

BIBLE EXAMINER.

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

VOL. III.

PHILADELPHIA, FEBRUARY, 1848.

No. 2.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.
J. T. WALSH, RICHMOND, VA., ASSISTANT EDITOR.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 21 N. SIXTH STREET,
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

☞ FOR TERMS, See last page.

☞ This paper is subject to newspaper postage only.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD.—NO. III.

By J. T. WALSH.

Having spoken of the *territory* of the kingdom, and of the *dominion* and *advent* of the king, we shall return, and bring up another branch of this subject.

THE SURE MERCIES OF DAVID.

Abraham begat Isaac, Isaac begat Jacob, and of him it is thus spoken: "Out of Jacob shall come he that shall have *dominion*, and shall destroy him that remaineth of the city." Numbers 24: 19. Jacob, a short time previous to his death, while pronouncing certain blessings upon his children, speaks thus of *Judah*, from whom Christ descended: "Judah, thou art he whom thy brethren shall praise; thy hand shall be on the neck of thy enemies, thy father's children shall bow down to thee. Judah is a lion's whelp; from the prey, my son, thou hast gone up: he stooped down, he crouched as a lion: who shall rouse him up? The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a law-giver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and to him shall be the gathering of the people." Gen. 49: 9, 10.

The above is evidently a prediction concerning the Messiah, who is, indeed, "the Lion of the tribe of Judah." It relates not only to his first advent, but, also, to the time when he shall "reign over the house of Israel forever;" at which time his "brethren shall praise him," and "bow down to" him.

The Lord said to David, "And when thy days shall be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy *seed* after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build a house for my name, and I will *establish the throne of his kingdom forever*. I will be his father, and he shall be my son. If he shall commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men: But my mercy shall not depart from him, as I took it from Saul, whom I put away before thee. And thy house and thy kingdom shall be established forever before thee: *thy throne shall be established forever*." 2 Sam. 7: 12—16.

Some commentators suppose the above paragraph refers to Solomon exclusively. But it must be obvious to the most casual observer, that this quotation looks farther than the *days* of Solomon. Solomon was a very striking *type* of the Messiah, in more

aspects than one. Of Solomon it is said, "And Solomon reigned over all kingdoms, from the river to the land of the Philistines, and to the border of Egypt: they brought presents and served him all the days of his life. For he had dominion over all the region on this side the river, from Ziphah even unto Azzah, over all the kings on this side the river: and he had peace on all sides around him." 1 Kings, 4: 20—24.

Let the reader remember, that Solomon was the *first* king that reigned *peaceably* over *all the territory* promised to Abraham and his *seed*; and he will see at once, that, in this particular, he was a type of the Messiah's reign, or kingdom over the *same* territory. And, inasmuch as Solomon was a type of the Lord Jesus in his kingly character, what is said of David's *seed*, and of his *throne* and *kingdom*, in the quotation already made, must be understood as applying to Solomon in so far as he is the type of Messiah. Hence he promises to "be a father to him," and claims him as "his son," in a peculiar sense. Also, he promises "to establish his throne and kingdom forever." And, as if to fix the meaning of the passage in its application to the Messiah, as well as to show the meaning David himself attached to it, David says: "Thou hast spoken, also, of thy servant's house for a great while to come;" thus showing conclusively that he did not apply it to Solomon, nor to the time then present.

Now let us turn to the last words of David, 2 Sam. 23: 1—5, "Now these are the last words of David. David the son of Jesse said, and the man who was raised on high, the anointed of the God of Jacob, and the sweet psalmist of Israel, said—The Spirit of the Lord spoke by me, and his word was on my tongue. The God of Israel said, the Rock of Israel spoke to me, He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God. And he shall be as the light of the morning, when the sun riseth, even a morning without clouds; as the tender grass springing out of the earth by clear shining after rain. Although my house is not so with God, yet he hath made with me an everlasting covenant, ordered in all things and sure: for this is all my salvation, and all my desire, although he maketh it not to grow."

This is one of the most interesting passages in the whole book, and the reader will excuse us for dwelling somewhat largely upon it.

Let us remember that David is here speaking "by the Spirit," and that these are his "last words." When he says, "He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God," he is doubtless speaking of the Messiah, for he immediately proceeds to describe him. "And he shall be as the light of the morning, when the sun riseth, even a morning without clouds; as the tender grass springing out of the earth by clear shining after rain." This refers to the time when he shall appear the "second time without a sin offering, in order to salvation." Then, as "the bright and morning star,"—"the

sun of righteousness,"—"the day star," he will dispel all darkness, "rend the veil away, that blinds the nations now;" and "fill the earth with the glory and knowledge of God."

David then proceeds: "*Although my house is not so with God; YET HE HATH MADE WITH ME AN EVERLASTING COVENANT, ORDERED IN ALL THINGS, AND SURE, for this is all my salvation, and all my desire, ALTHOUGH HE MAKETH IT NOT TO GROW.*"

Here David confesses that "his house," at that time, "was not so with God;" that present appearances were against the realization of his hope; "YET," says he, "God hath made with me an everlasting covenant," "ordered in all things and sure;" and this "everlasting covenant," "ordered and sure," in all its provisions, was "all his salvation," and "all his desire; although," for the time then present, "he made it not to grow." Now turn to the 89th Psalm, and read the following: "I have made a covenant with my chosen, I have sworn to David my servant, *thy seed will I establish forever, and build up thy throne to all generations.*"

Reader, these are "the sure mercies of David!" His "*seed,*" the Messiah, will Jehovah "*establish forever.*" He will "build up his throne"—the throne of his kingdom "to all generations."

Again, in verse 19th we read: "Then thou didst speak in vision to thy holy one, and say, I have laid help upon one that is mighty; I have exalted one chosen out of the people. I have found David my servant; with my holy oil have I anointed him: with whom my hand shall be established: my arm also shall strengthen him. The enemy shall not exact upon him: nor the son of wickedness afflict him. And I will beat down his foes before his face, and afflict them that hate him. But my faithfulness and my mercy shall be with him: and in my name shall his *horn* be exalted. I will set his hand also in the sea, and his right hand in the rivers. He shall cry to me, Thou art my father, my God, the rock of my salvation. ALSO I WILL MAKE HIM MY FIRST BORN, HIGHER THAN THE KINGS OF THE EARTH. My mercy will I keep for him for evermore, and my covenant shall stand fast with him. *His seed also will I make to endure forever, and his throne as the days of heaven.*" Again, at the 35th verse, "*Once have I sworn by my holiness, that I will not lie to David. His seed shall endure forever, and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established forever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven.*" Again, he adds, "*But thou hast cast off and abhorred, thou hast been wroth with thy anointed. Thou hast made void the covenant of thy servant; thou hast profaned his crown by casting it to the ground.*"

Here we have the perpetuity of David's throne and kingdom, fully and explicitly explained to us. And we also have the fact that his throne should be vacant, clearly indicated. And this harmonizes with the prophet: "In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up their breaches; and I will raise up its ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old." Amos 9: 11.

ZEDEKIAH was the last king that sat on David's throne; since that time "his crown has been cast to the ground," and "his tabernacle fallen down." But the time is approaching when "his tabernacle will be raised up," his throne erected, his kingdom organized, and his son will reign thereon "*forever!*"

[To be continued.]

POLYTHEISM NOT PECULIAR TO PAGANS;

OR, WITCHCRAFT UNVEILED.

No. II.

Here is the witch, and her dupe, Saul, who was a head taller than any other man in Israel, and was unquestionably identified by the witch at first sight. The predictions, adverse to his well-being, were too notorious to be a secret to a person of her character and practices. Saul's recent violence against her fraternity of witches must have operated to arouse her resentment, and provoke her to vengeance. And his immediate acknowledgement of her power, on his first introduction, would arm her with boldness, and increase her confidence in her ability at deception. Immediately, therefore, on hearing Saul's request—"I pray thee," (beseechingly) "divine unto me by the familiar spirit, and bring me *him* up, whom I shall name unto thee;" without asking or learning the name she should call, "the woman said unto him, Behold, thou knowest what Saul hath done, how he hath cut off those that have familiar spirits, and the wizards out of the land; wherefore, then, layest thou a snare for my life, to cause me to die?" As a matter of course, such a speech, she knew very well, would take Saul by surprise—give him to understand that she was ignorant of his person, and facilitate her project of duping him. The bait was caught eagerly—"And Saul sware unto her by the LORD, saying, As the LORD liveth, there shall no punishment happen to thee for this thing." This declaration, if there had been any doubt on the witch's mind, of the identity of the person before her, must, notwithstanding Saul's disguise, have dissipated it. "Then, said the woman, whom shall I bring up unto thee?" "And he said, Bring me up Samuel." There can be no doubt about the woman's previous knowledge of a man so conspicuous in Israel as had been this prophet.

At this stage of the proceedings, let us consider, that it does not appear that Saul's attendants were present; neither is it likely that the woman would have consented to witnesses being at the interview. And, *it being night*, the woman had full opportunity to avail herself of as much obscurity as she chose; and, as was customary with all ancient impostors, she undoubtedly took her position, and stationed her dupe, so that attending circumstances should aid her deception. She probably occupied a recess, fitted to such occasions, and was also screened by some contrivance or other from the gaze of Saul, if the dim light admitted should enable him to distinguish objects. Thus prepared, and Saul, standing at a proper distance, trembling with fear, and his mind distracted with conflicting emotions, which would necessarily operate to disqualify him from any accurate observation, *she opens the scene—SHE CRIES WITH A LOUD VOICE—and a frightful scream*, as of a person in peril, or terror, first saluted the ears of the now truly terrified king of Israel.

