
BIBLE EXAMINER.

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

VOL. IV.

PHILADELPHIA, AUGUST, 1849.

No. 8.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

JOHN T. WALSH, ASSOCIATE EDITOR.

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

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

☞ This paper is subject to newspaper postage only.

IMMORTALITY.

REVIEW—No. V.

Mr. Lee says—"Its (the spirit's) improvement, is a distinct matter from the improvement of the body."

What does he mean by the "improvement of the body?" Does he mean the *growth* of the "body?" What does he mean by the "body?" Does he mean the whole physical organization, or a part of it? If he uses the term as indicative of the whole organism, then it is equivalent to the *man*; which would be to make "the improvement of the spirit a distinct matter from the improvement of the man." Understanding Mr. Lee, therefore, to mean the physical constitution, the question recurs—does he mean by "the improvement of the body" its growth in bulk or size? If so, I would remark, that *stubborn facts* establish the *law*, that other conditions being equal, the development of mind is in the *ratio* of the development of the physical organization. What are these "*other conditions*?" The answer to this question is found in the fact, that there are several *systems of organs*, giving rise to different functions, and modifying the manifestations of mind. The *ample* development of the *glandular system* does not increase the mental power, but modifies it. The excessive development of the *muscular system* does not import mental activity; but it gives *durability* to body and mind. The *sanguineous* and *nervous systems* impart physical and mental activity.

Again, a person may be born with an organization unfavorable to the development of much mind—they may be idiotic; but, in this case, the *nervous system* will be defective. Again, they may be diseased, and, from this cause, imbecile. Again, education may have been *partial* and defective; the muscular system may have been cultivated at the expense of the nervous; and then, "the body may grow and flourish in all the perfection of health, and the mind make little or no progress." Again, the *nervous system* may be developed at the expense of the *sanguineous*, and "the body," or man, "be of exceedingly frail structure, pale and wan;" but it is not true that "a giant mind may develop itself from within." The mind of such a person may possess great *vivacity*, *sprightliness* and *brilliance*, but it will be wanting in *strength*, *depth*,

power and *durability*. But, in all this, the law holds good, that, *as is the organization, so is the mind*.

Mr. Lee says—"Some of the greatest geniuses the world has ever produced, have had but just body enough to hold the soul." This is a mere fancy sketch, containing no argument. A man, however, may be a "*genius*," with little or no *talent*. Again, Mr. L. says—"These facts certainly indicate that the soul and the body, are not one and the same thing!" Truly! who ever contended that they were "one and the same thing!" The one may be an attribute of the other, and both may be mortal—both matter—Mr. Lee's "facts" to the contrary notwithstanding!

2. Mr. Lee tells us, that "the body comes to maturity and begins to decline, at an age when the mind has but just commenced its career of improvement." This is a fallacy, for the "career of improvement" begins almost with our birth. "A sound mind in a sound body" is a sentiment, which embodies the truth upon this subject. The *nervous system* may be healthy, unimpaired and elastic, when the muscular and glandular have declined; and the mind may thus be proportionably active, when the physical strength is partially gone. But when there is a general decay of the whole organization, the mind goes down with the body. And whether a man shall be a *dotard* at "fifty, sixty, or seventy," depends upon the strength, soundness and durability of the *whole* constitution.

3. Mr. Lee alludes to the doctrines of phrenology, and informs us that nothing is gained by admitting their truth—that phrenologists "will not make this the issue, and base their science on the doctrine of materialism, to stand or fall with it." If by "*materialism*" Mr. Lee means *matter*, I affirm that phrenologists do base their science on "*materialism*;" for they base it on the anatomy and physiology of the *brain*—which is matter; while, at the same time, they may not follow up their *principles* to their *legitimate results*. I shall not reflect upon the *motives* of those phrenologists, who have labored to popularize, and harmonize phrenology with sectarian theology. *But, for one, fearless of all consequences, I DO MAKE THE ISSUE, AND BASE THE PHRENOLOGICAL DOCTRINES UPON THE MATERIAL ORGANIZATION OF MAN, INDEPENDENT OF ALL "IMMATERIALITY," IMMORTALITY, OR INCORRUPTIBILITY; AND I CHALLENGE ALL PHRENOLOGISTS, NO MATTER WHO, NOR WHERE THEY ARE, WHETHER IN EUROPE OR AMERICA, TO DISPROVE THE CORRECTNESS OF THIS POSITION.*

This is the only view that will, or can harmonize with the volume of Revelation; and every effort to harmonize the sublime science of mind, with the paganized traditions of modern sectarianism, degrades both it and them!

Yes, sir, a voice speaks from the highest heavens, and proclaims to all the sons of men, that they are *mortal*, having *not* one spark of immortality, but corruptible and perishing; and mental science—

the science of man—sends back the sound, all is mortal!

4. We shall now examine Mr. Lee's concluding philosophical argument, which is this: "The mind often develops itself in greater power and glory, just at the moment of death, shining out from an emaciated body, already wan and cold."

Here Mr. Lee rallies all his powers, concentrates all his forces, and pours along his logical troop! We shall pay particular attention to this argument, not on account of its strength, but on account of its commonness.

"The mind often develops itself in its greatest power and glory, just at the moment of death." This, as a proposition, is monstrous; as an argument, absurd; and as a fact, is not true. "The mind develops its GREATEST POWER AND GLORY, at the moment of death!" Did ever the mind of a man, "at the moment of death," develop the powers of a Solomon?—a Bacon?—a Locke?—a Herschell?—a Franklin? Here are specimens of mind in its "greatest power." Did ever the mind of man, "at the moment of death," when the "emaciated body" was "already wan and cold," develop the "glory"—the eloquence of a Cicero, or a Demosthenes? The answer is, and must be, in the negative. But Mr. Lee says—"It is true that in some cases the mind appears to decay with the decaying body, but to prove that it is the body or any part of it, this would have to be always so without exception, which is not the case." Mr. Lee has the argument here by the blade, instead of the handle; and cuts himself rather than his opponent! The mind should never "appear to decay with the decaying body," if it be immortal! If it be neither "the body nor any part of it," there should be no "exception" to the "power" and "glory" of its development "at the moment of death," "which," as Mr. Lee says—"is not the case." And now I will explain to Mr. Lee why it is, that some minds are more brilliant in death than others.

1. It depends upon the nature of the disease, and its seat. There are some diseases which preternaturally excite the brain, and consequently, the mental powers. We witness this in various forms of fever. And sometimes this febrile condition becomes so exalted and intense, that the patient becomes eloquent, musical, furious and insensible by turns, according to the nature of the case. In this condition the patient's animal, moral, or intellectual faculties may be principally excited, and develop their functions accordingly. They may shout, pray, sing, or curse, swear and rage, just as their different faculties are the seat of the most intense cerebral action. Some, in this condition may "die shouting glory! glory!! glory!!!" and others die perfectly frantic and furious.

Again, in disease of the heart and lungs, the integrity of the mind is partially maintained till death closes the scene; but this is because the brain is not immediately involved in the disease, and therefore it manifests its functions, though with less power, to the last.

2. Another cause, already hinted at, is, the fact that death sometimes commences at the heart, and at the lungs. The first is called death by *anæmia*—the want of a due supply of blood to the heart. In this case the faculties may be retained to the last for the reason already given.

The same remarks apply to death by *apnœa*, privation of breath. The person, being cut off sud-

denly, retains his senses to the end; or, if not dying suddenly, he gradually wastes away by consumption of the pulmonary organs, and dies in possession of a degree of mental power.

Death by coma may either be sudden, or more or less protracted according to circumstances.

These are some of the reasons why some persons die in the possession of some mental power, and others perfectly insensible. These phenomena are perfectly plain upon the view we take of the constitution of man; but can Mr. Lee, or any one else, explain them upon his hypothesis? "The mind may kindle up at the moment of death, and blaze out with intellectual fire," but it is the mere flickering—the mere flashing up, of the waning intellect, which, like the dimly burning taper, gives signs of its extinguishment! "The body" may be "wan, cold and helpless," and the mind will shine as dimly, and burn as faintly as the expiring lamp! An occasional out-burst—an occasional flash, is not the strength, power and glory of a giant mind; but the sure indications of a speedy dissolution.

Mr. Lee speaks of "the mind, being roused by the prospect of heaven, or seized with the terror of impending perdition," as "flashing with the fires of immortality," and "shedding a living glare as it quits its house of clay and enters upon the destinies of the spirit world!"

The whole of this is a beautiful delusion! a sublime absurdity!! There is no truth—no argument—no logic in it. This going to "heaven" at death, or down to "perdition," are old wives' fables. They are pagan traditions, newly vamped by the Mother of Harlots and abominations of the earth.

No, gentle reader, man is mortal, death is the extinction of life and sense and mind; and nothing but the resurrection can restore these attributes to man. So we come back to our starting point—no organization, no life; no life, no mind.

And here we leave Mr. Lee, to the mercy of his own ill-fated philosophical arguments.

J. T. W.

REVIEW—No. VI.

Having examined Mr. Lee's philosophical argument, I now proceed to his scriptural.

1. His first argument is based upon Gen. 35: 18, "And it came to pass, as her soul was in departing, (for she died,) that she called his name Ben-oni."

The reader will please bear in mind that the subject before Mr. Lee's mind is the "immateriality of the soul," and that this text has been adduced to prove it! But if he can see any connection between it and the subject, he can see far better than I can. Her "soul departed," ergo, it is immortal! Truly, this is an "age of reason." Mr. Lee says, "Her body did not depart. Her brains did not depart!" And was there nothing else which could "depart," and which, in scripture language, is termed the "soul?" Could not her breath—her life depart, and "her body" and "brains" remain? This text proves only one thing, and that is the departure of the woman's soul, life, or breath; and has no bearing whatever upon Mr. Lee's question.

But Mr. Lee thinks his doctrine of "immateriality," is taken for granted in the Bible! This is begging the question. The Bible, so far as I know, takes nothing for granted: and, even if it did, this would not do away with the necessity of Mr. Lee's

proving his position, by *proving* that the Bible takes it for granted. Let him not assume this, but prove it.

