

ADVENT REVIEW,

AND SABBATH HERALD.

"Here is the Patience of the Saints; Here are they that keep the Commandments of God, and the Faith of Jesus."

VOL. XVII.

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., THIRD-DAY, JANUARY 8, 1861.

No. 8.

The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald

is published weekly, at One Dollar a Volume of 26 Nos. in advance
J. P. KELLOGG, CYRENIUS SMITH and D. R. PALMER,
Publishing Committee.

Uriah Smith, Resident Editor. J. N. Andrews, James
White, J. H. Waggoner, R. F. Cottrell and Stephen
Pierce, Corresponding Editors.
Address REVIEW AND HERALD Battle Creek, Mich.

MINE."

HERE I find, what long I've sought,
Cooling draught, with healing fraught,
Flowing free from fount divine,—
"I have called thee, thou art mine."

Jesus, grant thy kind control,
Visit, cleanse, and make me whole;
Bid me not this pledge resign,
"I have called thee, thou art mine."

While I read thy death for me,
Through my tears of love, I see
This, the sweetest word of thine,
"I have called thee, thou art mine."

If I weakly dare to sigh
For earth's pomp and vanity,
Thou dost speak—no more I pine,
"I have called thee, thou art mine."

Wanderer oft, do I desire,
Israel's token, cloud of fire?
This I have, my constant sign,
"I have called thee, thou art mine."

Has my spirit faithless grown?
One assurance, one alone,
Bids me all my fears resign,
"I have called thee, thou art mine."

When, with God's elect, I stand,
Sword of truth in ready hand,
On my banner's folds shall shine,
"I have called thee, thou art mine."

At thy sacramental board,
Added joy these words afford,
While I taste the bread and wine,
"I have called thee, thou art mine."

If death, at the outer gate,
Summons brings, for which I wait,
Let me hear from lips divine,
"I have called thee, thou art mine."

CULTIVATION OF A DEVOTIONAL SPIRIT.

To maintain a devotional spirit, two things are especially necessary—habitually to cultivate the disposition, and habitually to avoid whatever is unfavorable to it. Frequent retirement and recollection are indispensable, together with such a general course of reading, as, if it do not actually promote the spirit we are endeavoring to maintain, shall never be hostile to it. We should avoid as much as in us lies, all such society, all such amusements as excite tempers, which it is the daily business of a Christian to subdue, and all those feelings which it is his constant duty to suppress.

And here may we venture to observe, that if some things which are apparently innocent, and do not assume an alarming aspect, or bear a dangerous character; things which the generality of decorous people affirm (how truly we know not) to be safe for them; yet if we find that these things stir up in us improper propensities, if they

awaken thoughts which ought not to be excited, if they abate our love for religious exercises, or infringe on our time for performing them, if they make spiritual concerns appear insipid, if they wind our heart a little more about the world; in short, if we have formerly found them injurious to our own souls, then let no example or persuasion, no belief of their alleged innocence, no plea of their perfect safety, tempt us to indulge in them. It matters little to our security what they are to others. Our business is with ourselves. Our responsibility is on our own heads. Others cannot know the side on which we are assailable. Let our own unbiased judgment determine our opinion, let our own experience decide for our own conduct.

In speaking of books we cannot forbear noticing that very prevalent sort of reading which is little less productive of evil, little less prejudicial to moral and mental improvement than that which carries a more formidable appearance. We cannot confine our censure to those more corrupt writings which deprave the heart, debauch the imagination and poison the principles. Of these the turpitude is so obvious that no caution on this head, it is presumed, can be necessary. But if justice forbids us to confound the insipid with the mischievous, the idle with the vicious, and the frivolous with the profligate, still we can only admit of shades, deep shades we allow, of difference. These works, if comparatively harmless, yet debase the taste, slacken the intellectual nerve, let down the understanding, set the fancy loose, and send it gadding among low and mean objects. They not only run away with the time which should be given to better things, but gradually destroy all taste for better things. They sink the mind to their own standard and give it a sluggish reluctance, we had almost said a moral incapacity for everything above their level. The mind, by long habit of stooping, loses its erectness, and yields to its degradation. It becomes so low and narrow by the littleness of the things which engage it that it requires a painful effort to lift itself high enough, or to open itself wide enough to embrace great and noble objects. The appetite is vitiated. Excess instead of producing a surfeit, by weakening the digestion only induces a loathing for stronger nourishment. The faculties which might have been expanding in works of science, or soaring in the contemplation of genius, become satisfied with the impertinences of the most ordinary fiction, lose their relish for the severity of truth, the elegance of taste, and the soberness of religion. Lulled in the torpor of repose, the intellect dozes, and enjoys in its waking dream—

All the wild trash of sleep without the rest.

In avoiding books which excite the passions, it would seem strange to include even some devotional works. Yet such as merely kindle warm feelings are not always the safest. Let us rather prefer those which, while they tend to raise a devotional spirit, awaken the affections without disordering them, which, while they elevate the desires, purify them, which show us our own nature and lay open its corruptions. Such as show us the malignity of sin, the deceitfulness of our

hearts, the feebleness of our best resolutions; such as teach us to pull off the mask from the fairest appearances, and discover every hiding place where some lurking evil would conceal itself; such as show us not what we appear to others, but what we really are; such as co-operating with our interior feelings and showing us our natural state, point out our absolute need of a Redeemer, lead us to seek to him for pardon from a conviction that there is no other refuge, no other salvation. Let us be conversant with such writings as teach us that while we long to obtain the remission of our transgressions, we must not desire the remission of our duties. Let us seek for such a Saviour as will not only deliver us from the punishment of sin, but from its dominion also.

And let us ever bear in mind that the end of prayer is not answered when the prayer is finished. We should regard prayer as a means to a farther end. The act of prayer is not sufficient; we must cultivate a *spirit* of prayer. And though when the actual devotion is over, we cannot amid the distractions of company and business always be thinking of heavenly things, yet the desire, the frame, the propensity, the willingness to return to them, we must, however difficult, endeavor to maintain.

The proper temper for prayer should precede the act. The disposition should be wrought in the mind before the exercise is begun. To bring a proud temper to an humble prayer, a luxurious habit to a self-denying prayer, or a worldly disposition to a spiritually minded prayer, is a positive anomaly. A habit is more powerful than an act, and a previously indulged temper during the day will not, it is to be feared, be fully counteracted by the exercise of a few minutes' devotion at night.

Prayer is designed for a perpetual renovation of the motives to virtue; if therefore the cause is not followed by its consequence, a consequence inevitable but for the impediments we bring to it, we rob our nature of its highest privilege, and run the danger of incurring a penalty where we are looking for a blessing.

That the habitual tendency of the life should be the preparation for the stated prayer, is naturally suggested to us by our blessed Redeemer in his sermon on the mount. He announced the precepts of holiness, and their corresponding beatitudes; he gave the spiritual exposition of the law, the directions for alms-giving, the exhortation to love our enemies, nay, the essence and spirit of the whole decalogue, previous to his delivering his own divine prayer as a pattern for ours'. Let us learn from this that the preparation of prayer is therefore to live in all those pursuits which we may safely beg of God to bless, and in a conflict with all those temptations into which we pray not to be led.

If God be the center to which our hearts are tending, every line in our lives must meet in him. With this point in view, there will be a harmony between our prayers and our practice, a consistency between devotion and conduct which will make every part turn to this one end, bear upon this one point. For the beauty of the Christian

scheme consists not in parts (however good in themselves) which tend to separate views, and lead to different ends; but it arises from its being one entire, uniform, connected plan, "compact by that which every joint supplieth," and of which all the parts terminate in this one grand ultimate point.

The design of prayer therefore as we before observed, is not merely to make us devout while we are engaged in it, but that its odor may be diffused through all the intermediate spaces of the day, enter into all its occupations, duties and tempers. Nor must its results be partial or limited to easy and pleasant duties, but extend to such as are less alluring. When we pray, for instance, for our enemies, the prayer must be rendered practical, must be made a means of softening our spirit and cooling our resentment toward them. If we deserve their enmity, the true spirit of prayer will put us upon endeavoring to cure the fault which has excited it. If we do not deserve it, it will put us on striving for a placable temper, and we shall endeavor not to let slip so favorable an occasion of cultivating it. There is no such softener of animosity, no such soother of resentment, no such allayer of hatred, as sincere cordial prayer.

It is obvious that the precept to pray without ceasing can never mean to enjoin a continual course of actual prayer. But while it more directly enjoins us to embrace all proper occasions of performing this sacred duty, or rather of claiming this valuable privilege, so it plainly implies that we should try to keep up constantly that sense of the divine presence which shall maintain the disposition. In order to this we should inure our minds to reflection; we should encourage serious thoughts. A good thought barely passing through the mind will make little impression on it. We must arrest it, constrain it to remain with us, expand, amplify, and, as it were, take it to pieces. It must be distinctly unfolded, and carefully examined, or it will leave no precise idea; it must be fixed and incorporated, or it will produce no practical effect. We must not dismiss it till it has left some trace on the mind, till it has made some impression on the heart.

On the other hand, if we give the reins to a loose ungoverned fancy, at other times, if we abandon our minds to frivolous thoughts, if we fill them with corrupt images, if we cherish sensual ideas during the rest of the day, can we expect that none of these images will intrude, that none of these impressions will be revived, but that "the temple into which foul things" have been invited, will be cleansed at a given moment; that worldly thoughts will recede and give place at once to pure and holy thoughts? Will that spirit grieved by impurity, or resisted by levity, return with his warm beams, and cheering influences to the contaminated mansion from which he has been driven out? Is it wonderful if, finding no entrance into a heart filled with vanity he should withdraw himself?—We cannot, in retiring into our closets, change our natures as we do our clothes. The disposition we carry thither will be likely to remain with us. We have no right to expect that a new temper will meet us at the door. We can only hope that the spirit we bring thither will be cherished and improved. It is not easy, rather it is not possible to graft genuine devotion on a life of an opposite tendency; nor can we delight ourselves regularly for a few stated moments in that God whom we have not been serving during the day. We may indeed to quiet our conscience, take up the employment of prayer, but cannot take up the state of mind which will make the employment beneficial to ourselves, or the prayer acceptable to God, if all the previous day we have been careless of ourselves and unmindful of our Maker. They will not pray differently from the rest of the world who do not live differently.

