

THE ADVENT REVIEW, AND SABBATH HERALD.

"Here is the Patience of the Saints; Here are they that keep the Commandments of God and the Faith of Jesus."

VOL. VI.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., THIRD-DAY, DECEMBER 12, 1854.

No. 17.

THE REVIEW AND HERALD

IS PUBLISHED WEEKLY

At South St. Paul-st., Stone's Block,
No. 23, Third Floor.

TERMS.—One Dollar a Year, in Advance.

J. N. ANDREWS, R. F. COTTRELL, URIAH SMITH,
Publishing Committee.

JAMES WHITE, Editor.

All communications, orders, and remittances should be
addressed to JAMES WHITE Rochester, N. Y. 109 Mon-
ros Street, (post-paid.)

Leading Doctrines.

*The Bible, and the Bible alone, the rule of faith and duty
The Law of God, as taught in the Old and New Testaments
unchangeable.*

*The Personal Advent of Christ and the Resurrection of the
Just, before the Millennium.*

*The Earth restored to its Eden perfection and glory, the fi-
nal Inheritance of the Saints.*

*Immortality alone through Christ, to be given to the Saints
at the Resurrection.*

PROVIDENCE.

THE vast designs of God, in vain
Do mortals seek to understand,
Or purposes of right explain,
Who guides with an unerring hand;
While nature still his work fulfils,
A heavenly Father's care we learn;
And what we deem are threatening ills,
Full oft, to pious blessings turn!

To rich, or poor, or great, or small,
Alike, his tender love is shown;
Alike, is watched the sparrow's fall,
Or sway of empires overthrown.
No tear of grief, no throes of pain,
Unmarked by him, our sovereign Lord,
No trials will be borne in vain,
No sacrifice lose its reward!

Within our narrow bound, content
With what is given us to know,
Is better far than reasoning spent
By which none ever wiser grow;
For shortly to our wondering sight,
Life's hidden scroll shall be unrolled,
And beams of Heaven's unclouded light,
The ways of Providence unfold!

Wilton, N. H.

A. R. SMITH.

MAN NOT IMMORTAL:

THE ONLY SHIELD AGAINST THE SEDUCTIONS OF
MODERN SPIRITUALISM.

BY D. P. HALL.

[Continued from No. 6.]

OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

Having examined the most formidable and oft repeated objections to the *materiality, unity and mortality* of man, viz., that growing out of the use of words, *soul* and *spirit*, and having seen a great discrepancy between the popular and Bible signification of these terms, so much so, that the scripture view is not in the slightest degree objectionable, we are prepared to go forward and notice other objections of a less formidable character, which are almost invariably urged against this same Bible doctrine.

They are, (1.) The Rich man and Lazarus. Luke xvi. (2.) The thief on the cross. Luke xxiii, 43. (3.) Objections drawn from different expressions of the apostle Paul; viz., This tabernacle; his desire to depart; in the body or out; the inner man. See 2 Cor. v, 1; Phil. i, 21; 2 Cor. xii, 4; iv, 16. (4.) Moses and Elias. Matt. xvii, 3. 5.) Christ and the Sadducees. Luke xx, 27.

The above is a list of the principal ones: others of minor importance are sometimes urged; but these are mainly in the way of those who cannot at once embrace the view of man's unity and mortality. If these can be removed out of the

way by a fair and candid investigation and comparison of scripture with scripture, many who are now halting, will, we doubt not, immediately and heartily embrace the view we are now advocating as the Bible view.

In order to prepare our minds to understand the nature and force of the objections we are now about to canvass, let us consider again what has been proved by the very plainest Bible testimony; viz., That man is a *unit*, composed of *dust*, his *mental* and *moral* nature inhering in the *organized man*. That death reduces the entire man to a state of unconsciousness, when all his functions, physical, mental and moral, cease. That the entire man is mortal. That immortality is the gift of God through Jesus Christ, to the faithful only, to be conferred at the second coming of Christ, and the resurrection of the just. All the above named positions are sustained by plain Bible evidence, and if the objections named, or any others, are urged, they must bear against one or all of these positions.

Any person, who regards the Bible as a book of truth, and Bible writers as inspired of God, must see that the Book cannot teach two doctrines touching the same thing: it is not *yea* and *nay*; one thing in one place, and another thing in other places; Christ against Christ, and Paul against Paul; nor yet, Paul and Christ against Isaiah: all must bear uniform and harmonious testimony, touching the same thing; hence there can be no real objections to the harmonious testimony of all the inspired penmen. There may be some passages and circumstances which at first sight appear to be objectionable; but they cannot be really so, without destroying the testimony of the witnesses. I have frequently conversed with those who professed to believe the Bible, and yet did not recognize this important fact. They would admit the application of many passages used in support of the doctrine of man's mortality, and at the same time assert that there were other passages equally plain which taught a contrary doctrine. This certainly would destroy the testimony of all such witnesses, if there were any such. We repeat it then, that there are no real objections to the doctrine of man's complete mortality. That there are some few passages from which an inference unfavorable to this view can be drawn, we do not doubt. That some parable can be tortured into the service of an opposite doctrine, I shall not question; but that the Scriptures, when fairly examined in their several connections, and compared one with another, teach any other doctrine, I do not believe can be made to appear.

With these remarks I will proceed to an examination of those passages which at first sight appear to some to teach a contrary doctrine; viz., That there is an entity dwelling in the mortal body, called *soul* or *spirit*, which is immortal, conscious, intelligent, and which at the death of the body, goes out of it with its immortality and intelligence unimpaired, to the spheres, heaven, hell, or some other locality. We will commence with the first one named in the list; viz.,

THE RICH MAN AND LAZARUS.

This discourse of our Saviour is supposed to teach the popular doctrine of the entity, immortality, and consciousness of the soul or spirit. If it does so teach, we are free to admit that it is a real and difficult objection to dispose of; and not only so, but we are as free to admit that the Bible writers conflict with one another. If this case proves man conscious in death, it plainly contra-

dicts Job, David, Solomon, Daniel, Paul, and even Jesus himself, in other places. But before admitting all that popular theology claims for this case, let us carefully and candidly examine the nature of the proof. 1st. It is claimed to be all a literal narration of facts which have occurred; and, 2d. When this claim cannot be sustained, it is claimed to be partly affirmed of the body, and partly of the soul or spirit. Let us look at the first affirmation. Is it a literal history? This cannot be; if so, the literal angels from the courts above came down to earth and conveyed dead Lazarus, covered with sores to Abraham's bosom, literally. The rich man, after being buried, talks to Abraham concerning Lazarus and his five brethren. There is a great gulf literally lying between the two parties, which is impassable, and all this literal narration!

Other points equally objectionable to its being a literal history might be pointed out, but this is sufficient. Let us notice the second position, viz., that part of the narrative relates to men embodied, and part to souls or spirits disembodied. Let us read the transaction and see. Luke xvi, 19. There was a certain rich man, which was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day, (this is affirmed of a man embodied,) and there was a certain beggar named Lazarus, which was laid at his gate full of sores, and desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table: moreover, the dogs came and licked his sores. (All this is affirmed most certainly of the poor man embodied.)

Just at this point in the narrative, the scene changes, and disembodied souls become the actors, according to current theology; but let us read on and see if there is any evidence of this: "And it came to pass, that the beggar died, (this relates to his body,) and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom." (This relates to the soul.) Is there the slightest evidence for this assumption? The rich man also died, (this refers to his body,) and was buried; (what does this refer to? his soul? It certainly must if the Lazarus that was not buried, but carried by the angels to Abraham's bosom, refers to the soul of Lazarus, as is affirmed, then the rich man that was not carried there, but buried, must refer to his soul;) and in hell (the hades, grave or place where the dead are deposited) he (who? the rich man, or the rich man's soul, let us see) lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus (not his soul) in his bosom; and he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, (not his soul) that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame."

Read the whole, and you will see that Lazarus, in order to visit and warn the rich man's five brethren, must have a resurrection from the dead. How could this be, if it relates to the immortal soul or spirit? The truth is, not one single syllable in the entire transaction, relates to souls or spirits disembodied, but to two men embodied: it was Abraham, five brethren, the rich man, and the poor man, as embodied men, which are interested in the affair, and not their abstract ghosts, as is affirmed in order to make it appear objectionable.

Now I would like to know how any one can squeeze an objection from this, without showing that it relates to disembodied souls or spirits. I will hold myself ready to acknowledge this as a real objection, if any man living can show it to relate in any way to immortal souls. This narrative reads right straight on through into Abraham's bosom the same, no change; and so of the rich man: he lives, dies, is buried in his grave, (not the popu-

lar hell,) talks, has organs of speech, wishes water, &c., &c.; not the slightest intimation of any change from men to immaterial souls—this is all read in, in order to read it out. If we attempt to give an exposition of this, it will all be gratis, for we are not called upon to do it in order to defend from objections the doctrine we are teaching.

The case under consideration affirms nothing touching the *souls* or *spirits* of either the rich man, or the poor man. The whole is affirmed of the two men bodily, so that no objection can be fairly deduced from this circumstance at all. Why object this to the complete mortality of man? It is certain, beyond reasonable doubt that all is affirmed of *men embodied*, and not of *souls* or *spirits* disembodied. We might drop this matter here, and pronounce it no objection, without incurring the censure of the discerning and unprejudiced; but we are willing to go further, and offer an explanation, of this very difficult discourse.

