

THE 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. V.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., THIRD-DAY, JANUARY 31, 1854.

No. 2.

THE REVIEW AND HERALD.

TERMS.—See Last Page.

NO TEARS IN HEAVEN.

WHAT if our bark o'er life's rough wave
By adverse winds be driven,
And howling tempests round us rave,
There are no tears in Heaven.

What though affliction be our lot,
Our hearts with anguish riven,
Still never let it be forgot
There are no tears in Heaven.

If sweetest joys here vanish all,
And fade like hues at even;
Our brightest hopes like meteors fall—
There are no tears in Heaven.

The mourner sad, who drown'd in grief
Hath long in sorrow striven,
Shall find at last a sweet relief,
Tears wiped away in Heaven.

Thou, God, our joy and rest shall be,
And sorrow far be driven;
And sin and death forever flee
The tearless courts of Heaven.

There from the blooming Tree of Life,
The healing fruit is given;
Yes! There shall cease the painful strife—
There are no tears in Heaven.

THINGS TO BE CONSIDERED.

BY J. N. ANDREWS.

WE have before examined the main pillars on which the first-day Sabbath rests; and it is perfectly apparent that there is not a single particle of divine authority for the observance of that day. Hence, its advocates must observe the Sabbath of the Lord, or they must resort to the tradition of the "fathers" for proof of its change. The history of the change will be given in its place. But we now ask, what right had the elders of the Christian church to change the fourth commandment, any more than the elders of the Jewish church had, to change the fifth?

The Pharisees pretended that they had a tradition handed down from Moses, which authorized them to change the fifth commandment. The Papist and Protestant Doctors of Divinity pretend that they have a tradition handed down from Christ and the apostles, authorizing them to change the fourth. But if Christ rebuked the Pharisees for holding a damnable heresy, what would he say to the like act on the part of his own professed followers? Matt. xv, 3-9.

The same fathers which changed the fourth commandment, have also corrupted all the ordinances of the New Testament, and have established purgatory, invocation of saints, the worship of the Virgin Mary and prayers for the dead.

The Protestant professes to receive the Bible *alone* as his standard of faith and practice. The Papist receives the Bible and the tradition of the fathers as his rule. The Protestant cannot prove the change of the Sabbath from his own standard, (the Bible,) therefore he is obliged to adopt that of the Papist, viz., the Bible as explained and corrupted by the fathers. The change of the Sabbath is proved by the Papist as follows:—

"Ques. What warrant have you for keeping the Sunday, preferably to the ancient Sabbath which was the Saturday?"

"Ans. We have for it the authority of the Catholic Church, and apostolic tradition.

"Q. Does the Scripture any where command the Sunday to be kept for the Sabbath?"

"A. The Scripture commands us to hear the Church, [Matt. xviii, 17; Luke x, 16,] and to hold fast the traditions of the apostles. 2 Thess. ii, 15. But the Scripture does not in particular mention this change of the Sabbath. John speaks of the Lord's day; [Rev. i, 10,] but he does not tell us what day of the week this was, much less does he tell us that this day was to take the place of the Sabbath ordained in the commandments. Luke also speaks of the disciples meeting together to break bread on the first day of the week. Acts xx, 7. And Paul [1 Cor. xvi, 2] orders that on the first day of the week the Corinthians should lay by in store what they designed to bestow in charity on the faithful in Judea; but neither the one nor the other tells us that this first day of the week was to be henceforward the day of worship, and the Christian Sabbath; so that truly, the best authority we have for this, is the testimony and ordinance of the church. And therefore, those who pretend to be so religious of the Sunday, whilst they take no notice of other festivals ordained by the same church authority, show that they act by humor, and not by reason and religion; since Sundays and holy-days all stand upon the same foundation, viz., the ordinance of the church.

"Q. What was the reason why the weekly Sabbath was changed from the Saturday to the Sunday?"

"A. Because our Lord fully accomplished the work of our redemption by rising from the dead on a Sunday, and by sending down the Holy Ghost on a Sunday; as therefore the work of our redemption was a greater work than that of our creation, the primitive church thought the day on which this work was completely finished, was more worthy her religious observation than that in which God rested from the creation, and should be properly called the Lord's day."—*Catholic Christian Instructed*.

If further testimony is needed listen to the following:—

"Ques. What does God ordain by this commandment?"

"Ans. He ordains that we sanctify, in a special manner, this day, on which he rested from the labor of creation.

