

ADVENT



HERALD

J. V. HIMES, Proprietor.

"WE HAVE NOT FOLLOWED CUNNINGLY DEvised FABLES."

OFFICE, No. 46 1-2 Kneeland-street.

WHOLE NO. 255.

BOSTON, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1857.

VOLUME XVIII. NO. 40.

THE BELOVED SON.

"This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well-pleased."—Matt. 3:17.

It is the Father's voice that cries
Mid the deep silence of the skies:
"This, this is my beloved Son,
In Him I joy, in Him alone.

"In Him my equal see revealed,
In Him all righteousness fulfilled,
In Him, the Lamb, the victim see,
Bound, bleeding, dying on the tree.

"And can you fail to love again?
Far fairer he than sons of men!
His very name is fragrance poured,
Immanuel, Jesus, Saviour, Lord!

"He died, and in his dying, proved
How much, how faithfully he loved;
At my right hand, his glories shine;
Is my beloved, sinner, thine!"

O full of glory, full of grace,
Redeemer of a ruined race,
Beloved of the Father, come,
Make in these sinful hearts a home!

Beloved of the Father, thou,
To whom the saints and angels bow;
Immanuel, Jesus, Saviour, come,
Make in these sinful hearts thy home!

H. Bonar.

The Desert of Sinai.

BY HORATIUS BONAR, D. D.

Continued from our last.

In the course of the afternoon we had rather an unpleasant scene. The actors in it were the sheikh and one of our chief men,—a man of two camels, whose name was Audheh. The former,—said to be the owner of a thousand camels,—is a young man,—soft and indolent,—given more to smoking than to useful deeds,—but good-natured and most obliging to us. The latter was a middle-aged and middle-sized man, but fierce in temper and rough in manners,—rather thin in face and body, but tough and wiry in his frame-work. He was by no means obliging, and sometimes he was rude in words, both to us and to his fellows. Often did he complain about the overwork which he said that his two camels were undergoing, though they were neither overloaded nor overwrought, and one of them was as ill-tempered as its owner. He tried once and again to get us to stop short at three or four o'clock, threatening to go back, and letting it be known that he did not care for dragoman or gentleman, as all that he wanted was to get his camels fed. Between this man and the young prince of the desert a discussion arose by the way. The latter was anxious to take us all the way to Hebron, the former was determined not to move an inch beyond the contract, or rather, if possible, to avoid coming up to it. The road to Medeenat (or "the city," as they called Hebron),—the dangers of it, the troubles of it, and the like, were all discussed, but in language which left us for the present in total ignorance of the meaning of the conversation. By degrees the parties grew hot, at least the serf did; but his chief kept cool, though speaking sharply, as we could discover by his accents. The dragoman and some of the Arabs were trying to cool the rising wrath, and to soften the hard words. But in vain. The conversation grew hotter,—till at last, at some fierce word uttered by Audheh, and enforced by the flash of his fierce Arab eye, and the significant flourish of his disencumbered arms, the sheikh slid down from his dromedary and drew his sword. Audheh, who was walking by my side, was unarmed, at least he had no jambeh, or scimitar, although his baroudeh or matchlock

was slung over his shoulders. But he saw the other's movement, and instantly seized two or three stones which, in his angry hands, would have been missiles. I seized one arm, and an Arab seized another, whilst two others did the same to the sheikh. The sheikh yielded at once; but the serf struggled to get free. Seeing, however, that the feeling was against him, he consented to be pacified at last, and threw aside his stones as the sheikh sheathed his scimitar. Peace was restored, and we proceeded. Audheh scowled and seemed dissatisfied, because he had been compelled "to keep the peace." The sheikh looked troubled; and said a few words mildly to the other,—to the effect that he was ashamed of having exhibited such a spectacle before the howadji (gentlemen)—and that if Audheh insisted on renewing the strife, he must do so in some private place. This, however, was not a satisfactory adjustment of the matter,—but we could do nothing by the way. In the evening, however, we went out, after dinner, and took our seat among the Arabs, round one of their blazing fires,—those of us who smoked, sharing their pipes, and those who did not, their coffee. We spoke with the dragoman about the occurrence of the day, and he along with Mustapha, undertook to effect the reconciliation. Accordingly we sent for Audheh, who was seated round the other fire. He came, and we found that he had cooled. He was willing to "be friends," as also was the sheikh to "be friends" with him. So he stepped across to the place where the latter was, and they took each other's hands at once. Having done this, they threw their arms round each other's neck, and kissed on both sides of the face several times. They then sat down side by side like brothers; and so the last trace of the cloud passed away. The scene was like that of Esau and Jacob embracing each other.

Afterwards, the sheikh, Audheh, and some of the Arabs came into our tent, where we had a good charcoal fire, as the night was cold. Mr. Beddome produced his flute, and the children of the desert listened with delight to his music. It sounded most sweetly in the solitude,—only the notes of such an instrument seem almost too soft and refined for such a place and such an audience.

Wady Seram, Wednesday, Feb. 13.—Rose before seven, and walked out. Climbed a rocky hill, where I had a fine view of sunrise, and watched the light gradually stealing down the sides of the hills. To the west there appeared a beautiful serab,—a small wild lake, with a girdle of lovely hills, such as one meets with so often in our quiet glens at home. During breakfast, we were cheered by the lark, as he soared and sung in the flushing daylight. Walked on before our camels, and examined the terraces more fully. Near the northern extremity of the wady, we saw several inscriptions in a character very like those at Wady Mukatteb. There was the same frequently recurring of goats and camels. Near these there was a cave, into which we looked, but found nothing. On both sides of the wady we saw ruins to a large extent, indicating the sites of some considerable villages or towns, and on these ruins there were inscriptions like those already noticed. The buildings in some cases had been large in size, more like villas than common houses. They were not in the low ground, but all on the elevated parts, to

be beyond the rush of the winter-torrent. Their foundations were on the rocky flats and slopes, with which the low hills that hem in the valley abound. The Lord's parable of the wise and foolish builders occurred to me as I looked at the ruins. A house built on the sandy or lower parts of the wady would be immediately assailed by the rising stream as soon as the rains commenced. Against it "the stream would beat vehemently," because it would be in its very channel. Of course it would fall, and the "ruin would be great," because the rush of the torrent, undermining its very foundations, as well as beating against its walls, would sweep every stone away. A house built upon the rocky slopes of the wady, would be, in a measure beyond the reach of the flood at first. And when the flood did arise, and the stream beat vehemently upon the house, no injury would be done, for the rocky foundation would hinder the undermining process, and thus the walls could withstand the violence of the flood.

It is curious to observe how carefully the towns of the East have avoided the lower grounds, and always chosen the heights. In some cases this has, no doubt, been simply for protection against the assault of an enemy; but in general it is because of the invasions of the floods. With us a lower site is of less consequence. We can safely build upon the very margin of the stream, because we know that it has its regular channel, by which it will pursue its wonted way and leave our homes untouched. But in these eastern regions, where the rains are not spread over the year, but come down at certain seasons like waterspouts or cataracts, there is no channel for the stream; or rather the whole breadth of the wady is the channel for the time, and no building is safe in any part of it. Nay, the soil is not safe, but is swept off by the current, and hence the terraces of these wadys are not so much intended as the means of creating an artificial soil, as of retaining the natural soil of the valley in its place, and preventing the cultivated fields from being converted into a bare rock.

Having crossed a small height, we came into Wady El-Hafir or Hafir, where we found extensive ruins and terrace-walls as in the preceding valley, with like traces of cultivation and like spots of verdure. These stretch for miles along the wady, as if there had been an unbroken continuity of dwellings or villages in this region. How changed from the fruitfulness and populous life of other days!

About twelve o'clock, we came nearer El-Aujeh, and got a good view of it, though we did not go out of our way to examine it. The telescope did us sufficient service. There are two sorts of peaks; the higher looks like a castle, but turns out to be only the peculiar castellated formation of the rock. The lower is an old fortification, and both in situation and appearance was not unlike Home Castle in Berkshire.

We now came to immense beds of lilies and hyacinths, of various kinds, tall and broad-leaved; one species only was in bloom, thrusting up its lilac flower amid a profusion of leaves, upon a tall stalk, some two feet long. The plants grew thickly together and covered miles of the sand. No grass was visible between.

The road here winds along the slope of the low hill on which these lilies were growing;

and here one of our camels, who had always shewn his unwillingness to be loaded, now gave proof of his unwillingness to be relieved of his load. He commenced prancing furiously, apparently with the intention of disburdening himself. Nor did he fail; for in a minute barrels of water and cages of fowls came to the ground. No one, however, was injured; the camels stood the shock, nor did the fowls take any harm. The animal was soon seized and reloaded, in spite of all his objections and expostulations. We had an opportunity of seeing the awkwardness of the camel's movements, of which Jerome speaks, and which he tells us had made "a camels dance" a proverb in olden times.

Between one and two we came into Wady-el-Ab'deh, where doubtless stood Eboda, mentioned by Ptolemy as a Roman city, and which either took its name from or gave it to the wady. It would appear that in this region the Romans had established themselves in great strength, their footsteps being visible everywhere. It is not unlikely that the "wilderness of Beersheba" extended itself in this direction, and the cultivation of which we see traces, was begun in the days of Abraham and Isaac. As the region formed a sort of neutral ground or common, between Egypt and Palestine, it was a lively spot for the patriarchs to fix upon, where, undisturbed, they might obtain sufficient pasture for their flocks. Though occasionally molested by the Philistines, they yet, in general, seemed to have had this semi-desert in peaceful occupation; and through them these plains were brought under a partial tillage, which went on for ages, reaching its height under the Roman conquest, and after that gradually sinking back into a sterility probably greater than that from which it was at first reclaimed.