And first, we urge that it is *parabolic*, and give but one reason; viz., no man ever has, and never can explain it as being strictly literal, and make sense. Those who assert it to be literal, will invariably make it figurative before they finish the discourse. We might multiply reasons to any desirable extent in proof of its figurative character, but this must suffice for want of space and time. And second, we urge that it relates to Jews and Gentiles, and is to be explained according to the rule given by Jesus, Mark iv, 13. This rule requires a fact, for every distinct and important specification in the figure. The rich man and his five brethren stand as the representatives of the Father's House: the rich man for the fragment, then known as the Jewish nation, and the five brethren as the representatives of the supposed lost tribes, (the ten tribes,) each brother represents two tribes, they would therefore represent, twelve tribes: the poor man as the representative of the Gentiles in their starving condition, as it regarded the true riches of truth, &c. The death of the two men, represents the change of condition, effected by a change of dispensations: the rich man lost much in this change, and the poor man gained much. So of the classes which they represented, and so on to the end. We might carry this matter out in detail and show that it perfectly corresponds, as far as any figure can, with the facts touching the Jews and Gentiles, change of dispensations, and consequent change of the condition of the two classes. We would be pleased to go into a minute examination of every limb of this parable, even the most minute, but this must suffice for the present, as I have only time, and room to notice the objectionable features, and give brief expositions.

THE THIEF ON THE CROSS. LUKK XXIII, 42, 43.

The 42d verse records his *prayer* as follows: "And he said unto Jesus, Lord remember me, when *THOU* COMEST into thy kingdom." Not as it should read in order to contain the objection, that many in vain try to draw from it. It should read after this fashion: Lord, remember my *immortal soul* when thy immortal soul leaves the body to go to heaven. The 43d verse, records the answer as follows: "And Jesus said unto HIM, Verily I say unto THEE, To-day shalt THOU be with ME in paradise."

It should read, after this fashion, to answer the objector's purpose: Verily I say unto you, your immortal soul, shall leave your body and accompany my immortal soul to heaven this day, after our bodies die.

This circumstance of the promise of Christ, to the penitent thief is supposed by many to teach something concerning the soul or spirit, its immortality, &c.; but not a single syllable can be found in the whole affair: the whole is assumed: not one item of proof, save a little dot with a curl to it, called a comma. It is Lord, remember me. *Thou* shalt be with me in paradise, or my kingdom; which is the same. Let the comma be placed after To-day, and the mighty objection vanishes, like dew in sun shine: Verily I say unto thee to-day, shalt thou be with me in paradise; or, I will remember you when I come into my kingdom.

It is a very easy matter to show that paradise and the kingdom are promises to be fulfilled in the future. The prayer related to the future, and the

promise when fully expressed, would be, I promise you at this time, (when all human probabilities are against my claims to the kingdom,) that when I come in my kingdom, or when paradise is restored, you shall be remembered, or shall have a part therein. The comma, or punctuation, is the only thing in the way of this exposition, and is this inspiration? Certainly not; and how much confidence ought we to put in any punctuation which requires an entire perversion of the plain statements in the text and context? Certainly not much.

It is an easy matter to show a number of instances in which the punctuation as it now stands in our Bibles, destroys the sense entirely. Much might be said upon this interesting circumstance of the thief and his penitence, faith, &c.; but suffice it for the present to say that nothing can be brought from this circumstance to object to man's mortality, or in any way to sustain the immortality of the soul or the deathlessness of the spirit: seeing these themes are not even so much as once named therein.

EXPRESSIONS OF PAUL.

The third, in the order of objections, is, different expressions drawn from the writings of the apostle Paul; viz., *This Tabernacle*. 2 Cor. v, 1-11. *His desire to depart*. Phil. i, 21-23. *The inner man*. 2 Cor. iv, 16. *In the body or out*. 2 Cor. xii, 4. We class these all together for the purpose of comparing Paul with Paul. We believe this great Apostle taught but one doctrine concerning man's nature: all these expressions are to be so harmonized and explained as not to cause the Apostle to conflict with himself; to be *yea* and *no*: this he positively denied saying as recorded, [2 Cor. i, 17, 18.] When I therefore was thus minded, did I use lightness? or the things that I purpose, do I purpose according to the flesh, that with me there should be *yea*, *yea*, and *no*, *no*? But as God is true, our word, (or preaching, see margin,) toward you was not *yea* and *no*. See verses 19 and 20.

The question to be propounded in the commencement of this examination of Paul, is, Does he teach, by a fair and harmonious interpretation of his language, the immortality of the soul? if not, these expressions which are seized as objections to man's mortality, must have a different exposition from that usually given by current theology.

There are certain expressions, and long trains of arguments put forth by this great Apostle which forever sets this question at rest. See 1 Cor. xv. The entire chapter is a connected argument in proof of future existence, predicated upon the resurrection of Christ, and the consequent resurrection of those that are his. See verse 12. "Now if Christ be preached, that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?" Verse 18. "Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are *perished*." Verse 32. "If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me if the *dead rise not*? let us eat and drink; for to-morrow we die." In this argument the Apostle makes the future existence depend upon the resurrection; which he could not do, if the immortal-soul dogma is true. All the apparently obscure sayings of the Apostle must be explained by those which are plain.

We invite attention to the first item named; viz., *This Tabernacle*. This circumstance is urged as an objection to man's unity and mortality. It is urged from what the Apostle says in this connection, that man has an immortal soul dwelling in this tabernacle, the body. Please read chapters iv, and v, of 2 Cor., down to the 12th verse of the 5th, and notice several points:

First. Chap. iv, 11. "For we which live are always delivered unto death for Jesus' sake, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our mortal flesh." Verse 14. "Knowing that he which raised up the Lord Jesus, shall raise up us also by Jesus, and shall present us with you." Verse 16. "For which cause we faint not, but though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day." Verse 17. "For our light affliction which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory." Verse 18. "While we look not at the things which are *seen*, but at the things which are *not seen*, for

the things which are seen are *temporal*; but the things which are not seen are *eternal*." Chap. v. "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. For in this we *groan*, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven. If so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked. For we that are in this tabernacle do groan being burdened, not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon that *mortality might be swallowed up of life*. Now, he that hath wrought us for this *self same thing*, is God."

Here then we have an Apostolic conclusion of this whole matter; and what is it? for certainly an inspired Apostolic conclusion is to be preferred to a fallible one. God has wrought us for a certain thing: what is it? That this mortal body should be put off, and the immortal soul fly away to glory? No: this is what popular theology has wrought us for, but not so of God; but, that *mortality might be swallowed up of life*. See verse 10. "For we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad."

Now without going into the minutiae in the case, allow me to ask where there is the least support for the immortality of the soul in all this. Does the hope of resurrection with Jesus prove it? Does the hope of an eternal weight of glory? Does the contrast of temporal and eternal things teach it? Does the desire to be clothed upon (not unclothed as the objector has it) that *mortality might be swallowed up of life*? Do any or all these teach it? Certainly not, but quite the contrary.

There is not one jot or tittle of *soul* or *spirit* theology in this entire discourse; but perhaps the objector still insists that *we*, means the soul, and this tabernacle means the shell, or body which contains the *immortal man*, which is talking; if so, it proves too much, if any regard is to be paid to the grammatical construction of the text; for *we* is plural, and this tabernacle, singular; so that our friends in trying to prove from this an immortal soul in a mortal body, get at least two souls in every body, and from aught to the contrary, as far as can be determined by this, two hundred; seeing we may mean more than two, even, but this is not all: every family of souls, be they two or two hundred, have one body on earth and another in heaven; so that they can according to this notion, have a choice of dwellings, (quite convenient in these days of poverty,) but the marvel is, that after this family of souls, expressed by the *we*, have occupied their heavenly home, house or body for hundreds of years, it should be necessary to re-build the old deserted palace, and call them from their heavenly home to inhabit it again.

And then we are called upon to marvel again, when we find them possessed of such a roving nature. Certainly this is making quite an advocate of transmigration of souls, of the Apostle to the Gentiles. Shall we charge all this folly upon Paul, in order to sustain an objection to man's complete mortality? I trow not. The context shows most conclusively the grand design of this whole argument; viz., that *mortality might be swallowed up of life*, that temporal things might give place to eternal, and not, as it is affirmed by current theology, that mortality might *die* and the immortal soul fledge out and fly.

We next notice Paul's desire to depart. Phil. i, 21. For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain. But if I live in the flesh, this is the fruit of my labor: yet what I shall choose I wot not; for I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ, which is far better. The objector will reason something like this: Paul expected to die and by that means go to be with Christ, in the shape of an immortal soul. Paul expresses a desire to be with Christ, this is clear; but how did he expect to get there, or to be with him? by dying? No; for this was far better than life or death. It may be urged that this is the gain spoken of: to live is Christ, to die is gain; but to whom? to Paul personally? or to the cause of Christ? See verse 20, and all is clear: life or death would be for the furtherance of the cause of Christ. Whether he should live or die, he did not know; but one thing he was

perfectly clear and decided about, and that was his desire to be with Christ. Now how was he to get to be with Christ? by departing? This departing and being with Christ, is the objectionable feature. Is death connected with this? No: it is life. When Paul departs to be with Christ, it will be by leaving this earth, a living man, and departing to mid heavens to meet Christ in the air. See Paul in his letter to the Thessalonians. 1 Thess. iv, 16. "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the arch-angel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord." See 2 Tim. iv, 1-9. "Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing." Death, instead of translating us to heaven where Christ is, sends us down into the grave, to the land of darkness, as darkness itself. When God wishes to take men to heaven, he does not send them through the dominions of the enemy, but delivers them from death. Enoch and Elijah are standing memorials of God's plan: they were taken away alive, not killed and their immortal ghosts taken; but they were taken bodily, alive; so Paul will go when he departs. God's plan is the same in all ages. Death is declared to be an enemy; and does God employ an enemy to perform the work which he is qualified especially to do? We think not. We pass from this to notice the next point in order, which is,

Paul's vision. 2 Cor. xii, 4, 5. "It is not expedient for me doubtless to glory. I will come to visions, and revelations of the Lord. I knew a man in Christ about fourteen years ago, (whether in the body I cannot tell: or whether out of the body I cannot tell: God knoweth;) such an one caught up to the third heaven. And I knew such a man, (whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth;) how that he was caught up into Paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful (possible) for a man to utter."

The objectionable feature of this vision, if there be any, must be contained in the phrase, "in the body or out of the body." The person urging this as an objection, would reason the case something like this: Paul could be in his body, or out of his body; therefore Paul, the man proper, was the immortal soul, in a mortal body, cage, or shell: he could fly out at pleasure, and return at will.

