

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. VII.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., THIRD-DAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1855.

No. 6.

THE REVIEW AND HERALD

IS PUBLISHED

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

TERMS.—One Dollar for a Volume of
26 Numbers.

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

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

With 4000 paying subscribers we can publish the Review at 50 cts. a Volume.

IS THE SOUL IMMORTAL?

An Examination of the Scripture Testimony Concerning Man's Present Condition and his Future Reward or Punishment.

BY J. N. LOUGHBOROUGH.

[Continued.]

This leads us to the investigation of the necessary inquiry,

IS GOD A PERSON?

Whatever may be the truth in this matter, it certainly cannot be wrong for us to examine what the Word says respecting it. Many there are that would refrain from the investigation of unpopular truths because the cry of heresy is raised against them. We shall not consider ourselves subjects of the appellation, neither are we prying into the secrets of the Almighty, as we pursue the investigation of this matter. The Bible certainly contains testimony upon this point, and we again repeat, "Things which are revealed belong to us." We inquire then, What saith the Scripture?

The very testimony we have been examining in regard to man's being formed of the dust in the image of God, proves conclusively that God has a form, although the sentiment is contrary to what we have been taught, while children, from the catechism:

"Question. What is God?

"Answer. An infinite and eternal spirit; one that always was and always will be.

"Q. Where is God?

"A. Everywhere."

But we inquire, Is not God in one place more than another? Oh no, say you: the Bible says he is a spirit, and if so he must be everywhere alike. Well, if when man dies his spirit goes to God, it must go everywhere. But the Bible certainly represents God as located in heaven. "For he hath looked down from the height of his sanctuary: from heaven did the Lord behold the earth." Ps. cii. 19. Then certainly heaven cannot be everywhere, for God is represented as looking down from it. "Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven." 2 Kings ii. 11. But, says one, does not the Bible represent God as everywhere present? Ps. cxxxix. 8, 9, 10. "If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there: if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there; if I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there shalt thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me."

We reply, the subject is introduced in verse 7, as follows: "Whither shall I go from thy Spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence?" The Spirit is God's representative. His power is manifested wherever he listeth, through the agency of his Spirit. Christ, when giving the commission

to the disciples, says, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature, and lo! I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Now, no one would contend that Christ had been on the earth personally ever since the disciples commenced to fulfill this commission. But his Spirit has been on the earth; the Comforter that he promised to send. So in the same manner God manifests himself by his Spirit which is also the power through which he works. "But if the Spirit of him that raised up Christ from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you." Rom. viii. 11. Here is a plain distinction made between the Spirit, and God that raises the dead by that Spirit. If the living God is a Spirit in the strictest sense of the term, and at the same time is in possession of a Spirit, then we have at once the novel idea of the Spirit of a Spirit, something it will take at least a Spiritualist to explain.

There is at least one impassable difficulty in the way of those who believe God is immaterial, and heaven is not a literal, located place: they are obliged to admit that Jesus is there bodily, a literal person; the same Jesus that was crucified, dead, and buried, was raised from the dead, ascended up to heaven, and is now at the right hand of God. Jesus was possessed of flesh and bones after his resurrection. Luke xxiv. 39. "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I, myself; handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have." If Jesus is there in heaven with a literal body of flesh and bones, may not heaven after all be a literal place, a habitation for a literal God, a literal Saviour, literal angels, and resurrected immortal saints? Oh no, says one, "God is a Spirit." So Christ said to the woman of Samaria at the well. It does not necessarily follow because God is a Spirit, that he has no body. In John iii. 6, Christ says to Nicodemus, "That which is born of the Spirit is spirit." If that which is born of the Spirit is spirit, then on the same principle, that which has a spiritual nature is spirit. God is a spirit being, his nature is spirit, he is not of a mortal nature; but this does not exclude the idea of his having a body. David says, [Ps. cxiv. 4,] "Who maketh his angels spirits;" yet angels have bodies. Angels appeared to both Abraham and Lot, and ate with them. We see the idea that angels are spirits, does not prove that they are not literal beings.

It is inferred because the Bible says that God is a Spirit, that he is not a person. An inference should not be made the basis for an argument. Great Scripture truths are plainly stated, and it will not do for us to found a doctrine on inferences, contrary to positive statements in the word of God. If the Scripture states in positive terms that God is a person, it will not answer for us to draw an inference from the text which says "God is a Spirit," that he has no body.

We will now present a few texts which prove that God is a person. Ex. xxxiii. 18, 23. "And he (Moses) said, I beseech thee shew me thy glory." Verse 20. "And he said, Thou canst not see my face, for there shall no man see me and live." Verses 21-23. "And the Lord said, Behold there is a place by me, and thou shalt stand upon a rock: and it shall come to pass while my glory passeth by, that I will put thee in a cleft of the rock; and will cover thee with my hand while I pass by; and I will take away mine hand, and thou shalt see my back parts; but my face shall not be seen." If God is an immaterial Spirit, then Moses could not see him; for we are told a spirit cannot be seen by

natural eyes. There would then be no propriety for God to say he would put his hand over Moses' face while he passed by, (seemingly to prevent him from seeing his face,) for he could not see him. Neither do we conceive how an immaterial hand could obstruct the rays of light from passing to Moses' eyes. But if the position be true that God is immaterial, and cannot be seen by the natural eye, the text above is all superfluous. What sense is there in saying God put his hand over Moses' face, to prevent him from seeing that which could not be seen.

Says one, I see we cannot harmonize the matter any other way, than that there was a literal body seen by Moses; but that was not God's own body, it was a body he took that he might show himself to Moses. Moses could form no just conceptions of God unless he assumed a form. So God took a body. This throws a worse coloring on the matter than the first position; for it charges God with deception; telling Moses he should see him, when in fact Moses according to this testimony did not see God, but another body. A person must be given to doubt almost beyond recovery, that would attempt thus to mystify, and do away the force of this testimony.

Ex. xxiv. 9. "Then went up Moses and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel: and they saw the God of Israel: and there was under his feet as it were a paved work of a sapphire stone, and as it were the body of heaven in its clearness." They were permitted to see his feet, but no man can see his face and live. No mortal eye can bear the dazzling brightness of that glory of the face of God. It far exceeds the light of the sun. For the prophet says, "The light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun, and the light of the sun shall be seven fold, as the light of seven days, in the day that the Lord bindeth up the breach of his people, and healeth the stroke of their wound." Isa. xxx. 26. Notwithstanding this seven-fold light that is then to shine, the prophet speaking of the scene says, "Then the moon shall be confounded, and the sun ashamed, when the Lord of hosts shall reign in mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously." Isa. xxiv. 23. The testimony of John is, [Rev. xxi. 23,] "And the city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it: for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof."

Infidels claim that there is a contradiction in the testimony of Moses, because he said, he talked with God face to face. We reply, there was a cloud between them, but God told Moses, "No man shall see me and live." The Testimony of the New Testament is in harmony with that of the Old upon this subject. "Follow peace with all men, and holiness without which no man shall see the Lord." Heb. xii. 14. Who with mortal eyes could behold a light that far outshines seven fold the brightness of the sun? Surely none but the holy can behold him, none but immortal eyes could bear that radiant glory. Although the Word says we cannot see God now and live, the promise is, that the pure in heart shall see him. Matt. v. 8. "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." Rev. xxii. 4. "And they shall see his face, and his name shall be in their foreheads."

Paul, [Col. i. 15,] speaking of Christ, says, "Who is the image of the invisible God, the first born of every creature." Here Christ is said to be "the image of the invisible God." We have already shown, that Christ has a body composed of substance, flesh and bones; and he is said to be, "the image of the invisible God." Well, says one, we admit his divine nature is in the image of God. If

by his divine nature you mean the part that existed in glory with the Father before the world was, we reply, that which was in the beginning with God, (the Word,) was made flesh, not came into flesh, or as some state, clothed upon with a human nature, but *made flesh*. But says another, God is said to be *invisible*. Because he is invisible now, it does not prove that he never will be seen. The Word says, "The pure in heart *shall see*" him. Willing faith says, Amen.