"Q. What is this day of rest?"

"A. The seventh day of the week, or Saturday, for he employed six days in creation, and rested on the seventh. Gen. ii, 2; Heb. iv, 1, &c.

"Q. Is it then Saturday we should sanctify, in order to obey the ordinance of God?"

"A. During the old law, Saturday was the day sanctified; but the church instructed by Jesus Christ, and directed by the Spirit of God, has substituted Sunday for Saturday, so we now sanctify the first and not the seventh day. Sunday means, and now is, the day of the Lord.

"Q. Had the church power to make such a change?"

"A. Certainly; since the Spirit of God is her guide, the change is inspired by that Holy Spirit. The uniform, universal, and perpetual tradition of all ages and nations, attest the antiquity of, and consequently the Divine assent to, this change: even the bitterest enemies of God's church admit and adopt it.

"Q. Why did the church make this change?"

"A. Because Christ rose from the dead upon Sunday, and rested from the great work of redemption; and because, on this day, the Holy Spirit descended on the apostles and on the church."—*Catechism of the Christian Religion*.

This testimony shows conclusively that the fourth commandment, which the New Testament has never changed, has been corrupted by the Romish church. It was from Rome, as we may here see, that Prot-

estants learned to say that the Sabbath was changed because redemption was greater than creation. Here we will mention some things for special consideration.

1. Those who are now paying religious respect to the first day of the week, may possibly be led to examine the reasons for this course, by the following significant fact: The church of Rome undertakes to prove purgatory by the Bible, but acknowledges that Sunday-keeping cannot be proved by it, as she instituted that herself. Those, therefore, who despise the Lord's Sabbath, and in its stead honor the sabbath of the Romish church, virtually acknowledge that the authority of that church is above the authority of God, and sufficient to change his times and laws. Here is her statement respecting purgatory:—

"Question. But what grounds have you to believe that there is any such place as a purgatory, or middle state of souls?"

"Answer. We have the strongest grounds imaginable from all kind of arguments, from scripture, from perpetual tradition, from the authority and declaration of the church of God, and from reason."—*Catholic Christian Instructed*, page 146.

Hear the Catholic church once more, while she contrasts purgatory with Sunday-keeping:—

"The word of God commandeth the seventh day to be the Sabbath of our Lord, and to be kept holy: you [Protestants] without any precept of scripture, change it to the first day of the week, only authorized by our traditions. Divers English Puritans oppose against this point, that the observation of the first day is proved out of scripture, where it is said the first day of the week. Acts xx, 7; 1 Cor. xvi, 2; Rev. i, 10. Have they not spun a fair thread in quoting these places? If we should produce no better for purgatory and prayers for the dead, invocation of the saints, and the like, they might have good cause indeed to laugh us to scorn; for where is it written that these were Sabbath-days in which those meetings were kept? Or where is it ordained they should be always observed? Or, which is the sum of all, where is it decreed that the observation of the first day should abrogate or abolish the sanctifying of the seventh day, which God commanded everlastingly to be kept holy? Not one of those is expressed in the written word of God."—*An Antidote, or Treatise of Thirty Controversies*.

Reader, shall not such facts as the above open your eyes? Have you any better authority for Sunday-keeping than Romish tradition? What think you of that prophecy which foretells that the Pope should speak great words against God, and think to change times and laws? Dan. vii, 25. That church who styles her head, "Lord God the Pope," has here openly testified, that without any authority from Scripture, she has changed the commandments of God. She also declares that of her two children, Purgatory and Sunday-keeping, the former is the most important personage. Cannot that mother judge impartially between two such darlings?

2. But perhaps the fathers, as they are called, may be regarded by the reader as the best of authority. We are aware that not a few, who profess to be Bible Christians, rest their Sunday-observance solely upon such evidence. We request the attention of such to the following from Storrs' *Six Sermons*. It was written in defense of the author's views of future punishment; but the remarks are of equal value with respect to the Sabbath question.