In the examination of this vision, note, first, that Paul did not know what condition he was in, or could not tell, which is the same. Note, second, God only knew. Now will our immortal-soul friends undertake to tell more about this matter, than the Apostle himself knew? Modesty is certainly becoming in this case, to say the least. This cannot be urged as proving any thing touching Paul's condition relative to soul or body, in this investigation. The Apostle himself did not know what condition he was in when he saw these remarkable things. He was caught up to the third heaven. He was caught up into Paradise. As to how this was accomplished he did not know; and now who will tell us? Our immortal-soul friends are ready to do what Paul could not. Let us hear them: Paul's immortal soul left his body and winged its way to realms of bliss where God is, and where Christ is, and there his disembodied immortality heard unspeakable words which his mortal mouth could not utter, when his soul came back to inhabit its mortal tenement again.

Here then we have this mystery solved. If this is true of Paul's vision, I suppose we must have a key for explaining all visions commencing with the first one upon Bible record, and going on to the last. But what condition was Paul's body in during the exit of his soul? was it dead? So saith immortal soulism. Death is the separation of an immortal soul from a mortal body. Then at the return of his soul we have a resurrection. Is it not passing strange that so many deaths and resurrections passed upon prophets and apostles, and yet no record of the matter? So it would appear.

In the body, or out of the body, are expressions indicative of his lack of knowledge as to his real

condition during the vision: this is all that can be safely said of these phrases. To undertake to squeeze an immortal soul, or deathless spirit, out of this, is like a drowning man's catching at a straw.

We pass from this to notice another phrase which is not unfrequently brought forth as containing an objection, and so far sustaining the immortal-soul theory. It is Paul's "inward man." 2 Cor. iv, 16. For which cause we faint not; but though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day. The objector affirms the inward man to be the immortal soul, and the outward man to be the mortal body. Let us see what is declared of this inward man: it is renewed day by day. Is this declaration properly applicable to immortal souls? If it is, they are not of precisely the kind of composition that our immortal-soul friends represent them to be. To renew day by day, is to make new continually. Is immortality subject to this work of renewing? Is this in any sense proper of immortality? Certainly not, unless immortality be a condition or nature entirely different from that which the term imports.

But we are not left to guess at the meaning of this phrase. By noticing the context carefully, and comparing scripture with scripture, all is plain. See 1 Pet. iii, 4. Peter's *hidden man of the heart*. See Paul's *inner man*. Eph. iii, 16. "That he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man." Note: Strengthened with might by his Spirit. Hear Paul's own explanation of this affair: "That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith." Here then Paul explains himself, and all doubts are removed. See Eph. iv, 23, 24. "And be renewed in the spirit of your mind: and that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." Col. iii, 9. "Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds; and have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge, after the image of him that created him."

Citations of this kind might be multiplied to almost any extent; but those already brought are sufficient to place the matter beyond doubt as to what the Apostle meant by the *inward man*. Let us sum up the testimony of this great and faithful witness, upon man's nature. What was Paul's hope? Was it the hope of immortal-soulism? Was it the hope of the flight of his immortal soul to realms of glory at the death of his body? Did he expect death to bring him into the presence of God, Jesus and angels? We enter a positive negation to all these queries. His hope was in the resurrection of the dead; or the change of the living at the coming of Christ in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory. See his hope. Acts xxiii, 6; xxiv, 14, 15; xxvi, 6-8; 1 Cor. xv, 12, 18, 29, 32; 1 Thess. iv, 13-18; 2 Tim. iv, 1-9. Any amount of quotations might be adduced which show clearly and beyond a shadow of doubt, Paul's true position touching the matter under investigation.

We pass from this to notice certain transactions in the life and teachings of Christ. And first, the case of Moses and Elias, [Mat xvii, 3,] or,

The transfiguration. The objection to man's mortality in this case grows out of the appearance of Moses and Elias, after one had died, and the other was translated. The objector reasons as follows: Moses died and was buried: Moses was seen and heard on the mount of transfiguration, a long time afterwards; therefore Moses had an immortal soul, which did not die. Elias was taken to heaven bodily, and did not die: Elias was seen and heard on the mount of transfiguration a long time afterwards; therefore Elias had an immortal soul which survived death.

I cannot see any connection, I must confess, between the premise and the conclusion. I cannot see how it would follow logically, that man has an immortal soul, or that Moses and Elias had. It looks strange enough to me to conclude because Moses and Elias were seen and heard on the mount, that therefore they have immortal souls.

Quite a different conclusion would appear to me to be most natural and easy: Moses died and was buried; Moses was seen on the mount; therefore Moses must have been raised from the dead. This conclusion is positively

unavoidable, if Moses was in fact present on the occasion. Let us see how the matter stands with Elias. He was taken away alive and bodily; he was present on the occasion of the transfiguration: he must therefore have returned from his place of abode to earth again. To conclude from this circumstance that Moses and Elias had immortal souls, appears to me to be wonderfully far-fetched, to say the least.

But let us look into this matter more closely. The objector reasons the case out after this fashion: Moses died: Moses was seen: now as there is no record of his resurrection, he must have an immortal soul. But there is no intimation that his soul was seen: it was Moses; hence the objector is begging the whole question. But are you certain that Moses and Elias were in fact present? I can see no cause for their being present in fact, at all, to answer the design of the promise recorded in Matt. xvi, 28: "Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." See Peter's exposition of this same affair: [2 Pet. i, 16:] "For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye witnesses of his majesty."

The object of this vision seems to have been to give Peter, James and John, an eye-sight of the power, majesty and glory of the kingdom. This could be done without Moses' and Elias' being there in fact. They could appear there in the vision; and so they did. See verse 9: "And as they came down from the mountain, Jesus charged them, saying, Tell the vision to no man, until the Son of man be risen again from the dead. If it is difficult for any one to see how Moses and Elias could be seen, and heard, let them consult the visions of Daniel and John.

Much might be said concerning this matter, but this must suffice for the present occasion. There can be no objection drawn from this, without perverting the whole affair from beginning to end.

Next and last under this head we will examine the conversation between Christ and the Sadducees.

The objector seizes upon two or three isolated expressions in this discourse of the Saviour's, and tries to torture them into the service of immortal-soulism. They are as follows: God is not a God of the dead, but of the living: he is Abraham's, Isaac's and Jacob's God; therefore, they are living, and as their bodies are dead, they must live in the shape of immortal souls.

This is coming to a conclusion very hastily, and without taking into account the object of the argument, at all. Let us notice the conversation from the beginning.

Luke xx, 27. "Then came to him certain of the Sadducees, (which deny that there is any resurrection,) and they asked him, saying, Master, Moses wrote unto us, If any man's brother die, having a wife, and he die without children, that his brother should take his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother. There were therefore, seven brethren: and the first took a wife, and died without children. And the second took her to wife, and he died childless. And the third took her: and in like manner the seven also: and they left no children, and died. Last of all the woman died also."

We have now the basis of a very important query, for the Sadducees to present to Christ, who taught the resurrection. Hear it, and remember: "Therefore in the RESURRECTION, (not in the intermediate state of immortality souls) whose wife of them is she? for seven had her to wife. And Jesus answering, said unto them, The children of this world marry, and are given in marriage; but they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, (not the intermediate state of immortality souls) neither marry, nor are given in marriage; neither can they die any more; for they are equal unto the angels, and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection. Now that the dead are raised, (or as it is recorded Matt. xxii, 31: But as touching the resurrection of the dead; or in Mark xii, 26: And as touching the dead, that they rise,) even Moses showed at the bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob; for he

not a God of the dead, but of the living: for all live unto him. Then certain of the scribes answering, said, Master, thou hast well said."

We affectionately request any person who supposes this conversation between Christ and the Sadducees, to contain proof of the existence of life, between death and resurrection, in the shape of immortal souls, to read and compare carefully Matt. xxii, 23-35; Mark xii, 18-28, Luke xx, 27-40, and note 1. The faith of the Sadducees. They professed belief in the writings of Moses, and yet denied the resurrection of the dead: believing and teaching that a person died, and so remained for all time to come. 2. The teachings of Christ. He taught a resurrection of the dead.

Here then is a fair issue between Christ and the Sadducees. Now they hear him preaching and teaching the resurrection, and they, to object their faith to his, refer him to what Moses had said concerning marriage, and state a fact, with which they were familiar; viz., the seven brethren, all marrying one woman, and all dying. Now comes a very difficult problem, so thought the Sadducees: How will this matter be managed in the resurrection? (which you teach?) Whose wife will she be in the resurrection? (Not, How will immortal souls manage this affair in the intermediate state?)

Note Christ's answer, as recorded in Mark xii, 24, 25. Do ye not therefore err, because ye know not the Scriptures, neither the power of God? (Thousands in the same condition now.) For when they shall rise from the dead, they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels which are in heaven." Our Saviour, now refers them to Moses for proof of a resurrection, condemning them out of their own mouths, or proving from the very writings which they professed faith in, the very doctrine which he was teaching, and they opposing. See Ex. iii, 6. "Moreover he said, I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." How did Moses teach the resurrection, from this circumstance? To my mind it is perfectly plain and easy. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, were dead. God is not a God of the dead, (who never live again, or remain dead as you Sadducees believe,) but he is the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Now what is the logical and scriptural conclusion? They shall live again, or have a resurrection from the dead.

In this view Christ reasoned well, and answered the grand design of his undertaking; viz., confounded the Sadducees; and this matter was so conducted by our Saviour, as to gain the applause of the Pharisees, who believed in the resurrection.

If I was required to cite a plain case of the resurrection of the dead, I should select the one under investigation. How any person can logically or scripturally deduce immortal souls from this discourse, I cannot for my life see, without perverting the entire transaction, and making Christ a perfect bungler as a reasoner. He sets out to prove a resurrection of the dead; and when he gets through and looks at his conclusion, lo and behold!! it is quite another thing: he has proved that men don't die, and has thereby entirely set aside the resurrection. How he could ever have become noted for his wisdom as a reasoner, and teacher, I cannot see, if he was guilty of such bungling as the objector accuses him, in this matter.