2. His second proof is Numbers 16: 22, where God is spoken of as the "God of the spirits of all flesh." What has this to do with Mr. Lee's "immaterial soul?" I admit that God is "the God of the spirits of all flesh," because "in Him we live, move, and have our being;" but this does not prove that "the spirits of all flesh" are the "immaterial souls" of all flesh. Inasmuch as "the spirit of life," or "breath of life," which inflates the lungs, oxygenizes the blood, and gives life to the flesh, is from God; He is emphatically the "God of the lives of all flesh." And, I apprehend, this is the meaning of the passage. In Numbers 27: 15, 16, there is a passage of similar import.

3. Mr. Lee's third argument is Job 14: 22. "But his flesh upon him shall have pain, and his soul within him shall mourn." Were I disposed to be hypercritical, I might analyze this thus: First, we have the "flesh;" second, the "him;" and third, the "soul." The "flesh" is not the "him," because it is *upon* "him;" and the soul is not the "him," because it is *in* "him." It follows, therefore, according to this mode of reasoning, that neither the "flesh" nor the "soul" constitutes the "him," or man. How will this tally with Mr. Lee's theory? This shows the folly of all such reasoning. The simple meaning of the text is this: The "flesh upon" his person "shall have pain, and his heart within him shall mourn."

4. His fourth proof is Job 31: 30, "Neither have I suffered my mouth to sin, by wishing a curse to his soul." Here, again, I may ask the question, What has this to do with the "immortality of the soul?" The term soul is often used as a Hebraism for the person, and as often used for life; so that the text and context must determine its signification in any given case. In the text before us, it evidently means life, or the person of whom life was an attribute.

5. His fifth argument is chapter 32: 8, "But there is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding." This is the most plausible scriptural argument yet offered by Mr. Lee, but this does not prove his point. Mr. Lee himself admits that this "appears to be an allusion to God's breathing into man the breath of life, after he had formed him of the dust of the ground, by which he 'became a living soul.'" In addition to this admission on the part of Mr. Lee, it is remarkable that the spirit is represented as being without knowledge until the "inspiration of the Almighty gives them understanding." Mr. Lee makes another important admission, which I hope the reader will remember. It is this: "*Man* here denotes the visible, tangible frame, the *body*; in this there is a *spirit*." Very well; "man," then, is the "body," animated by "a spirit"—"the breath of life," and God gives them "understanding." Thus Mr. Lee has helped us to the refutation of his argument.

6. Mr. Lee's sixth proof is Proverbs 19: 2, "that the soul be without knowledge is not good." He thinks "this text clearly implies the existence of an intelligent soul, distinct from the body." But how can an "immaterial soul," which is self-conscious—self-intelligent, "be without knowledge?" Here Mr. Lee is caught in his own snare! I regard this text, therefore, notwithstanding what Mr. Lee says about the definite article, as being simi-

lar, in this respect, to the passage, "the soul that sins, it shall die;" and as referring to man, in relation to that attribute of his nature which is the seat, or *sensorium* of the mind.

7. His seventh argument is based on Eccles. 12: 7, "Then shall the dust return unto the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it." This clearly refers to God's "creating man of the dust, and breathing into his nostrils the breath of life;" and has no more to do with the "immateriality of the soul," than the *blood of man*. When man dies, that which came from the earth, returns to the earth; and that "breath of life" which God "breathed into his nostrils" returns to him in the expanse of Heaven. In point of *fact*, however, the *body* is not less from God than the spirit, or "breath of life." Both are from Him. And this same author, Solomon, as well as Moses, speaks of the beasts as possessing the same "spirit of life." "They all have one breath; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again."

8. Mr. Lee's eighth proof is Ezek. 18: 4, "Behold, all souls are mine: as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine." Why did not Mr. Lee quote the whole verse? Why did he omit the last clause? Was it because the whole verse would not answer his purpose? "*The soul that sinneth, it shall die*," was too strong for Mr. Lee! He reminds me of a person, who is running along a beautiful lawn, where everything is pleasant to the eye, and grateful to the senses; but suddenly an awful precipice presents itself, and the man starts back with horror at the impending danger! So Mr. Lee, conscious of the truth of his position, passes rapidly from text to text, hoping to fortify his favorite doctrine of "immateriality," when suddenly and unexpectedly he treads upon the very brink of a logical abyss, where all his arguments are in danger of being precipitated to the gulf below. He pauses, starts back, and retreats!! with the words sounding in his ears, and vibrating along the fibres of his brain,—"**THE SOUL THAT SINNETH, IT SHALL DIE!**" This text, so far from helping Mr. Lee, is fatal to his whole theory; for it affirms that the sinful soul shall die, which is incompatible with his view of the subject.

9. His next argument is founded on Zech. 12: 1, where God speaks of forming "the spirit of man within him." There is no difficulty here, according to our view, whether we understand the term "spirit" to apply to the *life* or the *mind*. Both life and mind are "formed," developed, or manifested "*within*" the man. But Mr. Lee takes a liberty which the rules of logic do not allow him. He proves that man has a soul or spirit, but its *nature* he takes for granted. He is not required to prove that man has a "spirit," but to prove that spirit "*immaterial*." This he has failed to do; for to do this it is not enough to prove that the spirit is a distinct entity from the body; but he must also show that it is necessarily immortal. This he can never do.

10. His tenth argument is based on Rom. 8: 16, where Paul speaks of the witness of the Holy Spirit "with our spirit." On this I remark that neither God nor man "bears witness," except by words or signs addressed to the minds of men. "The spirit bears witness with our spirits," minds, or hearts, if you please, that we are the children of God: but this "witness" is in his word, and addressed to our understandings; and not to our feelings or pas-

sions. The christian has better evidence of his being a "child of God," than a mere impulse, or feeling, which is the sport of a thousand circumstances. When his heart, his life, his words, &c. are all in harmony with the Gospel, then it is that "the spirit," by that word, "bears witness" with his mind, his conscience, that he is born of God.

11. His next proof is 1 Cor. 2: 11, "For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of a man which is in him?" This belongs to a class of texts already examined, and means no more, I apprehend, than that a man is alone conscious of the operations of his own mind.

12. Mr. Lee refers to chap. 6: 20 as a proof—"For ye are bought with a price; therefore glorify God in your body, and your spirit, which are God's." This proves that men can glorify God "in the body," although "matter," which, I suppose, is more than Mr. Lee would willingly admit. The text clearly teaches us the *whole man*, "soul, body and spirit," should be devoted to His cause. That all the physical, moral and mental powers should be consecrated to his service. I see nothing in this to favor the popular theory.

13. He then refers us to 2 Cor. 4: 16, where Paul speaks of an "outward" and "inward man." I am willing that Peter shall explain Paul. See 1 Peter 3: 3, where he defines the "inward" or "hidden man" to be "the heart."

14. His fourteenth proof is 2 Cor. 7: 1, "Let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit." Apart from the absurd idea that "filthiness" is here ascribed to an "immaterial spirit," it must be evident to those who think for themselves, that the apostle meant no more than that they should put away all evil—all immoral contaminations, and be holy in life, temper and disposition.

15. Mr. Lee's final argument in the article I am reviewing, is James 2: 26, "For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also." In this passage, it is perfectly evident the term "spirit" signifies "breath," the breath of life; and it is so rendered in the margin. This text is *against* Mr. Lee, and proves that, after the expiration of the breath, there is not an "immortal spirit" animating the body; but that as "faith without works is dead," so "the body without breath is dead also."

In Mr. Lee's concluding article on the immateriality of the mind, he argues thus: "The same words which are applied to man to describe his spiritual nature, are applied to God," "and any criticism which will invalidate the evidence in proof that the human soul is spirit, and not matter, will equally weaken the argument in support of the idea that God is a spirit."

Now, kind reader, that you may see the force of this argument, I will apply it to another matter, thus: "The same words which are applied to the wind, "to describe" its "spiritual nature, are applied to God," "and any criticism which will invalidate the evidence in proof that the "wind" is spirit and not matter, will equally weaken the argument in support of the idea that God is a spirit."

This is Mr. Lee's argument, only it is applied to the wind instead of man; and the reader can at once see its fallacy. I could give examples as Mr. Lee has done, but this is unnecessary. We might as well argue that because certain terms, generally

applied to other objects, are used in relation to God, that their natures were similar, as to argue that because the term spirit is applied to man, therefore his spirit is like God's—immortal. The terms "sun," "soul," "heart," "wings," "shadow," &c. are used in relation to Jehovah; but who would thence infer that He is of the same nature with the "sun," or that His "soul" and "heart" are of the same nature with the "soul" and "heart" of man?

Does Mr. Lee really believe that God has a "soul" and a "heart?" If so, He is a *compound* being, and no compound is eternal. These words are used in reference to Him, in an accommodated or figurative sense; so also is the term spirit when applied to man—to the wind—to the breath of life—to the mind—and to the life itself.

"God is a spirit" in the highest sense of the word; but when this term is applied to the wind, and to man, it is used in a subordinate sense. As well might Mr. Lee argue that because the same word is applied to the *beasts*, therefore, they have "immortal spirits." Mr. Lee's argument, to be valid, must hold good in all cases to which the term is applied; or else, if there be an exception, I shall maintain that *man* is an exception.

Mr. Lee refers to the text, "the spirits of just men made perfect," which, I apprehend, applies to persons raised from the dead, and not to men in the flesh. He also quotes the text, "God is spirit; and they that worship him must worship him *with* spirit and *with* truth," to follow his reading. What is the meaning of the passage? It is this; that mere outward forms—the "drawing nigh unto God with the lips, while the heart is far from him"—is not acceptable worship. His worship must proceed from the heart—be pure, sincere, and according to the "truth;" for "in vain do you worship me, teaching for doctrine the commandments of men." But the text contains not the slightest proof that the spirit of man is immortal, which is the point to be proved. Mr. Lee has signally failed in this part of his argument; indeed, we may say of them all, that they contain the elements of their own refutation. He set out to prove the "immateriality of the soul," and the reader can judge how far he has succeeded. Sometimes he affirms "immateriality" of the "soul," and then of the "spirit;" he quotes a text to prove this of the "soul," and, anon, of the "spirit;" so we are, after all, at a loss to know whether he affirms "immateriality" of both, or of one. The popular theory presents a chaotic system—a confused mass—a perfect Babel, without order and without light. The advocates of it talk of "*spiritual substances*," and yet deny the existence of *spirit-matter*, as though there was any difference between "*substance*" and "*matter*!" But I have gotten through with Mr. Lee's arguments, and must await his next article.

