

BIBLE EXAMINER.

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

VOL. III.

PHILADELPHIA, NOVEMBER, 1848.

No. 11.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

J. T. WALSH, RICHMOND, VA., ASSISTANT 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.

THE MIND.—REPLY TO J. T. WALSH.

This gentleman declares I neither understand *him* nor his subject. Whether I understand *him*, he may decide; whether I understand the subject, our readers may. He says he neither believes nor teaches that the mind and brain are *identical*, and refers me, in proof, to his previous articles on file; but in one published in No. 7, I find the following passages:

"But we shall doubtless be told, that although the brain is the instrument of the mind, nevertheless *it is not the mind*, and that, therefore, our argument fails."

"This objection introduces another question. 'What is the mind?' The objector replies, *the mind is the spirit*, the agent which operates upon the brain developing thought and reason. Thus mind is defined to be an independent and separate *entity*, possessing all the attributes of intelligence, and possessing all the phenomena of an intellectual and moral character." (Vol. 3, No. 7.)

Against this view that the mind is a separate *entity*, acting upon the brain, he proceeds to present a variety of objections, and succeeds in his own opinion, doubtless, in showing its absurdity, leaving me to infer, as I think justly, that he considered the brain and mind *identical*.

He now declares he does not, but believes "the *mind an effect, an aggregate of powers, as functions developed by the brain.*"

Again he says, "the *brain and the mind stand in the relation of cause and effect.*"

Mind is the *effect of a cause—brain*. Brain develops *thought*, the brain develops *mind*, *mind is the effect of brain—it is an aggregate of powers.*

Such are Mr. W.'s definitions of mind. Let us look at them. And first, do they give us any idea as to *what the mind is*, whether *matter or spirit*? Do they give us to understand that the mind is an *entity*? But one thing they do do, they teach us that the brain is the *cause of mind*; that mind was not created directly by God, but is produced by man's physical organization, and depends upon that for its existence.

"The brain develops *thought.*" What are we to understand by this? That the brain thinks? Such would be the natural conclusion, but that would make the *brain and mind identical*, which Mr. W. neither "believes nor teaches."

"The brain *develops mind*," is the cause of mind—thus the brain precedes the mind, and as all effects correspond to the causes, physical causes producing physical effects, the mind is physical, and if it be an entity distinct from the brain, then the brain has produced a physical *substance* called mind! Where is it? Why don't anatomists examine it?

What is that mind, the "effect of the brain?" Is it something, or nothing? Is it an agent, and does it perform actions? Does it exist any where, but in the imagination of the writer?

"It is an aggregate of powers." These powers are *reason, will, memory, conscience, &c.* Powers are mere capabilities of doing certain things. Reason, for instance, is the power to reason.

Now these powers belong to something to which we may refer them. What is it? If the brain, then that is the *mind*. But Mr. W. don't believe nor teach that.

Memory is not the mind any more than inertia is matter, but it is a capacity of mind. Thought is not mind, but the *action of mind*. As well might you define God to be an *aggregate of powers*, as the mind. In this view, to speak of the *powers of the mind*, is absurd, for the mind is an *aggregate of powers*. The more I look at these definitions, the more confused and unsatisfactory they appear to me.

I find something in man that thinks, reasons, judges. I ask Mr. W. what it is, and he replies the brain *develops thought*. But does the brain think; is that the mind? No, says Mr. W. again, the brain *develops mind*.

I again ask what is the mind when developed by the brain, and am told an *aggregate of powers*.

But powers are the powers of something; the power to reason, to will, are among this aggregate; to what shall I refer them? They are developed, according to this gentleman, by the brain, and hence to this must be referred; and this brings us back to our starting point; the brain is the mind; for that which possesses the power of volition and reason, is doubtless the mind.

All his reasoning leads directly to this conclusion:

The brain is a part of our physical organization, designed for the production of thought, as truly as the nerves of sensation. In the infant there is no mind. But as the brain matures, it becomes capable of producing thought, and develops certain powers, mental and moral; and these powers thus produced by the brain, constitute the *mind*, which is nothing but certain powers of the *brain*.

A power of the brain is a capability of the brain, and again we come round to our starting point.

Suppose I was to define matter to be an *aggregate of properties*; should I not be pressed with the question, is there no substance to which these properties belong? And what are powers but the powers of something? Neither powers nor pro-

perties exist abstractly from some entity to which they belong.

I have devoted the main part of this article to the great point in dispute, the existence of mind as a distinct entity from the brain; but there are several minor points introduced which deserve some attention.

He says I regard the new birth as wholly physical. By no means. That is his position. If man is wholly physical, then the new birth is wholly physical. Then "that which is born of the Spirit is flesh." So thought Nicodemus, so thinks Mr. W., but Christ declares it is not flesh, but SPIRIT!

Mr. W. declares it is *man*, composed of flesh, blood, bones, nerves and brain, who is the subject of the new birth. Now he either means that this flesh, blood, bones, &c., are changed by the new birth, or he does not.

If he does, here is the flesh born again, and we might ask what chemical change is produced in the blood in regeneration? If he does not, he believes it confined to the mind, here called man, and hence his play upon this word is done to cast up a breast-work for security.

Several of his logical conclusions are not very alarming. Take the following:

"It is the immortal soul that reasons, is enlightened, saved, &c. But some men, such as idiots and monomaniacs cannot reason. Ergo: They have no immortality, and cannot be the subjects of redemption."

But Mr. W. tells us the Spirit operates through the gospel, and moves to action by its motives and arguments, addressed to the *reason* and moral *sentiments*.

"But some men, such as idiots," &c., have no reason to be addressed, no moral sentiments to be appealed to. Let Mr. W. meet his own difficulties.

The immortal soul thinks; beasts think. Therefore beasts are immortal. This is a favourite resort. When pressed, we are asked if we believe beasts immortal?

The fact that there is a spirit in man, does not, of itself, aside from the will of God, secure immortality. Angels depend upon God as well as men.

And while nothing indicates that beasts were designed for endless being, every thing teaches this of man. Into the Bible argument I do not propose to go in this article; but the text "fear not them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul," receives this singular interpretation: Fear not them that can kill the present life, but are not able to kill the future life. Thus soul and body have the same radical meaning, *life*. Whereas they refer to entities.

But, it is added, fear him who is able, not only like man to kill the body, but to destroy both soul and body in *hell*. I must close this long article, and will do so by expressing a sincere desire for the welfare of my unknown opponent.

WM. H. BREWSTER.

LOWELL, Oct. 1, 1848.

REPLY TO W. H. BREWSTER.

I am willing with friend Brewster, to refer his understanding of the subject to our "readers." And I wish our "readers" to observe and remember, that Mr. B. has failed to answer the arguments

submitted in my last. After stating my position, as previously expressed, he adds—"leaving me (himself) to infer, as I think justly, that he (I) considered the brain and mind *identical*." Having disavowed any such absurd position as his "inference;" and in as much as no such "inference" can be logically drawn from my position, I leave it as unworthy of further notice.

But, for his sake, I will further illustrate my views of this matter. Because the human mind is manifested or developed by the brain, does it, therefore, follow that that which *develops* and that which is *developed* are the same? If this be his logic, it is not *mine*! Because the *sense of sight* is developed by the *optic apparatus*, or organ, does it follow that the *organ of sight* and *sight itself* are "identical?" And because the *auditory apparatus* as a whole, is the organ of *sound*, does it follow that that *apparatus* and *sound* are one and the same? Can not the gentleman distinguish between an *organ* and its *function*? Can not Mr. B. distinguish between the *brain* and its *functions*? Really, I am astonished!

But, after getting through with my definitions, he asks: "Do they give us any idea as to *what* the mind is, whether *matter* or *spirit*?" I give my first answer—the *mind* is an aggregate of *powers*, or *functions* OF AN INTELLECTUAL OR MENTAL CHARACTER. And I care not whether Mr. Brewster makes these *intellectual powers* or *functions* "matter or spirit;" they are such *powers* or *functions* as have no *consciousness*, apart from the living man, by whose brain they are "developed."

The human *mind*, human *thought*, human *intellect*, of *itself*, has no *consciousness*—this latter is an attribute of the *MAN*, and not of his *thoughts*, and hence, when a *man* dies, his "*thoughts* PERISH." The *five senses*, as they are termed, are, by all philosophers, called *intellectual*. Is *sound* "matter or spirit?" Is *sight* "matter or spirit?" Is the *shade* of a living tree "matter or spirit?" Ah! this word "*matter*!" It surely was not a fit thing out of which to form "*a living soul*!" But, nevertheless, God did "form man of the dust of the earth, and breathe into his nostrils the *breath of life*!"—another *material* thing!—"and he became a living soul."

What does my friend understand by a distinct "*entity*?" Does he mean that which has a separate and independent existence? Not independent of God, but of other beings? The *soul* of man is not such an "*entity*;" the *mind* of man is not such either; but *MAN*, *himself*, is such a being. Again, Mr. B. quotes me: "The brain *develops thought*," and adds, "what are we to understand by this? That the brain thinks?"

Shall I have to tell Mr. B. for the hundredth time, that *man thinks by means of his brain*, just as he sees by means of his eyes, hears by his ears? &c., &c. *Man* is the *THINKER*, and his brain is the *organ*, the *legitimate function* of which is to manifest thought; just as he has organs for the development of every function of his whole organization.

"The brain precedes mind," says Mr. Brewster. Yes; the brain of Adam existed before it developed mind; yea, before he had any life! But when his organization was put in *motion*, his brain manifested thought. *Cerebral motion* is necessary to *thought*. It is even necessary to *dreaming*, as was proved by the case of the girl, to which I have before referred. I can give *expression* to my *mind*. I can spread it out on paper, as I am now

doing; and so can Mr. B. The idiot has no mind, his *brain* is defective—it is imperfect; he cannot reason; and yet, he has as much *soul* or *spirit* as Mr. B. or myself.

May I not retort, and ask Mr. B. "where" his immortal soul "is?" "Why don't anatomists examine it?" If it be a distinct "*entity*," as he contends, and, also, indestructible, why is it that some physiologist or anatomist has not detected it? And, as he asks me, "Is it something or nothing? Does it exist any where, but in the imagination of the writer?"—Mr. Brewster!