I might notice the conclusions usually drawn from this in a syllogistic form, and prove that God was not their God, and that they never would be raised. Let us look at this still further. Note the conclusion to which immortal soulism comes from these statements:

1st. God is not the God of the dead. 2d. God is the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Conclusion: Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are alive.

If this conclusion is a truthful one, it may become the basis of another syllogism. Let us try it:

1st. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are alive.— 2d. Living men are not the subjects of a resurrection; therefore, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob will never be raised. Again,

1st. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob never will be raised from the dead. 2d. God is not a God of the dead; therefore he is not their God.

The two last syllogisms are true if the first one is

We see from this to what absurdities and contradictions immortal-soulism drives its advocates. Do, we beseech of you, renounce it, and embrace the plain, simple statements of God's book, and save yourselves from all these absurdities, and at last, after having believed and obeyed the gospel of the kingdom, you shall be called to inherit all its rich promises: immortality, incorruptibility, eternal life, an eternal weight of glory, be seated with Christ in his throne. O, how rich. I am not ashamed of the gospel; for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. We will close our notice of objections of this class, at this point, and continue the investigation from another point; viz., the point of eternal misery.

(To be Continued)

THE REVIEW AND HERALD.

"Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth."

ROCHESTER THIRD-DAY, DEC. 12, 1854.

WHO IS OUR LAWGIVER?

THERE is one lawgiver, who is able to save and to destroy. James iv, 12. Who is this "one lawgiver?" is an inquiry of vital importance to the Sabbath question, which we shall endeavor to answer from the Scriptures of truth.

By very many it is assumed, first, that Christ is the Christian's lawgiver: and, second, that he has given, in person and by his inspired Apostles, contained in the New Testament, a perfect code of laws for the dispensation of the gospel; then it is asserted that, as the Sabbath law is not repeated in the New Testament, the seventh-day Sabbath is not binding on Christians. This fabric seems very fair; but it rests upon sand.

Deut. xviii, 15-18, is offered as proof that Christ is our lawgiver; but it may be seen that it teaches the reverse. "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him shall ye hearken. . . . And the Lord said unto me, they have well spoken that which they have spoken. I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him." Deut. xviii, 15, 17, 18. Peter speaking of Christ, says, "For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you, of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you." Acts iii, 22.

Christ, as a prophet, or teacher, was like Moses. We now inquire, Did Moses legislate? Did he make laws for the people? He did not. Moses received words from the mouth of God and spake them to the people. There is no record that he ever assumed the position as an independent lawgiver; while the inspired record furnishes facts quite the reverse. In the case of the man who gathered sticks on the Sabbath, [Num. xv, 32-36.] Moses did not presume to decide his case, but left that for the great Lawgiver. "And they put him in ward, because it was not declared what should be done unto him. And the Lord said unto Moses, The man shall be surely put to death." See also Num. xxvii, 5-7; Lev. xxiv, 11-14.

That Christ, as a prophet, or teacher, was like Moses, we have the united testimony of Moses, [Deut. xviii, 15,] the Lord, [verse 18,] and Peter, [Acts iii, 22,] therefore he was not an independent lawgiver. Says the eternal Father when speaking of his Son, "He shall speak unto them all that I shall command him." Jesus testifies of himself on this subject, and his testimony agrees with that of his Father. Mark well the following declarations of the Son of God:—

Jesus answered them, and said, My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me. John vii, 16.

"Then said Jesus unto them, When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I am he, and that I do nothing of myself; but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things." Chap. viii, 28.

"For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak. And I know that his commandment is life everlasting;:

whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak." Chap. xii, 42, 50.

"He that loveth me not, keepeth not my sayings: and the word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's which sent me." Chap. xiv, 24.

By these testimonies from the Father and Son we learn that it was not the work of our Lord Jesus Christ to legislate; but he received the doctrines which he taught from the mouth of the Father, and spake them to the people. In this respect, as a prophet, or teacher, he was like Moses. In both cases the Father is the lawgiver.

The transfiguration is referred to as proof that Christ is the lawgiver in the gospel age. It is said that the presence of both Moses and Christ, (the teachers of both dispensations,) and Moses, being placed upon the back-ground by the voice from heaven, saying "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased, hear him," shows that Christ is the lawgiver of the present age, and that his teachings take the place of the law of God. But a very important personage is overlooked by those who take this position. It is the Father. He also appears at the mount of transfiguration. His voice is heard as the highest authority—"This is my beloved Son," "Hear him." However much the glory of Christ excelled that of Moses, it did not eclipse the glory of the Author of the ten commandments. The great God spoke the ten precepts of his holy law in the hearing of all the people. He did not leave them with Moses to write, and deliver to the people; neither was it the work of the Son of God to deliver them, or any portion of them, over a second time for the men of the present dispensation. Under circumstances of awful grandeur the great Lawgiver spoke the ten commandments directly to the people, and wrote them in the tables of stone.

Christ quotes several of them at different times to enforce the doctrines he taught, but not in the sense of giving a new law. He leaves them upon their original basis, as the law of Jehovah, and affirms their immutability. Matt. v, 17-19. He did not take the position of a lawgiver, but, rather, that of a teacher of the law.

If Christ be our lawgiver, who is our advocate? We have none. But the Apostle says, "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." 1 John ii, 1. Here are three parties introduced: (1) the sinner, or transgressor of the law, [Chap. iii, 4,] (2) the Advocate, and (3) the Father whose law the sinner transgresses. The truth on this subject, then, plainly set before us, is that in the dispensation of the gospel, the Father is the lawgiver, and Jesus Christ is the advocate, or mediator, between the offending sinner and an offended Lawgiver.

Now take the view that Christ is the Christian's lawgiver. Then "sin is the transgression of the law" of Christ. "And if any man sin, we have an advocate with" Jesus Christ! But who is this advocate? The Papist may answer, The Pope, while the Protestant remains silent.

We frequently hear it asserted, "It is very strange that nine of the commandments are given in the New Testament, and the fourth left out, if the Sabbath is binding on Christians." But is it not indeed strange that professed Bible students should thus expose their ignorance of the subject of which they speak? It is a fact that the first four commandments are not repeated in the New Testament. Does this prove that we should not regard the first, second and third? If it does not prove this, then it does not prove that the fourth is not binding upon Christians. Is it said that an equivalent is given to those commandments not repeated in the New Testament? we invite the attention of the cavalier to New Testament testimony in regard to the Sabbath.

1. The testimony of Christ in regard to the duty of Christians relative to the Sabbath, as late as the destruction of Jerusalem, and probably much later. "But pray ye that your flight be not in the Winter, neither on the Sabbath-day." Matt. xxiv, 20. Again, "The Sabbath was made for man."

2. The testimony of the apostle Luke relative to the holy women. "And they returned and prepared spices and ointments, and rested the Sabbath-day according to the commandment." Luke xxiii, 56. If the Sabbath law was abolished at the crucifixion,

several years before this fact was recorded, of what commandment does the historian speak?

3. The testimony of the same Apostle in regard to Paul's manner. "And Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three Sabbath-days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures." Acts xvii, 2. "And he reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks." Chap. xviii, 4.

"And when the Jews were gone out of the synagogue, the Gentiles besought that these words might be preached to them the next Sabbath." "And the next Sabbath-day came almost the whole city together to hear the word of God." Acts xiii, 42, 44. "And on the Sabbath we went out of the city by a river side where prayer was wont to be made; and we sat down and spake unto the women which resorted thither." Acts xvi, 13.

Turn to the "Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him," &c. and mark the distinction made between the commandments of God, and the testimony [teachings] of Jesus. Rev. xii, 17; xiv, 12.

Read the testimony of Jesus in Chap. xxii, 14. "Blessed are they that do his [the Father's] commandments," &c. Now if Jesus is the Christian's lawgiver, he would have said of men in the Christian's age, Blessed are they that do my commandments. True, we should keep all the sayings of Christ; but what does he say of his teachings? "My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me."

If it be said that the Apostles in their writings have given a code of laws for the gospel age, we reply, that this view makes twelve lawgivers, whereas James says, "There is one lawgiver."

2 CORINTHIANS, CHAPTER III.

THIS CHAPTER is, by many persons, supposed to teach the abolition of the ten commandments. We think this doctrine is not in any wise countenanced by this portion of scripture. Let us carefully attend to what the Apostle has written in this chapter.

Two ministrations are presented. The one is the ministration of death; the other is the ministration of the Spirit. Verses 6, 7. The word "ministration" signifies service performed by a minister or servant. Hence, two classes of ministers are introduced. The one class is Moses and those who, after him, carried out the work of ministration which he began. The other class of ministers is the apostles, and those who carry forward the work commenced by them. The one class is the ministers of the Old Testament; the other class is the ministers of the New.

The two objects concerning which these ministrations are performed, are denominated "death," and "the Spirit." Let us now inquire respecting the meaning of these terms as here used. What is meant by the word "death," in the sentence, "the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones?" We answer that it can only signify the words engraven upon the tables of stone; as though the sentence read, "the ministration of the ten commandments, written and engraven in stone." The reason why the law of God is called "death," may be gathered from the following scriptures: "the letter killeth;" "by the law is the knowledge of sin;" "The law worketh wrath: for where no law is, there is no transgression;" "the law entered that the offense might abound;" "I was alive without the law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died. And the commandment which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death. For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me. Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good. Was then that which was good made death unto me? God forbid. But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good; that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful."

What is meant by the word "Spirit" as used in this chapter? This word is definitely applied in verse 17: "Now the Lord is that Spirit." Then we understand that the law of God slays the sinner, and is hence denominated "death;" while the Lord is that Spirit who makes alive the sinner thus slain. Hence we understand the Lord from heaven to be the life-giving Spirit here referred to.

With these remarks we introduce verses 7 and 8. "But if the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away; how shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious?"