Paul's testimony in Phil. ii, 5, 6, shows plainly what may be understood by the statement, that Christ is the image of God. "Let this mind be in you which was in Christ Jesus: who being in the *form of God*, thought it not robbery to be equal with God." How can Christ be said to be in the form of God, if God has no form? Rom. viii, 3. "God sending his own Son in the *likeness of sinful flesh*." Christ is in the form of God, and in the form of men. This at once reveals to us the form of God.

Daniel speaking of God, calls him the Ancient of days. Dan. vii, 9. "And the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his *head* like the pure wool." This personage is said to have a head, and hair; this certainly could not be said of him if he was immaterial and had no form. But Paul's testimony in Heb. i, 3, ought to settle every candid mind in regard to the personality of God. Speaking of Christ, he says, "Who being the brightness of his glory, and the *express image of his (the Father's) person*." Here then it is plainly stated God has a person. Christ is the express image of it. Then we can understand Christ where he says, "He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father." John xiv, 19. He could not have meant, that he was his own father; for when he prayed he addressed his Father as another person who had sent him into the world. He styled himself the Son of God. Then he could not be the Father of which he was the son. When he says, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father," he must mean, that as he was the express image of the Father's person, those who saw him saw the likeness of the Father in him.

But we will now return to the subject of *The creation of man*. We have seen already that man's being made in the image of God, could not refer to a moral image, for it would involve the absurdity that the lifeless clay of which man was formed, had a character like God. We now see the Scriptures clearly teach, that God is a person with a body and form. Then Gen. i, 26, may be understood to teach the fact, that man was made in the form of God. Other scriptures agree with this testimony. See Gen. ix, 6. "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he man." This testimony cannot apply to a spirit, or immaterial part of man: that which is in the image of God has blood. I Cor. xi, 7. "For a man indeed ought not to cover his head, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God." James [Chap. iii, 9] speaking of the tongue says, "Therewith bless we God, even the Father; and therewith curse we men, which are made after the similitude (likeness, resemblance—Webster) of God." The foregoing testimony settles the point, that the image of God does not refer to character but to form.

Gen. ii, 7. "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." Grave Doctors of Divinity (as they are called) assert that what God breathed into man was a part of himself. This, say they, is what became a living soul. It must be immortal; for God cannot die, neither will he destroy a part of himself. But the text says, "Man became a living soul." Man was made of dust; then the dust became a living soul after being inspired with the breath of life. If it is a fact, that because God breathed into man the breath of life, that breath is immortal, then beasts must have immortal souls. Moses, in giving the account of the flood, [Gen. vii, 21, 22.] says, "And all flesh died that moved upon the earth, both of fowls, and of cattle, and of beasts and of every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, and every man.

All in whose nostrils was the *breath of life*, of all that was in the dry land, died."

If we must admit, because the breath of life came from God, it must be a part of himself, and hence immortal, we get ourselves into a grand difficulty. Sinners, you say, are to be punished with eternal misery, because God cannot destroy a part of himself; but your theory makes out that God is going to torment a part of himself to all eternity. If the above sentiment were true, we might perhaps find in it, a solution for the difficulty of the Predestinarian, who states, that God decreed from all eternity that some men should be lost, and they cannot alter their fate, but they are to be tormented eternally for being sinners, something they could not avoid. But if God has placed a part of himself in man, and finally punishes that soul, (a part of himself,) to all eternity, it may be after all, that the *guilty one* would be punished.

But here is the truth plainly stated: "Man became a *living soul*." The same original term which is rendered living soul in this text, is, in other portions of Scripture applied to beasts, and sometimes rendered *living creature*, and sometimes *living soul*. "Moses uses *nephesh, chay, chayiah, and chayim* to express animal life and creature; and these words are generally translated *soul, life, living, lives, and creature*. Gen. i, 24 reads, 'Let the earth bring forth the (*nephesh chayiah*) living creature after his kind, cattle, and creeping things, and beast of the earth after his kind.' In Gen. xi, 19, Moses states that these living souls are brought before Adam, and whatsoever he named *every living soul, (nephesh chayiah,)* that was the name of it." Adam Clarke, commenting upon verse 24, acknowledges that (*nephesh chayiah*) *living soul*, is "a general term to express all creatures endued with animal life." *Bible vs. Tradition*.

We notice this point thus definitely, from the fact that this is the first and primary signification of the term *soul*, and here it applies to the whole person. It is stated in Rev. xvi, 3, when the second vial is poured out, "And *every living soul* died in the sea." Here the same expression is used, doubtless applying to fish. We see then, if the term *living soul* when applied to man proves him to be immortal; it can prove no less when applied to beasts. But no one contends the application of this term to beasts proves them to be immortal, neither does it prove man to be immortal when applied to him.

"God planted a garden eastward in Eden." That garden he beautified with flowers of every tint, every thing which was pleasant to the sight was there, spontaneously blooming. Every thing which was good for food the earth did bear. The trees, beautiful flowers, and tall grass waved in the soft pressure of the spicy breeze. The gentle stream murmured slowly along, as its silver surface glistened in the rays of the noon-day sun. The beautiful birds warbled forth their merry songs from every bower. There all was peace, love, joy, and harmony. No evil beasts were there, but the delight of all was to see their fellows happy. There God placed that happy pair. No sorrow e'er had filled their breasts, they knew no pain, and in childlike innocence they walk forth to view their first abode. Their cup of joy was full, and as they beheld the God who thus had wrought for them, they struck a note of praise in honor of his blessed name. Fair angels looked upon the work of God; he had finished it and pronounced it very good. "The morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy."

When Adam was thus placed in the garden, God said to him, "Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." We have already stated that we would show that Adam was left to form his own character. By this we do not set aside the testimony of the word, that God made man upright. It must be apparent to the mind of all, with a few moments' consideration, that no character can be developed without a law. We should have no conception of wrong, unless we knew how matters ought to be, to be right. Then in the formation of character, there must be some test, some *rule* by which we are to walk. One great command, at least, God laid down for Adam

to obey. If he refrained from eating the fruit of a certain tree, he should live; if he partook of it, and thus transgressed God's commandments, he should die. Here was a test of character: the point was to be settled by Adam whether he would obey, or disobey.

Adam was on probation. It seems to be the will of God, instead of unalterably fixing the destiny of all men, to leave them to choose for themselves, at the same time holding out inducements to obedience before them. We inquire, What was Adam on probation for? Certainly not for life; for he was a *living soul*: not for happiness; for bliss surrounded him on every side: not for possession of the garden; for God had given him that, as also dominion over all the earth. There is but one thing he could have been on probation for; and that is, to decide whether he should eternally enjoy that state of bliss. He was on probation for *eternal life*. If he was on probation for eternal life, then he could not have been immortal. If he had been immortal he could not have died. And on the other hand, had he been mortal, his case was already decided for death. We conclude he occupied a position between them both, and was left to attain to either. He was incorrupt, and had he refrained from partaking of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, he never would have seen corruption.

Adam was not left in darkness as to what the consequence would be if he partook of the forbidden tree. The penalty consequent on the transgression of that command, God himself expresses in the following words: "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." But says the objector, God could not have meant to tell Adam that he should literally die in the day he partook of the forbidden fruit; for he did not die in that day: he lived 930 years, and then died. The Lord must have meant to tell him that he would die a spiritual death. By spiritual death, we suppose you mean "dead in trespasses and sins." A person *dead* in sins, must be one that is lost to all sense of the obligation he is under to obey God. We claim that this could not have been held out before Adam as a penalty: it was a natural consequence. If a man commits sin, and continues in those sins, he is spiritually dead. What should we think if the legislators of this Union, or any of its States, should pass a law stating that if a man committed murder, he should lose all sense of his obligation to keep that law, and that should be the penalty of his transgression.

Again, if the death threatened was spiritual, we find ourselves involved in a difficulty. Says Paul, [1 Cor. xv,] "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." If the death they died in Adam was a spiritual death, then being made alive in Christ from that death must be to be made holy. This also would be the first resurrection, as it brings men to life from the first death. This would make out that all men would finally be holy; for in Christ shall all be made alive. Rev. xx, 6. "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such, the second death hath no power." Then they that were once made holy would remain everlastingly holy; but the Word says, "Take heed lest ye fall." But we inquire, did God say, "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die?" The *marginal reading* of the text says, (Heb.,) "Dying thou shalt die." In the day he partook of that fruit he would be a subject of death, become corrupted and a prey to disease.