J. T. W.

THE DISCUSSION.—As Br. Lee, of the True Wesleyan, has expended his strength, in his article No. IX. on the immortality of the soul, particularly on a paragraph in our "Six Sermons," we have judged best to give the reader his entire article; and we should be pleased to see Br. Walsh's reply to it in the Wesleyan. We really wish we were publishing a weekly paper; for, in that case, we

would give all Br. Lee's articles entire, which would give us much pleasure; and we have been half tempted to give them as it is. We would reply to the following article ourself, but do not choose to interfere with our Associate Editor in his review.

THE CONSCIOUS EXISTENCE OF THE SOUL AFTER THE DEATH OF THE BODY.

An argument from the immateriality, or spiritual nature of the soul.

Our first argument in proof that the soul does not die with the body, but maintains a conscious existence after the body is dead, is drawn from its immateriality or spiritual nature. The foundation for this argument has been laid in the preceding numbers, in which the immateriality of the human soul has been proved. We are not called upon here to prove this point, but only to make an application of it as a truth already established.

Before we enter upon the direct argument, it is necessary to state the precise point to be proved by it. It has been misunderstood, and hence, met by a misdirected and insufficient reply. Rev. George Storrs, in his six sermons against the soul's immortality, meets the argument thus:

"It is said—*The soul is spiritual, hence indestructible, and therefore immortal.* One single consideration is sufficient to overthrow this argument, and show that it has no force. *He who created can destroy.* Our Saviour saith—*Fear him who is ABLE to destroy both soul and body in hell.*"

It should be remarked on this extract, that as a reply it is defective in two particulars:

1. It assumes that "destruction" means a loss of conscious existence, when applied to the soul. This is not admitted, but as it belongs to another division of our subject, we will not argue it here, *but leave it to be attended to in its proper place.*

Its capital defect is, it entirely misapprehends the question. The argument does not rest upon the assumption that God cannot destroy or annihilate a spirit after he has created it, but only that the soul is immortal in its nature, having no tendency in itself to annihilation, and must exist forever, unless sent into non-existence by the same Almighty Power which gave it being. There is an important distinction between the natural immortality of the soul, and God's power to annihilate it, which Mr. Storrs entirely overlooked in his attempt to meet the argument. God may be able to destroy what is immortal in its own nature, and what would live forever but for such destruction; hence, could it be proved that God can destroy the human soul; yea, could it be proved that he will annihilate it, it would not follow that it is not ever living in its own nature. If the soul is not immortal in its own nature, it must cease to exist by the operation of the laws of its being, just as the body does, and can need no destruction from the Almighty, any more than the body, to cause it to cease to exist. To argue that God can destroy the soul, as Mr. Storrs does, implies that it will not die of itself, without the direct exertion of Almighty Power to do it. The body is mortal, is a compound, an organism, and by the operation of the laws of its elemental and organic nature, must wear itself out and cease to exist, without being destroyed by the direct operation of external force, as is implied when Mr. Storrs affirms that God can destroy the soul. On the other hand, if the soul is a simple spiritual essence, immaterial, uncompounded, and indivisible, it must be immortal in itself, and must exist forever, unless actually destroyed by the Almighty Power that gave it existence.

This argument then, is not designed to prove that God cannot destroy the human soul, nor even that he will not, but only that the soul, being spirit and not matter, simple and not compound, indivisible and not dissoluble, it must be immortal in its nature, and live after the body is dissolved, yea, live forever, unless destroyed by the Almighty Power that gave it being. To this point we will now direct a few thoughts.

1. The soul being an immaterial, uncompounded spiritual essence, as fully proved in the preceding, it cannot be affected by such agents as operate upon and destroy compound bodies and organisms. Frost will kill the body, but no one will contend that an immaterial spirit can be frozen to death. The body is divisible, and may be cut to pieces, but it will not be pretended that an immaterial, intangible, indivisible soul can be cut to pieces, with saws, knives and axes. It is admitted that the soul resides in the body during our natural life; now suppose a machine should be constructed, which at one blow would cut the body as fine as the sand upon the sea shore, would the soul be cut to pieces by the operation, admitting it to be in the body at the time? It certainly would not, unless that which is immaterial can fill space so as to obstruct matter—unless that which is indivisible can be divided.

Suppose you cast both soul and body together into a furnace as hot as the one prepared by Nebuchadnezzar, and what will be the result? The body will be consumed in a moment; but the soul will not be burned up. An immaterial, uncompounded spirit cannot be affected by material fire, any more than it can by frost; it could dwell alike in the sun or in the polar regions. The reader will now see the importance and force of our long argument on the immateriality of the mind. It is a vital point; if we have proved in the preceding numbers, that the human mind is an immaterial spirit, as we trust we have, the above reasoning shows that it must be immortal in its own nature, and that it will live forever unless it be destroyed by God its Maker. By all the conclusiveness, then, by which we have sustained the immateriality of the soul, does its immortality follow.

2. The argument drawn from the immateriality of the soul, not only proves that it is immortal in itself, living forever, if left to the operations of the laws of its own nature, but it proves that God cannot destroy it, in the manner in which destructionists generally suppose. Be particular; we do not say that God cannot annihilate a human soul, or any simple spirit which he has created, but only that he cannot do it in the manner in which destructionists generally contend he will do it. If God should annihilate the human soul, it would require a simple withdrawal of that Almighty Power which he put forth when he created it, and which not only sustains every human soul, but the universe of both matter and mind. This mode of annihilation forms no part of the creed of destructionists; they argue their doctrine from the Scriptures, which threaten and describe the punishment of the wicked; and represent the loss of existence as a part of, and end of this punishment, and as the result of positive infliction and suffering; and hence, they rely upon the words, *destroy, burned up, consumed, and other like expressions.* The argument founded upon the spiritual nature of the soul, proves that God cannot annihilate it in this way. If God himself has made the soul immaterial, he cannot destroy it by bringing material agents to act upon it. God cannot dissolve that which is uncompounded, or divide that which is indivisible. The reader is requested to bear in mind that the question at this point, is not—would the soul fall back into non-existence, should God withdraw his creating and sustaining power? but—can the soul be burned up, or be annihilated by the exertion of power upon it? We will close this argument, with the following extract from Mr. Drew's essay on

the immortality of the soul. It may not be conclusive in itself, but taken in connection with our reasoning, on the immateriality of the soul, is not without its force.

"It has been already proved, that material bodies can never act but when they bring their surfaces into contact with each other. As an immaterial substance has no surface, it is a contradiction to suppose that matter can ever be brought into contact with it: to suppose such a contact possible, is to suppose a surface in an immaterial being, which at the same time is excluded by its natural immateriality. Whatever has an exterior, must have an interior; and what has both must be extended: and what is thus extended, cannot be immaterial. An immaterial substance, therefore, can have no surface, and that which has no surface can never be brought into contact with that which has; it therefore follows that the soul must be inaccessible to all violence from matter, and that it cannot perish through its instrumentality. As matter can only act by contact, it follows that without being extended beyond its physical nature, it never can destroy the soul. And to suppose matter to be thus extended, is to suppose it to be matter and not matter at the same time. Nor can any accession of power overcome the contradiction. No acquisition of power can alter the identity of its nature, or communicate to it a force of which its nature is incapable."

"We cannot conceive that an accession of power can cause matter to accomplish everything which is placed within the reach of its nature: but to suppose matter to extend its influence beyond the limits of its own existence, or to act where it is not, is to suppose its presence and absence at the same time. And to suppose it to annihilate a nature with which it has no physical connection, is to suppose it to act where it can have no influence; or that it can act and not act at the same time; which every one must see, is not only a moral but an absolute impossibility. It therefore follows, that the soul cannot perish by the instrumentality of matter, whatever influence be attributed to the application of its power; hence in reference to every material weapon,

"The soul, secure in her existence, smiles
At the drawn dagger and defies its point."

"It is certain that nothing cannot communicate what it does not possess; nor produce what it has not the power of producing. A being which can communicate annihilation, must be one which is in existence, for that which is not in existence can communicate nothing: and for the same reason can produce no effects. And that being which is in existence, cannot from the certainty of its own existence, include the absence of existence within its nature, and consequently, can never communicate to another that absence of existence or annihilation which it does not possess itself. Annihilation, therefore, can never be communicated, either by a being which is in existence, or by one which is not."

"If the soul be annihilated, it must be either by something which is in existence or by something which is not. But that which is in existence, can never produce what is physically contrary to itself; and that which has no existence can never act. The power which is supposed to reduce the soul to a point of annihilation, must either exist in this given point or it must not:—if it exist we have not yet arrived at that point which describes a nonentity: and where nonentity is not, annihilation can never be; and if it exist not in this given point, the soul can never be annihilated by its influence."

"Annihilation must be the result of power or it must not. If it be the result of power, power must continue to operate upon a subject, until the subject itself, through the influence of that power be reduced to a nonentity. But in admitting power to have an active operation, until it produces a nonentity, we

admit a palpable contradiction. The admission of a power which is known to exist only because it produces a nonentity furnishes the mind with a chaos of contradictions—because that which produces a nonentity is not power but *nothing*."

The above extracts from Mr. Drew go to show that the soul cannot be annihilated, as destructionists suppose, by the punishments and pains of hell; and as it (the soul) cannot be annihilated in the way they suppose, and as their arguments all tend to prove that it will take place in this way, so far as they prove anything, their entire theory must fail. But we have got yet to consider the main point, which is the Bible doctrine on the subject.

REVIEW—No. VII.

In Mr. Lee's article No. 9, he takes up the question of "the conscious existence of the soul, after the death of the body." His argument is "from the immateriality of the soul." He tells his readers that "the foundation for this argument has been laid in preceding numbers, in which the immateriality of the human soul has been proved." Those of our readers, who have read his articles, and our Review, will doubtless be prepared to determine whether Mr. Lee has "proved" the "immateriality of the soul." I humbly conceive he has not "proved" it, nor is it in his power to "prove" it, by all the argument he can bring to bear upon the question.

Mr. Lee thinks the question has been "misunderstood," and attempts to define it more accurately. He quotes from Brother Storrs' "Six Sermons" the following paragraph:

"It is said—*The soul is spiritual, hence indestructible, and therefore immortal.* One single consideration is sufficient to overthrow this argument, and show that it has no force. *He who created can destroy.* Our Saviour saith—'Fear him who is ABLE to destroy both soul and body in hell.'"