"It is said, 'The fathers believed in the endless torments of the wicked.' In reply, I remark, Our Lord and Master has prohibited my calling any man *father*. But, if the fathers, as they are called, did believe that doctrine, they learned it from the Bible, or they did not. If they learned it there, so can we, If they did not learn it from the Bible, then their

testimony is of no weight. It may have been an error that early got into the church, like many others. Mosheim, in his Church History, tells us, as early as the third century, that the defenders of Christianity, in their controversies, 'degenerated much from primitive simplicity,' and that the maxim which asserted the innocence of defending truth by artifice and falsehood, 'contributed' to this degeneracy. And he adds:—

"This disingenuous and vicious method of surprising their adversaries by artifice, and striking them down, as it were, by lies and fictions, produced, among other disagreeable effects, a great number of books, which were falsely attributed to certain great men, in order to give these spurious productions more credit and weight; for as the greater part of mankind are less governed by reason than authority, and prefer in many cases, the decisions of fallible mortals, to the unerring dictates of the Divine Word, the disputants of whom we are speaking, thought they could not serve the truth more effectually than by opposing illustrious names, and respectable authorities, to the attacks of its adversaries."

"This practice, spoken of by Mosheim, increased as the darker ages rolled on; and through these dark ages, what there are of the writings of the 'fathers' have come down to us. It is a truth, also, that the practice of corrupting the simplicity of the apostolic doctrine was commenced much earlier than the third century. Enfield, in his philosophy, says:—'The first witness of Christianity had scarcely left the world when' this work began. Some of the 'fathers' seemed intent upon uniting heathen philosophy with Christianity, and early commenced the practice of clothing the doctrines of religion in an allegorical dress."—*Fourth Sermon.*

Those who make the "fathers" their rule, would do well to consider the above facts. Every damnable heresy of the Romish church, she proves by those same fathers. Tradition is the unfailing resort of Romanists, to prove their dogmas; indeed, they openly acknowledge that tradition is a part of their rule of faith. Protestants claim that they make the Bible their only rule of duty; but, whenever their unscriptural arguments for Sunday-keeping are exposed, they fly for refuge to the fathers. Thus Protestants defend their heresies with the same weapons that the Papists employ to defend theirs. The same fountain head of corruption feeds the several streams of error that flow through both these bodies.

3. But, says one, do you not think that it would be safe to believe what those have said who conversed with the apostles, or at least, conversed with some who had conversed with them? If such should tell us that the Sabbath of the Lord was changed, would it not be safe to receive their testimony? We answer, that the holy Scriptures come to us with the divine guarantee that every word therein contained was divinely inspired. The tradition of the elders comes to us without a particle of such testimony. Wherefore it follows that the man who fears God will not reject that which he knows came from heaven, for the sake of following that which directly contradicts it, and which by that fact is proved to have come from the great enemy of divine truth.

But does the Bible contain the least intimation that what was written near the days of the apostles is any more sacred than what was written at a later period? Paul told the Thessalonian church that "the mystery of iniquity," or Romish apostasy, had already begun to work. 2 Thess. ii. If Paul was correct, it follows that it is far from being safe to adopt as sacred truth a doctrine which is not found in the New Testament, merely because it is said to have come from some who lived near the days of the apostles. Satan was then busily engaged in nursing in the bosom of the early church, the viper which should ere long infect with deadly poison a great portion of the professed people of God. Did not Paul warn those with whom he parted at Ephesus, that grievous wolves were to enter among them, and that of themselves men were to arise speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them? When any doctrine is brought to us from those who lived near the days of the apostles, it is then proper for us to inquire whether this comes from those who spoke the sentiments of the holy apostles, or whether it comes from those grievous wolves who were to follow after them, and speak perverse things.

Is there no way by which we can determine this

question? Certainly there is an infallible test. The New Testament contains the precise language of Jesus Christ and the apostles. Now if the fathers speak according to that word, they speak the precious truths of God. But if they speak that which makes void the word of truth, it is a very strong evidence that they belong to that class which Paul notified the church, should arise in their very midst, and speak perverse things, to draw away disciples after them. If the Holy Spirit has given us notice that false teachers were to arise in the very days of the apostles, should it not serve as a warning to us, that things which purport to come from the successors of the apostles, may, for all that, contain the most deadly poison?

4. If it were certain that the *early* fathers, in their zeal to improve upon the New Testament, changed the fourth commandment, it would only prove that they were of the number of grievous wolves that were to arise. But it by no means follows that the mystery of iniquity was able thus early to change times and laws. The testimony given from Storrs' Fourth Sermon, evinces clearly that even the fathers themselves do not now come to us with their own words. Their testimony has been corrupted, and many shameless forgeries are palmed off as their genuine testimony.

If the reader ever looked into a Romish controversial work, he will there find the very fathers, who are so much relied upon to prove the change of the Sabbath, quoted to prove all the heresies of that anti-Christian church. It follows, therefore, that one of two things must be true: either the testimony of the early fathers has been shamefully corrupted, or those so-called early fathers were wolves in sheep's clothing.