The divine command had gone forth. The penalty of disobedience had been stated, and Adam was left to choose life, or death. The serpent it is said "was more subtle than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made: and he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden? And the woman said unto the serpent, we may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden: but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die. And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die: for God doth know, that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened: and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." The testimony of the serpent prevailed, the woman partook of the fruit, gave to her husband, and jointly they

broke God's command. The *serpent* said, Ye shall not *surely* die. As the serpent was the most subtle beast, he was the agent used by Satan in the deception of that happy pair. Since man has yielded to Satan, he has an agent he can use better for the work of deception; he now uses man. This was the first great deceptive work performed by Satan. The card he then turned was, "*Thou shalt not surely die.*" In that game he won the world. He has not yet forgotten it; and although men are familiar with the history of those scenes, yet still they permit themselves to be deceived, while Satan, in various ways, whispers into their ears, "*Ye shall not surely die.*" We fear the sentiment taught at the present time, that all men have immortal souls, and therefore cannot die, (although its present advocates may honestly consider it to be truth,) came from the same source of deception.

After man had partaken of the fruit of the forbidden tree, and thus broke God's commandment, the Lord proceeded to pass sentence on the several ones engaged in this transgression. He explained to man what his punishment was to be. Gen. iii, 19. "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken; for dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return." There could certainly be no doubt in the mind of Adam, as to what God meant by saying, "dying thou shalt die." The Lord had explained it to him. He does not tell Adam that his immortal soul shall go to heaven or to torments, but simply he should die; cease to live; return to dust. After this curse was pronounced upon man, the Lord said, "Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever: therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden." God also cursed the ground for man's sake, and sent him forth to till it, but said, Thorns and thistles shall it bring forth unto thee. (It is said by some, that God wills the eternal misery of the wicked, but here it is stated, God drove man from the garden, lest he should eat of the tree of life and live for ever.)

Sorrow then filled the hearts of that hitherto happy pair. Their state of bliss was now changed for a life of toil and perplexity to end in death. Satan triumphed that he had molested the work of God and caused man to sin. The awful scene of misery, and wretchedness, that has followed as a consequent upon Adam's transgression cannot be described. Beauty has vanished, love is debased, sorrow, sin and death are in the world's cup; the last remains of Paradisean matter are swept away by the curse.

While God pronounces the penalty upon Adam, he leaves him room to hope. "The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head." In this, as all commentators claim, we have the promise of the Saviour, who was to be manifest "that he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil." "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." Adam still had room for hope, and although he had thrust himself away from the tree of life by transgression, and must die, faith in Christ would bring him up again. He should not perish everlastingly, as would have been the case had not God provided a ransom for him. But we pass this matter of reconciliation through Christ for the present, as it will be noticed in its place.

In the examination we have made of the creation of man, his fall, &c., we see no record of immortality or of any spirit being given to him that can possess consciousness separate from the body. We think that the testimony from Solomon, [Eccl. xii, 7,] may now be understood. "Than shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit to God who gave it." We find no record, that God gave any spirit to man except the breath of life, which in Gen. vii, 22, in the margin, is called the "breath of the spirit of life." The same original term that is rendered *spirit* in Eccl. xii, 7, (*ruah, breath, spirit, &c.*) is used in Gen. ii, 7. Then Ecclesiastes xii, 7, states merely the disorganization of man: dust returns to dust, and the breath to God who gave it. Says Job, xii, 10, "In whose hand is the soul of every living thing, and the breath of all mankind."

Says the objector, your testimony from Scripture seems to show that Adam was not created immortal, yet I believe we are immortal. We inquire, from what source do we derive our immortality? It must be either inherent, derived from Adam, or else it comes to us directly from God. We reply, we did not get it from Adam; for he did not have it himself. If he had immortality, and imparted it to us, his posterity, then the soul cannot be immaterial as claimed by the advocates of natural immortality. Immaterial is the opposite of material. *Material* is something; (*matter*;) has length, breadth and thickness; and one of its properties is said by Philosophers to be *Divisibility*. *Immaterial*, is the opposite, not material, not matter; then it does not possess those properties. Matter is capable of subdivisions; for *divisibility* is one of its properties. But immateriality being the opposite, is subject to no such divisions. Then if the soul of Adam was immaterial, it was not susceptible of subdivisions so as to give immortality to his posterity. Then if man has an immortal soul or spirit, it must come direct from the hand of the Creator at the birth of each individual. This position would be monstrous; for they tell us the soul is the life of the person, and unless this soul was imparted there would be no life. Thus we see that God is charged with giving souls to every being that lives, no matter how miserable their birth. And again, they tell us the soul is the mind: then some of these souls must be very limited in intellect when formed, as appears by the idiotic portion of the community.

One great reason urged that man is in possession of some principle of a higher nature than matter, is that man thinks; and with all candor we are told that matter cannot think; has not the power of self-motion, and would eternally remain inactive, were it not for the immortal power of volition which man possesses. We inquire. Do beasts possess an immortal will? They certainly have the power to will and move their bodies about. Philosophers have only given us the properties of unorganized matter; but every one must admit, that by combination of matter, results are produced, and properties made manifest, which did not exist in the original matter unorganized. Organized in a certain form, matter is made to produce music, and yet music is not a property of matter, but is the result of a peculiar organization of matter. But says one, "The music is not in the material instrument, but in the mind." But the mind does not produce the sound: sound is produced as the result of the organization of the materials of the instrument, the air being the medium through which it is conveyed to the nice organism of the ear, and there the mind takes cognizance of those sounds.

But says the objector, Man reasons, is capable of choosing and refusing. We reply, The same may be said of beasts: they choose. But, say you, this manifestation of knowledge in them is instinct. Is instinct a property of matter? Instinct as it is termed, if traced through the family of the brute creation, would be found to exist in a variety of forms, and so nearly allied in some, to the operations of the human mind, that some men would doubtless call it reason. But few, however, would contend that beasts possess immortal souls. Then *instinct* as it is termed, is the result of organization, and yet in some animals is pronounced *reason*. Then we inquire, if beasts are in possession of intellect without immortal souls, why may not man with an organization more refined, and a greater number of reasoning faculties, be in possession of reason, and intellect of a higher tone, and yet not be immortal? We do not wish to be charged with the position, that we claim mind is material; for we do not. We believe, however, that thought is an effect produced by material organization. For this we will assign our reasons briefly. 1st. The mind is developed in proportion to the volume of brain, and temperament of the body. The brain of an ordinary man is about one twentieth part the size of the body, while that of the horse is only one two-hundredth part.

If the mind was immortal, and not the result of the action of the body, why should earnest study cause weariness of body? If the contrary were the case, that the mind exists independent of the body, and that the body was as a clog to the powers of

that spirit, as has been claimed, then we should expect the nearer death we came, the brighter the intellect would be; but we find it the reverse. A sound mind in a sound body expresses the truth of this matter.

There is one fact that cannot be explained in harmony with the theory, that the mind is not dependent upon matter for its existence. When the skull of man becomes fractured, and depressed upon the brain, the sufferer is immediately unconscious, and yet the breath of life is in him. Many curious circumstances might be related, illustrative of this point, of individuals who remained unconscious for days, and after being restored to their senses again, were not conscious that any time had elapsed. We refer the reader to *Mental Philosophy* for testimonies upon this subject. What folly to talk of the mind of man being immortal, and independent in its existence, if disease of the body can affect it. What a sentiment to teach, that a man is conscious after death, when the facts are, injury of the brain makes a man unconscious while living.

[To be Continued.]

"Who went About doing Good."

This was said of Jesus. How descriptive of his life. What a beautiful exhibition of character. *Doing good*: thus his efforts were directed, thus his energies spent. Wherever he went blessings were borne; the sad were comforted, and the weary found rest.