Again: Mr. B., speaking of the "*powers*" which constitute the mind, says, "Now these powers belong to something, to which we may refer them. What is it?" I answer, *they belong to MAN*, and they are *manifested by the brain*. Mr. B. appears to refer *every thing* to an *immortal soul* and *nothing* to the *man*, as such, at all! What sort of philosophy is this?

Mr. B. says, "Memory is not the mind," "but a capacity of mind." Every intellectual organ has its memory. Thus we have a memory of language, of names, of places, of things, of events, of forms, &c., &c. And the same person's memory may be defective in some things, but excellent in all others. Can Mr. B. explain this on his hypothesis? If memory be an attribute of that which is immortal in man; why is it ever defective? Will Mr. B. tell us? Will he explain how it is that *partial* or *total* idiocy exists? Will he tell us *how* and *why* *monomania*, or partial derangement, exists, if the mind be not an aggregate of powers? Let him not evade these questions, for I have not evaded his, but let him look them fully in the face.

But Mr. B. informs us that "thought is not mind, but the *action* of mind." This position is untenable, "Thought is" the *result of cerebral "action,"* or the "*action*" of the brain.

Further on, Mr. B. says: "I find something in man that thinks, reasons, judges." Truly, Mr. B. has made a grand discovery! He says, "I find." Where did, or does he find it? In the heart, in the spine, in the lungs, in the *brain*, or diffused all over the body? Will he tell us? I am anxious to know its location—its "*habitation*," that I may "*find*" it also. And does he find this "*something*" in all men? In all idiots? This "*something*" that "*reasons*" and "*judges*," does he find it equally in the possession of *all*; and if not, what is the reason? Will he not tell us? For my part, "I find" a great many men who cannot "*reason*," and I rather suspect Mr. B. has seen a few himself! These, of course, have no immortal mind! or, if they have, will Mr. B. explain why it is they cannot "*reason*?"

Mr. B. is guilty of too much repetition; he repeats and re-repeats the same things over again and again, without advancing a single step. In his article before me, he states my views often enough one would suppose to make them familiar; but he does not refute them. He has too many *ifs* and *suppositions*. But let us have some more of his peculiar logic: "Suppose I was to define matter to be an *aggregate of properties*, should I not be pressed with the question, is there no substance to which these properties belong?"

Yes; and "suppose" I "define" the human mind to be an *aggregate of powers*; and should be "pressed with the question, to what do these powers be-

long?" I should answer most emphatically, to *MAN*.

Mr. B. continues: "And what are powers but the powers of *something*?" True enough; and these "*powers*" are the "*powers*" of the *man*! Again: "Neither powers nor properties exist abstract from some entity to which they belong." Good! And these mental "*powers* do not exist abstract from" the *man*! One word on the *new birth*. Mr. B. very adroitly attempts to make me occupy what I conceive to be his own position on this question. The new birth is not a *physical* but a *moral* change wrought upon an animal, or *physical* man, composed just as I before stated. The spirit of God operates through the Gospel, by motives, arguments, &c., addressed to reason, the moral sentiments, &c., and moves the *whole man* to action, his head, his heart, his ears, his eyes, his tongue, his hands and his feet. He "presents his *body* a living sacrifice to God." The new birth does not change *flesh* to *spirit*; it is a *spiritual* or *moral* change wrought in, and upon, the whole man, who is thus said to be born again.

But let us hear Mr. B. once more: "Mr. W. declares it is *man*, composed of flesh, blood, bones, nerves and brain, who is the subject of the new birth." Yes I do; and if Mr. B. will take all these away, *what will be left to be born again*? As to his enquiry about "chemical changes in the blood in regeneration," it is too puerile, too ridiculous to be noted.

What an absurd exposition Mr. B. gives of the Lord's words, "except a *man* be born," &c., when he says it, the mind, is "here called man!" The mind called man! This would make the Lord say, "except a *mind* be born again, it cannot see the kingdom of God." Again, "Except a *mind* be born of water and spirit, it cannot enter into the kingdom of God." A "*mind*" born of *water*! What an idea!! So Mr. B.'s *mind* has been born again, but Mr. B., *himself*, has not!

As it respects Mr. B.'s syllogism about idiots, it presents no difficulty to me at all. God does not hold idiots responsible. But, if they have immortal souls, I see not how Mr. B. will get out of the difficulty. They are difficulties thrown in the way of Mr. B.'s theory, and *he*, not I, must remove them.

Mr. B. has not met the question concerning the beasts. He must try it again. It is not I, but Mr. B. who is "pressed" on this question.

Mr. B. remarks: "The fact that there is a spirit in man, does not, of itself, aside from the will of God, secure immortality. Angels depend upon God, as well as men."

Very well; if "the fact that there is a spirit in man, does not, of itself, secure immortality, why predicate immortality of the *spirit*?" Immortality "depends upon the *will* of God," says Mr. Brewster, and so say I; but is it "*the will of God*" that sinners shall be immortal? Will Mr. B. meet me on this question? "Angels depend upon God, as well as men," for their immortality; but are *men* now immortal and "equal to the Angels?" Angels are immortal; but men are not, and hence immortality is set before them as something to be sought after. I thank Mr. B. for his admissions! They are fatal to his cause. Again Mr. B. says: "And while nothing indicates that beasts were designed for endless being, every thing teaches this of man." "Nothing indicates that beasts were designed for endless being!" Mr.

Wesley, the celebrated founder of Mr. B.'s Church, thought differently; and if Mr. B. make *intelligence* an attribute of that which is immortal, I see not what other disposition he will be able to make of them! But "every thing teaches this of man." "Every thing!" If this be so, why has not Mr. B. given at least one "thing" that "teaches" it? This he has failed to do.

Mr. B. speaks of my interpretation of "Fear not them that kill the body," &c., as a "singular" one. But as "singular" as it may be in his estimation, I am willing to rest the whole controversy upon a full *Exegesis of this text*. If he foil me here, then am I forever driven from the field! The terms are easy, will Mr. B. accept of them? We shall see. May the truth shine into the mind of Mr. Brewster, is the desire of

His friend and obedient servant,
J. T. WALSH.

SCRIPTURAL PSYCHOLOGY.*—NO I.

In these essays I shall divide the subject in the following order:

- I. MOSAIC PSYCHOLOGY;
- II. PROPHECIC PSYCHOLOGY.
- III. APOSTOLIC PSYCHOLOGY.

I. MOSAIC PSYCHOLOGY: This phrase embraces a period, extending from the creation of man to the era of Samuel the prophet. To the use of the term soul, during that period, I shall now direct the attention of the reader. But before entering formally into the investigation, I wish to state certain rules or principles of interpretation, which are admitted on all hands to be correct.

RULE 1st. A word, having a variety of significations, must be defined by the context, to ascertain its specific meaning in any given case. The correctness and importance of this rule, will be manifest when the term soul is examined.

RULE 2d. Words are to have their primary meaning, unless there is an obvious necessity for departing from it.

RULE 3d. If a given definition be the meaning of a word, in a given place and according to its context, then the definition may be substituted for the word, and it will make sense.

These rules will be applied in the course of my examination.

I will now proceed: "And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life, (in Hebrew *soul*,) and fowl that may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven." This is the first use of the term in the Bible. In the common version it is rendered "life," but in the original it is *soul*. Let the reader remember that this is not only the first application of this word in the Scriptures; but that it was thus used to signify life, by God himself, nearly six thousand years ago! Here we have both high and antiquated authority for asserting that the primary meaning of the term *soul*, is *life*. And, indeed, it cannot imply, or involve, the idea of immortality, for it is here used in reference to "moving" or *creeping* "creatures." Do creeping insects possess immortal souls? If the term soul involves the principle of immortality, then they are immortal, for they have *souls*. Moreover, this term *soul*

*These Essays, and those on "Christian Philosophy," &c., the author intends to publish in book form.

is applied "to *creeping*" creatures before it is to man; yea, and before man was created! *Man was not the first living soul!*

Again: "And God said, Let the earth bring forth the *living creature*, (in Hebrew, *living soul*,) after his kind, cattle, and the creeping animal, and the beast of the earth after his kind."

Here the earth is made to bring forth "living souls" in the form of "cattle," "creeping animal," and "beast of the earth." Here we have a variety of "living souls;" are they all immortal? If so, we shall have immortal "cattle;" immortal "creeping animal;" and immortal "beast." "And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to every animal that creepeth upon the earth, in which is *life*, (Hebrew, a *living soul*,) I have given every green herb for food."

In this place "a *living soul*" is ascribed to "every beast of the earth," "every animal that creeps," and to "every fowl of the air." Are these "living souls" immortal? If so, the earth beneath and the heavens above, are thronged with *immortals!* Are all the beasts immortal, from the great Mastodon to the smallest animalcule that creeps beneath your feet? Are all the fowls immortal, from the Eagle that soars beyond the clouds, and gazes at the sun in his splendor, to the little humming bird that sucks sweetness from a thousand flowers? If you respond in the negative, then, I affirm they are "living souls;" and, therefore, if they are not immortal, it follows that "living souls" are not necessarily *immortal souls*. A *living soul* is one thing, and an *EVER LIVING SOUL* is quite another.

In the second chapter of Genesis, seventh verse, we have this account of the creation of man: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a *living soul*."

We have now arrived at that, which is usually supposed to distinguish man from the brute creation; but we have already seen, that *man*, as a "living soul," has no pre-eminence over the *beasts*—they are *living souls*. The possession of a "living soul" is not the distinguishing feature between man and the lower animals. The superiority of man must be looked for elsewhere: it does not consist in a superior *soul*, nor *spirit*, or *breath*, but in a superior ORGANIZATION, giving rise to a superior MIND.

