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O, lift up your heads, your redemption draws near,

Let nothing discourage, or cause you to fear;

Our Saviour is faithful, his promise is sure.

To all who bear truth, hold fast and endure.

Will you for mercy's sake, your cause is sure?

Plead, plead to the end, that none lose crown;
The spirits of darkness will seek to devour,

But Jesus and angels exist in power.

Rich promise to all who shall now overcome;

To Christ till given in God's second done,

Essential with his name and the Son of love,

And of the City which comes from above.

Mill Oren, N. Y.
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( Concluded.)

D ear Sir:—In exposing the folly of the view that God abolished the ten commandments, and then re-enacted nine of them, the review of your Bible class, report spoke as follows:

"No man has ever quoted the law, or by what means the law of God was re-enacted. Most have taken it for granted, because the last six commandments are never rest on one of two foundations, may be seen at a glance."

(1.) On their original authority as the unabolished commandments of Jehovah. (2.) Or they have been abolished, and now rest upon re-enactment as their authority.

In the whole New Testament there is nothing that looks like their re-enactment; and in your third article, you expressly denied such a doctrine. Hence, they exist on their original authority, or they do not exist at all. But if they exist upon their original authority, the dogmatist has not been abolished! We shall presently notice the manner in which you enforce the commandments. Your next statement, which is also false, is as follows:

"But it will reply, Then the first three are not enjoined by the New Testament. Let us see if the New Testament treats the first three commandments as it does the fourth."

We have never rest on a re-enactment of the authority of God, which says, "Thou shalt worship God."

But you rest the commandments upon "re-affirmation" of all the commandments. Matt. v, 19; words, which in resisting the Devil, Christ quoted, not from something else! But in showing the re-affirmation of the second commandment, you quote the words of the Lord's prayer, [Matt. vi, 12]. "Hallowed be thy name," an expression of reverence and filial awe on the part of those who approach Jehovah. But the precept forbidding the profanation of the name of God, were "done away, abolished," how would surely its loss be felt for all that the Lord's prayer contains to supply its place. And how evident it is, that this very expression grows out of the unabolished commandment, which says, "Thou shalt not take my name in vain." You have, also, another evidence that Christ re-affirmed the third commandment; and that is the very evidence, which, in your sixth article, you adduced as proof, that he "placed himself in strong contrast with it, "set it aside, superseded it!" You refer to Matt. v, 33-37. The precept, however, which Christ referred to, was not the third commandment, but was a statute from Lev. xix, 12-15, which forbids a false oath.

You next ask for the re-affirmation of the fourth commandment. The view of the great constitution. But to what law were men amenable, with reference to idolatry, in that period of 20 years between the abolition of the tenth commandment, and the enactment of this precept by the apostles?

For a re-affirmation of the third commandment, you quote the words of the Lord's prayer, [Matt. vi, 12]. "And the Sabbath which comes from above."
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The fact that the Sabbath was instituted, as Creation, is proof positive that it was made for Adam and his posterity. It was not made to uphold the nakedness of Sin for the Hebrews!

In examining your position on Rom. xiv, the Review presented as worthy of notice, the remarks of Dr. Graham, on the subject of Sabbath. Your reply to them consists in pronouncing them of no consequence, more assertion, and the like. And you affirm that Sabbath-keepers are driven to a foolish and unreasonable defence of their views. Every course of argument is a proper one, any theory could be maintained without difficulty, as any one could suppress the arguments of an opponent, and pronounce them in as absurd a manner. But I commenced the following from the Sabbath Manual as worthy of a better reply:

"Some, after they embraced the Gospel, thought that the Sabbath was not to be observed, and that God miraculously doubled it! And that God associated with moral laws, and the days spoken of are not the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, associated by God inapserably with the moral law? Read the connection. What is it? Is it, one man believe he must worship Jehovah; another who is weak, worship Christ alone? One believes that he must not commit murder, idolatry or theft, and another thinks he may? Were those the laws about which they were contending, and with which were connected the days that he speaks of? No: about those laws there was no dispute.