Some men are content with *wishing good*—they have many brave thoughts respecting it, but their thoughts never ripen into deeds—they shrink from toil and sacrifice. Their words may be those of kindness, but their acts are wanting in love. The Lord Jesus did. His whole life was but an expansion of the principle of benevolence, large, warm-hearted benevolence. He went about doing good. He did not wait for the needy and suffering to be brought to him; he sought them out—put himself in their way.

And who can measure the good he wrought, while on earth? How many homes did he gladden. How many crushed and wounded spirits did he lift and heal. How was he ever seeking and saving the wandering and the lost. And he did good to men in their higher interests. He labored for their spiritual welfare. This brought him from heaven—this was the great thought of his life. How unlike Alexander, who led his armies from province to province, regardless of human happiness, intent only on self-aggrandizement; how unlike all those great men whom worldlings love to honor, and around whom multitudes slavishly fawn and smile.

Christ did good, not evil; he committed no blunders—was guilty of no wrong. Yet his life was an active one; he mingled largely with men in laborious and self-denying exertion. But he was so single in heart, and his aims were so pure and excellent, that light and gladness sprang up wherever he moved. The disciple should be like the blessed Master. Usefulness should be his aim, doing good his delight. Not forced, but easy and natural. The whole heart should be in such a work—a heart overflowing with love and good will.

Are you laboring thus, my brother? Are you giving yourself to noble enterprises? In this way happiness comes, in the forgetfulness of self. When the heart goes out for others, it meets with sweet joys at every step, and the whole progress is one of sunshine. The luxury of doing good should be tasted by every man, and once known, one will be loth to deprive himself of its pleasures. Think not thou canst do nothing. This is the prompting of indolence—the suggestion of Satan. The fields are white for the harvest. Some burdened one thou canst aid, some sorrowing one thou canst comfort—that desponding heart thou canst strengthen by thy sympathy; that sinning brother thou canst lead to Jesus.

MORMONISM.—A correspondent of the Philadelphia Ledger, writing from Nauvoo, states that "Mormonism is as different and distinct from any thing which the Prophet Smith ever taught or ordained, as Mahometanism is different from Christianity. The sect is already split into seven different bodies, each repudiating the other. These are as follows:—Rigdonites, who are the Simon-pure of the sect, are scattered through the land; Brighamites, usurpers, occupying the valleys of Utah; Strangites, a la force, Beaver Island, Lake Michigan; Hydrates, squatters on the unsurveyed public lands in Western Iowa—Kanesville their head quarters; Outlerites, settled on Silver Creek, Mills County, Iowa; Brewsterites, at Socorro, New Mexico; Bishopites, at Kirkland, Lake County, Ohio,

The Strangites, Brewsterites, and Bishopites, are new lights; the Outlerites are reformers; and the Hydites are the Whig branch of the usurpers of the government of the church after the assassination of Prophet Smith."

THE REVIEW AND HERALD.

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

ROCHESTER, THIRD-DAY, SEPT. 18, 1855.

The Original Advent Faith.

We have received a friendly letter on this subject from Bro. E. B. Newton. We give below as much as is necessary to answer his inquiries. He says:—

"I see in the *Review and Herald*, Apr. 18th, 1854, you say,

'We claim to stand on the original Advent faith, therefore do not reject the *past movements* on this great question, which has called out a people to prepare for the coming of the Lord. We claim all the light of past time on this glorious theme, and cherish it as from Heaven.'

"If it were from heaven I don't see how you could surrender one inch of faith; for if that voice and that cry, 'Behold the Bridegroom cometh, go ye out to meet him,' was from heaven, then Christ did come on the tenth day, seventh month, 1844; for many declared that he would come as sure as there was a God in heaven, and time would be no longer. This is the original faith you claim to stand upon. And if it was the revelation of Jesus Christ which God gave unto him to shew unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass, then Christ has come; and you are bound by the original faith, and every principle of truth and righteousness to prove that Christ has come, how and when. That was what the Apostles labored to prove after the death and resurrection of Jesus. You admit all the prophetic periods have run out, and now what wait we for?

"I want you to give me all the light you have upon this all-important subject. The truth is what we want."

The above remarks would seem to make the whole Advent faith depend on the personal appearing of our Lord in 1844; and since that event did not then occur, we may be assured that what would be understood by the original Advent faith, has proved an utter failure. Very many of the world's people, who were observers of that movement, wonder why we still persist in our belief of the Advent doctrine. They say, Has not your time passed? Has not your theory failed you? Hav'nt you been disappointed in all your expectations? And they laugh at our credulity or stubbornness (for they hardly know to which to attribute it) in still clinging to what they term our folly and delusion. How completely is the way thus paved, that, when a few more days are passed and the great event finally comes, it shall steal upon them like a thief in the night, and take them unawares.

True, the Lord did not appear in 1844. Our expectations failed; and the disappointment fell upon us—how heavily, those can best judge who felt it; and we would that all such would prove the sincerity of the love they then professed for Christ and his coming, by heeding the greater light which now shines upon this subject, and accepting the explanation which God, in his word, has given us. There is an explanation for all this, and in that explanation, a new flood of light is thrown upon our pathway.

We do not claim that the Lord came, as it is promised that he shall come, visibly in the clouds of heaven, in 1844; and if this is the coming the writer above refers to, we are not bound to prove "how and when" it took place; for we frankly admit that it has not yet occurred. Well, then, the inquiry comes up, are you not surrendering the Advent faith? We think not. The Advent faith is founded wholly on the word of God; and it is a cheering fact, that, notwithstanding our disappointment, not one single promise or prophecy has yet failed. The declaration of our Saviour that heaven and earth should pass away sooner than his word should fail, still holds good. When we expected the Lord in '44, as we

have of en said and often proved, we were expecting that which we had no warrant for in the Scriptures of truth. We drew a wrong conclusion; but yet every argument on which we rested our hope is as good now as it was then.

Those clear chains of prophecy given us in the book of Daniel, still remain sterling truth; and their fulfillment, as far as it has been developed, stands as a veritable pledge that that which still remains, will surely be accomplished. The commencement and the termination of the prophetic periods, as we then held them, we see no necessity and no reason for changing. We only mistook the event to occur at the end of those periods, and being corrected on this one point, all is harmonious and clear.

It may now be said, You admit that your expectations in then looking for the Lord, were wrong; why then do you not reject a movement which was the result of those expectations. Here, for our encouragement and comfort, our past experience and disappointment are not without a precedent in the history of God's people. Go back with me to the time of Christ's entry into Jerusalem, and explain the meaning of that shouting multitude. Why are all classes, young and old, pressing in the way before and behind him, and, absorbed in one emotion, shouting, Hosanna to the Son of David! Blessed be the King that cometh in the name of the Lord! Hosanna in the highest! They cut down branches from the trees and strewed them in the way, and they spread their garments before him, an act which was done to royalty only. Doubtless they expected that his kingdom should then be set up. In their rejoicing they quote from a psalm which probably applies to the future reign and triumph of the Messiah. They thought the time had come for those events to be realized. In these expectations they were to be disappointed; but were they therefore wrong in shouting and rejoicing as they did? Let Jesus answer: "I tell you that if these should bold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out."

In this light we are disposed to regard the great movement which took place upon the Advent doctrine in '44. A faith was there manifested, seconded by works, which like that of Noah, will rise up in the judgment and condemn an unbelieving world. We regard the message of the first angel as there having its fulfillment; and we believe that it was accomplished according to the purpose of God. Further light has shown us the work that was to be accomplished by our great High Priest in the heavenly Sanctuary; it has shown us another angel with a solemn message who must fulfill his mission; and those who reject the past reject some of the plainest portions of a chain of prophecy through which God is now leading his people. Those who reject the light of the past on this subject, have let go their only anchor, and are now adrift among the perilous delusions of these last days. This is attested by the numbers who have sought out many strange and discordant theories since that time. Either apostasy or some baneful systems of error, have swallowed up the mass of those who have forsaken their first love. And last, but not least, those who will not acknowledge the validity of the great movements of the past, on this question, are absolutely unable to present the inquirer with a harmonious system of truth, on this all-vital subject. This is a significant fact, and worthy of due regard.