What a contradiction it is to lament the weakness, the misery, and the corruption of our nature in our devotions, and then to rush into a life though not perhaps of vice, yet of indulgences calculated to increase that weakness, to inflame

those corruptions, and to lead to that misery! There is either no meaning in our prayers, or no sense in our conduct. In the one we mock God, in the other we deceive ourselves.

Will not he who keeps up an habitual intercourse with his Maker, who is vigilant in thought, self-denying in action, who strives to keep his heart from wrong desires, his mind from vain imaginations, and his lips from idle words, bring a more prepared spirit, a more collected mind, be more engaged, more penetrated, more present to the occasion? Will he not feel more delight in this devout exercise, reap more benefit from it, than he who lives at random, prays from custom, and who though he dares not intermit the form, is a stranger to its spirit. "O God, my heart is ready," cannot be lawfully uttered by him who is no more prepared.

We speak not here to the self-sufficient formalist, or the careless profligate. Among those whom we now take the liberty to address, are to be found, especially in the higher class of females, the amiable and the interesting, and in many respects, the virtuous and correct; characters so engaging, so evidently made for better things, so capable of reaching high degrees of excellence, so formed to give the tone to Christian practice, as well as to fashion; so calculated to give a beautiful impression of that religion which they profess without sufficiently adorning; which they believe without fairly exemplifying; that we cannot forbear taking a tender interest in their welfare, we cannot forbear breathing a fervent prayer, that they may yet reach the elevation for which they were intended; that they may hold out a uniform and consistent pattern of "whatsoever things are pure, honest, just, lovely, and of good report." This the Apostle goes on to intimate can only be done by THINKING ON THESE THINGS. Things can only influence our practice as they engage our attention. Would not then a confirmed habit of serious thought tend to correct that inconsideration, which we are willing to hope, more than want of principle, lies at the bottom of the inconsistency we are lamenting?

If, as it is generally allowed, the great difficulty of our spiritual life is to make the future predominate over the present, do we not by the conduct we are regretting aggravate what it is in our power to diminish? Miscalculation of the relative value of things is one of the greatest errors of our moral life. We estimate them in an inverse proportion to their value as well as to their duration; we lavish earnest and durable thoughts on things so trifling that they deserve little regard, so brief that they "perish with the using," while we bestow only slight attention on things of infinite worth, only transient thoughts on things of eternal duration.

Those who are so far conscientious as not to intermit a regular course of devotion, and who yet allow themselves at the same time to go on in a course of amusements which excite a directly opposite spirit, are inconceivably augmenting their own difficulties. They are eagerly heaping up fuel in the day on the fire which they intend to extinguish in the evening; they are voluntarily adding to the temptations against which they mean to request grace to struggle. To acknowledge at the same time that we find it hard to serve God as we ought, and yet to be systematically indulging habits which must naturally increase the difficulty, makes our characters almost ridiculous, while it renders our duty almost impracticable.

While we make our way more difficult by those very indulgencies with which we think to cheer and refresh it, the determined Christian becomes his own pioneer; he makes his path easy by voluntarily clearing it of the obstacles which impede his progress.

These habitual indulgencies seem a contradiction to that obvious law, that one virtue always involves another; for we cannot labor after any grace, that of prayer, for instance, without resisting whatever is opposite to it. If then we lament that it is so hard to serve God, let us not by our

conduct furnish arguments against ourselves; for, as if the difficulty were not great enough in itself, we are constantly heaping up mountains in our way by indulging in such pursuits and passions as make a small labor an insurmountable one.

But we may often judge better of our state by the result, than by the act of prayer. Our very defects, our coldness, deadness, wanderings, may leave more contrition on the soul than the happiest turn of thought. The feeling of our wants, the confession of our sins, the acknowledgment of our dependence, the renunciation of ourselves, the supplication for mercy, the application to "the fountain opened for sin," the cordial entreaty for the aid of the Spirit, the relinquishment of our own will, resolutions of better obedience, petitions that these resolutions may be directed and sanctified, these are the subjects in which the suppliant should be engaged, by which his thoughts should be absorbed. Can they be so absorbed if many of the intervening hours are passed in pursuits of a totally different complexion? pursuits which raise the passions which we are seeking to allay? Will the cherished vanities go at our bidding? Will the required dispositions come at our calling? Do we find our tempers so obedient, our passions so obsequious in the other concerns of life? If not, what reason have we to expect their obsequiousness in this grand concern? We should therefore endeavor to believe as we pray, to think as we pray, to feel as we pray, to act as we pray. Prayer must not be a solitary, independent exercise; but an exercise interwoven with many, and inseparably connected with that golden chain of Christian duties, of which, when so connected, it forms one of the most important links.

Business, however, must have its period as well as devotion. We were sent into this world to act as well as to pray, active duties must be performed as well as devout exercises. Even relaxation must have its interval; only let us be careful that the indulgence of the one do not destroy the effect of the other, that our pleasures do not encroach on the time or deaden the spirit of our devotions; let us be careful that our cares, occupations, and amusements may be always such that we may not be afraid to implore the divine blessing on them; this is the criterion of their safety and of our duty. Let us endeavor that in each, in all, one continually growing sentiment and feeling of loving, serving and pleasing God, maintain its predominant station in the heart.

An additional reason why we should live in the perpetual use of prayer, seems to be that our blessed Redeemer after having given both the example and the command while on earth, condescends still to be our unceasing intercessor in heaven. Can we ever cease petitioning for ourselves when we believe that he never ceases interceding for us?

If we are so unhappy as now to find little pleasure in this holy exercise, that however is so far from being a reason for discontinuing it, that it affords the strongest argument for perseverance. That which was at first a form, will become a pleasure; that which was a burden will become a privilege; that which we impose upon ourselves as a medicine, will become necessary as an aliment, and desirable as a gratification. That which is now short and superficial will become copious and solid. The chariot wheel is warmed by its own motion. Use will make that easy which was at first painful. That which is once become easy will soon be rendered pleasant. Instead of repining at the performance we shall be unhappy at the omission. When a man recovering from sickness attempts to walk he does not discontinue the exercise because he feels himself weak, nor even because the effort is painful. He rather redoubles his exertion. It is from his perseverance that he looks for strength. An additional turn every day diminishes his repugnance, augments his vigor, improves his spirit. That effort which was submitted to because it was salutary, is continued because the feeling of renovated strength renders it delightful.—*Hannah More.*

DIVISION OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES INTO CHAPTERS AND VERSES.

THE division of the Scriptures into chapters and verses is of comparatively modern origin, being generally referred to the thirteenth and the fifteenth century of the Christian era.

Dr. Horne says:—

"The very great advantage it affords for facilitating references to particular passages, has caused it to be retained, though much to the injury of its interpretation, as many passages are now severed that ought to be united, and *vice versa*."

It is often subversive of the sense, and far more frequently breaks in upon the necessary connection of historical facts or arguments. A few instances out of great numbers which might be collected, will demonstrate this.

Joshua, chapters five and six, are so separated that very few persons observe that the captain of the Lord's host continues his conversation with Joshua, and that the first verse of the sixth chapter is a parenthesis.

Ezra vii, 12 and 13.—The close of one verse and the beginning of the next, if not separated, would read, "Perfect peace, and at such a time I make a decree." It now stands thus: "Perfect peace and at such a time."

"I make a decree."

Thus nonsense is made of what otherwise would appear to be connected reasoning. Artaxerxes made a decree in a season of perfect peace, which he intimates would not have been so proper at a period of civil commotion or war.

1 Cor. xiii, xliii, and xlvth chapters.—The separation of these three chapters prevents many readers from following the reasoning of the Apostle. He says:—

"Covet the best gifts, and yet show I unto you a more excellent way. Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels and have not charity, I am nothing," &c.

"And now abideth faith, hope and charity, these three, but the greatest of these is charity. Follow after charity and desire spiritual gifts."

By interposing two artificial divisions, and commencing a new chapter with "Though I speak," and another with "Follow after charity," the connection is entirely broken, and the ordinary reader is precluded from understanding the argument.

Every student of the Bible will recall numerous instances of this character. Indeed it is so common that those who would know the truth, are obliged generally as they read, to disregard these divisions into chapters and verses.

Everything that is possible ought to be done to present the thought to the mind of the reader as it was communicated by the Holy Spirit. Whatever of human invention breaks the argument, or obscures the sense, should be avoided. Some of the rarest beauties of thought and expression are entirely destroyed by the present system of breaking up a letter from an apostle into chapters and verses, which he never imagined, and could not have approved. Take, for example, the letter of Paul the apostle to the Philippians. How beautiful and touching, read as a letter! How broken and disfigured, cut up into chapters and verses!

PUNCTUATION OF THE BIBLE.

THE punctuation of the Bible is modern. Taylor, the celebrated editor of Calmet's Dictionary, says: "It is still much to be wished that in this respect the Scriptures were carefully revised."

Dr. Horne asserts, as clearly proved, "that there was no regular or accustomed system of punctuation in use in the fourth century. The majority of the points or stops now in use are unquestionably of modern date."

"At the invention of printing, the editors placed the points arbitrarily, probably (Michaelis thinks) without bestowing the necessary attention; and Stevens in particular, it is well known, waived the points in every edition."