Upon this he remarks, that "as a reply, it is defective in two particulars:"

1. It assumes that "destruction," means a loss of conscious existence, when applied to the soul; which is "not admitted;" but, because "it belongs to another branch of the subject," he does not argue it. I will also let it pass, at present, for the same reason.

2. Mr. Lee says—"Its capital defect is, it entirely misapprehends the question." Let us see: Mr. Storrs states the argument of his opponents thus: "*The soul is spiritual, hence indestructible, and therefore immortal.*" There is no "misapprehension" of the question here, for Mr. Lee himself argues upon this hypothesis; and the very article I am now reviewing, is based upon this assumption.

But, perhaps, Mr. Lee alludes particularly to the latter part of this paragraph, where Mr. Storrs says "one single consideration is sufficient to overthrow this argument, and show that it has no force. *He who created can destroy.* Our Saviour saith—'Fear him who is ABLE to destroy both soul and body in hell.'"

I apprehend that, if Mr. Lee will examine this argument again, he will find more force in it than he is disposed to admit. The radical idea of *immortality*, is, *not subject to death, or deathlessness.* It follows, therefore, that that which is *absolutely* immortal cannot be "destroyed" by any power in the universe; for, to reason otherwise, would be to make it mortal and immortal at the same time,

which is an absurdity. And hence the force of Mr. Storrs' argument—if God be “able” to “destroy” the soul, it is not *absolutely immortal*, because if immortal, it is necessarily *indestructible*. There is more argument, therefore, in Mr. Storrs' reply than Mr. Lee could perceive, or, perhaps, was willing to admit. Mr. Storrs' argument stands thus:

That which is immortal cannot be destroyed ;
But God can destroy the soul ;
Therefore it is not immortal.

But, I apprehend, Mr. Lee himself does not state the question as clearly as it ought to be stated. The *primary* question, and the one Mr. Lee has been discussing, is this—*is the soul naturally immortal?* Mr. Lee says *it is*; and that it is *in its nature* analogous to the *nature of God*. If so, it cannot be destroyed, because God cannot destroy himself! But God can destroy the soul, therefore it is not analogous to the nature of God—it is not immortal. Thus Mr. Storrs' argument comes back in all its original force.

We take the broad ground, first, *that the soul is naturally mortal*; second, *that he is able to destroy it*; and third, *that he wills to destroy it, if wicked*. In order, therefore, for Mr. Lee to meet this question fully in all its latitude, he must prove, *that the soul is naturally immortal—that God is not able to destroy it—and that he does not will to destroy it!* under any circumstances.

3. But, the fact is, Mr. Lee does not know what the soul is. He says “it is a *simple spiritual essence, immaterial, un-compounded, and indivisible*. Now, how does Mr. Lee know that the soul is “a simple spiritual essence, immaterial, un-compounded, and indivisible?” All this is mere *assumption*, without the shadow of a shade of proof! May I not ask Mr. Lee how he knows the soul is “un-compounded and indivisible?” From whence did he get his information? for it must be based upon facts, or be a matter of revelation. If upon facts, where are *they*? And, if upon revelation, give us the proof.

But he says—“This argument is not designed to prove that God cannot destroy the human soul, nor even that he will not, but only that the soul, being spirit and not matter, simple and not compound, indivisible and not dissoluble, it must be immortal in its nature, and live after the body is dissolved; yea, live forever, unless destroyed by the Almighty power that gave it being.”

Here Mr. Lee argues the immortality of the soul, upon the absurd assumption that it is “*spiritual, un-compounded and indivisible!*” What an argument! *Credat Judæus Apella*. But, after all, Mr. Lee virtually yields the question, for he does not introduce this argument to prove that God cannot, or that he will not destroy the soul! Then, pray, what is gained to his cause by his argument? I confess I can see nothing, for he says it “will live forever, unless,” yes, “*unless destroyed*” by the Almighty Power that gave it existence!” Well, suppose God should “*destroy*” it, as he says he will, what then becomes of Mr. Lee's favorite doctrine? It will be as though it never had been! Moreover, in confirmation of this view of the subject, we are taught that the Lord God “*drove out*” the man from the Garden of Eden, lest he should partake of the tree of life, eat, and live forever, an *immortal* sinner. Immortality, being an attribute

of God—“he only having immortality,”—he cannot destroy that which is immortal, because to do so would be to act contrary to himself. To prevent, therefore, such a result as would have followed the act of Adam's eating of the tree of life, he drove him out, and obstructed his way to the life-imparting tree; knowing that, if he should partake of it, he would live forever as a necessary consequence. All the evidence, then, going to prove that God is “*able*,” and that he *wills* to destroy the soul of the sinner, equally disproves the “*natural immortality of the soul.*”

But, I repeat it, Mr. Lee does not know what the soul is. He speaks of it as an *entity*—as a distinct thing or essence, “un-compounded” and “indivisible.” But, the truth is, Mr. Lee has been discussing the merits of an *attribute*, rather than an *entity*. Life, strictly speaking, is not an *entity* but an *attribute*. Immortality is not a *thing-entity* or essence, but a *quality*, an *attribute* of the *thing* of which it is predicated. Reasoning, therefore, upon a false assumption, what a flourish of “*saws*,” “*knives*” and “*axes*” Mr. Lee makes in his *first* paragraph. His whole argument on this point, is inconclusive and defective in the extreme, when considered in relation to the truth of his own theory! The fact is, he subverts his own hypothesis, as we shall presently see.

Mr. Lee concludes from his reasoning on the “immateriality of the soul,” that “God cannot destroy it, in the manner in which destructionists suppose.” Further on he says—“God cannot dissolve that which is un-compounded, or divide that which is indivisible.” Thus Mr. Lee's own reasoning brings us back to the point, that, if the soul be immortal, it will, by a necessity of its own nature, live forever. But, as God has declared that, “the soul that sins shall die,” it follows, as a necessary consequence, that it is not immortal; and, therefore, that it can be destroyed by an “*exertion of power upon it*,” and also, by being left to the operation of its own laws, as in the case of Adam.

Having subverted his own theory, Mr. Lee invokes the aid of Mr. Drew to effect its annihilation! Mr. Drew's first sentence is a *death-blow* to Mr. Lee's whole argument on the fancied “immortality of the soul!” Mr. Drew says—and Mr. Lee endorses it—“It has been already proved, that material bodies can never act but when they bring their surfaces into contact with each other!” This may have been deemed sound reasoning in the days of Mr. Drew, but, at the present time, every school boy of ordinary intelligence, knows better. Mr. Lee appears to have been asleep for a quarter of a century, without even *dreaming* in the time; and now that he is waked up he supposes every thing is just like it was when he fell asleep! He is waked up in the wrong place! and supposes himself living a quarter of a century past; and, consequently, speaks and reasons in harmony with the ideas which he obtained at that time! But he is behind the age, or else he would never have endorsed the sentence already quoted. Mr. Drew continues: “As an immaterial substance has no surface, it is a contradiction to suppose that matter can ever be brought into contact with it,” &c.

I am willing to submit it to the reader, yea, to Mr. Lee himself, whether Mr. Drew has not *disproved* the very position he intended to establish! Let the reader remember, then, that Mr. Drew and

Mr. Lee regard it as "a contradiction to suppose that matter can ever be brought into contact with" that which is "immaterial." It follows, therefore, from their own principles, that, as the body is matter, and the soul, in their estimation, is "immaterial," they can never be brought into contact! They, therefore, have no connection whatever! If this argument is not suicidal, there is no truth in the universe. According to this absurd and "vain philosophy," God, being "immaterial" in their view of the subject, can have no connection with the universe of matter he has created. I hesitate not to say, that this opinion is atheistical in its tendency, and absurd and monstrous in fact!

Mr. Lee, by endorsement, says—"Whatever has an exterior, must have an interior; and what has both must be extended: and what is thus extended cannot be immaterial." Mr. Lee, by the aid of Mr. Drew, has clearly proved, admitting the correctness of their reasoning, that the soul is *nothing*! The following is their description of it: It is "simple," "uncompounded," "indivisible," "indissoluble;" without "exterior" or "interior surface," is not "extended," and "can never come into contact with matter!" Thus they have, by laboring to make the soul everything, reduced it to *nothing*! They have proved the very point we at first stated, viz.; *That that which is immaterial is nothing—it is a nonentity!*

And, just at this point, let me ask Mr. Lee a few questions: Upon your hypothesis, was the "immaterial soul," as you will have it, created of the dust, or breathed into the nostrils of Adam? If created of the dust, it is not "immaterial;" and, if breathed into his nostrils, it had "extension"—"surface," and necessarily came in "contact with matter;" and is, therefore, not "im-material!"

Again, how many "immaterial souls" did God create in the beginning? How many had Adam? How many had Eve? Did they have more than one each? If they had only one each, whence have their numerous offspring derived theirs? You say it is "indivisible" and "indissoluble," consequently it is not transmissible! And that which is transmissible comes in "contact with matter;" but you say the "immaterial" soul "cannot come into contact with matter;" therefore it is not transmitted; and, consequently, unless God creates an "immaterial soul" for every child born, the offspring of Adam have no "immaterial soul!"—ergo, in your opinion, they have no soul at all! So Adam, according to the working of your philosophy, has given birth to a soulless progeny! Thus Mr. Lee, in attempting to prove that men have "immaterial souls," has actually proved that they have none at all!

The remainder of Mr. Lee's article abounds in the same sort of logic; it is suicidal in reference to his own theory! If Mr. Lee can reason no better than this upon his favorite view, he will murder his own cause, and bury it so deep, that no mortal hand shall ever be able to disinter it!

It would be a waste of time to extend the review of this article any further; but the reader, who is curious to see how completely Mr. Lee subverts his own theory, is referred to the article itself.

In conclusion, let me say, that Mr. Lee is utterly unable to sustain his theory by such arguments as he has adduced in the above article; nor do I believe that the man lives who can do it, by any sort of argumentation within the grasp of mortal intellect.

We fall back upon the conclusion, established

alike by philosophy and revelation, that man is mortal in every part; and that immortality is the gift of God, through Jesus Christ, by a resurrection from the dead!

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, AUGUST, 1849.

ENDLESS LIFE ONLY IN CHRIST.

"He that hath the Son hath life: he that hath not the Son of God hath not life."—1 John 5: 12.

