BIBLE EXAMINER.

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

VOL. IV. PHILADELPHIA, MAY, 1849. No. 5.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.
JOHN T. WALSH, ASSOCIATE EDITOR.

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

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

☞ This paper is subject to newspaper postage only.

THE DISCUSSION CONTINUED.

TO MR. J. T. WALSH:—*Does the soul consciously exist after death till the resurrection?*

My Dear Sir:—I am content to leave the points already discussed to our readers. I will, therefore, in this article, call attention to a few considerations not before noticed in this friendly discussion.

First. The express condemnation of the doctrine of Sadducees. Their views are comprehensively expressed in *Acts 23d, 8th.*—"For the Sadducees say there is no *resurrection*, neither *angel*, nor *spirit;* but the Pharisees confess both."

Here are three negative positions embraced by the Sadducees, and their opposite by the Pharisees, and on each of them, Paul declares *himself a Pharisee.*

What was the creed of the Sadducees as here presented? They denied a future existence for man, by denying both the resurrection of the body, and the separate existence of the soul, or spirit.

There is no way to escape the force of this, but to deny the reference of the word "*spirit*" to the *soul* or spirit of man, disembodied. But what else could they mean? Man's hope and destiny was the topic under consideration.

1. By spirit they meant something distinct from angels, because they are mentioned separately.

2. They believed in a God, and therefore the reference is not to him.

3. They did deny the spiritual existence of man as well as the resurrection of the body. How natural that they should be named together, *especially* as the Pharisees believed *both*. I believe therefore that by "spirit" we are to understand the spirit of man before the resurrection of the body.

Secondly. In Matt. 22d, from the 23d to the 32d, we have a detailed conversation between Christ and some of the leaders of this sect, when they urge what they considered a fatal objection to a future existence, as well as the resurrection of the body. In answering this objection the Saviour utters this remarkable language, 31 and 32—"But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob!

God is not the God of the dead but of the living."

There are two points to which I wish to call particular attention.

1. God *is* the God of Abraham, but God is not the God of the *dead*, and therefore, Abraham, though in appearance, and in the language of men dead, he is not *really* so, otherwise God would not be his God. With any other view the text contradicts itself.

2. God is only the God of the *actually* living, while he is the God of Abraham, therefore Abraham is actually living.

You will reply, perhaps, that it is the *resurrection* the Saviour is proving. But the word of necessity implies nothing more than a future life, to stand up, to live again, and the context obliges us to give it this definition in this place. 1. Because of the declaration "in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage" which *must* be understood as tantamount to, *in the future life*, "they neither marry," &c.

2. Because Christ declares Abraham *then* living, which fully disproved the doctrine of the Sadducees.

If it be said he calls God the God of Abraham in view of his *subsequent* resurrection to life "at the last day," I reply: 1. The text does not declare that God is the God of those *now dead*, but who *are* to live, but emphatically "God *is not* the God of the *dead*, but of the *living*"—those *actually now living.*

2. Abraham's future resurrection to life and consciousness, ceases to be a matter of *rational* expectation, unless his soul still exists in a conscious state.

I submit it to the reason of the unbiased, that if there be no soul, separate and distinct from the body, capable of living after that has died, there is no such being as Abraham of Mesopotamia in existence.

There being no such person, he cannot be raised from the dead, for the obvious reason, that a being that does not *exist*, cannot have a resurrection.

The appeal to omnipotence will avail nothing in this case, for omnipotence cannot do, what in the *nature* of things is contradictory and impossible.

God can create another being resembling *Abraham*, but he would not be *the* Abraham that once "dwelt in tents with Sarah and Isaac, heirs of the promise," but another; and if made to feel he was, he would be deceived. And hence I fully believe your view destroys the hope even of a future resurrection. The two doctrines live together and die together. Another being created to take my place could not recognize my previous affections as his own.

After a thousand years, during which time I have not only failed to think, but the whole power of thought has become annihilated—my *whole* being returned to the dust from which it was taken—my resurrection is an utter absurdity.

Third. Another passage is found in Matt. 17th. 2d. "And there appeared unto them *Moses* and *Elias* talking with him." Here I believe both doc-

trines are illustrated and confirmed to the disciples. Here was Elijah in a resurrection body confirming that doctrine. Here was Moses, who died and was buried 1400 years before, a proof of the other doctrine contended for.

But had not both bodies? I cannot say, though both were made known to the disciples, what was their appearance. *God* sometimes assumes a body and makes his *angels* to appear as men, *spirits* or *flaming fire*. Could he not clothe, for the time, the soul of Moses in a body, as it pleased him?

There is no proof that he was raised from the dead, i. e. that his body was raised, and if you deny my declaration, you must base that denial on sheer assumption.

My dear sir, on this side of the question I have now done. I am most respectfully and truly your friend and brother, W. H. Brewster.

Reply to Mr. Brewster.

Dear Sir,—In your article you base an argument,

1st. On "the express condemnation of the doctrine of the Sadducees."

Truly, in Acts 23d, 8th, it is said "For the Sadducees say there is no *resurrection*, neither *angel* nor *spirit*." What is the *force* of this passage? The Sadducees, by denying a "*resurrection*," as a necessary consequence, denied the existence of "*angels and spirits*;" thus predicating the existence of them upon *their* resurrection. There seems to be a hint here, that "angels" have attained to their present condition by a previous probation and resurrection from the dead. This idea receives support from the Mosaic account of Man's fall, &c. According to this view, the existence of "*spirits*" should be predicated on the resurrection of *men*. The saints, when raised, are termed the "*spirits* of just men made *perfect*." But this merely by the way.

"The Pharisees confess *both*." "*Both*" what? The term "both," refers to *two* only. But your say "here are *three* negative positions embraced by the Sadducees, and their opposite by the Pharisees, and on each of them, Paul declares *himself* a *Pharisee*."

Now the term "*both*," referring to *two* things only, must be applied to "angels and spirits," whose existence is predicated upon a resurrection, or else, if you apply it to "angels and spirits," you must leave out of the question the "*resurrection*," altogether! And, accordingly, we do find just such an idea among some of the Pharisaic Jews, who affirmed, "that the resurrection was passed," the soul having gone to heaven at death, "and overthrow the faith of some."

But, waiving all this, did Paul affirm "himself a Pharisee" in the *three* particulars above noticed? He has not left us to *infer* his meaning, for in the 6th verse he tells us in what sense he is a Pharisee. He says—"I am a Pharisee—*concerning* the *hope* and *resurrection* of the *dead*, I am called in question." So there is no evidence that he was a Pharisee, believing in all the paganism of disembodied spirits, and "ghosts of frightful mien."

After asking what was "the creed of the Sadducess," you reply, "they denied a future existence for man, *by* denying *both* the resurrection of the body, and the separate existence of the soul, or spirit." Now, if you had finished the sentence at the term "body," you would have expressed the truth in the case, for the Sadducees truly "denied a future existence for man, *by denying the resurrection of the body*"—upon which that "existence" depends! But denying *this*, the *other* followed as a necessary conclusion.

2. Your second argument is founded on Mat. xxii. 23—32.

Now, be it remembered, the Sadducees affirmed there was no resurrection; (see 23d verse,) and consequently no future life for man. Death, with them, was an "eternal sleep;" and for the purpose of puzzling the Lord, they asked him—whose the woman shall be in the resurrection, for the seven had her? They did not ask whose wife she shall be in the intermediate state, or the state between death and the resurrection; but whose wife she shall be in the *resurrection*? The Lord replied, "ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God. For in the resurrection, (not in the state of the dead,) they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven;" thus predicating the angelic nature upon the resurrection. He continues, "but as *concerning the resurrection of the dead*, (not their *separate* existence,) have you not read that which was spoken to you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the *dead*, (who live no more, as you suppose) but of the living;" that is, of those who shall live again by a resurrection, which you Sadducees deny. Such is the obvious meaning of the passage. You say "God is not the God of the dead"—that is, of those who are "*really* dead;" then by what logic will you make him the God of those who are *half dead*? Again you say, "God is only the God of the *actually living*;" but why prefix "really" and "actually" before "dead" and "living?" Do not the words express the ideas? Men are either dead or alive, and therefore the case stands thus:

1. God is not the God of the dead;
But Abraham is dead;
Therefore God is not the God of Abraham.
This is not the true position; let us try another.

2. Living men are not the subjects of a resurrection;
But Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are living;
Therefore *they* will not be raised from the dead.

Are you willing to endorse this? Perhaps not; let us try again:

3. God is not the God of the dead, who live no more;
But Abraham, Isaac and Jacob will live again;
Therefore God is the God of Abraham, &c.
This expresses the truth on the subject, and *both of us* can endorse it with all the heart!

I have no objection to your definition of the term resurrection—"to stand up, or *live again*." It is a RE-*living*, or living again, and necessarily implies the previous *death* of the subject. No death, no resurrection; no re-surrection, no future life.

You speak of "Abraham's resurrection to *life* and *consciousness*" as "ceasing to be a matter of *rational* expectation, unless his soul still exists in a *conscious* state." Really, I should like for you to help me to an understanding—a "*rational*" understanding of this sentence! In the first place, you endow Abraham with "*life* and *consciousness*" while *dead*, and then, strange to tell, *raise* him to "life and consciousness"! He will then have a *double life* and *double consciousness!* May we not say, that, *if Abraham's soul exists in a state of "life and consciousness,"* his resurrection to "life and consciousness" "ceases to be a matter of rational expectation"? It would, indeed, be an *absurd* "expectation."

You then "submit it to the reason of the unbiassed, that if there be no soul, separate from the body, there is no such being as Abraham in existence." Further on you say, "There being no such person he cannot be raised from the dead, for the obvious reason that a being that does not *exist*, cannot have a resurrection."

Here you have precipitated yourself against the sharp rocks of skepticism, and cannot save yourself without "suffering loss."