Man was not created immortal, else the tree of life would have been superfluous; but he was made "a *living soul*," or person; not an *immortal living soul*, implying he could never die, nor an *everlasting soul*, implying he should live forever; but simply a *living soul*, depending on God for the perpetuation of his life—his existence. Eating of the *tree of life* was the means by which he was to live forever. This he would have done, had he not been disobedient; and then God would not suffer him to eat of it, lest he should live forever in sin. His expulsion from the garden of Eden was an act of mercy; and yet men are taught to believe now, that God, who would not suffer our first parents to become immortal sinners, will positively keep sinners alive in a burning hell, suffering indescribable torments, through the endless succession of ages! He must have changed since the *expulsion!*

I shall now examine the places in this book—Genesis—where this word *soul* occurs, and see what its meaning may be in any given case. Gen.

xii. 13. And Abram said to his wife: "Say, I pray thee, thou art my sister: that it may be well with me for thy sake; and my soul shall live because of thee." Now, what is the meaning of this? Did Abram expect to save his "immortal" soul by his wife saying she was his sister? Surely not: he only expected to save *his life*, which he thought he was in danger of losing on account of her beauty. The context shows the correctness of this. (See the 11th verse.) "And it came to pass, when he (Abram) had come near to enter into Egypt, that he said to Sarai his wife, Behold now, I know that thou art a fair woman to look upon: Therefore, it will come to pass, when the Egyptians shall see thee, that they will say, This is his wife: and they will kill me, but they will save thee alive." Abram apprehended the Egyptians would kill him for his wife; and this was the reason of his request to her, in which he says: "my soul shall live;" a Hebraism for *I shall live*.

Turn now to Genesis xix. 20. "Behold now, this city is near to flee to, and it is a small one: Oh, let me escape thither! (Is it not a small one?) and my soul shall live." Can any reasonable person suppose, that Lot expected to save his (*immortal*) soul, by fleeing to Zoah? Certainly not. What then did he expect to save? Did he not expect to save his *life*? Surely he did; and his language is equivalent to his having said—"and I shall live." The language of Isaac is worthy of note. He said to Esau: "Make me savory meat, such as I love, and bring it to me, that I may eat; that my soul may bless thee before I die." This according to the Hebrew idiom, means—"THAT I MAY BLESS THEE BEFORE I DIE."

"O my soul," says Jacob, "come not thou into their secret;—the secret of Simeon and Levi. Do you suppose that Jacob referred to his "immortal" soul? Or, rather, did he not say, that "He did not wish to enter into their secret?"

It is said of Shechem—"And his soul cleaved to Dinah the daughter of Jacob, and he loved the damsel, and spoke kindly to the damsel."

Now, which shall be believed, the proposition that Shechem had an immortal soul which cleaved to Dinah, or that the whole sentence is but a Hebraism expressive of the fact, that *Shechem, himself, cleaved to Dinah in love?* Again, in the eighth verse, Hamor said, "The soul of my son Shechem longeth for your daughter." Can any one make me believe that an "immortal" soul would "long" for a woman? It is folly to suppose so. No, the truth is, *Shechem, himself, 'longed' for her*, for a wife; and this is expressed by his "soul longing."

In the thirty-fifth chapter, eighteenth verse, we have this expression: "And it came to pass as her soul was in departing, (for she died,)" &c. Perhaps some may be disposed to believe that Rachel had an immortal soul, that departed to heaven. This might have some force, but for the expression explanatory of "her soul departing;" "FOR SHE DIED." As it is, this is all the historian meant by her "soul departing."

J. T. W.

"BORN OF WATER."

BR. MAGRUDER'S REPLY TO THE EDITOR.

Passing by some points of the Editor's criticism (for the sake of saving time and space) I come to reply to the "difficulty" in which he thinks me

involved, that in John, 3d chap., Christ had no allusion to Christian baptism—that because Abraham, Noah, and the thief were justified and pardoned before the resurrection of Christ, and therefore before Christian baptism was ordained, therefore in John, 3d chap., he was not speaking of Christian baptism. Suppose the Editor be right—that 3d John has no reference to Christian baptism, does it thence follow that because Noah, Job, and the thief were saved without it, we (in this day) may be saved also, independently of this ordinance? Certainly not; for it is answered *conclusively*, no such command was given to *them*, and "where no law is, there is no transgression, for sin is the transgression of the law." 1 John, 3d chap. 4. Now such a law is given to *our* contemporaries, and on that account they must obey it at their peril. And here is the very point of the argument. The argument is not that 3d John 5, relates to baptism, (though I am persuaded it does,) but that because the thief, Abraham, &c., are to be saved *without* baptism, we are not *thence* to conclude that we, who live under different laws are also to be saved without it. It is to this point I call the Editor to respond.

It seems to me (in all kindness) it is no answer to this reasoning, to urge that as Christ said, "except a man (that is *any* man) be born of water and the spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God," and then to cite the fact that Abraham, &c. have never been born of water, and will be in the kingdom, and so infer that baptism is *not* essential to entrance into the kingdom. This is certainly not "rightly to divide the word of truth." The declaration, "except a man be born of water," &c., relates obviously to the future, and may be the present, but certainly not *the past*. What would be thought of a law-giver who, when propounding a *new* law, should hold it applicable to acts committed or omitted before it was enacted, thus giving it an *ex post facto* effect? The law, "except a man be born of water and the spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God," of course, and obviously means, "he cannot in future;" hereafter no man can enter except on these terms. To illustrate: Moses enacted circumcision, and declared that *whoever* neglected it, should "be cut off from the congregation of the Lord." Would you therefore contend that no one can be saved unless he be circumcised? Certainly not: the reason is plain. Because no such law is obligatory under the Christian dispensation. In regard to the thief, the case is plain. Christ had the power, when on earth, and often exercised it, to forgive sins unconditionally. He could say to the sick of the palsy, "Son, thy sins be forgiven thee," annexing no condition, because, as he said of himself, "The Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins." So to the thief, he graciously said, "Thou shalt be with me in Paradise." But how stands the matter now? He is no longer here in person to forgive sins. He proceeds now by *laws*, made known in the gospel, "for the obedience of faith among all nations," and to these laws, ordinances, and institutions, must we submit ourselves (as did Saul, of Tarsus. Acts 22: 14—16,) in order "to wash away our sins," and to obtain the blessings promised. Well may Paul himself say, "How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed (or fully explained and elucidated) by them that heard him." I submit the above as some reply to the objec-

tion that because Abram, the thief, &c., were saved without Christian baptism, therefore we may "escape," though we "neglect" it.

But the Editor urges this question, "Is being born of water, John 3: 5, Christian baptism?" He replies, "with present light" "it is not." If not then, pray what is it? If not baptism, what is it, I repeat? Those who object, are bound in candor to give us a better explanation of the words than we offer. What is a birth of water if not baptism? What a birth of water and spirit, if not Christian baptism? I await the reply. Meanwhile, let me say, I have never said (I believe) that 3d John 5, had exclusive reference to Christian baptism, implying in the subject a belief in the death and resurrection of Christ. John's baptism was no doubt as essential to those to whom John preached as was the baptism of the day of Pentecost to those to whom Peter preached. Both were "the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." They differed in the facts to be previously believed. Paul says this in Acts 19, "John verily preached to the people that they should believe on him who was to come after him, that is Christ Jesus." Hearing this, they (John's disciples) were baptized in the name of the Lord. For a Jew to reject John's proclamation and baptism, was no doubt as great a sin as for Jew or Gentile to reject the apostle's. Nicodemus was one of these rejectors of John's baptism. Jesus, "who knew what was in man," discerning his incredulity on this point, said to him at once, "Except a man be born of water and spirit (as John's disciples were) he cannot enter," &c. Until this law is repealed, or unless any one in this generation can shew that he is embraced in the exception which saves the thief, the palsied man and others to whom the Saviour spake audibly when on earth, let every unbaptized man or woman who hopes for a place and a name in that kingdom, beware of neglecting a compliance with these terms of admission. Such may be among the foolish virgins who go to replenish their lamps at the moment of the Lord's approach, and so are shut out from his presence, for some, we are assured, will experience this bitter fate.

A. B. MAGRUDER.

NOTES ON BR. MAGRUDER'S REPLY.

We do not look upon John 3: 5, in the light of "law" at all; it is the announcement of a fact; which fact was just as real and important in the days of Noah, Abraham, Job and Daniel, as in the days of Nicodemus. But if it were a "law" it was in "force" from its announcement, unless the Law Maker specified another time, future, for it to take effect. No such specification is appended, hence Br. M.'s difficulty remains. The dispute between Br. M. and ourself is not whether it is essential to salvation to attend to Christian Baptism—that topic we leave to him and Br. Grew. The entire argument between Br. M. and ourself is, "Is being born of water, John 3: 5, Christian baptism?" Br. M. must not try to draw us away from that point. He admitted, in his previous article, that "Christian Baptism was not instituted until after our Lord hung upon the cross;" that admission sustained our position that being born of water, John 3: 5, was not Christian Baptism. Br. M. now changes the issue, and calls us to respond to a point in which he and

Br. Grew are at issue; and we must be excused from interfering between them. Br. M. entirely misapprehends us in saying, that we "cite the fact that Abraham, &c., have never been born of water and will be in the kingdom, and so infer that baptism is not essential," &c. Really, Br. M., we did no such thing. We did not say that "Abraham, &c., have never been born of water." We asked if Br. M. would undertake to prove they would enter the kingdom without being "born again?" we know they will be in the kingdom, and we believe they will, at the time, have been born again, in precisely the sense in which our Saviour used that expression, John 3: 5. "The declaration," John 3: 5, "relates obviously" to the "past" as really as to the "future," if it relates to any thing done this side the resurrection. Our Lord states a fact, not makes a "law;" and that fact was as really a fact in the days of Abraham as in the days of Nicodemus; and none the less so because Nicodemus, "a master of Israel" was ignorant of it. Our Saviour himself virtually affirms this truth, verse 10—after Nicodemus expressed his surprise—"Art thou a master of Israel and knowest not these things?" Poor Nicodemus was blamed, according to Br. M., and those that think with him, for not knowing what was impossible to have been known, because according to them the thing to be known had no existence till now. Really, our Lord was too severe on Nicodemus, "if these things are so." Why censure him for not knowing that a man must be born of water and the spirit, if the fact had no existence in the Scriptures till that hour? and had never in any clear form been stated before? Tell us, ye "masters of Israel," why our Lord blames Nicodemus for his ignorance of a thing that could not have been known, because it had no being before, if your position is the true one?

We repeat, again, that we have made no such statement as Br. M. attributes to us, that "because Abraham, &c., were saved without Christian baptism, therefore we may," &c. When we make such a statement it will be time enough for us to defend it. Br. M. says, "If being born of water, John 3: 5, is not baptism, what is it?" and he adds, "I repeat—those who object are bound in candor to give us a better explanation of the words than we offer," &c. Br. M. further adds,—"I wait the reply." Now, he need not wait; we gave our opinion in the Examiner, No. 8. Dr. N. Smith gave his in No. 9; and if Br. M. will allow us our judgment in this matter, we will say, that either of these opinions are "better" than the one for which he contends; for that, with present light, to us, is the most unlikely and improbable of either.