Those who offer this verse as proof that the ten commandments are abolished, have fallen into that error by confounding the ministration of that which was engraven upon stones, with the law itself that was there engraven. Thus making the law of God and the ministration of that law mean the same thing. But the next verse by furnishing a perfect parallel to the sentence in question, exhibits the absurdity of that view. "How shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious?" No one will claim that the ministration of the Spirit is the Spirit itself. Let them treat verse 7 with as much consistency as they do verse 8, and they will avoid the error that the ministration of the ten commandments is the ten commandments themselves.

But verse 7 must distinctly mark the meaning of Paul in the use of the word "ministration;" and no one who will carefully read the verse need to confound the ministration with the commandments. Notice the first clause of the verse: "But if the ministration of death written and engraven in stones was glorious;" now read the explanatory clause and you may understand what that ministration was, and in what its glory consisted: "so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance." Then the last clause of the verse is a distinct explanation of the first. The ministration or service to which Paul refers, was commenced by Moses when he took the ten commandments from Jehovah and brought them down to the people. That ministration was so glorious that the minister by whom it was performed, veiled his face to hide its glory. The full account of this interesting ministration of Moses may be read in Ex. xxxiv, 29-35. Nothing can be plainer, therefore, than the fact that by the word "ministration" in verse 7, Paul means not the ten commandments, but the service of Moses the minister, in bringing down from God that law which he had just engraven on the tables of stone.

The ministration commenced by Moses, was carried forward through the entire period of the Old Testament. Moses placed the two tables in the ark, and placed the ark in the Most Holy Place of the typical sanctuary. Ex. xl; Deut. x. He then set apart the Levitical order of priesthood to minister before that ark while the typical sanctuary should continue. Ex. xxviii; xxix; Lev. viii; ix. When Moses brought down that holy law, it was to that sinful, rebellious people, but "condemnation" and "death;" for it could only show their guilt in the sight of God. It showed them exposed to its just penalty, and contained in itself no promise of pardon.

But the ministration committed to the apostles and their successors, was expressly appointed to hold out pardon to the guilty, hope to the desponding, salvation to the lost. It recognizes indeed the great fact that the whole human family are under the just condemnation of the law of God, as its transgressors; [Rom. iii, 19;] but it bases its offer of pardon on the fact that Christ has died for the human family thus situated, [2 Cor. v, 14, 15,] and that all who will avail themselves of this great propitiation may be forgiven freely. The great subject of this ministration is Christ, the life-giving Spirit, who has died for us. The priesthood which Moses appointed to minister before the ark of the testament in the typical sanctuary, offered no sacrifice that could take away sin; it could only cite penitent sinners forward to the great Sacrifice that should be offered for the sins of men. But in the heavenly Sanctuary before the ark of God's testament stands that great High Priest who has laid down his life for the world, and who is able to save to the uttermost all that come to God through him. Heb. vii; viii; Rev. xi, 19.

If therefore the ministration that could only exhibit man's guilt and just condemnation, was so glorious that Moses, its minister, had to veil the glory of his countenance, how unspeakably glorious must that ministration be, that offers life, pardon and salvation to the guilty, the condemned, the lost!

Moses while performing that ministration had a veil upon his face; but in contrast with this, Paul says, "But we all with open [literally unveiled] face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory even as by the Spirit of the Lord."

Let us now inquire respecting the thing abolished in verse 7. That the word *glory*, inserted by the translators in its last clause, was rightly placed there, admits of certain proof. For the expression "teen katargoumeneen," rendered, "which glory was to be done away," is in the feminine accusative, and hence necessarily refers to "teen doxan," "the glory," which immediately precedes it, and is in the same gender and case, and not to "he diakonia," "the ministration," which is more remote, and is of a different case. On this point there can be no dispute. Hence the translators by inserting the word "glory" in the last clause of this verse, have faithfully expressed the sense of the original.

Then Paul in verse 7, asserts the abolition of the glory of the former ministration. Verse 10 tells us that though that ministration was made glorious, yet in this respect it had no glory, by reason of the glory that excelleth. Now verse 11 will explain to us how the glory of the former ministration was done away, and also in what respect that ministration had no glory. It is more correctly rendered by Macknight than by our version. For "diadoxeas" must signify, "by glory," and not the adjective, "glorious." As rendered by Macknight it reads: "Besides if that which is abolished, is abolished by glory, much more that which remaineth, remaineth in glory." Two important facts are determined by this verse. 1. That the glory of the former ministration was done away by the surpassing glory of the present ministration, just as the glory of the stars is done away by the glory of the sun arising in his strength. 2. And hence we understand that it had no glory by reason of the glory that excelleth, in the same manner that we understand that the stars have no glory when the sun shines.

We will now quote verses 13 and 14. "And not as Moses, which put a veil over his face, that the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished; but their minds were blinded; for until this day remaineth the same veil untaken away in the reading of the Old Testament; which veil is done away in Christ." Verse 13 being explanatory of verse 7, we have here a good opportunity to determine what was abolished. And we shall find its statement on this point the same as that of verse 7. When the veil was upon the face of Moses, "the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished." What then did the veil hide? for the answer to this question determines the whole matter. Were the tables of stone hidden by that veil? No verily. But it was the glory of that ministration, which glory in the estimation of the Jews still abides. The veil upon his face hid that which is abolished; but the tables of stone were neither hidden nor obscured by the veil: he held them in his hands. Ex. xxxiv, 29.

The veil with which Moses hid the glory of his face still remains upon literal Israel. They still connect in an inseparable manner the great constitution, the ten commandments, with the glory that enshrouded Moses and that attended the Levitical ministration, not seeing that that ministration has given place to another of far surpassing glory. Israel cannot see that the hidden glory is gone; but as they can still see that holy law, they believe that that glory must abide as well as that law. Others at the present day fall into the opposite error. They can see that that glory is gone, and hence conclude that that holy law has gone also. They do not see that in the heavenly tabernacle, where our great High Priest is ministering for us, the ark of God abides as well as it did in the earthly tabernacle. Rev. xi, 19. They think highly indeed of the mercy-seat; but the law of God contained in the ark beneath that mercy-seat, is despised and counted a thing of naught. Ex. xxv, 17-22; Heb. ix, 4. But the dream that the blood of Christ blotted out the moral law (the very thing that caused it to be shed) will be found vain and delusive in the day of God.

The act of Moses in covering from the sight of Is-

rael the glory that beamed from his face at the commencement of that ministration represented this great truth; viz., that that ministration with its glory was not to abide; and that when it should be succeeded by a ministration that could give life and pardon to guilty man, Israel would not understand the fact. To this day the veil is upon their heart. Every thing relating to the ministration and the glory in the reading of the O'd Testament, is with them inseparably connected with Moses. This veil is done away in Christ; and when the heart shall turn to the Lord, the veil shall be taken away. Every thing relating to salvation and glory will then be associated with Christ and the better ministration.

In this chapter, therefore, there is no intimation that the law of God is abolished. Those who make it teach such a doctrine, wrest the words of Paul to their own destruction. Even the verses on which such persons lay the greatest stress become a complete absurdity when made to teach the abolition of the ten commandments. For in the first place they have to assume that the word "ministration" instead of signifying service performed by a minister, [as the word invariably signifies, and is expressly so applied in the latter part of verse 7.] signifies the ten commandments. This absurd assumption is the basis of the doctrine. Let us see how consistent a doctrine can be erected upon this basis. It stands thus: If the ten commandments were glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses &c. Any one can see how incongruous such a statement would be. To say that the ministration was glorious so that they could not behold the face of the minister, is a statement perfectly consistent, being indeed the very thing that Paul has affirmed; but to say that the tables of stone were the subjects of this glory, and yet, have that glory only appear upon the face of Moses is reasoning from unlike to unlike. If the tables of stone constituted this glorious ministration, why was not the veil which hid that glory wrapped about the tables of stone, and not placed before the face of the minister? The answer is obvious. It was the service performed by Moses that was thus glorious: and that glory was hidden when Moses veiled his face.

It remains that we quote two or three texts in which Paul directly teaches the perpetuity of the law of God. The word of Paul was not yea and nay, so that he does not affirm a doctrine in one place and deny it in another.

1. The following is Dr. Bloomfield's translation of 1 Cor. vii, 19, with his note appended:

"Circumcision is of no moment, and uncircumcision of no moment; but keeping the commandments of God is something of consequence; i. e., as being the test of genuine faith."

2. "Children, obey your parents in the Lord; for this is right. Honor thy father and mother; which is the first commandment with promise; that it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long upon the earth." Eph. vi, 1-3. In this text it is certain that Paul enforces the duty of children to their parents, by the commandment which he quotes, thus acknowledging its supreme authority. Nor can the argument from this text be evaded by saying that he quoted it from a revised code which Christ had established. For it is a fact, that although Christ has quoted this commandment, he has never appended a promise to it; much less has he added the one here quoted by Paul. But it is also a fact that this commandment does stand in the decalogue not only as its first commandment with promise, but with the very promise in question annexed. Hence it is certain that Paul acknowledges the fifth precept of the decalogue as the fountain-head of all authority on this point.

3. "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law." Rom. iii, 31. Now it is an interesting fact that the verb "katargeo" which in 2 Cor. iii, is rendered 'done away,' 'abolished,' is the same one that in Rom. iii, 31, is rendered 'make void.' We have shown that the word is not used in 2 Cor. iii, with reference to the law of God. As a demonstration of the truth on this point, we present these words of Paul to the Romans. In the strongest manner he expresses his abhorrence of the sentiment that the law of God is abolished. Those who make Paul in 2 Cor. iii, ut-

ter a sentiment which in Rom. iii, he solemnly disavows, should pause and reflect, lest they thus wrest his words to their own destruction. J. N. A.