In Luke xxii, 46, it is stated that our Saviour

in the garden of Gethsemane, came to his disciples, and "found them sleeping for sorrow, and said unto them, Why sleep ye? Rise and pray." &c. "And while he yet spake, lo, Judas, one of the twelve, came," &c.

In Matt. xxvi, 45, the same event is related, in the same connection; but in the English version, the question is changed into a command to do the very thing to which he objected. "Sleep on now and take your rest," &c. "Rise let us be going," &c. "And while he yet spake, lo, Judas, one of the twelve came."

By changing what is evidently an interrogation into a command, the translators make our Lord give two opposite commands at the same time. "Sleep on now," "Rise," "Take your rest," "let us be going." All these discrepancies would be avoided by making the first a question: Sleep ye on now and take your rest? or, Do ye now sleep and take your rest?

The same discrepancy occurs in Mark xiv, 41 and 42.

In John xii, 27, our Saviour says:—

"Now is my soul troubled, and what shall I say? Father save me from this hour? But for this cause came I unto this hour."

This is consistent. He is talking to his disciples, and inquires regarding the anguish which is about to overwhelm him. What shall I say? Shall I say, 'Father, save me from this hour?' But I cannot say that, because 'for this cause came I unto this hour.'

In the common version, by changing what is evidently an inquiry into a prayer, the Lord is made to ask for that which he says would be inconsistent with the whole object of his life.

Many inaccuracies in punctuation have been pointed out by commentators, but it occupies so large a space to explain any one of the cases, and to show the reasons which render the correction necessary, that we forbear to bring forward any more. It is but justice, however, to say that the changes needed in this department are fewer than might reasonably have been expected, considering that no thorough revision has been made for so long a period of time, during which scholars and theologians have had opportunity to collate scripture with scripture, and discover the corrections needed in one place by comparison with others.

AN EVENING WITH CHRIST.

It was about the time of the passover. The soft airs of the vernal equinox began to breathe from the plains of Sharon, laden with the aroma of the young vines, and of the opening roses. On the silent city falls the moonlight, making Moriah's templed top to tower like a mountain of silver above the greenh of the vale Kedron. A few lone women are grinding their evening meal in the doorways here and there; a Pharisee that has lingered long at his vespers (a Papist before the Papacy) is hastening homewards; a belated fisherman from the Jordan is driving his beast toward the city gates to get outside them ere they are bolted for the night. The Roman sentinel on the temple wall calls the watch-word *All's well*. The evening glides on. Through the silent street—gathering his robe up close about him to conceal his face and keeping out of the moonlight, a ruler of the Jews passes stealthily along. Into a retired court—out of the aristocratic quarter—and hard by where God's poor are crowded close together, the ruler knocks at a lowly door. A plain, serene personage puts forth his hand to take the ruler's jeweled fingers and a rich turban bows low to the floor in reverence. "Rabbi," says the Pharisee to the meek Nazarene in his coarse raiment—"Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God, for no man can do these miracles that thou doest except God be with him."

Without waiting for any further preliminaries; without wasting time in idle talk, the omniscient teacher proves his divine wisdom by the solemn declaration, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born again he cannot see the king-

dom of God." Surprise steals over the ruler's face, as he fixes his keen Jewish eyes on the Master. "How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter the second time into his mother's womb and be born?" The poor pitiful idea of a second bodily birth enters into the mind of Nicodemus. He cannot get hold of the spiritual new birth. It is an enigma. Christ patiently explains it to his anxious inquirer. * * *

The Pharisee listens to it all. We may imagine that the turban was laid aside and the eager face bent to catch the words of life from the lips of the Nazarene. Evening wears on toward midnight ere Nicodemus puts on his sandals to depart. He rises to go away a wiser man. He goes away to remember the solemn and weighty teachings—not to forget. He goes away convinced, but not yet converted. He goes away saved out of Phariseism, though not yet saved into Christianity. Already is the hand of Christ upon his heart; and when we afterwards see him rising up in the Sanhedrim to demand a fair treatment of the persecuted Saviour, and at last bringing sweet spices to embalm the mangled form just rescued from the cross, we only see the glorious outcome of that evening with Jesus Christ.

Perhaps some reader of this sketch is now sitting where Nicodemus sat that night—on the seat of honest inquiry. He has sat there long already, but delay has not improved his guilty heart. He knows the theory of salvation, but the practical steps he does not get hold of. My friend, you may perish in that very seat. You may sink to the pit from the place of the inquirer, if you make it too the place of the palterer, and the trifler with the Holy Spirit. What you want is action. You have waited long enough. Go straightway to Christ. Lay hold of the first duty to which conscience calls and do it. Begin at once to serve God. If your will rebels, pray God to subdue your stubborn will. If Satan hinder, "resist the devil, and he will flee from you." If business beguile you, set your face like a flint to the one great business of securing the salvation of your soul. The very attempt to serve God will bring out the wickedness and the weakness of your heart, as no other process possibly can. But try it. Every attempt will bring you nearer to Christ. Persevere! Like Bunyan's pilgrim, you will find that the way to heaven "lies through this very valley." Struggle on! And when you can perform one solitary act, however humble, from no other motive than the glory of God—when you can renounce a single sin from no other motive than honoring the Saviour, then have you experienced a new birth; then will your feet be safely planted in that straight path that leads to life eternal.

WORRY.

Don't you know that multitudes of human beings turn away from the many blessings of their lot, and dwell and brood upon its worries? Don't you know that multitudes persistently look away from the numerous pleasant things they might contemplate, and look fixedly, and almost constantly at painful and disagreeable things? Now I put it to every sensible reader, whether there be not a great deal too much of this kind of thing. Are there not families that never spend a quiet evening together without embittering it by raking up every unpleasant subject in their lot and history? There are folks who both in their own case, and that of others, seem to find a strange satisfaction in sticking the thorn in the hand further in; even in twisting the dagger in the heart. Their lot has its innumerable blessings, but they will not look at these. Let the view around in a hundred directions be ever so charming, they cannot be got to turn their mental view in one of these. They persist in keeping nose and eyes at the moral pig-sty.

NEVER undertake any work until you have your warrant; or you will find the expense to be heavy, and the labor a task. David would have built a temple, but he was forbidden.

The Review and Herald.

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

BATTLE CREEK, MICH. THIRD-DAY, JAN. 8, 1861.

THOUGHTS ON THE ADVENT.

An exhaustless theme is opened before us in the subject which we have chosen as the basis of a few brief thoughts; but it is one from which, though much treated upon already, we trust the reader will never be inclined to turn away from lack of interest. No grander theme than the glorious advent of the Saviour to this fallen world can occupy the thoughts and pens of the inhabitants of earth. No subject has greater claims upon the earnest and unabating consideration of all classes; and none especially greater claims upon us who have professedly come out from the ordinary pursuits and calculations of life, and, before the world, are waiting and watching for our Lord's return. Have we come thus far in vain? Have we been deluded into the expectation of that which we have no warrant to expect? Have we run wild in speculation upon the word of God? or have we been guided thus far by declarations of truth and soberness? have we been building upon the rock? and are we moving on to the certain and full fruition of our hope?

Upon all these questions we certainly cannot too often re-assure ourselves, and renew our faith; and hence a reconsideration of the evidences of our position, some of which we here propose to notice, can never be amiss. As we toil on "in this wilderness state," feeling the ills of mortality pressing heavily upon us, we console ourselves with the thought that the Life-giver is soon to appear, when this corruptible shall put on incorruption, and this mortal shall be clothed with immortality. And when poverty and oppression, persecution and peril are sore upon us, we look away, as our only hope, to the unfading crown, the enduring treasure, the victory and the rest, to which the righteous Judge shall introduce us, in the day of his coming and his kingdom. The question is not now whether it is *strange* that we should desire this coming and kingdom; but, are we *wrong* in looking for it? Is the world still destined to continue in its wonted course for centuries to come? Might we as well join with the worldling in his temporal schemes, in his plans and calculations for a distant day? Are our sacrifices uncalled for and vain, and our hope doomed to disappointment? Let not these questions be understood as designed to imply doubt, but only to excite inquiry.

That we do well to come out from the world, that our expectations are not vain, but that the coming of the Lord draweth nigh, yea, is even at the doors, we shall now endeavor to show; not from a desire to have it so, in itself considered, however strong that desire may be, but because we so understand the word of the Lord to teach. We *desire* our Lord to come, because we love him; we believe that he *will* come because his word so declares, and we know that sooner heaven and earth would pass away than one jot or one tittle of that word would fail.

The first passage to which we call attention, is one which we ever read with fresh delight. It is one which must electrify with joy every heart wherein the love of Christ is found. It was spoken under circumstances which cannot fail to give a correct and vivid idea of the nature and manner of the return of our blessed Saviour; and it contains an announcement of the truth so clear and forcible that it cannot well be evaded or ignored. We refer to the testimony of the angels to the men of Galilee as they stood gazing up into heaven to catch the last glimpse of their ascending Lord. When Jesus had finished the work which he had personally to accomplish on the earth, he led his disciples out as far as Bethany, bestowed upon them his parting blessing, and was taken up into heaven. And while in mute astonishment they gazed steadfastly up towards the cloud which had received him out of their sight, two men in white apparel stood by bearing to them the very promise which was best adapted to their situation in that hour of separation and trial—a promise, too, which has proved of equal comfort to every saint from that day to this, who has mourned the long-continued separation of the church

from her beloved Lord. They testified as follows: "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." Gracious words! worthy to be graven in letters of gold; worthy to be worn as "frontlets between the eyes," and written upon every door-post, as no doubt, they are deeply cherished in every Christian heart.

