

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. VI.

PHILADELPHIA, AUGUST, 1851.

NO. 8.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY,

At 68 North Eighth Street, between Arch and Cherry,
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, \$1; six copies, \$5;
thirteen copies, \$10; always in advance.

STATE OF THE DEAD.

BY REV. WM. GLEN MONCRIEFF, SCOTLAND.

This brother has republished, in England and Scotland, Henry Grew's pamphlet on "*The Intermediate State*," or state of the dead prior to the resurrection, to which he has appended "notes" and added an "appendix," all of much interest. We present our readers with the principal notes, to be followed by the appendix. The first note is a prefatory one, as follows:—

"The question as to the state of the dead has long occupied my own thoughts, and has frequently been proposed to me by others, and the following short treatise is issued because it seems to be fitted to help God's people to arrive at a scriptural understanding of the matter. Let it be used as a human help to the comprehension of a deeply interesting subject, and the wish of the pious author, and of the editor, will be gained.

"The editor wishes it to be understood that he does not endorse all that is said in the author's pages, the treatise on the general question is the best, among the smaller works he has seen on the subject, and he considers it worthy of a careful perusal. Here and there a very few sentences have been omitted in the text to save space, but they were not essential to the argument. A few notes have been added to the text, and these are signed with the editor's initials. The reader's attention is also requested to the "Appendix" at the close of the work.

"Musselburgh, April, 1851."

After the text Gen. 2: 7, quoted by Bro. Grew, Bro. Moncrieff appends the following note:

"If man, after receiving the breath of life, became 'a living soul,' he must have been a soul before he became alive, just as a watch is a watch before it is wound up and made to go;—wind it up and it is a going watch. That which God made of 'dust' (Gen. 2: 7, 'God formed man of the dust of the ground,') was soul, and all that it needed to make it a LIVING soul, was the breath of life. God 'breathed' not soul into man, but 'the breath of life,' and man,—the soul man, the organized being made of dust, became, on receiving the life-breath, a living soul. Such is the account of the soul man, delivered by Him who made man at first. In being a soul, man does not differ from the other animals in the world, for they are souls as much as he is; the difference between them consists in the position in the scale of creation which he has above the other

living souls formed by the Creator. That the inferior creatures are souls as well as man can be easily shown. Here is the proof: Gen. 1: 21, "God created great whales and every living creature (Hebrew, 'living soul,') that moveth." Verse 24, "Let the earth bring forth the living creature," (Hebrew, 'living soul,') The same Hebrew word (*nephesh*) translated creature in these texts, is the identical term used in the original translated 'soul' in the expression 'man became a living soul,' Gen. 2: 7. If man was a soul before he got the breath of life, it only made him a soul alive; and, hence, we see at once that when he loses his breath, ceases to breathe, and, therefore, to live, he must be a *dead soul*. Hence we read, Num. 9: 6, "defiled by the dead body of a man"—Hebrew, the dead soul (*nephesh*) of a man: the "dead soul" of a man is then just a dead man. Num. 6: 6, "He shall come at no dead body," (*nephesh*, Hebrew dead soul.) See Cruden under the word "soul." In harmony with this we find, souls smitten with the sword, Josh. 10: 30, 32, 39, and 11: 11;—a soul redeemed from the grave, Ps. 30, 3, and 49: 15;—a soul delivered from death, or, a man spared in the land of the living, Ps. 56: 13;—we read also of a soul going to the grave, Ps. 89: 48;—of the blood of souls, Jer. 2: 34;—and of souls dying, "the soul that sinneth it shall die," Ezek. 18: 4.

"It is justice to the English reader to inform him, that the word translated 'life,' in the phrase 'breath of life,' is in the Hebrew plural, 'breath of lives' (*ruach chayim*.) But in this there is no peculiarity in man, for the inferior creatures, the other souls made by God, received also 'the breath of lives.' For instance, Gen. 6: 17, 'Behold I, even I, do bring a flood of waters upon the earth to destroy all flesh, wherein is the breath of life,' (Heb. 'lives,' *ruach chayim*.) Gen. 7: 15, 'And they went in unto Noah into the ark, two and two of all flesh, wherein is the breath of life,' (Heb. 'lives,' *ruach chayim*.) Solomon says men and animals have all one breath, (*ruach*.) Eccles. 3: 19. It appears to me that men, fishes, and other living animal creatures, are said to have the breath "of lives," because they have a portion of that breath which sustains so many different lives on this globe. They have all one breath, (*ruach*;) but it is the breath that quickens and supports the lives of many and very diversified living souls."

After the texts Gen. 35: 18; 1 Kings 17: 21, 22, and Psa. 16: 10, he inserts the following:—

"Even these three texts have no reference to what is popularly called a soul; a few words will show this. Gen. 35: 13, 'And it came to pass, as her soul was in departing, (for she died,)' Soul here designates *life*, and life is called "soul" inasmuch as it was the life of her—a soul. 1 Kings 17: 21, 22, 'Let this child's soul come into him again,' i. e. let his life (called soul because it animated the soul) come into him again, or let him live again by beginning again to breathe; see verse 17. Ps. 16: 10, 'Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one to see corruption.' The word "hell" here (Heb. *sheol*) signifies the state of

the dead, sometimes translated grave in the Old Testament, as in Eccles. 9: 10, "There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave, (*Bisheol*, i. e. *bi*, in—*sheol*, the state of the dead,) whither thou goest." To be in *sheol* is to be in the state of the dead, where the dead lie. "My soul" in the first part of the verse is paralleled and explained by thy "holy one" in the second; so that the verse may be read thus,—Thou wilt not leave my soul, or thy holy one in the state of the dead; neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one, or my soul, in a word, *me* to see corruption. Christ's soul then was that which could see corruption, or become corrupt, but which God here promises should not see corruption. The verse then is simply a promise that, though Christ should die, he would have a *very early resurrection*, a resurrection before corruption commenced. Compare John 2: 18, 19, 21; John 11: 39; Acts 2: 22, on to the end of verse 34.

On the text Matt. 22: 31, 32, we have this note:

"Luke says our Lord concluded his argument thus, 'He is not the God of the dead, but of the living; for all live unto him,' 20. 38. Well then, let it be observed that the subject in dispute was the resurrection, which the Sadduces utterly denied. Our Lord affirmed there was a resurrection and proved it by the quotation from the Old Testament, concerning God being the God of Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob. Let us take the common idea, that man has a spirit which lives and thinks when separated from the body, and then ask what proof would the existence of such a spirit, after death, be of a resurrection? We can see no force in it. The Sadduces might have replied, suppose we grant the spirits of Abraham and Isaac are now living in a disembodied state, that is no evidence of the resurrection of their bodies, for, if their spirits are living though disembodied, they may so continue to live on forever. And yet our Lord's argument was so successful that its power astonished the multitude who heard the debate. Matt. 22: 33. If the living of these men depended on a future resurrection, the argument was clearly unanswerable, and it seems to be so, only on that supposition. "God is not the God of the dead,"—of utterly and perpetually defunct beings. But how, it may be asked, can it be true of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, that they "all live unto God?" Two explanations may be submitted for the reader's consideration. 1st. As the Saviour does not say they now live with God, but that they live "unto him," it may mean, they are living with respect to him, or he views them as living when he says he is still their God. Or, 2d. They may be said all to "live unto him" to imitate the certainty that they will yet awake to live forever, just as we find the Bible calling that dead which is not actually dead, but doomed to die, and certainly to die, as in these texts, 'So death passed upon all men.' Rom. 5: 12, 15. 'If Christ be in you, the body is dead.' Rom. 8: 10. 'Ye are dead, but your life is hid with Christ in God.' Col. 3: 4."

On 1 Thess. 4: 13-17, he appends these remarks:

"It should be remarked that, in the passage referred to, death is called a 'sleep,' as in other places. Do men think when they are sound asleep? Again, it is said the saints living at Christ's coming will not 'prevent' or go before the resurrected holy ones, to meet the Lord and enjoy his glory. 1 Thess. 4: 13, 17. If the spirits of these dead saints are now with Jesus, seeing him face to face, have they not gone before those living on earth? and yet the apostle says the living, when Jesus comes, will not go be-

fore them? The passage teaches that all are to meet him *at once*; so it seems a fair question—how can dead saints be seeing him now?"

In his note on the case of the rich man and Lazarus, he remarks:—

"Whitby, the Commentator, says, regarding this part of our Lord's teaching, (Luke 16: 20-31,) it is only a parable, and not a real history of what was actually done, because we find this very parable in the *Gemara Babylonica*, whence it is cited by Mr. Sheringham, in his preface to his *Joma*.' Moreover, it should be considered that our Lord represents the rich man as in Hades, not in Gehanna, the fire-hell. Sheol is the state of the dead, as formerly mentioned, and Hades, the Greek synonym for Sheol, imports the same thing. The prophecy in Ps. 16: 10, 'Thou wilt not leave my soul (or me) in Sheol,' is, by the inspired Peter, expressed thus, 'Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell,' (Hadou,) i. e. in the condition of the dead, exposed to corruption, which would have taken place had Jesus not been quickly raised. In Sheol, or Hades, 'there is neither work nor device,' &c. Eccles. 9: 10. If Hades, or Sheol, is such a state, how could the rich man there be actually suffering, and speaking? Does it not meet all the demands of the narrative, which is surely a parable, or fictitious story, employed by our Lord to teach some great general truth—we say, does it not answer all the demands of the parable, to understand Lazarus as representing the poor despised Gentiles: about to be taken into favor with God, as it were, lifted to Abraham's bosom; and the rich man to typify the Jews, long rich in privileges, but mighty abusers of them, about to be judicially cut off, (Rom. 11,) and subjected to trials so severe, that they were fitly to be represented by a man suffering in Hades, *had that been possible*, as some then appear to have imagined?"