If Abraham's soul is not living, you say he does not exist; and, consequently, he cannot be raised from the dead. This is your argument. Of course, then, the *body* of Abraham, to say nothing of his soul, has *no existence;* and this, according to your view, can never be raised: so that you are driven to the dreadful alternative of denying the resurrection of the body *in toto!* Then, if there be any resurrection, it must be affirmed of the *spirit;* but this, according to your view, *is alive*, and therefore cannot be the subject of a resurrection to life. So your view leads to a denial of the resurrection altogether. Here, then, we have this *Pago-Christumized Theology* to the life. The spirit or soul survives the body—*this* returns to dust, and ceases to exist—therefore it can never be raised—therefore the grave will never yield up its prey, but have the "victory"—therefore we can never sing, "*O! grave where is thy victory*"—therefore the sea will never give up its dead—therefore death is an "eternal sleep"! From such theology good Lord deliver us! But this is the *legitimate* tendency of the popular doctrine. It leads the mind back to Infidelity and Paganism. I am sorry, truly so, to find friend Brewster advocating such views.

Again, you say, "the appeal to omnipotence will avail nothing, for omnipotence cannot do, what, in the *nature* of things, is contradictory and impossible." My good sir, you are in company with those Athenians who mocked when they heard Paul on the "resurrection of the *dead*," and with those to whom he said—"Why should it be thought *incredible* that God should raise the *dead*?" Is there anything in the "*nature*" of the resurrection "contradictory and impossible"? I am almost constrained to say—"You do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the *power* of God;" for if the body has no existence, and cannot be raised, Paul erred when he said—"Our vile *bodies* shall be *fashioned* like his most glorious body." And, "if the spirit of Him who raised up Christ from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead, shall also quicken your *mortal bodies* by his spirit that dwelleth in you."

But how can a body be "fashioned" when it has "no existence?" Or how can "mortal bodies" be *made alive* if they have no "existence?" This, according to your view, is "contradictory and impossible." The resurrection is, in a qualified sense, a *new creation;* but it is the reorganization of the former body. If this be not so, how is it, that "we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may RECEIVE IN BODY, the things he has done, whether good or bad?" And how are they who "*sleep in the* DUST *of the earth* to awake?" How is the "*earth to cast out her dead?*" as the Prophet says.

May I not adopt your language, and, with all the emphasis I can give it, declare that, IF YOUR *view be correct*, THE "RESURRECTION IS AN ABSURDITY?"

3d. Your third proof is Mat. 17: 2, on which I shall be brief. And,

1st. We may remark, that the whole transaction is a "*vision*," and does not necessarily involve the *personal* presence of Moses and Elijah. But,

2d. Granting they were there *personally*, what does it prove? Of Moses it is said that he *died*, and the Lord *buried* him. The *man Moses died*, and the *man Moses* was *buried*; and if he *personally* appeared on the Mount of Transfiguration, he must have been raised from the dead.

Of Elijah it is said he went up to heaven in a chariot of fire, and no difficulty is presented in his case; but how you invest him with a "*resurrection body*," I cannot conceive. Elijah was not the subject of a "*resurrection*," but a *translation*. All he left when he went up was his *mantle*, which he left as a legacy to Elisha. It is said that the "Devil disputed about the *body* of Moses," but we have no evidence that Elijah left his body as a legacy to his Satanic Majesty, and received another as he went up.

You say, "there is no proof that Moses was raised from the dead." The very fact of his appearing on the mount, is "proof" to my mind.

You say, "*God* sometimes assumes a body," &c. Where is the proof of this? The *bodies* of "angels" are not "assumed." They "appear as men," because this is their form. Man was made in their image. I regard it, therefore, as a "sheer assumption" on your part to deny the resurrection of Moses. If he *personally* appeared on the Mount, he was certainly raised, and his *presence* there would be the proof.

In conclusion you say, "On *this* side of the question I have now done."

O! that I could hope soon to have you on *this* side of the question, contending for incorruptibility, immortality and eternal life in Christ, by a resurrection from the dead!

Shall I not hear from you on the passages previously quoted? I have much additional testimony in store, and should like to have an opportunity of presenting it; if not in hope of changing your views, at least for the benefit of our readers. May the Lord bless us both, lead us into all truth, and give us an abundant entrance into his everlasting kingdom, is the prayer of your sincere friend,

Jno. T. Walsh.

Philadelphia, April 30th, 1849.

SCRIPTURE EXPOSITIONS.

Ephesians II. and III.

Verses 11 and 12. Wherefore remember, that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called uncircumcision by that which is called the circumcision in the flesh made by hands. That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world.

The apostle having previously clearly stated their high calling, and the exalted standing to which they had now attained, next gives them a word of caution. "Wherefore remember," call to mind, recollect—"that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh"—that is, were not of the nation in covenant with God—"remember that at that time ye were without Christ,"—Christ being of the Jews, and not previously having been proclaimed to them—"being aliens"—strangers to, ignorant of, separate—"from the commonwealth of Israel," not citizens; and as a consequence—"strangers from the covenants of promise,"—not allied to God in covenant—"having no hope"—of the resurrection from the dead: or of the adoption of children, "and without God in the world,"—atheists in the world; having no knowledge of the true God or the nature of his service, nor of that glorious state to which God designed to raise the holy and unblamable in love.

VERSE 13. But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometime were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ.

"But now in Christ Jesus"—by the regenerating power of "the word of truth," which is the seed in producing a union with Christ, who is the *truth*, as well as the life; so that now—"ye who sometime were afar off"—that is, *aliens*—"are made nigh"—no longer aliens, but brought to be worshippers of the true God—"by the blood of Christ." Christ was of the Jews by blood. When his blood was shed, or his life received by descent from Abraham was given up, his relation to them, "after the flesh," being dissolved, he enters into relation with persons out of all nations by the Spirit of Life, or through the spirit by which he lives forever more, and which raised him up from the dead.

VERSES 14—18. For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances: for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace; and that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby. And came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh. For through him we both have access by one spirit unto the Father.

"For he is our peace"—*i. e.*, he is the author of it—"who hath made both"—Jews and Gentiles—"one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition,"—the wall of division—"having abolished"—made useless, rendered worthless—"in his flesh"—i. e., in his sufferings—"the enmity"—that which was the cause of the division between Jews and Gentiles—"even the law of commandments contained in ordinances"—those under which the Jews had heretofore been held; which by the sufferings and death of Christ were now rendered worthless. In bringing about the death of Christ both Jews and Gentiles were active agents—united in his crucifixion—and could therefore have no just cause of complaint if they were all placed upon the same footing. The purpose of God was, now that Christ had made useless the law of ordinances—"to make in himself [Christ] of twain [Jews and Gentiles] *one new man*"—bringing both into union with himself, so that they should constitute *one body*, while he [Christ] would be *the head* of this "new" and spiritual creation; thus constituting "ONE *new man*;" as perfectly united together as the head and body of the one animal man—"so making peace"—or concord, union, harmony, between those who before were in discord:—and that he might reconcile both [Jews and Gentiles] unto *God in one body* by the cross"—by his death—"having slain the enmity thereby"—the animosity existing between them; that is, his condemnation and death was the occasion of the hostile parties uniting together, [see Acts 4: 27,] as some great and deeply interesting event, not unfrequently, unites men from extreme points, as well as abolishing the law of commandments—"and came"—by his ambassadors—"preaching"—proclaiming—"peace"—reconciliation—"to you who were afar off"—who were aliens, *i. e.*, Gentiles—"and to them that were nigh"—the Jews: "for through him [Christ] we both [Jews and Gentiles] have access," admission, "by one spirit"—even that spirit which was upon Christ our head without measure—"unto the Father." Being united with Christ as a branch to the vine, or to keep to the figure of the apostle, as the members of the one body are united with the head and partake of whatever life animates that, so all the members in Christ have access through their head, by the spirit of life in him, to the Father, and in no other way: for, saith the Savior, "No man cometh unto the Father but by me."

VERSES 19—22. Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord. In whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit.

"Ye"—Gentile christians—"are no more strangers and foreigners" as ye were once—"but fellow-citizens"—that is, are united under one head and system of government and favor—"with the saints"—the holy ones who first hoped in Christ; [see chap. 1: 12.]—"and of the household" family—"of God." The apostle now changes the figure to a building—"And are built upon"—rest firmly on—"the foundation"—the word of truth, the gospel of their salvation, [chap. 1: 13,] proclaimed—"of the apostles"—messengers of Christ, "and prophets"—either those of the Old Testament, or those of the New, or both—"Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone"—that without which there would be neither union or strength in the building: and he was that of which prophets and apostles all testified who spake of salvation for men; and which was chosen of God to be the head or foundation of the new, or spiritual creation—"in whom all the building"—the whole body of saints, "fitly framed together"—each part adapted to its place and in its proper position. Any part of a building out of its place weakens the whole: but properly adjusted it becometh, or—"groweth unto a holy temple in"—*or, on*—"the Lord"—he being the head stone, or foundation—"in whom," or, on which—"ye also are builded together"—built up in company, each forming a part of the structure—"for a habitation"—an abode, residence, a home—"of God through"—*en*—by "the Spirit." The church, the spiritual building, is designed of God as the home, the abode, the residence of his Spirit: first resting in Christ without measure, and from him flowing into every soul built on him; thus making them partakers of the

divine nature; and, ultimately, exalting them to the immortal honor of a tabernacle, for God, that shall not be taken down, and eternally be that temple through which he will manifest his glory before other created intelligences: and this is "the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints:" see chap. 1: 18. Let us see to it, that none of us put forth a hand to mar or injure any person, even one of the least, composing this building, or that God is endeavoring to bring into its structure. The least of all may be as important, in its place, as the greatest; and, indeed, fills a place that the greatest could not occupy.

CHAP. III. VERSES 1—7. For this cause I Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles, if ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God which is given me to you-ward: how that by revelation he made known unto me the mystery; as I wrote afore in few words: whereby when ye read ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ. Which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit: that the Gentiles should be fellow heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the Gospel: whereof I was made a minister, according to the gift of the grace of God given unto me by the effectual working of his power.