The wady was sandy, but still marked by a considerable amount of vegetation. It was studded everywhere with the liliaceous plants, which I have already noticed, as well as with crocuses and similar small bulbs. Nor were these stunted and meagre; they were tall and bushy, as if the soil were quite congenial. It was pleasant to hear the hum of the bee, and to mark it as it went singing along through the air or stooping among the camel-shrubs, which were growing plentifully, and claiming this territory as the desert. We felt that this was border-land. The intermixture of the lily with the tanfa and the ritt'm, seemed to imply the contention for the mastery, between the sand of the desert and the soil of the land flowing with milk and honey.

All suddenly at this spot our men, leaving the camels, made a rush towards a huge mound or cairn of stones on our right. Their manner was so furious that I thought there was something wrong, and that possibly they might have seen some serpent or wild beast lurking among the debris. They cast stones, they lashed the mound with sticks, they spat, they cursed, they yelled. Then, in a few minutes, they returned peaceably and pursued their way. Having asked an explanation of the scene, I was told that this was the tomb of Sheikh Amri, a cruel chief of other days, whose memory is so hateful to the Bedaween, that they cannot pass the cairn which covers his bones without this frantic explosion of abhorrence.

After passing some more terrace-walls we came to the dry bed of a river. The channel was not very broad but tolerably deep,—much

deeper than we had been accustomed to see in the desert. Its bed was beautifully pebbled, and its banks fringed with various shrubs, that shook their green leaves over its white stones. Had there been but the pleasant flow of water, however small, there would have been as picturesque a glen as our own island could furnish. Even as it was, the scene was most attractive, forming such a contrast to the wastes which we had traversed; and we could almost supply its one defect by fancying

"The burn stealing lone thro' the lang yellow broom."

We now passed up a sandy eminence and came into Wady-en-Nehiyeh at a quarter before three. On all sides were hillocks of bright yellow sand, of a softer and moister kind than any which we had hitherto seen. The shrubs were finer and more plentiful, indicating a moister if not a better soil. The ritt'm especially shot up in beauty, and liliacious plants were scattered profusely around. Several small flowers also were making their appearance here and there. But who had sowed them? It seemed as if the soil of the desert were filled with innumerable seeds which need but the rain to call them up. We observed grass upon the more sheltered and better watered places, while large flocks of sheep, with thick tails, were feeding in all directions. We were evidently passing out of the desert into a region which, perhaps, had once been more fully cultivated, and which was quite capable of yielding something to the hand of the tiller. But though the lower parts were thus somewhat greener, the hill-slopes were as bare and stony as ever.

A little before four I left the party and ascended the ridge to the right, to examine what appeared in the distance like ruins on the long, level top, which was perhaps about three hundred feet in height, and to which there was a gradual slope over rough, loose stones, which covered the whole slope.

There were some fifteen inscriptions in all. They bore very considerable resemblance to the Mukatteb ones, though they were not exactly the same. They looked sharper and more recent. I walked along this flat ridge for about a mile, and came upon several circular mounds which had the appearance of ruins. One of these was of considerable size. The inscriptions were on flat pieces of horizontal rock, not on the side of any eminence. The ridge was above Wady-en-Nehiyeh.

Descending, I rejoined the party, of whom I had not allowed myself to lose sight; and, as we moved northwards, we came upon some ploughed fields to the left, where there was a man with an axe cleaving the baked soil,—"breaking up his fallow-ground," or rather cutting up the ground when brought by rain and sun into that state described in the Book of Job: "When the dust groweth into hardness, And the clods cleave fast together."—(Job 38: 38.)

The birds were singing blithely and hopping from shrub to shrub. About five o'clock we passed into Wady-er-Ruhaibeh, and encamped. The evening was fine, and the sky without a cloud, yet the heat was moderate. The air seemed to breathe of spring. All was freshness and balm. I walked out, and took my seat upon a sandy hillock, with the ritt'm and shia pressed down under me for my carpet, till the darkness came down.

We traversed this day a region of much beauty. We are still indeed moving through borderland, for fruitfulness and barrenness are fighting hard for victory over each other. There is yet more of the latter than the former, but the progress is visible. We have got real verdure at last, though it is but scanty. We miss the unbroken plains of grassy pasture, for which no mere patches of green can make up. We miss the green knolls and the glad river-sides of the north. We miss, too, the daisy and the primrose. But, notwithstanding, the scene has been brighter to-day than any through which we have come for many weeks, and we feel as if we were really "coming up out of the wilderness" by a gradual but cheering ascent of road, which is, mile after mile, throwing off the lean and scorched nakedness of the desert, and putting on the rich clothing of Syria's happier soil.

(To be continued.)

Christ and the Cross—As Paul Viewed Them.

The heart of the apostle Paul appears, as though it were always on pilgrimage to Calvary. Throughout his writings—whether he seeks by doctrine to enlighten the faith of man, or by precept to guide their practice—no theme possesses in itself sufficient interest to render him unmindful of "Jesus Christ and him crucified." So to speak, he builds up every separate truth of Christianity as an eminence, on which he may stand and catch a glimpse of the cross.

The epistle to the Hebrews strikingly exemplifies this observation. The sacrifice of Christ forms the chief subject of that epistle. Its necessity, its dignity, its efficacy, constitute the burden, or at least the culminating point of the apostle's argument; and he establishes these positions with the most luminous analogies and most cogent reasonings. Now, one would think that here, where this theme stood so long before his mind—here, if ever—it would prove to Paul an exhausted theme. But when he passes, in the close of the epistle, from that high discussion to the enforcement of duty, he returns, again and again to the sacrifice of Christ, as if he deemed it a topic always fresh—attractive always.

If he exhorts believers to draw near before God, with a true heart, in full assurance of faith—it is because they have "boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus."

If he warns them against apostasy—he enforces the warning by reference to the punishment, sorer than death, of which those must be thought worthy "who have trodden under foot the Son of God, and have counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith they were sanctified, an unholy thing."

He exhibits the faith of the Old Testament saints, "of whom the world was not worthy." He gathers them about our path, as a great cloud of witnesses, under whose notice we run the race set before us. But he cannot withhold the counsel that we should look even from them, to "Jesus the author and finisher of our faith, who, for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God."

He unfolds the privileges which give to the dispensation of the Gospel its superiority over the dispensation of the law. That the demand for "reverence and godly fear" may weigh upon our consciences with utmost solemnity, it does not suffice him to tell us that we "are come unto Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the first born, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect." His heart constrains him to add, as rising above these things, that we are come "to Jesus, the Mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, which speaketh better things than the blood of Abel."

Instructing believers "not to be carried about with divers and strange doctrines," he reminds them that "Jesus suffered, to sanctify the people with his own blood," and admonishes them to manifest similar constancy and patience in the endurance of reproach and persecution for the sake of truth. "By him, therefore," he proceeds—that is, by this Jesus who suffers, and through suffering sanctifies—"let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually," even "the fruit of our lips, giving-thanks to his name."

It is thus that the apostle seems to think that no subject touched by his pen, has accomplished its mission or answered its purpose, until it supplies him with an opportunity to recall "the offering of the body of Jesus Christ, once for all, to take away sin." We have need to catch his spirit in this matter. It is as "lifted up," that Christ draws us to himself. Only when we see "the blood of the cross" flowing between us and the iniquities that would beguile us, have we constraining and irresistible motives to refrain our feet from evil. Let us contemplate His sacrifice of sorrow and shame until it makes transgression an abhorrence in our eyes: until we can say from the heart—

"Oh, how I hate those lusts of mine

That crucified my God;
Those sins that pierced and nailed his flesh
Fast to the fatal wood!

Yes, my Redeemer, they shall die,
My heart hath so decreed;
Nor will I spare those guilty things
That made my Saviour bleed.

While with a melting broken heart,
My murdered Lord I view,
I'll raise revenge against my sins,
And slay these murderers too."

Religious Herald.

"Sleep, Sleep, Sleep."

Once upon a time, these words, uttered in a Fifth avenue church in this city, created "no small stir" among an aristocratic congregation, and woke up the slumberers among them in a most unmerciful hurry. The thing happened in this wise: It was a very warm afternoon in the early spring, the air was oppressively heavy, and the sermon, though an interesting one, had been longer than usual. Before its close there was unmistakable evidence that a number of the hearers heard better with their eyes shut. The clergyman saw the state of things, and determined to wake them up. By-and-by the sermon, like all things earthly, came to an end, and the sleepy individuals bent their heads and went off faster than ever. About the third sentence of the prayer, the clergyman besought forgiveness for "the thoughtless ones who profane the sanctuary by their drowsiness, and who sleep, sleep, SLEEP, through its solemn services," raising his voice at each repetition of the word, till the last "sleep" rang through the building. The effect was electrical. The sleepers awoke in a perfect agony of terror, almost starting to their feet in their excessive fright. For my part, though I can safely say that I was wide awake and had been through all the service, I felt as guilty as if I had been fast asleep, and strongly disposed to go and tell my pastor that he need not have done that for my benefit, nor included me in such a whole sale condemnation, since I, at least, made a point of never giving way to drowsiness under his preaching. For several Sabbaths after that, you may depend upon it no one went to sleep. I think it was the following Sunday our pastor took occasion to speak on the subject, not alluding to the particular fact, which we all remembered with great distinctness, but in a general way pointing out the impropriety and sin of going to sleep in church. He gave us several instances of the different methods adopted by clergymen to prevent drowsiness among their flocks. That one was in the habit, whenever he observed the premonitory symptoms, of announcing in a loud voice the price of grain or some other piece of intelligence equally interesting to the community. Another sat down and wept. That was very foolish, certainly. Just as if he, and he only, were the one to blame in such a case. Now, unfortunately, it cannot be denied that clergymen frequently preach very dull sermons, causing the truth to appear as little interesting and awakening as possible. Nevertheless, I maintain that so long as our churches are so oppressively warm, and so improperly ventilated, as they are at present, just so long will it be impossible for our congregations always to keep awake. The spirit is willing but the flesh is weak, very weak, and should be aided in its attempts to keep awake, instead of, as now, having every encouragement given it and every facility afforded it for going to sleep.—*N. Y. paper.*

Baptism: by Tholuck.