Three points are at once made clear by this testimony; namely, (1.) the fact that the Lord will come again. Said the angels (and their testimony will at once be conceded as good authority) he *shall* come. (2.) The nature of that coming; personal and real, not spiritual: "this same Jesus." (3.) The manner of that coming; visible in clouds of heaven, as they had "seen him go into heaven." Bodily, personally, and visibly he ascended. The transaction was accomplished in the light of day; and the disciples beheld him with their literal eyes, till a literal cloud hid him from their view. In like manner will he come again, personally and visibly in the clouds of heaven; and eyes that would then gladly turn from the sight, and seek to be buried by the rocks and mountains from his presence, will be compelled to look upon his majesty and glory. Rev. vi, 16. May it rather be ours, dear reader, in that dread day, to be ready to exclaim with all the assurance of a heart at peace with him, Lo, this is our God, we have waited for him and he will save us. Isa. xxv, 9.

(To be continued.)

THE TRUTH FOUND—A REVIEW.

SOME time since a MS. was placed in my hands, which purported to be a review of the tract entitled, *The Truth Found*. On referring it to those having charge of the *Review and Herald* it was considered unworthy of publication, and of an extended notice such as a publication would necessarily involve. But the writer, who signs his name "Not a Babylonian," seems to consider himself neglected, as we are informed, or to think that we keep his arguments from the public, as fearing such a powerful exposure of our weakness.

We will not at this time quote the passage of scripture which justifies us in noticing some of his positions, but will rest on the supposition that our readers are always interested to know what new phase the opposition assumes. We notice such arguments in the article as are new and novel. His exposition of Heb. iv, which is about as consistent as the points we notice below, we pass entirely, as we have been notified that we shall soon be called out on that scripture by one who we presume can present stronger opposition than the writer of the present article. We have another reason that will justify us in noticing all the arguments that may be brought against the truth. As advocates and disseminators of the truth we endeavor to bear in mind that the devices and cavils of men, though they may appear unworthy of notice when put forth in written form, are continually being thrust before the world and the brethren privately, and thus often become the means of the overthrow of some who are but just inquiring for the way of truth. The writer of the article is an entire stranger to us, and for aught that appears in the article he has signed his real name; and he does not give us the opportunity of referring to him by any other. But for the sake of brevity and convenience (not to speak of justice) we shall drop the *prefix* which he has attached to his name, and give only his *surname*, to wit, "Babylonian."

Taking up the tract he becomes very indignant at the rule of evidence adopted from Dr. Carson, "An unnecessary inference is without authority," and exclaims:

"What! has it come to this? . . . Are the words, acts, or circumstances of the lives of Christ and his apostles of so little consequence that an inference drawn therefrom is unnecessary? God forbid. Yet so Mr. W. teaches."

"Mr. W." does not so teach or think. We did not speak at all of inferences from the words, &c., of Christ, but of *unnecessary* inferences drawn from them or anything else. It is wonderful that any one that has intellect enough to learn to write a legible hand cannot see the difference. We always thought that necessary or legitimate conclusions *might* be drawn from the

words and facts of the New Testament as well as those of the Old; and in the tract in question we attempted to draw inferences from the words and facts of the New Testament; of course, confining the argument to necessary or reasonable inferences. But Mr. B. thinks (or at least speaks) otherwise. He writes as though every inference drawn from the New Testament was unnecessary. Dr. Carson's admirable argument has stood the test of the closest criticism from the most able reasoners; and we can imagine but one reason why Mr. Babylonian should object to such a reasonable rule; to wit, the rule would preclude every conclusion he has arrived at in his article!

Mr. B. then, to show the fallacy of my reasoning, tries his hand at logic; and endeavors to draw a conclusion parallel to the first one in the tract on page 3. He says:

"Let us try Mr. Waggoner's position thus: God made the world and all things, not accursed as at present, but good, holy, and unpolluted; therefore the world and all things can never cease to be holy and unpolluted, even as it can never cease to be a fact that God created them so. Conclusion, therefore the world was never accursed for man's sake."

This he calls the "legitimate result" of the argument, and denominates it a "parallel case." Let us trace the parallel in the record of facts and see how far it goes.

God made all things in six days.	God rested the seventh day.
He saw that all was good.	He blessed the seventh day.
He said, Cursed is the ground, &c.	Where's the parallel?

A sentence on page 4 of the tract will show that Mr. B. willfully perverted the argument. It reads thus: "So it must remain a sanctified day, *unless* it can be shown to be also a fact that God has removed or withdrawn the sanctity from it." Here is an opening for a subsequent fact to supersede the first. In his illustration a subsequent fact does supersede the first; but in the case presented in the tract *no such subsequent fact exists*. On this we justly claimed the argument.

Again, there is a further deception in Mr. Babylonian's illustration, as in the tract there are two distinct points examined; first, the creation; second, a quality added. Each of these has its separate argument and conclusion; and what will apply to one will not always apply to the other. Hence, the proviso, as here quoted. But Mr. B. mingled the two together, and left out the proviso, thus presenting the argument in a false light.

On the subject of the repeal of the law he says:

"It is admitted that the command was plainly given, but it is not admitted that there are not sufficient grounds for assuming that the command to keep the seventh day holy was, and is, expressly repealed."

He then complains again of the *rule* as shutting out inferences favoring such assumption. But why talk of *inferences* and *assuming*, if it was "expressly repealed?" He need not assume anything, nor infer anything. Let him point to the express repeal and we will cheerfully yield the point.

The following is one of the most singular of all the singular positions yet taken by Sunday advocates or Sabbath opposers. It clearly establishes Mr. B.'s reputation for invention, if not for logic. We call it a rare sample of the *ingenuity of error*—fertile in expedients, but blind to consequences. After quoting Eze. xx, 13, &c., where the Lord says they polluted the Sabbath, Mr. B. adds:

"Here we have the whole thing stated plainly. The sabbaths which were given for a sign, and the seventh day was so given, were polluted. Is a thing polluted holy? Even a lamb was required to be perfect in order to become a sacrifice, and can this polluted day become the representative of the rest of Jesus? . . . Thus we see the seventh-day Sabbath bears the same characteristics as the other sabbaths. It was a sign like unto them, and was to be kept holy. It was also polluted as they were, thus proving that it was not exempted from any circumstance affecting the purity of the other sabbaths, and therefore must have been a part of the ceremonial law."

We think we may now justly "try Mr. Babylonian's position thus," to use his own words, only we will give an exact parallel, which he did not do.

The name of the Lord is holy. Ps. cx, 11. It is to be revered, and not taken in vain. Ex. xx, 7. Note the following scriptures:

Jer. xxxiv, 16. "But ye turned and polluted my name." Query again: "Is a thing polluted holy?"

Pollute and profane are synonymous. Webster.

Eze. xxxvi, 21. "But I had pity for my holy name which the house of Israel had profaned among the heathen." Also verses 22, 23; Amos ii, 7.

Notice, it was holy though they had profaned it.

Mal. i, 11, 12. "My name shall be great among the heathen, saith the Lord of hosts. But ye have profaned it."

Is the name of Jehovah "exempted from any circumstance affecting its purity?" Not if Mr. Babylonian's reasoning is correct; and he seems to rest much on this point, as he refers to his having proved that the seventh day is profaned or polluted, and no longer holy. But the children of Israel polluted the Sabbath, and put no difference between the holy and profane. Mr. B. is guilty of the same offense. The text where this rebuke is found carries the point still further.

Eze. xxii, 26. "Her priests have violated my law, and have profaned mine holy things; they have put no difference between the holy and profane; neither have they showed difference between the unclean and the clean, and have hid their eyes from my sabbaths, and I am profaned among them."

So, according to Mr. Babylonian, the Lord God himself is not exempted from circumstances affecting his purity! Mr. B. was certainly very blind or very reckless in putting forth an argument involving such a blasphemous conclusion.

But Mr. B.'s argument affects his own position also. To pollute or profane a holy day is to do servile work, or secular labor on it; and Mr. B. claims that Sunday is or was a sacred day by the act and appointment of Christ. But has Sunday never been profaned? Would not secular labor on that day neutralize its consecration as much or as readily as it would that of the Sabbath? If Mr. B.'s argument availed anything it would prove that, even if Sunday ever had been sacred, it ceased to be so long ago, by being profaned.

Mr. B. says that I deny that the Lord Jesus arose on the first day of the week, and then, wondering at my infidelity, devotes considerable time and space to prove it. In this he is only unfortunate. I never denied it, and refer to the tract entitled, *Nature and Obligation of the Sabbath*, for evidence that I believe it and have so published to the world. And when Mr. B., or any one, will show it a duty, by scripture, to keep the day of Christ's resurrection, I will keep the first day. But we believe it from concurrent events, and not because it is so stated, for it is not. And this is what is said in the tract. We do not, however, admit the testimony on which Mr. B. relies. He says:

"The keepers were appointed to watch and know the very hour when Christ arose; and what were they instructed to say? Why, that the disciples came by night and stole him away while he slept. Would they have watched that night if Jesus had arisen the day before? Such is the preposterous condition of Mr. Waggoner's argument."

Not so fast, dear Mr. Babylonian! You appear to be in great haste to exemplify your name. Where did you learn that "the keepers were appointed to watch and know the very hour when Christ arose?" &c. Whatever we may think of your capacities, your opportunities have certainly been great; for the very best proof we have been able to reach says that they were appointed to watch and prevent the disciples stealing him away; and so far from placing any reliance on the testimony of the soldiers, we are of the decided opinion that "what they were instructed to say" was a vile imposition—a falsehood. We hold that this has no bearing on the Sabbath question, and therefore the information Mr. B. gives is of no particular value to us, though it may be to others. As the modern Babylonians follow the Romans in commencing the day at midnight, it is of interest to them to know what time of night the soldiers said he arose. Without this, on your own ground, you prove nothing; and as you are the only person we ever heard of that so fully understood the subject, we refer it to yourself for a further decision.