BIBLE EXAMINER.—We have now exhausted all the funds we have to publish the Examiner. We are in debt to our subscribers, who have paid for this volume, four numbers more, which we intend they shall have if we can contrive any way to pay the printer; till then our friends must not look for the Examiner's regular monthly visits. We regret that we are brought to this necessity, but "the destruction of the poor is their poverty;" so we submit. We can still furnish the back numbers of the Examiner from January 1848. About three hundred new subscribers for the present year would give us the means to complete this volume; and we can furnish that number with the Examiner from January last; here we leave the matter.

ANY PERSON who will send us one dollar, current money, free of expense, for the Examiner for 1850, i. e. for Vol. V. before the middle of December next, we will, on the receipt of the money, send them one copy of Dobney on Future Punishment, in paper cover; or, three copies of the Six Sermons, 18mo; that is—the pamphlet of 120 pages; and if the Examiner is not published next year, we will send, instead of it, two more copies of Dobney; or, eight of the Six Sermons, as they shall choose. Please state distinctly in all cases which you will have. This proposition cannot apply out of the United States.

LOOK AT THIS.—One of our monthly exchanges, printed on paper about the same quality as our own; with 40 pages to the number, exceeding the Examiner in amount of matter only as 70 exceeds 42, that is, to use a printer's phrase, it has 70 thousand *ems*, whilst the Examiner has but 42 thousand, is \$2 per year in advance. Each number has a paper cover, and so the postage is 3½ cents instead of one, or 1½, like the Examiner. Now look at the following statement. This monthly exchange gives its readers 840 thousand *ems* annually, at a cost to the subscriber of \$2 42 cents, including postage: we now give 504 thousand *ems* at a cost to subscribers of from 62 to 68 cents!! We propose to give our subscribers for 1850 a semi-monthly, which will make one million and eight thousand *ems*, [1,008,000] or an excess over our exchange of

168 thousand *ems*, and all at a cost, including postage, of from \$1 24 to \$1 36 cents, or about one half the price of our exchange, provided we receive two thousand paying subscribers for the next year. But if we publish only once each month, as now, and yet increase the price of the Examiner to \$1 00, we shall then give you nearly five-eighths as much matter as our exchange gives for *less than half the money*.

BOOKS BY MAIL.—Our friends who order *bound books sent by mail* are informed; by law they “are not mailable matter;” and our Post Office will not forward them. We have had several calls to send bound Hymn Books and Sermons by mail: we cannot do it. *Please remember this.*

THE IMMORTALITY DISCUSSION.—Br. Lee, of the True Wesleyan, has nearly finished his side of the question. The Wesleyan of July 14 contained three numbers on the subject; in reference to which the Editor says—“This week’s paper contains the whole of the direct argument against annihilation, at, or subsequently to the resurrection;” and he asks “particular attention to this argument;” and adds—“We believe it to be unanswerable, though we are liable to over value our own argument; at least, we could not answer it to our own satisfaction, and that is our rule of testing an argument.” We thank Br. Lee for this very candid confession: we should not expect he could answer two sides of any question to his own satisfaction at the same time. We have been in a similar position sometimes ourselves; but further light has shown us that we could answer our previous argument to our entire satisfaction. And we think Br. Lee may yet, with the light that shall be shed on his path, be able to answer his own argument to his entire “satisfaction;” so far as he has stated the argument of his opponents clearly; which he has by no means done in all cases. His favorite phrase is “*annihilation*,” with that he and our opponents generally try to make a sound; and many minds are more affected by sound than sense. Let any one, even Br. Lee himself, read over his entire argument and substitute *death* for his unscriptural and unwarantable word “*annihilation*,” which we never use, and the largest portion of his argument will be found powerless. Just here we cannot forbear giving an extract from a letter we received from the late ORANGE SCOTT, founder of the “Wesleyan Methodist Connection of America.” Writing us not many months after the first appearance of our views, in 1841, he says:

“S*** has been out against you; and, two weeks ago, B**** preached, or rather read a labored discourse against you. It was full of sophistry! and so are P*****’s articles!! and so is every thing I have yet seen against you!!! You must, however, expect something when Lee comes out, for

he can make a lie appear like the truth. You are likely to have work enough to answer all who oppose you; but you have put your hand to the plow and must not look back.”

Br. Lee seems to lay considerable stress upon the opinions of “*the fathers*” in this controversy, so we have thought to give him a specimen of the opinion of a father of the Wesleyans in America. The letter of Br. O. Scott was written to us before we had put forth the strength which the Lord afterwards gave us, by which he enabled us to bring out the “*Six Sermons* :” those were not preached till a year later; and to use Br. Lee’s language, “*We believe*” the main positions of our Six Sermons are “*unanswerable* ;” sure we are Br. Lee has not answered them; “*though we are liable to over value our own argument.*” Br. Lee has put forth his strength; and we acknowledge that we expected if any man could show us to be in error, that man was Brother Lee; but skilful as he is both in logic and “*sophistry*,” in our judgment, he has utterly failed, this once, to make the pagan fable [we will not say “*lie*”] “*look like the truth.*” So far from it, that we now consider the matter settled firmer than ever before, that man has *no immortality out of Christ*; and *no future life except by a resurrection from the dead*; and, also, that “*all the wicked will God destroy*”—“*THEY SHALL BE AS THOUGH THEY HAD NOT BEEN.*” Ob. 16. Call that “*annihilation*” if you will: it is what God says of the wicked, in plain words, in opposition to all pagan, papal, and protestant *inferences*. We rejoice that Br. Lee has made this last effort; and we wish to make no other reply, ourselves, than what is contained in our Six Sermons and views on the intermediate state as found in our 18mo. pamphlet; we will risk that with Br. Lee’s “*unanswerable argument*” the world over, and have no fears for the result in any mind not bound by sectarianism. Our Associate Editor will, of course, finish his Review of Br. Lee’s argument so soon as we shall have the means to publish it; and if the “*unanswerable argument*” is not thoroughly answered and its fallacy fully shown to the “*satisfaction*” of others, if not to Br. Lee’s mind, we are greatly mistaken.

NOTE.—We wish it distinctly understood, that Br. Scott’s reference to Br. Lee related *only* to his logical and controversial powers; not that Br. Scott or we ever had an idea that Br. Lee would knowingly attempt to make a *lie* look like the truth, but that such is his skill, that if he took the side of error, he could make it seem truth.

THE ATONEMENT.—We have heard that some persons have busied themselves in reporting that “*Br. Storrs denies the atonement* :” and some, we fear, under the garb of professed friendship, have helped on this falsehood by *insinuating* their fears that we deny the atonement. If you read the Ex-

aminer you need have no fears but that you will know our belief, for we have not shunned to declare our views on any Scripture subject when we thought there was a call for it. Br. E. Miller, Jr., has written on the subject of the atonement in the Advent Harbinger, and we are gratified to see that he advocates the same view that we expressed in the Examiner as long ago as April, 1848. We have not hesitated to express them publicly and privately since. We have no room to enlarge now, though we had intended to do so soon. But those who have read the articles in the late numbers of the Harbinger, by Br. E. Miller, may regard these views as substantially our own. We believe Christ died for our sins, but not in the sense of "*paying our debts*," nor "*in our room and stead*." if so, universal salvation inevitably follows; and it is mockery to ask God to *forgive* our sins when the debt is paid. Some men's theology converts the God of love into a demon, and then deprives him of all exercise of the glorious prerogative of "*forgiving iniquity, transgression and sins*." We believe they do it "ignorantly in unbelief," being blinded by the creeds and traditions of men. May the Lord *forgive* them.

PREACHING every Lord's day, morning and evening, at the Saloon of "TEMPERANCE HALL," Third Street, below Green, west side, by the Editors of the Examiner.

CHOLERA—We are living in the midst of this sweeping scourge. Several of our Congregation have been attacked by it and suffered severely. We have been called to mourn its fatal visitation in the loss of our beloved brother James Masson, who died July 14th. Br. Masson was an every day christian—one of the right sort. He was always in his place in our public worship. He was one of our earliest friends in this city, and could always be depended upon. It is sad to see his place vacant. Great as the loss is to the Church, it is greater still to a large family of children, and other relations, to whom he was a *father indeed*; and to add to their affliction, Sister Masson, whose health has long been feeble, followed her husband in a few days to the silent grave; and thus are their household, almost with one stroke, deprived of both father and mother. Two more consistent christians are seldom met with: their last end was peace—they fell asleep in Jesus in the full hope that they would be awaked by him at his appearing and kingdom. Happy they who are always ready.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

No. I.

The Saviour inquired of the hypocritical Pharisees and Sadducees, "How is it that ye cannot dis-

cern the signs of the times?" This inquiry implies that the indications of the times, if carefully observed and inquired after, will show clearly the position we occupy in the world's history, and need not be mistaken. The times in which men live are to determine, in a great measure, their course of conduct; for it will appear in the course of our remarks that what may be proper and right to be done in one age, or in one period of an individual's life, may be exceedingly improper and wrong to be done in another age or period. We may illustrate this truth in various ways. For example—A mariner may go to sea at once, when his vessel is loaded, if wind and tide favor him, and there are no indications of a disastrous storm about to burst over him; but should such indications appear, so apparent as not to be mistaken by a careful observer of the signs, would he do well to disregard them, and rush out to sea, perilling all, rather than delay the commencement of his voyage? And if he should thus disregard the signs of the coming storm, and launch forth, and is wrecked and all lost in the tempest, is he not justly stigmatized as a fool for his course? And is he not blame-worthy? Did not Paul censure the Centurion of the vessel which carried him prisoner to Rome, because he disregarded the sign he had given him, that if he loosed from a certain port it would be attended with loss and damage? See Acts xxvi. Again—The farmer, when about to gather in his crops, or the fruits of the earth, carefully watches the signs of the weather, waiting for favorable indications to reap down his fields. He will not be guilty of the folly of reaping down his ripe grain, when there are indications of a storm immediately upon him. He watches with care and solicitude signs to satisfy his mind as to the course he is to pursue, and he is governed in his operations by the conclusions at which he arrives in his observations. Does he not act wisely in doing so?

Let us now take Scripture illustrations. Of Noah it is said, Heb. xi., 7, "By faith Noah, being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house, by the which he condemned the world, and became heir of the righteousness which is by faith."