The writer, above, says, You admit that the prophetic periods have all run out; and now what wait we for? The answer is easy: We are striving in all honesty to heed the admonition of Paul when he says, For ye have need of patience, that, after ye have done the will of God, ye might receive the promise. We are waiting till he who is our life shall appear, and then we expect to appear with him in glory. We are waiting till the last solemn ministration of our High Priest shall be accomplished, the destinies of mankind decided, and the day of our redemp-

tion and deliverance comes. For this time we can but earnestly long, while in these days of our exile and pilgrimage; and also for that fullness of time, when sin and its agents, dating far back, from the first apostasy, that of Satan himself, shall be swept from creation, its effects all repaired, and the whole universe shall be as fair and holy as it was before sin had ever entered to mar the handiwork of God.

U. S.

Unity of the Third Message.

THE message of the third angel is one message. And as it is the last step in the restoration of primitive christianity, and the last merciful warning to prepare a people for translation, it will unite God's people in one. It will not divide and scatter the flock of God, but will move on harmoniously, and accomplish its destined work. There is no danger that the ship will split upon some rock; for our Father is at the helm.

The first message did not finish the work, neither did the second, therefore they must be succeeded by the third. But there is no fourth message marked out by the Holy Spirit to correct the errors of those who should give the third—the third message finishes the work. It will not be corrected by another message.

What! do you believe that those who first preached the third message had no errors?

By no means. They have already discovered some of their errors and repudiated them. Men are not infallible, but the message is. What I mean to say is, that the work will move on harmoniously till all the errors of God's children will be corrected, and they stand without fault before the throne of God. This is the last message, and the Lord has set his hand to fulfill it; and those who will labor in harmony with it, may correct their own faults and those of others; but whoever attempts to reverse the engine will only switch himself off on some fallacious track. May God help me, and all my dear brethren, to work in harmony with the work of God.

The last message before the time of trouble is the sealing message. The sealing angel ascended from the east. Now we are not told that in his westward course he met another angel who informed him that he was sealing the people for destruction, and consequently the work must be reversed. Therefore, since there is no such work marked out in the prophecy, nothing of the kind will need to occur in its fulfillment. There is no uncertainty in the fulfillment of all that is specified; and there is no safety in trusting in that which is not specified.

All doubts then must turn upon the question, Is the third angel's message being fulfilled? If it is, we are safe in moving on in harmony with it; for God will surely carry it straight through to its destined result. But, if it is not, we certainly shall do wisely to give it up, and "look about us for a position which we may occupy with safety and profit," as some have already done. Their downward course, in denying almost every important, life-giving truth connected with the message, is a sufficient guaranty that the Lord will confound the language of all who shall attempt to create a faction, or disturb the harmony and unity of the message.

The work is the Lord's; therefore let us subdue every evil passion and keep in harmony with the work of God.

R. F. C.

Olcott, N. Y., Sept. 5th, 1855.

Communication from Bro. Hart.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—Perhaps it might not be uninteresting to the brethren and sisters to hear from our Tent-meetings.

After leaving Bristol we went to Stockbridge. We there secured a piece of land and pitched our Tent, there being none of like faith in the place. As it was a very busy season of the year, we had no meeting on the Sabbath. On First-day a good congregation came out to hear. The meeting was very interesting, so that it was thought best to stop another week.

The next First-day the congregation was some larger. Quite a number of our hearers were those who were disappointed in the late Time movement, some of whom heard the reasons of our faith with joy. Several promised to walk in obedience to all the commandments of God, with tearful eyes which bespoke the feeling heart.

From this we went to Waterbury, and pitched our Tent on the land of Bro. Butler. A goodly number of the brethren and sisters came together. There was a good gathering also of those who were but little acquainted with our faith, only by report, and that quite unfavorable. They listened to the reasons of our faith, behaving themselves kindly towards us; and as we have made it our practice to leave the Tent alone, they had an opportunity to climb one of the ropes and put on the top of the pole a flag in large letters, "Hear, then Judge."

From this we went to Johnson, and held our meeting on the land of Bro. Peck. Had a large gathering of believers on the Sabbath. There was also on First-day a large congregation, many of whom knew but little of our faith, and had no disposition to learn.

Our next place of meeting was in Irasburgh, on the land of Bro. Barrows. There seemed to be, at this meeting, a desire on the part of the church for a deeper work of grace, and a closer walk with God; which made our social meetings interesting. Our meeting on First-day was not so pleasant. The mass of unbelievers who came were very unwilling to keep their seats, were quite noisy, and somewhat disposed to show the dragon spirit, but did no damage to the Tent.

We next went to Richford, where there are none of like faith. A number of the Advent brethren came out on the Sabbath, and were deeply interested in what they heard. On First-day there was a good congregation, with none on the outside disposed to make light of the truth which we presented. On the evenings of Sabbath and First-day the Academy was opened for us. There was truly an ear to hear. We have the very best of reasons to believe that there will be quite a number there who will step out on the truth, and those too, who will be an ornament to the cause.

From the evidence that we have of the prosperity of the cause of truth the past season, it is evident that those who labor in this cause must change their plan of operation. We have been accused by our opponents of having a nutshell faith; but it is not so. But they might reasonably say that our labors were such. There must be more of a thrusting into new fields. The church must feel more of a missionary spirit. Let them send out into new fields with the Tent and otherwise, such as they think are qualified to present the truth, and sustain them in such places. If there is much more done in such places as Vermont, it will cause a sacrifice on the part of the church. Have we forgot, brethren and sisters, the labors of the servants of God to bring the truth to us, that we esteem dearer than life? If so, God grant that by calling to mind the past, our minds may be refreshed, and our hearts feel for those who, as yet, know but little about the present truth. Let those that have the truth, send laborers into the field, and with their prayers and means sustain them there.

J. HART.

Waterbury, Vt., Sept. 12th, 1855.

NOTE ON THE ABOVE.

I fully agree with Bro. Hart as to future operations. But it has seemed necessary to hold Tent-meetings where there were believers to sustain them, and so the old ground has been occupied to little profit, only to the church, while new fields, where the people will hear candidly, and where much good can be accomplished, have been neglected. I am more than ever satisfied that the "harvest of the earth" is fast ripening. If preaching brethren wish large and attentive congregations, let them enter new fields. Do they desire freedom in preach-

ing the Word, and to see souls brought to acknowledge the truth, then let them enter new fields.

But it is a fact that some of our preaching brethren are obliged to labor on the old ground, where but little or nothing can be done, for want of means to go out as missionaries into new fields, where much can be done. I would here suggest that before another Tent season comes on, a sum of \$500 be raised for each Tent company that shall go out, to sustain them in new fields. Let there be as many Tents in the field as can be well manned with preachers, exhorters, and good help, let them enter upon the work with energy and faith, and let the church sustain them. But I have said more on this subject than I designed to when I took up my pen. Would it not be well for others to speak out on this subject? J. W.

TENT MEETINGS.

In our last we gave an account of the meeting at Roosevelt. Our next meeting was held in Vanburen, on the farm of Bro. Walker, who spared no pains to make preparations that the truth might be brought before the people. In the above place we tarried two Sabbaths and First-days. Our congregations were quite large and attentive, especially the second First-day, when the solemn conviction seemed to rest on the people that we had the truth. Many furnished themselves with books, seeming desirous to understand more perfectly the things they had heard. Among the rest, two men who had previously avowed their principles to be infidel, purchased each of them a set of bound tracts, saying they wished to understand this subject. This was a new field, Bro. Walker and family being the only Sabbath-keepers in the place previous to the meeting.

Our next was held in Olcott, as appointed in the Review. The congregations were not as large as in some of our meetings, but those who came were attentive. On the second Sabbath and First-day Bro. White took a part in preaching the word. The Lord gave him freedom in speaking on the Sabbath question, especially in the last discourse. We trust that we shall yet see souls obeying the commandments of God as the result of the effort in Olcott.

