BROTHER HALE'S ARTICLE.

[Concluded.]

THE BRIDE.

That "the bride the Lamb's wife," denotes that "great city, the holy Jerusalem," is settled by the word of God. Rev. xxi, 9, 10. And if God designed that we should understand something else to be denoted, he certainly could have informed us, as he has explained the seven conicles of the two witnesses—the waters—the woman, or the beast that carried her.

It is equally clear that "the marriage of the Lamb" is an event that is always placed in the future, among the events which close up the scenes of this world. It is also equally clear that the actual reception of the throne and kingdom by Christ, is placed among these events.

Again, then, I mean to say that every Adventist, at least, will admit that it is the New Jerusalem which is to be called "the throne of the Lord." (Jer. i, 17,) "the city of the great King," who shall "sit as a priest upon his throne," a "priest for ever" over the house, or family of God. As old Jerusalem is doomed to perpetual desolations all these things can be true only of the New Jerusalem.

Now, is there any one surprised by the supposition of the figure of a marriage to denote the reception of the throne and kingdom? Let us see. By turning to one of the oldest of the prophets, we read: "And it shall be at that day, saith the Lord, that shalt call me Ishi: i.e., my husband. And I will betroth thee unto me for ever; yea, I will betroth thee unto me in righteousness, and in judgment, in faithfulness, and in loving kindness, and in mercies: I will even betroth thee unto me in faithfulness, and then shalt thou know the Lord." Hosea ii, 16—20.

But who is this that is to call "the Lord," "my husband," in that day? In the appointed symbolic action of the prophet, who represents "the Lord," he is commanded to "take a wife of whomres and children of whomres; for the land hath committed great whomres, departing from the Lord." (Jer. ii, 1, 2. The wife is "God's," the children, "Jerusalem," i.e. the seed of God," whose blood "the Lord says I will avenge." 2. "Lorubmah, i.e. not having obtained mercy," and 3. "Leommi, i.e. not my people.""

The Lord disowns Gomer as his wife, because the people are rejected. (4.) She is punished for her conjugal infidelity, and at length returns to her first husband. (7.) This "the wife," throughout this allegorical scene, is "the land," as well as she is to be fully settled in other portions of the earth, and the marriage, in this case, brings the land back to the Lord. The children are the different classes which constituted the people of the land. The revelation of Christ, and his work for them, their character and history, are exhibited by a similar allegorical scene, in the third chapter, and there is no marriage in the case.

Shall we turn to Isaiah? "Sing, O barren, thou that didst not travail with child, for the children of the desolate are more than the children of the married wife, saith the Lord."—Isa. lv. 1. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all. For it is written, Rejoice thou barren: break forth and cry thou that travailest not, &c. Is this city, which figures in the "allegory," as "the mother of us all," provided with a child, as her children are rejected. (4.) Yes. And do not be frightened, brethren, if he should tell us that in the "allegory," which is called in other forms of speech, our brother; it certainly cannot be any more alarming than that our "elder brother" should be called our husband, as he is called the "first husband." But if any complain, their complaints must be directed against the word of God, and not against us.

But who is the husband of "the mother of us all?"

Answer. "For thy Maker is thy husband: the Lord of hosts is his name; and thy Redeemer the Holy One of Israel; The God of the whole earth shall he be called." (Isa. lv. 5.) Surely we must believe that he is the Lord Jesus. The prophet adds, "This Jerusalem is like a wife that hath no husband; she saith: My lovers they are destroyed, herSeleccione de voces:—and among these, which can be true only of the New Jerusalem.

Again,—The prophet speaks of Jerusalem which is to be made "a praise in the earth," as follows: "Thou shalt no more be termed Forsaken; neither shall thy land any more be termed Desolate; but shalt be called Hephzibah, and thy land Ben- ner. For the Lord shall rejoice over thee, and thy land shall be married. For as a young man marry a virgin, so shall thy sons marry thee: and as the bridegroom rejoiceth over the bride, so shall thy God rejoice over thee." (Isa. lvii, 4, 5.) But are we not sure how far the speaker is justified? Not if the church is "the church." But as they are to receive the kingdom as joint heirs with Christ, the marriage may denote just the same act in each case.