But, one believes that he may eat all things, which are nourisbing, whether allowed in the ceremonial law, which regulated such things, or not. Another, who is weak, eateth herbs. Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not; and let not him that eateth not judge him that eateth, for God hath received him. 1 The laws about which they were contending, and with regard to which the Apostle was giving them instructions. It was not the moral, but the ceremonial laws; and the days spoken of were connected, not with the former, but with the latter.

So, in the second chapter of Colossians, "Let no man judge you in meats, or in drink, or in respect of holy days, or in the new moon, or of the sabbaths." The sabbaths spoken of, are not the Sabbath associated with, then shalt not commit murder, or adultery, or theft; but the sabbaths associated with meats and drinks, and bless, and, indeed, shadows of things to come. But to take what he said about those sabbaths which were associated by God with ceremonial laws, and which the Apostle himself in this very discourse, associates with them, and apply it as you have to Sanhedrin which God associated with moral laws, is wrong." Pages 134, 135, 136.

You affirm that the Review, in introducing the expression of the people should gather a certain quantity of manna every day, as calculated to throw light on the expression, "another sabbath every sabbath," has been guilty of perversion. Your reason is, that while verse four says that the people should gather a certain rate every day, verse five says that on the sixth day they should prepare which they bring in, and it should be twice as much as they gather on the Sabbath and twenty and six except the Sabbath, on which they should not gather at all.

But to show how little sincerity you could have in pointing out the double quantity, on the sixth day as compared with any one of the other days, and that God miraculously doubled it! And with regard to the seventh day, on which they were not to gather, I remark, that such a statement was not made to the people until the Sabbath itself drew on. I believe, indeed, in accordance with verse 22, that the children of Israel voluntarily gathered a double quantity of manna on that day; it is evident from verse 23, that Moses had not previously said any thing of the kind to them; so that the direction that they should gather a certain rate EVERY day had not taken place, and yet it did not authorize them to violate the Sabbath.

This chapter was referred to as direct proof that the expression "every day," does not necessarily include that day, which is thus distinguished, and preserved to himself. We shall presently notice that the expression as used by Paul is necessarily limited by the subject of discourse.

I pass over your remarks respecting the folly, blindness, and perverseness of the Review, merely remarking that such is a cheap method of supplying the lack of Bible argument.

Yes, you speak of the meaning of Rom. xiv, 5, as obvious and plain. I answer, you. And the subject of discourse is such that it is highly unreasonable to apply these remarks to the moral law.

If there is any propriety in applying the words of Paul, in Rom. xiv, 5, to be observed in the great constitution, then you have not perversion; but if his whole subject is the law of carnal ordinances, as in Col. ii, then you have gross perversion.

Now what does Paul's Rom. xiv, 5, Is it the commandments of God? Not a word respecting them. He says, one believeth that he may eat all things, another who is weak eateth herbs. And in verse 14 he declares that there is no distinction between clean and unclean meats. Now there was a law which made such distinctions; but that was the middle wall of partition between Jews and Gentiles, [Eph. ii] and not the commandments of God, which said nothing on the subject. Connected with these meats, drinks &c., were many days of feasts, new moons, annual sabbaths and the like, which had no other existence than that which the law of carnal ordinances gave them. Hence, the same act that destroyed the distinction between meats, clean and unclean, destroyed all the authority on which these things rested. Therefore they were matters of indifference.

Now the whole subject of Paul's discourse forbids the idea that he had the great unabolished constitution of Jehovah in view, for that had nothing to do with these matters. But in the preceding chapter, he do
de out his latest division, and acknowledges its authority.

When Paul speaks of those who "eat not" and that put a difference in days, and of those that do eat, and do not put this difference in days, reason, as well as Scripture requires that we understand him to refer to that law which regulated all this. And when it is further seen that every fact in the New Testament shows that God's great constitution is unabolished, the character of the effort that would break down its fourth precept, may be seen in the true light.

With how much greater force do you attempt to prove the abolition of the fourth commandment, by citing a portion of Scripture very far from us to point to any such rule? Does the Sabbath become a holy day, and that the latter phrase often occurs in the Old Testament then I remark, that you have made a false statement respecting the New Testament as you have made several others. 1 Thess. v, 2; 2 Pet. iii, 10, 12.