Baptism is the oath of allegiance which those take who have consecrated their own lives to the King of life. According to St. Peter, it is "the answer of a good conscience toward God." What a beautiful, expressive symbol! As one descends into the baptismal waters, and rises again from the pure wave, he leaves behind him all that has clung to him from birth, religion, friendship, custom—"all things must become new." Faith lifts the Christian into a new world. "Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature." Baptism expresses this significant truth. The Apostle Paul still more clearly explains this beautiful symbol, when he

says: "We are buried with him by baptism unto death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." As Christ left in the grave every sorrow which sin had brought to him, so we leave behind us in the watery grave, the sorrows and pleasures of sin and the world; and as he arose to a glorified life, so we are "quickened together with Him" to a spiritual life. This is the confession, this the prayer, this the vow, which each one offers at his baptism.

Breathing blessings upon the newly baptized, the church salutes him with the fraternal kiss. He has forsaken all for Christ; now he finds father, mother, brother and sister again. The favors and gifts of the church, its offices, its services and sacraments, are henceforth offered to him. No longer a wild growing plant, he has been transplanted into the garden of the Lord; no longer a stranger he has become a child of God. The tribulations of Christ he freely accepts, but His joys and consolations are also his. He has become partaker of the cross, but also of the crown.—*New York Examiner.*

The House of Clay.

Curious letter from a gentleman to a lady.

Dear Madam: As you have been very kind in honoring me with your friendship, I think myself in return bound to throw off all disguise and inform you of my real circumstance. You will be surprised at the commencement, and perhaps think I joke; but you may depend upon it as actually the case, and if there was necessity for it, I could bring our worthy parson to vouch for the truth of the whole. I live in a poor sorry house of clay, which stands on the waste, as most other cottages do; and what is worse, liable to be turned out at a moment's warning. It is a sort of freehold tenure, and the custom of the manor is this: For the first forty years I am to pay no rent, only to serve and attend the courts, which are held once a week, and sometimes oftener if demanded; and when I have nothing to pay, it will not be long before my person is seized, and out, will be the word. I might have had the tenement, such as it is, upon much better terms, had it not been for a fault committed by my great grandfather and his wife, who were concerned something about a tree, which they had no business with, as I have heard say, and so forfeited their privileges to my sorrow. However, I must rub on as well as I can, and endeavor to keep my house in tolerable repair as long as the lord of the manor gives me leave.—My kitchen, where I prepare my victuals, is a little roundish room, something in shape like an oven; however, it answers the purpose it was designed for, so that is enough. My attics, indeed, are but indifferently furnished; but they are rooms people now-a-days seldom regard; but the worst part of the story is, that it costs me a power of trouble in thatching; for as my covering stands pretty much exposed, the building decays faster than ordinary. I have one apartment, however, which I reserve for my choicest friends; it lies on the left side of my house, and is very warm, where you will always be a welcome guest, and may depend upon a lodging as long as the edifice is in possession of,

Dear madam, yours, &c.,

No Reparation for an Evil Death.

If an ignorant peasant, who had never drawn a bow, should be commanded to shoot at a mark far distant, upon condition that, if he hit it, he should be highly rewarded with many rich gifts; but if he missed it, and that at the first shot, he should be burned alive, in what straits would this poor man find himself! How perplexed that he should be forced upon a thing of that difficulty wherein he had no skill, and that the failing should cost him so dear as his life; but especially that it was to be only once essayed, without possibility of repairing the first fault by a second trial! This is our case. I know not how we are so pleasant. We have never died; we have no experience or skill in a thing of so great difficulty; we are only once to die, and in that all is at stake; either eternity of punishment

in hell, or of happiness in heaven. How live we, then, so careless of dying well, since for it we were born, and are but once to try it? This action is the most important of all our life.—Upon it depends eternity; and, if missed, without repair or amendment. These human actions which may be repeated, if one miss, the other may hit; and that which is lost in one way may be regained in another. If a rich merchant had this year a ship sunk in the ocean, another may arrive laden with such riches as may recompense the loss of the former: but if we once fail in death, the loss is never to be repaired. That which is but only one is worthy of more care and esteem, because the loss of it is irreparable.—Let us, then, value the time of this life, since there is none other given wherein to gain eternity.—*Jeremy Taylor.*

Mounds of Nineveh.

The Bible has made us familiar with the wars of Sennacherib against Israel and Judah; the capture of their cities; the long and obstinate siege of Lachish, during which Sennacherib extorted from Hezekiah thirty talents of gold and three hundred talents of silver; that he sent forces to take Jerusalem, where 185,000 were destroyed in one night by the "angel of the Lord;" and that Sennacherib, returning to Nineveh, was slain by his own sons while worshipping the very idol he had trusted in.

Twenty-five centuries have passed. The mighty power of Nineveh has disappeared; its walls and temples have been destroyed; not even a village bears the name once so famous; and infidels denied that Nineveh had ever existed, and called the Scripture narrative a fiction.

But the mounds of ruin are now excavated; the remains of buried palaces explored. Their walls are found to have been formed of large stone tablets covered with historical and other inscriptions. The key to decipher many of these inscriptions has been discovered, and these ancient records confirm the Scripture.

Over one highly finished bas-relief representing the king on his throne in state, with the officers around him, and many prisoners before him, some of them in the hands of "tormentors," is this inscription:

"Sennacherib the mighty king of the country of the Assyrians sitting on the throne of judgment at the gate of the city Lachish—I give permission for its slaughter."

Another tablet says, "Because Hezekiah king of Judah did not submit to my yoke, forty-six of his strong-fenced cities, and innumerable smaller towns which depended on them, I took and plundered. But I left to him Jerusalem, his capital city."

The record also speaks of having exacted of him thirty talents of gold, and eight hundred talents of silver, including perhaps the spoils of the other cities of Judah.

If these stone tablets had remained exposed to the weather, they would have perished ages ago, but a sudden and overwhelming desolation entombed and thus guarded them.

Little did Sennacherib imagine that his mighty capital would be obliterated, as the prophets foretold should be; still less, that his own stone memorials of his exploits in Judah should, after so many centuries, reappear—to prove the divinity of the God whom he defied, and the vanity of the idol he worshipped.—*Messenger.*

The Right kind of a Wife.

A New York Editor says he had an introduction last week to the heroine of the following sketch:

Mr. —, a merchant, now residing in Philadelphia, who formerly lived in rather an extravagant style, was in the habit every Monday morning of giving his wife a certain sum of money for the table and other household expenses of the week; he never mentioned his business to his wife, and she, deeming him sufficiently capable of attending to his affairs, never inquired into them. About five years after marriage, through some slight mismanagement, and the rascality of his confidential clerk, Mr. — suddenly broke, and his fall was mentioned "sym-

pathizingly" on 'change, and, like all such matters, there all sympathy ended. The merchant kept the affair a secret, and the first intimation his lady had of it was a news paragraph in the Ledger. Shortly after dinner was over, on the discovery of the startling fact, Mrs. — requested her husband to remain in the parlor a few moments, as she had something to say to him. She then left the room, hurried up stairs, and shortly after returned, with a splendidly bound Bible in her hand. Handing it to her husband she said:

"George, the day after our marriage you gave me this precious book as a token of your love, and as a rich fountain to look to in the day of trouble. Its pages have been precious to me; and as your brow looks sad to-day, I now return it to you, that you may glean from it some consolation in the hour of gloom." She then left the room.

The merchant opened the book carelessly, and a bank bill fell out. He picked it up and glanced at its face—it was a \$10 bill. He opened the book again, and another note of the same amount was before him. He opened it at the first page, and continued to find an X between every two leaves till he had arrived at the commencement of the book of Revelations. He was saved—could commence business, and had a capital of \$9,000.

He rang the bell—a servant appeared.

"Request your mistress to come to me immediately," said the merchant.

The lady obeyed, entering the room with something between a tear and a smile.

"Kate! Kate! where did you procure all this money?"

"This is the weekly saving of our household expenses for the last five years," was the modest reply. "Every week I put ten out of the twenty dollars which you gave me into our Bible bank, that when a day of trouble came upon us, we should have something to save us from the wolf."

"But why put it in the Bible, Kate?"

"Because it is a good bank, one which will not suddenly break," replied the lady.

"You are an angel, Kate," cried the delighted husband, clasping her to his heart.

And so she is. Does any one doubt it!

The above is a very beautiful story, but some how or other we are unfortunately addicted to the habit, whenever we see figures, to examine the problem and see if it is worked out right. According to the above, this couple had been married five years, or 260 weeks, and the wife had laid aside \$10, per week, which would amount to only \$2,600!

Again: an elegantly bound bible would have about 1000 or more pages in it, and a bill between every two leaves, would enable it to contain about 500 bills, which, at \$10 each, would be \$5000. This is not \$9000, and to have amounted to this would have required a marriage of ten years. Why could not the inventor of the story have written that they had been married ten years, and that \$5000 was the sum found in the Bible? Had he done this the story would not have been spoiled by its discrepancies and some people might have credited it. As it is the husband is represented as giving his wife one thousand and forty dollars a year for five years, or five thousand and two hundred dollars in all.—She paid all the table and other household expenses out of it, living in *extravagant style*, and saved nine thousand dollars out of it, or nearly twice as much as the whole amount he had given her.—*Ed. Her.*

It is much of its duty, for a church to preserve and enact, steadily and always, a pure testimony for Christ. How often in his ministry does the Saviour speak of preaching the gospel in all the world, for a witness to all nations; eis marturion autois; for a testimony against them, as it is sometimes rendered.—Once, Luke 9:5, it requires this solemn rendering more palpably; where, instead of the simple dative plural, autois, it is much more burdensome and emphatic eis marturion ep'autous; for a testimony upon them. It will be a very crushing weight, upon them, in the day of Judgment, if they die in their sins!—God's word shall not return to

him void. It shall accomplish, he says the thing which I please; it shall prosper in that whereto I sent it. Whether of judgment or of mercy, it shall do his work, who speeds it on his own errands. And his own servants shall not lose their reward. If their testimony is pure and true, and their motive right, it shall turn to them for a testimony and a praise, in the day of reckoning. They indeed desire not the ruin or the misery of men; but they do desire the glory of God, and in this shall they be gratified, as truly as God shall be glorified.