In immediate connection with this he falls into an-

other error. He imputes to me the belief that the seventh day

"—is the day on which Jesus proclaims his peace (or rest) without the smallest command given in the New Testament or practice to warrant it."

No, no, Mr. B. Such a ridiculous notion never entered my head. We think you are fairly entitled to a patent on it. Our faith is that the Sabbath is a day of rest—made for man. You say the Sabbath is a day for Christ to proclaim his peace or rest. How a command could reach such an institution, we cannot perceive.

He further blames me for requiring definite testimony in regard to the first-day Sabbath. And why should we not? We have definite testimony on the Sabbath, and shall another institution be admitted in its place without any definite testimony to warrant the change? But we do not argue the point here. Our views are plainly stated in the book in question. We will follow Mr. B. once more. Speaking of us he says:

"He would be satisfied with the laws of the Medes and Persians if there were none in the United States sufficiently definite to suit him."

If there were no definite laws here we should regard no law here; as an indefinite law would be unworthy of any regard. And we firmly believe there is not a jury in the land who would convict on testimony as vague, indefinite, and contradictory, as that offered by the advocates of Sunday for its institution as a Sabbath. The laws of the Medes and Persians have been referred to by others. We will state our position fully on that point.

1. If we had been under the laws of the Medes and Persians and no definite laws had superseded them, we should still observe them, and consider the duty plain to do so.

2. If the laws of the Medes and Persians had been the laws of this land, and the United States had definitely declared that they did not destroy or make them void, then we should hold that they were the very foundation of this government, and keep them accordingly.

3. If the people of this country had found those laws in force, and had said they did not purpose to do their own will but the will of the pre-existing power and authority, then also I should observe those laws, as a citizen of the United States.

We have heard of an ancient feud between the parties, from which we might conclude that Mr. Babylonian had an especial antipathy to the laws of the Medes and Persians, and if so, his prejudice appears to be as wide-spread as deep-rooted, for it extends to other laws that "alter not;" but to the unprejudiced we would appeal: Is not our position on the above three points correct? And such is our relation, in the gospel, to the law of God; for, the Saviour found the laws of his Father existing: He said he came not to destroy it: He said he came not to do his own will, but that of the Father: and there is no law superseding the fourth commandment, or instituting another Sabbath. On this subject we rest with assurance and safety.

We beg permission to go one step further on this point, and ask, Why are we not bound to keep the laws of the Medes and Persians? The reply will be readily given; that government was subverted and overthrown. But who subverted the law of God? Did the Saviour? or the man of sin? See Dan. vii, 25; 2 Thess. ii. Which gospel does Mr. Babylonian claim his liberty under, that of Jerusalem or Rome? We leave this question open to all antinomians.

On the sanctification and blessing of the first day he is unusually bold in his assertions; more so than most of his co-laborers in the same cause. He says:

"But the occurrences of the day of pentecost are sufficient to elevate it into a day of holy convocation, for the descending of the Holy Spirit sanctified and blessed it."

We must certainly be approaching the climax. What can induce a man claiming to be candid and christian, to make such statements? Did the day of pentecost come weekly? It did not. Did the descent of the Spirit occur more than once? It did. Was every day sanctified on which the Spirit was poured out or descended on the believers in Jesus? Or would first-day be doubly sanctified by its recurrence on that day? Probably Mr. B. and his fellow Bs. never thought of

this. But where do they learn that the day was sanctified by any such means? Nowhere. They do not know it. It is folly and presumption; no less than adding to the word of God, to make it say what it does not say, that they may appear justified in their transgression. There is no ordinary act of disobedience in this: it is rebellion, it is treason. Have not the words of the wise man an application here? Eccl. viii, 11.

But the last proof on this point, and the closing one of his article, is one which, we have no doubt, our opponents will all hail with joy, provided they can be made to believe in Mr. B.'s theory. He says:

"It [Sunday] is the day on which Christ first performed that which he commanded to be done, saying, 'This do in remembrance of me,' as though he had said, Remember me on this day—equivalent to remember the Sabbath-day. This is not a simple co-incidence, but a fact."

We wonder what the fact is, for there are three statements made, neither of which are true. Truly, three false statements in twice as many lines, should not be called a "simple co-incidence"—it is a complex one.

Of all the perversions of scripture that it has been our lot to witness, we have never seen the equal of this. And yet (we are informed) the writer is a minister of one of the large denominations of the day! The words of the act of instituting the Lord's supper are turned from their plain, evident intent, to support another institution, the existence of which is not hinted at in God's word. For, he affirms (and everything with him is settled by an affirmation), that the Sabbath is not seventh day, but first day, in the New Testament. And thus we have the scripture expounded: when Jesus distributed the bread and the wine, and said, This do in remembrance of me, it was equivalent to saying, Remember and keep Sunday!!!

We have always confidently supposed that Paul understood the intent of the Saviour's words, and the object of the institution; and in commenting on it in his letter to the Corinthians he says: "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." 1 Cor. xi, 26. But according to Mr. Babylonian, the Saviour had altogether another object in view—his words looked in another direction. And the words of Paul, corrected to suit Mr. B.'s theory, would read thus: For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do keep Sunday!

Thank you, Mr. Babylonian; in behalf of all the opposers of God's holy Sabbath, we thank you. We never should have thought of finding Sunday in 1 Cor. xi, 26, is you had not set us on the track.

It is very generally conceded that the Saviour gave the commandment above referred to as early as Thursday evening; so that if we had any authority whatever for attaching the institution to a day, or if Mr. B.'s words were true, that the Saviour meant to say, Remember me on this day, the observance would be fixed to fifth or sixth-day, and not to first-day. But there is not a shade of evidence that the Lord's supper and the observance of any day in any manner, are at all connected. It is on a par with other assumptions by which men seek to justify their transgression of God's law, and shows the weakness of the cause they are trying to sustain, and their own recklessness in their efforts to sustain it.

Though such efforts as this of Mr. B. are unworthy in themselves of any consideration, they yet serve to show the nature of the opposition which is now being so extensively offered to the law of God. And if the truth on the Sabbath can be set aside or evaded in this manner, what duty in God's word can be enforced? Well might the infidel denounce the Bible as an instrument of contradictions and absurdities if it would justify such quibbles and evasions as those of Mr. B. herein noticed, or even of many of more learning, and of (apparently) more candor.

We cannot look upon such efforts without solemn reflections. While fools make a mock at sin, the worldly moralist would often despise it, and the saint of God would hate it. If, then, sin appears odious according to the position and character of the beholder, how must such perversions of truth and of the testimony of the Bible appear in the sight of a holy God? Surely, angels must look with astonishment at the presumption of mortals in insulting heaven with vain excuses to set aside the authority of the Creator.

MARTIN LUTHER ON THE LAW.

On reading the article from Bro. White in *Review* No. 5, of present Vol., I noticed an extract from Michelet's *Life of Luther*, on the subject of the Sabbath. I supposed from that quotation that Luther was to all intents a no-law, and no-Sabbath man. The thought struck me (as I have Michelet's *Life of Luther*) that I would get together all he says of Luther's views on the Sabbath and law. The result is, as our readers will see, that Luther was not a no-law man, but he designed to strike against *superstition* in his remarks that seem to be against the law.

On p. 183 Luther is represented as saying: "Why do we teach and keep the ten commandments? The reason is, that nowhere is the natural law so well arranged and laid down as in Moses. I wish we had borrowed from him in temporal things as well." Then follows the quotation above referred to concerning keeping the Sabbath, not as a matter of necessity, but because nature teaches us to take a day of rest, &c.

It was not Luther's intention in the above text to strike against the law, as he elsewhere shows. He says on p. 215, in speaking of the Antinomians, and, in particular, of Bisleben, "Such doctrine, however, must not be endured. Reject the law, without which there can be no church nor government! this is not tapping the cask, but breaking it in." Again, he says of him on the same page: "He would base repentance on the love of justice, and so preaches the revelation of divine wrath to the just and pious only. He does not preach for the wicked. Yet St. Paul says the law is for the ungodly. In short, by taking away the law, he takes away the gospel, and he withdraws our belief from the firm support of conscience to subject it to the caprices of the flesh. Who could have dreamt of this sect of the Antinomians."

On pp. 216-7, he says of Luther: "Master Jobst, dining one day with Luther, showed him some propositions, according to which the law ought not to be preached, since we are not justified by it. Luther got angry and exclaimed, 'What, will my brethren propose such innovations even while I live! Ah! how ought not Master Philip to be honored, who teaches with clearness and truth the use and utility of the law! Cousin Albert Vou Mansfield's prophecy is being realized. He wrote to me: "There is Munzer lurking behind that doctrine;" and, indeed, he who pulls down the law, pulls down at the same time the whole framework of human polity and society. If the law be thrust out of the church, there will no longer be anything recognized as sin in the world, since the gospel defines and punishes sin only by recurring to the law. If, at the outset, I inveighed against the law, both from the pulpit and in my writings, the reason was, that the Christian church was at the time overlaid with superstitions, under which Christ was altogether buried and hidden, and that I yearned to save and liberate pious, God-fearing souls from this tyranny over the conscience. But I have never rejected the law."

I would here remark that it matters little to the Bible student whether great men have subscribed to its truths or not. But for the sake of those who may trust in the multitude of mighty men it may be good to learn that Luther was in sentiment on the side of God's truth; although it is quite certain that he did not keep all the ten commandments.

J. N. LOUGHBOROUGH.

Battle Creek, Jan., 1861.

TRUTH vs. SPIRITUALISM.