I have seen the proposition of Bro. Hart and the remarks of Bro. White in the present No. of the Review in regard to operating with the Tents in new fields. I am satisfied that much more good can be accomplished in new fields, than to endeavor to reach the hearts of those who have had the clear light of present truth set before them, and have hardened their hearts against it. In looking over the meetings of the past Summer, I can testify that we have had more freedom in speaking the truth, and more real interest in the word spoken, in new places, than we have had where the reasons of our faith have been previously set before the people. The expression of Bro. White in his remarks, that "the 'harvest of the earth' is fast ripening," is a solemn truth that should rest with weight upon us. While the truth is being presented in old fields of labor where but little can be accomplished, if the Tent was in a new field hearts might be reached that have no prejudice against our position. Dear brethren, during the present Winter will be the time to enter into arrangements for operations another season. Who will take hold of this work? J. N. LOUGHBOROUGH.

Rochester, N. Y., Sept., 18th, 1855.

The Lamb's Book of Life.

"And there shall in no wise enter into it anything that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie; but they which are written in the Lamb's book of life." Rev. xxi, 27.

1. It is the LAMB'S book of life. There is significance in that. But why is it called the Lamb's book of life? Has not man from his very nature a principle within him which will live for ever whether or not his name is written in that book of life? and how is he dependent, as far as his existence only is concerned, on that Lamb of God which was offered for the sin of the world? Grant that popular the-

ology is true, and he is not; but grant that he is, which is here more than intimated, and popular theology is not true.

A great fact is here incidentally presented. We have no claim on life except through the Son of God, and all who at last enter immortality, will possess the precious boon through his merits alone. Hence there is a peculiar propriety in calling that book the Lamb's book of life in which are recorded the names of those who shall finally take their station with the redeemed upon Mount Zion. Christ will be the center and sun of the ransomed hosts. He is the only door by which man can regain the life he has forfeited; and he himself proclaims to us in our fallen and helpless state, "I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me."

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, I am the door of the sheep." "By me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out, and find pasture." "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life." It is then his book, because without him no man will find his name recorded therein. It is his, because all who shall be written there will be those who shall be ransomed by his sacrifice.

2. It is the Lamb's book of LIFE. There is significance in this also. It does not read a book of happiness, and declare that an existence in misery will be the portion of those whose names are not written therein. But it is the book of life. Whoever would live in the future state must have his name written in that book. It is life to these: it is death to all besides; for "whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." "This is the second death." U. S.

"Why call ye Me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" Luke vi, 46.

THE above and many parallel passages, demand our careful and thorough investigation. When we say Lord, it implies that we are servants; and servant implies obedience to that Lord. We cannot effectually call Christ our Lord except we do as he says. "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven," &c. Christ is our example that we should follow his steps who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth. He came and fulfilled the law, an example for others to fulfill. His example was love, not hatred; mercy, not sacrifice; long-suffering, not revenge; meekness; not stubbornness; gentleness, not harshness. These sublime principles shone through all his walks of life, setting forth examples, illustrating them by saying, "Love those who hate you, pray for those who despitefully use you; and he that smiteth you on one cheek, turn the other, and he that taketh away thy goods, ask them not again."

Christ laid the axe at the root of all covetousness and selfishness. Sacrifice for injury, and revenge for insult, were abrogated by the Master of Christians. Love and mercy are the chief attributes of pure christianity; and living out these principles, as set forth by our Saviour, gives us the right of calling him Lord, and no other. This is what constitutes a Christian, completes a man's conversion and fits him for Paradise. The last angel of mercy says, "Here are they that keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus." If we keep the faith of Jesus, we shall have confidence in his principles and live them. There are many close points, a few of which I wish to notice. The Word informs us that whatsoever we do, we should do all to the glory of God. Without faith we cannot please God; and by works faith is made perfect. We may have works to be seen of men; but this is not of faith, and does not please God.

Our Saviour says, "When thou doest alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth; that thine alms may be in secret, and thy Father which seeth in secret, himself shall reward thee open-

ly." Alms given in this way will more likely be done in faith, which will please God. Jesus says there is no reward to that which is done to be seen of men. A maxim of Wm. Penn is, "Do what good thou canst *unknown*, and be not vain of what ought rather to be *felt* than seen." If we can give a large sum for the cause of God, or write a good letter, we are apt to think much of it because we did it, and our name will be extolled. This is not of Christ nor of faith, and does not please God. The humble, in the parable of the day of judgment, forgot their good works, and said, Lord, *when* did we so and so; while others remembered theirs and claimed favor; but they were cast off.

We are apt to tell how much we have done for the cause, that others may know and make much account of what we do for God, while the things that we do to please ourselves are forgotten. If we have but two mites and give all, pride may lead us to keep this secret. But if we have much, and give a part, or all, it would seem that we should lose part if not all our reward, unless it was trumpeted that others might know our acts and deeds. O let the testimony search us lest we be deceived. It is not so easy a matter for self to think that the widow's two mites were doing more in the sight of God than they who cast in their abundance.

On the entire consecration of property, John Wesley says, "Must we not rank among those that desire to be rich, all that, in fact, lay up treasures on earth," a thing as expressly and clearly forbidden by our Lord as either adultery or murder. By riches, I mean not thousands of pounds, but any more than will procure the conveniences of life. Yet who takes warning? Who seriously regards the awful declaration of the Apostle; even "they that desire to be rich fall into temptation and a snare and into divers foolish and hurtful desires, that plunge men into destruction and perdition."

Do you that possess more than food and raiment, ask, "What shall we do? shall we throw into the sea what God has given us? God forbid that you should. It is an excellent talent, and may be much employed to the glory of God. Your way lies plain before your face: if you have courage, walk in it. Having gained, in a right sense, *all you can*, and saved *all you can*, then, in spite of nature, and custom, and worldly prudence, *give all you can*. I do not say, Be a good Jew, giving a tenth part of all you possess. I do not say, Be a good Pharisee, giving a fifth of all your substance. I dare not advise you to give half of what you have; no, nor three quarters, but ALL. How is this done? 1st. Provide things needful for yourself, food, raiment, what nature moderately requires for preserving both health and strength. 2. Provide for your family or others who belong to your household. If when this is done, there is an overplus left, do good to them who are the household of faith. If there is an overplus still, as you have opportunity, do good unto all men. In so doing, you give all you can, nay, in a sound sense, *all you have*."

Under this last message of mercy, let us not deceive ourselves, but be sure to lay up our treasure in heaven, that when we are turned out of our stewardship we "may be received into everlasting habitations." Let us remember the terrific woes denounced against those that lay up a treasure upon earth: The rust of them shall be a witness against us, and eat our flesh as it were fire. The Lord help us to measure ourselves by his word.

Again, let us examine ourselves. We may claim much virtue for the graces we possess. Says Penn, "Content not thyself that thou art virtuous in the general, for one link being wanting, the chain is defective. Perhaps thou art rather innocent than virtuous, and owest more to thy constitution than to thy religion. To be innocent is to be not guilty, but to be virtuous, is to overcome our evil inclinations. If thou hast not conquered thyself in that which is thy own particular weakness, thou hast no title to virtue, though thou art free of other men's." Some may be more liberal and less covetous than others, but it may be constitutional and not virtue. Some

more patient, meek, gentle and forbearing and yet no true virtue. The Christian will possess these graces, but he will have to deny self and strive for them, and is tested by the declaration of our Saviour, "Love thy neighbor as thyself," a valuable principle, but more valuable when reduced to practice.

"And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." This develops itself in buying and selling, in giving and receiving, in injuries and trespasses, in faults and mistakes, and has been heard many times, but imperfectly practiced; for how much easier it is to receive favors than to bestow them. If we would forgive as we would be forgiven, how easy to adjust all our difficulties. If we would love others as we would have others love us, how easy to go to them with their faults, and not report them to whom it does not belong; and be more ready to diminish than to magnify. If we would have others love to oblige us, we must love to oblige them, and do it from principle, and not from selfishness. It is selfishness to be kind to others for the purpose of having them kind to us; but it is of pure love to be kind to the evil and unthankful. If we would not desire others to speak of our faults, we should not speak of theirs, for the same that we measure to others will be measured to us again. When we are overtaken in a fault, we desire others to show us love and mercy, and we should do the same to them under like circumstances. When we observe these rules, our trials will be greatly diminished. If our enemy sue us at the law and take away our coat, forbid not to take our cloak. If a man compel you to go with him a mile, go with him twain. Overcome evil with good. If we forbid the cloak, or refuse to go the second mile, we are disobedient to our Master. Some said, "These are hard sayings, who can bear them;" but "why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say."

