,) shall we appear with *him* in glory." Col. iii. 4, 1 John iii. 2.

You refer to "depart and be *with Christ*." Believers are said to "sleep in Jesus." I understand to sleep in Jesus, and to depart and be with Christ, is to *DIE* in the faith of Christ, as it is written, "Blessed are they who *die* in the Lord, that they may rest from their labors." Paul says it is far better; the *Revelation* says it is blessed. Paul knew bonds and imprisonments awaited him. Paul says that he shall receive *his crown* at Christ's *appearing*, 2 Tim. iv. 8; and in Col. iii. 4, Paul writes, "When *Christ*, who is our life, shall appear, *THEN* (and not at death) shall ye appear *with him* in glory."

The Savior does *not* bestow his rewards until he comes in the clouds. "When the Son of man *COMETH*, *THEN* shall he reward every man according to his works." Matt. xvi. 27. Again, Paul distinctly states that the *future life of the dead* entirely depends on a *resurrection*: "for if there is no resurrection of the *DEAD*, *THEN* those that are *fallen* asleep in Christ (Christians) are *perished*." 1 Cor. xv. 14—18. How could this be the case if believers were gone to heaven at death?

You next refer to Hades, which is a compound word, and means hidden, invisible, the same as *Sheol*, (Hebrew) both signifying the grave, (or place of the dead.) I see with you a difference in Hades, Sheol and Gehenna, the latter referring to the valley of Hinnom, south of Jerusalem, where children were burnt to Molock. 2 Kings xxiii. 10. I do not understand Paradise to be IN HEAVEN OR THE GRAVE. Paradise was *on* the earth, and Christ's kingdom will be *under* the whole heaven, and when Paradise is restored it will be in the *new earth*.

With regard to the *souls* of the departed, the word soul has several meanings, nor can it be determined without its context. The terra soul is applied to animal life, both man and beast. In some places it

signifies persons. "Souls (or persons) on board," in Acts xxvii. 37; in Lev. xvii. 12, "No soul of you shall eat blood." In Gen. i. 20, it means life. In 1 Sam. xviii. 1, it signifies affections, nor can I find that souls exist separate from the body IN THE SCRIPTURES, and this idea was taught by the Heathen Philosophers, who were entirely ignorant of the glorious doctrine of the resurrection for which Paul endured such opposition.

At the close of your note you write that I seem to take pleasure in the prospect of remaining *inanimate* till the resurrection. Indeed, I would wish to be satisfied with all *God's revealed will*, and like Paul say, if I may but attain unto the resurrection *ex anastasis* out from among the dead, and be one of the blessed and holy who shall have part in the first resurrection. Rev. xx.

Remaining, yours respectfully,
ELLEN TANNER.

STILL THEY COME.

ANOTHER MINISTER IN THE FIELD.

Ellicottville, N. Y., Nov. 19th, 1849.

BR. STORRS.—For several months past I have been examining the doctrine of the destruction of the wicked, and am convinced that it, rather than eternal conscious torment, is the penalty God has annexed to his violated laws. I have commenced preaching in accordance with this view, and find freedom and pleasure in so doing. I have not the least doubt *Death*, the penalty threatened to Adam, is to be understood to mean, just as common sense would indicate, a *cessation* of life.

How this new doctrine in my preaching will be received I cannot tell. Some are examining it, and I trust in the spirit of candor. I believe *many* will embrace it—though I know of but *one* besides myself in all this section of country that does at present. The heaven of truth is at work. Permit me to say here, I am quite certain that the doctrine of eternal conscious torment has been the occasion of thousands embracing universalism, and even infidelity outright.

To know and proclaim the entire truth, as it is in Jesus, is the business of my life; and it little concerns me what will be the *consequences* to me of pursuing this course. I am quite sure I shall lose caste with the churches of my own denomination, (Baptist;) but that causes me no anxiety. I leave myself and all my interests with Him whose I am.

Your brother, in hope of eternal life,
C. M. RICHMOND.