His note on 2 Corth. 5: 1-10, is as follows:—

"This passage will perhaps be even a little plainer, if it is recollected that, according to Gen. 2: 7, a living body and a living soul are the same thing; and of course, that a living body is a living man, and so is a living soul. It is the property and privilege of a living soul to think, reason, and to own itself; so that the expression 'our earthy house' is just ourselves as we are, that is, ourselves mortal and corruptible. The 'our' is not the language of a being dwelling in an earthy house, but the language of a mortal man speaking of himself. The following seems to be a fair representation of the apostle's ideas: Verse 1, 'For we know that if we mortal believers were to die we shall be raised immortal. 2. For, as we are, we groan, earnestly desiring to be now immortalized and thereby freed from our pains. 3. Since being so immortalized we shall not be found naked, or in a state of death. 4. For we, as we are, groan, being burdened with cares, and, though anxious to be freed from them, we have no love for death, having a strong desire to be immortalized now, as the living saints will be when the Lord comes; we wish that mortality might be swallowed up of life, as would be the case if we mortal men were to be now immortalized. 5. Now he that hath wrought us for this immortality, which we expect at the resurrection, is God, who hath given us, in the meantime, the earnest of the Spirit; and, at the last day, we expect to receive the full promise; we shall then be spiritualized, (1 Cor. 15: 45, 48, 50,) by being perfectly born of the Spirit. 6. Therefore we are always bold in serving Christ, knowing that whilst we are mortal, we are absent from the

Lord, though not always to be so. 7. For we walk by faith, not by sight. 8. We are thus bold I say, even as we are, but, nevertheless, wishing rather to be immortalized and thereby to be with Jesus. 9. Wherefore we labor, that, whether present with him or absent from him, we may be accepted by him."

After Bro. Grew's remarks on Phil. 1: 23, the following note is appended:—

"One word more on this passage—Phil. 1: 23. It is questionable if Paul, when he said '*for me to die is gain*,' meant gain to himself or to Jesus. He does not say which. If it was gain to himself, then he intimated that, by dying, he would cease from his troubles and earn a great reward at the resurrection of the just. If it was gain to Christ, then it was the gain that would flow to Christ's gospel from his perseverance unto death, and his martyrdom. In either way the expression '*to die is gain*' can get an excellent meaning, and a scriptural one, too, though the first is, perhaps, the most natural interpretation. The succeeding verses may be paraphrased thus:—'For if I live in the flesh, or continue alive as I am, this is the fruit of my labor: Christ shall be magnified, as I have already said, (v. 20,) and what I shall choose in my toil-worn and persecuted condition, I do not well know, for I am in a strait betwixt the two, that is, between living and dying, since I am not anxious for either of them, and yet one of them I must choose; I am not anxious for either of them, for I have a wish in my mind, if I only could get it granted, and it is this, to be immortalized and to be with Jesus; this is far better than living in these toils and sufferings—it is also far better than to die, for, in that case, I will not behold Jesus till the resurrection morning. However, it would not be profitable for you were I to die, or were my wish for immortalization to be graciously conceded to me by my Master, so then I will remain with you a while longer as I have done.' Paul does not assert a wish to depart by death to be with Christ. He desired, obviously, to depart in a way similar to Enoch and Elijah, by being immortalized at once, or, as he expresses the same idea in 2 Cor. 5: 4, by having 'mortality swallowed up of life,' as will be the case with the living saints when the Lord descends from heaven."

On the case of the "penitent thief," Luke 23: 43, is this note:—

"It will be observed that the thief asked something *future*, not something which he believed could be got by him on the day when he presented his petition to our Lord. He said, 'Lord, remembered me when thou comest into thy kingdom,' and thereby expressed his belief that the Saviour had a kingdom to come to, not a kingdom to go to. He will come to his kingdom when he sits down on his *own* throne, which is the throne of David; at present he sits on his Father's throne in heaven, till the predicted time for entering his kingdom and sitting down on his own throne has arrived. Now the thief asked to be remembered then, and our Lord gave him a promise that he would be with him in paradise, or in the paradisaical state, when the earth shall be a new earth, and the heavens a new heavens. Let us recollect the awful position of the dying thief, and how much he needed in his agony a word of consolation and hope. Such the Redeemer could not deny him. He would not leave him in suspense. He, therefore, answered his request at once—on the day when it was presented, and thereby did more than even the suppliant expected,—'I say unto thee to-day, (or I to-day say unto thee) thou shalt be with me in para-

dise.' This appears to be the simple meaning of our Lord, and it quite harmonizes with all the other scriptural teaching."

In our next we shall give extracts from his "*Additional Remarks*," which follow his notes.

LIFE IN CHRIST.

BY EDWARD WHITE, ENGLAND.

[Continued from page 99.]

Br. White next proceeds to consider the "*grounds and reasons for REGENERATION, or the new birth.*" After having shown that "*the loss of the Divine image in the character*"—or "*the moral corruption of our nature*"—is "one principal reason why we must be born again," he proceeds to say:—

It seems to be taught with equal clearness in the divine revelation, though but little remarked in modern times, that our *mortality*, or loss of the prospect of immortality, through the fall, is another principal ground for the necessity of the new birth. Being born under the curse of the law, DEATH for sin, we "must be born again," in order to inherit the everlasting kingdom of God.

A striking confirmation of this statement (as has been already noticed,) is afforded by the remarkable name imposed upon us by the Spirit of Inspiration, THE DEAD:—signifying those who are under sentence of death; as when God said to Abimelech, "*Thou art but a dead man.*" Gen. xx. 7. In every passage where this appellation is employed, it is indeed usually understood to convey nothing more than the idea of a state of *moral alienation* from God; without any reference to the prospect of existence or non-existence, of life or destruction. It is sometimes attempted to be explained by the unscriptural* phrase, "*dead to God*," which is intended to

*The words LIFE and DEATH, with their derivatives, appear to be employed in Scripture to denote the following ideas:—

LIFE stands for the idea of,

1. *Vital Existence*, as distinct from the death or dissolution of vegetable or animal structures; and as opposed to the insensibility of material things. Also, it signifies ETERNAL LIFE.

2. *Activity of movement or agency*; as, "living waters;" "the word of God is *quick* (living) and powerful;" "*quicken* thou me in thy way."

3. *Happy existence*; not *happiness* alone, but *happy life*. "In thy favor is Life." "Wisdom is a tree of Life." "Now I live if ye stand fast in the Lord."

4. "*To be alive in the spirit*" is to be living a spiritual life in opposition to that carnal one of which Paul says, "If ye live after the flesh, ye shall die." So also, we find "alive unto God." Rom. vi. 11, and, "the life of God," or godly life." Eph. iv. 18.

But LIFE never seems to stand for *holiness* alone, or a state of union with God, as is commonly supposed. This appears to be a *purely gratuitous assertion*; on which rests the whole fabric of the opinions which we are venturing to reject. At the same time, it is readily granted that the term *Life* is properly associated in the case of the righteous with the idea of *holiness*, as it is also with the idea of *happiness*. But, that it ever loses its proper radical meaning of existence has yet to be proved, and of course the burden of proof lies with the opposite party.

DEATH, on the other hand, stands for—

1. *The loss or destruction of vegetable or animal life*. "A dead tree," "a dead lion," "a dead body."

2. *The state of condemnation to such literal death*. "Thou art but a dead man." Gen. xx. 7.

3. *Danger of Death*. "Thanks be to God who hath delivered

signify a departure from the "life of God," or a godly life, an absence of spiritual religion; so that the state of moral corruption above described is understood to be the only thing denoted whenever mankind is spoken of as "dead in trespasses and sins." Now, although it is undeniable that whenever the race of man is represented as "dead," there is a strong collateral reference to their sinfulness, misery, and alienation from the blessed God, it seems both natural and necessary to conclude, from an examination of the evidence, that this term is employed with a special allusion to the originally denounced punishment of sin, the curse of the law,—to that death which, as we have already seen, Adam incurred, a total and final cessation of the being of the humanity. Let the passages in which the word occurs be adduced in their order:—

Matt. viii. 22: "Let *The Dead* bury their dead." Here the corpses (*nekrou*) which "the dead" were to bury, point strongly to a literal interpretation: i. e. "Let those without the spirit of life bury the defunct. Let those who are as good as corpses bury corpses;" (*nekroi, nekrou*.) If *The Dead* signified here only those who are devoid of religion, the parallel went no further than a play upon the words: but, interpreted in the sense suggested, the language of the Saviour appears instinct with deep and awful significance.

Eph. ii. 1-5: "And you hath he quickened (to you hath he given life) who were *dead* in trespasses and sins" (*nekrou*, corpses.) "But God who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he hath loved us, even when we were dead in sins, (*nekrou*), hath quickened us (given us life,) together with Christ, and raised us up, and made us sit together in heavenly places."

Here, the *death* from which the Ephesians were delivered was one from which they were delivered when Christ was raised from the tomb, and one from which they were delivered "together with him." But this could not be a "moral death" of wickedness, since "in him was no sin." It could be only literal death, the opposite to which was "life in the ages to come" after a "resurrection." This life, the Ephesians could participate by union with Christ as their head, in the gift of immortality.

2 Cor. v. 14:—"If one died (*apethanen*) for all, *then were all dead*, (*ara oi pantes apethanon*) and that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again." Here, the word *dead* must signify the same thing in the two clauses, "if one died for all," and, "then were all dead;" else, the adverb *then* is a mockery of the forms of reasoning. But the *death* which Christ died was a literal and not a figurative or "spiritual" one. Hence, the

us from so great a death." So also, "destruction of the flesh," in 1 Cor. v. 5, is used for a mortal disease.

4. To be "*dead to*" anything, signifies to cease to be, or to live in certain relationships to it. "Dead to the world,"—"to sin,"—"to the Law." But the phrase "*dead to God*," never occurs.

5. To *mortify*, or put to death, signifies to destroy the life of anything, either literally, or in the sense of its activity and power; as when it is said, "Nabal's heart became *dead* within him."

6. It has never been shown that *death* stands for a state of misery, or of sinfulness, apart from the idea of that literal destruction, or death, which is the "wages of sin."

7. The expression, *Spiritual death*, and the distinction between temporal and eternal death, are alike unknown to the Holy Scriptures. They are, we venture to think, the necessary creations of an erroneous theory.

death which is declared to have been the state of "all" by nature was literal also. This is made still clearer by the following clauses:—"That they which *live should not henceforth live unto themselves*, but unto him that died for them and rose again." Whence it appears that the *life* which they obtained by the death of the Redeemer was not essentially holiness or happiness in itself, but a life which is to be stamped with those characters through a subsequent voluntary dedication of it to God. "We thus judge, that they which live, should not henceforth *live unto themselves*."