The first verse seems to be the commencement of an exhortation which is interrupted to the close of the chapter, and then resumed at the first verse following. Paul, for preaching the word of truth, the good news of salvation, to the Gentiles, was grievously persecuted by the Jews, and at length is found a "prisoner" at Rome, from whence he sent out this epistle. He calls to their mind the fact that he was a prisoner for their sakes, on their account; and then reverts to his call to preach Jesus Christ to them, and says, "If ye have heard of the dispensation"—of the charge or trust committed—"of the grace"—favor—"of God which is given me to you-ward: how that by revelation" the Lord Jesus *unveiled* himself to him, so that he saw him, and received his mission directly from Christ; and in such manner as precluded all doubt on the subject of his call and work: see Acts 26: 12—18, and 1 Corth. 15: 5—8: at this time, Jesus—"made known unto me the mystery"—the secret—"which in other ages"—or previous dispensations—"was not made known as it is now revealed"—uncovered, brought to light, rendered conspicuous—"unto the holy apostles and prophets"—persons who communicated truths directly by inspiration of God: and such there were in the days of the apostles: see Acts 11: 27, 28, and 13: 1, 2; and other places. To these prophets and apostles God made known clearly—"by the Spirit, that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs, and of the same body"—with the Jews—"and partakers of his promise in Christ by the Gospel"—which promise is, that all, without regard to nation, that become holy and blameless in love, shall have "the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself," or, be made partakers of his incorruptibility and endless life: of which glorious tidings, Paul says—"I was made a minister"—or, a servant, to the Gentiles—"by the effectual working of his power:" see again Acts 26: 12—17

VERSE 8. Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ.

"Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints"—or, holy ones, that is, the least of all the apostles, as is evident from 1 Corth. 15: 8, 9, which see—"is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ." Christ has *riches*; and they are unsearchable, and so extensive that they cannot be explored, nor exhausted. Let us dwell here a moment. What are we called to? First, a *union* with Christ: to become his bride. Of course, partners in his treasures, honors, and whatever belongs to him. Let this truth be proclaimed. But who and what are we? Mortal, corruptible, dying creatures; whose foundation is in the dust; and all of whose tendencies are to return to dust again; with no principle of immortality or endless life in ourselves. To such creatures Christ is proclaimed, as seeking to bring us into a relation to himself of the nearest and most interesting character. Men are allured by the charm of *riches*, gold, inexhaustible mines; that wakes up their whole being, and they eagerly inquire what it is, where it is, how they can find it, how they may possess themselves of those treasures; and if they find there is even a chance for success in the pursuit, they enter at once on the expedition, hazarding all the labor, toil, risk, suffering, or privation that may be attending the enterprise. Now, says the apostle, I come to proclaim to you riches unsearchable, a mine that is inexhaustible in Christ. He is the Son of the living God, and heir of God: heir of his incorruptibility, glory, endless life, and whatever pertains to the fulness of God. He proposes to share these riches with us: and in exchange for this short and fleeting life to give us an endless life: instead of these corruptible bodies to give us incorruptible ones: instead of the dishonor of consuming in the grave, by worms, to raise us to crowns of glory that fade not away: in a word, to give us riches as much more glorious, valuable, and durable than the richest diamonds, or the most refined and pure gold, as they exceed the most worthless and loathsome object that earth bears upon its surface. But all comparison fails, and we feel the deepest sense of weakness in the attempt, and leave it to your own reflections to follow up the contemplation of the honor, glory, and riches that are so freely offered to us in Jesus Christ.

VERSES 9—12. And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ: to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God. According to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord: in whom we have boldness and access with confidence by the faith of him.

"To make all see"—to enlighten all: not the Jews only, but those of every nation—"what the fellowship"—participation, communion—"of the mystery"—the secret of the calling of the Gentiles, "which from the beginning of the world"—or, ages—"hath been hid in God"—not known as now, though in the purpose of God—"who created"—caused to exist, formed, instituted, or, formed anew, regenerated, renovated; [it may relate here entirely to the "one new man," chap 2: 15, or the one "body," verse 6; the regeneration committed to Christ,]—"all things by"—through, or, in—"Jesus Christ: to the intent that"—in order that—"now unto principalities"—authorities—

"and powers"—rulers—"in heavenly things"—in things relating to the kingdom of God, or the regeneration—"might be known by"—or *in*—"the church the manifold"—the immense, the infinite, "wisdom of God." The whole scheme of creation, redemption, and renovation, is one of boundless wisdom; faintly manifested at first, and but imperfectly understood until after the death, resurrection and ascension of Christ, and the consequent outpouring of the Holy Spirit, and the further gift of prophecy in the days of the apostles, by which was made known, vastly more perfectly than in any previous dispensation, the boundless wisdom of God in the work of renovation, progressing to a completeness and perfection never before conceived of by the sons of men; not even the most enlightened, *viz.*, the Jews; and which even the first christians, not excepting the apostles, were slow to learn: so much so that the Saviour said, "Oh unwise and slow of heart to believe;" and Peter had to be taught in a vision, by a sheet let down from heaven, even after his baptism of the Holy Spirit: and our Lord Jesus had personally to appear to Paul with light from heaven that overpowered him, before the church fully understood, or engaged in earnest to carry out God's designs of mercy and salvation to the Gentiles; which design was not new, for it was "according to the eternal purpose," according to the determination before the ages: that is, before either the Christian or Jewish ages; and as expressed, or *set forth, exposed to view*, [for so the original word here translated *purpose*, signifies,] to Abraham, when God informed him, that in his seed, which is Christ, all the families of the earth should be blessed: this was that "which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord," that "the Gentiles should be fellow heirs, and partakers of his promise in Christ Jesus;" verse 6: "in whom we have boldness and access with confidence by the faith of him." Through the promise of God, and the knowledge of his purpose to make us, Gentiles, partakers in the adoption of children, we now have access to God, with a firm reliance upon his mercy to us, who are in Christ, united to Christ, in the one body. Glorious privilege, glorious calling, glorious hope: and let the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ have glory now and evermore, through our head and deliverer, the Son of God.

IS THIS AGE FINAL, OR PREPARATORY?

No. I.

Most Christians are looking for a glorious state of triumph for the Church of Christ on this earth. Do the Scriptures warrant such an expectation? Let the word of truth decide the question, and not our prejudices or fancies. We go back to the time of Moses; Numb. 14: 21. "But as truly as I live, all the earth shall be filled with the glory of the Lord." Here is a most solemn oath of the living God. Has the promise made by this oath ever yet been fulfilled? Surely, none can be at a loss for an answer. How did the Psalmist understand this subject? See Psalms 22. 27. "All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord: and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee." Has this prophecy ever had its fulfilment? Certainly not. But he tells us when it shall be, *viz:* When "the kingdom is the Lord's, and he is Governor among the nations;" verse 28. At that time it is said "a seed shall serve him: it shall be accounted to the Lord for a generation. They shall come [the seed,] and shall declare his righteousness unto *a people that shall be born*, that he hath done this." Here is a people to be born, after the kingdom is the Lord's, who are to be taught the works God has wrought in subjecting the nations. This portion of Scripture needs no further comment to show that the events spoken of are future, and they are not "*conditional*;" a phrase much used by those who, though not designedly, are, in fact, turning the Scriptures into "a cunningly devised fable."

That we do not misunderstand the Psalmist in this matter, let us look at Psalm 72, where speaking of Messiah's reign, he says, "The kings of Tarshish and of the isles shall bring presents: the kings of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts. Yea, all kings shall fall down before him: all nations shall serve him." At the 17th verse he adds:—"His name shall endure for ever: his name shall be continued as long as the sun: and men shall be blessed in him: all nations shall call him blessed." In view of that glorious period he breaks out in praise and prayer, verses 18 and 19, "Blessed be the Lord God, the God of Israel, who only doeth wondrous things. And blessed be his glorious name for ever: and let the whole earth be filled with his glory. Amen, and amen." These are no dark sayings; but full, clear and plain. It does not require a Solomon to show that this prophecy is unconditional, future in its accomplishment, and before the new earth dispensation. See verse 8. "He shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth." Compare this with Rev. 21: 1—"And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away: and there was no more sea." The two periods are as distinct as language can make them; and it seems to us, the impartial mind cannot fail to see it.

Let us next examine Psalms. 102: 13—22, "Thou shalt arise, and have mercy upon Zion: for the time to favor her, yea, the set time is come. For thy servants take pleasure in her stones, and favor the dust thereof. *So the heathen shall fear the name of the Lord, and all the kings of the earth thy glory. When the Lord shall build up Zion, he shall appear in his glory.* He will regard the prayer of the destitute, and not despise their prayer, *This shall be written for the generation to come: and the people which shall be created shall praise the Lord.* For he hath looked down from the height of his sanctuary; from heaven did the Lord behold the earth. To hear the groaning of the prisoner; to loose those that are appointed to death. To declare the name of the Lord in Zion, and his praise in Jerusalem. WHEN THE PEOPLE ARE GATHERED TOGETHER AND THE KINGDOMS, TO SERVE THE LORD." Here the language is clear. It is at a time when the Lord personally appears in his glory. This was written for a future period: and the people which shall be created shall then praise the Lord. The Prophet Habakkuk says: "The earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea," Hab. 2: 14. This certainly relates to the future.

IN THAT AGE, THE JEWS MISSIONARIES.