The phrase, "And when the woman saw Samuel, she cried with a loud voice," is merely *imagery*, intended to convey an idea of the mode of practising the deception. For, as a matter of course, a cause existed for the woman's exclamation—and the cause is merely placed in order before the effect—she was to raise the spirit of Samuel, and she announced the success of her incantation by a frightful scream. Now the cunning of the impostor is seen. As if the spirit she had raised, had inform-

ed her, she says to Saul, "Why hast thou deceived me? for thou art Saul." This naturally causes Saul's mind to revert to what occurred at the commencement of the interview, and induces him, as she expected, to reassure her of her safety. Saul, you will remember, *has seen nothing*—he has been electrified by the woman's terrific outcry, and thereby more fully prepared to swallow her deceptions. "And the king said unto her, Be not afraid: for what sawest thou?" The answer of the witch is admirable. She is desirous of heightening the wonder of her dupe—she assumes the power of commanding the supposed infernal deities, by her answer. "I saw Gods (in the plural) ascending out of the earth." Saul's immediate reply shows the confusion of his mind, and his first idea as being uppermost. He therefore asks, "What form is he of?" Imagine the condition of the parties, at the present moment. SAUL HAS SEEN NOTHING. The woman commenced the farce, very probably, by burning incense, or some fumigating gum, in a pan of coals; and, ensconced in a recess, a smoke between her and Saul, she first announced the effect of her incantation by a terrific scream. Saul is now full of agonizing expectation. And Saul instead of shaping his question, as it would be reasonable to expect, in conformity to the information conveyed to him by the woman, that she "saw Gods ascending out of the earth," inquires of the woman respecting the *form* of the spirit, as though ONE, only had been raised. There is a very singular discrepancy in the phraseology of the translators, who make the woman, in the first instance, to cry out, "when she saw Samuel." Now the real fact is, that nothing is said of seeing Samuel, either by the woman herself, or by Saul, during this part of the farce. But, instead of this, the woman, immediately after she had given Saul to understand, that she had discovered who he was, by means of her incantations, instead of saying that she had seen Samuel, affirms, positively, in reply to Saul's interrogation, on hearing her outcry, "What sawest thou?" that she saw "Gods," in the plural, "ascending out of the earth." And, immediately on hearing Saul's second interrogatory, "What form is he of?" she gives a new shape to her farce. How absurd, therefore, has been the conjecture of those commentators, who have fancied that the Witch actually raised the spirit of Samuel, which they very reasonably conclude the Witch had no idea of seeing, she was so terrified as to cry aloud

The next scene in the farce of the witch, is quite in character. As she must have had a previous knowledge of Samuel, etc., as I have already mentioned, she was fully prepared for Saul's question—"What form is he of?" and she answers *instantly*, "An old man cometh up; and he is covered with a mantle." The old woman, of course, was too modest to coerce the spirit of Samuel to appear at her bidding, without bestowing on him a decent covering. And as she had, very likely, seen Samuel, frequently, during his lifetime, she very charitably lends him HIS OLD CLOTHES TO WEAR ON THAT OCCASION. As soon as Saul learns the form of the spirit from the Witch, who, in conformity to his request to call up Samuel, informs Saul that an old man covered with a mantle, was the appearance or form of the Spirit; the account goes on, and says, "And Saul perceived that it was Samuel, and he stooped with his face to the ground, and bowed himself." Notwithstanding this mode of expression, SAUL SAW

NOTHING; unless the witch exposed her own person to be partially observed by Saul, through the gloom and smoke that enveloped her. This might have been the case—and the attitude and dress assumed by her at that moment, and, dimly exposed, with the aid of Saul's diseased imagination, would have passed for a dozen different things. However this may have been, the term *perceived* does not necessarily import further than this, that Saul, under the circumstances of the case, on hearing from the witch a description of the appearance of the spirit, came to the conclusion, that it was, in reality, the spirit of the dead prophet. It would be absurd to suppose that Saul saw the form of any thing, with his own eyes, in a manner sufficiently clear to satisfy himself of the appearance of the spirit in any shape.—(If Saul saw, with his own eyes, that it was Samuel, why ask the witch, "What form is he of?" J. T. W.) The dupe, being thus prepared, half crazed with apprehension of the result of the expected battle, his imagination ripened to the verge of bursting, with expectation of wonders from the witch's incantations, and bowed to the earth in an humble acknowledgement of his own inferiority, compared with the messenger of heaven, before whom he believed he stood, and from whom he would learn his doom, was admirably fitted to be duped even by a more clumsy, and a less experienced impostor than the Witch of Endor.

The phraseology of Samuel in addressing Saul, is very consistent and proper, on the supposition that the witch *personated* the spirit of the prophet; and is, as I shall show, precisely what should be expected under the circumstances of the parties; but very improbable indeed, on the supposition that a *real spirit*, and the spirit of the departed prophet, Samuel, actually appeared on that occasion, *by the agency of JEHOVAH*, to denounce to Saul his approaching doom. In the first case, as I shall contend, the whole operation being a sheer deception on the part of the woman, assisted very greatly by the superstition and alarm of Saul, the real facts, as they appear, are necessary, as constituting the imagery or parts of the deception, and are not a whit superior, when correctly understood, to the usual *mummery of experienced and adroit impostors*.

There is a fact connected with this woman's manœuvres, which goes to prove both her courage and her abilities, as a shrewd, cunning, and experienced impostor. We learn most explicitly from the connexion, and from the woman's declaration to Saul, that Saul had put away, or, as the woman's phrase expresses it, *cut off* those that have familiar spirits out of the land. No doubt, in one of Saul's freaks, he had made, as he thought, a thorough crusade against witches and wizards; perhaps, as an offset to some of his impious refusals to obey the commands of Jehovah. And this woman, in defiance of Saul's authority, and in despite of all his attempts to destroy her, had maintained her ground. And it also appears, that she openly practised her forbidden sorceries; and, as a consequence, possessed a corresponding notoriety; for, as it were, *instantly*, on Saul's expressing a desire to consult a woman having a familiar spirit, he was told where one was located. What was necessary in this case on the part of the woman? To *personate* Samuel, in a way that should deceive Saul. And as the woman had an opportunity unsought by her; to avenge herself, her enemy, who had sought her life, being present, she availed herself of Saul's alarm and fear

to increase it, by denouncing against him his certain and approaching ruin. From her trade, she must have been acquainted with human weakness, and human folly; and was unquestionably qualified from her experience, and her previous knowledge of Saul, and of the predictions of certain ruin, made by the prophet, of Saul, and of the kingdom being given to David, to arrange her plan of operation immediately on Saul's application to her. He came to the witch a trembling supplicant. Malice and imposture combined, and all in the head and heart of a cunning, bold woman, on the one hand—on the other, a man rendered almost frantic by fear, his imagination disturbed by portentous forebodings, and a superstition of the most abject kind, stood before a witch *begging* her assistance.

J. T. WALSH.

(To be continued.)

"ANNIHILATION"—LA ROY SUNDERLAND.

An article, headed "Annihilation," has appeared in the Advent Herald, signed La Roy Sunderland, and dated Boston, Nov. 9th, 1847. We propose to offer a few reflections on the "cursory thoughts" of this gentleman. And

1st, He proposes "to show," "that what has been written" in the columns of the Advent Herald, and "other Advent papers, has proved nothing—just nothing—in favour of annihilation."

Now, as we do not know what has been written in the Advent Herald, on this subject, we shall not say what has, or has not, been proved; but, so far as our views, on the subject of "annihilation" extend, we would merely observe that "annihilation," in its philosophical sense, is not taught in the scriptures. And, that, so far as my knowledge extends, no advocate of the "destruction of the wicked," has contended for any such view of the subject.

All honest inquirers after truth, should be satisfied with what the Scriptures teach, and not seek to impose a philosophical *sense* upon the *words* of Scripture. Suffice it, then, for us to say, that "annihilation," in its philosophical sense, is not taught in *nature* or *Revelation*; but the doctrine of DESTRUCTION—*absolute and unqualified destruction*—IS TAUGHT IN BOTH! Mr. Sunderland's labour is all lost, in this part of his argument. For the purpose of drawing the line of distinction still more plainly between the words "annihilation" and "destruction," we would remark, that "annihilation" signifies to reduce that which is *something* to *nothing*. It signifies to reduce an *entity* to a *nonentity*. This is its philosophical sense. The word "destruction" means to *unbuild*—to *disorganize* that which is organized—to reduce to its original elements. Hence whatever is "*annihilated*" is, *necessarily, destroyed*; but a thing, or person, may be *destroyed* without being "*annihilated*."

Mr. Sunderland says: "Most of the articles I have seen on the subject, are exceedingly unsatisfactory, because they do not *define* either the thing, *substance*, to be annihilated, nor do they show the existence of any laws by which its annihilation is to be brought about." Discarding the word and idea of "*annihilation*," with which Mr. Sunderland's mind seems to be filled, we would observe, THAT WICKED CORRUPTIBLE MEN will be the *subjects* of that "*destruction*" of which the Scriptures speak. The "*thing, substance*," then, to be destroyed will be nothing more than a class of *mortal, corruptible men*,

corruptible in soul, body, and spirit; and, surely, Mr. Sunderland has not to learn by what "*LAWs*" *corruptible men* can be destroyed! But, apart from any "*law of nature*" in the case, the *revealed laws of God* are sufficient to establish the point before us. The wicked, corruptible and mortal as they will be, are to be destroyed by, and in accordance with, the "*laws*" of God, as set forth in that divine code, the Bible. This Holy Book is full of "*LAW*" on the subject, but we will only refer to one at this time, viz: "*He that soweth to his flesh, shall of the flesh reap CORRUPTION.*" So that, as Mr. S. says, "God works by laws," but he does not always work by *natural laws*. Christ did not die for sin according to *natural law*; but "according to the pre-determination of God." And sinners are not saved from sin, nor from eternal destruction, by obeying the natural laws: but by obeying the *revealed LAWS* of God. The saints will be saved eternally upon the same principle; and the wicked will be "*consumed*" for disobedience to the same laws, and thus *suffer the penalty affixed to them, viz: DEATH, the second death.*

Mr. S. says: "we have no definite ideas as to first principles," "with regard to matter and spirit." We are sorry *he* has not; for we are perfectly satisfied, that if Mr. S. did possess correct "definite ideas," "with regard to matter and spirit," he would cease to oppose the "destruction" of the wicked, upon the flimsy hypothesis, that it does not accord with the *natural "laws"*. Again, Mr. Sunderland says, "All results must correspond with the cause, or causes which have produced them; as there cannot be any result, or effect, without adequate cause." This is true: and there is an "adequate cause," in relation to the destruction of the wicked. That "*cause*" is sin—a violation of *revealed law*; and, hence, God says the "wages of sin is death;" and "the soul that sins, shall die." God, himself, is the *executioner*, for "all the wicked will God destroy;" and his agents, or instruments, are the material elements, which acting upon the bodies of the wicked, will produce death, disorganization, destruction. The *eating* of the forbidden fruit was an "adequate" cause of death, and all the ills growing out of a *mortal* existence: and will any man undertake to say, that *disobedience* to the laws of Jehovah is not an "adequate cause" of the final result, which is *eternal death*, a death from which there is no redemption?