5. If the Lord Jesus Christ and his apostles were now on earth, mingling with the men of this generation, as they once mingled with a former generation, we ask, Would it be safe for the men of the third or fourth generation from this to receive as sacred truth all that the fathers of the present generation might transmit to them? Is it not self-evident that unless human nature should undergo a radical change, the men of the following generations would have handed down to them as Christ's sayings, all the vain and foolish sentiments that different partizans might wish to maintain? In the case supposed, we ask, What would be the safety of the coming generations? There is but one answer, and in this all will agree. If this were the age in which the New Testament was written, the safety of the coming generation would be secured *only*, by faithfully testing, by that sure rule, whatever might be handed down to them as gospel truth from the fathers of the present age. Should they thus rigidly cleave to inspiration, they would be safe; but if they added to that sure word all the fables which satan would instigate the present fathers to attribute to Christ and the apostles, what would become of them?

If the Advent body itself were to furnish the *fathers* and the *saints* for the future church, Heaven pity the people that should live hereafter! Reader we entreat you to prize your Bible. It contains *all* the will of God, and will make you wise unto salvation through faith in Christ Jesus.

Those who believe in a change of the Lord's Sabbath should look at these facts: The Sabbath of the Lord means the Rest-day of the Lord. Six days the Almighty wrought in the work of creation, and the seventh day he rested from all his work. The Sabbath or Rest-day of the Lord, is, therefore, a definite day, which can no more be changed to one of the days upon which God wrought, than the resurrection-day can be changed to one of the days upon which Christ did not rise, or the crucifixion-day be changed to one of the six days of the week upon which Christ was not crucified. Hence it is as impossible to change the Rest-day of the Lord as it is to change the crucifixion-day or the day of the resurrection.

Men of God, to whom the Scriptures have been committed, can you longer pervert the commandments of Jehovah and not be guilty of willful transgression? Must it not be exceeding sinful in the sight of Heaven for you to change the Sabbath of the Lord for another day, and then to steal that commandment which guards the holy Sabbath, to enforce the observance of that new day? When the hailstones of Jehovah's

wrath shall sweep away the refuge of lies, [Isa. xxviii, 17; Rev. xvi, 21,] how many of the arguments for Sunday-keeping will be left? The Bible thoroughly furnishes the man of God to all good works. Sunday-keeping is not, therefore, a good work; for the Scriptures furnish nothing in its favor. Why should you be ready of heart to believe what God has never spoken, and slow of heart to believe his plain testimony? Thus saith the Lord, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God;" "Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy."

ALL THINGS ARE YOURS.

A BROTHER sends us the following excellent communication, written by H. L. H. We know not what paper he took it from.

"Poor in this world—rich in faith—heir of every thing. This sentence contains an epitome of Christian history from the earliest ages to the present time; 'having nothing,' forsaking houses and lands; and yet possessing all things, even 'an hundred fold in this life.' 'Having nothing' that this blinded world can see or do desire—a pilgrim stranger—yea, houseless and homeless sometimes: yet he is rich. Though he has no gold or gems, no titles or honors; though he possesses no fame or glory, he is rich: for the love of God is his; the presence of Jesus is his; the comfort of the Holy Ghost is his; the sure word of prophecy is his; exceeding great and precious promises are his; fellowship of the saints is his; the faith once delivered to the saints is his: the bliss of expectation and the expectation of bliss; the joys of hope and the hope of joy—all these, and even more, are his, even in this dark and stormy world.

But, this, however, is the foretaste, not the fruition; this is the trial, not the reward; this is the warfare, not the victory; this is the labor, not the rest; this is the poverty, not the riches; this is the earnest, not the inheritance; this is the gloom, not the glory; this is the darkness, or, at best, the dim twilight, instead of the glory of the perfect and unending day.

There is, notwithstanding the gloom and sorrow that gather here, a brighter and lovelier scene before us. Beyond the dark night of weeping, comes forth the bright morning of joy; beyond the valley of sighs, is the mountain of singing; beyond the din of battle, is the heavenly song of peace; beyond the howling wilderness, is the Eden of bliss; beyond the barrenness of the desert, is the beauty and the verdure of the Paradise of God; beyond the darkness of the sepulchre, is the light of the resurrection; beyond the sad sleep of death, is the joyful waking to immortal life; beyond the weary pilgrimage, is the blessed home; beyond earth's week of toil, is the Eternal Sabbath of rest; beyond earth's passing gloom, is heaven's unending glory; beyond the endurance of 'tribulation,' the 'fight' of faith, and the 'patience' of hope, is the pilgrim's home, the saint's inheritance, the Christian's portion, the servant's reward, the victor's palm and the conqueror's crown.