The truth of this is established by putting to these three questions. 1. Who is the Lamb's wife? 2. What is denoted by the marriage? 3. When, with these, (the blood of calves and of goats;) but the typical tabernacle had to be "purified;" and the city?—or the city itself? Let us see. Who are those that sing of the marriage? The command to which they respond is as follows: "And that which doeth these things shall be called in the name of the Lord, and shall be the house of living God, all ye his servants, and ye that fear him, both small and great." This is the same company that is brought to view, Rev. xi, 18. This must be the marriage of the Lamb, because it was the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of mighty thunders, saying, Alleluia: for the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth. Let us be glad and rejoice, and give honor to him: for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready. If the church is the "wife," why do they sing of another party as the wife? Will the church (or Christ) not receive the bride in this manner? It may be proper enough for "one of the elders" to say, "These are they which came out of great tribulation," &c. But when the church speaks for herself, she says, "I am come unto you." "How shall we be redeemed us? If the church is the bride, who are the guests at the marriage supper? The church cannot figure here as the wife. It must be, as God himself has described in Rev. xxi: We do not suppose there is any bride to "make herself ready." Is Christ to be married to stone walls? &c. &c.

It is necessary, therefore, to allude to the most obvious and familiar views of language, and of interpretation, that our brethren may be not be betrayed into a spirit of levity, which would better become the Ballou and Whittemore school, or our common enemies, than Adventists. It must be known to every one from the very first, that the blood of Christ, as King into his throne, which is just such a throne of the Lord. And what that work is it is proper enough for "one of the elders" to say, "This is the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of the Lamb?" This text has given rise to three questions. 1. Who is the Lamb's wife? 2. What is denoted by the marriage? 3. When, in the order of events, does it take place? 1. Who is the Lamb's wife? The church?—the city?—or the city itself? Let us see. Who are those that sing of the marriage? The command to which they respond is as follows: "And that which doeth these things shall be called in the name of the Lord, and shall be the house of living God, all ye his servants, and ye that fear him, both small and great." This is the same company that is brought to view, Rev. xi, 18. This must be the marriage of the Lamb, because it was the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of mighty thunders, saying, Alleluia: for the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth. Let us be glad and rejoice, and give honor to him: for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready. If the church is the "wife," why do they sing of another party as the wife? Will the church (or Christ) not receive the bride in this manner? It may be proper enough for "one of the elders" to say, "These are they which came out of great tribulation," &c. But when the church speaks for herself, she says, "I am come unto you." "How shall we be redeemed us? If the church is the bride, who are the guests at the marriage supper? The church cannot figure here as the wife. It must be, as God himself has described in Rev. xxi: We do not suppose there is any bride to "make herself ready." Is Christ to be married to stone walls? &c. &c.

It is necessary, therefore, to allude to the most obvious and familiar views of language, and of interpretation, that our brethren may be not be betrayed into a spirit of levity, which would better become the Ballou and Whittemore school, or our common enemies, than Adventists. It must be known to every one from the very first, that the blood of Christ, as King into his throne, which is just such a throne of the Lord. And what that work is it is proper enough for "one of the elders" to say, "This is the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of mighty thunders, saying, Alleluia: for the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth. Let us be glad and rejoice, and give honor to him: for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready. If the church is the "wife," why do they sing of another party as the wife? Will the church (or Christ) not receive the bride in this manner? It may be proper enough for "one of the elders" to say, "These are they which came out of great tribulation," &c. But when the church speaks for herself, she says, "I am come unto you." "How shall we be redeemed us? If the church is the bride, who are the guests at the marriage supper? The church cannot figure here as the wife. It must be, as God himself has described in Rev. xxi: We do not suppose there is any bride to "make herself ready." Is Christ to be married to stone walls? &c. &c.
and the heavenly things themselves than these."—Heb. ix, 23. The typical work of atonement for the holy sanctuary, and for the heavenly things themselves than these. — Heb. ix, 23. The typical work of atonement for “the heavenly things themselves,” which was on the ninth day of the seventh month, Lev. xxvi, 29, 33. And when that work was thus completed, and Christ had sanc-
tified, he was ready to become his throne.

And to her was granted that she should be arrayed in fine linen clean and white: for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints. They "wash their robes, and make them white as the Lamb." By his own blood he entered in once, into the holy place. The holy city—the heavenly Jerusalem—is indecipherable to the senses, but the sain ts are indebted to it for their purity.

When does the marriage take place? It is as- 
serted that it must be after the destruction of the wicked, after the judgment, at least, of the "great whore." But why so? The fact that the "great whore," as it falls after the destruction and judgment of the people and persons, is, of itself, no proof of it. The parts in this book in particular, must be arranged, not by the order in which they occur, but by the order of the narrative. The order of chapter xix begins a new portion unless when it is to the order in which they occur, but by the order of "the typical argument," that verse 4th of chapter xix, closes the portion which begins with chapter xvii, and that the 5th verse begins a new portion? Compare Rev. iv, 5.