All that Mr. Sunderland says, in his second paragraph, about "matter and mind in motion," "heat, motion, light, forms," &c. &c., are as far from the philosophy of the subject, as they are from the *mind* of the Holy Spirit, presented to us in the word of God. His ideas of "*eternal progression*," in relation to the "Mineral, Vegetable, and Animal kingdoms," are as visionary, as transcendental, as the Arabian Nights Entertainments. For one, we say, God forbid the "eternal progression" of the animal kingdom! "Mind is" *not* "the perfection of the three preceding," kingdoms, mineral, vegetable, and animal, as Mr. S. affirms. *Mind* is the result of *organization*. We now speak of the *mind of man*. It is not true, as Mr. S. would have us believe, that "mind is the perfection of the three preceding kingdoms, so that they become *individualized* into a conscious, intelligent spirit, *corresponding in its elements with the elements in the essence of the first producing cause*," WHICH IS GOD HIMSELF. We say, this is not true; for, first, as we have already stated, mind is not the perfection of the Mineral, Vegetable and Animal king-

doms: and, secondly, Mr. S. *does not know* "THE ELEMENTS OF THE ESSENCE OF THE FIRST PRODUCING CAUSE;" and, consequently, cannot determine whether "the elements" of the mind of man, "correspond with the elements of the essence of the first producing cause!" From the preceding, the reader may judge upon what a shallow hypothesis Mr. Sunderland "infers this *progressive, unending existence of the human spirit!*" Again, Mr. S. says, "The laws by which Spirit is *developed* and *individualized*, are eternal, and, consequently, as long as those laws exist, spirit must exist. "The laws" by which the human mind is "*developed*," are *organic laws*; and are these "eternal" in relation to *mortal man*? Dissolve the organization, and where is the mind? The fact is, Mr. Sunderland has become entangled in the meshes of a vain philosophy—a philosophy, falsely so called; and nothing but a careful study of God's word can extricate him from the difficulty.

Mr. S. says again, "And yet persons who believe in the Divine Essence, tell us that *spirits* are to be annihilated!" We repudiate the use of such terms as "divine essence," and the "annihilation of *spirits*." They are not in the Book, and form no part of our Theology. Again, he says, "But God works by laws; and his laws are universal, invariable, and eternal." *Good!*—*The Revealed laws of God* are "invariable, and eternal," and, consequently, the "end" of some is "destruction,"—a death ending in death; because they violate his "invariable" and "eternal laws." "God only hath" inherent "immortality"—He is the source—the fountain of it; and he will bestow it upon none but the obedient. "The wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life, THROUGH JESUS CHRIST OUR LORD."

J. T. W.

PHRENOLOGY.

MR. FOWLER—SPIRITUALISM.

Having been a believer in the philosophy of phrenological science for many years, as well as a constant reader of the American Phrenological Journal, we have seen much in that work to admire; and it is with no little regret that we feel called upon by TRUTH to oppose anything coming from Mr. Fowler's racy pen. But the position Mr. F. occupies, as well as the influence he wields in the phrenological world, demands that, however much we may respect him, we should oppose what we believe to be at war with the philosophy of mind and the teaching of the Holy Scriptures. We have read, time and again, articles on marvellousness, or what Mr. F. calls "spirituality," from the pen of this gentleman, and lamented that he did not understand the subject before him; but an article in the December number of his journal, determined our mind, and we resolved at once to make an effort to set him right on the subject indicated. And we now proceed to redeem the pledge.

1. Let us first examine Mr. Fowler's definition of *marvellousness*. Here it is: "*Intuition; Faith; Prescience; spiritual perception of Truth, what is best, what is about to transpire; the "inner light;" perception and feeling of the spiritual; credulity; belief in the superhuman; and trust in divine guidings.*"

Here, then, we have Mr. Fowler's definition of the organ, or rather function of marvellousness, as large as life. But by what means he gets at the "intuition," or the "prescience" of this organ, we

are not informed. He makes it an *intellectual* organ, and endows it with "spiritual perception!" He says, it sees "what is best," and perceives "what is about to transpire." He calls it the "inner light," and says it gives the "perception and feeling of the spiritual." All this will do very well for *assertion*, but where is the proof? This, Mr. F. has failed to give us. We are perfectly satisfied that *Faith*, and FAITH only, is the legitimate *function* of marvellousness; and that all the wild and extravagant things ascribed to it by Mr. Fowler, are palpable *abuses* of it, and have no more foundation in truth than the vagaries of Swedenborg. Marvellousness does not belong to the intellectual department of the brain, much less is it a *perceptive* faculty. It gives the power—the tendency—the disposition to believe, but does not foresee, nor predict, future events. It is *sentimental* in its character, and acts in harmony with the moral and intellectual powers. Man can *rationally* believe nothing without evidence. Where testimony begins, faith begins; and where testimony ends, faith ends. And where testimony and faith terminate, SUPERSTITION, with all its wild, unintelligible foolery, begins. The following is the order of its development: 1st, Credulity; 2d, Faith; 3d, Superstition; the latter of which is an abuse of marvellousness.

"Large spirituality," says Mr. F., "*perceives and knows things INDEPENDENTLY of the SENSES or intellectual faculties.*" Mr. F. has here left all philosophy, common sense, reason and revelation, far behind, toiling after him in vain! "*Perceives and knows things independently of the senses?*" Independently of the "intellectual faculties?" Mr. Fowler's marvellousness is by far too large. This declaration savors more of superstition than of sound philosophy. Could the deaf and dumb have *correct "perceptions"* and "knowledge" of things "spiritual," "independently of the senses, or intellectual faculties?" Let the thousand and one *mutes*, that have been taught *how* to "perceive" and to "know," by means of the "senses" and "intellectual faculties," reply!

But, Mr. Fowler continues: "Small spirituality—*believes only on actual evidence.*" To be sure it does; and may we not add, that *marvellousness, legitimately exercised, never does believe except upon "actual evidence?"* God save me from the testimony of the man, who can believe *without evidence!*

But, Mr. Fowler did not learn all these wild notions from phrenology, for they are not in it, and, consequently, could not come out of it. His mind has been corrupted by popular theology! Hence, he says, "That man is endowed with an *immaterial principle—an undying soul—which sees and knows* by intuition, irrespective of material eyes or reason, is to many an experimental reality—a *conscious fact!*" Again, he says, "But for it (spirituality) the idea of God as a spirit, of the *immortality of the soul*, or of an *immaterial, disembodied spirit*, would have been absolutely impossible!"

Now, we ask Mr. Fowler, if his phrenology teaches the pagan notion of the "immortality of the soul!" Does it teach the doctrine of "an immaterial, disembodied spirit," or of an "undying soul?" If so, his phrenology is not our phrenology! Now, we affirm, and challenge Mr. Fowler to the proof, that these notions, which he has set forth as the teachings of phrenology, are not taught by the

science. They are the relics of Pagan philosophy. They are Platonic, and not Christian! Phrenology scouts them; and Revelation repudiates them!! Upon this subject Mr. Fowler is behind the age. He has suffered his overgrown marvellousness to lead him far beyond the confines of philosophy and common sense, and is lost amid the smoke and dust of the crumbling temple of pagan theology!

Phrenology teaches that the brain is the organ of the mind. Mind is developed through it; and when the brain is disorganized and resolved into dust, the mind is no more. That which is "immaterial" is nothing—it is a nonentity. And to affirm "immortality" of that which is "immaterial," is to affirm it of nothing! Mr. Fowler's "undyng soul," the Bible affirms, "shall die;" for "the soul that sinneth it shall die." And as for his "disembodied spirits," ten thousand of them might dance on the point of a needle, without being at all incommoded!

This making a *religious system* of Phrenology, my soul abhorreth. Phrenology is the only true science of the mind; but Mr. Fowler has made too much of it. It is so good, as absolutely to be good for nothing! Medicine, politics, religion, and everything else, must be made to bow before it! The Bible itself has been sacrificed at its shrine, as in the case before us, and many others we could mention.

At some future time we may go a little more into this subject. We only intended, on the present occasion, to give a check to the erratic imagination of friend Fowler. And we hope he will give it a careful perusal. We may have been severe; but we mean well, and hope Mr. F. will receive it accordingly.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

J. T. W.

PHILOSOPHY OF MAN.—NO. II.

By J. T. WALSH.

What Man lost by the Fall.

What, we ask, did man lose by Adam's sin? Did he lose immortality? No; for Adam had it not, but was himself a candidate for it. Did he lose life eternal? No; for Adam was not in possession of this. What then did he lose? We answer, most emphatically, he lost life. All that Adam lost the title to, viz.: immortality and eternal life, by transgression or disobedience, Adam himself and his posterity gain a title to, and finally get possession of, by obedience through Christ. Some have ignorantly supposed that Adam's sin exposed him to temporal and spiritual death, and to eternal torments. His transgression never did, and never could expose him to eternal torments in hell. For if it had thus exposed him, it would have rendered all his posterity obnoxious to the same punishment. Would God punish men, and infants too, eternally in hell torments, for an act which they never committed, over which they had no control, and in which they had no part or lot? It is a libel on the character of God. Infidelity, yea, Atheism itself, is more consistent than this diabolical representation of the great Jehovah. Man then lost his right and title to life by Adam; he lost his life, his very being, and nothing more. And all this is gained by the "second Adam," the

"Lord from heaven." And, now, his life, his being, can only be lost by his own disobedience in rejecting the Lord Jesus, who is our tree of life, who is the resurrection and the life eternal. "Blessed are they who do his commandments, that they (but not others) may have a right (a title) to the tree of life." What, now, we ask, becomes of the doctrine of total depravity, and consequent infant damnation? It is not here—no place can be found for it—it has a name, but no habitation! "But," says one, "do not our children come into the world without the knowledge of God, and is not this total depravity?" We answer, our's necessarily come into the world without the knowledge of God, and if children had been born to Adam, before he fell, they, too, would necessarily have been without this knowledge until taught, and, therefore, in this sense equally depraved. "But," says another, "have we not inherited all of our diseases, physical, moral and mental, from Adam and Eve?" We give an unequivocal No! For, Adam's constitution knew nothing at all of the thousand and one diseases with which humanity is now afflicted. Whence, then, have they, and do they come? We answer, they have been superinduced by an habitual and perpetual violation of the organic and physiological laws of our nature—laws which Adam never violated. God never intended that man should drag out a miserable existence here, but that he should live to a good old age, be happy while he lived, and finally wear out and drop into the grave, covered with honor and filled with peace. Those persons who charge all the ills, afflictions, &c., around us to the first sin, charge God with folly. "Why so?" Because the penalty of that law was death, one death, and not one thousand, which hundreds and thousands of our race suffer before they actually die. Many a fond mother has charged her own sins and misdeeds upon God, when she has had to follow a beloved child to the charnel house of the dead; when, if the truth was known and told, she, and she alone, is the guilty one. In fact, we have no reason to believe that God ever intended that an infant should die while such! O! the folly—the madness—the insanity of mortals! When? O! when will they learn wisdom? To sustain the doctrine of the Universalist, it would be necessary to prove that all men are condemned to the pains of hell forever on account of Adam's sin. But, when we view the whole matter in its true light, and see man, who was condemned to death in Adam, adjudicated to life by obedience through our Lord Jesus Christ, we have no difficulty in understanding how God is the Saviour of all men, although multitudes will die "the second death;" not, however, in consequence of Adam's sin, but of their own wilful rebellion, and that alone. Herein, also, do we see how strictly and emphatically true it is, that Christ is the "life of men?" Since the race forfeited life in Adam, and by his offence, no man has ever breathed one breath of life, whether temporal, spiritual, or eternal, but in and through the "second Adam," "who is the Lord from heaven."