Letter from Dr. Duff.

Letters from Dr. Duff respecting the progress of the Mutiny, and coming down to dates as late as July 3, are received, and we make a few extracts:

It is not easy to imagine or realise the strangely saddening and depressing influence produced on the minds of all here by the daily reports of the deplorable events now everywhere occurring in the north-west. And what gives intensity to the sadness is, that there is scarcely any one amongst us who has not a father, mother, brother, or sister, a son, daughter, or some other relative or friend, either already numbered among the victims of atrocious massacre, or in a position of imminent peril. To all this also has to be added the succession of dangers through which we ourselves have passed. All the relations now made serve to show that these dangers were in reality vastly greater than any one at the time was fully aware of, or could bring himself to believe.

An eye-witness to the brutal conduct of the mutinous sepoys at Allahabad, who himself had a narrow escape from their ruthless hands, thus writes:—"A next-door English neighbor of mine was visited one night by a gang of upwards of two dozen sepoys, fully equipped with destructive arms. On the hue and cry being given, I went up to the terrace of my house, and saw with my eyes the rascals cutting into two an infant boy of two or three years of age, while playing with his mother: next, they hacked into pieces the lady; and subsequently, most shockingly and horridly, the husband." The writer made his escape by a back-door, and, by means of a bamboo, he managed to cross the Ganges, and make his way through multiplied difficulties to Benares.

At one of the stations, a lady, in panic terror, had hidden herself in an obscure corner of the house. Through a chink or crevice in the partition she saw the bleeding head of one of her children rolled as a ball across the floor; and on emerging from her hiding-place beheld the fragments of another scattered about her!

Here is another variety of incident in the terrible tragedy now enacting in the north-west, as related by an eye-witness:—"An officer and his wife were attacked by man sowars, or mutineers of native cavalry. The brave officer singly shot dead seven of them on the spot, and at last was overcome by a number of the rebels. Instead, however, of allowing himself to be disgraced by the scoundrels, under the pressure of the awful emergency he first killed his wife, and then put an end to his own life!

Similar to its main object was another case, of which certain information has reached us. A small party of gentlemen, with a young lady lately resident in Calcutta, and well known to some of us, effected their escape to an isolated house, where they were hard pressed by the ferocious mutineers. In case of their being eventually overpowered by numbers, they entered into a mutual though dismal agreement, to kill the lady to save her from the brutal outrages of the murderers, and then to sell their own lives as dearly as they could.

The troops at Seetapore, in Northern Oude, after the bloody butchery they had committed there, proceeded towards Muhundie. They met on the road the refugees from Shahjehanpore, and the civil officers of Muhundie, fleeing from the latter place; all of whom they deliberately slaughtered, save one, Capt. Orr, who witnessed the horrible scene.

June 29.—Still no cessation of heavy tidings from the north-west. In one of our journals to-

day appears the letter of a correspondent at Allahabad, who after stating that the destruction of property there was total, thus proceeds:—"Did the report reach you of the massacre of the Futtehghur fugitives? It passed in atrocity all that has been hitherto perpetrated. A large body of Europeans, men, women, and children, in several boats, left Futtehghur for this; they were all non-military residents of the place. On arrival at Bhitoor (near Cawnpore) the Nana Sahib fired on them with the artillery the Government allowed them to keep. One round shot struck poor Mrs. —, and killed her on the spot. The boats were then boarded, and the inmates landed and dragged to the parade ground at Cawnpore, where they were first fired at, and then literally hacked to pieces with tulwars, or axe-like swords.

July 1.—To-day news have reached us of the native troops having risen at Bareilly, the largest station in Rohileund. They first of all took possession of the guns, and then set at liberty 3000 prisoners in the jail, who laid the station in ruins. Many of the British officers and other residents, it is supposed, made their escape.

Indeed it may be added, that from every station where as yet there has not been actual mutiny, the handful of Europeans who have not been able to escape are living in hourly expectation of an attack.

July 2.—At an early hour of this deplorable rebellion I was led—from the analogy of the Vellore mutiny, as well as various minute circumstances which had come within my own cognizance—to infer that the cartridge affair and its alleged caste-breaking tendencies were a mere shallow but plausible pretext in the hands of evil-minded designing men, and that the real originating cause of the whole mischief would be found of a purely political character. To this persuasion I gave free expression at a time when few were prepared to entertain it. Every disclosure, however, which of late has been made goes to demonstrate that it has been the result of a long concocted Mohammedan conspiracy against the supremacy and rule of Great Britain in India.

Information received from arrested spies and papers found in their possession serves to implicate the ex-King of Oude, and especially his Prime Minister the Nawab Ali Nukhi Khan—one of the cleverest and wildest of Asiatic intriguers. Indeed, it is said that since his imprisonment in Fort William the latter openly avows that he had a principal share in contriving and working out the deeply laid plot, and that he glories in having done so, adding that he has woven a web around the British Government which it will not disentangle for many a day.

To all appearance the titular Emperor of Delhi and members of his family have also been deeply implicated in the dark and foul conspiracy. In time the whole truth may gradually be unfolded. Meanwhile, gleams of light like the following shoot out upon the subject. An officer who escaped from Fyzabad states that, in a conversation with the sabadar of his own regiment, the latter said, "as you are going away forever, I will tell you all about our plans. We halt at Fyzabad five days, and march via Darriabad upon Lucknow, where we expect to be joined by the people of the city. Proclamations have been received from the King of Delhi, informing all that he is once more on the throne of his fathers and calling on the whole army to join his standard. Rajah Mann Sing has been appointed Commander-in-Chief in Oude." The sabadar farther added,—"You English have been a long time in India, but you know little of us. We have nothing to do with Wajid Ali (the ex-King of Oude) or any of his relations. The kings of Lucknow were made by you; the only ruler in India empowered to give sunnuds (titles of kingship) is the Emperor of Delhi; he made a king of Oude, and it is from him only that we shall receive our orders."

July 3.—For the last two or three weeks, no communication has reached this Government from the Governor of Agra. Already some of the fugitives of the north-west have arrived in Calcutta; and their oral accounts more than confirm the distressing accounts which from time to

time have appeared in our public journals.—The condition of the north-west is, according to the testimony of these respectable eye-witnesses, beyond measure deplorable. It seems to be one universal scene of violence, depredation and plunder,—no Government, with its wholesome restraints, anywhere—no administration of justice—no control of police authority,—no collection of revenue,—no traffic,—no buying or selling,—every man's hand uplifted against his neighbor,—might being right, the strongest is for the moment the sovereign power! Oh! what need of humiliation before God! What need of the prayers of God's people! Oh for the penitential spirit of Nehemiah and Daniel of old; and their gifts of copious and appropriate utterance! Truly the floods of the ungodly "have lifted up their voice; the floods have lifted up their waves." What, then, can be our consolation?—What but that of the Psalmist,—“The Lord on high is mightier than the noise of many waters, yea than the mighty waves of the sea.”

Under much pressure and sorrow of spirit, I remain, yours very affectionately,
ALEXANDER DUFF.



The Advent Herald.

BOSTON, OCTOBER 3, 1857.

The readers of the Herald are most earnestly besought to give it room in their prayers; that by means of it God may be honored and his truth advanced; also, that it may be conducted in faith and love, with sobriety of judgment and discernment of the truth, in nothing carried away into error, or hasty speech, or sharp, unbrotherly disputation.

Justifactory.

In the Herald of July 18th, an inquiry was made by Elder D. Bosworth, whether the interrogations in Isa. 33:14,—“Who among us shall dwell with devouring fire? who among us shall dwell with everlasting burnings?”—were equivalent to asking, “Who shall dwell with God?” which he had heard given, erroneously, he thought, as the sense of the passage.

This was editorially replied to in the negative. It was shown that the terms “devouring fire” and “everlasting burnings” are not denominative of God; that the application of the term to Him by a metaphor, to illustrate the punishment of sin, does not, by any law of language, make it significant of Him when it elsewhere occurs; that, by a well-established law of trope,—the figure being always in the predicate and everlasting fire being the subject of enquiry,—it could be only understood as literally expressed; and that the “who,” which is the nominative of shall dwell, is in opposition with the “he” in v. 16, and therefore expressive of the “sinners” and “hypocrites” in Jerusalem. The request was also made that one who had been in the habit of giving this exposition, would show wherein the text was misapprehended.

The week following, the one, whose attention was thus directed to the subject, responded, argued the question, and gave his understanding of the interrogations, to be

“Simply this, Who among us will be permitted to dwell in the presence of the overwhelming, burning, everlasting glory of God. Though, possibly, this may not be the meaning of the text.”

The reasons given for this view, were replied to in a kind, courteous and Christian manner, in the Herald of July 25th, the laws of tropes, as applicable to the case, were more fully unfolded, and the brother was invited to show wherein those laws were incorrectly affirmed or applied. He has made no attempt to show their inaccuracy or inapplicability, but, in the Herald of Sept. 19th, made six enquiries thus:

1. What is “the majestic shade” of Samuel?
2. How can the wicked “dwell with devouring fire,” as in Isaiah 33, if that fire is the “fire of hell,” which “burns eternally”?
3. Does not the very question imply that they cannot dwell with such fire?
4. If they can dwell with such fire why is the question asked?
5. Does not the connection show that they will be utterly consumed?
6. How much is left of thorns after they are “burned in the fire”?

“The Request” thus made, was very cheerfully “Complied with”—the questions all having reference to the present subject, with the exception of the first, which had respect to a phrase editorially used in the Herald of June 27th. In another column of the present No., the brother takes exception to the answers given to his interrogations, in a “Rejoinder,” that is doubtless intended to be received as a frankly spoken but kind and courteous document. And therefore the following is penned as a

SURREJOINDER.