The Prophet records from the mouth of the Lord, Zech. 8: 21—22. "And the inhabitants of one city shall go to another, saying, let us go speedily to pray before the Lord, and to seek the Lord of hosts: I will go also. *Yea, many people and strong nations shall come to seek the Lord of hosts in Jerusalem, and to pray before the Lord.*" Here is a prophecy too plain to be mistaken. The next verse shows that this is to be at a time when the Jews will be missionaries to "the nations." The objector may say "Jews are the spiritual seed." If that is admitted it does not in the least affect the argument; because there are those "of the nations" who are not Jews; and these "take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, we will go with you for we have heard God is with you." We understand, of course, that it is the literal Jews that are spoken of in this verse; and we believe the remnant of them, who escape the terrible judgments with which that period will be ushered in, will be converted at the manifestation of Christ personally to them as he manifested himself to Saul of Tarsus on his way to Damascus. At that manifestation they will weep and mourn as described, Zech. 12: 10—14; and it will not be the mourning of despair, but of genuine repentance for having so long rejected their true Messiah, the crucified Jesus: "in that day there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem for sin and uncleanness;" Zech. 13: 1: and the iniquity of that land will be "removed in one day:" see Zech. 3: 9. This people, thus saved, not changed to immortality, but among the "left of the nations," [Zech. 14: 16,] will be the first or chief of the nations, during the next age or dispensation, and will be employed as suggested by the text, Zech. 8: 23, that is, as missionaries, successful missionaries to "all languages of the nations." Under their labors among those left of the nations, "many people and strong nations shall come to seek the Lord of Hosts in Jerusalem, and to pray before the Lord."

A QUESTION.

In Heb. 2: 14, the apostle, speaking of Christ, says: "that through death he might destroy him that hath the power of death, that is, the devil." Again, in John 3: 8, it is said, "for this purpose the Son of God was manifested that he might destroy the works of the devil."

Here the two inspired witnesses speak too plain to be misunderstood. They mean simply this, that Christ will *destroy* the DEVIL and his WORKS."

Will some one that believes in the immortality, and never ending sins and torments of those persons that die in their sins,—and the immortality and never ending sins and torments of the devil, tell me how, and when, Christ will bring about the great event of destroying the devil and his works?

E. W. KNIGHT.

Glenns Falls, N. Y.

DOES IT DO ANY GOOD?

We have heard so many sneers from a certain quarter against the view we entertain on the immortality question—and it has been so significantly said "I never heard of the doctrine doing any good," that we have concluded to give these *ignorant* persons two items, among many within our knowledge, of good done by the *hated* doctrine.

OSWEGO, Ind., April 1st, 1849.

BR. STORRS:—For your encouragement I would state, that the "Six Sermons" have been blessed in bringing some dear souls to the correct knowledge of Bible Truth. God has been pleased to make a single copy, when introduced into a neighbourhood, a pioneer for the herald of salvation to follow. In this way numbers have been led to know, that *sin and death* came through the first Adam, *and life and immortality* came through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; and that God does not send *death* to gather his saints unto himself, but, that he will *send Jesus Christ* to gather them at the second advent, who will present the entire church, as the glorious bride, without spot or wrinkle, unto God his Father, arrayed in beauty, possessing immortality and incorruptibility, whose inheritance will be in the new heavens and new earth—the inheritance incorruptible, undefiled and unfading. Hence, a need of the second coming of Christ is felt, and in this manner a way is opened for proclaiming this blessed doctrine.

S. A. CHAPLIN.

TYLER, Ill., March 22d, 1849.

DEAR BROTHER STORRS:—It has now been about two years since your "Six Sermons" first caught my eye. They called in question a doctrine, the truth of which I considered of vast importance; *viz.* the immortality of the soul: for upon this, and the doctrines unavoidably growing out of it, I had based all my hopes of future bliss and glory. I was a Universalist. Believing that all men are a compound of mortality and immortality, destined at the death of the body to ascend in their nobler nature, which was a part of Deity himself, to his own right hand to enjoy his favor forevermore. This, in my estimation, being true, I decided that God would not punish sinners with eternal torments in hell forever, for in so doing he must of necessity punish a part of himself. I was preparing, as fast as my circumstances would permit, to proclaim this, to me, glorious doctrine. But before I had completed my investigation of the "Six Sermons," I became fully satisfied that the entire system [of *natural* immortality] was based upon the serpent's first lie,—"Ye shall not surely die." I rejected it at once, and was led as I believe into a knowledge of the true source of immortality; and to see that God would render unto every one according to their deeds. "To them who by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for glory, and honor, and immortality, eternal life." Since that time I have felt it my duty to proclaim, according to the ability given, life and immortality through Jesus at his coming and kingdom. During the past year I have travelled through a part of Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio: and among those looking for the coming and kingdom of Jesus, I have found but three, who do not believe with you in respect to the nature and destiny of man: one in Illinois, one in Indiana, and one in Ohio. I believe these truths should be kept in the front of all preaching; for they are the fundamental doctrines of the Bible. They strike a death blow to Universalism in all its parts. I have found in conversing with Universalists, since I embraced my present view, that they are entirely unprepared to meet these truths. The weapons

they use so successfully against eternal torments fall lifeless when tried against the Bible view of the destruction of the wicked.

Yours, in hope of Eternal Life,
D. P. HALL.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, MAY, 1849.

ENDLESS LIFE ONLY IN CHRIST.

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

BIBLE EXAMINER.—We have concluded to say a few words as to the prospects of our paper; and especially as some, even of our friends, from our silence and through insinuations of others, have been led to think that the Examiner is amply sustained. We abhor the *everlasting* begging and dunning practiced by some.

From our subscribers we have not received funds sufficient to pay our printer for the present volume; and unless we can realize at least four hundred more new subscribers during this year, we shall be exceedingly embarrassed in finishing the volume for 1849, and shall be plunged in debt, without having received a cent for our personal labors. If half our present subscribers will send us two new ones, each, with the pay in advance, we shall be able to finish the year not only free from debt to the printer, but also a trifle for our own services; at which you will rejoice, if we have contributed any thing to your profit. No subscription will be received for a less time than one volume. All the numbers for 1848 can be had if desired.

Any person who will send us *two* new subscribers, with pay in current money, free of expense to us, we will send a copy of Dobney, in paper cover, without charge. Dobney on Future Punishment, or the end of the Wicked, is the most grand and interesting work that has yet appeared. If any prefer the Six Sermons instead of Dobney's work, as a premium for the two new subscribers, we will send *three* copies of them. We now leave the subject with our friends, to do what they judge best and right.

DR. JOHN T. WALSH.—All letters to him should be addressed PHILADELPHIA, Pa., No. 63 Ogden St.

TOUR EAST, WITH VARIOUS OBSERVATIONS.—Our apology for the lateness of the Examiner this month, is our absence. After our last went to press we concluded not to issue the May number till our return. We left Philadelphia March 28th at six o'clock in the morning, and arrived in New York City, 100 miles, at half past one, P. M., where we were welcomed to the hospitable home of our old friend Henry F. Johnson. A meeting had been given out for the evening in American Hall, Broadway, where, notwithstanding the wet weather, we had the satisfaction of seeing many old friends, and a good assemblage of attentive hearers, to whom we spoke "of things new and old;" and again in the same place the next evening. Saturday, March 31st, we left New York at 8 o'clock in the morning, by the cars; going north and east we passed through Bridgeport, New Haven, and Hartford in Connecticut, Springfield, and Worcester in Mass., principal towns and cities on the route, and arrived at Boston about six o'clock in the evening, having travelled about 230 miles in ten hours, including stops. This is winging our way fast enough for any age but the present. So has steam entered into the composition of men's minds, in these days, that the means of locomotion are altogether too tardy, and invention is at its "wit's end" to see if some more expeditious means of conveyance cannot be brought into use, whereby the land of promise [California!!] can be gained in "two days" by travelling the heavens above instead of the earth beneath. Yes, they seem determined to travel in the air, and are quite confident that they can succeed, and thus all but annihilate distance, making a pleasant ride, above the clouds, to California or England in "*two days.*" Truly, "man" was "made upright," but we "have sought out *many inventions.*" But all these movements indicate the closing up of the present age, as truly as the attempt to build Babel indicated the confusion of tongues, whereby the devices of men were overthrown to establish the purposes of God.

Sabbath, April 1st, we preached three times in Chapman Hall, Boston, to an attentive congregation. During the week we attended several meetings and preached. Sabbath the 8th, we again spoke to the people three times; and Thursday following, being the State Fast of Mass., we preached twice. In our discourses we took up the signs of the times; the saint's inheritance; the locality of the Kingdom of God; the prospects of the Jews; the nature of the coming age; and the immortality question; as well as practical holiness, or the importance of being Christ-like in our lives and conversation. True, we had to touch all these subjects but slightly, time not allowing us to enlarge upon them; but we have the satisfaction of knowing that what we did say made the people anxious to hear more; and we were strongly importuned to remove to that city, to preach statedly; but we were compelled to decline, believing that the providence of God called us elsewhere. We may again *visit* the friends there, as we were urged to do if we could not take up our residence with them. The house of Br. Prescott Dickinson was our *home* while there; and many have proved his hospitalities as well as we. From Boston we went to Lowell, the city of

Factories. Here we were cheered by the cordial greeting of our beloved brother, the "eminent Methodist preacher," Merrit Bates of the "Wesleyan Methodist Connection of America." We felt some as Paul did when he met the brethren at "Appiforum, and The Three Taverns" on his way to Rome, and "thanked God, and took courage." It was truly refreshing to meet with one minister of the religion of Jesus Christ who manifests its spirit, and is far removed from the narrow spirit which characterises nearly all religionists of every name and party. Here also we met our old friend and brother Wm. H. Brewster, Br. Walsh's polemical opponent, who is also a minister in the Wesleyan Methodist connection, and preaching in Lowell. Our interview with him was of a most pleasant character, and contrasted amazingly with the narrow spirit of most of our theological opponents. Differ as we may and do on some subjects, we felt that the bonds of christian friendship and fellowship were strong and unbroken. We gave Br. Brewster a copy of Dobney on Future Punishment, and since learn that he was highly pleased with the "first part," which was all that he had read at the time. We hope and trust he may be equally well pleased with the "*Second* part;" and if so, we doubt not, he will become the powerful advocate of "the faith he once destroyed."