Thus, we see how the death of Christ has been undervalued—They have ascribed to man an "immortal soul," and told us that it could not die. But if it be true, and true it is, that, since the race forfeited life in Adam, no man has ever breathed one breath of life, whether temporal, spiritual, or eternal, but in and through the second Adam;

then, the doctrine that man has an "immortal soul," which cannot, and does not die, is a fiction, a real tradition of paganism. This doctrine is calculated to underrate, to undervalue the death of Christ, and ascribes that to an "immortal soul" which really and positively belongs to the "second Adam, the Lord from heaven." Indeed, if man has an immortal soul, we do not see any possible escape from the deistical notion that Adam's sin exposed him and his posterity to the pains of hell forever! For our first parents would have died, and if they had an immortal soul, that of course, no matter what became of the body, would have suffered hell torments forever, if the popular view be correct! We do hope, for the sake of truth, that our opponents will undertake to show us how this result can be otherwise than true upon the hypothesis that man has an immortal soul!

That man is a physical, moral, and mental being, we have before shown, and this, therefore, will not be argued now. But what do we understand by his physical nature? We understand that he is an organized being, consisting of bones, muscles, nerves, brain, flesh, blood, &c. What do we understand by his moral nature? We understand, by his moral nature, those powers, or faculties of the human mind, which constitute him an accountable being. Such are the following: Conscience, or conscientiousness, the sense of justice, of right and wrong, &c. Benevolence, faith, or marvellousness, which gives the tendency to believe. Hope, or the desire and expectation of future good. The sentiment of veneration, which gives the tendency to adore, &c. We understand by man's intellectual powers, those faculties of the mind which reason, perceive, compare, judge, &c. Man, then, differs from the inferior animals in the following particulars:

1. Man was made in the image of God—the beasts were not.
2. Man was neither mortal nor immortal, but susceptible of either; and the beasts were mortal.
3. His intellectual faculties are more numerous, and of a more exalted and refined character than theirs.
4. He has some mental powers which they have not.
5. He has a moral nature, which they have not.
6. He is a responsible, accountable being, and they are not.
7. He is susceptible of immortality and eternal life, and they are not.
8. He has the gift of speech, which they do not possess.
9. He will be raised from the dead, and the beasts, so far as we learn, will not.
10. He is the subject of rewards and punishments, and they are not.

The principal items of resemblance are the following:

1. Both have animal bodies.
2. Both have souls—see Gen. i. 20.
3. Both have spirits—see Eccle. iii. 21.

UNIVERSALISM.

The following occurrence speaks volumes as to the power of truth to "stop the mouths" of Universalists. The "Non-Universalist" is a resident of

New York city; well known as a most kind and Christian man. He was a few years ago convinced of the truth—"All the wicked will God destroy." A short time since he sent the following article to the "New York Christian Messenger," a Universalist paper.

MR. EDITOR:—There is one argument, which, with my present views, seems to conflict severely with the doctrine of Universalism, vindicated in your paper, and I have no recollection of having seen or heard it answered at all. If, therefore, you will now answer it as conclusively as I admit, you *have* frequently exposed the fallacy of the doctrine of *Endless Torment*, I know not of another so powerful an argument against becoming a Universalist myself. The argument is simply this:

The Scriptures appear abundantly to prove that unbelieving men, dying in their sins, are not to be immortal, *i. e.*, that they are not to *live* for ever at all; neither in endless bliss nor endless misery.

Should it please you to give this argument a fair answer, as I doubt not you will, if you answer it, and in your next paper, by proving, or attempting to prove, *directly*, that the *souls* or *bodies* of *all* men will *live* for ever, in some supposed condition, it would please me to give your arguments a fair examination, and then to inform you, if I am satisfied therewith, or give you my reasons for it, if I am not.

Yours, respectfully,

A NON-UNIVERSALIST.

The "Messenger," instead of attempting an answer to this plain statement of Bible truth, resorts to the following expedient, which is found in that paper of Dec. 11th, 1847.

"Our unknown correspondent, a 'Non-Universalist,' is informed that we cannot comply with his request till we have his name. We always suspect those individuals who prefer darkness to light, and therefore must decline having anything to do with anonymous communications."

Reply to the "Messenger," sent Dec. 16, 1847, but not noticed by that paper.

MESSRS. EDITORS:—I am not surprised at your refusal to publish the argument sent you, of the non-immortality of the wicked, which was brought against Universalism, though your alleged reason for declining it was unexpected. I had imagined that your principal objection would be the difficulty of answering it to your own satisfaction, and your manner of disposing of it confirms the opinion. I have long supposed that names and characters of private individuals were not necessary for public advocates of any peculiar doctrine, in their publicly defending it, when assailed, and in a spot or point, too, previously undefended, as in this case. And as to your having my name, by which to publish and answer the argument, probably you are aware that inasmuch as the argument also assails your opponents' views, called the orthodox, a private individual would naturally feel averse to the personal hostilities he might expect from publishing his name under such circumstances. Joseph of Arimathea was afraid of the Jews for a while, though afterward, in perilous times, he boldly came forward. And as the case now stands, I am the more opposed to being made public in your

paper, from the fact of your having already commenced personalities, in classing me with "those individuals who prefer darkness to light." But there would be no objection to your having my name now, *confidentially*, and to be made public, should I hereafter so attack men's persons in this matter as to deserve a public chastening. To conclude: as the case is now, I appeal to the general usages of editors, whether you have, or have not, honourably acquitted yourselves as Christians and public defenders of the Holy Scriptures, in thus far suppressing the scriptural argument in question, instead of publishing and answering it directly, and as conclusively as it might be done in your opinion.

Yours, A NON-UNIVERSALIST.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, FEBRUARY, 1848.

BIBLE EXAMINER.—Our readers will see that we have given them about one quarter more matter in this number than in the last, by using smaller type. This course, if continued, will increase our expenses much above our original estimate; but the expressions of satisfaction with the January number, and the help sent us, has induced us to increase the amount of matter thus early, in the belief that the Providence of God, through our friends, will supply us with the requisite funds. We trust none will fail of doing whatever they think the cause of truth demands to sustain us. It will be seen, by our terms, that any person who sends us four new subscribers, with the cash, \$2.00, will be entitled to the fifth copy without charge. We have received over one hundred subscribers monthly, for the last two months. All new subscribers will be supplied from the commencement of the present volume, unless they order otherwise, which we hope they will not do till we give notice that we cannot furnish the first numbers.

Our absence to Brooklyn, N. Y., and other engagements, have prevented us, personally, from furnishing much matter for the present number, but our lack of service is well supplied by our brother "ASSISTANT," and others. We intended an article on the "sixty-two weeks" of Dan. 9th, but must defer it. We had also prepared extracts from several letters which are crowded out.

COMMENTARY LETTERS:—We have our full share of such letters, but our friends must excuse us for not publishing all they say in our favour. It savours too much of self-praise, and indicates that self-esteem is largely developed, to see an editor filling up much space with such letters; and, after all, adds nothing to the popularity of his labours. For private use such letters are comforting, and we thank our friends for them. We occasionally give

extracts from them, but entirely disapprove of it, as a general thing. We had rather publish censure of ourselves than praise: the latter puffs up, the former humbles; and we have all more need of humility than pride.

OUR FRIENDS will forgive us for having said any thing in our December number, in *self defence* against an attack upon our veracity. Any *religious* paper that can stoop to make a personal attack upon the character of a brother, without ever having taken one gospel step with the supposed offender, and then refuse or neglect to correct the erroneous charge, when clearly pointed out, we shall strive to let pass in future. All will understand the reason. Let our opponents give us *argument* and we will meet them; if they give us personal abuse we will try to be silent, and leave our Master to vindicate us.

TO BE REMEMBERED:—Phrases used by our Lord and his apostles on the end of the wicked are:—First, *Literal*: Such as *die, death, perish, destroy, destroyed, &c.* Second, *Figurative*: these are always to be explained by the *literal*, and not the literal by the figurative. The literal are *plain and positive*: not *preservation* in any condition, but *destruction, death, &c.*, See Matt. 10: 28. The immortal soul theorists always reverse this order: they explain the literal by the figurative, and that leads straight down the road to spiritualism, and every other fanciful delusion. If such persons cry out against spiritualizers, they only condemn themselves; for they have laid the foundation, and others have built thereon.

IS THE DEVIL A FRIEND?

So some intimate. *To whom?* All the saints that die, to be sure! Who says so? The Bible, certainly! That is, if we believe what the defenders of the immortal soul theory say. Mr. "Winslow on the doctrines of Christianity," speaking of the "Intermediate state between death and the resurrection," says:—

"We wish to know, when death shall come to stare us in the face, and lay on us his icy fingers, what he is commissioned to do with us; whether to hand us over to the warm embrace of our Saviour, and the sweet fellowship of angel-spirits, or consign our panting spirits for unknown ages to the horrible gloom of annihilation."

Here is a very strong insinuation that "death is commissioned to hand us over to the warm embrace of our Saviour, and the sweet fellowship of angel-spirits." As the "Devil" has "the power of death" [see Heb. 2: 14,] he must "commission death to do" whatever it does; consequently, if Mr. Winslow is correct, the devil is indeed a kind friend to the saints! However, Peter represents the matter in a

different light. He says, "Your adversary the devil walketh about seeking whom he may devour:" 1 Peter 5: 8. Mr. Winslow and his coadjutors represent, unintentionally of course, the devil as the great benefactor of the saints! Truly "Christ and Belial" seem to have some "concord," if one receives and the other commissions death to "hand over the saints to the warm embrace of our Saviour!"