Endeavoring ever to keep in mind the standing paragraph at the head of the editorial columns, there will be a constant endeavor to conduct all editorial responses “in faith and love, with sobriety of judgment and discernment of the truth, in nothing carried away into hasty speech, or unbrotherly disputation.” It is believed that a violation of this rule will be vainly sought for in any editorial; and however far short any effort has fallen, the intention has ever been to honor God and advance His truth, and not in any case to aim at personal victory. Being ever ready to retract any error, or to admit the relevancy of anything that is argument against any position taken, the Rejoinder is here replied to, in the belief that our brother is also ready to forsake any error, and that he has the frankness and generosity to confess to any change of opinion; for if any disputant is not thus actuated, any effort to reason with, to communicate to, or to receive instruction from him, would be so much labor lost.

It is a subject of regret, of course, to find our brother expressing his “entire dissatisfaction” with the answers given; for it is always pleasing to the maker of an honest effort, to see it crowned with success. It should, however, be borne in mind that, in answering questions under the editorial head, the giving of satisfaction to the one who asks, is no part of the object aimed at; which is simply to present truth, to unfold the teachings of Inspiration, and to defend the doctrines of revelation irrespective of whether they may please or displease. “Go preach the preaching that I bid thee,” says God to his servants, “whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear.”

One's satisfaction with an argument, or dissatisfaction, is dependent on the stand-point from which it is viewed. If it is from the pedestal of truth and reason, a sophistical argument will give dissatisfaction; but if the stand-point is in the vale of error and sophism, dissatisfaction will be equally pointed against sound and conclusive argument.

As a more full acquaintance with truth will always dispel the dissatisfaction of the candid enquirer, the expression of pleasure or displeasure cannot weigh at all as an argument, except as it is fortified by unanswerable reason, and incontrovertible logic. That of our brother will therefore,—kindly and courteously, but with the determination to ascertain its precise weight and value—be subjected to the test of criticism, that it may be seen how far it is sound or faulty.

1st. Our brother's first premise is that to his first enquiry, as to the meaning of the words “majestic shade,” an answer is given “from Webster, Dryden, and Heathenism, but not a word from the Bible.”

If his enquiry had had respect to something claimed as Bible doctrine, the proof of it should come from the Bible. Or if the brother had enquired if “shade” was a Bible word, he would have been promptly told that it was not. Or if he had enquired what Bible term it is the synonym of, he would have been promptly answered. But he simply enquires respecting a phrase, “What is it?” and to answer the question which he has asked, it is only necessary to show the significance of the term, by its general and classical usage. A question in mathematics is to be determined solely by the laws of that science. Biblical doctrine, may be solved only by the Bible. And the appropriate use of words may be determined only by the laws of philology.

The general and classical use of a term, determines its significance. And though this may be objected to, this mode of doing it will stand the test of the severest criticism, notwithstanding the objection raised.

Our brother says that an answer has been given from “heathenism.”

This word slipped hastily from his pen, or he would have erased it; for, if he will look, he will see that no heathen, but only Christian writers are quoted; and a moment's reflection will convince him; as shade is simply an English word, it could never have been used by any heathen writers, who all wrote in foreign languages. It is purely a Saxon word, and signifies “to cut off;” hence, when the light is cut off from any object, it is said to be in the “shade;” and as a shadow

may be seen, but is not manifest to the touch, the same term, by a poetical and metaphorical usage, has been applied, in English lexicographical and classical literature, as the denominative of any real or imagined visible spirit manifestation. Could it be shown that spirits do not exist, that the spirit dies with the body, that man's spirit is only his breath, and his soul a mere principle of life, it would not affect the accuracy of the term, as used to express the idea of a spirit visibly manifested, however erroneous the idea might be. No one can safely to his own literary reputation, call in question the appropriateness of lexicographical and classical authority on a question of this nature. And if no words may be used in the discussion of Scriptural questions but those contained in the Bible, then our brother must discontinue the use of a number of his favorite expressions, and even expunge quite a list of words from his present communication, as they will be looked for in vain among the words and phraseology of Inspiration!

Our brother asks if Samuel's soul was present with Saul and the woman at Endor, if it spake, and if it gave a truthful utterance? To these interrogatories he imputes an editorial affirmation, but wishes himself not to be asked “to swallow such an idea.”

In reply to this, our brother is reminded that it was not the editorial pen, but the inspired record, that affirms that, “the woman saw Samuel;” that “Saul perceived that it was Samuel;” that “Samuel said to Saul;” that “then said Samuel;” and that “Saul was sore afraid because of the words of Samuel”—five positive declarations of the inspired penman respecting Samuel's being seen, his speaking, and the effect of his words; and that his utterances were truthful, is not questioned by the inspired writer who records them. That the Lord had departed from Saul, had rent his kingdom from him, and given it to David, as it is affirmed that “Samuel said,” no one will deny; that this was done because Saul would not obey the voice of the Lord, all will admit to have been truthfully spoken; that this was in accordance with what the Lord had spoken by Samuel, is equally indisputable; what the Bible denominates “Samuel,” affirms that it was; “as he spake by me,” and that the prediction—“The Lord will deliver thee and tomorrow shalt thou and thy sons be with me”—is shown to be true by the records of Israel's defeat and of the slaughter of Saul and his sons on the morrow—reckoning Jewish time.

If this spirit uttered any falsehood, it remains yet to be shown. And if it was not Samuel who is affirmed to have been seen and heard, it is needful that some law of language be adduced to demonstrate that the phraseology is misapprehended.—When the Bible says, “the woman saw Samuel,” it is not enough to say, I don't believe it; when it affirms that “Samuel said to Saul,” it is not meeting the question to reply, I don't believe Samuel spoke to Saul; nor when it reads that “Saul was sore afraid because of the words of Samuel,” is it a sufficient answer to say, I don't believe they were the words of Samuel.

Our brother has not made use of these words; but if they do not express the meaning of “Do not ask me to swallow such an idea,” then the literal significance designed to be conveyed by the metaphor, is entirely misapprehended.

Any declaration of Scripture, may be met with an I don't believe it; but that will not be satisfactory to those to whom every word of the Lord is true, who conform their opinions to the word, and who never seek to bend the word to their opinions. What has God said? is the inquiry of such; and what He has said, they believe. If it be translated in unintelligible, in doubtful, or in equivocal terms, then they ask for a more intelligible rendering of it; but unless the rendering can be simplified, or the phraseology otherwise harmonized, they believe what is written without a hesitation or doubt. And till our brother can show an inaccuracy in the translation, or some law of language which admits of Samuel's absence from the scene where his presence is affirmed, there is no resource but to believe it, however much there may be a disinclination to, or however “blasphemous” may be regarded what the Bible denominates “the words of Samuel.”

Because the Bible affirms that in Sheol the wicked cease from “troubling,” our brother concludes that Saul, before entering Sheol, could not be made the cause of Samuel's being “disquieted,” so as to come at the direction of Jehovah to pronounce Saul's doom. As the troubling of the wicked is by their rage and malice, and as Saul's impertunity for Samuel, was owing to his despair and regard for him, the relevancy of the quotation is not readily seen; and therefore there will be no dissent from the appropriateness of

the heading under which our brother has chosen to place it.

2. The answer given to our brother's second enquiry, how the wicked can dwell with devouring fire, that it is “dependent on God's ability to fulfill His word,” is met by him with several Scriptural quotations which affirm that they will perish, and be burned up, &c.; and he enquires how much shall be left of them then?

It is here necessary to call our brother's attention to a few facts. First, that the word “up” in connection with burned, has nothing to represent it in the original of Mal.4:1. It is precisely the same as that in Joel 1:19: “the flame hath burned all the trees”; so that the emphasis often placed on a little monosyllable that don't exist, is entirely gratuitous. Second, that what is “burned up” may still remain, as in Jer. 9:12, “the land perisheth and is burned up.” Third, that many of the righteous have been burned up by Papal and Pagan malice. Fourth, that notwithstanding the destruction of the wicked, as brought to view by the passages he quotes, they are all to be raised at the end of the millennium. Fifth, that he admits in his Rejoinder that when any thing is burned up, the material of which it was constituted remains. And, sixth, that one of the elements of which man is constituted is Mind, which has none of the attributes of matter and is subject to none of its laws.

This part of the argument however, which is entirely defensible, is not gone into, for the want of space in this article to do justice to it; but if it is wished by the opposite side, to have a candid and Christian, but earnest and thorough discussion of it, if they will depute some amiable and good natured debater, in whose ability and competency they may be willing to trust their cause, the arguments for and against may have a fair and full discussion, in the manner both parties may agree upon.

3d. Our brother objects to the answer given to his enquiries, that it makes the questions of Isaiah “appear foolish.”

If it so appear to him, before this can be presented as an argument against the logical and scriptural correctness of the answer given, he should show its inconclusiveness. The foolishness which he imputes to it may be dependent more on the stand-point from which he views it, than on any intrinsic defect in the answer given; and this needs to be determined, before this classification of it can be admitted as a logical deduction. For, instead of being a condemnation of the argument, it may be a sentence passed on his own judgment.

Everything that is not believed, is foolishness to those who reject it. Even the “preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness”; and it has “pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe.” Christ crucified, is “to the Greeks foolishness”; and even “the things of the spirit of God are foolishness to him that believes not”; but, on the other hand, “the foolishness of God is wiser than men,” and “the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God.” Its appearing foolish, therefore, does not determine the irrelevancy of the reply.

Our brother now claims that the interrogations in Isa. 33:14 are in a negative form.

They are however, precisely the same as when in the Herald of July 25th, he imputed to them an affirmative form, by explaining them to mean:

“Simply this, who among us will be permitted to dwell in the presence of the overwhelming, burning, everlasting, glory of God?”

And giving as an answer that the righteous will.

The form of the question has not changed, nor does our brother confess that he was incorrect in the position then taken, or allude to any change in his own mind; and yet what was then affirmative to him, is now negative! Should not this change of opinion have been announced, and the reason for the change given? Or should an opposite view be now contended for, while preserving silence respecting having advocated another?