In what sense John could, according to your theory, have a vision on the great day of the Lord—the thousand years, which are even yet future, we now proceed to inquire.

(1.) It is not only impossible for a prophet 1800 years since to be in vision on a period of time not even yet arrived, but I know of nothing in all the Bible, to justify such an idea.

(2.) That John was not standing in vision and the events of the day of God is evident from the reading of the first chapter. The single word "hereafter" which included the events of the future down to the eternal reign of the saints, ought to correct for ever this strange idea.

(3.) But to see the events of the day of the Lord pass before one in vision, and be to vision on that day, are two widely different things. The first is frequent in God's dealings with the prophets; the last is utterly impossible until that day actually arrives.

(4.) The place and the date as given by John are simply literal. He was in vision on the island of Patmos, on the Lord's day.

But as if you anticipated that such a strange doctrine would be exposed, you remark, that if in a subordinating sense it was applicable to one of the days of the week, you think there is better reason to apply it to Sunday than to any other day, because on that day Christ was raised from the dead. And it is proper to
obey the laws of the land, and useful to be uniform in the day of worship, &c.

It is a fact that the term Lord's Day is now applied to Sunday; few persons, however, are aware who gave Sunday this appellation. "The history of the Sabbath" on the authority of Luke's Ecc. Hist. Cont. 4. p. 740, makes the following statement:

"To give the more solemnity to the first day of the week, Sylvanus, bishop of Rome, at the close of the first century, is said to have proposed that the Sunday should be kept in memory of the resurrection of Christ, but his suggestion was rejected by the church."

The reader can choose for himself.

27 ; Rev. i, 10. If you have any proof that Jehovah who utters such an exhortation, would break them upon his command in summing up so important a question. The fourth commandment is a part of the royal law, and it is his part to get it out, not ours to insert it in a second place. The idea that the moral law of God intended to be enforced by the Son of God, by any of his apostles, is a singular, and in the highest degree absurd. Christ often took the law of God for authority, for what he said was the law and the apostles. But as marvels will never cease, we are given to understand that what Christ and his apostles did not enforce, is not binding on us as Christians. And the law of the Sabbath stands on another ground. Paul, or Paul and John stand in array. You can show to be sinful. But they may be used to justify others as well as the sin of Sabbath-breaking. By the law is the knowledge of sin. Rom. viii, 7, 15. This is the only standard by which sin is shown. It is the embodiment of God's own principles of holiness, and nothing can be riper or more perfect, even by Omnipotence. Ti. i, 2; Rom. vii, 12.

It is enough that the apostles have told us what the standard is by which sin is shown; we take the standard, and tell any man who breaks the law of God either by the form, or by the spirit of it, that he is a sinner, and the wages of sin is death! We do not rebate a man for an act of sin, by turning away from any of the catalogues of sins; we take the standard by which these sets are shown to be sinful and rude to him, thus saith the Lord!"

In replying to the above, you quote the extract from the Review; (the longest extract, which you have ever made;) but you keep out of sight all the leading arguments of the Review, and merely seize one of the brief points made by it in summing up the matter.

Because I stated in the paragraph which you quote, that the moral law which Christ came to obey in all its requirements, and then to submit to its curse and die for the unjust, did not need to be enforced by him, as it already possessed the highest authority and himself was made under it, you affirm that I concede that the New Testament does not require the keeping of the Lord's Day, which was the Sabbath. Those who will read the above extract from the Review can judge for themselves.

You next quote from the second paragraph its first sentence, and then attempt to wrest it. Willfully overlooking the statement in the same paragraph, that Christ solemnly taught the perpetuity and immutability of the commandments. Your language, that blind superstition will carry its willing victim to fearful lengths, is not inappropriate to your own case.

"I had not known sin but by the law." Roy. vii, 15. This is the only standard by which sin is shown. It is the embodiment of God's own principles of holiness, and nothing can be riper or more perfect, even by Omnipotence. Ti. i, 2; Rom. viii, 12.