In the same sense, therefore, we feel obliged to believe that the term is employed in the remaining passages:—Rom. vi. 13: "Yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, (*ek nekron zontas*.)" 1 Tim. v. 6: "She that liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth." (*Zosa tetheke*.) Rev. iii. 1, "Thou hast a name that thou livest and art dead," (*nekros ei*.) 1 John iii. 14: "We know that we have passed from *death* unto life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not his brother, *abideth in death*."

The language of the Apostle Peter, however, affords the strongest confirmation to the foregoing interpretations. He thus writes: 1 Pet. i. 23: "*Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God which liveth and abideth forever*; 24, For *all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man is as the flower of the field; the grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away: But the word of the Lord endureth forever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you*." It is obvious that in the twenty-fourth verse the apostle is giving a reason wherefore (*dioti*, for) we must be born again of the incorruptible seed of the word, which *liveth and abideth forever*. Because, says he, all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man is as the flower of the grass. The grass *withereth*, and the flower thereof *falleth away*. It is evident therefore, that he regarded man's mortality and evanescence as a ground for the necessity of regeneration, and he resolves the new birth into a participation of the *everlasting nature of the divine word*: "*But the word of the Lord endureth forever*." And it seems equally clear, that the Apostle does not refer alone to the body when he declares that "all flesh is grass;" for he adds, that *all the glory of man is as the flower of the grass; it withereth; it falleth away*; and this surely must include the entire nature of man. It is scarcely possible to conceive a stronger mode of declaring that the whole present constitution of humanity is born of "corruptible" or perishable seed.

Under the ordinary view, which restricts the necessity for regeneration to the single circumstance of a corruption in the character of an immortal soul, this passage will afford but a feeble sense. "Being born again, renewed in the image of God's holiness, not of perishable but of imperishable seed, by the word of God which liveth and abideth forever. For all flesh is as grass, the body is mortal, and all the glory of man is as the flower of the grass. The grass withereth, the flower thereof falleth away, the pomp of worldliness will die, but the word of the Lord endureth forever." If the nature of man be already immortal, the Apostle's studious reference to the immortalizing power of the truth, seems altogether incongruous; whereas viewed in the light thrown upon it by the suggested interpretation the passage acquires a grand and perspicuous signification.

In full accordance with the preceding doctrine is our Lord's declaration to the Jews. John vi. 47:—

"Verily I say unto you, he that believeth on me hath everlasting life. I am that Bread of Life. Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead: This is the bread that came down from heaven, that a man might eat thereof and not die. I am the living bread which came down from heaven, if any man eat of this bread he shall live forever. And the bread which I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world. The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat? Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, Verily I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of Man, ye have no life in you," (*en eautois*), in yourselves. These observations may enable us to attach their full meaning to our Lord's declaration to Nicodemus, John iii. 6: "That which is born of the flesh, *is flesh*,"—is of a corruptible and perishable, as well as of an animal nature. "Marvel not that I say unto thee, Ye must be born again."

Thus does the testimony of Scripture lead us to the conclusion, that the necessity for regeneration is founded upon the complex fact of man's moral depravity and mortality of nature. This fact is designated by the Apostle Paul, "the law of sin and death;" and it is also felicitously expressed in one word, which conveys both ideas, *Corruption*; "the bondage of corruption." Hence, by a distinct argument, we derive a confirmation of the foregoing reasonings concerning the fall of man and the scheme of redemption.

II. The way is now prepared for an inquiry into the nature and results of the great change of Regeneration: and the previous reasonings have, in some measure, anticipated the statement that it consists in a renewal of the divine likeness in the character, and, consequently upon that, in a restoration to the hope of Immortality or everlasting life.

1. The world at large, as we have seen, presents the awful spectacle of universal sinfulness and misery. Every human spirit is disorganized: the balance of its faculties is disturbed; and "peace, the central feeling of all happiness," has passed away. The image of God which shone upon the countenance of Adam in Paradise, has been exchanged for the likeness of the beasts which were subjected to his sway, or worse, for the likeness of "devilish" malignity and wickedness. The understanding understands no more; the memory will not remember the precepts of the Almighty, the heart goeth after its covetousness; selfishness has become the guiding principle of humanity; and habit has riveted its oppressive chains. It behoves us briefly to describe the moral process through which this degraded nature is prepared for "the inheritance of the saints in light;" for "without holiness no man shall see the Lord."

"The wisdom that is from above is first pure." The reclamation of the spirit from the thralldom of the animal nature is the earliest sign and consequence of Regeneration. When the glad tidings of salvation approach the sinner, they find him "the servant of corruption:" the lowest propensities of the flesh asserting a fearful predominance over the energies of the inner man. The faculties of his soul are deadened through vicious indulgence, and Sinful Pleasure is drawing him as with an irresistible spell along the fatal pathway of perdition. The light of conscience may indeed afford his unwilling eyes occasional tremendous glances at the issue of his course; yet the dreadful glare, which flashes for a moment over its termination, imparts no salutary power to resist the fascinations of the sorceress who is leading him to destruction. But when the Sover-

eign Almighty Spirit lends His divine assistance and touches the heart of man, this spell is broken; sensuality loses its attractions, and the mind asserts its right to command. How often have we beheld the countenance once bearing but too evident a testimony to the brutal slumber of the inhabitant within, brightening into divine animation, and lighted up with the intelligence of the awakening soul;—the delighted wonder of the emancipated victim, at the world of Truth presented to his gaze, resembling that which might follow the healing of the blind man, for the first time rejoicing in the spectacle of the heavenly hosts. And, even when the restraints and influences of a refined education may have checked the grosser outbreaks of pollution, how marked the difference between this accidental and constrained repression of the lower nature, and that internal, voluntary principle of purity, which results from the union of the "earthly man" with the Eternal Spirit!—This is the first result of that ineffable influence which expels the "law of sin" from the character, and stamps the lovely image of the divine spirituality upon the regenerate soul.

Resemblance to the divine VERACITY AND RIGHTNESS is imparted by the same holy power. The bridling of the animal passions permits the intellectual part to develop its capacities, hitherto blunted and stupified by carnal vices:—and the intellect thus enfranchised turns by a supernatural instinct towards Truth as its proper and natural object. By nature, an utter carelessness as to the most important subjects reigns in the heart of man. Any opinions, that may be presented first, are esteemed good enough to be the guide of life;—whether they are wise or foolish, they are alike received and entertained without examination, as part of the inheritance, if only they are sanctioned by parental example and the authority of antiquity. Any scruples or difficulties which understanding or conscience may in early life suggest, are speedily silenced and exterminated by the dictates of interest, of fear, of shame, of sympathy. A servile imitation of the opinions of the former generation, ("*Baalim which their fathers taught them*,") joined with the ever degenerating tendency of error, combine to increase at once the force and the danger of the prejudices thus received. The same spirit commonly pervades teachers and the taught. In the one, as amongst the Brahmins, a superstitious dread of impugning the sentiments which are sanctioned by the accumulated weight of the belief of many centuries and generations, is exhibited in a fierce defiance of any adversaries who may arise; in a boundless arrogance of denunciation, which clothes itself, perhaps, in the swelling importance of a pagan "orthodoxy," without the least respect to its own personal insignificance, or to the solidity and value of the objections that may be adduced. Thus is it, also, that in Europe we daily hear certain ancient "delusions" defended, the one half of which offer violence to every dictate of man's understanding, the other half, to every moral sentiment of his heart: defended by scorn, by falsehood, by vehement contumelious reproaches, by every weapon which can serve to illustrate how small a share profound and calm conviction has in all the demonstration. For he who knows the intricacy of that labyrinth in which mankind is born, and the steepness of the ways of truth, will best appreciate the difficulties of the earnest inquirer, will be the first to show how gentle heavenly wisdom is, and will most readily perceive how little storms of indignant zeal are able to reclaim the wandering or maintain the right. Such, however, unhappily, is the usual method in which the diversified

fabric of opinion are upheld, whether in heathen or professedly Christian lands; and we need not be surprised that the inevitable result, in the minds of the multitude, is to breed a carelessness as to intellectual integrity, through a dread of the overwhelming punishment which avenges independent inquiry. Truth itself comes to be held in the spirit of falsehood; not because of its evidence, but because it is orthodox; not from conviction, but from deference to a universal opinion. Articles are hypocritically professed which, when brought in close contact with the common understanding, array against themselves the whole force of its determinations: and each man submits his soul to be wielded by the vulgar crowd, although, perhaps, if inclined to pride, he may hold in contempt and detestation nearly every individual of which that crowd is composed.

The entrance of heavenly grace, however, gradually produces a sublime revolution. In the case of the religious teacher the dishonesty is, generally speaking, cast away. Truth everywhere, Truth always, and Truth at all hazards, becomes the object of his soul. He learns of God to disdain equally the cowardly submission which conceals solemn convictions, or adopts a creed against which his mind revolts; and the diabolical pride which would impose a creed on others irrespective of their consciences. He learns to dread that awful day when the righteous God shall light up the bosoms of assembled mankind, and display the secrets of all hearts before the creation: when no capacities for metaphysical equivocation will avail to cover with excuses the frightful guilt of him who has withheld the whole counsel of God, or interposed the clouds of his philosophy, between the souls of men and God's intelligible justice, wisdom, and love; or who has confused by his speculations the natural dictates of "the law written on the heart." And in the case of the multitude, the practical change induced by regeneration is equally conspicuous. Before, the understanding yielded an easy assent to every proposition in religion, alike uninterested in them all: now the faculties of the soul turn upon the poles of sincerity and truth. The mind which formerly found its "chief joy" in fictions of the imagination, or in the falsehoods which palliate "the exceeding sinfulness of sin," now humbly advances towards the Father of Lights, and carries on a solemn communion with the Author of Life, as the great Reality denoted by all the types and shadows of the material universe around. The regenerate man, when "perfect," passes at once from words to thoughts, from symbols to the things signified. He submits to the evidence which leads him to the dictates of divine authority, and to nothing less. The spirit of transparent integrity animates and pervades his soul. He turns aside from the wilderness of the world, from the dreary waste of barren formality and heartless custom; and, "putting off his shoes from his feet," contemplates for himself "that great sight," that flaming Fire which burns without support, the SELF-EXISTENT WISDOM, POWER, GOODNESS OF JEHOVAH:—and when, returning from the resplendent vision, his countenance is illuminated by the transforming radiance, as it were "the face of an angel," the worst of worldly men will frequently confess the unearthly dignity of a religion which commences in the ardent love of Truth, and leads to vital intercourse with its Original.