The Word Ministration

In 2 Cor. iii, is from the Greek word *diakonia*, and occurs as follows:

- Luke x, 40. Martha was cumbered about much serving,
- Acts i, 17. had obtained part of this *ministry*.
- 25. he may take part of this *ministry*
- vii, 1. neglected in the daily *ministration*.
- 4. to the *ministry* of the word.
- xi, 29. determined to send *relief* unto the
- xii, 25. they had fulfilled their *ministry*,
- xx, 24. the *ministry*, which I have received
- xxi, 19. among the Gentiles by his *ministry*.
- Rom. xi, 13. I magnify mine office:
- xii, 7. Or *ministry*, let us wait on our *ministering*:
- xv, 31. that my *service* which I have
- 1 Cor. xii, 5. differences of *administrations*,
- xvi, 15. themselves to the *ministry* of the saints,
- 2 Cor. iii, 7. if the *ministration* of death
- 8. the *ministration* of the Spirit
- 9. the *ministration* of condemnation
- the *ministration* of righteousness
- iv, 1. seeing we have this *ministry*,
- v, 18. the *ministry* of reconciliation;
- vi, 3. that the *ministry* he not blamed:
- viii, 4. the fellowship of the *ministering* to
- ix, 1. the *ministering* to the saints,
- 12. For the *administration* of this service
- 13. the experiment of this *ministration*
- xi, 8. wages of them, to do you *service*. [lit for *ministering* to you]
- Eph. iv, 12. the work of the *ministry*,
- Col. iv, 17. Take heed to the *ministry*
- 1 Tim. i, 12 putting me into the *ministry*;
- 2 Tim. iv, 5. make full proof of thy *ministry*.
- 11. profitable to me for the *ministry*.
- Feb. i, 14 sent forth to *minister* for them
- Rev. ii, 19. know thy works, and charity, and *service*,

Speaking of the Image.

AND he had power to give life unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed. . . . And that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast or the number of his name. Rev. xiii, 15, 17.

When the image has power to speak, he will be able, not only to decide who are heretics, but also to tell what shall be done with them. They shall "be killed." The first beast received the power to kill of the dragon: the image will receive the same power and authority from the two-horned beast. The dragon power of the ten-horned monster gave his seat and authority to the Catholic church: the dragon power of "another beast" will give his authority to another church. Give civil power into the hands of Protestants, and the result will be a "holy war" against heretics.

To worship the image is to submit to his authority. All must bow or be killed. To deprive one of the privilege of buying and selling, unless he cultivate a fruitful soil, must terminate in death by starvation. And implements are necessary to cultivate the soil. In short to live in society without buying or selling is next to impossibility.

But is there no other way, by which we may escape the wrath of the image, but by the reception of the mark of the beast and his image? Yes, we can submit to his authority another way. We can have the mark or the name of the beast, or the number of his name. It is evident that we can have a share in the name of the beast and have the privilege of observing the Sabbath of the Lord. But we must be in season in this matter or the image will be completed, and we shall be too late; and then there will be no alternative but to receive the mark, or brave the wrath of the image.

Before the image is made, we can become incorporated and known in law, as one of the many names or denominations; or we can unite with some one name already thus known, and go to the polls and with our votes help make the image, thus securing an interest in the name.

But when the image is completed the book of names will be closed—the 666 shares of stock will all be taken, and then if we belong to a people adjudged in law to be "no people," we must receive the mark or be condemned to death.

But, thanks be to God! the saints will be caught away to the sea of glass, having "gotten the victory over the beast, and and over his image and over his mark, and over the number of his name."

R. F. COTTRELL.

Discordant Opinions.

Under this head, we find the following in the *Bible Examiner* for December.

"We are all too apt to think others must see as we do or there can be no fellowship with them. Now we are as likely to err in this matter as others, but we abhor it in *ourselves* and all others. The positive spirit on prophecy, relating to events future, or now passing, till more plainly developed—which is manifested by some—we deeply regret; because we think it tends to anything rather than the promotion of brotherly love. There are, at this time, several different opinions among those who believe the coming of Christ the second time is near.

"One class have believed, and taught, that the event would certainly occur *this* year. Though we were perfectly satisfied, from the commencement, that they were mistaken in their calculation of time, yet many of them were men we much loved and esteemed, and we did not feel called upon to take a public stand against them, believing that we could better serve them, and the cause of truth, by a kind course toward them, while at the same time they all understood we did not agree in their theory. We knew a short time would realize their expectations or satisfy them of their mistake.

"Another class maintain that before Christ can come 'the second time,' Russia must overrun Turkey, and the Jews be restored to Palestine. With this view we do not agree, at all; but we do not feel disposed to enter into a controversy about it, which must be exceedingly profitless, and call off attention from what we regard as far more important matters to this dying world. We do not affirm that this view is not correct; but we have no faith in it; and especially in the positive assumption that the *se* thing 'must' be done 'before' the Lord can come.

"A third class agree with the foregoing so far as relates to Russia overrunning Turkey; affirming that Russia is 'the king of the north,' spoken of, Daniel xi, and must overflow Turkey before Christ can come 'the second time;' and that, hence, until Turkey is overwhelmed by Russia, we can have no scriptural hope of our Lord's return from Heaven. With this view we have no more sympathy than with the previous one. But, as we said of that, so say we of this; we do not say that *such* events will not take place before Christ's return. But to affirm that they *must*, positively, we think is overstepping our province as fallible mortals. We do not believe that Russia is 'the king of the north.' It is our opinion that any power that reigns over Syria is—for the time being—'the king of the north,' spoken of Daniel xi; hence that the Turkish Dynasty is *now* that power. If Russia, Austria, England, or France should become possessed of supreme power over Syria, *then* it—which ever it might be—would become 'the king of the north.' Till then none but the Turkish Dynasty occupies that position, in our opinion. Our views of Russia, Turkey, and France are known to our readers. No arguments, nor ridicule, that has yet appeared, has in the least shaken our mind; yet we do not affirm that we are right; *events* may convince us that we are wrong in this matter. We have no theory at stake, and shall feel, we think, no mortification to find we are—just what we believe all others to be—fallible."

Recollection is the life of religion. The Christian wants to have his heart elevated more above the world by secluding himself from it as much as his duties will allow, that religion may effect this, its great end, by bringing its sublime hopes and prospects into more steady action on the mind. I know not how it is that some Christians can make so little of retirement. I find the spirit of the world a strong

assimilating principle. I find it hurrying my mind away in its vortex, and sinking me among the dregs of a carnal nature.—*R. Cecil.*

OBITUARY.

My Sister Anna sleeps in Jesus. She died of Consumption November 30th, 1854, in the 26th year of her age.

Several years since, her health became much impaired by over exertion in pursuit of an education. From this she had never recovered. About two years since Anna came to this city, accompanied by my Bro. Nathaniel (who fell asleep May 6th 1853,) to spend a few months, with the hope of recovering her health. She was then very feeble. But her health gradually improved up to last Spring. From that time she began gradually to decline, which brought sadness into our family. And as she grew more feeble and helpless, darker and heavier seemed the mantle of gloom that was thrown over us. It was indeed painful to see her fast sinking away from the surface of the sea of life; yet there was one hope, and but one, that lit up the future, as we stood around her sick and dying bed. It was the "blessed hope," that those who sleep in Jesus will be raised incorruptible at the soon coming of the Son of man.

At the age of 6 years, Anna manifested true repentance toward God, and faith in Jesus Christ, and although young, was a consistent and decided Christian. Living in the enjoyment of the Saviour's love, she was prepared to receive with joy the doctrine of Christ's speedy coming. And during the period of declension she maintained her profession.

Soon after coming to Rochester, Anna examined the subject of the Sabbath, and reviewed the evidences for the soon coming of Christ, and came out decided and happy on the side of truth. About one year since, with a heart full of love for the Young, she took charge of the Youth's Instructor, but was soon forced to leave the work in which she desired to spend her life. In her last sickness, she manifested great desire to be ready for her last change, and then submitted herself fully to Christ, in whose arms she seemed to breathe out her life.

A few hours before she fell asleep she repeated, "As the apple-tree among the trees of the wood, so is my beloved among the sons of men." "He is the chief among ten thousand, the one altogether lovely."

The services of the funeral were conducted by Bro. J. N. Andrews, who preached a clear and comforting discourse from 1 Thess. iv, 13-18.

We place dear Anna beside Bro. Nathaniel, in Mount Hope Cemetery, there to rest till both are called forth to receive crowns of immortal glory.

Jesus, the life-giver, tasted death, lay in the tomb, arose from the dead, and in triumph brought away the keys of death and the grave, and ascended on high. "I am he that liveth, and was dead; and behold I am alive forevermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell [hades, the grave] and of death." Rev. i, 18. Jesus lives. With the keys of the grave and death, he is coming to open the graves of the just and call them forth to life eternal. JAMES WHITE,

LINES

Occasioned by the Death of Anna White.

SHE hath passed Death's chilling billow,
And gone to rest;
Jesus smoothed her dying pillow—
Her slumbers blest

Parents saw with grief unspoken,
Only in tears,
Their sweet bud of promise broken—
Youngest in years.

In yon, lonely grave, a Brother,
Friends, weeping, laid;
Called so soon to see another,
As lovely, fade.

God support, while hopes have perished
In Sorrow's tide;
While a Sister, loved and cherished,
Sleeps by his side.

Precious seed had she been sowing
On Life's broad field;
Rich will be the harvest, showing
The sheaves it will yield.

Youth and children now are sighing,
Who feel her worth,
That her cold, pale form is lying
Low in the earth.

From the bitter cup that's given,
We should not shrink;
Since the mandate is from Heaven,
That bids us drink.

Sleep, dear Sister, kind and tender,
To friendship true,
While with feeling hearts we render
This tribute due.

When the morn of glory, breaking,
Shall light the tomb,
Beautiful will be thy waking,
In fadeless bloom.

Where no wintry winds are blowing
No burial train,
Crowned with gems celestial, glowing,
We'll meet again!

ANNIE R. SMITH.

My Dear Companion, Eliza Vandyke, aged 32 years, departed this life Sept. 4th, after an illness of about four weeks, which she endured with Christian patience and resignation. She embraced the present truth about two years since, and continued firm in the faith until death closed the scene. The law of God and the faith of Jesus were her chief delight.