Let us repeat the doctrine: The law of God is the only standard by which the sets of men as moral beings, are shown to be either righteous or wicked in the sight of God. None who present any other standard are requested to do so. (2.) (The New Testament distinctly teaches the doctrine. Rom. vii, 7; I John iii, 4. (2.) This pronounces it not perfect. Rom. vii, 12; James ii, 8–10; i, 25. (3.) But for the benefit of those who claim that the New Testament furnishes us with another standard by which sin is shown, besides the law of God, we refer to this image which may be tested with this question: Does the New Testament show it to be wrong for a man to marry his sister, or his daughter? Shall I be answered as I was sometime since. 'Such an act would not be sinful!' These acts being the subject of the passage, can it lead it at length, in Lev. xviii. That the abominations there described are not mere Jewish pollutions, is evident from the fact that the land of Palestine was said to vomit out its first inhabitants on account of these things.

With the following points from the New Testament, we submit the question:

1. The perpetuity and immutability of the law of God is distinctly taught.

2. The law of God is made the standard by which sin is shown.

3. Redemption from its fearful condemnation by the death of God's only Son, lays us under infinitely stronger obligations to keep it.

According to the above, you quote the extract from yourself, and the first short paragraph from the reply of the Review; (the longest extract, which you have ever made;) but you keep out of sight all the leading arguments of the Review, and seize one of the brief points made by it in summing up the matter.

The word of the Father can lead it at length, 1 Thess. i, 10–12, 4, 5. The catalogue of sins named in the New Testament, contain nothing that the law of God does not require. The law of God is not "required to keep them!" But to show how little weight it would have, had our Lord quoted the fourth commandment several times, we add, that the word of God was fulfilled in six; a part of the word of God times, are all abolished, together with the first four which he did not quote, all of which they attempt to prove from 2 Cor. iii. So that since that time we have a right to say that the Sabbath, this holy law in person and himself wrote it, has abolished it, to re-ecum it either through Christ or his apostles. Not approving the expression, we do not say that Christ and his apostles enforced the law, for how could he by Christ or his apostles, we are not as Christians under obligation to keep it. Those who make this assertion seem not to have weighed it very well. The fourth commandment is the Lord's day. The Lord of the Sabbath was crucified between two thieves; in like manner has the Sabbath itself been crucified, one thief the sixth, the other the first-day of the week.

The Scriptures are explicit respecting the day, which, in the beginning, God reserved to himself, and thenceforward throughout the Bible calls his holy day. Gen. ii, 1–6; Ex. xx, 9–11; Lev. xix, 32; Mark ii, 27; Rev. i, 10. If you have any proof that Jehovah has put away his holy day and chosen another, I call upon you to present it. But as I know well that you can produce no such kind of evidence from the Bible, I call upon you to cease this unholy warfare upon the "Holy of the Lord and Honorable," the Sabbath.

Rev. i, 14, contains, therefore, direct testimony that John did esteem one day the Lord's day, and did not "equate every day such," now. One of two things are certain: either the Lord's day is excepted by Paul, or Paul and John stand in array. You can point to no authority to show that the Sabbath has been abolished upon you wish; the Review only believes his testimony. But in the language of J. B. Cook, I remark, "All the Bible is the truth.

But I would have it necessary to have a stamped day for worship. But it is not necessary, in order to have that, we take the day by part of the beast; nor, the Sabbath of the Lord made for man, is of no less importance with the design of the Sabbath, is that it is a day to love it as something made for us. He says that 'the Sabbath was made for man,' and that much hated law of God. Born. iii, 20. Hear him again. "By the law is the knowledge of sin." Born. vii, 7, 15. This is the only standard by which sin is shown. It is the embodiment of God's own principles of holiness, and nothing can be riper or more perfect, even by Omnipotence. Ti. i, 2; Rom. vii, 12.

I answer, we have ever manifested a willingness to support the great expounder of his Father's law. He says that "the Sabbath was made for man," which gives us a definite idea of its great design, and causes us to love it as something made for us. He says again, "I will enter into life, keep the commandments. We have heard him in this; but those who will not hear him as affirmed in the text just quoted by yourself, shall be destroyed from among the people. He says, also, that those who do and teach the commandments shall be highly esteemed in the sight of the Lord; we have heard him to this, and his words encourage us, as we are compelled to meet the scorn of those who break them and teach men so. And now if you have heard him say that we need not keep the fourth commandment, we will set according to his words, and you cannot act thus, will you as he has said, "keep the commandments?"