Mr. Winslow says:—

"The position which I am to demonstrate is this—*That between death and the resurrection, the souls of men, disembodied, are in a state of living, active, conscious existence, enjoying or enduring the retributions of eternity.*"

That position we should like to see "demonstrated," if it can be done. If no writer has come nearer to it than anything we have seen from Mr. W.'s pen, we are quite sure it does not begin to be demonstrated. Will the learned gentlemen be kind enough to give us a little light on his discovery that the Bible teaches that any body "*endures the retributions of ETERNITY?*" The phrase "eternity" occurs but once in our translation of the Bible, viz., Isaiah, 57: 15, and is there applied to "the high and lofty one." As to a sinner's ever "going into eternity," we have yet to learn that the Scriptures warrant any such doctrine. When "dead" they "know not any thing," when raised from the dead they are judged and condemned to the "second death;" then they are "destroyed forever;" Psal. 92: 7; "Burned up, root and branch;" Mal. 4: 1; "Consumed into smoke;" Psal. 37: 20: "*Both soul and body destroyed;*" Matt. 10: 28.

"POWER OF CHURCHES."

BROTHER STORRS:—Will you allow me to present to your mind a few remarks on your objections to Br. Goodell's views of the power and right of churches?

Br. G. claims that churches have the same right as other volunteer associations to reject persons applying for membership. You object to "the idea of likening the church of God to any other associations." I understand Br. G.'s comparison refers simply to the right of receiving and rejecting members. If the church possesses this right, as I believe, there can be no solid objection to the comparison thus far. I understand you, however, to deny that the churches possess this right. You remark, "if the Lord has added a man to his church, shall man, or any body of men, take upon themselves to attempt to thrust that man out of the church of God?" Now, brother, although this question is most forcible to condemn those who reject the very persons whom they acknowledge to be true christians, it has no force in respect to the claim and right of every church to judge *whom the Lord has added to his church and whom he has not, and to receive and reject accordingly.*

It is true indeed that no body of men have any right to institute any other organization of the christian church than that which is found in the New Testament. But that very organization re-

quires the exercise of the right of judging of the characters of men, whether they are such as the Lord has received, or whether they are such as the word of truth declares have no inheritance in the kingdom of God.

You remark, "I had as lief ask admission to the Church of Rome, as to any other church that claims the right to decide that I may be a member or not." Now, I ask, if you and your associated brethren do not claim this very right? If not, I think that your association is in a fair way to become quite as worthy of the appellation of a synagogue of Satan as of that of a christian church. But do you not in fact claim the right to decide that unrighteous and ungodly men, who have no inheritance in the kingdom of God, shall not be members of your christian association or church? You indeed will not reject any whom you believe "that Christ has received." So, I understand, Br. G. will say. You both, however, claim the right of judging of the evidences of christian character, and of the validity of the claim of individuals to the possession of those evidences.

You say, "Let both grow together till the harvest." Grow *where*, brother? Not in the church, but in the world. They are to grow together "*in the field.*" "The field is the world." Matt. 13: 38. If "the tares," "the children of the wicked one," are to be permitted to grow with "the good seed," "the children of the kingdom" in the church, you are in error yourself in saying that "men may and ought to be rejected from christian fellowship for practices clearly condemned by the bible."

While I claim for myself and allow to others the individual right of judgment in respect to what constitutes christian character, and whom we will fellowship or not as such, I believe that Br. Goodell errs in one important respect, viz., in making more essential, in doctrine, to constitute christian character, than the word of the Lord warrants.* Consequently, he falls into the serious evil of rejecting those whom the Lord receives.

Truly yours in christian love,
HENRY GREW.

REPLY TO BR. GREW.

Our brother admits, in the first part of his article, nearly all we contend for. To his inquiry whether we and our associated brethren do not claim the right to decide that a particular person may be a member or not of the church, the answer is: We neither claim nor exercise any such right, for the plain reason that we believe the Head of the Church has forbidden us to do so; but we do claim and exercise the right to fellowship or not fellowship any person, according as the evidence appears to our individual minds for or against that particular person. We warn all, that "the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God"—that he who "eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself," not to the Church: we caution all, "Let a man *examine himself*, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup." Not, let the Church examine him. We warn the

* I understand that Br. G. will not fellowship any one as a christian who believes the words of Jesus Christ, "My Father is greater than I," unless he at the same time believes that Christ is as great as his Father!

Church herself, at her peril, not to interfere between an individual soul and its Judge in this matter. Christ has not made his Church responsible for those that eat the Lord's supper unworthily, if it discharge its duty in warning the wicked. Our Lord himself had with him, "on the table," when he instituted the supper, "the hand" of one who had betrayed him; see Luke 22: 19—21. Those organizations that claim and exercise the right to determine, authoritatively, who shall or shall not be members of the Church, are quite as likely to become "synagogues of Satan" as we who claim no such right.

But, says our brother,—“You claim the right of judging of the evidences of christian character, and of the validity of the claim of individuals to the possession of these evidences.” True: and we withhold or extend *fellowship* accordingly. But to be *members* of the Church of Christ is another and a very different matter. None but God can make such membership. No evidence appears to our mind, in the Bible, that any church ever assumed the right to make members. The idea that churches have that power, we believe, has led to all the *religious* persecutions since the days that Papacy had being.

Br. Grew quoting from my previous article,—“Let both grow together till the harvest”—asks, “Where, brother?” Our Saviour answers for me, “Among the wheat.” not simply in “the world.” Our Lord, we apprehend, never supposed his followers would attempt to kill the wicked out of the world. Br. Grew's argument seems to imply that he thinks our Saviour supposed his followers might attempt to destroy the wicked out of the world. We think he saw the effort that would be made by fallible men to keep his church *pure*, and that in their zeal to do so they would be as likely to “root up the wheat” as the tares. He therefore restricted his people to the work of proclaiming the *truths* of the word of God and the Gospel of the Kingdom, with directions to leave the *winnowing* process to him “whose fan is in his hand.”

Many of his professed followers have lost sight of their appropriate work and set themselves to making and unmaking *church members*. This has kindled the fires of persecution in the sectarian divisions into which the Church of Christ has been rent. More strife and contention has resulted from this course than from all other causes. They all profess to have the noble object to keep the church *pure*. “Wilt thou,” say they, “that we go and gather up the tares?” Without waiting for the Master's answer, they hasten to use their wisdom to remove the tares from “among the wheat.” The Master cries, “Nay: lest while ye gather up the tares ye root up the wheat also with them. Let both grow *together* until the harvest. In the *time of the harvest* I will say to the reapers, Gather ye together first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them; but gather the wheat into my barn.” “No,” the sectarian churches cry, “we will have a pure church now: the tares shall not grow ‘among the wheat’ till the harvest.” Thus, in disobedience to the Master, they set themselves to work, and as often bring tares into their churches and root out wheat from among them as otherwise. How can this but be the case? The best among them are fallible men, and often blinded by prejudices of which they themselves are not aware.

Let the followers of our Lord content themselves

to proclaim the truth of God's word, according to their best understanding of it, and leave that truth to work the *purity* of men.” “Sanctify them through thy truth,” prayed the Son of God, and added—“Thy word is truth.” He did not pray—sanctify them by church organizations, and so keep my church *pure*. He knew too well that no such organization ever would exist, till he come again, that would be competent to make or keep his church *pure*: he saw there would be a mixture of “tares among the wheat” till the end of the age, and warned his servants against attempts of their own to separate them from among the wheat any farther than the preaching of God's truth would produce such separation, by driving away such as could not endure sound doctrine.

Br. Grew says: “If ‘the tares’—‘the children of the wicked one,’ are to be permitted to grow with ‘the good seed’—‘the children of the kingdom’ *in the church*, you are in error yourself in saying that men may and ought to be rejected from christian fellowship for *practices* clearly condemned by the bible.”

I have not said that the tares are to be permitted to grow “in the church;” nor do I believe they do grow in the Church of Christ; but, they do grow “among the wheat;” but though they are among the wheat, they are not *in* the Church of our Lord's building: they are, indeed, in the sectarian churches, and the more the sects attempt to root them up the more they multiply: and no wonder, for those churches are not identical with the Church of Christ, and are trying to do a work which our Lord forbid.

Our view of the matter is this: When a professed Christian is guilty of a “*practice* clearly condemned by the Bible,” he, by that act puts himself out of the true church, or is excluded by the Head of the Church, *authoritatively*; *i. e.*, by the word of truth; and the witness of the Spirit is withdrawn from him. The Church, individually, then regards that person according to the evidence he manifests to them of the fact that he has lost his membership: if that evidence is clear to each individual, they, individually, withdraw fellowship from him: not to do so would be, themselves, to lose fellowship with Christ. The true Church of Christ have no power to receive *members* into that body; nor have they any to “root out” members *authoritatively*: its Lord has entrusted it with no such power; and has warned it against the exercise of such power in the very parable before us. Br. Grew's mistake is in supposing that some such “organizations must exist as are called churches in these days, in which the “man of sin” has power over the saints and “prevails against them;” and will continue to do so “until the time comes that the saints possess the kingdom.” These sectarian organizations are the master-piece of deception, to carry out the determination to “root up the tares” in opposition to the command of the Head of the Church. If we mistake not, Br. Grew himself has been the victim of this sectarian despotism. We think, however, in his case, the wheat was, as is often the case, rooted up instead of the tares. But how else could the sectarian church maintain its existence? It *makes* church members and *un-makes* them according to its will or judgment, fallible as it is. In this city, three or four years ago, a Baptist Church published its act in excluding some dozen *members* from their body for a change

of sentiment, and concluded by saying:—"It is due to the excluded brethren to say, that the Church believes them to be *good Christians*." Thus, according to their own confession, they rooted up the wheat. Surely those "brethren" ought to rejoice that they are out of *such a church*.

BROOKLYN N. Y.—The Editor of the Examiner spent two Sabbaths, and the week intervening, in that city, and preached twelve times. He had an attentive and candid hearing, and trusts that much good will be the result of his visit there. The friends subscribed nobly for the Examiner, and otherwise contributed to help us, for which they have our most hearty thanks.