And another angel came and stood at the city gate, and cried, "Get thee hence, thou unclean person, and be thou naked, and wail, and cry." And he had a sharp angel with a everlasting, and with which he must be taken, in the closing up of our mortal state.

4. The condition of things around us goes to confirm the supposition that this step has been taken; while the circumstances evidently in accordance with those described in the word of God, as the lot of his peo-
de, at the approach of the middle of the en-
tine, and that they are His people.

The entire picture is also remarkably in accord-
ance with the history of the Adventists, while they
are described in the word of God, as the lot of his peo-
ple at the end. These will be noticed in their
union with the "sins of the world," and with the "sins of the world," and that too, by referring them to facts plainly
en; while the Adventists, as a body, are placed in circumstances evidently in accordance with those
that verse 4th of chapter xix, closes the portion
which begins with chapter xvii, and that the 5th
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5. This interpretation harmonizes all those figu-
rateative portions of the word of God, which spoken of the coming of Christ, in their special application, and that too, by referring them to facts plainly
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I have myself rested on the seventh day, and on that account I have blessed and sanctified that no other day of the week, that you may observe it, and keep it holy, not because it is in itself better than any other day, but because I have blessed and sanctified it. Which is a better reason than any you can advance why you should make way for the introduction of a new command; and if it is held to be a sufficient reason, then it is evident, without falsehood, that God blessed “one day in seven,” but of “no day in particular.”

2. God never blessed “one day in seven,” without blessing a particular day. He either blessed one day of seven, or the seventh day, as the day of rest, or the day of the Sabbath, or the day of the Sabbath-day, does not mean any particular day, but “one day in seven,” or some one of the days of the week. You allege that “the day of the Sabbath,” “the Sabbath-day,” “the Sabbath,” “the Emperor of Russia,” or “the King of Denmark,” is a generic term, alike applicable to all the members of the same class. The phrase, “the King of Russia,” you say, refers alike to Peter, to Alexander, and to Nicholas, though we could never suppose that they could all be the Emperor of Russia at the same time.

I assert that “God blesseth the seventh day,” or the Sabbath-day, or the day of the Sabbath, says not one word about “the Sabbath,” or “the day of the Sabbath.” Those, and the fourth commandment, are not one and the same. The fourth commandment enjoins the keeping holy of “one day in seven,” but of “no day in particular.”

Therefore the Sabbath-day must be a particular day of the week. Therefore the Sabbath-day is not “one day in seven,” or “the day of the Sabbath” means not “one day in seven” that we are required to remember, and keep holy, and in which we are forbidden to do any work; but “the seventh day” of the week, which was then, is now, and will be till the end of the world, “the day of the Sabbath” of the Lord our God.

3. No day of the week but the seventh was ever called “the day of the Sabbath,” or “the day of the Sabbath,” or “the Sabbath-day,” among the ancients. Search both Testaments through and through, and you will find no other day called “the Sabbath” or “the Sabbath,” except the ceremonial Sabbaths, with which, of course, we have nothing to do. If you believe, after the close of the canon of inspiration, the seventh day, and no other, was still called “the Sabbath,” if you can prove that any one man, among all that lived before the close of the canon, ever called any other day “the Sabbath,” you are as false from the truth as if you said “the day of Saturn,” and that to attach this proper name how to some other day of the week, and to affirm that God meant that other day, as much as he did the seventh, when he wrote the Law on tables of stone, is as unreasonable as it is impious. If you say, that when God speaks of “the Sabbath,” he means “one day in seven,” but in no particular day, or you are as far from the truth as the man who said that God does not mean any particular man, but “some one of the Israelites.” Moses was one of the Israelites, just as the Sabbath-day is one day in seven. But when God says “the Sabbath,” or “the Sabbath-day,” he means the seventh day of the week. You may give different names to the same object, without interfering with the propriety of the same name coming to the same object. So with two different objects, and then to affirm that these two objects are identical the same, so that what is predicated of one must be true of the other, is as though a navigator should discover an island distant from the one he had before found, and then affirm that the late work of Mr. Macaulay, entitled “The History of England,” is a verbal and authentic history of his newly-discovered eminently distant island. What is the difference of the stolidity or of the lowness of that navigator?