We were invited by the official members of the Wesleyan church, to whom Br. Bates ministers, to preach to them on the immortality question. We gave them five Discourses on the subject—two during the week, and three on Sabbath, April 15th. The word spoken was listened to with deep attention. We had both Methodist and Universalist ministers to hear. Br. Bates openly avowed his belief in our view of the end of the wicked; and we doubt not he will be fully sustained by the church and congregation to which he ministers in Lowell; he had preached one discourse to them on the question before our arrival, which made them the more anxious to hear us. Br. Bates went to the Annual Conference of the Wesleyan church, for New England, while we were in Lowell; and though all knew his views on the immortality subject no objection was made to passing his character; the Conference thus manifesting a noble spirit of toleration which does them much honor, and honors the religion they profess. Several copies of Dobney on Future Punishment were disposed of at that Conference, and also of our "Six Sermons." The church at Lowell *unanimously* requested Br. Bates to return and labor among them another year: Br. Brewster also returns to his congregation in Lowell. Our visit to that city was highly gratifying and encouraging. We parted with the friends there, particularly with Br. Bates, with much regret: it was painful to take the final grasp of that brother's hand, with whom we had enjoyed such a refreshing season; but, we shall meet again; so proclaims the voice of faith. A history of that brother's trials and persecutions, in years past, for the truth's sake, is a chapter written in the "book of remembrance;" and will not be forgotten when God shall "make up" his "jewels." He has a part to act, in future; for which may our Lord fully prepare him, and strengthen him mightily in its performance. Eight years has his mind been exercised more or less on the immortality question. When he was Presiding Elder in the Methodist Episcopal Church, in the Troy Conference, we sent him a copy of "Three Letters," the first thing we ever published on the subject. Those Letters were originally written to the late Rev. Orange Scott, afterwards founder of the "Wesleyan Methodist Connection of America," and which he often told us he was unable to answer. It was by his advice we published them; though his name was suppressed as the person to whom they were written. In the spring of 1841 we sent a copy of those Letters to Br. Bates, and the seed then sown has never ceased to vegetate, though sometimes it has lain comparatively dormant, and then starting forth with fresh vigor, till at length it has appeared in strength, and is vigorously manifesting itself.

The "Three Letters" became the basis of the "Six Sermons," which were first published in Albany, N. Y. in the spring of 1842, and *before* we had any thing to do with "Millerism." We make this statement because that theory has often been charged with being the author of the doctrine of the destruction of the wicked as advocated by us in our "Six Sermons." But there was never any connection between the one and the other; and Mr. Miller always opposed our views on the immortality question. 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.

From Lowell we returned to Boston, and from thence to Springfield, where we were welcomed by many friends, particularly Brethren R. E. Ladd and Moses Stoddard, good men and true, who stand for the right and truth at whatever cost. Sabbath, April 22d, we preached morning and afternoon in Dwight's Hall; and in the evening in the Universalist Church, on the subject,—"No immortality to man except through Jesus Christ." Here we had a large and attentive congregation, to whom we opened and expounded the Scriptures as to the fact, that the death threatened Adam was not a *moral* one, but a literal dissolution of his entire being; from which there is no recovery except by Christ, and no im-

mortality only by a union with Christ, and being made partakers of the divine nature in him; or, without holiness,—being made Christ-like. After the sermon, full liberty was given to question us, and we answered all that chose to ask; and there were several, which gave new interest to the subject.

While in Springfield we visited the grave of O. Scott, to whom we refer in our previous remarks. He *sleeps* in the Cemetery, near the Methodist Church. Near two years have passed away since he has "slept in the dust of the earth," awaiting "the voice of the archangel and the trump of God" to waken him to meet his descending Lord. Many reflections rushed upon our mind as we gazed upon the spot of earth where he lies whose warm hand we had often pressed—whose animating voice and countenance had often cheered us—by whose side we had often stood in doing battle against oppression—and who, first of all ministers of the Gospel, encouraged us to proclaim to the world our views of no immortality to wicked men. Our emotions, as as we stood by his grave, can be more easily imagined than described. We did not indeed fancy an immortal spirit fled to some imaginary heaven; but we did feel an oppression come over our mind that he with whom we were once so intimate in active life was now before us, but could not hear our voice, nor mingle his affections with ours. No, silence reigned: but *hope* was there; and that hope was in our heart that he who lay before us in the silent dust would, ere long, hear the voice of the Son of God, and come forth to eternal life. We reluctantly took a last look of his dusty bed, and turning away, could scarce restrain our tears: it had a softening and chastening influence on our affections which still remains; and we shall often reflect upon that scene, and live in hope that we shall meet again where death is known no more.

From Springfield we travelled west to Albany, N. Y., the place where we first preached our "Six Sermons" in 1842. At Albany we now preached three times, and trust the Lord will bless the word spoken to the good of such as heard it. Our interview with old friends was of a refreshing character. Some, however, were scattered abroad, and some had fallen asleep. We here became acquainted with Eld. Jasper Hazen, Editor of the Christian Palladium, a periodical of the Christian connection; he is Editor also of the American Christian Messenger. We were refreshed by the kind and brotherly spirit he manifested towards us. We cannot but love men, who, though they differ from our views, manifest that they are in possession of a brotherly heart. "*Love* is the fulfilling of the law;" without this all our professions and knowledge are vain. Eld. Hazen was among our hearers while in Albany, and we feel a pleasure in the remembrance of our interview with him.

On our return to Philadelphia, we spent the first Sabbath in May in the city of New York, and preached three times in the American Hall; but the day was one of the most rainy of the season, so that few attended.

Now, after an absence of six weeks, we are once more at home in our "own hired house." Our Heavenly Father has kindly watched over us in our travels, so that no harm has befallen us in passing over near a thousand miles by steam power. He has brought us to our habitation in peace, and preserved ours in safety during the period of our absence; and we now desire to record His loving-kindness and tender mercy. To Him be glory and praise through Jesus Christ, His Son, our Saviour and Hope.

THE TRUE WESLEYAN—IMMORTALITY.

Since our last paper went to press, the Editor of the True Wesleyan has commenced a series of articles on "*The Immortality of the Soul.*" In the first article he stated the *reasons* for discussing the question, and the *conditions* on which replies would be admitted into the Wesleyan: one of those conditions was, if the respondent be an editor he shall publish both sides in his paper. We had a personal and friendly interview with the Editor of the Wesleyan, and an understanding that we were to republish in the Examiner no more of his articles than we might be disposed to reply to. With this arrangement we left our response to his article "No. 2," with him, on our way to Boston. Soon after we arrived at Boston we received a note from the Editor of the Wesleyan, saying that he had concluded to have his articles stereotyped, and make a book of them; and as such a work should contain a reply to all the objections urged against his views, and as those replies would most naturally arise out of his rejoinders to ours, he desired that we should first publish in the Examiner, and then he would copy from our paper and respond when through with his regular course of argument: this would enable him, with least expense, to stereotype his rejoinders to complete the book. We wrote him in reply, that we did not wish to oppose any obstacle in the way of his book being got up in the way most convenient to himself; but still, thought his new proposition would give him a *double* advantage: first, the influence of his entire argument would be on the minds of the readers of the Wesleyan before the first of my replies would appear; and then, second, each of my articles was to be accompanied with his rejoinder to prevent the minds of his readers from losing whatever impression his series of articles might have made: and besides, the time that would elapse from the time his articles were published to the appearance of mine, would make it necessary for

me to quote more from his than if they followed immediately. Under these considerations we requested him to return the article we left him, and now present our readers with his article from the Wesleyan, of March 24th, with our reply: it is as follows:

THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL.—NO. II.

THE IMMATERIALITY OF THE SOUL.

The Scriptures alone can certainly and satisfactorily settle the question before us, in the minds of christians, yet there may be arguments drawn from reason and philosophy which have much force; and as these may assist in coming at a right understanding of the Scriptures, we will commence with them, and close with a direct appeal to the Bible. We will commence with the spiritual nature of the soul. The soul or mind is not matter but spirit, and of course forms no part of the body. This raises an important issue with one class who deny the immortality of the soul. There are some who deny the existence of a soul or spirit in man, to be contradistinguished from the body, and insist that what we call the mind is a mere function of the brain, and that the brain itself is intelligent.

So far as the researches of philosophy extend, there are but two primary substances in the universe, and these are MATTER and SPIRIT. All we know of these substances is certain properties and phenomena which they exhibit. Matter is known to possess the properties of Impenetrability, Extension, Figure, Divisibility, Indestructibility, Inertia, Attraction. Spirit is that which thinks, perceives, remembers, reasons, wills, and is susceptible of love, hatred, joy and grief. The former of these properties are found in our bodies, in common with all other matter; the latter constitute the phenomena of the mind. It is not reasonable to suppose that properties so opposite to each other, inhere in the same substance, and the only rational conclusion is that matter is not mind, and that mind is not matter. There must therefore be in man an intelligent spirit, which forms no part of the body, and this is what we call the soul. We reason upon the modern and generally admitted principles of natural philosophy, and unless we are greatly mistaken, the whole system of philosophy will have to be exploded to invalidate our arguments.

The admitted properties of matter, and the admitted properties of mind, cannot inhere in, and be essential properties of the same substance. A few illustrations will make this plain. The body is matter, every part of it is matter; the bones are matter, the flesh is matter, the blood is matter, the nerves are matter, the brain is matter, and all the secretions are matter, every part is matter, and the whole is matter, and to every part and to the whole belong the properties of matter above described. Where these properties inhere, as they do in the body, the properties of mind cannot inhere.

Inertia, which is an essential property of matter, cannot inhere in the same substance with will or volition, which is an essential property of mind. Inertia is that property in matter which renders it incapable of self-motion, or self-action; matter acting only as it is acted upon: will or volition is that property of mind which renders it capable of self-determination and self-action. Now as matter can only act as it is acted upon, and as mind has the power of self-action, they cannot be the same substance,—matter cannot be mind, mind cannot be matter. Again, matter can only be moved by physical force; matter acts on matter by contact, and one material body cannot act on another material body, only as their surfaces come in contact; but mind is acted upon by motives, and acts from motives, and mind acts on mind through the medium of motives without physical contact. This proves as clear as a sun-beam that matter and mind are not the same.