BRO. SMITH: Never were we more convinced that we have the truth, and that Spiritualism is the great delusion by which the enemy opposes the truth in these last days, than we were the evening of the 9th inst., while reviewing a series of lectures that Mr. Potter, a Spiritualist from Massachusetts, gave in this place a few days since. The truth seemed precious to us, and while we had feelings of pity and compassion for those who opposed the truth, we felt thankful that the Lord had preserved us from the delusion of Satan, and that we could rejoice in the light of God's word. Mr. Potter was present, and tried to resist the truth, and show that the Bible was darkness instead of light; but he merely denied and affirmed without proving, and tried to make the people laugh by using droll expressions. Since reviewing his lectures we have heard that he had

said he would make the people laugh if he did not do anything else. He perfectly disgusted himself in the eyes of those who had any respect for God and his word, and who preferred sound reason to bare assertions.

Though it is painful and unpleasant for us to dwell on the blasphemous views of Spiritualists, yet we will notice the main ideas that Mr. Potter advanced in his lectures.

He said that Spiritualism had no Bible, no theory; that the Bible was a human production; that it was absurd to say we could purchase the infallible word of God for thirty-three cents; that Constantine decided what books should be introduced in the Bible; that the God of the Bible was unjust and partial, because he would punish some and leave others unpunished; because he made a difference between an infidel and a Christian; between one that prays seven times a day, and one that does not pray at all.

In reply we affirmed that the Bible was worthy of our confidence, and proved its human and divine authority by testimonies from heathen and ecclesiastical writers, and by arguments from prophecy. Mr. P. accused us of being partial in our quotations from history; and we challenged him to produce testimonies that would counteract the testimonies we had presented, and to back up his assertion in regard to Constantine by a plain fact from history. But he made no reply. We also affirmed that the God of the Bible was not unjust and partial, and remarked somewhat as follows: A certain parent has two sons. One is obedient and faithful; the other is disobedient and unfaithful. Reason, justice and impartiality would require this parent to punish one of his sons, and leave the other unpunished, and thus make a difference between them. Now the God of the Bible punishes the wicked and leaves the righteous unpunished, or gives them life. He makes a difference between those that obey him, and those that obey him not. Therefore the God of the Bible is just and impartial (impartial in the administration of his government—in the vindication of the justice of his law. The justice of God's law appears in the punishment of the sinner, as well as in the reward of the just).

Again, a parent that would make no difference between a child that obeys him, and one that obeys him not, would be called unjust and partial. Now the God of Mr. Potter is a God that makes no difference between those that obey him and those that obey him not. Therefore the God of Mr. Potter is a partial and unjust God. We have not such a God as this. The God of the Bible "is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted with him;" and he will not leave the wicked unpunished. Acts x, 34, 35; Prov. xi, 21; xvi, 5. A theory that makes no difference between a wicked man and a righteous man, virtually destroys the law of God, and the penalty that guards that law.

Mr. P. "The Bible does not agree with the science of geology. Hugh Miller teaches in his *Old Red Sandstone* that the earth is more than 6000 years old."

Answer. A true science is based on immutable and unchangeable principles. Geology is the science of the structure and materials of the earth; and the principles on which it is based have led to remarkable discoveries. But geology as a science is only in its infancy; and we should be careful not to confound the opinions and speculations of men on the Bible, with the teachings of the Bible. The Bible will explain itself if men will let it; and no true science (when rightly understood) will clash with the Bible. But if it is a fact that "Hugh Miller teaches in his *Old Red Sandstone* that the earth is more than 6000 years old," it is also a fact that Hugh Miller teaches in his *Footprints*, p. 313, that "there are no calculations more doubtful than those of the geologist," and that geology "furnishes us with no clue by which to unravel the unapproachable mysteries of creation." Hear him further: "These mysteries belong to the wondrous Creator, and to him only. We attempt to theorize upon them, and to reduce them to law, and all nature rises up against us in our presumptuous rebellion. A stray splinter of cone-bearing wood, a fish's skull or tooth, the vertebra of a reptile, the humerus of a bird, the jaw of a quad-

ruped—all, any of these things, weak and insignificant as they may seem, become in such a quarrel too strong for us and for our theory. The puny fragment in the grasp of truth forms as irresistible a weapon as the dry bone did in that of Samson of old, and our slaughtered sophisms lie piled up heaps upon heaps before it." This is a testimony from Mr. P.'s favorite author, which infidels would do well to ponder. We have nothing to say against the *genuine* science of geology; but we do enter our solemn protest against that science falsely so-called, which makes the word of God of none effect.

Mr. P. "God did not write the same words on the last tables of stone that he wrote on the first."

Ans. "And the Lord said unto Moses, Hew thee two tables of stone like unto the first; and I will write upon these tables the words that were in the first tables, which thou brakest." "And he wrote on the tables, according to the first writing, the ten commandments." Ex. xxxiv, 1; Deut. x, 1-4.

Mr. P. "God is unjust. He sent a lying spirit to persuade Ahab to go up to Ramoth-gilead that he might fall in battle." 1 Kings xxii.

Ans. Ahab was a very wicked king. He caused Israel to depart from the Lord; and of him the Bible says, "Ahab the son of Omri did evil in the sight of the Lord above all that were before him." 1 Kings xvi, 30. God had faithfully warned him by his servants, and had given him time to reform; but he continued to do those things that were displeasing to the Lord. Finally the Lord suffered him to follow his own way, gave him over to the control of a lying spirit, and decided that he should fall in battle at Ramoth-gilead. Surely God has a right to punish the disobedient and penitent; and we have in the case of Ahab a striking illustration of God's justice and long-suffering.

Mr. P. "Spiritualism is governed by nature. Nature acts just as it did 6000 years ago. Christ agrees with nature; and Christ speaks of the things that are, and not of the things that will be in the future. A Methodist or a Baptist is right if he agrees with nature."

Here Mr. P. professes to give the foundation of Spiritualism. Nature is the criterion by which he judges persons and things; and he asserts that a Methodist or a Baptist is right if he agrees with nature. But according to his own statement, "Christ agrees with nature." Hence a Methodist or a Baptist is right if he agrees with Christ. This is all we claim. But what does Mr. P. make Christ teach? He says, "Christ talks of the things that are, and not of the things that will be in the future." Is this statement correct? Let this question be answered by those who know what Christ taught. Mr. P. must have known that Christ spoke of the future; for in his last lecture, while trying to create laughter in regard to the teachings of Christ and Paul on the subject of marriage, he remarked as follows: "Christ taught that they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world neither marry nor are given in marriage. Christ spoke of the future. He never spoke of the present." He continues:

"Christ says to the woman taken in adultery, Neither do I condemn thee. John viii. Christ did not condemn her. But the churches condemn and exclude such. Why don't they agree with Christ?"

Christ did not decide that this woman should be stoned according to the expectation of the Jews; neither did he uphold her in her sin. Sin is the transgression of that law of which the seventh commandment is a part; and Christ said to the woman, "Go and sin no more. Christ was without sin; and he came not to destroy the law, but to fulfill. He said to the young man who wanted to know what good thing he should do that he might have eternal life, "If thou wilt enter into life keep the commandments." Matt. xix.

Mr. P. "Men answer to the purpose for which they were made. The Universalist is a philanthropist, a charitable man. The Methodist sends men to hell. One has large benevolence; the other has small benevolence. A man that has no benevolence cannot be a Universalist. These facts grow out of nature—out of the physical development in man. Again, one man is a Christian and prays seven times a day; another is a pirate, and slays his fellow-men. Are these men organized alike? No, There is no devil. Men are growing wiser."

Ans. It cannot be made to appear consistent that "men answer to the purpose for which they were made," when they have bad dispositions, and do those things which are evil, and repugnant to reason and humanity. The benevolent and wise Creator made man upright, and pronounced him good; and the happiness of God's intelligent creatures consists in their being good; and certainly men should not be called good when their dispositions and actions are evil. Mr. P. says, "These facts grow out of nature." What facts? Why, the fact that Universalists are charitable and benevolent, and that Methodists have small benevolence and send men to hell, and the fact that a Christian prays seven times a day, and that a pirate slays his fellow-men. But nature is the rule by which Mr. P. judges persons and things; and of course nature must be right. Then Universalists, Methodists, Christians and pirates are right; and Mr. P. has proved Spiritualism! We see that Mr. P. labors under a difficulty; and he will labor under a serious difficulty as long as he does not admit that an enemy has marred the works of God.

Mr. P. "We must have facts precede assumption. There is no fact in nature that proves a future punishment."

Ans. The God of nature, who "declares the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand" [Isa. xlii, 10], has spoken to men by his prophets, and his word has had its fulfillment. This same God teaches in his word that the sinner shall be punished; that those who break his law, which grows out of immutable relations that men sustain to God and to their fellow-men, shall suffer its penalty—shall die the second death, and we believe it. God speaks in prophecy concerning signs that were to be the precursors of his coming wrath; and we have signs around us, in the heavens above, in the earth below, among men and in nature, that answer to God's word in prophecy, and proclaim with awful certainty that the day of God's wrath hasteth greatly. See the "Signs of the Times," published at the *Review and Herald* Office.

Mr. P. "We say that the soul of man is immortal, because the spirits of our departed friends communicate to us, and say they are immortal."

Ans. Spiritualists admit that the spirits do not always tell the truth, and that "there are mean, low, dirty imps of darkness that tell falsehoods." (This is the testimony of a famous Spiritualist who attended these lectures.) Now if this is so, how can we rely on their testimony? If there are mean, low, dirty, lying imps, is there not danger of being deceived? May not these spirits be the seducing spirits of which Paul speaks? 1 Tim. iv. May they not have learned their lesson in regard to the nature of man from the father of lies, who said in the beginning, "Ye shall not surely die?"

Mr. P. "We read in Mark xvi, These signs shall follow them that believe. They were to believe the gospel. Gospel means good news. Do these signs follow the churches? They follow Spiritualists if they follow any. This age has its gospels and revelations."