I cannot close this chapter without reminding you, that in attempting to refute the above reasoning, the main thing you have to do is, that you must look to the Sabbath, or the day of the Sabbath, as an indefinite or general expression, applicable alike to at least two different days of the week, and that it is used indefinitely in this commandment. It refers, as you have shown, to some one day of the week, then it is true, and I will remain forever true, that the original Sabbath law requires the sanctification of no other day. This is the truth which I wish to exhibit in this chapter, and it is my first reason for believing the proposition under consideration.

Connecticut Circuit

The lawyer contended that although the first day of the week had no divine authority for its sanctification, the Sabbath-day had been observed by the Jews for 13 centuries, and that it was kept as scrupulously and conscientiously as the seventh day demanded, it could not but be as acceptable to God.

I asked to such sophistry, the Sabbathian submitted the following legal case to him:

1. I am told that I can purchase, in the State of Connecticut, one hundred copper cents, bateing the impress and superscription of the United States Mint, and if you will undertake, for a fee of $10,000, to defend my cause against a prosecution for passing such false coin, and exonerate me from conviction in the United States Courts.

The lawyer's answer unhesitatingly was, "I cannot urge your cause in the very teeth of so unquestionable a law as appears to exist on the Statute Books."

The Sabbathian replied:—"Then, as you admit yourself, you have no other day called "the Sabbath" or a Sabbath." And to answer you as the celebrated Mr. Whiston did Chancellor King of England upon a similar question: "If God Almighty should be as consistent, as just, and as jealous of his laws in the Court of Heaven, as the Lord Chancellor is in his, where are we then?"

The interference—If, then, I cannot obtain an advocate on earth, (for no one of repute would undertake, to defend my cause against a prosecution for passing such false coin, for the violation of a law of man's making, what ground have I to expect that the only advocate to be obtained in the Court of Heaven, i. e. the Lord Jesus Christ, will defend my cause against a breach of that law which his father ever made punishable with death, temporal and eternal?—and who himself, when on earth, in his comment on that law, averred that not one jot or tittle could pass from it? (Matt. v, 18, 19.)—[Sab. Tract No. 7.]

I will defend my cause against a breach of that law which his father ever made punishable with death, temporal and eternal?—and who himself, when on earth, in his comment on that law, averred that not one jot or tittle could pass from it? (Matt. v, 18, 19.)—[Sab. Tract No. 7.]

Deb. Bro. White: I returned home yesterday from a tour through some of our principal cities and large towns, where I went to seek out those who have an ear to hear relative to the "present truth." By appointment I lectured in the Temperance Hall in Full Wall, Mass., August 12th. At this time the first day of the present truth that had been presented there, some of my hearers were somewhat excited with respect to their present and future relation, with the two-horned beast of Rev. xi. As this became interested to know the whole truth, and gladly received the books I handed them; and wished the paper directed to them. From thence I went to Springfield, where I lectured in Bro. Samuel Carrier's hall on the 14th. Here are some who I believe will embrace the whole truth, and stand in the battle in the day of the Lord. I there got Bro. White, who was engaged in the work. I was glad to learn, through the paper, shortly afterwards, that he had embraced the whole truth. I left here the 15th, to meet with the brethren in Connecticut. Our meeting with them, which had been well attended, was very successful. We went to Berlin, proved a strengthening and reviving season. Their interest is still increasing; (just as it should with all true Sabbath-keepers,) as they see the great and dreadful day of God is now at hand. I baptized three who were much strengthened and blessed of the Lord. I spent a great part of the 18th, in company with Bro. Chamberlain, in Mid-
To the Two Laws.

The Moral and Ceremonial: their origin, and the distinction between the object and design of each; the perpetuity of the moral law, and the limitation of the ceremonial law.

First, the moral law is the divine government of God over the children of men, by the rod of his commandments, each one of which is a type of the eternal law. Every child of God is a subject of the moral law, and a true Christian is not only subject to it, but is prepared to answer for his obedience to it. The moral law is the expression of God's love to his children, and a bond of union between them, and the Father of the flesh; and a model for the establishment of the church of the first-born, which is the Heavenly Jerusalem. The distinguishing, unprofitable views relative to what is termed spiritual union. We did not believe and taught from the time such views arose. We have had from the beginning, and we love the children of God, when we have seen it, and hear witness. Said Jesus, "I am that bread of life. I am the living bread which came down from heaven, to give life unto the world." The Son of man and drink, his blood, ye have no life in you. Whose eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath not life in him; but he that eateth the flesh of the Son of man, and drinketh his blood, hath eternal life in him. "The words were framed by the word of God. Heb. xii. 23. "And he is the Mediator of the new covenant, and he of the old. Col. i, 14-17. And his name is called the word of God." Rev. xix. 3. "It is written, man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that cometh out of the mouth of God." And the word [or law which was from the beginning.] was made flesh and dwelt among us." Again, [John i, 1.] That the word was made flesh is the expression in which we learn that the attributes of God's holiness and moral perfection and righteousness, are revealed to us in Christ Jesus. The words of this law are the words of the covenant of which he has said, "My covenant which I have made with them, shall I break?