The "*Six Sermons*," can be had, by the friends in that immediate vicinity, of Brother James Mortimer, 82 Fulton St., also, Brother Walsh's "*Aspects of Phrenology on Revelation*," &c.

Post Offices must be looked after by our subscribers. Some connected with those establishments seem to think our paper so good they cannot deliver it. Considerable complaint has been made to us in this matter.

THE AGE TO COME. INQUIRIES AND REPLY.

We totally disapprove the practice of appending *notes of interruption* to communications; and are resolved never more to practice it. Let a writer say what he wishes, and then reply. The following letter of inquiry from Br. Bell, Weed's Port, N. Y., and the reply by Dr. Thomas, are both interesting:—

BR. BELL'S LETTER OF INQUIRY.

BR. STORRS:—In perusing your valuable paper, I find much to admire, many new and pleasing ideas advanced, as well as some that I am not fully prepared to endorse, at present. The idea that the wicked are not immortal, and that they will be finally destroyed after the last resurrection and final judgment, appears to me to be both rational and Scriptural, as well as being more in conformity with the character and government of a both just and merciful God, than that of endless existence in misery. Your views of the sleep of the dead, and the intermediate state, &c., I am not fully satisfied with, as yet; but of their correctness or incorrectness I shall say nothing at present.

There have been some ideas advanced in some of your selected articles, in regard to the future age, the next dispensation, or the Millenium, which I wish to notice—not for argument's sake, but for the sake of information or further light on those very interesting and important subjects. You will recollect that in an article from the editor of the "*Herald of the Future Age*," No. 9 of your paper, (a very able and well written piece,) in speaking of the Messiah's kingdom, which he says is soon to be introduced or set up, he denominates it "an indestructible kingdom, and that those who are appointed to its honours, dignities, offices, &c., in the beginning of it, will retain them as long as it lasts; and as it is everlasting, it is very obvious

that flesh and blood, or mortal men cannot inherit it." Again, he states "that it is to absorb all other kingdoms, and to exist as a new dispensation for a thousand years; and that before the saints can possess the kingdom, they must arise from among the dead; or if any such be living, that they must be changed from flesh and blood, which is corruptible, into flesh and spirit, a combination which is indestructible and deathless." Now, that the dead saints will rise, and that those among the living that are found worthy, will be changed, I have no doubt; but he intimates that none will live on the earth, or exist during that age, or dispensation, but immortals, or such as have, either by the resurrection or transformation, passed from a state of corruptibility to a state of indestructibility. Now, if these things are so, I must acknowledge that I have misunderstood the literal interpretation of the Scriptures; and with all due deference to the opinion and abilities of the author, I will here propose a few questions for your explanation.

And 1st. I would inquire, if none but the immortal saints are to exist on the earth during the Millenium, or reign of Christ a thousand years, who are the saints to reign over? for, he admits (as Paul declares) that the "saints shall reign as kings, and officiate as priests in the new imperial monarchy to be founded by Christ." Can we suppose they are to reign over one another? or would it not be more reasonable, as well as more in accordance with the numerous predictions of the Prophets, and declarations of the Apostles, that they will be heirs and joint-heirs with Christ in his reign over the remnant of the Jews and those that are left of the nations of the earth in the flesh, which will, at the commencement, or during that dispensation, be converted to Christ, through their ministrations and agency?

Again, I inquire: is there much force in the argument that attempts to prove that none can exist in the mortal state, during that dispensation, because that the reign of Christ and his saints is said to be everlasting? Is not this reign or dispensation confined and limited to a thousand years? And may not the age of men in the flesh, when Satan is bound, the curse, with the causes of sin and death removed from the earth, live even a thousand years? Once more, I inquire: if none are to exist in the flesh, who are those that Satan is to deceive at the end of the thousand years? Is it possible that he can deceive the immortal saints that have dwelt and reigned a thousand years with Christ on the earth, and they thus become subjects of destruction, when they are already both "indestructible and deathless"? Or, must we be driven to the very inconsistent conclusion of Mr. Miller, that they will consist of the wicked *dead* after the last and final resurrection!

There is one idea more I wish to notice, contained in the very excellent article on "*The Millenium and New Jerusalem contrasted*," by Wm. Ramsey. Near the conclusion of his article, he says that in the "fifth or Millennial dispensation, the Messiah, as the Son of David, shall reign in humanity over this world." He also says that "the dead saints will be raised, and be associated with Christ in his reign during the thousand years; but they will probably be invisible to those in the flesh." Now, here I have another question to ask: Have we not just as much reason to suppose that the saints will be visible, as that Christ will be

visible? And if the saints are not to be visible, have we not reason to fear that Christ's reign will not be either visible or personal, but spiritual? for we are told, that where he is they shall be; they shall see him as he is, and be like him. Does not this idea savour too much of the spiritualists' mode of interpretation? Please answer these inquiries, and thus oblige an anxious inquirer after truth.

ISAAC BELL.

BR. THOMAS' REPLY TO BR. BELL.

THE SOCIAL BASIS IN THE AGE TO COME.

BR. STORRS:—A letter from an intelligent correspondent, addressed to you, and signed "Isaac Bell," is before me, and to which, at your request, I offer the following explanation. I would remark summarily, that there is no difference at all between my views and Mr. Bell's on the subject of his letter. The difficulty in his mind which has created the misunderstanding specified in his epistle, I perceive to be, a want of distinct apprehension of the difference between *INHERITING the Kingdom and being a SUBJECT of the Kingdom*. I quoted Paul, that "flesh and blood, or mortal men, cannot inherit the Kingdom," from which he infers that I teach, that "flesh and blood" cannot be the subjects thereof, and consequently "intimate that none will live on the earth, or exist during that Age (the Future) or Dispensation, but immortals, or such as have either by the Resurrection or Transformation passed from a state of corruptibility to a state of indestructibility;" hence, with this supposition before him, he very pertinently inquires, if there be no mortals then on earth, "who are the saints to reign over?" This reminds me of a similar question I put to one of Mr. Miller's friends, a preacher, at a big meeting in Aurora, Indiana, in 1843, I think it was. He had preached the *dogma* (for it is certainly not *doctrine*) that all the wicked would be burned up when Christ came—not one of them be left on earth—and then the saints would possess the Kingdom under the whole heaven. "If this be so," said I, "who are the saints to reign over?" "Oh," said he, "it will be Paradise restored, and as Adam reigned over the beasts, so will the saints reign over them likewise!" "Indeed," I rejoined, "that is very curious: does not the Scripture say, that 'to him that overcomes I will give power over the Nations, and he shall rule them;' will you please inform me at what epoch God distributed them [the beasts—*c. s.*] into nations, and determined the bounds of their habitation?" This *reductio ad absurdum* put an end to further conversation on the subject.

At the same meeting, another preacher had affirmed, that, when Christ came death would be abolished; the inference from which was, that immortals only would dwell on earth for the ensuing 1000 years. Really, sir, said I, that is a very singular speculation in face of the "testimony," that, under the New Heavens and New Earth, when Jerusalem shall be a rejoicing and her people a joy, "the child shall die a hundred years old;" and "the sinner being 100 years old shall be accursed." Here childhood, sin and death, are set forth as existing in Israel, the most favoured nation of the Future Age, when the Lord rejoices in Jerusalem and joys in his people; will they not also obtain throughout the globe? Sinners a hundred

years old in the Land of Israel and no death! how do you reconcile this with Paul's saying, that "the wages of sin is death?" But he turned away, and did not vouchsafe to answer.

I mention these incidents to show that I have always maintained the ground, ever since I turned my attention to the subject, that there will be parentage, sin and death, under Messiah's *personal* and only reign upon the earth. The expectation of possessing a share in a Kingdom and Empire without subjects, or of reigning, like a drover, over quadrupeds, as the dominion of the Future Age, is no part of my Hope, or understanding of the Law and the Testimony.

To inherit, or possess, an estate or thing, is a very distinct idea from that of being a part of the thing inherited. A Russian nobleman inherits an estate in which are included the serfs or slaves upon the soil; he becomes the head or chief, but he is not, therefore, any part thereof. The serfs work the land, they minister to his necessities, and his enjoyments, but they do not, therefore, inherit or possess. If they hold any portion of the soil, it is only as *tenants at will*,—until death or the will of their lord ejects them. So, in the Future Age, the Saints are the Noblemen—the Aristocracy of the World—who derive the patents of nobility from God. They inherit or possess all terrestrial things in a royal copartnery with Jesus, who is the Chief of the Inheritors. "The meek shall inherit the earth," and "the saints shall rule the world," and command the services of the Heavenly Host. The nations will be their serfs—first subjugated by violence, then yielding a willing and grateful service until seduced by Satan from their allegiance—inherited by virtue of their divine right to the soil of Palestine and the secondary dominion of the earth attached. Hence, the basis of the social fabric of the Future Age or Dispensation of the Fulness of the Appointed Times, or world to come, of 1000 years' continuance—the true INTERMEDIATE STATE; a state *intermediate between* the Times of the Gentiles and the Third, or Eternal Heaven—the basis of society in the coming age is the fruition of a convulsion by which every principality, power and dominion, whether monarchy, empire, or republic, now extant upon the globe, will be demolished and forever abolished:—by which nobles, princes, kings, emperors, popes, priests, clergy, presidents, governors, office holders, fleets and armies, will be suppressed, leaving only an undistinguished and headless multitude, which "shall wait for His law," who shall "bind their Kings with chains, and their Nobles with fetters of iron." He will appoint "princes throughout all the earth."—Ps. 45: 16. These princes are "the children of the Promise;" become the sons of God by believing the promise made to the Fathers—"the things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the name of the Lord Jesus Christ;" and by such believers being immersed into the glorious name in hope of the things believed, even in full assurance of these and of those things affirmed concerning Jesus. Having thus "put on Christ" and being "Christ's" they are Abraham's seed (for it is the children of the promise—believers of the promise—that are counted for the seed) and heirs according to the promise." These sons of the Divine Father, and brethren of the eldest Son of God, having, like Him, become the sons of God with power, according to their holy, spiritual and

angelic nature, by a resurrection from the dead—will be distributed and appointed throughout the world as the undying and permanent successors of “*the powers that be.*” Is not this sufficiently plain to prevent future misapprehension?

Leaving Mr. Ramsey to extricate himself as he best can, from what appears to me his inextricable difficulty and most inexplicable speculation of an invisible saintly rule, I subscribe myself affectionately, your fellow servant in hope of ruling the subject nations with a strong sceptre, decorated with a crown of life and a robe of righteousness, with honour, immortality, and an eternal weight of glory in the Future Age.