It will be remembered that the discussion began with the question whether “devouring fire” and “everlasting burnings” were denominative of God? the Herald denied this, but claimed they were illustrative of future punishment. That was then the issue. Now our brother has abandoned his time-honored and public exposition of the text, and does not now make fire the denominative of God, nor the questions, an affirmation that some among us will dwell with God. His present position, therefore, in claiming that the questions have a negative form, is a full justification of the position which the Herald at first took, and which he controverted,—the duration of that punishment not having been yet discussed. The attention of our brother is simply called to this; for on seeing it, he will not do justice to his usual frankness, candor, generosity, and good nature, if he fail to ac-

knowledge, that the exposition which he formerly gave, to harmonize that text with his theory, is incorrect, that he has abandoned it and that his present effort to harmonize it is a new thought.

This, however, it is hoped he will also abandon, when he shall see as an examination of the interrogation will show him that to claim a negative form for the questions is not in accordance with any law of language—the violation of which he so judiciously deprecates.

There are various forms and uses of the interrogation. It may be used simply to solicit information, or to affirm or to deny any thing with great emphasis, or it may be used for neither of those purposes, but to call attention to a subject,—without either affirming or denying. The familiar study of any reliable treatise on Rhetoric will show that the form of the interrogation in question does not deny, as our brother supposes; and he will find that this position is incontrovertible. He will remember that in the *Herald* of July 25th, he adduced the same form of inquiry, when he quoted, "Who shall abide in thy tabernacle? who shall dwell in thy holy hill?" "Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord? or who shall stand in his holy place?" &c., and admitted that the answers given, showed who *will dwell* and *abide* there. Therefore he cannot now claim what he does of this form of the inquiry without denying also the dwelling of the righteous in glory as well as the wicked in devouring fire. This difficulty in the way of his exegesis, requires his serious consideration and frank admission. In the present case the questions are answered by showing who will not dwell there,—they being of a form that may be answered, by showing who will or who will not, without any denial that the sinners and hypocrites in Zion, who were "surprized" at God's destruction of the Assyrians, could dwell there.

4. Our brother expresses himself "surprized" at the chemical analysis given of the constituents of thorns, and what would remain of them when burnt.

This surprize excites no surprize in return—such a result not being considered improbable when the analysis was given; for it was not seen how the asking of the question was explainable on any other hypothesis. But being surprized at anything, is no evidence against its conclusiveness.

Our brother says that "a thorn is not the material of which it originally was made"; but he does not proceed to show by any chemical analysis that the material that constitutes it, is any thing different from the material of which it is made, or that its constituent elements will not remain in all their original volume and essence. He virtually admits that it all survives the burning, though the thorn may be disintegrated or decomposed, so as to be no longer a thorn. But the constituent elements will all exist, and may pass into other combinations, or be recombined in precisely the same form and substance by another growth of thorn, should God so order them—nothing being lost that constituted the thorn.

5. With the analysis given of man, our brother is "more and more astonished." Astonishment, however, is no more an evidence against anything than surprize. Daniel was "astonished at the vision," but the vision was none the less true in every particular. When the door opened and the disciples "saw Peter, they were astonished," but the apparition was none the less Peter because of their astonishment. Astonishment often precedes belief. The disciples "were astonished at Christ's words," yet received them heartily; and "the deputy, when he saw, believed, being astonished." The astonishment of our brother is at the position taken that in the burning of a man, there are evolved elements which do not enter into the constituency of thorns,—particularly the element of Mind,—and at the claim that mind does not inhere in, is indicated by none of the elements, and exists independent of its connection with matter. These positions are met only by expressions of astonishment, and yet they are impregnable, as any one will find who shall buckle on his armor, and attempt to assail them.

Our brother asks for an instance of the existence of a Mind without personal organization. This last term not being found in the Bible, its significance can be determined only by the Dictionary. There we learn that what is organized has been made, or formed; that is, fashioned or created in such a manner that all its parts act in harmony with each other. If it is claimed that the Creator of all things is thus organized, then who was His organizer? For whatever is organized implies an organizer, the same as whatever is created, implies a creator. But organism, or creation, cannot be predicated of the great Original Being, who is the Creator of all things. It is true that God is a Person, but His is a spiritual essence; for "God

is a spirit"—phraseology not originating in the *Herald* to which the saying of it is imputed, but words of inspiration—and not a material thing; nor was his existence ever dependent on any fortuitous combination of atoms, spontaneously adjusted, nor on matter organized by some prior existing intelligence, as all organized things must be.

From this it will be seen that the issue is not whether a mind is a personality, or has form; nor is it whether a mind may be organized; for the Creator may organize as many intelligences as it may please Him—He alone being uncreated. But the issue is simply this, may the created intelligent spirit exist independent, not of organization, but of material organization. As the burning of a man separates the material constituents of his nature, and as they remain in all their original essence, who can say that the element of mind, when separated by igneous action from man's material constituents, does not also exist, as well as the gases and ashes, in its created essence? Has mind any attributes save those of reason, memory, consciousness and volition? and has matter any of these? Whoever will, let him meet this question, or else not assail it.

But is there no instance of the existence of the Spirit separate from its material form? The case of Samuel is to the point. His dust reposed 55 miles South of Endor. But the Bible affirms, that Samuel was seen, and that he spake to Saul. It could not be the dust of Samuel which had returned to the dust as it was; but the spirit which had returned to God who gave it.

Moses, though dead, appeared on the mount and spake with Jesus. What straits of exegesis have been resorted to, to obviate the explicit revelation of this supernatural fact!—some claiming that he was raised, others that he never died, and others denying the record of his presence.

Our Savior affirms that a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as Himself had after His resurrection.

The penitent thief was promised admission to paradise with the Saviour on the day of his crucifixion. The various criticisms resorted to for the purpose of obviating this conclusion, will not bear a moment's examination.

The Saviour in his illustration of Dives, Lazarus and Abraham, speaks of them as thinking, intelligent beings in the interval between death and the resurrection; and whatever it may be claimed they represent (!) it is nevertheless true that the Saviour uses as the representative agents, conscious intelligences, whom He represents as existing subsequent to death and anterior to the resurrection. He never used falsehoods to illustrate any truth, but drew all his illustrations from actual verities.

Paul avows his faith in the susceptibility of man to have conscious existence out of the body, when he utters his ignorance of whether he was in the body or out at the time of his wonderful visions.

Eliphaz the Temanite affirms to having seen a spirit, which passed before his face, and spake to him, though he could not discern the form thereof.

Inspiration has distinguished between flesh and spirit, in the declaration that horses are flesh and not spirit.

The existence of spirit, is affirmed, as well as angels, and the truth of the resurrection, when it is announced as a peculiarity of the Sadducees that they believed neither.

Those who were warned in the days of Noah are represented as "spirits in prison" when Peter wrote; while Paul recognizes the "spirits of just men made perfect," which would be incongruous, if the entire man was then perfected.

In the symbolization of the first resurrection, John first saw the souls of them that were beheaded, and then that they lived. Had it read, the souls that were beheaded, then souls might be understood to be put by a synecdoche for the persons; but "of them" following the word souls, the latter is spoken of specifically in distinction from the body. And in the symbolization of the condition of the martyrs under the fifth seal, they are also specified as "the souls of them that were beheaded" distinct from the beheaded bodies, but in a conscious and anticipative condition—the bodies not being then resurrected.

The righteous who had perished, are represented by Isaiah as "resting in their beds," and also at the same time, as "each one walking in his uprightness;" which is reconcilable only in view of the two-fold condition, as dust returned to the earth and spirit returned to God, to which they are subjected.

It is affirmed of the king of Babylon that he was denied a burial, and yet his entrance into Sheol, is represented as being accompanied by the exultant tauntings of the other kings who had preceded him, that he had become as weak as they.

Paul affirms that when at home in the body we are absent from the Lord; and that to be "absent

from the body" is "to be present with the Lord." He expressly distinguishes between being in the body and out, and also between being in this tabernacle, being unclothed and naked, and being clothed upon by the house from heaven.

He also contrasts living in the flesh with departing and being with Christ; declares the latter to be far better; and yet he makes that departure from the flesh and being with Christ, to synchronize with a period when his abiding in the flesh is more needful for those he was then addressing.

With the foregoing evidence from Inspiration that the element of mind, which enters into the constituency of man, survives the decay of the material part of his organization, the question is rested with the conviction—however much it may be assailed, however foolish it may appear, however much surprise or astonishment it may create, or dissatisfaction it may give—that it is God's truth, eternal, impregnable, and forever abiding. So that the appearing of Samuel and Moses after their dissolution, or the dwelling of Zion's surprised hypocrites with devouring fire as expressed in the words of inspiration, will stand the test of logical argument and Scriptural research.

After writing the foregoing, the article signed "Justice" was received from a ministering brother, who has lately given up the doctrine of the soul's unconsciousness and embraced that here advocated.

MY JOURNAL.

Thursday, Aug. 27th.—We took leave of Bro. Moore and his family, and came in company with Bro. Boyer and wife, to the Second Fork, the place of his residence, and arrived just in season to escape a heavy rain-storm. Bro. Litch and Jackson were caught in it, and detained till the next day. Here we rested part of two days, and then started for our next meeting on Bennett's Branch, in a Grove situated at the foot of the mountains, five miles above the Fork. The late rain had swollen the river so that it was not fordable the first day of the meeting.