Ans. The fact that signs and wonders follow Spiritualists does not prove that Spiritualists are right. The magicians of Egypt had remarkable signs, and did wonders, till their folly was made manifest by the power of God which wrought through Moses and Aaron. Ex. vii; 2 Tim. iii, 8, 9. And Elymas, the sorcerer, "an enemy of all righteousness, a child of the Devil," resisted the truth in the days of Paul; and his folly was also exposed. Acts xiii, 6-11. The Scriptures speak of lying wonders [2 Thess. ii, 9], and of spirits of devils working miracles. Rev. xvi, 14. But we need not be deceived. We have a rule by which we can try the spirits. Says Isaiah, "When they shall say unto you, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto wizards that peep and mutter: should not a people seek unto their God? for the living to the dead? To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Isa. viii, 19, 20.

We read in Mark xvi, "These signs shall follow them that believe; in my name shall they cast out devils." Does this sign follow Spiritualists? No. They are very careful to say as little as they can about devils. This is the first sign of which Christ speaks; and this

sign was very prominent in the primitive church. Christ commenced his work by breaking the power the Devil held over the suffering, and by casting out devils. He had a controversy with the Devil and wicked spirits during his entire ministry; and his disciples could say, "Even the devils are subject unto us through thy name." Luke x, 17.

Mr. P. says, "This age has its gospels and revelations." Granted. But do these gospels and revelations agree with the law and the testimony? Does the gospel that Mr. P. brings agree with the gospel that Christ and the apostles taught? It does not. It speaks against the Bible and against the God of the Bible, and makes no difference between a wicked man and a good man. It destroys all distinctions of right and wrong, says there is no Devil, and denies the doctrine of a future punishment. This gospel is very different from the gospel which Paul preached; and truly God's blessing cannot rest on those who teach it. Says Paul, "Though we or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." Gal. i, 8.

Query. Was it customary for holy men of old to whom the Lord gave revelations for the people, to stand before a congregation and lecture one or two hours in vision with their eyes closed?

D. T. BOURDEAU.

THE CONDITIONS OF ETERNAL LIFE.

CHRIST said to the Jews, If ye believe not that I am he you shall die in your sins. John viii, 28. It appears from this language of our Lord that faith in Christ was indispensable to salvation, and that it was absolutely necessary to believe that he was the Messiah in order to have eternal life. This language is in harmony with that of the apostle Peter where he says, This is the stone which was set at naught of you builders, which is become the head of the corner. Neither is there salvation in any other, for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved. Acts iv, 12. This language was addressed to the Jews, who were called the builders. They set at naught the stone, which was Christ, and as they did not believe that he was the Saviour that should come into the world, there was no possible chance for their salvation so long as they continued in unbelief. Yet notwithstanding the Jews were a stubborn, rebellious people, Christ's love was manifested to them. This we see demonstrated at the time when he wept over Jerusalem, as he makes use of the following language, Luke xiii, 34: O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets and stonest them that are sent unto thee, how oft would I have gathered thy children together as a hen gathereth her brood under wings and ye would not. It appears from the above testimony that they were unwilling to receive salvation through Christ, choosing rather to climb up some other way, which Christ denominated as being thieves and robbers. Behold, said Jesus, your house is left unto you desolate.

This desolation took place at the death of our Saviour, when the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom. This was a clear demonstration that God had withdrawn his presence from their earthly house, and as that blood was then shed which was to be ministered in the heavenly sanctuary, all who desired pardon must now look in that direction. Under the old dispensation, those who had sinned had to bring their offerings, which were to be without blemish, and present them to the high priest, and confess their sins on the heads of those victims, and through the blood of those offerings their sins were transferred to the sanctuary where the atonement was made. They had to go through with this routine of duties every year. But what made the atonement necessary? Answer; sin. What is sin? The transgression of the law. Then all who had transgressed the law needed a part in that ministration. So also those under the present dispensation who have sinned, need pardon. But how is this to be obtained? Answer: on condition of repentance toward God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ. Jesus our great High Priest has given his life a ransom for the sins of the world. By the grace of God he tasted death for every man, thus making a way possible whereby all may

be saved. Again we read that he is no respecter of persons; but in every nation, they that fear God and work righteousness are accepted with him. He also hath appeared once in the end of the world to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. He did not have to enter the holy places often as the earthly priests did, else he must have suffered often, for they had to slay a victim every time they entered into the sanctuary. But as the sacrifice was made at the death of our Saviour, and his blood was spilt to atone for the sins of the world, it becomes necessary for all who desire a part in the atonement, to come to God through Jesus Christ, who bore our sins in his own body. But before a person can be induced to come to Christ he must see the need of a Saviour, and before he can see the need of a Saviour he must be convinced that he is a sinner, and to convince him that he is a sinner, the claims of the law must be presented. As he looks into that perfect law of liberty, he sees himself a transgressor and justly exposed to its penalty, which is death, and beholding himself in this wretched condition, under the penalty of a broken law, he looks away to Jesus, heartily repenting of his sins, and laying hold by faith on the promises of God. Jesus undertakes his cause for him, and as he presents his blood to the Father, the Father accepts the offering, and through the channel of living faith salvation sweetly flows to his heart. He feels the witness of the Spirit that he is a child of God and an heir of glory. Then through the blood of Jesus his sins are borne into the heavenly sanctuary, there to remain on the condition of obedience until the closing work of our great High Priest, when those sins which have been heartily confessed will be transferred from the sanctuary and placed on the head of their originator, the Devil. Then God's people will be forever free from the effects of sin, and in a position where they can receive the blessing which God has pronounced upon those who do his commandments, viz., a right to eat of the tree of life, and enter in through the gates into the city.

R. BAKER.

Mackford, Wis.

P. S. BRO. SMITH: I would say in behalf of the Seventh-day Advent church at Mackford, that we earnestly desire that Bro. and sister White and Bro. Loughborough should attend conferences in Wisconsin next spring, and will pay our proportion of their expenses to this State, providing our request is granted. We believe their labors are very much needed. We think the time has come for the strait testimony to be given.

R. B.

Extracts from Letters.

Bro. A. J. Stover writes from Indianola, Iowa: "It has not been long since I became acquainted with the doctrines of the remnant people. I have had more light on the Bible since then than I ever had before in the same length of time. I feel more like casting my all on Christ than ever. It makes me feel little but more thankful for the mercies of God. I know that I come far short of what I should be, but what little I do I feel that God blesses me for it. Last spring when Bro. Hull was at Indianola, I heard him on the law and Sabbath two sermons, which very nearly convinced me. As soon as I went home I commenced reading and became convinced the same week. Since that time I have been trying by the help of God to keep the commandments. Some of my neighbors say, I am certain for hell if I do not quit keeping the Jewish Sabbath. I tell them Christ is my judge."

Bro. C. M. Nichols writes from Vernon, Dec. 25th: "There are a few here striving to keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. Many are fighting against the holy Sabbath, but I do thank God that the way grows brighter all the while. I have been for nearly four years a believer in the near coming of our Lord. It does me good to hear from the brethren and sisters abroad that they are striving for a deeper work of grace. We number ten in this place. O that we may put our trust in the Lord, obtain strength and wisdom from him to worship him in Spirit and in truth."

We only ask of God what we *think* will be best, but he gives us what he *knows* is best.

THE REVIEW AND HERALD.

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., THIRD-DAY, JAN. 8, 1861.

NEW subscribers for the *INSTRUCTOR* will please state whether they have received the first No. for the year 1861.

THE CAUSE IN NORTHERN N. Y.

BRO. SMITH: Bro. Whitney and myself left home Dec. 6th to spend a few weeks in St. Lawrence Co. Spent the next Sabbath with the brethren at Buck's Bridge, and the next day (Sunday) went to Hermon, where we expected to hold meetings, but the prejudices of the people were so high that we only held one meeting and passed on, hoping to find a better opening.

We went from there to Edwards, where we found the ground pretty well occupied by the Methodists, both Wesleyan and Episcopal, and evening schools. We however spent the Sabbath with the few brethren in that vicinity, some of whom we found rather weak in the faith, and others almost discouraged. The enemy is busy here as elsewhere, and the cause was suffering somewhat from a spirit of fanaticism clearly discernable in some.

We endeavored to bear our cross, by kindly bearing the strait testimony, both in our Sabbath meetings and in visiting the brethren at their homes, and we trust the Lord will bless our efforts to the good of some. In the meantime we gave four lectures with some interest, beside one or two at other places.

On our way up we called on a brother Fleming, who has lately embraced the truth; and who invited us to hold meetings in his neighborhood on our return.

Accordingly we stopped and commenced a course of lectures, and gave five discourses, when the school-house was closed again, and as no other opening presented itself, we were obliged to leave. Still we believe some were sufficiently interested to search the Scriptures, and we hope may be led to obey the truth. We left behind us about five dollar's worth of books, and obtained two subscribers each for the *Review* and *Instructor*. We found some interest to investigate in families that we visited, outside of the influence of our public efforts.

At Edwards we were somewhat blessed and comforted in again mingling our prayers and tears with those of our dear sister Castle, who is suffering under the fell disease, consumption, but whose prospects are brightening for the future kingdom.

Yours in the bonds of the gospel,

H. W. LAWRENCE.

Bangor, N. Y.

NOTES ON MEN AND THINGS.

WHITEWASHED HEATHENISM.—A writer in a late N. Y. *Tribune* tells us in a few (poetic) lines, that he has a friend in heaven, and wished to send her a message. First, he placed it upon "a small white cloud," but that "died in the crimson west." He then gave it to a lark; but "its pinions grew faint and weary," and there was another failure. Finally he heard a strain of supernatural music, and placing it upon the "music's outspread wings," it soared aloft, and he then knew that it had "passed through the golden gate." If our world was to have an age of superlative nonsense, it surely is the one in which we are living.