Br. M.'s assumption that "Nicodemus was one of those who rejected John's baptism" shall have an answer when he gives us the proof; at present the evidence is the other way. His assumption, also, that "John's disciples were born of water and spirit" shall have like attention when he gives us the evidence; as he has offered no proof of either, we need not go into the argument, but meet both with a simple denial.

We have much hope of our good brother M.; for he shows, like ourself, that he is not ashamed to change when he finds his ground not tenable. He found that being born of water, John 3: 5, could not be applied to Christian baptism, so now he has fallen back on John's. We think we shall be agreed yet; at any rate, we will not quarrel if we are not agreed.

'THE SECOND DEATH.'

By RICHARD WHATELY, D. D., ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN.

'Many of the ancient Fathers look upon (the expulsion of Adam from Eden) as a merciful dispensation, THAT MAN MIGHT NOT BE PERPETUATED IN A STATE OF SIN.' Bishop PATRICK.

'Whatsoever had a beginning can also have an ending, and it shall die, unless it be daily watered from the streams flowing from the fountain of life, and refreshed with the dew of heaven, and the wells of God: and therefore God had prepared a tree in Paradise to have supported Adam in his artificial immortality: immortality was not in his nature, but in the hands and arts, in the favor and super-additions of God.' Bishop JEREMY TAYLOR.

We know that in this present world there is evil as well as good. whether in the next world there will be an end put to all evil, is a question on which Scripture, if we look to that alone, gives us only this slight hint; that we are told (by Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 25) that Christ 'must reign till He have put all things under his feet;' and that 'the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.' And this does not seem consistent with the continuance forever of a number of wicked beings, alive, and hating Christ, and odious in his sight.

The Scripture do not, I think, afford us any grounds for expecting that those who shall be condemned at the last day as having wilfully rejected or rebelled against their Lord, will be finally delivered; that their doom, and that of the evil Angels, will ever be reversed.

What that doom will be—whether the terms in which its commonly spoken of in Scripture ('death,' 'destruction,' 'perishing,' etc. *) are to be understood figuratively, as denoting immortal life in a state of misery, or, more literally, as denoting a final extinction of existence—this is quite a different question. It is certain that the words 'life,' 'eternal life,' 'immortality,' etc., are always applied to the condition of those, and of those only, who shall at the last day be approved as 'good and faithful servants,' who are to 'enter into the joy of their Lord.'

'Life' as applied to their condition, is usually understood to mean 'happy life.' And that theirs will be a happy life, we are indeed plainly taught; but I do not think we are anywhere taught that the word 'life' does of itself necessarily imply happiness. If so, indeed, it would be a mere tautology to speak of a 'happy life;' and a contradiction to speak of a 'miserable life;' which we know is not the case, according to the usage of any language. In all Ages and Countries, 'life,' and the words answering to it in other languages, have always been applied, in ordinary discourse to a wretched life, no less properly than to a happy one. Life, therefore, in the received sense of the word, would apply equally to the condition of the blest and the condemned, supposing these last to be destined to continue forever living in a state of misery. And yet, to their condition the words 'life' and 'immortality' never are applied in Scripture. If therefore we suppose the hearers of Jesus and his Apostles to have understood, as nearly as possible in the ordinary sense, the words employed, they must naturally have conceived them to mean (if they were

* See Matt. x. 28; Rom. vi. 21—23, etc.

taught nothing to the contrary) that the condemned were really and literally to be 'destroyed,' and cease to exist; not that they were to exist forever in a state of wretchedness. For they are never spoken of as being kept alive, but as forfeiting life: as for instance, 'Ye will not come unto me that ye may have life:'—'He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God, hath not life.' And again, 'perdition,' 'death,' 'destruction,' are employed in numerous passages to express the doom of the condemned. All which expressions would, as I have said, be naturally taken in their usual and obvious sense, if nothing were taught to the contrary.

That these expressions however are to be understood not in their ordinary sense, but figuratively, to signify an immortality of suffering, is inferred, by a large proportion of Christians from some other passages: as where our Lord speaks of 'everlasting punishment,' 'everlasting fire,' and of being 'cast into Hell, where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.'

From such passages as these it has been inferred that the sufferings, and consequently the life, of the condemned is never to end. And the expression would certainly bear that sense; if these were the only ones on the subject that are to be found, in Scripture. But they will also bear another sense; which if not more probable in itself, is certainly more reconcilable with the ordinary meaning of the words 'destruction,' etc. which so often occur. The expressions of 'eternal punishment,' 'unquenchable fire,' etc. may mean merely that there is to be no deliverance—no revival—no restoration of the condemned. 'Death' simply does not shut out the hope of being brought to life again: 'eternal death' does. 'Fire' may be quenched before it has entirely consumed what it is burning: 'unquenchable fire' would seem most naturally to mean that which destroys it utterly.

It may be said, indeed, that supposing Man's soul to be an immaterial Being, it cannot be consumed and destroyed by literal material fire or worms. That is true: but no more can it suffer from these. We all know that no fire, literally so-called, can give us any pain unless it reach our bodies. The 'fire,' therefore, and the 'worm' that are spoken of, must at any rate, it would seem, be something figuratively so-called—something that is to the soul what worms and fire are to a body. And as the effects of worms or fire is, not to preserve the body that they prey upon, but to consume, destroy, and put an end to it, it would follow, if the correspondence hold good, that the fire, figuratively so-called, which is prepared for the condemned, is something that is really to destroy and put an end to them; and is called 'everlasting,' or 'unquenchable' fire, to denote that they are not to be saved from it, but that their destruction is to be final. So in the parable of the tares, our Lord

† This last expression of his is taken from the book of the prophet Isaiah (lxvi. 24), who speaks of 'the carcases of the men that have transgressed, whose worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all [living] flesh: describing evidently the kind of doom inflicted by the Eastern nations on the vilest offenders, who were not only slain, but their bodies deprived of the rights of burial, and either burned to ashes (which, among them was regarded as a great indignity), or left to moulder above ground and be devoured by worms.

describes himself as saying, 'gather ye first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them; but gather the wheat into my garner;' as if to denote that the one is to be (as we know is the practice of the husbandman) carefully preserved, and the other completely PUT AN END TO.

We must not, indeed, venture to conclude at once, from our conviction of the divine goodness and power, that evil will ever cease to exist since we know not how to explain the existence of any evil at all. We can only say that there is some *unknown* (reason) for it; and that it is a foolish presumption to think of assigning a limit to the effects of the unknown cause, except where revelation guides us. But when we are told that Christ is to 'reign till he shall have put all things under his feet,' and that 'the last enemy that shall be destroyed is DEATH;' this *does* afford some ground for expecting the ultimate extinction of evil and of suffering, by the total destruction of such as are incapable of good and of happiness. If 'eternal death' means final death—death without any revival—we can understand what is meant by 'Death being the last enemy destroyed,' viz.: that none henceforth are to be subjected to it. But if 'Death' be understood to mean everlasting life in misery, then, it would appear that Death is never to be destroyed at all; since, altho no one should be henceforth sentenced to it, it would still be going on as a continual infliction, for ever.

On the whole, therefore, I think we are not warranted in concluding (as some have done,) so positively concerning this question as to make it a point of Christian faith to interpret figuratively, and not literally, the 'death' and 'destruction' spoken of in Scripture as the doom of the condemned; and to insist on the belief that they are to be kept alive for ever.

There are persons, I believe, who do not like to hear this question spoken of as one that is left undecided by Scripture. Some would wish that the final extinction of the condemned should be positively declared, because they wish to believe that doctrine true; and some again, from thinking it a dangerous doctrine, wish to have the opposite one positively declared. But all such wishes are quite foreign from the subject. In judging of the sense of Scripture, we should be careful to guard against the error of suffering our wishes to bias the mind. If, indeed, we had to devise a religion for ourselves, we might indulge our wishes as to what is desirable, or our conjectures as to what seems to us in itself probable, or our judgment as to what may seem advisable. But when we have before us 'Scripture-revelations' on any subject, it is for us to endeavor to make out what it is that Scripture teaches, and what it does not teach. We may wonder perhaps why Scripture has taught us so and so, or why it has withheld such and such knowledge, or why it has not more distinctively revealed this or that: but if we presume to interpret Scripture according to our inclinations or judgments, or to speak positively on points which Scripture has left doubtful, because we think it advisable that all such doubts should be removed, it is plain that this is, not to make Scripture our guide, but to make ourselves the guide of Scripture.

On one point, and that which ought to afford us the fullest satisfaction, we are left in no doubt. That 'when Christ, who is our life, shall appear, we also (if of the number of his approved servants) shall appear with him in glory,' which is to last for

ever, we have the fullest assurance from Scripture.

Ignorant, however, as the wisest must be on these subjects, the most ignorant of us is wise enough for his own purpose, if he will but seek for the knowledge of his duty, and use what knowledge he has. Short-sighted as we are, we can see by the light of God's word that there are two paths set before us; the ends of which we cannot indeed distinctly see; but we know that the one leads to everlasting happiness, and the other to ruin; and that God has offered us our choice between them, and entreated us to take the better, and promised us strength to walk in it, if we will 'strive to enter in at the straight gate.'

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, NOV., 1848.

ARE THE WICKED IMMORTAL?

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

BIBLE EXAMINER.—The next number will complete the present volume. No person will have it sent to them after that, unless we receive payment in advance—see terms first page. This rule will apply to all who are now subscribers, as well as to new ones. We hope our present patrons will attend to this in season, and avail themselves of some one of the "Three Offers" in our last number. Immediately on the issue of our next number, we shall have a quantity of Vol. III bound. The price of it will be seventy-five cents, single copy, or four copies for \$2, current money, sent us free of expense. Those who wish the present Vol. complete, unbound, can be supplied with it at the subscription prices. If they wish us to lay aside any for them, bound or unbound, till they call for them, we will do so if they send us the money with the order. Remember, if you wish the present volume complete, you must apply for it soon.