This grand renovation necessarily includes the impartation of dignity and courage. "The sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty" display the evidence of their heavenly birth by that magnanimous nobility of disposition and demeanor which becomes

the "offspring of God." An open, fearless countenance, a graceful mingling of humility and conscious greatness, a divine harmonious conjunction of mildness and forbearance with lion-like boldness in the pursuit of truth or duty, attest the celestial origin of a character which puts to shame the meanness of the world's heroes, with their petty arts of tyranny and fraud. An elevation of mind which regards with unconcern the frowns of the whole human race, and which aspires to an unchangeable abode amongst those things which are unseen and eternal, at once arms the regenerate man against the opposition of earth and hell, and teaches him to place his happiness above the regions which littleness can reach or malice disturb. The true Christian is a soldier, and his life is a difficult campaign. Every day brings its circumstances of trial, in advantages to be foregone, in sacrifices to be offered, in sufferings to be endured, in scorn and hatred to be encountered, in principles to be maintained, in labors to be undergone, and in triumphs to be achieved. It is a conflict in which unaided nature fails, but in which, "strengthened with all might by the Spirit in his inner man," the genuine believer is made "more than a conqueror through Him which hath loved him."

"CHRIST DIED."

BY THOMAS READ, NEW YORK.

"He asked life of thee, and thou gavest it him, even length of days for ever and ever." Ps. 21: 4. "WHEN THOU shalt make his soul and offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand. He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied, * * * because he hath poured out his soul unto death." Isa. 53: 10.

We suppose that the whole of the 21st psalm refers to Christ. This was the 'travail of his soul' then—the 'strong crying and tears.' He asked LIFE of God and a numerous progeny, or as the Vulgate reads, 'a long-lived seed,' which of course he could not have asked if he or they were already immortal. When God had given his Son, and had made his soul an offering for sin, God had no living Son, who was the Lord's anointed One, in existence. But having prophetically promised that he would prolong Christ's days, he 'raised him from the dead,' and then Christ being made perfect by being invested with an incorruptible and glorified body, God declared of him, 'Thou art my Son; this day (the day of his resurrection) have I begotten thee' from the grave. Acts 13: 33. And 'because Christ humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross; wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name.' As Christ has been begotten from the grave, so we 'in the regeneration' shall be begotten from the grave, and then will Christ 'see his seed' and 'be satisfied;' and then will he say, Behold I and the children whom thou hast given me, who are the incorruptible saints, for they are the children of God, 'being the children of the resurrection.' And as Christ will then have given 'eternal life to as many as God has given him,' they will become the children of him who is the 'resurrection and the life.'

This solves all the difficulties in Heb. 5: 7. If Christ ceased to live, and became utterly unconscious, then 'Christ died according to the scriptures, and was raised again the third day,' and proved to be the Son of God with power. 'And if Christ died, and rose again, even so, those that sleep in Jesus,

(are unconscious in the grave,) shall God bring with him'—at his second coming. It is therefore evident that Jesus was not raised from the dead by any inherent, or adhering, or separated principle, or power, belonging exclusively to him in his humiliation; he being entirely under the dominion of death; but by the omnipotent energy of the Eternal Father, and was declared to be the Son of God with power. This same Jesus Christ will come in the clouds of heaven to raise the dead to life and consciousness.

But was not Christ immortal? Most certainly not, else he could not have died for us, and thereby made an atonement for our sins. But was not his soul immortal? No, emphatically no; for his soul was himself, his life, the very thing that was poured out unto death, and which made the sacrifice available. We have proved that Christ died, nevertheless we must reiterate, 'God ONLY hath immortality.' 'As the LIVING FATHER hath sent me, and I live by the Father, even so, he that eateth me, even he shall live by me.' 'He asked life of thee; and thou gavest it him, even length of days for ever and ever.' 'As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself.' 'I am he that liveth and was dead; and behold, I am alive for evermore. Amen; and have the keys of death and the grave.'

Although Christ was not immortal in his own nature, he has become the first fruits of immortality; the first begotten of the dead; he is the first man that has arisen from the dead with a spiritual, or incorruptible, and therefore an immortal body. For Christ being raised from the dead, dieth no more—death hath no more dominion over him.

The doctrine of the non-immortality of Christ prior to his crucifixion, and his submission to the entire deprivation of life for a period, and his resurrection again to life, not by his own inherent power, but by the power of God, is the very foundation of the gospel. Paul contrasts the faith by which a man is saved with the righteousness that comes by the law. Rom. 10: 5. We quote from Griesbach, 'For Moses writeth of the righteousness which is of the law. The man that doeth those things shall live by them.' But alas! no man complies with these conditions. But the righteousness which is of faith speaketh thus, 'Say not in thy heart; Who shall ascend into heaven? That is, to bring Christ down; or who shall descend into the bottomless pit? That is, to bring back Christ from the dead. But what saith it? The word is nigh to thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart; that is the word of faith, which we preach, that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth that Jesus is Lord, and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou wilt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth he confesseth unto salvation. For the scripture saith, 'Whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed.'

It becomes, then, a serious question, Can any person that believes Jesus always to have been immortal, and that his body only died, while his soul remained conscious, and that he, on the morning of the resurrection, again re-united himself or his soul or his spirit to his dead body by his own inherent power, that 'he burst the bars of death,' we say can such a man believe in his heart that God raised Christ from the dead. Paul says, 1 Cor. 15: 2, that we are saved by holding these fundamental truths of the gospel; that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures, which assert that his soul was made an offering for sin, his soul was poured out unto death; that he was buried, and that he rose from the dead the third day. Alas! how few believe that Christ truly died. But

some will still say, was it not the body of Jesus Christ that was once offered? Yes, verily; but in offering the body he offered himself, his life, the Holy One; he could not offer his body without pouring out his soul unto death. 'So CHRIST (the whole of Christ) was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without [a sin offering] unto salvation.' The scriptures do not inform us that God gave only a human body, but that God gave his Son. This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses.

But some will still object and refer to John 10: 18, 'I lay down my life for the sheep. * * * Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father.' 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit.' These passages will bear this explanation. I voluntarily submit to death; to lay down my life for the sake of the sheep. And I can confidently commend my spirit or life to the care of my Father, for he has given me power to live again; therefore, he will not leave my soul in Sheol; but will raise me from the dead. The implied objection of the opponent that Jesus must have been conscious to have resumed his own life, is equal to saying that Jesus did not lay down his life.

Merely the laying down of a human body, which Christ had assumed only for a short period, and which was the accompaniment of toil and sorrow, and the continual cause of anxiety, and which, it is assumed, is only a clog to full spiritual development, as the soul when separated has more knowledge and more happiness, and has more enlarged capacities without than with the body, (we write it reverently in the thorough conviction that it was not so,) if an inanimate body that did not constitute the whole man—Christ Jesus—was given merely, it was no great gift after all—a small price for the redemption of a world—a slender foundation for our faith and hopes to rest upon. Upon this supposition it would not be true that God gave his Son to die for our sins; for his body without his soul was not his Son. Neither would it be true that God raised him from the dead.

FROM THOMAS BIRCH.

Hartford, Conn., June 1, 1851.

BR. STORRS:—I received a letter from my aunt Evans, in England, a short time ago. I am happy to inform you that she is rejoicing in the belief of that truth you have labored so hard to promulgate, i. e. "No Immortality out of Christ." She says she is amazed when reading all the Epistles, that she could be so stupid as not to understand better; but that she is like many more, and can give no other reason than that she has been taught by her would-be spiritual guides. Oh! are they not blind leaders of the blind? It is distressing to me to think that both the leader and the led must fall into the ditch. As we see so many of our fellow-creatures walking in heathenish darkness, how it becomes those of us who have the light of divine truth to let it shine. Peradventure, I might be an instrument in the hand of our God of saving at least one of our fellow-mortals from stumbling headlong into the ditch of perdition.

I am glad you have sent me your new paper, the Truth-Seeker. Will you please continue it to my address.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, AUGUST, 1851.

"AGES TO COME."—If we speak of "*The Age to Come*," some persons appear to think we have coined a new phrase, and wonder we cannot keep to scriptural expressions. We think such people are much too sensitive. If the expression "ages to come" is a scriptural one, it certainly cannot be unscriptural to speak of one of those ages in particular; for if there are ages to come, there must be one that is nearer than the others, and that one is "the age to come." The Apostle Paul tells us of some things that were "hid from ages and from generations, but are now made manifest." So there have been ages in the past: see Col. 1: 26. He speaks also of "eternal life which God promised before the world [*pro chronon aionion*—before the ages] began." Tit. 1: 2. Again, he says, God has "made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus, that in the ages to come he might show the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness towards us through Christ Jesus." Eph. 2: 6-7. Once more he saith "Unto Him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end;" or, as McKnight translates it, "throughout the endless succession of ages." Eph. 3: 21.

In all this there is surely good and scriptural ground for speaking of "the age to come," and the language of the apostle wakes up our thoughts to speak of "*the ages*." In the sense in which Paul uses this term, we understand periods of time in which some peculiar work was done, or manifestation was made.

The history of this world has been divided into periods, or ages; each of which has had its peculiarities and epoch. They have had a marked beginning and termination. We design to notice in the first place, briefly, the ages past.

1. THE ADAMIC AGE.—This was from the creation to the fall. The length of this age we have no means of ascertaining. That it occupied some little space of time is clear. We are not to suppose that Adam fell the first day of his creation, there must have been some time for all the developments to be made that are there recorded. Some have supposed that sixteen years elapsed; but though that seems little time enough, yet it is wholly conjectural. Whether little or much time is taken up in that period, it was an age, and the age of the trial of our first parents, and their expulsion from the Garden of Eden.