Noah was "warned" of a coming flood, or had some sign or token, by word or otherwise, of that coming event. He heeded it, and prepared an ark to the saving of his house; and we all say he was wise in doing so. But suppose he had disregarded the sign, or warning, would he not have perished with the ungodly? And we here remark, to illustrate the principle we laid down at the outset, that though it might have been very proper and right for Noah to have bought land and built houses before he received the warning or sign of the flood, it would have been folly and madness for him to do so afterwards, and full evidence that he did not believe the flood was coming. And what a sorry sight it would have been for Noah to be preaching a flood at hand, and instead of giving his attention to building the ark, had spent his time in buying farms, building houses, factories, railroads, or hunting for gold mines. Surely a scoffing world might justly have said he was either a hypocrite or a fool.

Let us look at another case: Heb. xi., 24-26, "By faith Moses, when he was come to years, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter. Choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people

of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season: esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt: for he had respect unto the recompense of the reward."

Moses understood the signs of the times. He knew the period of the bondage of Abraham's seed "in a land not theirs" was near its accomplishment: and he understood that the nation that oppressed them about that time was to be "judged," and Israel brought out, or delivered. Observing these signs of the times, he refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter; or, refused the throne of Egypt, the pleasures of which he saw could only be enjoyed for a season. At a previous period, and under different circumstances, it might have been right and proper for Moses to occupy a place at Pharaoh's court; but the time had come—the signs had appeared—that Egypt was to be judged and Israel delivered. If Moses believed this, could he consistently continue at Pharaoh's court, and acknowledge himself the son of Pharaoh's daughter? Hitherto there had been no harm or wrong in his doing so; but now the case is different. Has he "faith" in God's word or not? He has; and changes his course of life, and departs from a position he could no longer occupy with safety. It is true he was guilty of an act of indiscretion, but even that was overruled to separate him from a position that to him was full of danger. When Moses came from his forty years retirement in Midian to demand of Pharaoh to let Israel go, suppose in connection with that demand he had daily been bargaining with the Egyptians to buy their land, and contracting with them to build him houses; would that have been consistent with his professed faith that God was about to plant Israel in the land of Canaan—the promised land? Surely such a course would have been highly inconsistent; yet it might have been perfectly proper in the early part of Moses' life, but the signs of the times forbid it now.

We take another example. When the Jews were carried away captive into Babylon for seventy years, God, at the commencement of their captivity, expressly commanded them to build houses in Babylon, and dwell in them, and seek the peace of the city where they might dwell. See Jer. xxix. Hence it was right, proper, and their duty, to do so at that time. But, by and bye, the times indicate that they are soon to return to Palestine:—would it now be proper for them to be purchasing fields and building houses to dwell in, as if they were still to continue in Babylon? True, many of them did; and of course did not return with their brethren who went up out of captivity: they had no faith or no inclination to share the fortunes of their brethren who left Babylon to return to Jerusalem. Did they act faith in God's promise of restoration? We have introduced this case as illustrating our principle, that what may be right and proper to be done at one time is neither right nor proper at another; and would be a mark of great folly if not of wickedness.

We might illustrate our principle with other examples, but we judge these are sufficient for our purpose: we proceed, therefore, with the application. The Lord Jesus Christ is to return to this earth, and is to receive the throne of his father David; the present age is to end, and a new order of things is to be established on earth. We shall not stop here to prove these points, believing that

a large portion of our readers embrace them as settled truths, though they may differ somewhat as to the order and character of the events of the coming age, while nearly all of them will admit that a very great change is coming over the world. Believing, then, that the personal advent of Christ to this earth the second time, and that a great change is to take place in the world at that time, are events to be realised at some period; and seeing great convulsions now going on in the earth, does it not become us to be wise, and inquire what those commotions indicate? or of what times are they the signs? And if satisfied that they are signs of the "kingdom of God" being "nigh at hand"—that fifth universal empire so clearly exhibited in Dan. ii. and vii., and shadowed forth in the Book of Revelation—does it not become us to regulate our pursuits and course of life in agreement with such evidence and such a revolution as the establishment of the kingdom of God on earth implies? We should not suppose any sane man could give any other than an affirmative answer. The point then to settle is—do the events of the times in which we live indicate the soon bringing in of the kingdom of God, or reign of Christ personally upon the earth? In answering this inquiry we do not design to go formally over the prophecies that relate to the four first universal monarchies set forth in Dan. ii. and vii., as those topics have been to the minds of most of our readers often fully presented, and there can remain no reasonable doubt but those four monarchies have had their day, and passed away, and that we have been for many centuries in the divided state of the fourth; i. e. Europe divided into a number of petty monarchies, amazingly controlled by a mongrel power, symbolized by a "horn having eyes as a man." This power being acknowledged by all Protestants to be the *Politico-Ecclesiastical* power of Rome. This power is again symbolized in Rev. xiii., by a beast rising up out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns. This description marks the time of the development of the politico-ecclesiastical power of Rome as coming into existence in the divided state of the fourth, or Roman empire, when kingly governments were in existence, as the crowns upon the horns indicate. In the seventeenth chapter of Rev. we are presented with another aspect of the same power: it is the politico-ecclesiastical power of Rome, after some of the kingly powers of the divided Roman empire have fallen, so that the scarlet colored beast there, though it has seven heads and ten horns, is presented without any mention of crowns at all; perhaps not because it had no crowns on any of its horns, but because some of them had become *republican* at the time "the judgment of the great whore" is to take place. It is evident John was shown that power at a period just prior to its destruction, and while the seventh vial of the seven last plagues was being poured out. At that time he was shown a corrupt woman [a corrupt ecclesiastical power] sitting upon a scarlet-colored beast, [a bloody secular or civil power] full of names of blasphemy. To mark its location on earth it has seven heads and ten horns, showing that it is Roman, and can answer to no other power in existence than the Papal, civil and ecclesiastical power combined, as seen in the symbol of a corrupt woman riding and directing a bloody beast, in a time when repub-

licanism had been established in some of the horn kingdoms. If this view is correct, it fixes the time of this aspect of the Papal power to the period since France, "the eldest son of" that corrupt "church," became republican; or subsequent to February 1848.

This corrupt woman, who has a name written upon her forehead, "MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS, AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH," was riding and governing the beast that had been in the bottomless pit, but ascended out of it just prior to the aspect of it presented in this 17th chapter. The same power under another aspect, in Rev. 13th, went into *captivity*, or *descended* into the bottomless pit; this was done in the days of Napoleon Bonaparte, when for a time the Papal power was stripped of all its civil authority; but afterwards this beast was re-instated or *ascended* out of the bottomless pit, though under another aspect: it was the "eighth" king, though in fact "of the seven;" i. e. it is the same power as the beast of Rev. 13th with seven heads, &c., but had now taken its last form. In this last form the beast, or civil power of Papacy, would be brought into circumstances calling for the *intervention* of the other civil powers, symbolized by the horns, and they should have one mind, and should give their power and strength unto the *beast*, not to the woman; but to strengthen and establish the papal civil power. And what do we see at this very time? One of the strangest and most astonishing events that has ever been recorded on the pages of history, viz. a nation just emerged from monarchy and thrown the crown from its horn in contempt, volunteers by her rulers, to restore the Pope to his *civil* power; and in doing this, that nation is seen *agreeing* with the despots of Europe to reinstate the Pope in his civil power, i. e. they "agree and give their power and strength to the scarlet colored beast!" But mark well, this is only to be done "till the words of God shall be fulfilled:" for, before this conflict is over, there will be a hatred kindled up against the woman—the ecclesiastical power of papacy—which shall only be quenched by eating her flesh and burning her with fire. The woman includes the city where her abominations have been concocted, and from whence they have been carried into execution; and also, most likely, all those kings of the earth, or old Roman empire, that have committed fornication with her, by upholding her spiritual wickedness and bloody persecutions. Hence we are of opinion that Rome itself, i. e. the city, will be utterly destroyed in the conflict, as was ancient Babylon, which was a type of it; and then one principal city after another, whose rulers were in the agreement to re-establish papal civil authority, will meet with a like destruction; and most likely Paris will be the second in the fall, and so on till they are all overthrown, and Europe is a desolation, as the prophecy clearly indicates it will be. This, of course, brings in that state of anarchy which we understand the scriptures clearly to teach as immediately preceding the establishment of a fifth universal monarchy—the kingdom of God—or the personal reign of Christ on the throne of his father David, which Jehovah has promised to give him, in spite of the rage of kings and rulers of the earth of whatever form their governments may be.

We do not feel justified, till we shall have further developments, in going more into details, or particulars, of coming events. The details may vary

from any of our calculations, but the great fact that the scarlet-colored beast is soon to go into perdition, or be utterly destroyed, together with the woman who has been its rider, and that the reign of Christ is soon to follow, to our mind, admits not of a doubt. It may, however, be several years, and probably will be, before the whole work is accomplished; but it is nevertheless *now* in a state of accomplishment.

We may give more on this matter at another time, but rest here for this month. If these things are so, can we live in the same course of management of our temporal affairs that might have been justifiable and proper before the signs of the times indicated that this age is drawing to a close, and that the kingdom of God and the reign of Christ on earth and under the whole heaven is about to be opened? Let conscience do its work, and let us see to it that we do not slight its warning voice in these perilous times.

July 4th, 1849.

QUESTIONS ANSWERED.

FIRST QUESTION.—"How do you harmonize Zech. 14th with Matt. 13: 37—43?" s. w. g.

We suppose this question relates to the fact that Zech. 14, represents that there are persons "left of the nations" who, evidently, are in a state of trial after the advent of Christ, and in that day when "The Lord shall be king over all the earth:" while Matt. 13, seems to convey the idea of the entire destruction of the wicked at the end of the age, or at the time of the second advent of Christ. The 14th of Zech. is too plain and positive on the fact that there will be left of the nations, after the advent, who are in a probationary state, to be disproved either by argument or sophistry, however skillfully managed. We do not believe that a soul who has attempted to explain away that view, has ever satisfied himself yet, for any length of time. It is an impregnable fortress against all and every class of advocates for the termination of probation to all men, without regard to their circumstances for hearing and knowing the truth, at the end of this age. No language could make the subject plainer than that used by the prophet Zechariah, that a state of trial to some of the inhabitants of earth will be continued after "the Lord my God shall come and all the saints [holy ones] with thee."