THE "THREE OFFERS."—In our offer of the "Six Sermons," 18mo., we include our views on the Intermediate State of the Dead, and the tract, "Rich man and Lazarus," with each copy of the Sermons. The postage on each copy, including the whole, is about four cents. We state this for the information of all inquirers. Our "offers" cannot be extended to friends in Canada, without the addition of the amount of postage we are obliged to pre-pay on the Examiners sent there, which is eighteen cents, on each copy, per year; and also the postage we will have to pay on the Sermons, if sent by mail. The best Canada bank bills are five per cent discount here.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—We wish to oblige all, but we cannot possibly publish every thing we would if we had a weekly issue, or an enlarged monthly. Our friends, then, must bear with us if their com-

munications do not always appear. We may also err in judgment in our selections from their favors; but we will do the best we can. We have given place to more commendatory items during the year than we intended at the outset, but it has been done by the desire of others, contrary to our own judgment in some respects.

We are compelled to lay over several articles intended for the present number; and among them the first article of a Review of the Lectures of J. W. Bonham, against the destruction of the wicked, in which that production of endless miseryism is handled as it merits, but kindly, by H. Grew.

"PROPHECY OF ZECHERIAH."—The Bible Advocate, published at Hartford, Conn., seems almost to take fire at our remarks upon this prophecy in the last Examiner. It is "half inclined to believe" our article was "designed as a refutation" of one it had published; but the Advocate says:—"Our arrangement and proof are such as are not touched by this reply." We wonder why it "flutters" if it was "not touched?" Why be at the pains of publishing six columns of additional matter to help that which was not harmed?

But, says the Advocate,—"If the Examiner had only published our article, we should have no need to say a word in reply." Did not all those persons see your "article," Br. Advocate, that will see your reply? If so, your "reply" is a "needless" affair according to your own admission. Did not the Advocate then undertake a work of supererogation in replying at all? Did that paper really think the Examiner would copy its "article?" We must have been excessively fond of accommodation, to have copied six columns and a half from a weekly paper. When did that paper ever set us the example of such disinterestedness? Carefully, it would seem, till now, have the Editors abstained from ever mentioning our paper, though we have published occasionally for more than three years, and regularly for more than a year. They have not copied an article from the Examiner, nor mentioned its name all this long while, except at the time when Dr. Cray has managed the editorial. With that exception, the Advocate never let its readers know that such a paper as the Examiner was in existence. Now it seems to wonder that we could not have copied its long article on Zechariah! "Consistency should blush for an answer," truly! If the Advocate intends the introduction of its last article, of an "old fiddle" and "Judas" hanging "himself," to illustrate our reasoning, as it evidently does, we will only say—"Physician, heal thyself." we have no controversy with such very logical deductions.

The "article" in our "exchange" paper, to which we referred in our last, in one and the same

paragraph, admits the Mount of Olives, Zech. 14, is literal, and says "the feet of the Lord stood upon" it at his first advent; and then, when it comes to the cleaving of the Mount of Olives, and half of it removing one way and half the other, it means "the destruction of the Jewish polity"!! Aye, and the "fleeing to the valley of the mountains" is "literally to be dispersed among the Gentiles"!!! If this is not an "arbitrary application of scripture," we may defy a Jesuit to tell what is. But, we leave that paper to pursue its own way, and we shall take the course to which we believe God and duty calls us. We feel no fears in letting our remarks on Zechariah go the world over, without strengthening them, along with the twelve and a half columns our exchange paper has served up for its readers.

MORTAL AND IMMORTAL TOGETHER.—"No doubt but ye are the people, and wisdom shall die with you," Job 12: 2. One of our exchange papers, in laboring to prove us wrong in the opinion that some will be probationers in the next age, or under Messiah's personal reign, and to avoid the difficulty in which it was placed by our argument, from the fact that angels have visited and preached to men; as, for example, Gabriel to Daniel—to the father of John the Baptist—to Mary, the mother of Jesus—and others—gravely inquires—"Are angels immortal?" and adds—"The same argument which proves that they are, will prove that men are." Surely, "wisdom shall die with you," brother Exchange. Our Lord saith—"They that are accounted worthy to obtain that age, and the resurrection from the dead, cannot die any more: [why not?] for they are equal unto the angels:" that is the reason why they cannot die any more. Here our Lord clearly affirms that the holy angels cannot die: but our Exchange, says—"They are not said to be immortal:" and it further affirms that "Angels and men will be all of an age in immortality." Our Lord is thus represented as saying—"They that obtain that age," &c., "cannot die any more, for they are equal to themselves." Truly—"How forcible are right words." Will our Exchange give us chapter and verse in proof that "angels and men will be all of an age in immortality"? aye, and a little proof that angels will ever be made immortal at all, if they are not so before men? or, if those are not immortal now who "kept their first estate"?

We conceive our brother Exchange has made another very great mistake in applying Paul's language, 1 Timothy 6: 15—16, "to Christ;" a mistake, however, which would be pardonable in a learner, but hardly so in one who is so positive in conclusions, without evidence, as some of his statements are. His words are—"Paul, referring

to Christ, the only Potentate, says, *Who only hath immortality, dwelling in light, &c.*" If our brother had quoted the remainder of the verse, he would have found it to read thus—"Which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen nor can see." Will he affirm that is "Christ?" The same apostle, in the same epistle, chapter 1: 17, affirms that "The King eternal, immortal, invisible," is "THE ONLY WISE GOD." He *only* hath inherent immortality: but, does it therefore follow that holy angels are not immortal, because men are not yet so? Is that logical? Just as much so as the following:—"There is *none* good but *one*, that is God,"—"therefore no man nor angel is good." Though God alone is *inherently* good, yet he, at *diverse* times, imparts of that goodness to his creatures. How then can our brother Exchange prove that God does not impart immortality at diverse times to his creatures? And hence, how can he prove what he has so *positively* affirmed, that angels are not now immortal? If his assertion is to be relied upon as proof, it proves too much—it proves angels never can be immortal; for, then the "only Potentate" could not be said "*only*" to have "immortality."

Our brother seems to say, that our Lord was mortal after his resurrection, and until his ascension, for he says—"Nor is there any evidence that he was immortalized, until he was glorified after his ascension." Pray, why did our brother not affirm at once, that he is not "immortalized" yet? for he says—"Angels and men will be all of one age in immortality." "The man Christ Jesus," [1 Tim. 2: 5,] is not "immortalized" yet, according to these *assumptions*. We agree with our brother, *fully*, that "Faith founded in *speculation*, may supplant Christian faith, but it can never honor the Gospel."

We have received, we presume from the author, a small pamphlet of fifty-eight pages, on "The purpose of God in creating the World," &c. "By E. R. Pinney." We have not examined it as fully as we may. In some things we agree with him, and in others we are compelled to disagree; particularly in the application of the *prophetic periods*. But time will soon show if he is right. Those who may wish to procure the work, can obtain it of the author, at Seneca Falls, N. Y. Price \$4 per hundred; six cents single copy.

THE PENALTY OF ADAM'S SIN.

A writer signing himself "Timothy," in the *Bible Advocate*, September 28th, very briefly notices our article on the "Death Threatened to Adam, not Moral, nor Spiritual, but Literal," in the *Examiner* of July. Instead, however, of letting the "*original sin*" of that article fall back on the *Bible Examiner*, "Timothy" says it is "A piece [that] appeared in the *Advent Harbinger* of July 15th." That is true, but, it is not *all the truth*. The *Harbinger* gave

credit for it to the "*Bible Examiner*." However, we care nothing about that so far as we are concerned: if "Timothy" is afraid to say *Bible Examiner*, or does not choose to name it, we have no fault to find on that account.

"Timothy" does not quote us correct, or the *Advocate* has made him say what he did not mean. He represents us as saying that "It involves the greatest absurdity, and that it confounds language, to suppose that moral death was *included* in the sentence threatened to Adam."

Our language is, "Some contend that death [threatened to Adam] was a moral death. Such a view involves the greatest absurdity and confounds language. We shall see this by an examination of those texts in Moses and the Prophets where the phrase *surely die* occurs." We did go into that examination, and found, yea demonstrated, that that phrase is never used where *moral death* is the subject referred to; and this "Timothy" does not attempt to disprove from Moses and the Prophets; evidently, because it cannot be done. We said not a word about whether "moral death was *included* in the sentence;" but we did say, that was not the *penalty* of Adam's sin, which God threatened; and we repeat it—to maintain that it was, "involves the greatest absurdity, and confounds language;" it is contrary to the entire analogy of the language of the Law and the Prophets, as we have shown; and it will be time enough to strengthen that position when "Timothy" gives any evidence that we have misunderstood or misapplied the words of Moses and the Prophets.

The civil law threatens men with *death* who commit murder—that they "shall be hung by the neck till they are dead." Is that a literal death, or a *political* one? Perhaps "Timothy" would say it "*includes*" political "death." Suppose we admit that—Is *political* death the *penalty*? or, is it a mere accident? an unavoidable consequence, which it would be "*absurd*" to legislate about? It follows as a matter of course when a man has committed murder, that he loses his political life; but no one ever dreamed that was the penalty for murder. Equally absurd is it, to maintain that when God said to man, whom he had just "formed of the dust of the ground," "thou shalt surely die," he meant a *moral* death! That would amount to just this—"O, Adam, I have formed thee of the dust of the ground—if thou sinnest, thou shalt surely be a sinner!!!" Most marvellous penalty! Know, O man, if thou dost commit murder thou shalt surely be a murderer!

"Timothy" next goes on to catechise us; and we judge he has been to the "Assembly's Catechism" to get his questions—they are a very fair specimen of that school.

QUESTION 1. "Does mankind retain the moral image that Adam had when he was first created?"

ANSWER. When you tell us what moral image Adam had at that time we will answer you.

QUESTION 2. "If man has not lost his moral image, is not morally dead, why should Christ have come to atone for sin?"