You next style the Review, Moses' discourse. I answer, No Sir. In doing and teaching the commandments were the disciples of Jesus Christ, and those who break them and teach men so, are neither the disciples of Moses nor of Jesus.

You are the one that refuses to hear Christ on the commandments; and even his statement respecting the design of the Sabbath, is of less importance to you than an inference from the words of Moses.
In keeping the commandments of God and the testimony of Jesus, whether in the way of life or of death, is our whole duty. The law was given to sin, to bring sin to light, and to make it manifest; and this, and the second commandment, are so often repeated, that they must be as a howling lion, and must be as children without fear of God.

Your remarks that we reject Christ's testimony, and admit that we have a different gospel from Christ and his apostles, are false. And with this you attempt to comfort "fearful souls.

To those of your readers, who would say, with the man in the parable, "I pray thee have me excused," it is doubly various that this idea that they need obey the gospel of present truth. But it will not be comforting to awake in the day of God to the fearful fact that they were mocked with a falsehood, concluded with a lie.

The language of the Review can be treated only in a violent manner. Christ acknowledged the authority of the moral law of God, as the expression of his own person, its fearful curse. Christ took its curse upon himself. Where no law is there is no transgression, is understood your sixth article, you there affirmed that the law and the prophets are abolished; yet we regret that the space it occupies cannot be left ver.

Styling the commandments the law of Moses, you next read - "We saw you under the law to Christ, but if we are under the law of Moses we are under the curse. Gal. iii. 10. In coming to us in the violation of God's commandments, are under the curse, and under its fearful curse. Rom. iii. 10. Those who have been persuaded by the blood of Jesus, are under the curse of the law, and under the fearful curse of God, through Christ, through God's curse, through God the Father, by the law, through the commandment of God's curse.

In the preceding extract from the review of your report, you were requested to present another complete standard of holiness beside the moral law. You think that this is your sixth article, where you endeavored to place Christ in strong contrast with the sixth and seventh prefatory of the deaconage, and also with the second of the two great commandments. The character of your effort was shown in letter ver.

We had, we should have noticed and enforced the following:

1. The faith of Jesus, and from this work, we are determined not to receive the promise. For yet a little while and he that shall come will come, and will not tarry. Heb. x. 37.

2. If the death of Christ destroys the natural law, then the human family are delivered from its fearful sentence, whether they repent or not. This makes the statement unconditional; hence, it is the doctrine of Universalism. 1 Cor. ii. 20; Matt. xx. 19; John iii. 10.

3. The doctrine that temporal, instead of the second death, is the ultimate penalty of God's law, is the real foundation of Universalism. 1 Cor. ii. 20; Matt. xx. 19; John iii. 10.

4. If you are resolved to continue the non-resurrection of the wicked, then make void the law through fear of God. Rom. xiv. 26; Gal. v. 3; Heb. x. 36, 37.

5. That "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness," that is, its great design, or object, was a matter directly important, and right in the sight of God, is obtained by faith in him, whom God hath set forth as a propitiation; and in this sense, charity is to be regarded as the abolition of the commandment, but its great design or object. 1 Tim. i. 5.

Mark, Christ's domain适用于 those only who "believe," but those who do not believe in and follow him, are under its curse. And the question of the faith of Jesus that shows our present duty. Perhaps however, you see no reason to uphold you over the following points in the Zerecha.

1. The doctrine of the destruction of the wicked rests upon the perpetuity of the law, which is the ultimate penalty of God's law. 1 Tim. iii. 19. Sin is the transgression of the law. 1 John iii.; Rom. xiv. 26.

2. If the death of Christ destroys the natural law, then the human family are delivered from its fearful sentence, whether they repent or not. This makes the statement unconditional; hence, it is the doctrine of Universalism. 1 Cor. ii. 20; Matt. xx. 19; John iii. 10.

4. The doctrine of the non-resurrection of the wicked, is the ultimate penalty of God's law, is the real foundation of Universalism. 1 Cor. ii. 20; Matt. xx. 19; John iii. 10.