JOHN THOMAS,
Editor Herald of the Future Age.
Richmond, Va., Dec 26, 1847.

SELECTED.

From the Truth Seeker.

FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

[Concluded.]

The fact is, that while the more Scholarly priests of the age know very well that in the Greek Scriptures there are *distinctions* not preserved in the translation, it would not do to let their ‘sheep’ into the secret, lest their control over them should be weakened. It is by a slavish ‘fear,’ not by a scriptural ‘faith,’ that they drive their flocks into their sectarian folds; and hence it is, that they dislike a truth-seeking Christian Re-storer, far more intensely than a sensualist, ‘whose god is his belly,’ or a mammon-worshipper, or even a downright Atheist. Such characters they will honour, and even associate with, in general society; but the pure-living, free-thoughted, and zealous-hearted New-Testament Christian, they will denounce, defame, and if possible destroy. If they cannot *burn* him, they will *starve* him; and if they cannot consume his carcase, they will calumniate his character.

Now, “O” is clearly the victim of the species of fraud to which we allude. He fancies that ‘Hell is a *place of torment*, and of the *second death.*’ He means of course, by Hell, some *place* represented by the Greek term translated ‘Hell,’ for the English word, from the Saxon, simply signifies a *Hole*. But, firstly, I beg to inform him, that the Greek ‘*Ades*’ does not denote ‘a *place of torment*,’ in a single literal passage; nay, that nine times out of eleven in which it occurs in the New Testament, it does not signify a ‘*place*’ at all, but a *state*! Secondly, I must remind “O,” that in jumbling together ‘Hell’ and ‘the *second death*,’ he is paying very little respect to the ‘plain declarations’ of that Scripture which he so gratuitously recommends *me* not to reject! In fact, in identifying the two, he acts just as absurdly as if he were to mistake the *pot* for the *potato*, or the *pan* for the *potage*! These, however, I have long since learnt, are distinctions very easily lost sight of by the disciples of the priests, whether of Rome, Oxford, or Homerton. Indeed they have acquired in perfection the old Pharisaic art of ‘straining out the gnats’ of Heresy, and ‘swallowing the camels’ of Orthodoxy! The Scripture says, that ‘the Devil was *cast into* the lake of fire;’ but surely the Devil was *not* the lake of fire? So with equal explicitness, Scripture affirms that, ‘Death and *Ades* were

cast into the lake of fire.’ Now, then, can ‘*Ades*, ‘the place of torment’ in Luke 16:28. be also the place *into which* it was itself cast? How can the contained be also the container? I leave “O” to reflect upon the problem at his leisure, only repeating his own question, ‘What meaning is there in these figures, if they do not show that Hell is’ nor ‘the place of the second death?’

The passage in Mark 9:46, is a quotation from (probably the Septuagint version of) the closing chapter of Isaiah. I will furnish “O” with a translation.

“22 For as the new Heaven and the new Earth, which I make, *REMAIN* (*meno*) before me, says the Lord, even so shall your seed and your name *CONTINUE* (*remor.*) 23 And it shall come to pass from month to month, and from sabbath to sabbath, that *ALL FLESH* shall come to worship before me in *Jerusalem*, says the Lord. 24 And they shall go *forth*, and *SEE THE CARCASSES* of the men that have transgressed against me: for their worm shall not die, and their fire shall not be quenched: and they shall be *an abhorring spectacle* to *ALL FLESH.*”

What the vulgar Christians of the day make of this I cannot tell. Surely they do not entertain the frightful fancy, that ‘the spirits of the just’ occasionally pass ‘the great gulf fixed’ between God’s Heaven and the fire-Hell, to look upon the resurrection ‘carcases’ of the wicked, broiling upon infernal gridirons? Such a spectacle is just what they represent the devils themselves to delight in; have the saints a similar taste? Yet if they do *not* believe this atrocity, what is the quotation to *their* purpose?

The *worm* and the *fire* are, with Isaiah, irresistible instruments of *DESTRUCTION*; one to consume the *flesh*, the other to calcine the *bones* of ‘the carcases;’ *why* should we suppose then, that Christ, ‘the Mercy-seat’ and Messiah of God, should convert them into instruments of *TORTURE*; instruments not only immortal *themselves*, but somehow *conferring immortality* upon the fuel they are said to destroy! Away with such wretched and contradictory ravings! For the honour of Christianity, let us have no more of them.

I shall not, here, show more fully what the passage really does mean; it is sufficient that I demonstrate that it does *not* denote ‘eternal torture.’

It is said, that the virtuous shall *remain* before the Lord: i. e. *continue*, with all their faithful seed, to *live in the conscious presence of their Creator*. But the transgressors will *not* continue; they will be utterly consumed, and therefore *CEASE*: or, in the accordant language of Paul, Sylvanus, and Timothy, they will be ‘*punished* with everlasting destruction *from the presence of the Lord.*’ Nothing shall finally *remain* of them, for even their ‘carcases’ will be fully consumed under the operation of the inextinguishable, because omnipotent, instrument of divine wrath.

Thus, then, the facts that this language is applied to judgments in ‘the flesh;’ that it has reference to feelings in the flesh, such as abhorrence, and to motives which only obtain in this disciplinary state; and that there is a *difference in duration* clearly expressed between the fate of those who shall *continue*, and those who shall *not*; of which ‘infinity’ does not admit: render the quotation incapable of proving ‘the *ever-lasting torment* of human souls.’

Similar language occurs in the Septuagint version of Isaiah 34: in a prophecy of the *earthly* desolation and *limited* doom of Idumea.

“8 For it is the day of the judgment of the Lord,

and the year of the recompense of Sion in judgment. 9 And her valleys shall be turned into pitch, and her land into sulphur; and her land shall be as pitch burning night and day. 10 And it shall never be quenched, and her smoke shall go up; it shall be made desolate throughout her generations. And for a long time birds and hedgehogs, and ibises and ravens, shall dwell in it."

The same language is employed by Christ, by Jude, and by the writer of the Apocalypse, and, I maintain, in the very same sense.

(4) In reply to the fourth argument, embodied in the question, 'How can ungodly men, if they cease to exist, dwell with the devil and his angels?' I reply, first, that their ceasing to exist now, neither excludes a future existence of limited suffering, nor includes a torment of infinite duration; second, that the Scripture does not affirm that men will dwell for ever with the devil [whatever He may represent,] 'cast into the lake of fire, WHICH IS THE SECOND DEATH'; hopeless and everlasting: on the contrary, Revelation and Reason alike inform us, what is the consequence of being cast into such a dreadful agent of DESTRUCTION. The wicked are consumed, killed in soul, burnt up, perish, and for ever. This is 'the second death'; for, indeed, 'who can dwell with the devouring fire?' 'who can dwell with everlasting burnings?' The terms are contradictory; the supposition an impossible absurdity.

(5) 'Ever-lasting punishment' MAY mean a never-ending punishment. In the case in question I have never said that it does not: the difference concerns the nature, not the duration, of the penalty of sin. But still it is an undoubted fact, that the terms translated 'for ever,' 'everlasting,' etc., do not necessarily and invariably mean eternal. The nature of the subject limits them; just as above, where I say—'I have never said.' This does not imply my 'eternal' existence, does it?

But do the promises of God really hang upon one phrase only? Is there such poverty of language in the Bible that we must have recourse to fallacy in order to hold fast to our 'immortal hope?' Not so! God has declared, in various phrase, that while the sinner must DIE, the righteous shall LIVE—shall NOT DIE. But even if He had not, the very nature of the case would lead infallibly to the inference. He who hath begun the good work, and given us the life of ages, will 'continue' that life in his presence, and the seed of virtue shall 'remain.' No one can pluck the good out of the Saviour's hand: 'neither can they die any more.' [Luke 20: 36.]

I have now passed in review the 'Scriptural reasons' of my brother Truth-Seeker, and shall be glad if my remarks at all aid him in his further search. My own impression is, that it is quite useless for him 'to multiply reasons,' since the number cannot make up for the badness of the nature. But, in truth, he has already advanced his 'strong reasons'; those behind can only fill up the gaps of the phalanx to the eye, without rendering the regiment stronger; they are like the drest-up clowns in a play, standing as a back-ground to the real Actors, but themselves taking no part in the performance: they have the soldier's coat, but not his courage!

"O" admits that my 'doctrine appears so agreeable to his fallen nature, that he should be glad to believe it true.' I can fully credit this statement. But does he not mistake the reason? Is it not his love of God and man that prompts to this faith? But fallen love, or depraved benevolence, are terms

I cannot comprehend; they do not consist together; it is not the fallen, but the unfallen principle of man's nature which renders a rational and loveable exhibition of the Divine character so pleasing; just as it is the selfish and gloomy pride of priests which makes so many of them delight in preaching 'the doctrine of devils,' and 'the torments of the damned.'

I have already shown that the proclamation of the doctrine of eternal destruction as the Divinely appointed punishment of the impenitent, did not produce the fruits of unrighteousness in the Church at Thessalonica, and I am not aware of its having ever done so since. On the contrary, while I know that the advocates of that doctrine in Britain and America, are amongst the most moral, truly pious, and virtueloving of mankind, I am equally persuaded that it is not so with the great mass of vulgar Christians. I do not believe that two-thirds of the professing Church are truly religious and converted characters. Cant phrases, outside formalities, fierce fanaticism, and all that can be simulated in religion, are visible enough; but self-denial, knowledge, temperance, charity—where are they? The 'religious world' is a huge sham, pervaded at heart with the persecuting, selfish, deceitful, and diabolical spirit of the old Pharisees. 'The Church,' in short, is a 'white-washed sepulchre,' notwithstanding your Evangelical Alliances, not a cleansed Temple for pure and loving souls. Of course, there are many individual exceptions—some Gamaliels and Josephs amid the mass—some grains of corn amongst the chaff. And this state is just what was predicted. Were Christ to return in person, as he has in spirit, he would scarcely find faith upon the earth. The reigning religion is a monstrous machinery of fashion, pulpits, and power. In America it is the stronghold of Slavery: in Britain the citadel of Intolerance. The primitive Truth has been corrupted and concealed, and the condition of the world now demands that the real Christian, and sincere Truth-seeker, should do something to restore it to its primitive purity and power.