To insist in opposition to the above view, that mind is matter; that intelligence and volition are its inherent properties, and consequently that man has no soul, which forms no part of his body, must subvert the admitted principles of philosophy. Philosophy insists that inertia is an essential property of matter; man's body is matter, as shown above, and yet it exhibits locomotive powers, and is seen acting without any visible agent acting upon it, and hence the doctrine of the inertia of matter must be given up, or we must admit that there is a rational soul inhabiting in the body, which controls it, moves it, and guides it. We see a steam engine in motion, and we know that the power of motion does not reside in any part of the machine; that it acts only as it is acted upon. We know that the steam propels it, but we know at the same time that the steam acts only as it is acted upon; that there is an intelligent, reasonable agent that directs the whole.

So with the body; it is an animal machine, the bones are studs and braces to support the frame, and are levers for the purpose of mechanical action; the muscles, by their contractions and distensions, operate on the bones and set the machinery in motion; but the muscles have no intelligence, or volition, and when the machine is in order, they are under the control of, and are guided by the mind. The foot or hand cannot will to move; the eye cannot will to open or shut. This our own consciousness proves. Let any man try to will with his foot or hand; and his own consciousness, which is the highest proof possible, will tell him that there is no power to will in his foot or hand. Man can will, and may be conscious of willing to move his foot, but at the same time he is conscious that his foot does not will, and that he does not will with his foot, but that he, his mind, wills concerning it. The muscles are put in motion by a power superior to themselves, which must be intelligent. Now what is this power? Those who deny that man has a soul, which is no part of the body, and which is an immaterial spirit, say that the brain is this self-determining, controlling and guiding power. This we deny on the ground that it is matter, and only matter, and possesses only the properties and powers of matter. If it be said that there is something in or associated with the brain which is not matter, which is superior to matter, the whole argument is given up, for that is just what we contend for, and that superior something which is not matter, we call the soul. If it be said that the brain is only matter, then however refined it may be, it possesses only the properties of matter, one of which is inertia, directly the reverse of self-operation. The brain then cannot act only as it is acted upon, and we come back to the question, what is this superior power that sets the muscles in motion, when we will to move the foot or the hand? If it now be said that it is the brain, we ask what power acts

upon the brain, causing it to act on the muscles? The brain being matter, can act only as acted upon. We have then got to give up the first principles of Natural Philosophy, or seek for some higher cause of the phenomenon of motion. We allow that the muscles operate on the bones, that the brain operates on the muscles, through the nerves, all the nerves and spinal marrow terminating in the brain; but we insist at the same time, that there is an intelligent soul which acts on the brain, or it would never act. This doctrine being admitted, the phenomena of matter and mind are made to harmonize without involving any philosophical contradiction, or absurdity; deny it, and the principles of natural philosophy, which past ages have developed and matured, are thrown back into chaos, and we have to begin, de novo, and grope our way in search of first principles.

The above view accords with our own consciousness. Every man is conscious of thinking, but we are not conscious of thinking with any part of our body, not even the brain. That the head is the seat of the intelligence, no rational man can doubt; we are conscious that the thinking operation is carried on within the head, but no man is conscious that his brains think. The rational soul is mysteriously united to the body, and the brain is doubtless the point of union, and constitutes the medium through which the soul holds communion with the physical world without. The fact that this union is mysterious constitutes no objection, for if we deny it, there will be as great a mystery involved in the idea that the whole mental phenomena is the result of properties inherent in matter, and found only in the brain, in contradistinction from all other matter.

Response to Article "No. II."

Br. Lee,—As you have kindly granted me the use of the Wesleyan to respond to your articles on Immortality, I hope to do you the justice to keep to the conditions you have specified in your last number; and I earnestly pray that the Father of Lights may give us both understanding, and guide us into truth. Whatever may be the result of our controversy, I truly desire that we may be able so to conduct it as to show that we can, *if we must*, differ in love.

The philosophical part of the question interests me but little, and hence, upon that part, I shall probably say but little. I perfectly agree with you that "the Scriptures alone can settle the question before us." The *facts* of inspiration must determine what is the constitution of man. Philosophers have never yet come to an agreement among themselves on this subject; and their speculations may well be termed "legion." Their imaginings have mainly grown out of the notion that there are "*two substances*:" though in that they were not always agreed. Bishop Berkly, it seems, adopted the notion which amounts to this, *viz*: "*matter does not exist*." Berkly, indeed, calls man *a substance*, but then he is an *incorporeal substance*. He, and Plato before him, regarded MOTION and INTELLECT as real and independent existences, and not as qualities of matter; this doubtless led him to his conclusion as to the non-existence of matter, inasmuch as we see neither motion nor intellect except in connection with matter. Locke declares, we do not know *what matter is*; and endeavors to prove from this fact, that we do know what *immaterial substance* is! Truly, "the world by wisdom knew not" man, any more than it did "God."

The Double Substance theory is that from which you reason on the question under discussion. So far as I am concerned, I wish it understood that what constitutes the being of God does not enter into this controversy. We agree "THAT HE IS;" but *what* He is, beyond the fact that He is Spirit, I shall not attempt to define. Whatever He is, it proves nothing as to what man is.

You tell us, "so far as the researches of philosophy extend, there are but two primary substances in the universe, and these are matter and spirit." The term "primary" implies secondary "substances." What are these? Are they neither matter nor spirit? Among your definitions of matter is "indestructibility; but you say "every part of the body is matter." Do you really believe "every part of the body" is "indestructible?"

Again, are electricity and light matter? and do they possess the property of "inertia?" "The whole system of philosophy" is "exploded" if the properties of matter, as you have defined them, pertain not to these.

"Inertia, which is an essential property of matter," you tell us, "cannot inhere in the same substance with will or volition, which is an essential property of mind." But, is it not a fact, that the mind "inheres" in the "brain," which, you say, is "matter?" and hence, is it not a fact, that mind, will and volition, "inhere" in matter?

You say again—"Inertia is that property in matter which renders it incapable of self-motion, or self-action," &c. Is this true of light, of magnetism, and electricity? If not, does not your argument fail?

It appears to me that you have given the properties of what philosophers term "*inanimate* matter," and not matter organized, or living matter; and hence I think you do not reason conclusively on this point.

If light, magnetism, and electricity be spirit, and not matter, then "attraction" is not only the property of matter, but mind, or spirit also. "Matter," you say, "can be moved only by physical force." But the muscles move, or contract and expand, it is said, by nervous power. Do the nerves exert a physical force? If so, what sends the electric current along the nerves? Do you say, "it is the will." If so, as "matter can be moved *only* by physical force," must not the *will* be physical? that is, must it not be matter?

Once more, you say—"Matter acts on matter by contact, and one material body has no power to act on another material body, *only* as their surfaces come in contact." But, does not matter act on matter without *contact of surface*? The sun, millions of miles from the earth, acts with tremendous "force" on it. And do not all the planets act on one another without contact? According to the philosophy upon which you base your argument, mind can do no more. "This proves," if not as "clear as a sun beam," yet, clear enough, "that matter and mind are" modifications of "the same." Br. Lee being judge: and thus you "subvert the admitted principles of philosophy." Does "philosophy insist that inertia is an essential principle of" *organized* "matter?" If so, it is false philosophy.

Br. Lee says, "We are not conscious of thinking with the brain." Are we conscious of thinking *without* our brain? For my part, I am just as conscious of thinking with my brain as of seeing with my eyes; or, as I am conscious of walking with my legs. But suppose I had not that consciousness, would that any more prove I did not think with my brain, than it would prove my stomach did not digest my food because I am not conscious of that? The brain, by excessive study, becomes fatigued and pained; and we are conscious of using our brain when we think; and when it becomes affected by disease, we feel an inability to think.

We again repeat, that the darkness philosophy has thrown over this subject, arises from the Double Substance theory; and this principle is in opposition to the relation in Genesis, where God is considered, not as an immaterial substance, but simply as an "ETERNAL BEING, who by his will *condensated that which constitutes heaven and earth*, and communicates to matter, motion and life." No philosopher has ever been able to give even a tolerable definition of his fancied "*immaterial substance*:" the expression itself is without meaning, and an evident contradiction of ideas; and since the idea of *substance* contains the idea of *matter*, ought not the expression "immaterial substance" to be rejected from Philosophy?

In conclusion,—If the philosophy upon which your reasoning is founded be true, that "inertia is that property in matter which renders it *incapable* of self-motion or self-exertion;" and, in order to these manifestations, there must be added "spirit," or an immaterial substance, without which "self-determination and self action" would be *impossible*; then, does it not follow, that all animals, birds, reptiles, insects, fishes, and the smallest animalculæ, possess "spirit," or the immaterial substance, as *really* as man? for they all are "capable of self-motion, or self-exertion." Shall we not rather conclude that the Infinite, Eternal, and Self-existent Being, who is the Creator of all things, has *power* to *organize* matter so as to impart to it life, and endow it with "self-determination and self-action," without the fancied immaterial substance?

Yours truly, in the Gospel of Christ, with much esteem, GEORGE STORRS.

PHILADELPHIA, Pa., March 27th, 1849.

FUTURE STATES.

By Rev. REGINALD COURTENAY, A. M.

(Continued from page 62.)

ON THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

Let us now turn to St. Paul, 1 Cor. xv. "The trumpet shall sound, the dead shall be raised incorruptible; this mortal shall assume immortality. *Then* shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. O Death, where is thy sting, O HADES, where is thy victory!" Here the apostle exults over Hades and Death together, because God, he knew, would on his appointed day rescue the souls of men from their dark dominion; and make an utter end of those evil powers, who, in the strength of sin, had reigned for a time over mankind. And it would appear from his language that the victory of Hades over the soul is as complete as that of death. But if there be an intermediate consciousness, and for the redeemed an interval of most blissful rest, *Hades has no victory at all*. Death may conquer the body, but Hades, so far from subduing the soul, would actually liberate it from a heavy burden and bondage, and promote "the glorious liberty of the children of God." St. Paul however declares that Death and Hades now reign together: nevertheless, knowing that they shall hereafter be cast together into the "lake of fire," and that an interval of death and unconsciousness, to be terminated on the last Day, is but a momentary decease, and scarcely to be regarded as an evil, he anticipates the final triumph, and exults over them as already subdued. For Hades may be deemed to have no captives, unless she can bind them in everlasting chains.