5. That "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness," that is, its great design, or object, was a matter directly important, and right in the sight of God, is obtained by faith in him, whom God hath set forth as a propitiation; and in this sense, charity is to be regarded as the abolition of the commandment, but its great design or object. 1 Tim. i. 5.

6. It is evident that the time of the patience of the saints is a definite period, as much as the First, or Second Advent. - Gen. xvi. 25; Ezek. xxxiv. 24; Matt. xxv. 4-13, 32, 33; Rev. iii. 10, 11, 17; Matt. xxiv. 36, 44; xxi. 20; xxii. 3, 4; Rom. ii. 25.

The points of vast importance which it contains are, first, the patience of the saints, second, the commandments of God, and third, the faith of Jesus.
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The points of vast importance which it contains are, first, the patience of the saints, second, the commandments of God, and third, the faith of Jesus.

It is evident that the time of the patience of the saints is a definite period, as much as the First, or Second Advent. - Gen. xvi. 25; Ezek. xxxiv. 24; Matt. xxv. 4-13, 32, 33; Rev. iii. 10, 11, 17; Matt. xxiv. 36, 44; xxi. 20; xxii. 3, 4; Rom. ii. 25.
And he opened his mouth, and taught them, saying, blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted. Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth. Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled. Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy. Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God. Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God. Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you.

Jesus said to his disciples, "Ye shall be the light of the world. A city that is set on a hill cannot be hid. Neither do men light a candle, and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick, and it giveth light unto all that are in the house. Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven." Matthew 5:14-16.

As we observe the people, in all the walks of life, manifesting the spirit and life of Christ, and consecrated by our Lord, then we are in-duced to think of the "light of the world," a city that is set on a hill. But if we do not, then we do not keep the commandment, "Let your light so shine before men." Matthew 5:16.

Mark well the language of the last were quoted. Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven. Matthew 5:16.

If we as a people, in all the walks of life, manifest the spirit and life of Christ, and consecrated by our Lord, then we are induced to think of the "light of the world," a city that is set on a hill. But if we do not, then we do not keep the commandment, "Let your light so shine before men." Matthew 5:16.

Mark well the language of the last were quoted. Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven. Matthew 5:16.

Every time there was a period when the words of our Lord, "Ye are the light of the world," were applied with greater force than at the present time. The reason, when they were spoken, was that the Christians were enveloped in gross darkness and drunk with the wiles of Babylon. God's holy law is supremely treasured, and the commandments and traditions of men are exalted in its place. "If, of all the disciples of Christ should be a bright light in this benighted world, it is now in the hands of the infernal enemy and out to research from the approaching storm of truth, and sit a people to stand in the day of God." The truth may be preached with clearness and power, but if the children are not informed in these truths, our words to a people, will be nothing. The most powerful preachers are those humble devoted disciples who show by the words of their嘴字, and in the manner of their lives, the spirit of God. They are "walking epistles," "read and known of all men." And by their godly lives, unspotted from the world, they carry a mighty influence in favor of the holy religion of Christ. Our strength and only hope of benefiting others, is in being blameless and holy, that we may have power with God, and in showing by our daily walk that religion has done something for us. Than our light will shine before the world. Matthew 5:16.

Our Lord, in his sermon, continues: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets. I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. oben is therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall say, "Thou madest me to destroy the kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall destroy them, the least shall be least in the kingdom of heaven." For he saith unto them, "What think ye of Christ? Whose son is he? They say unto him, "The son of David." He saith unto them, "Verily I say unto you, that ye know not the Scriptures, neither do ye understand what things are written in them. For the prophets and writings do testify of me, saying that I must suffer many things, and be raised again the third day. And he began to say to them, "This day is the appointed day of the Lord to fulfill the things written in the law, and the prophets. Then he opened and read in the book of Isaiah the prophet, the Seventy-seventh chapter. And he said, "Thus spake the Lord, saying, 'Go forth into the wilderness, and in the wilderness shalt thou prepare my way; prepare the way of the Lord, make his paths straight.'" Then began he to send missionaries among the nations, and to work out the kingdom of God. Matthew 11:2-12.