The doctrine of HELL—with its flame and sulphur, its roasting spirits and tormenting devils—has been tried quite too long. Let us try what the truth of Heaven will do. We have faith in Knowledge; we have hope in truth. But Fear is at once a pitiful slave, and a cruel tyrant: it never did, it never will, get one soul to Heaven. Even in earthly matters it never re-forms: how then can it re-generate? Love casteth out fear; this is one side of truth; and the other is, Fear casteth out love. The terrors of the law cannot educate, but only restrain: beyond a certain point, they cease to do even that. Our cruel laws, we know, actually engender crime; and they do so because they root up the last remnants of love and respect. We are finding this out in the affairs of earth, but theologians still persist in palming our pernicious errors upon the economy of Heaven! Nevertheless, men will only be made virtuous, and prepared for paradise by education, knowledge, and truth. Terror will not answer the end proposed. God does not drive man to heaven with the lash of fear, he draws them with the cords of love.

But I will not enter further into this question of reason, and the supposed immoral tendency of the doctrine. Let it be first proved what is the scriptural theory; I shall then be ready to discuss the tendency of it. I will add, however, a cautionary remark from one of the most consummate logicians and most able theologians of the day—Archbishop

WHATELY—who is also favourable to the theory of Holy Paul, Silvanus, and Timothy.

'In speaking of the rewards and punishments of the next world, I have always *studiously confined myself as closely as possible*, to that which has been revealed to us in Scripture; for there is no subject in which it is *less safe to trust such conjectures as our own reason may lead to*; being one which is the more mysteriously difficult the more it is considered.'

I hope that when our friend "O" has *himself* more maturely considered the *pros and cons* of this question, he will announce his opinions with somewhat less of that air of reproof and dogmatism which characterizes the latter portion of his epistle.

PATHFINDER.

THE SON OF GOD.

The following is the first of a series of numbers, which we extract from the writings of HENRY GREW, of this city, on the character of our Lord Jesus Christ. We hope they will not only be read, but *studied*. Br. Grew, in the preface to his work, says:

"Deeply impressed with a sense of the importance of obtaining, so far as is revealed, a correct knowledge of 'the only true God,' and of Jesus Christ, whom he hath sent, I have humbly endeavoured to 'search the Scriptures,' looking unto Jesus for the guidance of his holy Spirit which he promised his disciples to lead them into all truth. The result of this investigation has been delightful, though labourious." * * * *

"I beg leave to remark to the reader, that it is necessary to remember, that however firmly he may believe his present sentiments, no man is *infallible*. To read any work of this kind, with such positive assurance of our present views, as is consistent only with infallibility, is useless. We may as well cry out hereby, the moment we know an author's sentiments are contrary to our own, as to do so after we have heard his arguments, for such a feeling of mind will resist the most conclusive proofs, and prevent our conviction of the most important errors." * * * *

NO. I.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE DIVINE TESTIMONY CONCERNING THE HIGHEST CHARACTER AND GLORIOUS PERFECTIONS OF THE SON OF GOD.

1. *The testimony of the Prophets.*

Isa. 9: 6. And his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, &c. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, &c. Isa. 7: 14; Matt. 1: 23. Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted, is, God with us. Micah 5: 2. Whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting. John 3: 31. He that cometh from Heaven is above all. John 1: 34. And I saw, and bear record that this is the Son of God. John 3: 36. He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life: but the wrath of God abideth on him.

2. *The testimony of the Apostles.*

John 1: 1—3. In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was

God. All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made. Eph. 3: 9. God created all things by Jesus Christ. Rev. 19: 13. And his name is called the Word of God. John 20: 28. And Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and My God. Rom. 9: 5. Christ—who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen. Col. 2: 9. For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. Col. 1: 15. Who is the image of the invisible God; the first-born of every creature, for by him were all things created, &c. Heb. 1: 3. Who being the brightness of his (the Father's) glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, &c. Acts 10: 36. He is Lord of all. John 2: 25. He knew what was in man. John 6: 64. Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who should betray him. John 1: 4. In him was life. Matt. 9: 35. And Jesus went, &c., healing every sickness, and every disease among the people. Matt. 14: 33. Then they that were in the ship came and worshipped him. John 9: 38. And he worshipped him. 2 Pet. 3: 18. To him be glory both now and forever. Amen. Rev. 1: 6. To him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen. Rev. 5: 12. Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing. Rev. 5: 13. And every creature, &c., heard I saying, Blessing and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever. Rev. 7: 10. Salvation unto our God, which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb. Matt. 16: 16. Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. Acts 9: 20. And straightway he preached Christ in the synagogues, that he is the Son of God. Heb. 4: 14. We have a great high priest that is passed into the Heavens, Jesus the Son of God. 1 John 4: 15. Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God. John 20: 31. But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God: and that believing ye might have life through his name. 1 John 5: 5. Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God. 1 John 5: 10—13. Rom. 1: 3, 4. Rom. 14: 10. We shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ. 2 Cor. 5: 10.

3. *The testimony of Jesus Christ.*

Rev. 1: 17. I am the first and the last. John 8: 58. Before Abraham was, I am. John 10: 30. I and my Father are one. John 5: 22, 23. For the Father judgeth no man; but hath committed all judgment unto the Son: that all men should honour the Son even as they honour the Father. John 17: 5. And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was. Matt. 28: 18. All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. John 17: 2. As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him. John 10: 18. I have power to lay it down (my life) and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father. John 5: 26. For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself. Matt. 9: 6. The Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins. Matt. 18: 20. Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of

them. Matt. 28: 20. Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Luke 22: 69. Hereafter shall the Son of man sit on the right hand of the power of God. Matt. 25: 31. When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory, &c. John 11: 25. I am the resurrection and the life. John 9: 35. Dost thou believe on the Son of God? John 3: 16. For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life. John 3: 18. He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already; because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.

4 The testimony of God the Father.

Heb. 1: 8. Unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever. 1: 6. When he bringeth in the first-begotten into the world, he saith, and let all the angels of God worship him. Zech. 13: 7. Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, saith the Lord of hosts. Matt. 17: 5. This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him.

How glorious and precious is this divine testimony concerning the sinner's friend! Let us carefully examine what truths it plainly exhibits for our faith and love.

1. We have here most plainly revealed to us, that our blessed Saviour *really existed before he appeared on earth*. He was before Abraham. He was with the Father in the beginning, and possessed glory with him before the world was. He came down from Heaven. God created the world by him, consequently he must have *really and actually* existed in the beginning, and not merely in the divine purpose.

2. Here also the eye of faith beholds him with admiring joy, "*God over all.*" As by him all things were made, so by him all things consist. His throne is to endure through all generations.

3. *He is an object of worship.* To him every knee must bow. Angels are commanded to worship him. His disciples prayed to him and worshipped him.

4. In the divine character of the Son of God, he is presented to a dying world as *the only name "by whom we must be saved."* In him alone we have eternal life, believing in him as the "only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth."

TO CORRESPONDENTS: "*What is Truth?*" is deferred for further consideration. In the meantime, we would suggest to the author, if the "sanctuary" is "the church," and that again is a "spiritual temple," it is to have no place in the New Jerusalem: see Rev. 21: 22. Our present view of the article is, that it is not such as we wish to place in the Examiner; but, can see no reason why those papers which still are the medium of similar articles should refuse it. "*The Diagram,*" by the same author, has been so often published, that we do not think it profitable to repeat it; but your remarks on the folly of attempting to "stretch the eight chronological points and dates" of Mr. Miller's theory, are appropriate. *Time, however, will soon settle all that matter.*

M. BATES: We have not seen the article of which you speak, in the "True Wesleyan." We have never received but two copies of that paper in exchange; we do not know why. As to "Edwards against Chauncy," Br. O. Scott and myself examined that argument together before I ever published a word on the destruction of the

wicked. Br. Scott pronounced it no answer to my argument.

S. S. ROBERTS: We may publish in pamphlet if there are calls that warrant it.

BUSINESS NOTICES.

J. MARSH.—Money received; all right.

ORIN ROBERTS: "Keith's Land of Israel" costs 75 cents, but cannot be sent my mail unless the cover is taken off. We have not the funds to put in Pamphlet form the work you speak of.

"DEPOSITORY IN BOSTON:" Several friends, East, have inquired whether we could not keep our "Six Sermons," &c., in Boston! We have not the funds to make any depositories: but, if any person will keep the works, and advance us the money on them, we put them very low. We cannot publish without cash; "silver and gold have I none."

LETTERS are not acknowledged in the Examiner, because nearly all who write us order something: if they receive what they order, they know their letters are received and the money they sent.

TIMOTHY LYON: We have sent a set of the papers to you, for which we make no charge.

J. DONALDSON: The money in your previous letter paid for all we sent you, and for Vol. 3.

WM. ALGIRE: Your paper was sent at the same time the pamphlet was; the fault is in the Post Office: we have sent you another January number.

M. H. TYLER: We have sent you the pamphlets and six numbers of last year's Examiner, and credited you for Vol. 3.

DAVID HEWITT: Bank broken—Bill returned.

ALL those wishing to advance scientific and mechanical researches in this country, we would recommend to subscribe to the *Scientific American*, published by Messrs. Munn & Co., New York, at Two Dollars per year.

THE EDITOR of the Examiner preaches every Lord's day at COMMISSIONER'S HALL, Third Street, below Green, east side; at 10½ A. M., and in the evening at 7 o'clock.

THE "SIX SERMONS" on the End of the Wicked, &c., can be had at No. 21 North Sixth Street, or of the Author, 18 Chester Street, between Race and Vine, 8th and 9th. Price, in Pamphlet, 15 cents, or 10 copies for \$1.00. The pamphlet includes the views of the author on the question, "Have the dead knowledge?" The Sermons advocate the doctrine, that "All the wicked will God *destroy*," or cause them to cease from life, after the judgment.

These Sermons can also be had of J. MARSH, Rochester, N. Y.; DR. FONDEN, 811 Broadway, Albany, N. Y.; and R. E. LADD, Cabotville, Mass.

We keep on hand the Sermons, full bound in morocco, and lettered, including our own and Brother Grew's views of the intermediate state of the dead. Price 37½ cents.

THE "BIBLE EXAMINER" is published monthly, at 21 North Sixth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; it is a super-royal octavo, of 16 pages. Its object is an examination of the Scriptures independent of all sects. The Editors, George Storrs, and John T. Walsh, maintain the opinion of the final and utter destruction of all the enemies of God, so that "they shall be as though they had not been."

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

NEWSPAPERS giving the above an editorial insertion, will please send us the paper containing it, and their bill.