There is the New Earth in its unmarred beauty—in its unfading glory—in its unstained purity. There is the wide-spreading kingdom, the far reaching dominion 'of our Lord and of his Christ.' There is the firm throne of Messiah, established in righteousness and truth. There, too, is the King in 'his beauty,' in his 'power and great glory,' 'ruling over men,' 'just,' reigning in glory, that far outrivals the shining of the 'morning without clouds.'

There is the 'Jeweled City,' with its radiant glory and dazzling light—with its burnished battlements and golden streets; there is the pure river with its bright waters and verdant banks; there is the living tree with its monthly fruits and healing leaves, and there is joy and blessedness untold, unfelt, unknown.

No wonder, then, that one who 'walked by faith,' who looked 'not on the things that are seen,' who had been caught up to the third heaven, who had 'heard unspeakable things' while there, and who had, in constant and blissful prospect, 'Salvation with eternal glory'—while reviewing the saints' possessions, while seeing how much was compre-

hended, and how little was left out, while gazing on the crowns of glory, on the diadems of beauty, on the garments of salvation, on the robes of righteousness, on the glory of the glorified, on the salvation of the saved, and on the vast heritage of the blest inheritors, while his heart throbbled and his bosom swelled with struggling emotions, should exclaim with all the confidence of living faith, 'ALL THINGS ARE YOURS!'

REVEREND.

THIS word is found once in the Bible, and only applied to the name of the LORD—(Ps. cxi, 9)—"Holy and reverend is his name."

Now, to take this name, and give it to any man, appears to me to be not only idolatry, but also taking the name of the Lord our God in vain, if not even blasphemy. We read of a scarlet-colored beast, full of names of blasphemy. Rev. xvii, 3. And does not this mean some who apply to themselves the names of the Most High?

Though ministers, or elders, or any other officers in the church, or in the state, should be honored and respected according to their station and worth, yet I would most respectfully and most earnestly request all Protestants to leave this species of idolatry entirely to those who love to worship "His Holiness" the Pope of Rome, their "Right Reverend Father in God," with other such "names of blasphemy!"

If our New Testament was filled up with the Rev. Dr. Matthew, the Rev. Dr. Mark, the Rev. Luke, the Rev. John, the Rev. Peter, the Rev. Paul, the Rev. Titus, &c., as full as some religious books and newspapers are, I would not object to giving such "*flattering titles unto man.*" See Job. xxxii, 21, 22.

Again, if our blessed Saviour refused to be called "Good Master," because that title belonged only to God, (Mark x, 17,) and if one who showed many things to John, said to him, "See thou do it not," when John was about to worship him, (Rev. xxii, 8, 9,) then ought not every minister or elder to refuse to be called *Reverend*, because that title belongs only to God?

Would it not be as well, and as proper, for religious writers and editors to omit the "*Rev.*," and insert *Eld.*, when speaking of religious ministers? As for myself, I should think it as right, and as proper, to bow down and pray to any man as to call him *Reverend*.—*Sab. Rec.*

Second Coming of Christ.

THERE is no subject that is more calculated to inspire the heart of God's people with joy, than that of the second advent of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. And not only is it a subject upon which the lovers of Christ at the present day desire to dwell, but in examining the Word of God, we learn that the prophets, apostles, and the early Christians, dwelt upon this theme with pleasing anticipations. And Enoch, the seventh from Adam, looked forward (through a long series of intervening ages) to the time when the Lord should come with ten thousand of his saints. And Job, who was declared to be a perfect man, cried out in the language of inspiration, and declared that at the latter day, his Redeemer should stand upon the earth. And although worms might destroy his body, yet in his flesh he should see God.

Paul, when he wrote to Timothy, declared that at that day, i. e., the resurrection, he should receive a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, would give him. And John, while looking forward to the glorious morn, when Christ would come to be glorified in his saints, and admired by all those that love him, cried out, "*Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection.*" And the early Christians were willing to suffer persecution and death, knowing that if they suffered with him, they would also reign with him, at his appearing in his kingdom.