A portion of these present came from twenty to sixty miles to meet with their brethren; but most of them live in the vicinity of the city. We were happy to meet with Bro. Rhodes and Holt at this meeting. They are much evidences of outward, and yet happy in the power of the Spirit in their conversation without it. On First-day several hundred came to hear, and the word of the Lord had free course.

The Conference at Cannon Valley, July 24th and 25th, was indeed a refreshing season. It was held in Bro. Leach's field, about ten miles from the city. A portion of these present came from twenty to sixty miles to meet with their brethren; but most of them live in the vicinity of the city. We were happy to meet with Bro. Rhodes and Holt at this meeting. They are much evidences of outward, and yet happy in the power of the Spirit in their conversation without it. On First-day several hundred came to hear, and the word of the Lord had free course.

The first No. of the Tenth Messenger will be sent in most of our readers' hands. They who wish it, will inform us immediately.
THE REVIEW AND HERALD.

1. The theory which reckons the three days and three nights in full time, seems, at least, to contradict the multitudes of texts which speak of the resurrection on the third day. For as He was buried before the close of the crucifixion day, was in the tomb (if we follow this theory) a part of Friday, all of Saturday and Sunday, and a part of Monday; thus making a part of six days. How then could be raised on the third day?

2. He was crucified on the thirteenth day of the first month, the anniversary of the paschal lamb, [1 Cor. v. 7; John xvi. 28, 29] and raised on the sixteenth day, the "morrow after the Sabbath," the antitype of the first fruits. Lev. xii. 1-11; 1 Cor. xv. 53.

3. He was crucified on Friday, [Mark xvi, 42] and raised the day after the Sabbath, Mark xvi, 1, 2.

But does not this idea of making out Sunday the first day, and a period of momentum, excuse for breaking the fourth commandment, than a royal, sincere effort to obey it? On whom do you bless the commandments, or on those who find an excuse for not obeying? J. N. A.
DEAR BRO. WHITE:—I feel that I am a pilgrim and stranger here in this world of sin, pursuing my heavenly inheritance. “O. I long to be there, and the thought that ‘tis near, makes me almost impatient for Christ to appear.

But when I look around, and see many of God’s dear people yet covered up under the rubbish and darkness, I feel as though I could stay until all the jewels are sought out and made ready for the King’s use, and I also feel encouraged. I feel as though the Lord is seeking meekness and being very humble in the sight of those who have been so watched over by his grace, and I desire that I may be permitted to help them out of all places where they have been scattered in the dark and cloudy day. (Rev. xxxiv. 12.)

So I dwell with delight upon this message. I feel that I would say to all those who have started in the work of preparation, and of rescuing them from the impending storm of God’s wrath, which will soon burst upon a guilty world. I feel too, that our children who love the dear Saviour, and love to keep God’s commandments, should feel their own responsibility, and that they too, have a part to act in the great work of preparing and fitting themselves and their families for the end, and know their destruction was sure, unless their course should be changed. “Why” says he, “I would say right hold of them, and would hold them fast. I would not let them go.” And should not this be our feeling, one and all, especially in much prayer to God in behalf of such as do not feel the power of these truths, which alone can shield and save them in the great day, which hasteth, and hasteth greatly.

You will be glad to hear that the children in this place are somewhat interested and some of them are much interested in the contemplated paper, and Sabbath lessons. Nine came together for the purpose of reading, and instruction in God’s holy word. The melting Spirit of the Lord was felt and we hope it will not prove a lost opportunity.

F. M. SHIPMER.

Granville, Pt., July 10th, 1852.

From Bro. Washburn.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—We are still striving to serve God in obedience to his commandments, but we find many times we are mistaken and not keeping him as we ought. I praise the Lord that he has had so much mercy and compassion on such an unworthy worm of the dust as I view myself. I feel very dark and gloomy in my mind, sometimes, for we are deprived of the privilege of meeting with the true followers of Christ, or conversing with the precepts of the Great King. But I am resolved to hold fast, and have faith in God, let the events be what they may. As for me and my house, we will serve the Lord.