Sylvan, Mich., Nov. 6, 1849.

BR. STORRS.—The more I read the Bible, the clearer I see that the doctrine of Life and Death is too plainly taught to be misunderstood. Long before this time should I have embraced this view, if I had given it proper attention. But better late than never. I believe it to be the only doctrine that can save a world from universalism and infidelity; and the only thing that can harmonize the Scriptures; for I am certain that upon no other interpretation of the Book can the atonement be made consistent. This I came to see when I was examining that doctrine—For what did Christ die? and the nature of that death? The books would tell me that "Christ died in the sinner's room and stead, to save from endless torments." If this be

true, Christ must still be suffering. But the fact is, he never redeemed us from any such thing, as appears from Adam's sentence from God. "Dust," &c., and Christ's death, "even the death of the Cross."

I attended the (so called) "True Wesleyan Methodist" Conference, in this State, a short time ago. Some of the preachers said they thought Brother Lee had not done anything very great on the immortality question. Some of them said that a preacher in the Conference had got up lectures on that subject that were far superior to Lee's, for Lee argued immateriality, and so makes out the soul of man an immaterial NOTHING. The preacher spoken of takes the ground of spirituality, which, they thought, was far preferable.

The doctrine of Life and Death is a new thing to most all here, though numbers have turned among my friends; some who, before, were Baptists, Methodists, &c. Last Sabbath was the first that I had introduced it in public. The house was crowded—quite an excitement.

J. B. FRISBIE.

"BIBLE EXAMINER EXTRA."—We send all our subscribers an *Extra*, containing an article on the "*Second Death*," by Bishop Whately—a "*History of the Doctrine of an Immortal Soul*"—also, our "*Six Sermons*," entire; with an article on the "*Fire of Gehenna and its Use*," and the "*Index*" to the chapters of "*Dobney on Future Punishment*." The *Extra* contains 16 pages quarto, and is put at the low price of \$2 per hundred copies. The quarto edition of the *Six Sermons*, with our views of the *State of the Dead*, as previously published, may be had at the same price, if any prefer that edition to the *Extra*; or they may have part of each, only let them say definitely which, and how many of each.

DONATIONS to complete the Volume for 1849:—

Joseph Wilson, Ohio, - - -	\$1.
James Carless, Canada, - - -	\$1.32
Samuel Sands, Md. - - -	\$1.85

DEPOSITORIES OF BOOKS.—Dobney on "The Scripture Doctrine of Future Punishment," reprinted from the English edition, may be had in
BOSTON, Mass., of Geo. T. Adams, 87 Hanover St., Hat and Cup Store.

ALBANY, N. Y., at Christian Palladium Office, and H. B. Holmes, 16 S. Pearl St.

NEW YORK CITY, of Dr. John Burdell, Dentist, No. 2 Union Place, and of Henry F. Johnson, No. 327 Hudson St.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., of Marsh & Finney, Advent Harbinger Office.

PROVIDENCE, R. I., of Ransom Hicks, No. 215 Pine St.

HARTFORD, Conn., of Dr. D. Cray, Eld. J. S. White, and Aaron Clapp, Main St.

PRICE OF BOOKS, ETC., AT THE EXAMINER OFFICE.

CHRISTIAN PSALMODY, (New Hymn Book,) 128 pages, 24mo., paper covers, 15 cts. each; ten copies for \$1.00; for \$3.00, one hundred copies.

SIX SERMONS, Quarto, 16 pages, (newspaper postage, only, when sent by mail,) \$1.00 per fifty copies. No further discount can be made on either of the above works.

DOBNEY ON FUTURE PUNISHMENT, bound, *seventy-five* cts.; in paper covers, *fifty*.

SIX SERMONS, 18mo., 120 pages, bound, *twenty-five* cts.; in paper covers, *fifteen*.

CHRISTIAN PSALMODY, bound in plain morocco, *twenty-five* cts. On the three last named works *one-third* discount will be made to those who buy to sell again.