To be a Christian is to be Christ-like. Do you ask, Will it be safe to let the world know that we believe these principles? Jesus says, "Whosoever is ashamed of me and my word before this wicked and adulterous generation, of him will I be ashamed before my Father and the holy angels." Shall we put our light under a bushel, or on a table? How can I say, I am a Christian, or Christ-like, unless I am willing to suffer the loss of all things. When we live these principles before the world, then, and not till then, shall we be clear lights in the world. By these we shall know whether we think of life, more than meat. Some think they cannot keep the Sabbath, for fear they shall suffer for want of meat. But did God give commandments that were not essential? Did Jesus give testimonies that were vain? Nay, verily; and "Here are they that follow the Lamb (not occasionally, not when it is convenient, but) *whithersoever* he goeth." If we are afraid of our name, reputation, property or lives, Christ will be ashamed of us before his Father. If practicing these principles takes my name, I have a new name, above every name. If it takes my reputation, I have that honor that comes from above. If it takes my life, I shall live forevermore.

But our unbelief and fearfulness will bring before us many frightful images of robbers and ruffians; but faith in the promises of God will drive them all away, and we shall be prepared to say with the poet, "What beauties in my Saviour dwell;" and, "A palace would a toy appear, and prisons palaces prove, if Jesus but dwell with me there." Then we could say, "The reproaches of Christ are greater riches than the treasures of Egypt."

O let us not in heart call Christ a hard Master, reaping where he has not sown. We have not yet resisted unto blood, striving against sin. Don't let us claim a title under the last message of mercy, or think we follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth, until we can sympathize with him in coming down to earth clothed in swaddling clothes, wearing a crown of thorns, blindfolded and suitten; sweating as it were drops of blood, his locks wet with the dews of night, and at last stretched between the heavens and the earth with the cold spear piercing his body, while he cried, "Lord forgive them for they know not what

they do." And when we are afraid of a few acres of land, our name, or our lives, look at our Master and his faithful followers, wandering about in sheep-skins and goat-skins, dwelling in caves and dens of earth, and then blush at our sacrifices, and tremble for our faith, when we are so fearful of the principles which teach Christ and him crucified.

In order to be a true witness of Jesus, our testimony must correspond with his teachings. O wake up brother, wake up sister, to these last and solemn truths, and seek for a holy state, lest we deceive ourselves and be left out when God for his children shall call. Remember that the life of our Master was not one of ease or of selfishness, but of toil and labor for the good of others. Then let us yield ourselves to him, not in word only, but in deed and in truth; and let his life be our life, his willingness to suffer for us our willingness to suffer for others, his reproaches our riches, his cross, our glory. Then he will be our Lord and we his servants, and when he comes we shall reign with him for ever and ever.

C. W. SPERRY.

Family Worship.

WHAT can be more beautifully appropriate than the worship of God in families?

Here is a little company of human beings, joined together in the most intimate connection—dwelling under one roof, fed at one table, supplied with the necessities of life from sources of income that are common to them all feeling themselves to have altogether common interests, common wants, and common exposures. It is granted that they all ought to worship God; is it not appropriate that they should worship him together? Each of them ought to thank God for his daily food, and daily to ask God for the needed supply. But the family take their food together. It is supplied from a common store, and spread upon a common table, and the daily gatherings around that table are the recognized symbol of their close intimacy. Is there any other scene which ought to be sanctified with prayer, if not that where a family most frequently look in each other's faces—where the responsible providers distribute the liberal provision—where parental love lavishes itself upon its tender objects—and where the children not only have their bodies nurtured, but their minds and manners cultivated?

A prayerless family meal is a most unchristian, a most ungodly thing, and seldom does that graceless spirit whose plainest name is *fashion*, show her impiety more plainly than when, at a social entertainment, she whispers that, as the family table would be too narrow for so numerous a company, so the family custom of giving thanks at table is too homely for so splendid an occasion: just as if the larger and costlier provision did not need the divine blessing, and I did not call for thanks, as much as the ordinary meal; and just as if an unblest meal, partaken by a numerous company scattered through the ample spaces of a parlor, were any more Christian than the same thing at an ordinary table.

Nor is it only at table that families should worship. Sheltered by one roof, the family have laid them down in peace and slept, and awoke in safety, because the Lord hath sustained them. Coming from their several chambers, they meet and exchange their affectionate salutations, glad to feel, "*We are all here*." It is a common protection they have shared. They have *together* been kept from the assassin from the fire, from "the pestilence that walketh in darkness." Should not they kneel together, and give thanks to their heavenly Guardian? They are going forth too to duties, and to dangers, and they need a common guidance; shall they not ask for it together? And at the close of the day, have they not equal reasons for united prayer and thanksgiving? They have all been led and kept by one Providence, and they all need to commit themselves to one divine Guardian. On both occasions it is appropriate, besides the prayer, to read the divine word together, and to unite, if they are able, in sacred song.

There will of course be mornings when all have not come from their chambers in the glow and the joy of health; there will be evenings when the family will sadly gather, returning from a new grave. Thenceforth, at the table and at the fireside, there will be "one vacant chair." All families may have these days of sorrow. What shall they do with this sorrow? To whom shall they tell it? On whose friendly strength shall they lay it? There is no such other place for a bereaved family to soothe and comfort themselves as their family altar. Is it the father that is gone? Nowhere else will they find such comfort as kneeling, in their tears, at the family al-

tar, and pouring out their prayers from their broken hearts; through the channel perhaps of a feebler and softer voice than that to whose manly tones they were accustomed.

Or has one of the little ones been taken? The table must henceforth lack the light of his happy face—the house will no more ring to his merry laugh; but there is no sweeter memory, when you see the white hands laid together on the still breast, than that you had seen them folded on the edge of the table at the giving of thanks, or on the chair by your side at the daily worship.

In joy and sorrow, amid all the varieties of domestic experience, they who live together may most appropriately and beneficially worship together.

COMMUNICATIONS.

From Bro. Friable.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—I have been watching affairs closely for the last two years. Perhaps no one knows more of the state of the cause in the western part of Michigan than myself. I have just visited most of the Sabbath-keeping families, and have been preaching among them, and in some new places.

In some places there is quite an ear to hear; others scarcely any. There are quite a number of new places open for lectures in the north settlements, where all that is needed is faithful labor, and no doubt many would embrace the truth. In some places Sabbath keepers have sprung up without any preaching, by the means of papers, books, &c. I baptized some twelve, and more will soon go forward when an opportunity is presented. My health is poor. Perhaps I ought to say with Paul, "I glory in mine infirmities." This may be the only means of my salvation. My poor health has greatly humbled me. I sometimes get greatly discouraged over it, and think to cease traveling with the message, and would not hesitate in so doing if I could be sure the Lord would not be displeased with me.

Here is a wide field of labor, north, west and south, in this State. The harvest is ripening for the truth, but where are the laborers. I have large fields of acquaintances, formed when a Methodist traveling minister, that I have not yet been able to break upon. One, south of Adrian; another, LaPorte, Ind. Both of these places I have been looking upon as important. I learn the No-Sabbath and No-law arguments are of little or no account where there are no nominal Adventists. But among the sects, the fulfillment of prophecies as laid down upon our chart, the signs of the times, and by whom and how the Sabbath was changed, at once brings a whole community into conviction that we have the truth. But it is much easier to convince a new community that we have the truth than it is to make them keep God's holy Sabbath; for there is a cross over which thousands must and will stumble to destruction.

Yours believing we have the truth.

J. B. FRISSIE.

Battle Creek, Sept. 11th, 1855.

From Sister Palmiter.

DEAR BROTHERS AND SISTERS, scattered abroad, whose testimonies make the *Review* a welcome messenger, to you I would say, that it is nearly two years since I commenced by the help of God to keep all his commandments, and I cannot say that I have suffered loss; on the contrary, had I known what advantages are derived spiritually, in the increase of knowledge by a study of his word and seeking after truth, proving all things that come up before me, and investigating by the helps within my reach, I could have made the sacrifice long before.