ANSWER. The expressions "moral image"—"morally dead"—and "spiritual death," are all very good *mythology*, but do not belong to Bible theology—they are as unscriptural as "*immortal souls*;" and belong to the same *brotherhood*. It is by such stereotyped phrases, brought out of the *Creeds* of Babylon, that men's minds are bewilder-

ed and blinded. The question is a mere play upon words. If you had asked "If Adam was not a sinner—was not subjected to death—why Christ should have come as a deliverer?" all would have been plain; but such a question would have brought you exactly on the ground we occupy. But we reply to your question—If the *penalty* of Adam's sin was moral death there could have been no atonement; and the race of man was lost. That death which could make atonement must be of *like* character—Christ must have died a "moral death"—must be "morally dead." That would be to "atone for sin" with a vengeance. We have long seen that the advocates of the theory "Timothy" contends for, are virtually denying the atonement, and establishing the doctrine of the "endless misery" of all mankind, so far as they do anything. "The second death" is *like* the first: if the first is a *moral* death so is the second: if the first is *literal* so is the second: there is no avoiding this conclusion. Nor is that all: if the first death is a moral death, no man can die the "second death" who has not been first made morally alive: hence, either all men are thus made alive and then die a second moral death, or else none can possibly die the second death—it would only be to continue under the first moral death. But still another absurdity follows the moral death theory, *viz*: If the first death be a moral death, as they must be made morally alive to die a second moral death, then, this "second death" must be in the present life; i. e., they must be morally dead to be liable to moral death! and if they die another moral death after the resurrection, it must, of necessity, be the *third* moral death!! Let the moral death of Adam theorist escape this dilemma if he can.

QUESTION 3. "Where is the necessity of the atonement? If literal death was the only penalty attached to the first transgression, if literal death only was contained in the sentence against sin, then justice has no demands, only to bring this dust back to dust again."

ANSWER. Can "Timothy," or any one else, show that "justice has" any other "demand" for "the first transgression?" If they can, let them do it. We deny that justice has any further demand than that. The penalty of that transgression is inflicted—there is no remitting the penalty, all are made subject to death: but the second Adam, Jesus Christ, has obtained the right to "*abolish* death;" this he will do by a resurrection of all that are in their graves, or by a change of the living which is equivalent to a resurrection. But, "Timothy" seems to think all sin is wrapped up in the first sin: for, according to his argument, if man [all men] did not morally die by Adam's sin there is no need of an atonement. We think otherwise, but shall not argue that point now.

"Timothy" says—"The brother in quoting Ezk. 3: 18, &c., says, Can it mean moral death? and also says [asks] Are not the wicked already morally dead? I would say, [ask] does not the brother here overthrow his argument by allowing that the wicked are morally dead?"

We would say in reply, when we asked the question, "Are not the wicked already morally dead?" we used the phrase "morally dead" as a *quotation*, though we did not mark it as such; it was using our opponent's own phraseology to show the inconsistency of applying the threatening to what they call moral death. To say a wicked man is morally dead, is to say, a wicked man is

wicked. But God said "to the wicked, thou shalt surely die," &c., in Ezk. 3: 18. The threatening did not relate to what "Timothy" calls a "moral death;" for, the person spoken of was, at the time addressed, what he calls "*morally* dead." We did not, therefore, "overthrow" our "argument," but established it. But if we were to admit that all wicked men are "morally dead" it does not touch the question, as to what death was the penalty of the law Adam violated.

"Timothy" adds—"I know that the state of mankind by nature and by practice, would teach that doctrine." [That is, that "the wicked are morally dead."]

The wicked most certainly are *wicked*—"morally dead;" if you please—who disputes that? The question is not touched even if you had proved that. What has that to do with the penalty of the first transgression? Just as much as the fact that a man is *politically* dead when he has committed murder, and no more. His being politically dead does not prove that was the penalty of the law against murder. "Timothy" quotes Scripture—"To be carnally minded is death,"—"And you being dead in your sins," &c., [Not Adam's sins, but their own.—Ed. Ex.]—"Having the understanding darkened; being alienated from the life of God." The inference of "Timothy" from these texts is truly marvellous; he says:—

"We see that scripture agrees with what the brother allows, that the wicked are morally dead, and that they have been ever since the fall of man."

We have made no such admission as this language seems to imply. We do not allow that any man since Adam, or by Adam, was made "morally dead." Adam sinned, and hence was a sinner; but God has sworn by himself that no man should have occasion to say, "the fathers have eaten sour grapes and the children's teeth are set on edge;" Ezk. 18: 1—4. We wonder when men will cease to impeach the oath of the Lord of Hosts; and leave off the guilt of charging on God their own wickedness.

"But," says Timothy, "See the pride, the anger, the hatred, the malice, that rushed into the human heart after the fall." He adds, "Cain was morally dead—Lamech was morally dead."—&c.

Prejudice and superstition are always blind. Some men can see nothing good in the world: we do not know but such men are "morally," or, at least, *mentally* dead. Was Abel morally dead? We wonder if Cain did not "morally" kill him! Quite as likely as that Cain was "morally dead" by any act but his own; or, that his "moral death" was "*the penalty* of the first transgression" of his "father!" Was Seth morally dead? Was Enoch morally dead? Was Methuselah? Was Noah? Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob? Was Joseph, Moses, Joshua, Caleb, Job, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, and the Three Hebrews? Were all these "morally dead? Oh, but these were not "the wicked," it is only "the wicked" that "Timothy" says are "morally dead!!!" That is, it is only the wicked that are wicked! But "pride, anger," &c., "rushed into the human heart, after the fall." Did not a little *rush* into mother Eve's before she fell? Was not the desire to "be as Gods" a little touch of "Timothy's" "pride rushing into the human heart" before "the fall!" Wonder if Eve was not born of somebody that was "morally dead!" Really, one needs to take a lesson of Job to know how to deal with those who can set aside the plainest declarations of Moses and the Pro-

phets on the subject of the death penalty to Adam. Let "Timothy," or any one else, take the article which drew out his remarks, and refute the position there laid down, if he can. We challenge them to do it. Our columns shall be open for them to make the attempt. The question is simply this, *Do Moses or the Prophets give any other interpretation of the phrase "SURELY DIE" than that of a LITERAL death?* We affirm, *they do not.* Who will join issue with us on that point?

P. S. Since writing the foregoing we have obtained and read the "Three Lectures of J. W. Bonham," delivered in England, on "The Eternal Punishment of the Wicked not Annihilation." We had seen the Boston organ of endless misery's notice of this work, which led us to desire to see the *puffed* "Lectures." They are, in our mind, a most singular failure—quite a good *echo* from Boston, Massachusetts; and a pity if Boston could not praise its own child. At another time we may give our readers a specimen of the double-faced character of that *abortion*. We just remark now that the author says, page 22, "The nature of the death Adam died in consequence of sinning is the point at issue." As our remarks on that subject have already been presented in the Examiner of July and this month, we shall add no more now, but may say more hereafter. We have no fear for the result, if the "Three Lectures of J. W. Bonham" are the best our opponents can do. We say to them all as Micah said to Ahab, king of Israel, 2 Chron. 18: 14, "Go ye up and prosper!" Please read that chapter if you wish to know the result.

THE DEAD UNCONSCIOUS;

OR, OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.—No. II.

It is said: "That the souls of the righteous are preserved in life in the intermediate state is positively stated by Matthew, Mark, and Luke." Where have either of them "positively stated" such a doctrine? We cannot find it. But "Moses was seen by Peter, James, and John, conversing with our Saviour upon the mount of transfiguration." Let it be distinctly understood, that manifestation was a "vision;" so our Lord himself declares, Matt. 17: 9. It appears, from Luke 9, at the time "Peter and they that were with him were heavy with sleep;" but "when they were awake, they saw his glory and the two men that stood with him." But it seems they were not so much awake as to know distinctly what was passing; for Peter wanted to make "tabernacles"—"not knowing what he said." Now as this was a representation by a "vision," it does not follow that Moses was personally and *really* present on that occasion, any more than it follows that the saints were *really* in life at the time Daniel saw the little horn making war upon them and prevailing against them, even till the judgment set; or, that the new heavens and new earth were actually in being when John saw them eighteen hundred years ago; or that the things seen in any other "vision" were realities at the time seen. This "vision" was designed to represent our Lord, himself, as he *will be* when he comes in his kingdom—not as he then *really* was: for, as yet, he had not been "quickened by the spirit;" and before that event would take place he was to be "put to death in the flesh." He was not, therefore, *actually*

in his glory at the transfiguration, but was represented in vision as he will be when he shall "come in his kingdom."

Another objection.—"The soul is a spirit, therefore the soul may, with perfect consistency, dwell with God and angels, separate from the body."

Where is the proof "that the soul is a spirit?" If the soul is "the man" it is not a spirit. Besides the Scriptures keep up a uniform distinction between soul and spirit. But what is "a spirit?" Has it *shape*? Has it *substance*? Or, is it immaterial? That is, having no substance, or matter connected with it? If the latter, we beg to know how a spirit can be *seen*? Can *thought* be seen? Can *mind* be visible to the eye? These absurdities are involved in the common theory.

Once more it is objected.—"If the Saviour has declared that whosoever liveth and believeth in him shall never die; we are bound to believe him, see John 11: 26." Most certainly we do believe him. But did our Lord assert by such language that Lazarus was not *then* dead. If he was not dead, then he did not raise him from the dead. But he himself had declared, "Lazarus is dead," verse 14. The interpretation the objector gives to our Lord's words, verse 26, makes him contradict himself, and makes the miracle to be no miracle: that is—the *dead* was not raised, because Lazarus was not dead. But our Lord said he was dead, and he calls death *sleep*. He did not say Lazarus' *body* sleeps, but "*Lazarus* sleepeth," and "*Lazarus* is dead;" and let it be recollected that the objector admits, and contends, the soul is the *essential* man; then the soul was the *essential* Lazarus; and *Lazarus* slept, and was *dead*, our Lord being judge.

What then did our Lord mean when he said: "He that believeth in me shall never die"? He must be understood in one of two ways: *First* That such a person should not die *for ever*, or remain forever under the power of death, though they die as had Lazarus. The *original* admits, we believe, of this construction; so some of the commentators have rendered the words, and among them Dr. Clarke. The previous verse shows that this may be the meaning. Our Lord had said: "*I am the resurrection and the life*;" he that believeth in me, though he were *dead*, yet *shall he live*;" *i. e.* he shall have a resurrection to life. Our Lord had told Martha that her "*brother* [not his body merely, but "*thy brother*,"] shall rise again;" he shall not always remain under the power of death; he shall not die *forever*, or, remain *always* dead; he "shall rise again." "And whosoever [not Lazarus only] liveth and believeth in me shall not die forever;" they shall live again, for "*I am the resurrection and the life*," and "in the resurrection at the last day" they shall live again. Such, we conceive, is the true meaning of our Lord's words, unless,—*second*—He had reference to those that should be "alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord," of whom Paul speaks, 1 Thess. 4: 15; such "shall never die." It is possible our Lord had reference to that class of believers, in the words under consideration; for that day had just been spoken of by Martha.