I find we must expect troubles, and trials, and persecutions in this wicked, fading world. But what is this in comparison with a crown of life? O, a crown of life is worth a little self-denial in this world. Oh, yes, if we can but obtain that rich treasure which is laid up for all such as are willing to follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth.

I would say to all those who have started in the glorious way, “Be very, very, very careful in doing well, but pressure, for the prize is just ahead. May the Lord help us all, that we may hold on till the Lord shall call for us. Then shall the weary be at rest, and the wicked cease from troubling. That we may all live in God, and that they too, have a part to act in the great day, which hasteth, and hasteth greatly.

Dear Bro. Washburn.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—I improve the present opportunity to direct a few lines to the scattered brethren, for a moment, to just say, that the cause of the Sabbath is open a large field and much light. To God be all the glory.

I trust that we shall not become like those who say and do not, but as we are professing to keep God’s commandments. (Rev. xiv. 12.) I do hope that we shall be enabled to keep our covenants on gospel ground. To me, it has opened a large field and much light. To God be all the glory.

I would that God would send some of his children here, so that I could converse with them on his holy law. And if any of the brethren come this way I hope that they will call and see me, and I will do by them according to the best of my ability. I am poor in this world’s goods, but am looking for glory, and honor, and riches in the world to come. May God grant us an abundant entrance into his everlasting kingdom.

From one who is striving to keep God’s holy law.

ZENA MARSH.

South Hadley, Mass., July 23rd, 1852.

From Bro. Camp.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—I feel that it is time for God’s people to stand firm on the truth, having on the whole armor of God, and to purify their souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit. I want, for one, to stand on the whole present truth. Present truth is what we want; truth on every point, that we may be enabled to meet our opponents on gospel ground.

We must have clean hands, and pure hearts to prepare us to stand when men’s hearts are failing them for fear, and for looking after those things that are coming on the earth.

One year has passed away since I embraced the holy Sabbath, and God has blessed me abundantly in trying to keep his commandments. They all look very precious to me. Christ said, “If ye love me keep my commandments,” and he told his disciples to love one another, and said, “by this shall all men know that ye are my disciples.” But do we see that love exemplified in the lives of those that profess to be his disciples? I think that all will answer, no, not among the different sects, for there we see discord and confusion. But I can say that among those, as far as my acquaintance extends, that keep God’s holy Sabbath, the spirit of love is manifest in their deportment, heavenly union prevail, and will among those that truly belong to Christ.

I feel like putting all on board, and going through to the kingdom. To me, the Sabbath is a delight, holy of the Lord and honorable, although some would fain have me follow the traditions of men. I have vowed to the Lord and cannot go back. I have read the Review with great delight. I feel greatly encouraged to persevere. I mean to strive to possess the kingdom with my brethren, and with them share its glories, and with them I expect to bear the trials and conflicts of the way, choosing rather to suffer affliction for the people of God than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season.

We should be glad to have the brethren visit us, as we have but little opportunity of meeting with them. We should be happy to see you and that will come bringing the present truth.

Let us in the hope of eternal life,

Chelms, Pt., July 18th, 1852.

WM. CAMP.

From Bro. Barr.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—I turn aside from the press of business, for a moment, to just say, that the cause of truth is moving onward in spite of all the powers of darkness combined. The living and true God is revealing himself mighty to save. Honest souls are being made to rejoice, after a long, gloomy night of sadness, to find themselves as last, in the path of the just.
Reply to Wrong Statements Respecting "Mis-

Dear Bro. White,—On my arrival at Albion, Wise, July 15th, I found the communication which you kindly forwarded me, a notice of which you had published in the Review and Herald and First-day Herald for July 14th. I studied it carefully, and sent it to Mr. N. B. Kennard.

An examination of the offer, after our reviews of meetings, I desired to reply to them personally. Before I had finished my letter, the advent Harbinger of July 10th was published, which stated that you had not in opposition to Mr. Low's re-
stated. "Produce a command of my Lord for keeping the Sab-

Two following extracts from the advent Harbinger of May 29th, 1852, headed, "Second Advent Meetings."

"Asbury—Advent Hall, over H. G. Vanandem's Drug Store, evening.

"Asbury—Advent Hall, over H. G. Vanandem's Drug Store, evening."