2. THE ANTEDILUVIAN AGE.—This commenced with the expulsion from Eden. It was an age which resulted in a total apostacy from God except one family. This age covered a period variously estimated from fifteen hundred to two thousand years. God during all this period was striving with men by

his spirit, which they resisted, hardening themselves in wickedness till wrath came upon them and swept them all away with a flood; there that age terminated.

3. FROM NOAH TO ABRAHAM may be denominated the *third* age. This was marked with its peculiarities. It commenced with Noah's advent from the Ark, and, like the previous age, was marked in its progress with almost a total apostacy of Noah's posterity. God had said, however, that he would no more "smite everything living as he had done." Another method was now to be tried to keep alive a seed in the earth that should acknowledge and worship the true and living God, and Abraham was called to go out from his countrymen and kindred to a strange land, and he went out at God's command, not knowing whither he went. This brings us to the

4th, OR PATRIARCHAL AGE.—The commencement of this age was marked by the call and departure of Abraham from Chaldea to go into Canaan, and is filled up with the most interesting incidents, viz: the covenants with Abraham—the birth and offering up of Isaac—the birth of Jacob, with the many and thrilling scenes recorded of these Patriarchs in the history of their lives and death, the multiplication of their posterity and their ultimate bondage in Egypt. Great and glorious developments were made during this age, which serve as a key to unlock all the succeeding ones to the present time and coming age. This age is marked in its termination by the advent of Abraham's posterity, through Jacob, from their bondage from Egypt and settlement in Palestine; and covered a period of five hundred years or more.

5. THE MOSAIC AGE.—This commenced with the deliverance of Israel out of Egypt, and embraces all the interesting events recorded in the Old Testament, relative to that people and the surrounding nations, pointing forward to "ages to come," both of humiliation and glory to that people and their Messiah. That age continued till the first advent of Messiah and the overthrow of the Jewish or Mosaic polity at the destruction of Jerusalem, and was filled up with most interesting developments, or manifestations of God's truth, power, and faithfulness.

6. THE GOSPEL AGE.—*The ministration of the spirit and calling of the Gentiles.*—This commenced with the personal ministry of Messiah—was more fully opened on the day of Pentecost, but not perfectly developed till Paul became the minister to the Gentiles. It has been an age, emphatically, of contest between the *flesh* and the Spirit; or between the *animal* propensities of men and the Spirit waking in the mind, or in the affections. In this age many have been sealed by the Spirit and have overcome the world, the flesh, and the devil, but the vast majority of men, as in the previous ages, have walked after their own lusts, and refused the cross of Christ. The love of

the praise of men; the thirst for wealth, fame, power, or sensual enjoyment, has carried captive the largest part of men and drowned them in perdition; and all well grounded hope of this world, or its inhabitants, ever being recovered from Satan's dominion by the efforts of men in the flesh, i. e., by corruptible and dying men, whatever stations they may occupy, is vain. All such efforts have proved a failure; and unless a new age or dispensation is opened, the world fails of being regenerated—Satan is triumphant, and prophecy fails. So we understand the matter. But we have no doubt another age is to succeed this; or, that there is an "*age to come*," in which God's great purpose in creating the world and testing men under such a variety of dispensations, or ages, shall be fully developed, and Messiah's personal reign and glory, with his people who bore the cross, in previous ages, shall demonstrate that there is a power that can control men and cause them to be subject to God, to the everlasting confusion and discomfiture of Satan and all his fleshly-minded followers. The present age, then, will end or terminate with the return of Messiah to this earth to take the throne of David, to reign and execute judgment and justice in the earth. This brings us to the

7. AGE OF MESSIAH'S PERSONAL REIGN; its commencement is the *seventh* great epoch in this world's history, and is "the age to come;" being still future, though we are so near to it that its light dawns upon us, and the watchful will not fail to see its approach.

This age opens with the termination of the times of the Gentiles treading under foot Jerusalem—the overthrow of the present earthly monarchies—the return of God's favor to Palestine and Jerusalem—the gathering of the outcasts of Israel—the personal advent of Messiah as King of kings and Lord of lords—the assumption by him of the throne of Israel or David's throne, and his dominion over the earth, together with the resurrection and immortalization of all them that are his, who have suffered with him or for his words in any of the previous ages.

It embraces, in its progress, the destruction of all incorrigible enemies, and the subjugation of all nations to him and his government; it terminates by a revolt among the inhabitants of the earth, through a new effort of the Satanic power, resulting in their being destroyed by fire from heaven—the final judgment being executed on all God's enemies, and the full regeneration of the earth, so that it shall be said, "Behold, I make all things new," and "*it is done*." At that point we are brought to the borders of another age, which is a perfect one, when compared with any of the preceding, but is only one in a chain, or "endless succession of ages;" each of which, doubtless, will exceed the one going before it in glory and glorious developments; thus opening to the view an endless prospect of inexhaustible enjoy-

ment, and making the hope of *eternal life* a hope full of glory, and needing no endless torments to make it more blissful. All the wicked will have passed away and perished forever, and all surviving creatures in heaven, in earth, and in all God's dominions will be filled with joy and unending delight.

Such we conceive to be the true scripture doctrine, but we have not time or space now to go more largely into the subject.

"PNEUMATOLOGIST."—FROM THOMAS SMITH.

Br. Storrs:—I perceive that Br. J. Litch, of your city of "Brotherly Love," in his "Pneumatologist" for May, has a long dialogue between "Materialist" and himself; and in the second part of the same number has the dialogue continued between "Destructionist" and "Pneumatologist." He, of course, as was intended, has mastered, in a most triumphant manner, his opponent, who has acknowledged his error and renounced the same. This is as it should be, when men find themselves in an error, for error can do us no good, but much hurt. You will perceive by consulting the number for May, page 274, his criticism on Mark ix. "*Asbestos*," he says, instead of being "*unquenchable*," is "*unconsumable*." Again, page 275, he says: "The object of salt on flesh is to preserve it from putrefaction, and this same office fire shall fill in the case of sinners in Gehenna. The idea is terrible." Horrible indeed! yet if truth we must receive it. Thus, "*salt preserves meat—so fire preserves the sinner in the fire forever*." So thinks Br. J. Litch.

Yours in hope of Eternal Life.

Wellfleet, Mass., July 11th, 1851.

REMARKS BY THE EDITOR.—When Br. Smith's letter was received, we had no knowledge of the May number of the Pneumatologist, as we had neither seen nor heard of it. We have since procured and read it. "Materialist" in the dialogue would have been much more appropriately named "*Pliable*," after Bunyan's character of that name. Very little that this *pliable* character says is a quotation from writers on the side we advocate; but some weak disputant's private discourse, very likely, is the basis of most that "*Pliable*" says.

We think so far as "*Pliable*" has a real existence, we know who he is; and a man of no more stability than he possesses we should expect would talk as he does in that dialogue with the help of a little coloring; for Pneu. seldom quotes the exact words of his opponents, though they may be the words of "*Pliable*," for we shall call him by that name. We let the first dialogue pass with the single remark, that nearly every point in it, on Pneumatologist's side, has been met and refuted, in our judgment, in the Bible Examiner, in the past volumes; in particular in the Examiner for 1850, page 77-80, and 97-101, and in the article on "Demonology," in the January number of the present year. Some points which Pneu. says none of the writers on the other side from him, have ever noticed, we have met more than once, as he may find if he will examine the back volumes of our paper. On the subject of "Demons,"

page 66-69, Pneu. has some remarks that perhaps should be noticed, not because of their weight, but because "Pliable" and himself are so completely enveloped in the mists raised by a play on words. Pneu. quotes from Peter and Jude to show that the "knocking spirits" cannot be the "fallen angels," because Jude says the angels that kept not their first estate are "reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day." So, Pneu. says, "those angels are confined!" How *literal!* We wish he knew how to be so on other plain and positive texts that overthrow his theory. But, no, "they mean something else!" But the fallen angels are "chained"—"confined," and "the Bible," he says, "teaches no plurality of devils or Satans. Diabolos and Satanus are always in the singular number. But he has * * a multitude of angels."

Here are some curious admissions or assertions. We have answered the notion of only "one Satan." See Examiner for Jan., p. 12. But one or many, how came he loose! The fallen angels are all "in chains"—"confined," Pneu. says. Is Satan or Diabolos a fallen angel? If so, how, we ask again, came he loose? For Peter assures us that he "goeth about seeking whom he may devour." And if he is not "confined" in the sense Pneu. asserts of the "angels who kept not their first estate," how can he prove any of those angels are so confined as he wished to make Pliable believe? That mind must be pliable indeed that cannot see through so thin a web as Pneu. uses on this point. As to the "multitude of Satan's angels," what help are they to him if confined as literally as Pneu. affirms? Surely they cannot, in that case, "go about:" and then what follows? Why, one of these fallen angels, viz: Diabolos, has broke loose, or God has let him loose—so that his chains were not everlasting, literally—and now he "goeth about," and yet is omnipresent; for all Christians are exhorted to be vigilant, "because your adversary the devil (Diabolos) goeth about," &c. We might press this point, but we judge we have said enough to show that poor Pliable had some disease on his vision so quietly to succumb to such an argument.

We now leave these small matters to notice the criticism on the Greek term *Asbestos*, Mark 9: 43-48. "The fire is not quenched." Pneu. says (page 274) "*Asbestos*, instead of being unquenchable, is *unconsumable!*" Again, page 275, he says on Mark 9: 45, "*Eis ten Gehenna, eis to pur to asbeston*—into Gehenna, into the fire *asbestos*, which would be fire *unconsumable.*"

This is imposing, truly; and it has one advantage, it is an independent criticism so far as we have any knowledge. It may be borrowed, but we think not. We are sure it is not borrowed from the English language, nor from any Greek Lexicon that we have

examined; and as Pneu. gives us no authority, we conclude it his own private interpretation. Paul saith, Heb. 12: 29, "Our God is a consuming fire"—*pur katanaliskon*, from *kata*, intens., *ana*, up, and *leicho*, to lick. *To lick up, to devour, to consume.* *Asbestos*, Mark 9: 43-48, is from *a*, negative, and *sbennumi*, to extinguish, unquenchable, inextinguishable; and has no such meaning as *unconsumable*; and the term *unconsumable* does not occur in the Greek Testament, that we can find; but consume, devour, etc., do. Till Pneu., therefore, gives us some authority besides his own private one, we shall quietly go on, even though a dozen Pliables confess their mistakes.