BIBLE vs. MODERN THEOLOGY.—H. W. Beecher, in a sermon upon the subject of Religion and Politics, says: "And when the sun of Tuesday next (election day) shall go down, the sun of ages shall arise; the curtain shall fall upon one bad drama, and rise upon another one, glowing with new life and hope. After Tuesday next, I think it will be said that the wheel has passed the center, and from that time forward—aggression? fratricidal wrong? No; but justice, equity, truth, liberty, love, all of them are established forever!" But what says the Bible? "The time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall heap to themselves teachers having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables." 2 Tim. iv, 3, 4. In the last days perilous times shall come, for men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, &c. 2 Tim. iii, 1, 2. Evil men and se-

ducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived. 2 Tim. iii, 13. And while many, yea, multitudes, are giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils, instead of seeking unto God for wisdom and useful knowledge, while the nations are getting angry, and the whole civilized world is apparently arming for a tremendous conflict, while the groans of the oppressed and down-trodden are increasing and calling aloud to heaven for vengeance upon the oppressor, while vice and immorality in every form is increasing throughout the world,—surely the reign of peace cannot yet be inaugurated. And what means this loud cry of "Peace and safety," if it is not in fulfillment of the prophetic word? 1 Thess. v, 3.

"THE PRIESTS THEREOF TEACH FOR HIRE." MICAH iii, 1.—A preacher in this neighborhood, on returning from his circuit, was asked what success he met with. "O," said he, "good, good. The people did not hesitate about giving me \$300." It reminds us of the following anecdote: Two preachers, on meeting, entered into the following colloquy: "Brother," said one, "I had a dream about you the last night." "Ah," said the other, "what was it?" "I thought I saw you," said the dreamer, "in one of the streets of the New Jerusalem, upon your knees." "Praying, was n't I?" "No, you was trying to scratch up some of the gold!" Is it any wonder that in these last days the great mass of professors of religion should be lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God, when so many of those whom they accept as teachers set the example? Query. Would it be improper to have such dreams about some who profess to be Sabbath-keepers?

A CONTRAST.—"Pooh," said a neighboring professed minister of the gospel, "if you Advent people behave yourselves with decency and propriety, you will meet with no opposition or persecutions." It is as near the truth as many other things said, which are raked out of the dirt-heap of human reason and tradition, for the word of God tells us that "they that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution," and those that truly live thus, certainly "behave themselves with decency and propriety." WM. S. FOOTE.

Pendleton, Ohio.

APPOINTMENTS.

PROVIDENCE permitting, I will meet with the church in Convis, Sabbath, Jan. 19, and will commence lectures at the brick school-house on the plank road three miles south of Bellevue, Sunday, Jan. 20, at 1 o'clock P. M., and continue as long as the interest demands.

J. N. LOUGHBOROUGH.

Business Department.

Business Notes.

J. T. Ashley: The Bible Class contains lessons for children of Sabbath-schools. Price 15 cts. post-paid.

E. Day: The paper has been sent uninterruptedly to Mrs. A. Cochran. There was one dollar due on your paper, when transferred to the present address.

E. Stone: The REVIEW has been regularly sent to both Mrs. J. Evans, and J. H. Chrispell, Bellvue, Eaton Co.

Hannah Briggs: What is your Post-Office and State?

J. P. Rathbun: There will be 13 cts. due on your paper to pay postage for present volume.

Receipts.

FOR REVIEW AND HERALD.

Annexed to each receipt in the following list, is the Volume and Number of the REVIEW AND HERALD to which the money receipted pays. If money for the paper is not in due time acknowledged, immediate notice of the omission should then be given.

A. B. L. (for Mrs. A. A. Rice) 1,00, xvii, 1. Mrs. J. Ansley 2,00, xviii, 7. G. N. Collins 1,00, xviii, 1. M. Collins 1,00, xviii, 1. R. C. Ashley 1,00, xviii, 1. J. T. Ashley 1,00, xviii, 1. W. H. Ball 1,15, xviii, 7. Chas. Andrews 2,00, xx, 1. A. Cochran 3,48, xvii, 5. M. Thompson 1,00, xviii, 1. M. E. Lockwood (for Mrs. E. C. Bush) 1,00, xv, 10. E. Stone 1,40, xviii, 5. Mrs. M. Lathrop 1,00, xviii, 6. M. Slayton 1,00, xviii, 1. Mrs. L. A. Brobst 1,00, xviii, 1. S. Chase 1,00, xviii, 1. R. R. Coggeshall 1,00, xviii, 1. H. W. Moore 5,00, xviii, 7. G. P. Cushman 2,00, xviii, 1. J. N. Cunningham 1,00, xviii, 8. Geo. Adair 1,00, xvii, 15. Wm. Gulick 1,00, xvii, 10. J. P. Rathbun 1,00, xviii, 1. L. Griswold 2,00, xviii, 1. C. Cross 1,00, xvi, 7. A. Town 2,00, xvi, 8. J. Hunter 1,00, xvii, 1.

PUBLICATIONS.

Supplement and Addition to Hymn Book,	35 cts.
" in paper covers	25 "
Sabbath Tracts, Nos. 1-4. This work presents a condensed view of the entire Sabbath question,	15 "
The Three Angels of Rev. xiv, 6-12, particularly the Third Angel's Message, and the Two-horned Beast,	15 "
Hope of the Gospel, or immortality the gift of God,	15 "
Which? Mortal or Immortal? or an inquiry into the present constitution and future condition of man,	15 "
Modern Spiritualism; its Nature and Tendency. This book should be in the hands of every family, as a warning against Spiritualism,	15 "
The Kingdom of God. A refutation of the doctrine called Age to Come,	15 "
Pauline Theology, or the Christian Doctrine of Future Punishment, as taught in the epistles of Paul,	15 "
The Atonement,	15 "
Prophecy of Daniel. The Four Universal Kingdoms, The Sanctuary and Twenty-three Hundred days,	10 "
The Saints' Inheritance. The Immortal Kingdom located on the New Earth,	10 "
Signs of the Times, showing that the Second Coming of Christ is at the door,	10 "
Law of God, The Testimony of both Testaments, showing its origin and perpetuity,	10 "
Vindication of the true Sabbath by J. W. Morton, late Missionary to Hayti,	10 "
Review of Springer on the Sabbath, Law of God and first day of the week,	10 "
Facts for the Times. Extracts from the writings of eminent authors Ancient and Modern,	10 "
Miscellany. Seven tracts in one book on the Second Advent and the Sabbath,	10 "
The Seven Trumpets. The Sounding of the Seven Trumpets of Revelation viii and ix,	10 "
Assistant. The Bible Student's Assistant, or a compend of Scripture references,	5 "
Nature and Obligation of the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment—Apostasy and Perils of the Last Days,	5 "
Truth Found. A Short Argument for the Sabbath with an appendix, "The Sabbath not a type,"	5 "
An Appeal for the restoration of the Bible Sabbath in an Address to the Baptists,	5 "
Review of Crozier on the Institution, Design and Abolition of the Seventh-day Sabbath,	5 "
Review of Hillis—A reply to a series of discourses delivered by him in Battle Creek, on the Sabbath question,	5 "
The Fate of the Transgressor, or a Short Argument on the First and Second Deaths,	5 "
Brown's Experience in relation to Entire Consecration and the Second Advent,	5 "
Report of General Conference held in Battle Creek, June 3-8, Address on Systematic Benevolence, &c.,	5 "
Sabbath Poem. A Word for the Sabbath, or False Theories Exposed,	5 "
Illustrated Review. A Double Number of the REVIEW AND HERALD illustrated,	5 "
Spiritual Gifts Vol. 1, or the Great Controversy between Christ and his angels, and Satan and his angels,	50 "
Spiritual Gifts Vol. 2. Experience, Views and Incidents in connection with the Third Message,	50 "
Scripture Doctrine of Future Punishment. An Argument by H. H. Dobney, Baptist Minister of England,	75 "
Debt and Grace as related to the Doctrine of Future Punishment, by C. F. Hudson,	100 "
Voice of the Church on the Coming and Kingdom of the Redeemer. A History of the doctrine,	100 "
PENNY TRACTS. Who Changed the Sabbath?—Unity of the Church—Spiritual Gifts—Judson's Letter on Dress—Law of God, by Dobney (2 cts.)—Law of God by Wesley—Appeal to men of reason on Immortality—Much in Little—Truth—Death and Burial—Preach the Word. These small Tracts can be sent, post-paid, in packages of not less than twenty-five.	
Home Here and Home in Heaven, with other poems. This work embraces all those sweet and Scriptural poems written by Annie R. Smith, from the time she embraced the third angel's message till she fell asleep in Jesus. Price 25 cents. In paper covers, 20 cents.	
The Chart. A Pictorial Illustration of the Visions of Daniel and John. 20 by 25 inches. Price 15 cts. On rollers, post-paid 75 cts.	
German. Das Wesen des Sabbaths und unsere Verpflichtung auf ihn nach dem Vierten Gebote. A Tract of 80 pp., a Translation of Nature and Obligation of the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment. Price 10 cents.	
Holland. De Natuur en Verbinding van den Sabbath volgens het vierde Gebod. Translated from the same as the German. Price 10 cents.	
French. Le Sabbat de la Bible. A Tract on the Sabbath of 32 pp. Price 5 cents.	
La Grande Statue de Daniel II, et les Quatre Bêtes Symboliques et quelques remarques sur la Seconde Venue de Christ, et sur le Cinquieme Royaume Universel. A Tract of 32 pp. on the Prophecies. Price 5 cents.	

These Publications will be sent by Mail, post-paid, at their respective prices. One-third discount by the quantity of not less than \$5 worth. In this case, postage added when sent by Mail. All orders to insure attention, must be accompanied with the cash, unless special arrangements be made. Give your Name, Post Office, County and State distinctly. Address REVIEW & HERALD, Battle Creek Mich.