But it soon went down, so that a foot bridge was built and the carriages also could ford the river.—They have no bridges in this region, and therefore have to ford the streams when it is safe to do so. The labor and pains the people take to attend meetings here, shows a high appreciation of the Gospel. They climb hills, ford rivers, and go through sunshine and storm, and all with apparent pleasure, to attend on the means of grace.—Mothers too—and God bless them, press through every difficulty with one, and sometimes two or three children to enjoy the means of grace. While at Shippen, I gave four of my discourses in the midst of rain-storms; one in a thunder-storm, in which the lightning shivered a tree but a little distance from our camp. But many of the people remained unmoved,—some with, and others without umbrellas, determined that they would not lose a word of the blessed Gospel. It is some consolation, to a minister to preach to such a people. On our arrival we put up with Bro. Daniel Miller, an old settler, on whose land we were to hold the meeting. He has raised a family of fourteen children. Most of them are at home or in the neighborhood. And a more kind and well-behaved family we hardly ever meet with. It seems as though they could not do too much for the comfort of all that put up with them. Very hospitable and kind. I am glad to be able to say that several of these dear children were converted before our meeting closed, to the great joy of their parents, and Bro. Miller assured me, that he would soon put on Christ in baptism himself, having neglected this duty till now.

A few days before we arrived, they had had a terrible thunder-storm, in the midst of which, the lightning struck a very large hemlock-tree. It was about three feet through at the butt, and tall and large in proportion and very full of large limbs beginning within 8 or 9 feet of the ground, making a little forest in itself. It was struck about 3 o'clock in the P. M. of this day. It stood about ten rods from the house. Some members of the family were stunned by the shock. On going out to witness the scene of desolation Mr. Miller told me he found it shivered to pieces and spread over nearly an acre of land, trunk and limbs were shivered and scattered, leaving only a shattered stump or root. Bro. Boyer, Litch and myself went to the scene, saw the stump, and fragments. What power! What desolation is made by this almost almighty agent of the Almighty Jehovah. When he lets loose all his thunder-bolts on our guilty and polluted world he will make a quick work in dissolving the "elements," when "the heavens shall pass away with a great noise."

Saturday, Aug. 29th.—It having cleared off, the people began to gather, and our meeting assumed a promising aspect. It was continued four days

and well attended till the close, both by the churches and the public generally. I had good liberty in speaking, and gave two discourses per day, and Bro. Litch, Jackson and Holland, filled up with the rest of the time, in preaching and addresses, giving great interest and effect to the meetings.—On Sunday evening some of the unconverted began to break down, and came to the altar for prayer. Next evening a goodly number came, of whom several were converted. The work now became general, so that we had all we could do to attend to the enquiring. Tuesday, the last day of the meeting, the morning service continued until two o'clock, P. M. We could not break up the meeting at our usual time. I spoke from Acts 2; and though we did not have a Pentecost, or 3000 converted, we certainly had a season of refreshing, and of power something like it, in prostrating every soul before God. Even the hardened and stubborn yielded for the time, and wept before God. All who came to the altar found peace in believing.—Five offered themselves for baptism and a number of candidates were left for Bro. Boyer to baptise at a future time. Ten or twelve united with the church.

At 2, P. M. we adjourned the meeting to the water-side, near Bro. Saul Barr's, where Bro. Boyer baptised. I never witnessed a more pleasant or happy time at the baptismal waters. God was with us of a truth. All glory to His holy name. We now dismissed the audience, took refreshment and prepared for the evening service. The evening audience was large and the Spirit's power seemed to rest on every soul. It was easy preaching, and the word took effect. A large number came to the altar for prayer, most of whom were converted.

Just as our meeting had come to the highest state of interest and power, we were called by other appointments in Centre Co. to bring it to a close. Could it have been continued, and in the same spirit a few days longer, it was judged that most of the unconverted in the region would have been brought into the church. But, so it is, we cannot calculate on these seasons of refreshing, or make provision for their extension beforehand.—If this were the work of men, we could calculate results with exactness. But their arm is too short to produce such glorious results as our eyes witness from time to time in these camp-meetings.

At eleven o'clock we succeeded in bringing the very interesting services to a close, and took the parting hand. It was a painful, yet happy scene.

During the progress of the meeting, by invitation of Bro. Saul Barr, in company with Bro. Boyer, Jackson and others, we made an ascent to the top of one of the surrounding mountains. It was quite arduous and fatiguing. Our object in going up was to see a ledge of large rocks, containing many caverns, and one very long and deep opening of over one hundred feet in length and from four to seven feet in width. It was once one solid mass, and could it be closed up, would fit exactly in every part, as in the day it was separated. But by some powerful convulsion of nature it had been broken and separated. Situated as it is on the top of a high mountain, it certainly constitutes one of the wonders of nature, and is quite a curiosity to the lovers of natural curiosities. We were much interested and delighted in walking through these gorges and caverns, as also in our view from the mountain top of the vale below which seemed to lie at our feet, and the tops of the surrounding mountains, with which we now stood on a level. Like Moses on Pisgah, we stood upon a high elevation, yet not in a position to see that "Goodly mountain and Lebanon," or the promised land.—We could see this better at our camp, which was at the foot of the mountain, through the prophetic telescope, which we have in use for the pilgrims at all our encampments on the way to the kingdom.

Our work being done, and services closed, we began to think of our next encampment over the mountain in Centre County; and having but one day to get there, we concluded to bid adieu to our friends, and travel on our way as far as Bro. Boyer's that night. So we took leave of Bro. Miller and his family, and our teams being ready we started, and at mid-night, found ourselves safely domiciled in Bro. Boyer's hospitable mansion. We were all weary, but joyful in the Lord. We got a few hours' repose preparatory to a day's journey across the "Barrens," over the mountain-top, which would, with an enclosure about it, make a good place for a penal settlement!

Were the Elders mentioned in Acts 14:23, of the same character as the seven, that were set apart to serve tables? If so, does the word Elder and Deacon mean the same thing, or were they different offices in the church? W. J. N.

We think they refer to different positions in the church. A Deacon was not necessarily a preacher; but he might become a preacher or elder.

CORRESPONDENCE.



Correspondents are alone responsible for the correctness of the views they present. Therefore articles not dissented from will not necessarily be understood as endorsed by the publisher. In this department, articles are solicited on the general subject of the Advent, without regard to the particular view we take of any scripture, from the friends of the *Herald*.

Confidence in God.

"Clouds and darkness are round about him: righteousness and judgment are the habitation of his throne."

Jesus can make the darkest clouds immediately remove; They hear his voice and quick obey, The summons from above.

And when he lets them long remain, It is our faith to try; Our confidence, and trust in him, Who rules and reigns on high.

And when our faith is surely tried, He bids them all remove; A holy calm succeeds the storm— "His joy and peace and love.

Then let us never doubt his care, Who pleads for us above; But trust in every trying hour, His faithfulness and love;

And when the thunders loudly roar, And clouds o'erspread our sky, Bow low the knee in humble prayer, To Jesus quickly cry.

He soon will hear and send relief, And bid the tempest cease, Will calm the troubled billows' roar, And give us rest and peace.

He'll guide our bark o'er life's dark sea, And all our wanderings tell; He'll bring us safely home at last, "He doeth all things well."

H. D. L.

Boston, Aug. 1857.

Rejoinder.

BROTHER B.—Allow me to express my entire dissatisfaction with your answer to my questions! You say,

1st. Webster thus defines a *Shade*, when used in reference to the departed:

"The soul after its separation from the body; so called because the ancients supposed it to be perceptible to the sight, not to the touch; a spirit; a ghost; as, the shades of departed heroes."

"Swift as thought the flitting shade"—Dryden.

The shade of Cesar said to Brutus, "Thou wilt see me at Philippi."

This sense of the word is sanctioned by classic usage.

You have given me an answer from Webster, Dryden, and heathenism, but not a word from the Bible. The Bible says nothing about shades of departed heroes, and so I believe nothing about it.

Was Samuel's soul present when Saul consulted the woman at Endor? You say, yes. Did that soul of Samuel speak? You say, it did. Did it tell the truth? You say, yes. Whatever it was that spake, it said to Saul, "Why hast thou disquieted me to bring me up?" God had "departed from Saul," and would not "answer him" in any way whatever.

God had also forbidden His people to consult with those who pretended to speak with the dead. Samuel was dead, and at rest in *Sheol*—"the place of the dead."

Now a wicked man, forsaken of God, and whom God would not answer, is permitted, with his abominable conjurings, to invade the repose of a deceased holy prophet of God and disquiet him, and literally bring him up!!! O, my brother, do not ask me to swallow such an idea.

I think it little short of blasphemy. I have read somewhere about "chop logic!" The good book tells us of the condition of the dead, that "there the wicked cease from troubling!" How then could wicked Saul trouble Samuel? You say,

2d. The continuance of the wicked with "devouring fire" and "everlasting burnings," will be dependent on God's ability to fulfill his word.

That, we suppose, is not questioned.

Well, the Word says, "and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble: and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch."—Mal. 4:1. How much is left when both root and branch are burned up? "The wicked shall not be." "But the wicked shall perish, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs: they shall consume; into smoke shall they consume away." "The end of the wicked shall be cut off."—Psa. 37.

3. The Lord asks, Who among us shall dwell

with the devouring fire? You reply, the wicked can! Why then did he ask the question? Your answer makes the question appear foolish. Look at another part of Isaiah. "For the Lord of hosts hath purposed, and who shall disannul it?"—Isa. 14:27. Does not this mean no one can disannul it? This form of the negative frequently occurs in the Bible. So in the text referred to. "Who among us shall dwell with the devouring fire?" That is no one can—it is impossible. Let us not violate the plainest laws of language! I will leave it to any Hebrew scholar under heaven, if this text is not in the negative form! You say,

6th. To understand intelligibly what would be left of the burning of thorns requires a knowledge of chemical analysis. Those who are aware that fire does not annihilate any of the constituents of combustible bodies, but only separates them, do not need to be informed that for every 100 parts of matter constituting a bundle of thorns, 100 parts remain after they are burned. We do not suppose that our brother needs to be told this. The action of fire would separate the carbon, gases, and ashes that constitute the organism of thorns, so that they would no longer be combined with each other; while the ashes would be susceptible of a still farther analysis, yielding, probably, siliceous, alumina and oxide of iron, and an almost inappreciable amount of lime. But however this might be, everything that went in to make up the growth of thorns would "remain" in its full volume and original essence.