If the reader wish to see more fully the impossibility of making the Greek term *unconsumable* instead of unquenchable, let him turn to Ezek. 20: 47, 48; Jer. 7: 20; and Jer. 17: 27, in which places the Septuagint has *sbesthesetai*; there he will see the same form of expression as in Mark 9, and be able to judge for himself whether it means *unconsumable* fire. The very idea of an *unconsumable* fire is a contradiction; but no such idea is found in the Bible. Fire may burn without consuming through a special interposition of God; but an *unquenchable* fire is always used to denote a *consuming* fire.

To argue that because "salt preserves flesh," therefore being "salted with fire preserves the sinner," when the clear testimony of scripture contradicts the idea of preservation, looks like being hard pressed. For if that argument is worth anything at this point, it proves equally that the righteous are preserved by fire as well as the wicked, for the Saviour adds, "*Salt is good*: but if the salt have lost its saltness, wherewith will ye season it? Have salt in yourselves." So this *fire-salt* is "*good*" and the disciples are exhorted to have it "*in themselves*," and "*every one shall be salted with fire.*" The truth is, the salt in this text is not the "fire of Gehenna"—"the unquenchable fire"—which consumed whatever was cast therein. There are two kinds of fire spoken of in the scripture; one, the fire of Gehenna, which consumes, and into which all sinners will be cast; and the fire of God's love, concerning which the Psalmist said, "While I mused the fire burned;" this preserves, and is the true salt which preserves from putrefaction or corruption; but the other, the unquenchable fire, destroys, eats up.

The remainder of the dialogue with "Destructionist," alias Pliable, we regard as fully answered by our Six Sermons and other works that have been published on the subject, and we leave those works to do battle with all the mighty arguments which made Pliable so easy a conquest. The truth is, Pliable had placed himself in such circumstances that he courted a conversion to the old theory, and only wished a decent apology to go back where he might fare better with certain men than he had while laboring for the grand truth of the gospel, viz:

"Life only through Christ." We speak advisedly; we know well who Pliable is, and "verily he has his reward."

"MYSTERIOUS RAPPINGS."—PROGRESS.—Mr. Sunderland says, in his paper, p. 185:—

"We know that spirits or angels write letters and sentences. They not only do this by moving human hands, but they do it without human hands. *This we know to be the fact.* It has been done in our family many, very many times."

We do not call in question Mr. Sunderland's veracity at all in the matter; we doubt not he states the truth. Again he saith, same page:—

"That it is possible for angels to make articulate sounds, so as to evolve words to the external ear, is certain, as it has been done in our family and elsewhere."

Here again we accord to him truthfulness; but we regret he had not appealed to the Bible, which shows that angels did appear to men and converse with them in a most familiar manner in olden times. They may have appeared to and talked with Mr. Sunderland or his "family;" we shall not question it. We think they would act much more consistent to "evolve words," distinctly, "to the external ear" than to be thumping floors, tables, &c. But of course their worshippers are not at first prepared for words plainly uttered. We say worshippers, for it is as perfectly manifest to our mind that the devotees to this "spiritual development" are "worshippers of angels," as it is that the sincere Christian is a worshipper of the living and true God. In this matter is that saying of our Lord true, that "the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light." Only think! A company of spirit worshippers assemble together, form their circle, sit in silence, striving to be perfectly resigned to the will of the spirits, and waiting in this manner for hours to get responses, or to have communications! The most devoted Christian can hardly be induced, under any circumstances, to humble himself and wait in this manner. We cannot help thinking when we hear of these circles thus waiting, of the language of Satan to our Lord, "If thou wilt fall down and worship me, all shall be thine." This patient "worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen," was practised in Paul's time; and such, he says, practised "a voluntary humility," but were "vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind." Col. 2: 18. It was not spirituality that led to this course, but want of it; it was the flesh, that instrument of Satan; it is a departing from God and becoming "subject to ordinances after the commandments and doctrines of men." We have no hesitation in saying that all the circles of which we are speaking, are circles of devil worshippers; and it is no wonder if their lord and master, into whose ser-

vice they so solemnly initiate themselves, should write to them, or "evolve words to" their "external ear," when he has sealed up their hearts against God and his Christ. It is very true Satan seldom ever appears as Satan to those whom he dupes. Why should he? He knew better than to do so the very first time he ever practised his arts on the human race; he took then an unsuspected position, and hid himself in the serpent, a *beast*, not then unlovely as now, but the most wise of "any beast of the field." His object then, professionally, was to make man wiser—give him more knowledge or light—and make him happier than his Creator had done. Thus man was seduced from perfect confidence in God his maker to rely upon a quicker process for knowledge than Jehovah saw good for him. So now, "fall down and worship me" is the language of the spirit-rappers, "and all shall be thine"—all the knowledge of the "spheres above" you! Mistaken devotees! Their ways are ways of death! We write not now for their benefit, though we sincerely pity them, but if by any means we may save some unsuspecting souls from the awful pit to which they are hastening, who go after or follow this satanic development, thinking it may be "an angel of light."

First. It is settled in our mind that there is "no knowledge in sheol," the state of the dead; for "the dead praise not the Lord"—"in sheol who shall give Thee thanks?" Eccl. 9: 10; Psa. 115: 17; and 6: 5. This point being settled, these communications are not from any of the human race who once lived in the flesh. Then, second. Who are they? They are not angels of God, or good angels, because they do lie; if in no other particular they do so in affirming they are the spirits of dead men, and advancing in knowledge, in plain contradiction to the Spirit of God in the Bible. There is then only one alternative, either to maintain that the whole manifestation is sleight of hand practised by some secret art, or it is the work of the devil. We are satisfied it is the latter; in other words, that though there may be deception connected with some of the professed manifestations, there is really a working out of Satanic power, that some, having rejected God's truth, may believe a lie and perish.

But who is to blame for this deception coming on man? We unhesitatingly answer, those who teach man has an immortal soul that survives death, and is more knowing than while in the body. These have laid the foundation, and supplied the materials for this Satanic development. We give the following specimen of the effects of this immortal soul theory, showing how it makes void the resurrection and converts God's "judgment of condemnation" into a theme of thanksgiving. We cut it from an orthodox paper. Here it is just as it is headed in that paper:

Consoling Idea of Death.—"I congratulate you and myself," wrote John Foster to a friend, "that life is

passing fast away. What a superlatively grand and consoling idea is that of death! Without this radiant idea, this delightful morning star, indicating that the luminary of eternity is going to rise, life would to my view darken into midnight melancholy. Oh! the expectation of living *here*, and living *thus*, always, would be indeed a prospect of overwhelming despair. But thanks to that decree that dooms us to die—thanks to that gospel which opens the vision of an endless life, and thanks, above all, to that Saviour friend who has promised to conduct all the faithful through the sacred trance of death into scenes of everlasting delight.”

Where has the Saviour promised to conduct any man “through the sacred trance of death into scenes of everlasting delight?” He that believeth in Christ he has promised “I will raise HIM *up at the last day*.” It is a monstrous perversion of God’s truth to use it as is done in this “consoling idea of death.” Praising God for “dooming us to die!” What blasphemy this. Death was a penalty—a fearful penalty; but the serpent preached “Ye shall not surely die”—you are immortal; and this idea substantially passes for truth among Christians, and they are now reaping the fruits of such teaching in the “rapping spirits,” which bids fair to sweep many professors of religion down the whirlpool of perdition.

FROM A. L. SWEET.
Mount Sterling, Ill., June 23, 1851.

BRO. STORRS:—I send you one dollar for the Bible Examiner, beginning with this year. I am remarkably well pleased with it, because you take the bible just as it reads, without any alteration or amendments. I would be glad if about one half or two-thirds of it were devoted to other great truths of the bible that have been equally neglected or twisted. The life and death question has become old. After one becomes convinced, they want something else to keep them interested; something on the practical duties of Christians, &c. The great question that Luther called the “keystone to Popery” can still be kept rolling. I was glad to see your Truth-Seeker. We need something in this State like it. Our periodicals are quite averse to truth, unless it suit orthodoxy. I became convinced from reading the Bible that a Christian ought not to be connected in any way with government—that he ought not to fight under any circumstances, and that he ought not to be “unequally yoked together with unbelievers” in any society of human origin. I contended that we were pilgrims and strangers on the earth—that our King was now an exile, and until he returned we should continue to be so. I sent a communication to our Baptist paper in this State, on the subject; he did not notice it. I suppose he saw at a glance that it was contrary to *Baptist usage*, and probably thought, as many others do, that religion should keep pace with everything else. Bro. Penkake and myself wrote to Bro. Himes to put forth something on the subject. He replied he did not view these things as we did, and thought best to confine his paper to the one subject—Christ coming. *Query*.—What good does it do to tell people the Lord is coming and not tell them how to escape it? Since you have taken a stand against the notion of “double entity.” Should you not, when speaking of yourself, use *I* instead of *we*? I think you should, unless you still

believe there are two of you. Is it proper to call any one reverend, unless it can be shown that they have immortality and eternal life dwelling in them? I think not.

REMARKS BY THE EDITOR.—We did use the *singular* pronoun in the Examiner editorially up to 1848, and then concluded to use the *plural singular*, if such an expression is allowable; by which is meant that the singular person is represented by a pronoun in the plural form; it does not deceive any one, as it is understood by all, and Br. Sweet never thinks the editor is two because this form is used, as is manifest from his letter. One word in defence of this form. First. It looks less like egotism than “*I*,” which often disgusts. Second. It is not unscriptural for a writer to use the plural form. Paul did it. See Gal. 1: 8; 1 Cor. 9: 11, 12, and other places. It is true that he usually employs the singular form—but one clear use of the plural in speaking of himself establishes the fact that there is no wrong in using that form, and hence it becomes a mere matter of taste or choice.