We have this moment received a letter from Bro. M. L. Boulder of Cleveland, Ohio, stating that some three miles of relative views to what is termed special union. We did suppose that all people of common sense, who profess any regard for bible religion, would condemn at once such "damnation." We will call them, after seeing the awful effects of spiritualizing notions. We hesitate not to say that these foolish notions relative to being in the Eden state, &c. are all of the Devil. This we believe to be true, and we call upon our readers to awaken, and show the world the right. It is a source of grief to us that any should endure to be taught by those who get so much of fiery darts before they get rid of such notions. We are sure that we speak the minds of the brethren everywhere, when we say that we cannot sorry that any holding such notions, ever embraced the grace of God. We have now done with delusions. However, May God deliver us from such people, unless they immediately renounce such heresies.

**THE REVIEW AND HERALD.**

We will hold a Conference at West Medford (Mass.) at the following time and place: Monday, Thursday, Fifth, 8th, 9th, 10th, &c. 0'clock P. M., and hold for three days. All our invited to attend. Bro. C. H. H. and J. Bates are expected to attend. Those who come in the care should stop at West Medford Depot, on the Boston and Lowell Railroad.

By Bro. Rhodes, Chapin, and many others, are very anxious that Bro. J. Bates should come to visit me. I am well able to do this. Will you visit me? 

North, through thy truth; thy word is truth."
ing, or filling full a certain number of pitchers. When they were filled full, they filled others. So they filled them, or fill them full, so Christ had fulfilled the law, and he was the end of the law, and we were not under the law but under grace. Gal. iv, 9; Rev. xxi, 5. When Jesus had done these things, he saith unto them, Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and teach men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven. Heb. xii, 29; Luke 1, 54, 55, 72, 73; Dan. xi, 32—34.
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Every candid mind will decide in the affirmative.

But take off my restraint, and which hangs upon it. “Remember the Sabbath to keep it holy.” (Ex. xx, 11.)

And God has been more particular in guarding the Holy Sabbath, than any other precept in the divine constitution. The most awful denunciations of the eternal law in the Bible threaten the slightest violation of the Sabbath. If we observe it to be thus, for an experiment, we will quote the fourth oracle, and haters thereof. 

To them no other say that the testimony is the teachings of God, that shows itself to be the Lord our God, and that is a very special portion of the worship of God. And the most effectual acknowledgment on our part that he is our Lord our God. 

And whereas the observance of the Sabbath is now, in the latter times, a very special portion of the worship of God and man. Read Ps. xcii, 1; xcvii, 11; therefore, for it is holy unto you. * * *

The mark is not a literal, external mark in the forehead, but a principle received in the mind and carried into effect which the mind determines to be done. The mark is not a literal, external mark in the forehead, but a principle received in the mind and carried into effect which the mind determines to be done.
mandments of God and the faith or testimony of Jesus Christ. The beast, and the kings of the earth, and their armies will be gathered together to make war against him that sat upon the horse, and against his army, and the beast was wounded to death. Though the beast and kings of the earth, and their armies, make war with the Lamb and his army, the Lamb rebuke them, and smite them to death. The kings of the earth were as wool, and the elders as the dust of the earth. Those who have been to God's Holy Truth will not turn away from it. They will not be swayed by the powers of deception and lies. Let us continue in the word and in the love of the Lord.  

Let us pray for our children. But we must hold on to God with firm faith. He will not turn us away without the desired blessing. No, but he will make it his business to prove us and to test us, that we may know him, and that we may be approved of him. And the children of God will be gathered together at the last. Then will the kingdom of heaven be a reality and a possession. Then will the children of God be gathered together to be with the Lord and to reign with him. Then will the children of God be clothed in the righteousness of the Lord, and will bear the fruits of righteousness to the glory of God. Then will the children of God be victorious over all the powers of darkness, and will reign with the Lord forever. Amen.