If the prophets, apostles, and the early Christians were enabled to rejoice while looking forward to the long promised period, when the Tabernacle of God would be with men, and tears, sorrow, pain and death

should be felt and feared no more, ought not we who are living on the eve of eternity, to lift up our heads and rejoice, knowing that the day of our redemption draweth nigh?—*Selected.*

BOTH SIDES.

IN one of the September Nos. of the REVIEW, we gave a letter from E. Miller, Jr., to R. F. Cottr II, and Bro. C.'s reply, that both sides of the question might be seen. We give the following, and the reply, on the next page, for the same object. "Those who have the truth can afford to be fair," while those who are in error will seek to hide the truth, and make their errors prominent.—Ed.

FROM E. MILLER, JR.

FRIEND COTTRELL:—Although unavoidably hindered for so long a time from noticing your kind reply to my note in *Review* of Sept. 13th, and even now pressed by other duties, still I esteem it a privilege as all along has been my intention, to call your attention to it again: hoping to be instrumental in bringing you to see the light of truth more clearly.

I will first notice your exclamation, "Who hath bewitched you, that you should think that the rule, of moral obligation can be changed without a change in the relation existing between man and his Maker! Is God changeable?" My dear brother, is there anything absurd, in supposing that an unchangeable and all-wise God should require of men in one age what he does not in another? The plan of redemption is manifestly progressive in its development. Is it absurd that obligations should be laid upon men in different ages, corresponding with their different circumstances, and their different degrees of light? (1.) Absurd it may appear in your eyes, but a perfect Law-giver has most surely done so.

Again: You ask, "Could he make a better moral rule at the commencement of the gospel dispensation, than he could when he formed the first man?" The law that he enjoined upon the first man was doubtless best for him; but I see no absurdity in supposing that Jehovah in a 4000 years' training, should have prepared his people for one somewhat different. (2.) Again: You ask, "Can he improve his original law . . . by abolishing one tenth part of it?" I have said nothing about his having abolished "one tenth part of it," and trust I shall hear no more of it. Again: "Would he make known through the agency of man, that he had changed that law which he spoke with his own mouth," &c. Well, why not? God has had various ways of communicating his will to man, and he has a right to use whatever way he pleases. And his commands are of equal authority, whether spoken with his own mouth, or communicated through prophets or apostles. Hence, your supposed absurdities are only existent through your one-sided theory.

You say I admit that "the law from Mt. Sinai was the rule of moral obligation for that dispensation." I did not admit that the *ten commandments* was the law of moral obligation; but distinctly stated that the rule of life for the people of God, as given in the law, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms, was given to Israel, and forms the rule of moral obligation for that dispensation. I have never seen proof that the ten commandments ever were the moral law for any dispensation. Certain it is, that in the present dispensation, positive, moral duties are required, beyond what the ten precepts required. The same is equally certain relative to the past dispensation (the Jewish.) I know it is asserted that the ten commandments included all moral duties; but it is only *assertion*. Tell me, Is man's moral obligation summed up in *two* positive and eight negative duties? even so, if the ten cover all. I have only to keep the Sabbath and honor my parents as active duties, and refrain from doing eight acts. But suppose I do all this: keep the Sabbath and honor my parents, and refrain from idolatry, profanity, stealing, killing, adultery, false witness and covetousness, do I fulfill the "royal law, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself?" (3.) Nay, verily: I may do all this, and knowingly leave my next-door neighbor to starve and freeze while I have plenty. Let us understand that a command of God imposes a moral obligation, and we are morally innocent or guilty, as we obey or disobey, whatever be the nature of the requirement; and we will be freed from the necessity of assuming that the ten commandments enjoin duties that they do not speak of.

You next give us an argument concerning securing the favor of God, based on the assumption, that man was made a sinner by transgressing the law of the ten commandments. You may well suppose that I was surprised to find a man regardful of the Bible, taking such a position; but I have since learned that it was no accident, but that the position is contended for by many. It must be answered then. Well, recorded facts contradict the position. See the record. First,

the law given. Gen. ii, 16, 17. "Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat. But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." That the transgression of this law introduced sin and death into the world, see Rom. v, 12, 19. "Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world and death by sin," &c. "For as by one man's disobedience *many were made sinners.*" &c. Here then is the "original law," the transgression of which made man a sinner, and necessitated another law whereby sins might be forgiven. Which of the ten is it? Ah! Adam might have obeyed every one of the ten, and transgressed this. (4.) To me it is the climax of absurdity to talk of the transgression of a code 2000 years before it was given. Worse than that, to attribute an effect to a cause, different from that assigned in the record of the facts, is equivalent to a denial of the record.