It was her request that Bro. M. E. Cornell should preach her funeral sermon, which in consequence of duties that prevented his visiting us before, was delayed until Nov. 16th.

For our consolation, Bro. Cornell described the reward that awaits those who "sleep in Jesus," and contrasted the "temporal" with the "eternal" state.

We sorrow, but not without hope, and look forward to the resurrection of the saints with a blessed anticipation, and are comforted.

I am left with six children to journey through this vale of tears, and although we feel the loss of a faithful companion and mother, yet we are consoled with the prospect of a speedy re-union, where death can never come. P. VANDYKE.

Conway, Livingston Co., Mich.

I Hope to be a Christian.

You do! Why then do you not seek to be a Christian? "Ask, and ye shall receive; seek and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you." "Ye shall seek me, and find me, when ye search for me with all your heart."

Are you seeking for God with all your heart? No man ever yet escaped from the thralldom of Satan who did not struggle to be free; no man ever entered the strait gate who did not agonize to accomplish that glorious end. Carelessness and inattention afford no foundation for a hope that you are to become a child of God.

You hope to be a Christian! Why then do you not give up your sins, renounce the world as your portion, and cheerfully surrender yourself to Him who is the way, the truth and the life? He is ready and willing to receive you. He gave his life a ransom for sinners; he freely gives his Spirit to all who earnestly ask him; he has filled his revealed word with invitations and encouragements to those who desire his grace; he has long been knocking at the door of your heart for admission. How then can you hope ever to be a Christian?

You hope to be a Christian! When? Not now. You are too busy, or have something in view which must first be accomplished, or are so indisposed to give yourself to the work, that this is not felt to be the "convenient season." After a while, when you have accumulated a fortune, or passed the period when you can partake in the world's pleasures, or when there is a revival of religion, or at furthest on a dying bed, you hope to be a Christian. But God's commands and promises are for the present. He gives no encouragement to wait for a future season. You have no assurance that there shall be any season beyond the present.

You hope to be a Christian! So multitudes of others like yourself, who are living in sin, have hoped, but where are they now? Long ago have they been cut down as cumberers of the ground. Their day of grace and day of life have closed. They lived without Christ, and they died without him; they trifled away their precious time on earth, in the delusive hope that some day or other they would be Christians. That day never came to them, and never will come. "The harvest is past, the summer is ended," and their souls are not saved.—*Presb.*

ONE DROP AT A TIME.—"Life," says the late John Foster, "is expenditure; we have it, but are as continually losing it; we have it, but are as continually wasting it. Suppose a man confined in some fortress, under the doom to stay there till death; and suppose there is there for his use a dark reservoir of water, to which it is certain none can ever be added. He may suppose the quantity is ever great; he cannot penetrate to know how much, but it may be very little. He has drawn from it, by means of a fountain a good while already, and draws from it every day. But how would he feel each time of drawing and each time of thinking of it? Not as if he had a perennial spring to go to. Not, I have a reservoir, I may be at ease. No! but I had water yesterday—I

have water to-day; but having had it, and my having it to-day, is the very cause that I shall not have it on some day that is approaching. And at the same time I am compelled to this fatal expenditure! So of our moral transient life! And yet men are very indisposed to admit the plain truth, that life is at thing which they are in no other way possessing than as necessarily consuming; one that even in this imperfect sense of possession, it becomes every day a less possession."

It is a happiness of many to have a portion of the world; but to have the world for our chief portion is a misery.

COMMUNICATIONS.

From Bro. Hamilton.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—I desire to say a few words to all who are striving to keep all the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. I doubt not that you all have felt with myself that this is a great point in our pilgrimage to attain unto; but as great as it is, John saw a company that had arrived at that point, and we find they alone are not required to drink of the wine of God's wrath, which we all profess to believe is soon to be poured out upon all who are found with the mark of the beast upon them, as shown by the Revelator.

Dear brethren and sisters, we can see the necessity as we near the great day of the Lord, that we examine ourselves that there may be no spot or wrinkle found on our garments; for if there is we shall not be prepared to stand with that holy company. Ever since I took God's word alone as my guide, and tried myself, my hope, my faith, by that, I have discovered many errors in both faith and practice and I have by the grace of God assisting me, laid one after another aside, and rejoiced in God that I had seen and gotten the victory over them. When I look back upon the path that I have traveled, although crooked, I can see it strewn with the old filthy rags of tradition and creeds of men, and my earnest desire and prayer to God is, that I may be stripped of every error that the truth alone may be my shield and buckler.

Dear brethren and sisters, this must be the case with us all before we can see eye to eye in the truth, before that memorable prayer of our Saviour can be fulfilled in us, that we can be one as he and the Father are one. Brethren and sisters, do you think this prayer will ever be fulfilled in us? If not, can we be the subjects of that prayer? O may we all strive for the unity of the Spirit, and for the bond of peace that we may have the evidence in our own hearts that we are those for whom Christ prayed; for we certainly have through the merciful direction of the Holy Spirit been led far in the advance of many, to say the least, in the knowledge of the glorious plan of salvation; and as we increase in the knowledge of the truth, should we not also in love and good works? for we are told that love is the fulfilling of the law. How natural, while God who made the law is love, that love alone can fulfill it. Well might Paul say, that all other good traits were good for nothing without love; and we can see that love is the foundation and the topstone of God's plan of salvation; therefore we cannot love God as we ought, without loving our neighbor as ourselves. By this we can see whether we are fulfilling the law. I fear that here I often fail, by not loving my neighbor as myself. My desire and prayer is that I wish you may be able to fulfill the law.

I have been much benefitted by reading the writings of my brethren on holiness of life. Speak often one to another, and so much the more as you see the day approaching.

Yours, looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ who gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people zealous of good works.

J. HAMILTON.

Dec. 4th, 1854.

From Bro. Eggleston.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—You have been sending me the *Review* some four or five months without any pay. Neither have you heard anything from me, before this, as to whether I was being benefited by the reading of it or not. Here let me say to you, that the *Review* is received by me each week with a glad heart. I have been greatly benefited and instructed by it; and for ten times its yearly cost, I would not be deprived of its instructions. Some of its leading doctrines were entirely new to me; but now I am full in the faith of all of them. Last March or April was the first that I learned anything definite with regard to the Sabbath-keeping Adventists.

About that time I was furnished with a few numbers of the *Review*, and some tracts: the "Signs of the Times," the "Sanctuary" and some Sabbath tracts, all of which I read with much interest. And compared their teachings with the word of God, and was fully convinced that they contained truths brought out to prepare a people to be in readiness for the coming of their Lord. And from the commencement of my investigation, light has been coming in on every side: the Bible is to me a new book. I have perused its sacred pages with ten fold more interest than ever before in my life. I can now behold in its teachings a beauty and harmony that I never before discovered; and my mind is now prepared to understand many things that I did not understand before. I had no idea that the day of the Lord's coming was so near. I understood nothing with regard to the heavenly Sanctuary, and nothing definite with regard to the fulfillment of the prophecies. But thanks be to God, that I live in these last days, and had my eyes opened to see the bible in its true light.

Eight months ago I believed that I had an immortal soul, destined to live through a boundless eternity, in bliss or woe. I did not understand that the penalty for Adamic transgression was the reducing of the whole man to the dust, and that the penalty for personal sins was a death that meant cessation of existence. But now all is plain. And I rejoice that whereas I was blind, I can now see. I am striving day by day to overcome all besetments, and to lay aside every weight, and the sin that doth so easily beset me, and to run with patience the christian race. Myself and companion have been endeavoring to keep the Sabbath of the Lord since the middle of June, and now as the week rolls round and Sabbath returns, we feel that it is a day of sacred rest, and we find sweet consolation in keeping it beneath our own roof. Although we labor under many disadvantages, surrounded as we are by a Sabbath-breaking community, and deprived also of the privilege of meeting on the Sabbath with the brethren of like precious faith, yet we feel that it is good for us to obey God, by keeping all of his commandments, and having the faith of Jesus.

The reason that I have not sent the pay for the *Review* before this, is because that I have been so poor that I could not well get the \$1 to spare to send, but I now send you \$1.50 to pay for some of Bro. Stephenson's work on the Atonement. The other \$1.50 I procured from a friend of mine to pay for the *Review*, and \$0.50 worth of the Signs of Times which he wishes to distribute among his friends. He has been investigating four or five weeks, and is convinced that the second Adventists have the truth. He is sixty years old, has been a methodist many years; but has but just begun to understand the Bible in its true light.

As often as I can I shall send you my mite to help carry forward the cause of Christ.

Yours in hope of immortality at the appearing of the Saviour.

LEONARD EGGLESTON.

Dec. 2d, 1854.

From Sister Gray.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—I have been striving though in much weakness to keep all the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus for nearly three years, and your excellent paper has come as a very welcome messenger laden with rich treasures. How often have the tears flowed when I have read over the letters from the dear brethren and sisters and heard what the Saviour is doing for his people. My heart is with you, and O that I was altogether what I should be: filled with all the graces of the Spirit.

I have not seen any of the brethren for near twelve months. I often feel lonely, and contemplate the joys of the righteous. O what a mighty shout of victory will there be, when Christ is crowned upon his throne! I often ask myself, Shall I be there! With joy I read of the cause, and how God does stand by his people, and the prosperity of Zion, and of the work in Plattsburg, my native place, and in Champlain, where I have often been blest. O brethren, let us strive to get the victory over every sin. I am often astonished to see those professing godliness that cannot discern the signs of the times and see the claims of the holy Sabbath which are so plainly taught in God's holy word.

Your unworthy sister, striving to overcome.

ELIZABETH CRAY.

Nov. 5th, 1854.