Departing saints are sometimes known to triumph, in the hour of dissolution, as if their victory were already won. And Christians who "have fought the good fight" are certainly not forbidden thus to triumph, although it be not till the Last Day that Death is swallowed up in victory. For the interval will not be *felt*; no train of thought will disturb the deep sleep of the dead, sickening the soul with hope deferred: but they shall find that Scripture realised to them, "It is appointed unto men once to die;—and after this the *judgment*."

Death and Hades however are still permitted to reign; and are destined to exert their destroying power till the end of the world. At the opening of the "fourth seal," in the Apocalypse, St. John "Beheld a pale horse, and his name that sat on him was Death, and *Hades* followed with him. And power was given to them over the fourth part of the earth, to *kill* with sword and with hunger, and with death, and with the beasts of the earth." Here is Hades painted as one going forth to devour and destroy, in league with death. In the same book they are again coupled together, in their present subjection to the Son of Man, and in their final fate. "He hath the keys of Hades and Death," to unlock their dark gates on the predestined day; and when he executes the judgments committed to him, they shall be together cast into the lake of fire, which is the second death," and be themselves destroyed. Shortly before this, in the vision of St. John, the "sea gave up the dead that were in it, and Death and *Hades* (the supposed abode of *living* souls) delivered up the *dead* which were in them."

Still more numerous are the passages of the Old Testament, wherein death and Hell,—in the Hebrew Sheol, in the Greek Hades,—are mentioned together, not as if Hades were a pleasant place of refuge for the disembodied souls, the victims of death, but as if the two were conjoined in the work of destruction. See Job xxvi. 6. Prov. xv. 11, xxvii. 20. Hab. ii. 5.

It cannot be pretended that Hades is the place or state of the body merely—or indeed of the body at all. While the body moulders into dust and is scattered to the four winds, the soul is in Hades. "Thou wilt not leave my *soul* in Hades, nor suffer thy Holy One to see corruption," was David's prophecy concerning Christ. If in any passage of Scripture the body should seem to be in Hades, it is because a locality is given to Hades which does not in strictness belong to it; and it is then placed *in the grave*. Thought can have no locality: "one might as well say of a disembodied spirit that it is hard or heavy; or a cubic foot in dimensions, as to say that it is here or there." Hades has no more

locality than has Death; though both are in Scripture occasionally localized, or personified. But because the body descends into the grave, and will rise again from the grave, the man, body and soul, is said to do the same. "All men shall rise again, *with* their bodies;" and before resurrection the dead are said to "dwell *in dust*:" to "sleep *in the dust of the earth*." Yet it is plain, that the instant that mysterious tie is severed which connects the body and soul, all that gave locality to mind is wholly lost. When therefore it is said, that on the return of the body to the dust, "the spirit returns to God who gave it," we ought not to imagine, as some do, an ascent of the spirit towards the skies; but simply an assertion of the fact, that the spirit, which when given by the Creator, and detached, as it were, from Him, constituted a living creature, has now reverted back to him who gave it, and become, not by change of *place*, but of *ownership*, His property again.

Our Lord declared that as Jonah was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so should he himself be three days and nights in *the heart of the earth*. Here the *heart* of the earth is simply put in opposition to the belly of the whale, and the words do not differ essentially from those of the more usual prediction that our Lord should be three days *in the grave*. We read also that our Lord "descended into *the lower parts of the earth*." But no stress can be laid on this, inasmuch as it is not evident that *the earth itself* is not intended, which in comparison of heaven is termed, *the lower* (parts or regions,) *ta katoterа tes ges*: as where Isaiah says, "Sing, O ye heavens; shout, ye lower parts of the earth."*

The mention that is occasionally made in Scripture of an abyss, deep or bottomless pit, as the abode of certain spirits, and of the soul of Christ during its separation from the body, deserves consideration in relation to this point. This abyss appears to be the same as Hades, and to be a place wherein spirits are *confined*. Hence proceeded the locusts of the Apocalypse, and perhaps also Apollyon their king, and hence also the beast, on whom sat the Babylonish idolatress. It is probably a place of confinement for spirits, wherein they are prevented from all exercise of their powers. "I saw an angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand, and he laid hold on * * Satan and bound him a thousand years, and cast him into the abyss, and shut him up and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more." And it is the same as Hades, for this fate of Satan seems to be precisely that of the rebellious angels of St. Peter and St. Jude. Moreover we know that our Lord descended into Hades; and St. Paul writes, "who shall descend into the deep,—the *abyss*—that is, to bring up Christ from the dead." That it is a place of confinement would appear also from the intreaty of the Legion of demons to our Lord, that he would allow them to go into the herd of swine, and not command them into the abyss. Now the confinement of a spirit seems to be the same as the destruction of all his consciousness; if the mind be reduced to inactivity, all its thoughts perish, activity being of the very essence of *thought*.* But this imprisonment in Hades, whether of the human soul, or of an evil spirit, need not be local, inasmuch as thought is not local. Strictly speaking, the spirit or soul or life of man neither moves upwards to God and heaven nor downwards to the grave. The union of mind with matter alone can give locality; and it is this union imagined or foreseen, that has occasioned those Scriptural expressions—to "dwell in the dust,"—to "rise again with their bodies."† But these expressions would not have been used, this union during the intermediate state would not have been supposed, unless the condition of the disembodied soul harmonized with that of the body, so that when the one was buried, the other also could be said to sleep, and to be in "a land of darkness."

Again, we may learn something concerning Hades, from the fact that our blessed Lord himself descended into it, and on the third day rose again *from the dead*. It is evident from Scripture, that the death which our Lord endured did not wholly terminate with his passion on the cross. God raised him up, "having *loosed the pains of death*, because it was not possible that he should be holden of it." And the heart of Christ was to rejoice, and his flesh to rest in hope, *because* the Father would not 'leave his soul in Hades, nor suffer His Holy, One to see corruption." Now inasmuch as it was an infinite condescension in our Lord to take upon him our nature, and subject himself to the burden of the flesh, what were THE PAINS OF DEATH to him, what the triumph of his resurrection, if death had merely relieved him of the burden of the flesh, and enabled his liberated soul to pass into rest and glory? How was corruption obviated by his reassumption of that body of flesh which he had laid down on the Cross? Some are accustomed to say, that the glory of the resurrection of the saints at the Last Day will mainly consist in the investiture of their souls with glorified, spiritual bodies. But Christ took again the body in which he suffered. Again, "Christ being risen from the dead, it is said, dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him." Death then had dominion over him, *until* he "rose again from the dead." But for this resurrection the Holy One would, like David, have seen corruption; corruption would have had dominion not over a mere frame of flesh, but over that holy soul in which was no sin. Christ laid down on the cross all that life, which his Incarnation and Nativity had given him,—his human body and soul. "I lay down MY LIFE: I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again."

And what signify those sublime words, "I am he that liveth, and *was dead*, and behold I am alive for evermore."‡ And, "In that he died, he

* Thus in Rev. xvii. 8, it is written, "The beast which thou sawest was, and *is not*, and shall ascend out of the bottomless pit, and go into perdition." Now if by perdition is meant everlasting punishment in the lake of fire, everlasting consciousness, it would seem that there is no consciousness till the beast passes from the abyss, and goes into perdition. The expression, "is not," may however merely signify, "is no longer upon earth."

† And to that remarkable passage above quoted—"Many bodies of the sleeping saints, (*recumbent, reclining saints,*) arose, and came out of their graves."

‡ Rev. i. 18. "I am the living one, and I became one-that-is-dead, and behold I am living for ever."

* Eph. iv. 9. Isaiah xliv. 23. St. Paul, it may be observed, is speaking of Christ's ascension from the earth, not his resurrection from the dead.

died unto sin once, but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God." Shall we make them mean, "I lay down my body; I have power to lay it down, and resume it." "I am he that am embodied, and was disembodied, and behold I am embodied for evermore." "In that he parted with his body, he died unto sin once, but in that he hath it again, he liveth unto God." Rather we should believe, that our blessed Lord parted with his human soul; parted with *that life itself, whereby* he now liveth. If his resurrection from the dead had been merely the taking his body again, it would have been no more a victory over death, than was his incarnation; or at least no more than was the creation of Adam from the lifeless dust of the ground. But Hades grasped a human soul; and that, was wrenched from her dark dominion.

And so glorious was this victory over Hades, that in reference to this Christ is spoken of as the Son of God. He is termed "the first begotten from the dead," he was "declared to be the Son of God with power, by the resurrection from the dead;" and we are told that "God hath fulfilled his promises of mercy, in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is written in the second Psalm, 'Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.'" Thus also, "they who are accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, cannot die any more, and are equal to the angels, and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection:" and are said to "groan within themselves, waiting for *the adoption*,—to wit, the redemption of the body;" for "the manifestation of the Sons of God."

Had the victory been gained on the cross, our Lord's last words would have been those of exultation; sounds of joy and triumph would have filled the heavens, as at the nativity; and angels would have bidden the disciples to weep no more, cheering them as they did on the third day. And the bodies of the saints which slept need not have been detained in their graves until after his resurrection; but at once appearing unto many, might have testified to the subjugation of death.