As to the use of the term “*Rev.*,” that may be sinful or otherwise, according to the intention or motive of him who uses it. Formerly we rejected it altogether, and now do not wish to see it connected with George Storrs, but we do sometimes use it to avoid circumlocution in speaking of others. Some write “Minister of the Gospel;” that is all we mean when we employ “*Rev.*” It stands for that, and nothing more, with us, and so it is generally understood by all men. If others mean any more by it we are not aware of it, and *they* must be answerable for the sense they give it. If it were prohibited in the Bible, that would be a sufficient reason for abandoning it wholly. The term “*reverend*” occurs but once in the Bible, viz: Psa. 111: 9, “*Holy and reverend is His name.*” The original word, *Nouro*, here literally signifies “*fearful, terrible.*” In this sense it cannot be applied to any man without sinning. We are not to regard any creature in this light, whether good or bad. We use the term as Br. Sweet does the term “*Elder*,” which he wrote on the envelope of his letter to us. He might have been mistaken in the fact of our Eldership; still, it expressed, we presume, his meaning, viz: that “*Geo. Storrs, Philadelphia, Pa.*” is a “*Minister of the Gospel.*” “*Elder*” is a scriptural term, but is never there used in the *form* he used it. It is never said *Elder Paul, Elder Peter, &c.* But it does not therefore follow it is wrong, much less sinful, to use it in the form he has. We have thought that this pressing point not plainly settled by Bible language would only serve as an excuse, to some men, for not believing the important truths which are contrary to their traditions. They conclude as we have no clear testimony on such points as those we have just noticed that other points, however clearly proved by scripture testimony, are equally unimportant, be-

cause advocated by the same persons. Though that is false reasoning, yet *traditionists* are always ready to “*catch at straws*” to save themselves and their sinking cause.

One other point in Br. Sweet’s letter we will just note—his desire to have a large part of the Examiner devoted to “*other great neglected truths of the Bible.*” It has been our object first to present the “*Life and Death*” question; because we believe the errors on that subject lie at the root of all other corruptions of Christianity and Bible truth. If we can establish the truth, that there is nothing but death—*extinction of being*—by the first Adam, and that life and immortality can only be gained by Jesus Christ, the second Adam, and that *out of him* there is no *endless* life or conscious existence, then we have planted a battery—not carnal, but spiritual—that will demolish the whole superstructure built on the declaration “*Ye shall not surely die.*” Naturally following this work is, “*If any man be in Christ he is a new creature,*” and receiving life divine from this new source, he must bring forth fruit that is Christ-like, otherwise his pretence of being in Christ is false and vain. A man can no more be in Christ and not be laboring to be like Christ in meekness, patience, long-suffering, love and obedience than a branch can live that does not partake of the sap of the vine.

“*LIFE IN CHRIST, by Edward White,*” England.—We suggested in our last that we should be glad to see this work republished entire in this country, but that we had no funds to do it. We hoped there might be a response from those who are able to help. There can be no doubt it would do immense good—especially among the Congregationalists and Presbyterians. Br. White, as we understand it, is a Congregational Minister. In approaching different Christians, we must bear in mind that there exists a prejudice in most minds against views coming from other denominations; and views differing from those they have been in the habit of receiving as true, of their own sect. The fact that Dobney is a Baptist has given his work great influence among the Baptists of this country; and the work of White would have a strong influence with many Congregationalists and Presbyterians. It ought then to be republished immediately. We propose to do it, provided we can find encouragement. One thousand copies can be published, 12mo., and put up in paper covers, we think, for about \$200, so that they shall not cost exceeding 25 cents per copy. If 2000 copies are printed, the cost of the whole, in paper covers, will not probably exceed \$350, or less than 25 cents per copy. In this estimate we have allowed nothing for use of type, nor counted anything for our labor in attending to the work. The type we should use is

the same that we now employ in printing the Examiner, and we expect it will make about one hundred and seventy-five pages.

If the friends of truth wish to do a good work among their fellow-Christians of the denominations mentioned, as well as among others, here is a chance to employ some of their funds. Just say at once, for how many copies you will be responsible—and pay for them when the work is ready to deliver, that we may know if we shall go forward with it. We pledge ourselves to take 200 copies, whether one or two thousand are printed.

If any other person can or will get up the work, in the style we propose, at a less price, we shall be glad, and will take the 200 copies we have pledged; but we wish to see it done right. If any one should wish the work bound, they will say so. The additional cost for binding will depend upon the number ordered; of that we can say more hereafter.

The copy of this work which we imported from England cost us two dollars and twenty-five cents. Let it now be reprinted in the cheap form proposed, and scatter them, if need be, gratuitously.

SCRIPTURE EXPOSITION.

BY THE EDITOR.

[Continued from page 62.]

Likewise, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands, that if any obey not the word, they also may without the word be won by the conversation of the wives; while they behold your chaste conversation coupled with fear.—1 PETER III. v. 1 and 2.

The apostle here proceeds with the theme of the previous chapter, viz: order, subjection, in the various relations of life; that the harmony which God has established might be manifested throughout the family, or household of Christ, and appear in all its beauty, so that God may be honored and unbelievers won over to Christ by the holy, mild, kind, and submissive spirit begotten by the gospel of the kingdom. Therefore, says Peter, “*ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands*”—even those who are not yet partakers with you in the salvation of Christ—“*that if any obey not the word*”—that disobedience of their husbands does not release them from the obligation of subjection—“*they also may without the word be won*”—to the hopes and privileges of the religion of Christ—“*by the conversation*”—*anastrophe*—mode of life, conduct, deportment—“*of the wives, while they behold your chaste*”—*agneen*—pure, modest, innocent, blameless—“*conversation*”—manner of life—“*coupled with fear*”—probably of offending God, which led them to watch and walk in their present mode of life. How much does that wife mistake her calling, and the entire genius of Christianity, who, from a fancied sanctity, which she supposes she possesses by her religion, instead of living

as God has directed, by the apostle, sets herself at variance with her husband, and refuses subjection to him. She knows not what manner of spirit she is of. If her husband is an unbeliever, she will, by such a course, harden him in sin, and be justly chargeable with his ruin. Had she obeyed God in this matter, she might, by a persevering continuance in well doing, in due time, have won her husband to the Lord; or, if unsuccessful, would by such a course have attained a higher state of holiness, and hence a higher state of happiness and glory.

Whose adorning, let it not be that outward adorning of plaiting the hair, and of wearing of gold, or of putting on of apparel; but let it be the hidden man of the heart, in that which is not corruptible, even the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price.—VERSES 3 and 4.

“Whose adorning”—*kosmos*—dress, ornament, embellishment—let it not be that outward”—*exothēn*—outside, external—“of plaiting”—*emplotēes*—a knotting, twisting, braiding—“the hair, and of wearing of gold, or of putting on of apparel”—*imatio*—i. e. the upper garment—garments for show—for ornaments; elsewhere, called “costly array.” Some think if their dress is only *plain*, as they call it, that is enough; while they wear the most expensive clothing. But, says one, “we are commanded to be in subjection to our husbands, and my husband insists upon my wearing these things.” Very well—then wear them as your *cross*! But, take care you do not put them on to please and gratify yourself. If your husband will insist upon it, *obey*, and let him answer for it; in that case it is his sin, not yours. But if you love it, do not deceive yourself with the vain excuse that it is to please your husband. Quite likely in nineteen cases out of twenty, if the wife were to tell her husband that she really preferred modest and less costly apparel, he would not only acquiesce in it, but love her the better for it; therefore, let your adorning be ‘the hidden man’—*anthropos*—metaphorically it signifies the disposition of the mind, mode of feeling, thinking, and acting—“of the heart”—*kardias*—the desires, affections, purpose of mind. As if he had said, ‘let your adorning be those secret dispositions, desires and affections of the new mind you have, as those begotten again, and which specially pertain to the new man, that is to be fully developed at the appearing of Jesus Christ, which consists “in that which is not corruptible;” this is that ‘meek’—*praos*—mild, gentle, kind, benevolent, humane—“and quiet spirit”—*pneumatōs*—temper, disposition of mind produced by the truth and Spirit of God—“which is in the sight of God of great price”—*poluteles*—of great value, highly esteemed. Men may highly esteem you for outside adorning, but their esteem is corruptible like themselves; God will highly esteem you for the inward adorning; he is incorruptible, and will make you sharers in his in-

corruptibility and glory if you choose to please him rather than men; verily you will have your reward as your labor for the one or the other.

For after this manner in the old time the holy women also, who trusted in God, adorned themselves, being in subjection unto their own husbands; even as Sara obeyed Abraham, calling him lord, whose daughters ye are as long as ye do well, and are not afraid with any amazement.—VERSES 5 and 6.

“After this manner”—that described in the previous verse—“in the old time”—formerly—“holy women also, who trusted”—*elpizousai*—who hoped, confided—“in God”—sought their happiness in conformity to the will of God, relying on him for substantial enjoyment and an incorruptible inheritance—“adorned themselves, being in subjection” or subordination—“unto their own husbands: even as Sara obeyed”—submitted to—“Abraham, calling him lord”—*kurion*—prince, ruler, master—“whose daughters ye are—*tekna*—a figure of speech, i. e. whom you resemble as a daughter, a mother, including the idea of moral likeness—“as long as ye do well, and are not afraid with any amazement”—that is are not affrighted with any fear, but always trusting in God in the most hopeless hour, for so did Sara and other holy women.

Likewise, ye husbands, dwell with them according to knowledge, giving honor unto the wife, as unto the weaker vessel, and as being heirs together of the grace of life; that your prayers be not hindered.—VERSE 7.

The obligation is not all on one side. ‘Likewise, ye husbands dwell with’—live with—‘them according to’—or on account of—‘knowledge’—that knowledge which had been brought unto them by the gospel, of life incorruptible, and of which they had formerly been ignorant. But having received knowledge by the gospel, they were to obey that gospel and not put away their wives, as the Jews did, by reason of the hardness of their hearts, and as the heathen did who lived only for present gratification. The knowledge brought unto us makes plain God’s purpose and design that men should live, or dwell, cohabit, with their wives—not put them away nor leave them, but—‘giving honor unto the wife’—for, to her, i. e. to woman belongs the honor of giving birth to him by whom life and immortality are brought to light; it is ‘the seed of the woman’ that brings salvation to man; give her the honor that is her due, and that God has seen fit to bestow upon her in that respect; and give it to her ‘as unto the weaker’—*asthenestero*—more feeble, delicate; with the idea of more subject to injury; more frail—‘vessel’—*skeuet*—instrument, utensil for containing anything—‘and as being heirs together of the grace of life’—partakers of the hopes and looking for the same glorious destiny—‘that your prayers be not hindered’—*ekkoptesthai*—rendered ineffectual. The mutual discharge of the various duties enjoined in the different relations of life are essential to Christian character, if these are

wilfully neglected, we pray in vain—our prayers are rendered ineffectual. The secret of so many complaints that persons do not know as their prayers are heard is here solved; they neglect duty to each other, and God will not answer them.