I am surprised! A thorn is not the material of which it originally was made: that material may form a thousand different things that are not thorns.

When a thorn is burned up it is annihilated. The materials with which it was made may exist in other conditions, but the thorn is no more. So with man. When the man is burned up, the man is annihilated, and is no more, unless there comes a resurrection of the particles again. The materials of which he was made may enter a thousand forms, but that is not *the man*. You say,

In the burning of a man, however, there are elements evolved which do not enter into the constituency of thorns. Among others it is only necessary here to note the element of *mind*. All matter is characterized by the attributes of attraction, extension, inertia. Mind is not marked by any of those, but, instead, it has volition, memory, and consciousness, which never inhere in mere matter, though they may be combined with material organisms. The question then arises whether mind is a mere result of material combinations, or an element acting upon them? Those who contend for the former, make God to be only the result of a fortuitous combination of atoms. Those who hold the latter, make Him to be the original, unformed, uncombined Being, who as a self-existent Spirit created all the elements of matter and gave them form and being. As we are reasoning only with those who admit God to be no combined or developed intelligence, but an original and eternal Mind, it is not necessary to prove to them that mind can exist independent of the material organizations that we see swayed and moved by it.

I am more and more astonished! Give me one single instance, in the Bible or out of it, where mind ever existed without *personal* organization. God has "FORM." See Phil. 2:6. God is a "PERSON." See Heb. 1:3. "But you say, 'God is a Spirit.' Tell me of a 'spirit-being' not personally organized!!!"

EDWIN BURNHAM.

Questions in the Herald of Sept. 19th.

BRO. B.—I read with pleasure the six questions propounded by Elder E. Burnham, and with great satisfaction your scriptural and logical answer. Although I cherished for some twelve years, the views involved in those questions, yet for the last ten years, I have been decidedly opposed to their discussion either in our pulpits or periodicals. But notwithstanding the earnest entreaties made by believers and unbelievers in that doctrine of the unconscious state of the dead, the subject has been, with zeal unabated, thrust before the people as *the* question to be considered, until forbearance, on the one side, has been construed by the other, as an evident lack of intellect or scripture, or both, to meet their arguments. Circumstances have of late wrought a change in my views as it respects this subject, and also as to the policy to be pursued in relation to its discussion.

The doctrine is not one of vital interest to our pardon, peace and salvation; it is generally admitted to be, in this sense, of secondary importance, yet strange to say, such distinction is given to it, as that it has and now is vitally affecting the mission which under God we have been prosecuting, with many self-sacrifices, and much hard labor. It is a subtle error, and of positive injury to the success of some of the most blessed and glorious doctrines of the sacred Scriptures, and more or less schismatic in its consequences. It can be easily met, and it is time to show that something can be said on the other side, and that there are reasons worthy of some respect and consideration. Of the many general and local conferences, protract-

ed meetings I have had the privilege of attending, I cannot call to mind but a single discourse on the everlasting punishment of the wicked, and not one embracing the intermediate consciousness of the dead, and endless torment of the impenitent.—Whilst on the other hand, it has been notoriously the opposite;—even at Wilbraham, with all its pretensions to freedom from sectarianism and all partisan feeling, in the *last* sermon were "presented forcible arguments from the Bible to show that when a man is dead, he is not alive; and that eternal death and destruction do not mean eternal life in misery." So the closing sermon must be an expose of those peculiar sentiments, and the audience dismissed from the public ministrations with the great crowning subject resting with its "forcible arguments" on their minds. If a sermon had not been delivered, particularly impregnated with that doctrine, then, indeed, would it have been my duty to have made a public acknowledgement of mistrust and unfounded prejudice. If the last sermon, or a discourse at any time during the session of the camp-meeting, had been given, showing the plausible sophisms wrapt up in such cant expressions as "when a man is dead, he is not alive," and the modern perversions of terms such as "death," "destruction," &c., what would have been said about the spirit and propriety of the effort? It would have made all the difference possible. Would it then have been a heart-cheering scene to witness the harmony existing upon the encampment, and "have been truly said, see how these Christians love one another?" I throw not. My experience within a few weeks has taught me otherwise.

If we longer preserve silence on this question so destructive to the general prosperity of the cause, we prove recreant to our high trust, and merit the displeasure of the great Head of the church.—For these reasons, I was glad to see the questions proposed by Bro Burnham, and approve, most decidedly, your kind, but concise answers. It is to be hoped that Bro. Burnham will not leave the matter just here, but offer six questions more, or objections to your reply. And if you cannot by "forcible arguments" show the fallacy of that position, then have I greatly miscalculated your ability as a critic, a logician, and your knowledge of God's word, which is the only infallible standard of moral truth. JUSTICE.

NOTES OF A COLPORTEUR.

NO. XVII.

Being in the town of W—, I called on the minister of the Congregational church. Introduced my books to him. Asked if he had ever examined the subject of the pre-millennial Advent of Christ. He admitted he had given it but little attention. I stated that it was the great question of the day with Bible students, and that the signs of the times were eliciting great study of the prophecies. He had not noticed this, but admitted it might be so, and that he had been too indifferent about it; asked me many questions on the Scriptures, which I endeavored to answer; for I found him a very candid man. Among other things, he wanted to know why we found evidence sufficient to depend on the year-day theory. I told how it was demonstrated, and then told him it was the Protestant principle of interpretation in general use among all churches. He then complained that our people, and especially the ministers, were wanting in fellowship for others, and said a great deal about their formality and customs, coldness, &c. This I admitted, and confessed that we had probably erred much on these points, but that we were human, and while we felt the force of the great truths of revelation, and labored incessantly to save men, spending our property freely, and our whole strength to promote Christianity, our motives were impugned, we called heretics, and the people warned against us. We sacrificed ease, pleasure, reputation and all for Christ, while our brethren of the churches were indifferent, indolent, laying up money, seeking reputation, indulging in pleasure, attending religious frolics, pleasure parties, &c. These things had led us to speak in language rather severe, and begotten uncharitable feelings in us. Then to be called heretics and turned out of the churches for believing just the faith of all the best men of the church for nearly seventeen hundred years, after we had studied and ascertained the fact and knew what company we were in, had led us to deal in harsh terms.

This admission seemed to conciliate his feelings on that point, and he wished to know "why we were so earnest to advocate our views, what odds does it make whether we see as you do, if we are only engaged in the great work of leading sinners to Christ?"

I showed him why, and told him the tendency of loose principles of interpretation, and of a wrong

view of our inheritance, and of recklessness about the signs of the times, that these things were opening the way for spiritualism of all sorts; that the church was deeply infected now with spiritualism; and at present rates they would soon have no Christ to preach, no resurrection to hope for.

"Why," said he, "I don't believe our church is at all under the influence of spiritualism, or endangered by it."

"But do you not know that Mrs— who has an extensive influence by her associations and her writings, is a Swedenborgian in doctrine, and has been for some years?"

"Oh, yes, I know that."

"And Professor— is half way over, and has been teaching Pantheism in some degree for a long time."

"Well, he has a circle of influence, but there are few of such."

"Well," said I, "is not Professor S. another of this class? also I have found hundreds of such in your church," said I. "Then there is Professor S. of the Baptist denomination, just gone over to Swedenborgianism, and published a book which exerts its influence. These are only a few of the many deplorable apostacies, among which is Edward B— D. D., and his sister," &c. &c.

He then picked out three of the best books I had on our work, and said he wished to buy the best one, as he could buy but one, that he might investigate the subject. I thought for his case the "Time of the End" the best, and sold it to him, hoping it will do him good.

I stopped at another house in the same town; offered my books. The lady did not want to buy. I wished her to examine them; handed her the Saints' Inheritance.

"I have read that," she said. "It is one of the best books I ever read. Do you carry those?" "Yes," I replied. "I sell a goodly variety of that class of books." I then showed her several others. She bought the Treatise on Matt. 24th & 25th. I sold several copies of Saints' Inheritance; also of Treatise on Matt. 24th and 25th, and one on Spiritualism a Satanic Delusion, to families who were strangers to our hope.

While in the town of F—I called on a man who sells books, and with whom I left a copy of the Saints' Inheritance, some time since, for his examination; that if he liked he might sell that work. The man was not at home; the lady returned the book to me. I asked whether they had read it.

"No, but I read some of it, enough to know that we did not want to circulate such stuff."

"Ah, you do not like it then," said I. "You are not a Methodist—I supposed you were."

"Yes I am, but I don't believe such stuff as that."

"Why, what do you object to in so good a book as that? I do not understand how this is. Multitudes like it. The Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, and others, commend it highly," I said.

"Well, I don't believe such doctrine. I want a better place than this earth to live in after I die," said the lady.

"But perhaps you may not get so good a place. When God cleanses and restores the earth it will be good enough for me, and much better than either of us deserve. He pronounced it 'very good' before sin entered it. This is why you dislike the book then,—because it shows that Christ and his church will finally reign on the earth."

"Yes, I am a Methodist, I don't believe any of these new notions," she replied.

I disputed her. "No, madam, you are not a Methodist. They believe what you just now denied. Wesley preached and wrote it extensively. Clarke, Benson, Coke, Whitehead, Watson, and all the founders and early adherents of Methodism advocated it, whether it be true doctrine or not."

But this woman did not believe, although she had an abundance of the writings of these men in her house. The truth is, the modern teaching of the professed descendants of such men, do not teach the people the great leading truths of revelation which they taught. They do not know them, and they call us heretics for teaching them.

In W—I once sold the Saints' Inheritance to the son of an old Methodist minister, on credit. When I called for the pay the lady paid the bill and also spoke highly of the book. I saw the aged minister there and asked, "Did you read that book Father H—?"

"Yes."

"Did you like it?"

"Well some of it was good, but it is rather a Millerite book," he replied.

"Wherein?" I asked.

"Oh, he argues the restoration of the earth."

"Why not a Methodist book, then? Wesley taught that," said I.

"No, sir; you are mistaken. He did not," the