Our Lord, Matt. 13th, is speaking only of a *specified class* of wicked men, symbolized by "tares," and those too in a specified *location*, viz. "among the wheat;" and they grew "TOGETHER" with the wheat; and so nearly *resemble* it, that men, in the present age, have not sufficient judgment to be entrusted with the work of rooting them up. The original word, "tares," signifies "*bastard wheat*;" it resembles genuine wheat, and is scattered *among* it. The symbol therefore shows the class of wicked persons spoken of are *professors* of religion, and that they are *in* the nominal churches; the parable relates to them, and to them only. In relation to such wicked *professors*, with which the devil has filled professedly christian churches, from various motives, such as *respectability*; to get on better in *business*; and to cover up their wickedness under the cloak of religion, we have no idea that they will be of the number "*left*" of whom Zechariah speaks. They are "children of the wicked one"—

his offspring, or the fruit of his producing: "the harvest" for them "is the end of the world"—*aiōnos*—age: the end of the age that precedes the second advent, or personal reign of Messiah. Then they who have imposed upon true christians, and been a "scandal" to the cause of pure christianity, will meet with judgment, symbolized by being cast into a furnace of fire: their hypocrisy and wickedness exposed, and themselves cut off under circumstances of shame and anguish which will be a standing monument of God's abhorrence of all such characters. All this has nothing to do with those not included in this specified class; and the fact that our Lord adds—"Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father," shows there is somebody "left" for them to shine upon; and we are not left in the dark as to whom they are to enlighten, viz. "Every one that is left of the nations," contradistinguished from the nominal churches who have been judged.

SECOND QUESTION.—"Is the city of Zech. and of Rev. 20, the camp of the saints, and that of Rev. 21, which John saw come down from heaven, all one?" s. w. g.

If we understand this question, we answer, *no*. And with present light, we believe them to be three distinct cities; or, three distinct periods of time are covered by their history. Zechariah's being at a period somewhere prior to the advent, without now attempting to define that period: Rev. 20th being during the thousand years; Rev. 21st, after the thousand years; or, if during the thousand years, then to be regarded simply as a symbol of the glorified church, shining "forth as the sun," as the great city of Babylon was previously a symbol of a corrupt, persecuting, and destroying church. The latter being utterly destroyed, or "burned with fire," the pure and glorified church takes its place on earth, to bless those that are left of the nations, and spread its light and glory on all around, as the corrupt church had scattered darkness and spread a curse on earth's inhabitants before.

THIRD QUESTION.—"Will the saying of Peter, 3d chap., take place at the advent or towards the evening of the day of the Lord?" s. w. g.

We infer that this question relates to what Peter says of "The heavens and earth which are now" being "kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men." If Peter is speaking of the literal heavens and earth being dissolved by fire, it must, we think, clearly relate to the close of the day of the Lord, as it is an event connected with the "judgment and perdition of ungodly men:" this, certainly, is not universal till the end of the thousand years. See Rev. 20: 11—15:

SCRIPTURE EXPOSITIONS.

EPHESIANS, CHAP. V.

The apostle now proceeds to caution them against a class of sins which he thus enumerates.

VERSE 3. But fornication, and uncleanness, or covetousness, let it not be once named among you, as becometh saints.

"Fornication"—to which the Gentiles were notoriously addicted, even in connection with the worship of their gods, thus putting a religious sanction

upon that abominable sin—"and all uncleanness"—all *impurity*—"or, covetousness"—*pleonexia*—same word translated "*greediness*," chap. iv. 19; signifying "*inordinate desires*." It may relate to any object; whether money, food, drink, dress, or furniture, or whatever may be used for the gratification of the senses, or animal nature: "let it not once be named"—mentioned, heard of, or known—"among you"—let them have no existence in your midst—"as becometh saints"—those who by profession are *holy*.

VERSE 4. Neither filthiness, nor foolish talking, nor jesting, which are not convenient; but rather giving of thanks.

"Filthiness." The word signifies anything indecent or obscene—"nor foolish"—simple, useless—"talking"—which benefits none and may injure the talker and hearer—"nor jesting"—the primary signification of the word is *politeness*; but it is used to signify, jesting, buffoonery, scurrility, or low, vulgar abusive language. It is quite as likely the apostle uses the word here to speak against that mock and hypocritical politeness which is so common in people destitute of real love to their fellow men, who seek to make up for it in professions and unmeaning compliments: but, he says, such things "are not convenient"—*anekonta*—are not fit, not becoming, not proper, ought not to be. "Not convenient" is a very tame translation: as though men might do it, if it were only "convenient!" It is evidently a prohibition—a course of conduct *not fit* for imitators of God and Christ. "But rather giving of thanks." The word here seems to signify not the giving of thanks, in the ordinary sense, but—"decorous or instructive conversation"—the opposite of the conversation just censured.

VERSE 5. For this ye know, that no whoremonger, nor unclean person, or covetous man, who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God.

On this verse we need not remark, except again to call attention to what is said of the "covetous man"—he "is an idolater." We ask the reader to look again at our remark on verse 3, as to what constitutes a covetous person. Such persons are now denominated idolaters; and with propriety. That object of sense, which a person sets his mind upon *inordinately*, that is, immoderately, to excess, or disorderly—becomes his god: he is under its government—pays it the homage of obedience; looks to it as the object of his supreme happiness. Though he, himself, may not be aware of it, through blindness of mind, yet his life and conversation will make it manifest where his heart is. Listen to the conversation of many professing to be seeking a treasure in "the kingdom of God;" what do you hear? Alas! Balls, parties, dress, food, drinks, sensual gratifications, furniture, houses, lands, gold, dollars, offices, honors, &c., &c., all tending to show that they have those inordinate desires which constitute them the covetous persons, who Paul says are "idolaters," and who shall have no "inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God." Fearful words! Who has not cause of alarm? "Whose conversation is in heaven?" Who really manifest, by all their course of life, that they esteem the love of God and Christ, and an "inheritance in the kingdom," of more importance to them than all animal gratifications put together?

VERSE 6. Let no man deceive you with vain words: for because of these things cometh the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience.

This verse is too emphatic to need comment. If any man attempt to make you think these inordinate desires are harmless, beware that you are not deceived by them: God's judgment will fall on all such.

VERSE 7. Be not ye therefore partakers with them.

Be not *partakers* with them. If partakers with them in their wicked practices, you will be also in their exclusion from the kingdom of God, and in that wrath that is to come upon them.

VERSE 8. For ye were sometime darkness, but now are ye light in the Lord: walk as children of light.

"Ye were sometime"—in time past—*formerly*—"darkness"—used figuratively for *ignorance*: that is, "Ye were formerly ignorant of the wicked character and ruinous end of the course of life you were in"—"but now are ye light"—used figuratively for *knowledge*; that is, "Ye have now knowledge in regard to those things"—"in the Lord"—by that "word of truth" which has been preached to you, by which you have been brought into union with the Lord, so as to be "*partakers* of the divine nature;" thus, dwelling in light; therefore, "walk as children of light"—let your course of life correspond with the knowledge and truth ye have received.

VERSE 9. For the fruit of the Spirit is in all goodness, and righteousness, and truth.

It is by the Spirit of God that spiritual light, truth, or knowledge has been communicated, through prophets, apostles, and Jesus Christ, and its direct operations in the mind by the word of truth: and the fruit it produces is the opposite of the fruit of *ignorance* in which they formerly had their course of life: it is "in all goodness and righteousness"—piety to God, sanctity of life, "and truth"—verity, in opposition to what is false or wrong—it signifies, also, *sincerity*. Such is the character of the "new creature," or spiritual nature which is brought out by the Spirit in such as do not grieve and quench it.

VERSE 10. Proving what is acceptable unto the Lord.

"Proving"—*try, examine*—by the light—the word of truth—ye have received—"what is acceptable"—*well-pleasing* "unto the Lord."

VERSE 11. And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them.

"Have no fellowship"—no communion or participation "with the unfruitful"—*noxious, destructive* "works of darkness"—or *ignorance*; such as described in the previous verses: "but rather"—*the more* [walking in the light, and in obedience to the word of truth] "reprove," *rebuke*, or convince "them:" that is, show them that their way is destruction.

VERSE 12. For it is a shame even to speak of those things which are done of them in secret.

This verse needs no comment.

VERSE 13. But all things that are reprov'd are made manifest by the light: for whatsoever doth make manifest is light.

"All things that are reprov'd"—discovered—"are made manifest," or discovered, "by the light"—by the knowledge, or divine illumination

imparted to men: "for whatsoever doth make manifest"—or discovers to men the sinfulness of sin, and its dangerous consequence, "is light"—is divine knowledge, or illumination.

VERSE 14. Wherefore he saith, Awake, though that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee the light.

"Awake"—*egeirai*—to arouse one's self to a better course of conduct—"thou that sleepest"—that art slothful, careless, secure in sin—"and arise from the dead"—used figuratively to denote thine destitution of divine life—"and Christ shall give thee light"—shall shine upon you. Light here is equivalent to life. "Sinner arouse thyself—break off from sin—rest not in thy destitution of divine life—look to Christ—he came that you might have life, and that you might have it more abundantly; pursuing this course you shall receive that life, and thus gain eternal life, which is given unto us in Christ, and in him alone."

VERSE 15. See then that ye walk circumspectly; not as fools, but as wise.

"See," take heed, take care, be cautious—"then, that ye walk"—that you live—"circumspectly"—accurately, or assiduously—"not as fools"—*asophoi*—unwise, foolish, destitute of true wisdom, pagan; *i. e.*, in the practices he had warned them against—"but as wise"—those possessed of *true knowledge*, even that "light," or illumination, which "Christ gives" to those who receive spiritual life from him, when they arouse themselves from that careless and slothful state of sin spoken of in the previous verse.

VERSE 16. Redeeming the time, because the days are evil.

"Redeeming"—use, employ,—"the time, because the days are evil"—*i. e.* calamitous, afflicting, distressing: therefore, make the best of them—use, or employ them to the best advantage.

VERSE 17. Wherefore be ye not unwise, but understanding what the will of the Lord is.

"Therefore"—because the days are evil—"be ye not unwise"—ignorant, or destitute of true knowledge—that is, the knowledge of the truths herein presented to your minds—"but understand what the will"—purpose, design, intention—"of the Lord is." That purpose, design, and intention is, that we should be holy—separate from all those wicked practices and dispositions before enumerated—and that we should be filled with divine knowledge and love, that God's full design and intention may be fulfilled in our "adoption of children to himself by Jesus Christ" "How glorious is the design and purpose of God to those who embrace his plan to become holy and unblamable before him in love. Let us understand it and act accordingly.