I never rejected "the idea of two laws being spoken of in the New Testament," nor claimed "that the term, law, always means one and the same thing;" but I deny that the two laws spoken of are, one the ten commandments, and the other the balance of the Levitical law; and when you bring your proof of this position, I will consider it.

Further on, admitting a change of the law with the change of the priesthood, and asking, "What law?" you answer, "Not the original, royal law of ten commandments; for that can never change." If by this you mean that the ten commandments can never give place to another system of law, all the answer required is to ask, Where is your proof? I understand that it has given place to another code. For proof see Rom. vii; 2 Cor. iii. Not that the fourth commandment, simply, has been abolished! but that the whole code, having filled its time, served its purpose, ceased of obligation. You quote Matt. v, 18, "One jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled," and say it "does not pass away by little fragments," but rather must "all go together." That is correct. It all went together, giving place to "the law of faith," the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus, "the perfect law of liberty." (5.) You say "the context shows that all the prophets must be fulfilled before one particle of the law can pass." I can find no such idea in the context.

You think James speaks of the ten commandments. Chap. ii, 8. "If ye fulfill the royal law," &c. This is without warrant, as the Apostle tells what he means by the royal law; viz., "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself;" which is no part of the ten. (6.) Again this royal law can be transgressed by showing respect to persons—by giving to the richly appareled, a noble, and to the poor, an ignoble seat in the assembly; which is no transgression of either of the ten. Clearly then the royal law is something more than the Sinaitic code. The Apostle often refers to this code for illustration, to show that, although this showing respect to the rich was transgressing the royal law only in one point, it was still a transgression, and he was guilty of all. Your other quotations from James, David and Jesus, would have force if there was any evidence that they referred to the ten commandments. (6.)

I have referred you to Rom. viii, for proof that the ten commandments have given place to another law. Let us look at it a little. Verse 4. "Wherefore my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ, that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God." As the woman is released from obligation to her husband when he is dead; so we are released from obligation to the law, that we may come under obligation to Christ. Verse 6 repeats the same idea. Does this law embrace the ten commandments? Verse 7. "Is the law sin? God forbid . . . I had not known lust except the law had said thou shalt not covet." If you can find your two laws in these passages, you have a system of grammar with which I am unacquainted. (8.) I can but regard the testimony of the first part of this chapter as proof abundant, that the ten commandments ceased of obligation with the rest of the law. The other chapter referred to is equally pointed. I would also suggest that the passages quoted, do plainly teach that the seventh-day Sabbath has been abolished, by teaching that the only law which ever required it has ceased of obligation, and would refer them to the Editor as an answer to his request. If then the Decalogue, as a code of enactments, has ceased of obligation, is it not necessary that the New Testament should enjoin the Sabbath, to make it binding upon Christians?

Hoping that your kind feelings may not be interrupted, I leave the subject for the present.

Yours, striving to keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. E. MILLER, JR.
Middlebury, Elkhart Co., Ind., Dec. 22d, 1853.

THE REVIEW AND HERALD.

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

ROCHESTER, THIRD-DAY, JAN. 31, 1854.

THE Editor of the *Harbinger* is respectfully requested, if he copies the article of E. Miller Jr., in this No., to give the following Reply with it.

Reply to E. Miller Jr.

FRIEND MILLER:—If you are striving to keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus, I can heartily bid you God speed; for these two constituted the primitive, or apostolic platform, and though men professing christianity have apostatized from, and corrupted both, still the remnant will be found upon the same platform when Jesus appears for their deliverance. Now if you will show clearly the dividing line between the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus, without making any use of the ten commandments, which you think have "ceased of obligation," I will admit that you know whereof you affirm. Will you undertake it? If there are, in your own mind, definitely two things which you are striving to keep, you can doubtless tell what they are separately; if not, have you not borrowed an expression from your opponents without due consideration on the meaning of its terms? Do look at this seriously; for it is high time that we should be able to give a reason of the hope that is in us, with meekness and fear.

I will now proceed to notice several points in your letter, and, to avoid quotations, will refer to them by figures.