From Sister Richmond.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—I feel a deep and increasing interest in the cause of God and his truth, and an ardent desire to be wholly consecrated to him and to come up to the high standard of true happiness without which I shall not be able to stand in the trying time that is before us. The conflict is coming. God's

people must go through the furnace. The dross must be consumed in order to be fitted for the Paradise of God; and I often feel to exclaim. Who will be able to stand. God will have a holy people. The wheat he will gather into the garner, but the chaff he will consume. Those that are not willing to deny self but choose to cling to their errors will be shaken out from among God's people and consumed with the wicked. Solemn indeed is the time in which we live

Yours striving for holiness of heart,

LOIS J. RICHMOND.

Nov. 25th, 1854.

From Bro. Treat.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—I am determined by the grace of God to hold on to the present truth until I can find something better from God's holy word. While others teach the law of God nailed to the cross and done away, I must believe that the "law of the Lord is perfect converting the soul;" and while others contend that all days are alike, I must remember the Sabbath day, and try by the grace of God to keep it holy; and while others say that the law of God is still binding, and that the world is actually keeping the seventh-day Sabbath, I must dissent from it; for it looks like a device of Satan without the least foundation from the Bible to sustain it; and yet I believe that this delusion has done more in the state of Maine to lull the advent people into carnal security in regard to the Sabbath than everything else that has been devised. I praise the Lord that he has kept me from running after the delusions of this bewildered world, it is all of God, glory be to his heavenly name forever and ever. I have moved into a wicked place, and have none of like precious faith but my companion to unite with me on the Sabbath; and therefore I feel the need of the prayers of God's saints that I may be kept in the midst of the delusions of the world, and the temptations of the adversary.

I met with the brethren at Brewer last week, Bro. Barr was there: we had a good time, I think there is an increasing interest in that place and has been for some time past.

Yours in the blessed hope of immortality through Christ.

S. TREAT

Dec. 3d, 1854.

FOREIGN NEWS.

When after the long delays of Gallipoli and Varna, it was at last decided that the allies were to go to the Crimea, while Austria maneuvered into the Principalities, there were only two men in England who in the strongest terms denounced the intended expedition. Kossuth, in Glasgow, said to his audience that if the English went to the Crimea, they would be beaten, as their force was insufficient, and their cavalry would be destroyed by the Cossacks, since the Austrian occupation of the Principalities would enable the Czar to concentrate his forces around Sevastopol. Urquhart, in still stronger terms, said: "Not one of the soldiers who are going to the Crimea is ever to return." Both these statements were received with the credulous self-reliance of the English, who really believed that they were invincible.

Even after the Eastern hoax of the capture of Sevastopol had exploded, it was still boldly asserted that the fortress of Sevastopol would soon have to yield; but the tidings became, little by little, gloomier, and now it cannot be longer denied that the allies are in a rather critical position.

If the contest goes on at its present rate, the forces now in the Crimea will be destroyed somewhere about New Year's day, and the allies will have the doubtful satisfaction of knowing that the Russians have lost twice as many, but are at last masters of the field.

SEIGE OF SEVASTOPOL—INCIDENTS. November 3d.—It was expected in the French camp that an assault would be made on the 5th inst., and probably would have been, had not the Russians attacked the allied positions. Eight thousand French-men offered themselves as volunteers, but only 4,000, under Prince Napoleon, were selected. The first attack was to be on the Cemetery.

Apparently the assault was prevented by Menchikoff's attacking the camp on the 5th.

November.—The firing was slack on both sides. Preparations were being made for the assault, and scaling-ladders had been ordered up. Four Russian ships in the harbor had been sunk by the allies' fire. One of these ships was the "Twelve Apostles." Typhus had broken out in the city, from the number of unburied dead. Conflagrations are continually occurring from red-hot shot. Water is exceedingly scarce. The Russians are preparing for street-to-street fighting. They are posting cannon to sweep the streets, and fortifying houses.

HORRIBLE OCCURRENCE.—An occurrence of the most horrible nature has taken place. The great Hospital, in Sevastopol, was set on fire by the shells of the allies, and was burned to the ground, with all its inmates—two thousand sick and wounded.

In the battle of the 5th, the English had 2,000 killed and wounded. The loss of the French is not accurately known. The Russian loss is between 7,000 and 8,000.

The attack on the 5th was made by 40,000 of the enemy. The redoubts were taken and retaken. The French lost 1,500 killed and wounded.

The Russians had left the heights of Balaklava, and were expecting re-enforcements.

The typhus fever is raging at Sevastopol.

The allies are continually re-enforced.

The steam frigates have arrived at Batoum to convey 4,000 troops to the Crimea.

Letters from Constantinople of the 6th, state that 5,000

French troops had sailed from the latter place for the Crimea with a favorable wind.

THE REVIEW AND HERALD.

ROCHESTER, THIRD-DAY, DEC. 12 1854.

WE cheerfully insert the following notice of the *Bible Examiner*. This sheet, devoted to the Immortality question, presents an able and thorough discussion of the subject. We highly appreciate Bro. Storrs' able defense of the great truth of Endless life through Jesus Christ alone.

"THE BIBLE EXAMINER"

Is a Semi-monthly Periodical, of 16 pages, royal octavo, devoted mainly to the topic of

"NO IMMORTALITY NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE;"

or, that man is not constitutionally immortal; hence apart from Christ, he will cease to be. There is no endless sin or suffering. GEORGE STORRS, New York, Editor and Proprietor. Published at 140 Fulton Street, at \$1 for the year, commencing in January. No subscription for a less time. Payment always in advance.

THE EXAMINER has been published for nine years past; and the theme on which it treats is increasing in interest. The tenth volume commences with a semi-monthly issue, January 1st, 1855.

THE EXAMINER for 1854 contains a Discussion of the question—"Does the Bible teach that the Creature Man—which the Lord God formed of the dust of the ground—has a super-added entity called the soul?" PROF. H. MATTHEWS, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, affirms, and the Editor denies. The bound volume for that year can be had for \$1: in sheets 75 cents.

Various books and pamphlets are for sale by Mr Storrs on the same subject, among which are, the "Bible vs. Tradition;" 75 cts: "Dobney Abridged, or Part Second" of "Dobney on Future Punishment;" 25 cts: "Unity of Man," being a "Reply to Luther Lee, by Anthropos;" 15 cts.

"SIX SERMONS on the inquiry, Is there Immortality in Sin and Suffering?" By George Storrs. To which is prefixed a Biographical Sketch of the Author, and a Portrait. Also, added, a Sermon entitled—"Christ our Life Giver; or the Faith of the Gospel,"—the whole making a neat 12mo. volume of 168 pages. Price, well bound, 63 cents. In full gilt, binding, \$1. These sermons are on the basis of the "Six Sermons," first preached in 1842—about one hundred thousand of which have been circulated—but now thoroughly revised and much enlarged, and in a large, clear type. Address, in all cases, "Geo. Storrs, Bible Examiner Office, New York."

The late storm prevented Bro. Loughborough from filling his appointment at Oswego. He intends to be there next Sabbath, and at Lorain the week following.

Bro. Stephenson's work on the Atonement is completed—Price 15 cts—postage 2 cts. We can send 6 copies and pay the postage for \$1.

Bro Hall's work on Immortality will probably be ready in one week.

The first Volume of our Tracts, (embracing those on the Sabbath and Law of God,) will be ready for delivery in about one week. The second Volume we hope to complete by the first of February.—Price 50 cts for each Vol.

AGENTS.

MAINE.		NEW YORK.	
N. N. Lunt,	Portland.	J. Byington,	Buck's Bridge.
S. W. Flanders,	Canaan.	A. Ross,	Caughdenoy.
Cyprian Stevens,	Paris.	David Upson,	Mordland.
S. Howland,	Topsham.	R. F. Cottrell,	Mill Grove.
W. T. Hanniford,	Orrington.	John Wager,	Orangeport.
Wm. Bryant,	Wilton.	L. Carpenter,	Oswego.
NEW HAMPSHIRE.		A. H. Robinson,	Sandy Creek.
J. Stowell,	Washington.	E. A. Poole,	Lincolna.
S. Bunnet,	Claremont.	J. A. Loughhead,	Elmira.
MASSACHUSETTS.		John Hamilton,	Fredonia.
O. Nichols,	Dorchester.	PENNSYLVANIA.	
O. Davis,	N. Fairhaven.	M. L. Dean,	Ulysses.
Wm. Saxby,	Springfield.	J. H. Heggie,	Alleghany.
VERMONT.		MICHIGAN.	
R. Loveland,	Johnson.	Albert Avery,	Locke.
H. Bingham,	Morrisstown.	Ira Gardner,	Vergennes.
S. H. Peck,	Wolcott.	David Hewitt,	Battle Creek.
Lewis Bean,	Hardwick.	C. S. Glover,	Sylvan.
Edwin Churchill,	Stoue.	A. B. Pearsall,	Grand Rapids.
E. P. Butler,	Waterbury.	A. A. Dodge,	Jackson.
Josiah Hart,	Northfield.	Wm. M. Smith,	
R. G. Lockwood,	Waitsfield.	A. C. Morton,	Delhi.
Jesse Barrows,	Irassburg.	OHIO.	
Alonzo Lee,	Derby Line.	J. B. Sweet,	Milan.
E. Everts,	Vergennes.	WISCONSIN.	
H. Gardner,	Panton.	E. S. Sheffield,	Koskonong.
S. Willey,	Wheelock.	T. R. Sheldon,	Rosendale.
CONNECTICUT.		CANADA EAST.	
ELI Chamberlain	Md'town.	B. Hills,	Melbourne.
A. Belden,	Kensington.		

Letters.

J. C. Day, J. A. Feeler, D. P. Hall, L. Carpenter, R. F. Cottrell, S. Treat.

Receipts.

W. Phelps, J. Stewart, M. Southwick, G. Stults, A. D. Love, N. Ward, L. Eggleston, E. Cooley, E. Cray, Sr. Bryant, L. Ferry, S. Ferry, L. J. Richmond, O. Davis, each \$1. A. P. H. Kelsey, M. E. Kellogg, S. Chase, each \$2. H. Bingham \$3. A friend in Green Vale, Ill. \$7.—\$80.73 behind on the Review.