

him to spend his precious time in retracing his steps. Such an one, following the requirements of the Scriptures, will begin aright, continue aright and *end aright*.

QUERIES AND ANSWERS.

LAFAYETTE, May 19, 1883.

J. F. Floyd:

DEAR SIR.—If Adam was created mortal, as you say in your article on "Hereditary Total Depravity," please tell us when and where he got that immortal principle that you spoke of several weeks ago that either lived in Paradise or Hades till the resurrection and then would be reunited to the body? A definite answer to the above question is very desirable, as on a true and Scriptural answer to that question hangs the whole plan of salvation from spiritual and physical death.

ANNA M. MARTIN.

ANSWER.

Sister Martin ought to know when we stated that Adam was created mortal, we had reference to his *body* which was made out of the dust of the ground. We are not so much concerned about the "when" and the "where" he got his spirit or immortal principle; it is enough for us to accept the *Scripture fact* that man possesses such a principle. We leave the rest for the speculation of our good sister. Neither do we see exactly how the whole plan of salvation necessarily hangs on an answer to this question. This may appear so from the Seventh Day Adventist's point of view, but not so to one who accepts the Bible doctrine of the immortality of the soul. We suppose however as we have fathers of our *flesh* who correct us, while God is the *Father of our spirits*, that the Creator could give Adam a *spirit* as well as a body, and as he gave him the life to animate that earthly body. Heb.

Now as our sister seems to be an expert on questions pertaining to this subject and has occupied considerable space from time to time in putting them for our consideration, we think the time has come for the scales to turn. Hence, we propose to ask a few questions for her careful attention, as follows: If the soul is the body and the body the soul, as thought by some, and man possesses no immortal principle while living, hence during death the whole man sleeps in an unconscious state, while the only immortality of the Bible is a thing to be put on at the resurrection of the

righteous, will our querist please tell us,

1. What the Savior means in Matt. 10: 28?

2. What he means in Matt. 22: 32?

3. What he teaches in his description of the Rich man and Lazarus, Luke 16: 19-31?

4. Also about the evil spirits that possessed men in the days of Christ?

5. What the appearance of Moses and Elijah on the mount of transfiguration teaches?

6. And lastly the meaning of Matt. 25: 46?

We will freely give Sister Martin at least three columns in the HERALD to reconcile these passages with the doctrine above stated, and we hope by the time she puts the matter in a wholly satisfactory light to her own mind, she will see why we believe in the immortality and hence the ever conscious existence of the soul.

MCMINNVILLE, OR.,

May 15, 1883.

Bro. J. F. Floyd:

Please tell me in the columns of the HERALD who Theophilus was? and oblige.

ANSWER.

The word Theophilus means *friend of God*, and he was probably some noted and honorable person with whom Luke was acquainted, and who had accepted Christianity. Hence Luke addressed his gospel and the Acts to him. History gives us no further account of this person.

Selections and Comments.

ADVANCED THEOLOGY.—This item of news we get from the *Christian Intelligencer*, New York.

The Advanced Theology or the theology that claims to be advanced, not succeeding in starting a weekly journal in Boston, it is said has made a bargain with the *Christian Union* of this city, and is to present its belief through the columns of that journal. Since such a theology, or what is called a theology, does exist, it is a great relief to know that it is about to make a distinct and definite statement of its opinions—to write itself down in black and white. So far we have had the most vague and indefinite suggestions, and the endeavor to controvert them has been much like firing into a fog. It will be a great relief to have explicit statements. When the advanced faith comes to be formally and regularly expressed it will be found

to be a very much more insignificant matter than it has appeared when expanded in wide generalities. The men who accept "the evident meaning of the Bible" are neither frightened nor discouraged, but much pleased with the prospect of having this thing explicitly set forth.

Our opinion is that when this "advanced theology" fully defines itself (if such a thing is possible) it will be so far in advance of the Bible that the *Theos* part will be left behind. We advise R. G. Ingersoll to prepare another lecture, for he will evidently have sufficient food for at least a two hours speech when this new born child begins to speak through the *Christian Union*.

SIMPLICITY OF FAITH.—The following good lesson is taken from Ireneus in the *New York Observer*:

It is beautiful to observe the sweet simplicity of faith with which many earnest believers ask for temporal blessings. They know it is quite as well pleasing to God to give bread, as the Holy Spirit. And they ask for daily bread, as Christ taught his disciples to pray. They want to be prospered in a secular undertaking, and they pray for it. They do not look for a special interposition, a miracle of feeding or clothing; but they believe that he will work in his own good way. Sometimes the answer has reached the suppliant through an instrumentality they never knew. A father wanted help for a daughter who was earnestly seeking without success to find a situation where she might be usefully supported as a teacher. All avenues were apparently closed. Private and family prayer had been made long and in vain. He sent his request hitherward; and when it was read it fell on the ear of one who instantly bethought him of the very place the young lady was seeking. The inquiry was easily made with the result desired.

There is a power in prayer of which no one knows anything except the true believer. There is also a simplicity in such praying that is too often overlooked by many. Mere formal prayer is an abomination in the eyes of God. He who would pray acceptably must know and feel that he *needs* something, and then he should ask for *that* object in faith, *no*ing doubting.

The *Christian Herald*, of Oregon, says that we endorsed Rev. S. H. Mirick's exegesis of Acts 2: 38. A mistake: it was Bro. Mirick we endorsed—not his exegesis. Of that we forbore to speak.—*Christian Index*.

We did not understand it so; but as our brother is so positive,

we accept the correction. But we are curious to know what is the matter with Bro. Mirick that *he* needs endorsing?

GIVE US A BETTER ONE.—The *Signs of the Times*, California, in criticising our interpretation of Matt. 10: 28, says:

It needs no argument to show the fallacy of such reasoning. But we are a little surprised at the editor's assurance. He frankly admits that "we" cannot kill the soul; and it may not be too much for him to claim that what "we" cannot do, cannot be done by human power; but we really think he ought not to say that because "man cannot kill the soul" therefore it cannot be killed at all, or that God cannot do it. At any rate he ought not to have made such an assertion so soon after quoting the words of our Savior in Matt. 10: 28.

Did we say, brother, that God can not kill the soul? This is what you put into our mouth in order to make out your case. We said, "This shows * * * (2) That the body can be killed, but no man can kill the soul." If our interpretation of this passage is fallacious, will the *Signs* give us a better one?

HONESTY THE BEST POLICY.—The *Sunday School Times* very truthfully says:

It is true that men ought to have a higher motive than mere policy, for being honest. But it is also true, that it takes real faith for a man to believe, at all times and under every pressure, that the course of simple honesty is the only safe course. There are seasons of temptation, when it *seems* as if to speak the truth, or to meet the demands of honesty, would be ruinous. Then it is that one has need of faith; has need of such a restful confidence in God's overruling and restraining power, as will enable one to speak the truth, and to do the honest thing, at the risk of the heavens falling. To believe, at such a time, that honesty is the best policy, is to prove one's living faith.

Policy is not always wrong, but policy at the sacrifice of honesty is a sin far too prevalent now a-days. Christian men can not afford to act otherwise than from principle, and he who does so shows more love for this world than faith in the promises of God.

A GOOD HIT.—That the *New York Independent* is not always dead to a good point is evident from a sharp criticism in the fol-