Some persons are inclined to believe, that our Lord, when he entered the realms of Hades, entered as a conqueror; bringing into these desolate shades a light and life not their own; nay, proclaiming in them that gospel which his apostles afterwards preached on earth. They refer to the words of St. Peter,—"Christ was put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the spirit; by the which also he went and *preached unto the spirits in prison*, which sometime were disobedient, when once the long suffering of God waited, in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing." But all that St. Peter asserts is, that our Lord preached to the spirits in prison *by the same spirit* by which he was quickened; not by any means that he preached while he was numbered among the dead. And indeed, if there be meaning in words, the quick are not to be confounded with the dead; but to be "quickened" is to be raised again from the dead; which happened to our Lord not on the cross, but on the third day after his crucifixion. *Then* it was that the quickening spirit of immortal life, which utterly abhors and is incompatible with the state of death, visited and reanimated his mortal soul.

Let us consider too by what means Christ triumphed over death. Even by first submitting to death. He "tasted death for every man;" and "through death subdued him that had the power of death." He drank this bitter cup, and drained its very dregs, that the vials of wrath might not be poured out upon guilty men. Whatever gloom then there was in Hades before the advent of Christ, into that gloom he entered; whatever were the "pains of death" for the worst of sinners, those pains he underwent; nay, whatever *would have been* the utmost tyranny of Hades and Death over men, but for his mediation, to that Christ for a time succumbed. By no less a sacrifice could he have accomplished his great design of subduing death, by first submitting to death.* To suppose that the grave was a more lightsome place to him than it is, or would have been, to the worst of sinners, is to forget the price which was paid for redemption; and to leave room for the conscience-stricken sinner to dread lest he should be excluded from the benefits of the resurrection, since so dark a death as *his* had not been undergone by the Saviour. By first enduring all, Christ overcame all. Not in descending into the abyss, but in ascending up on high, he led captivity captive. Hades did not acknowledge him as a conqueror till on the third day he broke her bonds asunder, and cast away her cords from him; and mounted his eternal throne on "the holy hill of Sion."

No more inappropriate season for preaching could possibly be imagined, than that which is arbitrarily chosen for the publication of the gospel to the "imprisoned spirits." That they were in Hades at the time we have indeed ample reason to believe; but they were then as it were in the condemned cells, beyond the reach of reprieve, and waiting till they should be summoned from the bottomless pit, to go into perdition.

The doctrine of redemption through Christ's suffering of death, as well as the express language of the New Testament concerning Hades, confirms that testimony of the Jewish Scriptures which makes of Hades a land of darkness, and where all things are forgotten; a place wherein (while "the living know that they shall die") the dead "know not any thing." Spirits condemned and under confinement,—the souls of men while subject to the dominion of death,—and the proud city that was to sink to utter ruin and desolation, are alike said to be cast down to Hades, because they are all alike subjected to the Power of Destruction, have gone into darkness, silence, and death; and have become as though *they were not*. But still their souls are safe, still they live unto God, who have died in faith; even in the faith of Abraham, whose belief was "*in God, who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not, as though they were.*"

[We by no means endorse every expression in the foregoing article, though the general view is correct. ED. EXAMINER.]

* The death to which Adam became liable through his transgression is said to be temporal, spiritual, and *eternal*, the latter being sometimes held to include the suffering of eternal fire. But erroneously, for not only is the latter punishment a consequence of *resurrection unto damnation*, not of death; but, had this been a part of the original curse, our Lord, we may venture to believe, must have descended into the flames of Gehenna itself, in order to rescue man, by "tasting of death for him."

INTERESTING FOREIGN ITEMS.

ROME.—THE INTERVENTION AND ITS TERMS.

Letters from Florence of the 10th inst. state that a French steamer from Gaëta had landed the Secretary of the French Legation at Rome at Civita Vecchia, and that he had immediately left for the capital. He was said to be the bearer of the ultimatum of the foreign powers for the reëstablishment of the Pope. It appears that a simultaneous movement has been arranged between the powers; the French were to occupy Civita Vecchia, and Ancona; the Austrians, Ferrara; the Neapolitans, the frontier. On the arrival of the steamer from Gaëta, another steamer was immediately dispatched to Toulon with orders, it was said, to embark the expeditionary force. Civita Vecchia was being fortified.

The *Positivo* of Rome states that the following are some of the terms imposed by France and England on the Pope as the conditions on which they will aid his return to Rome: A general amnesty, a complete secular Government, inviolability of political liberty, abolition of the holy office and ecclesiastical tribunals except in the matter of the Clergy, and the suppression of proprietary religious orders.

SECRETS OF THE INQUISITION.

The correspondent of the *Daily News* describes a visit he had paid to the many small, dark, and damp dungeons of the Inquisition. The building is out of the beaten track, being in a sort of cul de sac behind St. Peter's. The dungeons, and all their apparatus, are to be thrown open to the inspection of the public, and will furnish a sight not likely to recommend priestly rule to the people. The correspondent says: The officer in charge led me down to where the men were digging in the vaults below; they had cleared a downward flight of steps, which was choked up with old rubbish, and had come to a series of dungeons under the vaults deeper still, and which immediately brought to my mind the prisons of the Doge under the canal of the Bridge of Sighs at Venice, only that here there was a surpassing horror.

I saw imbedded in old masonry, unsymmetrically arranged, five skeletons in various recesses, and the clearance had only just begun; the period of their insertion in this spot must have been more than a century and a half. From another vault full of sculls and scattered human remains there was a shaft about four feet square ascending perpendicularly to the first floor of the building, and ending in a passage off the hall of the chancery, where a trap-door lay between the tribunal and the way into a suite of rooms destined for one of the officials. The object of this shaft could admit of but one surmise. The ground of the vault was made up of decayed animal matter, a lump of which held imbedded in it a long silken lock of hair, as I found by personal examination as it was shovelled up from below. But that is not all: there are two large subterranean lime-kilns, if I may so call them, shaped like a beehive in masonry, filled with layers of calcined bones, forming the substratum of two other chambers on the ground-floor in the immediate vicinity of the very mysterious shaft above mentioned."—[It must be remembered that of late the power of the Holy Inquisition, even in Rome, was greatly fallen from its former high estate.]

Br. ELON EVERTS, Vergennes, Vt., writes:

Br. STORRS:—The Examiner is what the community here need. I am glad to see that such honest hearted, bold, influential men as Elder Bates and Hand are investigating the doctrines advocated in your paper. I am glad that Br. Walsh has no mean competitor. Mr. Brewster will probably mount the highest rampart, and ply the largest guns that his side can afford, but when his bulwark falls, (for error can't stand) it seems that the way will be cleared for him to join the victors, and lead on the host that has been shielding themselves behind the same untempered mortared wall. Truth is mighty and it will prevail.

Yours in Christian bonds.

Br. N. M. CATLIN, Kingsbury, Ind., writes:

Br. STORRS:—The Truth is spreading in these parts: people are investigating. I have disposed of all the "Six Sermons" which I ordered a short time since. I shall, I think, soon order more, and thus help spread the light of truth.

THE NEW WORK.—"*The Scripture Doctrine of Future Punishment*, by H. H. DOBNEY," Baptist Minister, England, is the very best work on the End of the Wicked we have ever seen. It is written in the kindest spirit, and cannot give offence to any. Though kind, it is clear, uncompromising and overwhelming against the popular theory of natural immortality and endless misery; and demonstrating, so far as argument can do it, that *utter destruction* is the punishment of wicked and unrepenting men. Put this work into the hands of all who will read, not forgetting ministers of all sects and parties. It contains 288 pages, 12mo. Price 75 cts. bound, or 50 in paper covers; this last, only, can be sent by mail. For *each* dollar, current money, sent us free of expense, we will send *two* copies of it and *pre-pay* the postage on them; or, we will send *three* without pre-paying the postage where the Post Masters will allow them to be thus sent. Since the notice we published in the Advent Harbinger, we find that the Post Offices are not uniform in requiring the postage to be *pre*-paid. In New York City they demanded it, and would not forward them without; but, we find, on our return home, that the Post Office in Philadelphia makes no such demand; so that we can do it or not, as those who order the work may desire.

One-third discount will be made to those who purchase six or more copies, if current money is sent us. Cash, always, with the order.

DEPOSITORIES OF BOOKS.—Dobney on "The Scripture Doctrine of Future Punishment," reprinted from the English edition, may be had in Boston, Mass., of Geo. T. Adams, 87 Hanover St., Hat and Cap Store; Lowell, Mass., of Eld. M. Bates, Chapel St., one door above Elm; Albany, N. Y., at Christian Palladium Office, No. 8 Commercial Buildings; New York City, of Dr. John Burdell, Dentist, No. 2 Union Place, and of Henry Johnson, No. 227 Hudson St.; Rochester, N. Y., of Eld. Joseph Marsh, Advent Harbinger Office.

All orders sent us, at Philadelphia, Pa., for Dobney, to be forwarded by *Express*, will be sent to New York City, without expense, going north, east or west.

Our "Six Sermons" can be had, as above, of Eld. Marsh Eld. Bates, Geo. T. Adams, and Dr. Burdell.

BUSINESS NOTICES.—Elon Everts. We have sent C. W. Sperr's paper regularly to Bristol, Vt., this year. We now send also to "Charles Sperry, Panton, Vt.," as you request. Shall we continue to send to both names? We shall, unless you direct otherwise.

James F. Compton. The "five dollars" your letter purports to contain is not received. Post Master says there is no help for us. The papers and 40 copies of Six Sermons, 12mo., are sent same as if we had received the money.

S. A. Chaplin. All the papers and Sermons have been sent as you desired, and also 8 copies Six Sermons, 12mo, to you.

Eli Cross. We should have paid the postage on the first that you ordered of Dobney—by mistake it was neglected—it is paid on the last. Charge us with the first.

Dr. M. Holm. We have sent you twelve copies of Dobney.

James Curless. Books sent as directed: one-third discount on them: $1.92 still due you.

James Donaldson. Four of Dobney's work were sent you in our absence; we have sent another copy since our return.

If any errors have occurred in answering orders in our absence, send us word, at our expense, and we will make all right.

☞The Examiner for June will not go to press till the middle of that month.

☞Our Hymn Book is not yet published: we have not the means to do it. E. Miller, Jr., pledges to take 75 copies. Who next?