From this text then there is no evidence that a man is dead and alive at the same time; or, in other words, that a man *is* dead, but *not* dead. "In that very day his thoughts perish," is the

testimony of inspiration. See Psa. 146: 4. And "*the dead praise not the Lord.*" Psa. 115: 17. "In the grave," in "*sheol*,"—the state of the dead—"there is *no knowledge.*" Eccl. 9: 10. Such testimony is *positive*; and no *inferential* conclusions can invalidate it. When a man is dead, he *is* dead; and were it not for the "*resurrection*," even those "that have fallen asleep in Christ are perished." But they shall live again to "*die no more.*" Compare 1 Cor. 15: 16, 18, with Luke 20: 35, 36.

H. T. ANDERSON.

We are exceedingly pleased to see that this gentleman has so ably vindicated *some* of the things, "concerning the kingdom of God." The readers of "the Examiner" will appreciate the article to which we refer, under the caption, "*Study of Prophecy*," taken from the "Christian Magazine," and edited by J. B. Ferguson, B. F. Hall, and T. Fanning. Mr. Anderson is far in advance of all his contemporaries in the "Reformation," as it is called, and his brethren will do well to listen to his faithful and lucid exposition of the subject of which he treats in the article before us. Perhaps they will learn from him, when the same views offered by another, would be rejected on account of the source from which they might emanate. At all events, the truth is proclaimed, and we therein rejoice; yea, and we will rejoice! The following is the article to which we refer.

J. T. W.

While I have my doubts of a universal conflagration, I have no doubts of a change in the constitution of the present heavens and earth. I do most religiously believe the saying of the Saviour, "Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the Earth." The song of the redeemed that John heard, ended with the words, "thou hast made us unto our God kings and priests, and we shall reign on the earth." There is a strong feeling of attachment to the earth on the part of those who suffered here. So it would seem from this song of theirs. Sin has indeed brought upon our race and upon our earth curses, which have sadly injured both. The race has become degenerate and wicked; and this fair globe has suffered from the consequences of the sin of man. We have death, disease and pain; labour, sorrow and tears. But in that new state to which we hasten, there will be neither death, nor sorrow, nor crying, nor any more pain; and God shall wipe away every tear from our eyes. Not only so, but there will be God's tabernacle with man, a pure river of water of life clear as crystal, flowing out from the throne of God and the Lamb. On this river, there will be trees which will yield fruit every month; the fruit will be food and the leaves for medicine, or, as John says, for the healing of the nations. What a glorious state this will be.

But, turn from this for one moment, and tell me, what healing of the nations is this? Will the nations need healing in that state which John describes? And who are these kings that bring their glory and honor into this city? Surely there must be some mistake about our ideas of a future state. John's new heavens and earth cannot differ from Peter's, nor can the state, described by

either of these differ from that of which Ezekiel and Isaiah speak. There can be no difference between prophet and prophet, for all have one spirit. But has Isaiah spoken of a new heavens and earth? He has, and says, 66: 22: "For as the new heavens and new earth, which I will make, shall remain before me, so shall your seed and your name remain. And it shall come to pass, that, from one new moon to another, and from one sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord." Does not this look like the saying of John with respect to the nations bringing their glory and honor into it. Such was the case in a less degree in Solomon's reign, when the kings around him brought gifts to the temple. There will be a healing of the nations, let the wise men say what they will of it. So says the Lord by his servant John. It is written, and we cannot unwrite nor reverse it. Make it intellectual, moral, physical: still it is healing. Now on the generally received opinion, that there will be, in that state, none but the resurrected, how can they need healing? I answer, they have no need of healing, for they are the inhabitants of the city; and they have no death nor pain, but are like the angels of God. And why this tree of life? Shall the resurrected eat of the fruit? I answer yes: for the Saviour says to the church at Ephesus, "to him that overcometh, will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the Paradise of God." But for whom are these leaves? I answer, *for the nations*. So says the testimony. Then, when the Tabernacle of God is with men, there will be nations of the earth who will need healing. Let the Doctors make of this what they can. If they spiritualize, then it is spiritual healing. There is no escape. From all this, I infer [?] that there will be no such universal conflagration as we are wont to hear of. For if this universal conflagration takes place, and none but the immortals shall remain, then why have leaves to heal, when there are no maladies?

Let the reader remember that Isaiah and Ezekiel were Jews; that Peter and John were Apostles of the circumcision and descendants of this same family. Let the reader also remember that one spirit taught these four men, and that they all write in the Oriental style, that Peter was at the Babylon in Assyria, the very centre of the settlement of the Jews, when he wrote, and that he wrote for the Jewish believers; and, then, with all these facts before him, he will be able to comprehend what he wrote. And let any one take heed how he calls in question the fact of Peter's being at Babylon in Assyria. But this, by the way; Isaiah says of Jerusalem, "the nation and kingdom that shall not serve thee, shall perish." Again: "I will make thee an eternal excellency, a joy of many generations." And again: "The sun shall no more be thy light by day, neither for brightness shall the moon give light unto thee: but the Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light, and thy God thy glory. Thy sun shall no more go down; thy people shall be all righteous; they shall inherit the land forever, the branch of my planting, the work of my hands that I may be glorified." Now as Peter, John, Isaiah and Ezekiel describe the same new heavens and earth, and as we find in Isaiah, Ezekiel and John nations subject to the holy people, we cannot conclude that that burning of which Peter speaks, is one of a universal char-

acter, or so extensive as to involve the nations of the earth: for then, verily, would there be no nations to subjugate. So, you perceive, that the new heavens of Peter and John being the same, the burning must take place prior to their existence. But in the new heavens and earth of John, Isaiah and Ezekiel (this last does not mention new heavens and earth; but the holy city, the waters and tree of life) we find the nations subjugated. Therefore, (I think you must permit this "therefore,") there can be no such burning as will involve the nations of the earth. I think, with all due deference to those who think differently, that the wisdom of the wise has failed them on this point. Remember that I have said, I believe in a change in the physical constitution of the present heavens and earth. Moreover, I believe that the Lord Jesus will be revealed, taking vengeance, by flames of fire, on them that know not God, and who obey not the gospel. This I religiously believe and teach. But I am constrained to interpret Peter so as to harmonize with the old prophets, and with John. Had I time, I would here quote from Moses and the prophets, the predictions relative to the land of Canaan; not the land only, but the heavens above that land, and perhaps we might find wondrous things out of the law, the prophets and the Psalms. But not to detain the reader with further remarks on that subject, I will introduce to his consideration a subject of another kind, but bearing upon the present one. First, then, a question: Is the Messiah an heir of any thing yet to be possessed? If so, what is that thing? Paul says, we are heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ. This joint-heirship has some future bearing; something is yet to be developed. Is the Messiah now on the throne of David, or the throne of his Heavenly Father? On the answer to this question hangs the hope of Israel, and of the Christian. If it can be shown that Christ is not on David's throne, then the idea of a spiritual Millennial reign vanishes "like the baseless fabric of a vision." Let me try the answer to that question. First, I remark, that the passage in the 2d of Acts, 30th verse, is not authorized. The words "to kata sarka anasteescin ton Christon," belong not to the text. In the next place, I will quote from the Saviour's words, Rev. 3: 21—"To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcome, and am set down with my Father on his throne." There is a throne which he calls his, on which he will hereafter sit. Open now, Isaiah, and read 9: 6, 7: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The Father of the Everlasting Age, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and justice from henceforth even forever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this." Well, then, the throne of David is his by inheritance, and he must yet sit upon it. He is the seed of David according to the flesh, and no other one can ever reign over the house of Jacob. Luke 1: 32, 33: "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest. And the Lord God shall give him the throne of his Father David. And he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be

no end." This needs no comment. The language is clear, simple and plain. I say no one but he can reign over the Jewish people. Where is their Priesthood, and their kingly line? They are both lost to them long since, but safely preserved for them in the person of Christ. How consoling this promise. I care not to enter into the difficulties of dark sayings. This is plain. He shall reign over the house of Jacob forever. And Peter said, lo, we have left all and followed thee, what shall we have therefore? Jesus said to them, "Verily I say unto you, that you, which have followed me, when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory in the Renovation, shall sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." This will be the portion of the Apostles, and every one that overcomes will sit with him on his throne. This is the consummation to which we hasten. He will have a throne of his own, of which he is the sole heir, which no one else can occupy, but which he will share with the faithful. When? In the Renovation, when the fulness of the Gentiles comes in; when the man of sin is destroyed, when the Israelites turn away from ungodliness, when the times of the restitution of all things shall come. Then will he sit on the throne of his glory, and the kingdom, and the dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom, under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High. Then shall the moon be confounded and the sun ashamed, when the Lord of Hosts shall reign in Mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously. "At that time shall they call Jerusalem the throne of the Lord; and all nations shall be gathered to it, to the name of the Lord, to Jerusalem." Jeremiah 3: 17. I did not conclude the quotation. "Neither shall they walk any more after the imagination of their evil heart. For the Lord will comfort Zion: he will comfort all her waste places, and he will make her wilderness like Eden, and her desert like the garden of the Lord; joy and gladness shall be found therein, thanksgiving and the voice of melody." Isaiah 5: 13.

I may at some future time give my view of Peter's 3d chapter. I have not entered into that subject, nor do I think it necessary now. I had long listened for some interpretation, which would cause that portion to harmonize with the other three that I mentioned, but my ears have not heard it from any quarter. The facts that I mentioned alone are important. Peter did not write for the Gentiles, and I think his language is understood only by those who give such an interpretation as will harmonize with Isaiah, Ezekiel and John, as well as other prophets. Be it known, that he wrote his letter a short time prior to the overthrow of Jerusalem, when that whole land, city and nation, were threatened by the Romans. The minds of the Jewish people were no doubt sadly perplexed with the coming vengeance, and needed all the aid that the Apostle could give. There is something exceeding sad to my mind, (what must it have been to that of a Jew?) in the whole of the 4th chapter of his first letter: but particularly in the 17th verse: "But the end of all things is at hand." They sound like the knell of the departing glory of the Jewish age. Imagine to yourself the homeless wanderer, driven from his own land, persecuted for his religion, which his Saviour had given; he has taken his last look at

the glorious temple, the city of a thousand years and more, and the centre of all that was loved on earth. The sound of war is in the land, the rumors of the approaching Roman host, the coming desolation, the end of which he knew not, all come before him; and then these sad and solemn words, "the end of all things is at hand." "A fire is kindled in my wrath which shall burn to the lowest hell." See Deuteronomy. These awful words must have struck deep into the Jewish heart. But it is a sad theme. I'll turn from it with a quotation. "Ye shall no more see me until you say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." The time I trust is not far distant. The Lord hasten the day. Nevertheless, says Peter, we look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth Righteousness. How striking this word, when contrasted with the excessive wickedness and sinfulness of the then existing Jewish nation. But enough for the present.