MISREPRESENTATION CORRECTED.—In a work issued from Boston, Mass., at No. 8 Chardon street, prepared and published by Sylvester Bliss, Elder Apollos Hale, and others—we find ourself noticed on page 252. Speaking of persons who attended the Union Conference, in New York, in April last, they say:—

“George Storrs, who renounced Mr. Miller’s views more than six years since.”

Then in a note they add as follows:

“He said two years since: ‘It is true that we were drawn into Mr. Miller’s theory for a time, but renounced all his peculiarities more than four years ago; and some of them more than five years since; and have had no connection with his peculiar views for more than four years past; the leaders in that system are among our opposers.’—*Examiner*, May, 1849. Yet he was one of the leaders in this mixed company.”

“The following were the ‘peculiar’ views of Mr. Miller, which Mr. Storrs boasts of having repudiated, and the repudiator of which is now found in the arms of Marsh, Cook & Co.:

“1. The regeneration of this earth by fire, and its restoration to its Eden beauty.

“2. The personal advent of Christ at the commencement of the millenium.

“3. His judgment of the quick and the dead at his appearing and kingdom.

“4. His reign on the earth over the nations of the redeemed.

“5. The resurrection of those who sleep in Jesus, and the change of the living saints, at the advent.

“6. The destruction of the living wicked from the earth at that event, and their confinement under chains of darkness till the second resurrection.

“7. Their resurrection and judgment, at the end of the millenium, and consignment to everlasting punishment.

“8. The bestowment of immortality, (in the scriptural, and not the secular use of this word,) through Christ, at the resurrection.

“9. The new earth the eternal residence of the redeemed.

“10. The termination of the prophetic periods about 1842.

“Neither of the above views was original with Mr. Miller; nor can one more than another of them be said to have been ‘peculiar’ to him; for his belief of them all (excepting the last) was equally strong. Mr. Storrs cannot say that the last of the above list was the ‘peculiar’ view he repudiated, for Mr. Miller always admitted that he might be mistaken in that.”

This extract is proof of the fact that the leaders in the peculiarities of Mr. Miller are among our opposers, as we said two years ago; and we are sorry now to add that they are reckless in a degree and to an extent that must fill every honest mind with disgust, who knows the facts. If we believed their statement concerning us was the result of misapprehen-

sion, we would not speak of them as we now do; but we are forbidden to believe any such thing. It bears on the face of it the evidence of design to stigmatise us *wilfully*. Read over again what they affirm were Mr. Miller’s *peculiar* views ‘which Mr. Storrs boasts of having repudiated.’ Now turn to the Bible Examiner for July, 1849, and read our own explanation of what I, ‘George Storrs,’ understood to be Mr. Miller’s *peculiarities*. In reference to this very statement, which Bliss, Hale and others quote from the Examiner of May previous, I there say:—

“Whatever the church or the world may understand by Millerism, I understand it to have three PECULIARITIES, and nothing more, viz: definite time for the advent, and that time not extending beyond A. D. 1847. That view I gave up in the winter of ’44 and ’45; and time has since demonstrated that I was right in so doing. The two other peculiarities of Millerism I gave up, one in the month of February, ’44, and the other in June, ’45. The three may be summed up thus: 1. Definite time for the advent, not to go beyond ’47. 2. No return of the literal posterity of Jacob to the land wherein their fathers have dwelt. 3. The earth all to be melted at the time of the advent, and none of its inhabitants left remaining. These three points constitute the whole of what I call Millerism, or the peculiarities of Mr. Miller. The second personal advent of Christ—that advent pre-millennial—nigh, even at the door—the kingdom of God on earth, or the earth the inheritance of the saints—the earth to be renewed—Paradise restored, and all those kindred doctrines relating to the kingdom of God, are no part nor parcel of Millerism.”

Such was the statement of ‘George Storrs,’ which was not unknown to Bliss, Hale & Co., when they made their statement concerning me. Let the reader again compare theirs with mine made in 1849; and bear in mind that Bliss and Hale had that Examiner in the office from which has just issued their statement, and see if there is any apology can be made for men occupying their public position—and with the facts before them—for making the *unchristian* and *ungentlemanly* charge they have against ‘George Storrs.’ Mark well what they say, after having stated ten particulars which they affirm ‘Mr. Storrs boasts of having repudiated;’ they add, ‘Neither of the above [ten] views was original with Mr. Miller.’ So say I, *George Storrs*, except it be the 6th; and therefore not one of the others was embraced in Mr. Miller’s *peculiarities* repudiated by me at the periods spoken of, nor was the 6th in the form they have stated; nor do I now, nor have I for the last seven years, dissented from the general view of the other nine particulars they have named. At any rate, none of them are the points repudiated at the periods named. Why do they entirely omit two of the particulars we did renounce and insert nine that we did not? Is this just? Is it honest? It certainly is not christian.

We may also add, that in the Examiner of Nov. 1847, we said: ‘Mr. Miller’s theory, so far as pecu-

liar to himself, has but *three* parts.' We then proceeded to state what they were; and they will be found to be the same as above quoted by us from the Examiner for July, 1849. The Examiner was sent regularly during '47 and '49 to the office where Bliss and Hale were engaged, and from whence has issued the work professing to be 'HIMES' DEFENCE.' If its statements generally are as reckless and untrue as that concerning 'George Storrs,' they are unworthy of credit.

Of the *ten* particular views which they say 'Geo. Storrs boasts of having repudiated,' we would say, briefly, the first we never renounced; but we do dissent from Mr. Miller as to the *time* of that event. On the second, we have never wavered; we believe and preach it still. The third we fully believe and preach. The fourth we believe, and on it have never wavered. The fifth we fully believe and have done so for the last eight years. From the sixth we dissent, but not without the qualifying word *all*. Mr. Miller believed that every living soul would be destroyed from the earth at the *time* of the advent, except the saints; we do not believe it; but we do believe there will be a great cutting off of wicked men; though still there will be "LEFT of the nations." As to the seventh we have never expressed a sentiment to the contrary. The eighth is expressed in a form to suit Jesuits. We teach immortality in the *scriptural* sense is through Christ alone, and bestowed at the resurrection. The ninth we have maintained unwaveringly; but as to the *time* the new earth will appear, that is another matter entirely. As to the tenth, we never renounced the idea that we were in the vicinity of the termination of the prophetic period, but believe that some of them may be extended to 1866-7. Mr. Miller never, to our knowledge, 'admitted that he might be mistaken' above *four* years; and the leaders in his theory of *definite time* for the second advent thus announced their view in March, 1844, in their *organ* paper. They said—

"There are none of the prophetic periods, as we understand them, extending beyond the Jewish year 1843. The above we shall *ever* maintain as the *immutable* truth of the word of God, and therefore, till our Lord comes, we shall ever look for his return as the *next event* in historical prophecy."

After the "Jewish year" 1844 passed away, one of these same leaders, supposed to be Elder Apollis Hale, but no doubt in connection with Bliss & Co., in the Advent Herald office, stretched out the periods to the "end of 1847." And among other matters, said—

"Those who are brought to view as subjects of the wrath of God at the Second Advent, are those who reject the testimony of God on the time of that event."
—Harmony of Prophetic Chronology, &c.

Yet now they have the audacity to change the form of expression to that found in their 10th particular; because to have stated the whole truth would

have been to condemn themselves instead of 'George Storrs.'

This effort to blast our character and destroy our influence is not the first that has issued from the same quarter, which has been borne in silence; and it gives us pain to feel that duty now calls us to rebuke openly those who have sinned in this matter. We have long time holden our peace while a stream of slander has been poured over the land concerning us from men who, if their *professions* could be relied upon, are as truly the representatives of Jesus Christ as the Pope is of St. Peter. But God will yet judge between us.

One word in relation to George Storrs being "one of the leaders" in the Convention in New York last April. It is a mistake entirely. We did not even *sign* the call for that Convention. We attended it, but took no very active part in it; we declined being on any of the Committees—we took very little part in any of the discussions, and our name we believe appears not in the minutes of the Convention except a simple notice that we preached one evening. We left before the Convention closed, and previous to the termination of the discussions. Truly this does not look like being *one of the leaders*—even if leaders there were.

POSTAGE.—Our friends, in ordering books, pamphlets, tracts, &c.; sent *by mail*, should remember that we are obliged to *pre-pay* the postage, and we cannot send any works in that way unless the amount of postage is remitted us in *addition* to the price of the works ordered; at the same time, they will see, in point of expense, it costs them no more to remit the postage to us than if they had it to pay when they receive the works. It is only the trouble and risk of sending it by mail. We prefer they should send us the money for works ordered instead of post office stamps, as some have done; yet where there is a *fraction* of a dollar to be sent they *may* send stamps for it. For the amount of postage to be *pre-paid* on any of our books, &c., see the last page of the Examiner for July. They should specially preserve that page, as we do not wish to fill our papers by republishing that matter.

In the "Truth-Seeker," No. 4, our compositor, by mistake, placed the rate of postage on the Bible Examiner *Extra* under *Bible Examiner*.

WISE MAXIMS.—The following brief maxims were adopted by the late Rev. Dr. Heugh, and if generally observed would revolutionize the whole social community; the sources of bitterness would be dried up, and peace take the place of envy and strife:

"Let me have the following maxims always in mind, for the regulation of my conduct:—*Never to praise myself and never to speak evil of, or detract from any other individual.* Better not to speak at all, than speak to slander and calumniate. Resolve, therefore, *never to use such language of any person as I should be ashamed to use in his presence.*"