VERSE 18. And be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess; but be filled with the Spirit.

"Wherein is excess"—prodigality, debauchery, rioting:—"but be filled with the Spirit"—or spirit of holiness. The use of intoxicating drinks brings men under their animal nature, and prepares them for debauchery, rioting, &c. Being filled with the Spirit, raises them superior to the control and slavery of animal, or, merely sensual gratifications; and thus giving the spiritual nature the predominance they rise in the strength of divine life, and ripen for the adoption, or immortality, incorrupt-

bility, endless life. Instead, therefore, of seeking such light and transitory enjoyments as arise from the intoxicating stimulants, to which so many resort, give yourselves to spiritual joys.

VERSE 19. Speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord.

"Speaking"—*lalouites*—recounting, setting forth, narrating, reciting, declaring, [see the song of Moses, and Miriam, Exodus 15, for an illustration]—"to yourselves"—that is one to another—"in psalms and hymns"—sacred poetry in opposition to the light trash used by such as seek only the gratification of the animal senses—"and spiritual songs—making melody in your heart"—mind; the understanding employed as well as the voice, if we would make melody "to the Lord." How much solemn mockery we have reason to fear there is even in professedly religious assemblies: how much melody of voice with no correspondence in the mind. Let us beware of such hypocrisy.

VERSE 20. Giving thanks always for all things unto God and the Father, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.

All we need to remark on this verse is the manner in which thanks are to be offered to God. "In the name"—signifying in, through, or by, *the person* "of our Lord Jesus Christ." He is the head of our spiritual creation, as we have before shown—no man can come unto the Father but by him: it is in virtue of our relation to him, or union with him, that we are pleasing to God; and our only way of access, by prayer or praise, is by being in Christ—one with him by that spiritual relation which constitutes us members of "his body, his flesh, and his bones," [verse 30;] that is, God regards us with approbation, or our prayers or praises, only as they proceed from us as *of the person* of Jesus Christ, his well-beloved Son. Thus appearing, He accepts both our prayers and praises as if they arose from Christ in person; and they really are such, because they are the out-breathings of that "one spirit" that animates his body, and gives vitality, or spiritual life to the whole in connection with its head, Jesus Christ.

EVENTS FUTURE.

By HENRY E. CARVER.

BRO. STORRS,—With you, I also believe that there are events, and momentous events too, in the history of the world to transpire ere that "same Jesus" shall stand upon the Mount of Olives, as brought to view in Zech. xiv. 4, and yet I am also clearly convinced that we may reasonably expect a *speedy deliverance* from this corruptible state, to that incorruptibility consequent on the resurrection of those who sleep in Jesus, and the *change* of those who are alive and remain; so that while I look forward, perhaps years, for the fulfilment of Zech. xiv., yet I do believe that it is our privilege to expect the speedy redemption of the body.

In order to harmonize what may seem inconsistent in this, permit me to call your attention to some of the circumstances attending the descent of the Son of Man to earth the second time. The prophet speaking of the day when his feet shall stand upon the Mount of Olives, says: "and the Lord my God SHALL COME, and all the Saints WITH

THEE." Again, the apostle declares that it doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that *when* He shall appear we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is; and again, "when Christ, who is our life, shall appear, THEN shall ye also appear *with him in glory*." From the above texts we are clearly taught that the saints will be *perfected* before the descent of Jesus to the place from which he was taken up, for if they are like him when he appears, and appear *with him in glory*, it is evident that they must have been resurrected or changed, and their vile bodies fashioned like unto his own glorious body, prior to that appearing. This subject is more clearly presented in 1 Thess. iv. 13, 17, where, after warning them against ignorance, concerning them that sleep in Jesus, the apostle says—"For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also that sleep in Jesus will God bring *with him*" (Jesus.) Here we have it distinctly stated that when God shall send Jesus, whom the heavens have so long retained; those who now sleep in Jesus will come *with him*. I am aware that this is in conflict with the generally received opinion respecting the order of events at the coming of Christ; but the apostle proceeds to give an explanation of the matter, and dissipates from my mind every vestige of difficulty and darkness, and opens to my view the way in which every jot and tittle of the "Word" will have its perfect accomplishment. The apostle proceeds to explain—"For the Lord himself shall descend from Heaven (where to?) with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first, then we which are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with them to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall we ever be with the Lord." Here, then, the matter is set plainly before us. When the Lord descends from heaven with a shout, &c., it is not to earth; neither is there an intimation that the world see him *then*, but he descends to where his Saints meet him—in the clouds, thus leaving ample space for the fulfilment of scripture between the resurrection and the appearing with all his Saints on the Mount.

Having suggested the subject to your mind, I now leave it with you to canvass; and by searching the scriptures to see whether there be light in it. To me it is plain that the resurrection does precede the appearing of Jesus, and thus, while I rejoice in the hope of *speedy* redemption, I can also with you *look forward* to the time when Christ shall come with all his saints, and find the armies of Gog and Magog [or Russia] gathered against Jerusalem in the land of Judea.

That the interval between the resurrection and that coming will be occupied in part with the return of the Jews is very probable; and that the descent of Jesus at the resurrection will be the time when his sign will be seen by the tribes of the earth, causing them to mourn, but will soon be disregarded, as all the rest of the signs have been, seems also plain; and it may be that the sign of the Son of Man will be the signal for the Jews to turn towards their own land.

Your brother searching after truth.

Cincinnati, Ohio.

The views of Bro. Carver, in the foregoing letter, are the same some Literalists take, both in England and America. We think we have impartially and

without prejudice, examined that view of the resurrection of the saints, before the appearing of Christ to others, or what is called "two manifestations;" one to raise the saints and glorify them, and the other his appearance to the world afterwards; and we are compelled to regard the subject in a favorable light, though we are not settled that that is the correct view.—EDITOR.

Br. WILLIAM ONGLEY, Chemung Co., N. Y., writes :

Br. STORRS,—Praise the good Lord, we find many that are steadfast in the doctrines of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief corner stone. They seem not to fear the nominal priest or people, who teach fables, but not the Bible. Last Lord's day we had a blessed public meeting. After which we retired to Br. Richard House's to spread the Lord's table, to break bread and take the cup free to all that love Jesus Christ. About twenty partook with us, and two or three came out and have made a bold stand for Jesus and his truth. Brethren pray for us, and for those lambs of the flock.

We have sold many copies of your Six Sermons in these parts; to the praise of our God they have been made a great blessing. I wish you to send me some more of them. Yours, waiting for immortality and eternal life.

Br. N. M. CATLIN, Indiana, writes :

Br. STORRS,—Truth is advancing in these parts. There is a great demand for your works on Immortality. I think I could dispose of \$10 worth per quarter, if I could raise the means to purchase, but I must do as I can, and I am glad to be able to do a little in circulating the light, for I love truth and its advocates.

Please accept the assurance of my highest regard for yourself, as a brother in Christ.

Br. O. H. HITCHCOCK, Arcade, N. Y., writes :

DEAR BROTHER,—Notwithstanding I cannot see just as you do upon some points, I do think there is interesting and profitable matter enough in each number of the Examiner, to richly pay for all its expense.

We truly live in a very eventful period. Signs I think there is no mistaking, that this world is ripening for destruction, and the greatest event the world ever knew is soon to take place. Judging from my observation in this part of the country, if the Savior should come now but very few would be found ready. May the perilous times in which we live caution us to cling close to the cross of Christ.

Br. S. W. GERRIERS, N. H., writes :

Br. STORRS,—I am well pleased with the Examiner as a general thing, though there are some ideas in it I cannot as yet fully understand. It appears to be our lot, in this state, to see through a glass darkly, but God has made it our duty and privilege to study his holy word. The Examiner, I am happy to say, has proved a powerful auxiliary

in understanding it. The things referred to above are, the return of the Jews and probation after the advent; but I am willing to read; and if I must be in error, I would as soon have Br. Storrs' as any others. I do not recollect having seen Zech. 14th harmonized with Math. 13: 37 to 43. Will you impart light to us on those Scriptures? Is the city of Zech. and of Rev. 20, the camp of the saints, and that of Rev. 21, which John saw come down from heaven, all one? Will the saying of Peter, 3d chapter, take place at the advent or towards the evening of the day of the Lord? A short article in answer to these inquiries will greatly oblige.

Br. R. L. PARTRIDGE, Ohio, writes :

Br. STORRS,—The cause of Christ is rather progressing here. Though we have had bitter persecution, and have waded through strong opposition, yet it seems as if the foundation of heathen superstition in some minds is shaken. While some acknowledge the supremacy of the advent views, as seen in Scripture light, others (fearing Diana may fall) think that the best way to get along with the "infidel doctrine," is to keep still and say as little about it as possible; among these latter are preachers.

But the brethren are industrious, and the subject of life and death is considerably agitated. One individual who has lately united with the M. E. Church during a recent revival, being in class-meeting said, if there is any reality in religion he wished to know it, (he having been trained in the popular theory of the day, and discovering its non-essentials) said that the great question with him is "If a man die shall he live again?" I thought that if it was light he wanted, I might possibly be instrumental in helping him to a new ray, clear from the horizon of scriptural abundance, and consequently handed him a copy of your Six Sermons, which he is now perusing. We have preaching occasionally by Br. Lyons, regular prayer meetings and monthly meetings.

Br. F. J. MANSFIELD writes from Illinois :

Br. STORRS,—We are with you, out this way, on the destruction of the wicked and the state of the dead. I know of none who believe in the soon coming of our Lord in northern Illinois, but what are with you. It seems to me if men would read without prejudice, they would see such an overwhelming amount of evidence in the case, that they would be constrained to say, It is the truth of God.

Your "Six Sermons," together with "Pinney on the Purpose of God," are doing great good. I wish it was in my power to scatter them through this western country. Many are inquiring on the subject and want light. I know of several who are now deeply interested in the subject of the advent of Christ, whose minds were called up to this subject by the *Life and Death* question. No one can bring himself to believe that Adam was threatened with hell fire when he died. No, that *fable* was invented by wicked men who made money out of purgatorial fires. The simple truth is—Had not God made provision for fallen man, he would have gone down to *death*, and would have been as though he had never been.