THE TWENTY-THREE HUNDRED DAYS.

BY DR. JOHN FONDEY.

BR. STORRS:—About eighteen months ago, I addressed you a few letters giving you the result of my investigations in reference to prophecy, which I designed simply as suggestions for a more able and extended consideration by you than I could give them; one of the chief results of which inquiries was, that the twenty-three hundred days were literal days, and yet future. The twelve hundred and ninety, and thirteen hundred and thirty-five days, were also regarded in the same light. Time, and further reflection, have deepened my original impressions of the correctness of these views; and with the view to elicit truth, and excite others to a thorough investigation of this subject, I present them for the consideration of all who love the study of prophecy.

The host spoken of in the eighth chapter Daniel, is conceded by most of us, I believe, to refer to the Jewish people. This chapter gives a description of several monarchies which were to be the agents permitted by God to chastise the Jews. Babylon being soon to pass away, is not mentioned. Persia, Greece, and the divisions of the Greek kingdom, are spoken of. But the principal character (for the little horn is, I conceive, an individual, and my authority for recognizing him as such, besides other arguments afforded by the other prophets, is drawn from Daniel 11: 36, where the action of this king are again noticed. It matters little, however, whether this be a king or kingdom here referred to, for the two others are closely connected,) is a little horn which springs up in the latter time of the kingdom of the divided Grecian Empire, and who, after accomplishing great things, is finally broken without hand. By comparing the different parts of this chapter together, it will be readily seen that the little horn, and the transgression of desolation, are identical. In the thirteenth verse, the daily is spoken of. This I believe to mean the Jewish daily sacrifices which are yet to be restored after the Jews shall have built a temple prior to the advent of Christ. This could be proved from the prophets, but I only speak of it now in passing to explain the twenty-three hundred days. These Jewish daily sacrifices and the transactions of this little horn, who is to be an active agent in inflicting judgment on the Jews, are to occupy a period of twenty-three

hundred days. These days I believe to be literal, and I will now give my reasons for this opinion, leaving it to others to decide for themselves whether they are of any value.

The argument is simple, and founded on the peculiarity of the words spoken by the angel while obeying the command in the sixteenth verse, to make Daniel understand the vision. In obedience to this command, he tells him to "understand, O Son of Man, for AT THE TIME OF THE END SHALL BE THE VISION." He does not say the vision of twenty-three hundred days shall begin with the commencement of the seventy weeks, which idea our advent brethren held out so valiently for, and many yet do, and as long as they do so will only be perpetually disappointed; nor three hundred, or one thousand years hence—but mark the phraseology—he says at the time of the end, which is somewhere about the time of Christ's second coming, *this vision shall be.* That passage seems to me a plain passage, and I wonder that I myself and others have stumbled over it so long—it shows that we are not to look for those twenty-three hundred days UNTIL THE TIME OF THE END. That time of the end is, I believe yet future, but as I am only considering the literality of the days spoken of in this chapter, I shall pass on to the next argument on this point.

In the nineteenth verse the angel says: "Behold I will make thee know what shall be in the last end of the indignation, for at the time appointed the end shall be." Let us analyze these words—at the time appointed (the conclusion of the twenty-three hundred days,) the end of the indignation should be. But will the indignation end on the Jews until Christ comes? No, for when he appears the Jews will be in such a time of trouble as never was and never again should be. This is not, however, the strongest point in this verse. But this is: "Behold I will make thee know what shall be in the LAST END of the indignation." This is the burden of the vision—this is what the angel comes to tell him about, viz:—the events connected with the time of Jacob's trouble, and which is yet future. Is that last end of the indignation, twenty-three hundred literal days, or is it twenty-three hundred years long? I believe it to be twenty-three hundred literal days. The whole period of the indignation of God on the Jews was to be seven times, or two thousand five hundred and twenty years. At the time Daniel had this vision, but one or two hundred years of this indignation had been inflicted on the Jews, leaving the most of the seven times punishment yet unfulfilled. Now this twenty-three hundred days finishes up the indignation on the Jews, and is said to be the last end of it. If the twenty-three hundred days are not literal days, but refer to years, I would ask if twenty-three hundred years would not be a long last end of twenty-five hundred and twenty years—the end would be nearly as long as the whole period spoken of.

Mark, he does not say I will make thee know what shall be in the beginning, nor the middle, nor the latter part of the indignation, "but I will make thee know what shall be in the LAST END of it, for at the time appointed (twenty-three hundred days,) the end shall be." The common sense meaning of words, will, it seems to me, warrant no other explanation of this verse, nor the one previously spoken of, than that the vision shall be at the time of the end, and that the last end of the indignation

is not more than twenty-three hundred literal days in length.

I have spoken of the twenty-three hundred days as making the duration of the last end of the indignation. This time, however is, I believe, divided into two parts, one of twelve hundred and sixty days, (which can be proved from the prophecies,) during which the transgression of desolation is to be treading down, which leaves for the other a period of one thousand and forty days, during which the Jewish daily sacrifices are to be offered. Both these periods added together, give us the whole duration of the vision. The question of the saint in the thirteenth verse, included both these events. The time of the continuance of the daily, and also the transactions of the little horn, or the transgression of desolation, and the time of their complete termination, was to mark the time of the complete cessation of the indignation on the Jewish people.

An objection might be started to these views, that as the angel gives an account of the different monarchies, they must be included in the period of the twenty-three hundred days, and consequently those days must be years. But if we look carefully at the explanation of the angel, we shall find that the burden of it referred to the actions of the little horn—the events connected with the last end of the indignation. Besides, I conceive the description of the other monarchies to have been given simply as an introduction to the subject matter of the vision, viz: the movements of the little horn. To illustrate this. When the historian gives us the history of a king, he does not immediately commence with the events of his reign, but traces his descent, and then goes on to give an account of his acts. So in this chapter we have the descent of the little horn as connected with those persecuting kingdoms given; he is shown to have sprung out of one of the four divisions of the Grecian Empire, and then his acts are given at length. I was pleased to see that you had made an advancement towards the views of the literality of the days in Daniel's prophecies. In the April number, subject Prophetic Periods, No. 6, you conclude the twelve hundred and ninety, and thirteen hundred and thirty-five days, to be literal, but the term translated twenty-three hundred days, you say is different from that of the twelve hundred and ninety, and thirteen hundred and thirty-five days, and therefore, I suppose, consider them, in distinction from these last, to be years. But in Daniel 12: 11, it speaks of its being twelve hundred and ninety days from the time when the daily shall be taken away to set up the abomination that maketh desolate. In Daniel 8: 13 and 14, it speaks of the daily and transgression of desolation containing altogether twenty-three hundred days. These two dailies and transgressions of desolation in the eighth and twelfth chapters, are evidently the same; and if your twenty-three hundred days are years, and twelve hundred and ninety days are days, you will have days cut off years, which spoils the harmony of prophetic dates. But if, as I believe them to be, the twenty-three hundred days are days, your twelve hundred and ninety days can commence somewhere in the duration of the first mentioned number, no violence is done to prophetic periods, and all is harmonious and intelligible. Another idea which presents itself to my view, is drawn from the twenty-sixth verse of the eighth chapter;

the vision is there said to be shut up for many days. Of course the twenty-three hundred days were not to commence until a very remote period.

The little horn in this chapter, I do not consider Papacy, but an anti-Christian power, yet to be manifested identical with the King in Dan. 11: 36, and the Russian Emperor (the great Gog) who shall last reign, I conceive to be the person indicated. The time, times and half of Daniel 7, are also yet future, harmonizing with the twelve hundred and sixty days during which the little horn of the eighth chapter is to be flourishing. The little horn (Papacy,) of the seventh chapter, makes war for twelve hundred and sixty days on the nominal Christian church, while the little horn or Russian Emperor of the eighth chapter, makes war for the same length of time on the nominal Jewish church; the two persecuting both the natural branches and the graft.

ALBANY, N. Y., Oct., 1848.

LETTER FROM BR. MANSFIELD.

BUFFALO, N. Y., Oct 9th, 1848.

BR. STORRS:—I find in your monthly paper much that interests me; especially in your articles relating to the question of man's condition in death, and the future state. When I first gave my attention to the advent doctrine in 1842, while in Cleveland with our departed brother Fitch, I fell in with your "Six Sermons;" and simultaneously with my investigation of the advent doctrine, I examined the subject matter of those discourses and became assured of the general truth of your positions. I have, it is true, found apparent obstacles in the way, but not more than are met in attempting a solution of the advent doctrine—the doctrine of sanctification—human rights, &c., &c. I have always endeavoured to maintain the truth upon the questions referred to, contained in those sermons; and have never felt that by so doing I violated any of my obligations to others, with whom I agreed on the great and absorbing theme of the second advent, who differed with me on the subjects of *death and immortality*. I feel now, as I have in time past, that the doctrine of the speedy personal coming of Jesus, is the sublime and thrilling theme of the heralds of Christ in this age of the world; but that all other truths should occupy their appropriate place in the arch of truth; assured that—although the keystone be in its place, the arch is imperfect while any truth is left out, and the fabric is in danger of falling. That the *dead are unconscious—and the wicked are not immortal*, I firmly believe, and therefore think the arch of truth incomplete without those views; and I am persuaded that the mass of advent believers entertain the same sentiments, though many do not.

I have never had occasion to change my views on the Jew question; but think the Millenarian scheme furnishes no satisfactory scriptural argument to sustain the idea of a mixed state in the millenium; and that no explanation has been given, from scripture, as to the termination of this mixed state, nor of the process by which the *mortals* living during that period shall become *immortal*. Accept assurances of Christian love, and believe me

Truly, yours in hope,

L. DELOS MANSFIELD.

Br. M. has travelled extensively in preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and returned last May from his arduous labours in the West Indies.—*Ed. Ex.*