I had always felt from a child that the seventh day was the Sabbath, and yet never knew a person that kept that day. Some thirteen years ago, when recovering from a bed of sickness, and reading the New Testament through by course, the Sabbath fastened itself upon my mind more forcibly than ever before, so that I spoke of it occasionally to Methodist ministers; of which church I was a member, hoping that I might get some evidence for a First-day Sabbath; but none of them could bring a thus saith the Lord, but I still consoled myself with the thought that it was not my duty to keep it, feeling that I must inevitably backslide, having no helps in the path of duty, as I could not meet with any people that kept that day. Thus I continued on trying, as I thought, to live a Christian, but how far from godliness! The way grows straiter and narrower the farther I advance in a knowledge of the will of God as revealed in his word, and if the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear? 1 Pet. iv, 18. Many I believe come under the class of sinners, who are saying, Lord, Lord, because they transgress the law by keeping another day which he has not commanded; and the wages of

sin I have found to be death instead of eternal life in misery; and the sleep of the dead until the resurrection, and eternal life through Christ, make a beauty and harmony in the plan of salvation unfathomable by orthodox creeds; and I can truly say that I never prized my Bible as I do now. 'Tis a precious beacon light to cheer the lonely pilgrim.

May God speed his truth, and may we individually let our light shine and have salt in ourselves, that we may be hid in the day of the Lord's anger, in the prayer of your unworthy sister.

F. M. PALMITER.

Oneida Co., N. Y.

From Sister Harris.

To the Editor of the REVIEW AND HERALD.

DEAR BROTHER:—After being for months a wanderer from my family and home, I can here raise my Ebenezer, and say, Hitherto hath the Lord been my helper. In every hour of trial and affliction, I have realized that as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth those that fear him; and that he will never leave nor forsake those who put their trust in him.

During the months in which I have been visiting friends, both in Upper and Lower Canada, it has not been my lot to meet with one Advent Sabbath-keeper, and my Sabbaths have been spent among those who were busily engaged in preparing to observe the first day of the week; thus taking the Lord's time to prepare for keeping the commandments of men; though at times I have felt lonely, yet I thank God that my peace has often been as river. Would that my righteousness was as the waves of the sea. Feeling that I am a helpless worm of the earth, it has been my constant endeavor to seek for grace and wisdom from on high, that I might not dishonor the cause of truth, or cast a stumbling-block in the way of any. I feel thankful to say, that I have met with some of like precious faith with regard to the second advent of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ: men who, loving the Saviour, long for his return to earth; and whose eyes are now turned to the East, anxiously watching the signs of the times, that they may be able to answer the inquiry, "Watchman, what of the night." In some denominations in Canada, there seems to be a general spirit of inquiry; both among ministers and people, and sermons are frequently preached upon the relation the present war sustains to prophecy.

The brother with whom I am now residing in Canada, is at present engaged in examining the subject of man's nature, and future destiny; should he embrace what we consider the Bible view on the subject, who may tell the good which he may accomplish. His position in the church, and his widespread influence, would enable him to be much more useful than any stranger could be in the Province. Even now he is wielding a great influence in bringing these truths, and also the Sabbath question, before the people; as day after day brother ministers call in and these subjects are freely canvassed, and a general spirit of inquiry awakened, both among ministers, and people.

The M. E. church in Canada has always been foremost in all questions of reform, and from what opportunity I have had of becoming acquainted with her ministry, I can truly say I have never met with a more holy, humble, and zealous class of men. They seem calm, reasonable, and intelligent, and on an equality with their Christian brethren, having no disposition to act as lords over God's heritage. When looking abroad upon this wide field, which seems white already unto harvest, I am often ready to exclaim, Who is sufficient for these things? But I rejoice to know that the work is the Lord's, and do pray him to send forth laborers into his vineyard.

The so-called Sabbath question is exciting great interest in all parts of Canada. Sermons are preached, and tracts on Sunday-keeping are distributed, and the mind of church members generally seems prepared for a law rigorously enforcing the strict observance of the first day of the week. In Lower Canada especially they seem very anxious upon the subject, as the Catholics who form so large a class of the community, do not keep the day in accordance with Protestant ideas of propriety. Conversing upon the subject a short time ago at the house of a friend, a very intelligent gentleman who was present said, "If I were not a Roman Catholic, I would certainly be upon your side of the question; but of course I consider the authority of the church sufficient." I find church members generally, much opposed to our views of the Sabbath. Having labored for years to secure the observance of Sunday, they feel anxious to preserve their ranks from division; and argue that it is better to have one day well kept than two partially, even if the law is still in force. Thus we see the enemy has been going ahead prepar-

ing the minds of the people to resist the truth, and reject the law of God.

Your sister in Christ.

ELIZABETH N. HARRIS.

Kilworth, Sept. 6th, 1855.

OBITUARY.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—It becomes my painful duty to record the death of Cynthia, my companion, who fell asleep in Jesus on the 10th inst., aged 57 years, after suffering about seventeen days illness, of the lung and typhoid fevers. Cynthia, two daughters and myself, have been cheerfully observing the forever blessed, memorable Sabbath of the Lord about 4 years. She had no doubts relative to the truthfulness of the position she occupied in the present truth, connected with the near coming of our Lord.

She had been passing through severe trials previous to her sickness, but she kept above the billows, and was apparently weaned from the world, and seeking an inward conformity to the divine will. She could look to the all-absorbing work of God in '44 when our great High Priest entered the Most Holy to cleanse the Sanctuary. She manifested her submission to the divine will, whether in life, or death. We find her place empty at the family altar, and in raising her voice in singing hymns of praise. Many of our Sabbath brethren and sisters are being laid aside until the resurrection morn. Should not those who survive, renewedly engage in the all-absorbing work connected with the near coming of our Lord.

From your afflicted brother.

LUTHER PAINE.

Springfield, Sept. 14th, 1855.

SELECTIONS.

Christ the Bliss of Heaven.

I think not of the starry crown,
Or robes the saints in glory wear;
'Twere heaven enough to bow me down,
Before my Saviour, Jesus there.

I think not of those harps whose notes
Swell sweetly o'er the heavenly plains;
The Saviour's voice in music floats,
In richer, sweeter, dearer strains.

I think not of those golden streets,
Where arches rise o'er pearly gates;
Or mansions in whose blissful seats,
Rest for the weary pilgrim waits.

But oh! the Saviour's face to see,
The blest Redeemer's voice to hear;
To be from sin for ever free,
The tempter's wiles no more to fear.

To feel immortal vigor fill
My soul, and quicken every power;
On angel's wing to do His will,
And with a seraph's love adore

[American Messenger.]

Courteous Reply to an Infidel.

An American traveler being unexpectedly detained at the mole or quarantine in Odessa, was very civilly offered "half of his apartments, and a sofa to lie on," by a young Englishman who acted as translator to the mole. After they had formed an intimate acquaintance, and one evening had retired to rest, the traveler asked his friend how he could endure the blasphemy which was so constantly heard there. The young Englishman replied, that as a gentleman these things were disagreeable to him, but as to their being intrinsically wrong, it was no matter of concern to him, as he denied the truth of revelation, and believed Jesus Christ to be an impostor.

The traveler, without supposing the remark would be heeded except by courtesy, replied, "Either Christ was an impostor, or he was not. If he was an impostor, we have the inconceivable phenomenon of a base man practising virtue, self-denial, charity, forgiveness of injuries, through his whole life, in spite of scourging, contumely, and even crucifixion. Is it philosophical to suppose that a bad man would take so much pains to make men good?"

But if he was not an impostor, then he has told the truth, and we must believe him."

"Is it possible that I never saw that before?" was the only reply of the young Englishman, but the argument sunk deep into his heart; and when the traveler had arrived at Alexandria, he received a letter from the former sceptic acknowledging him as "the best friend he ever had," encouraging him to be equally faithful to others; and praying him not to forget "his Odessa convert."

SLANDER.—Surgery may heal a bodily wound; but what balm can bind up the bite of a slanderous tongue? It runs like a contagion over the whole country, and cannot be recalled. Robbery may be