1. God has one standard of right and wrong for the human family which has no reference to the plan of redemption. What has the progressive development of the plan of redemption to do with this? Sin is sin, whether there is any plan of redemption or not; and sin is the transgression of the law. Consequently the law existed before sin; and had not man broken that law, no plan of redemption had been needed, and no dispute would ever have arisen about the Sabbath. Whatever you may say about the other nine precepts, the Sabbath existed before man sinned; and when it was made, it was made for man.

2. Supposing man had not sinned, would 4000 years training have prepared him for a law somewhat different from the original one? The difficulty seems to be this: you take man already a sinner, and make the law different at different times, corresponding to his different degrees of light on the plan of redemption. In other words, you make no distinction between the commandments of God, which prove man a sinner, and the faith of Jesus, which offers him pardon. Disease and medicine are two things.

3. James does not call the precept, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, the royal law; but would have that law fulfilled in a manner to accord with this scripture. That is, he would not have them profess to do two positive, and eight negative duties, and leave their next door neighbor to starve and freeze, while their own covetous selves had plenty of the gifts of Providence. This would be "negative" obedience indeed—no obedience at all. "The law is spiritual"—the "commandment is exceeding broad," it reaches the motives and desires of the heart, though summed up in so small a compass; and he that loves it can see in every negative precept a corresponding positive virtue inculcated. The prohibitions of having other gods and worshiping images, teach us that we should have one God and worship him. Does the Atheist, who says he has no God, keep the first commandment? According to your view of negative precepts he does; but Jesus would have us keep the first four precepts of the royal law, according to the scripture, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart. In the precept, Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain, I see the duty of revering his name as my God, and not the duty of never mentioning his name at all.

The second division of the royal law must be fulfilled according to the scripture which James quotes. Merely to refrain from killing, or positively injuring

our brother is not enough. We must love him, not in word only, but in deed and in truth. He that hateth his brother is a murderer. We have not only the law, but the scripture to teach us how to keep it; so we are left without excuse for its violation, or for obedience to the letter merely, without love to the law or its giver. Merely to rest from labor on the Sabbath is not enough; it must be done from heartfelt honor to the Creator.

You say, "The Apostle tells what he means by the royal law; viz., Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself; which is no part of the ten." Then we may read it thus: If ye fulfill the royal law, according to the royal law, &c. And then you set the Apostle to illustrate this one-precept, royal law, by the ten-precept, abolished law. How much easier it is, to understand the Apostle according to his most obvious meaning! Think, Brother, think, would you ever have thought that the "Sinaitic code" was used here merely for "illustration," if that code had contained no sabbath precept? How much more natural to understand him to quote from the royal law. Hear him:

If ye fulfill the royal law, (not in the letter only, but) according to the scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, ye do well; but if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convicted of the (royal) law as transgressors. For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all; for he that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law.

What law? One which is abolished? When a law is abolished, it ceases to be a law; therefore it cannot be transgressed; for where there is no law, there is no transgression. Do you say it is the royal law which is transgressed? Then carry out the Apostle's reasoning, and you will find that he that gave one precept, gave another; and he that gave these two, at the same time gave ten "and added no more." If there never was a time when it was right to break any, and every one of the ten commandments, then there never was a time when "the ten commandments ceased of obligation." It is beyond my powers of mind to grasp the idea, much more to explain it, how the ten could cease of obligation, and nine of them be of continual force. Consequently I see no way for myself, or for any of the little children of my capacity, to please God, but by keeping them all. How can the poor little children ever get into the kingdom of heaven, if such hard tasks are required of them? I must comprehend the theory, or I dare not risk myself upon it, since it is not plainly declared in the Bible.

4. Does the prohibition of eating of a certain tree include the whole law given to Adam in Eden? No: he had a God, and was under obligation to reverence and obey him; he had a wife, and he was under obligation to love her as himself, and of consequence not to wrong her in any way; he had a Sabbath, and was under obligation to love it as a gift of God, and in so doing honor the Giver. The tree of knowledge he had no right to: God had not given it to him. On the contrary, it was forbidden. In partaking then he dishonored his God and Parent, coveted what did not belong to him, and stole it. Yet you say "Adam might have obeyed every one of the ten, and transgressed this." In regard to the transgression of a code 2000 years before it was given, I would ask, Did Cain kill his brother, and then lie about it, 2000 years before there was any law against these crimes? If so, he did not sin in so doing; for sin is the transgression of the law, and where there is no law, there is no transgression. I regard the prohibition of the tree of knowledge, as a peculiar test of our first parents' fidelity, similar to the trial of Abraham's faith; yet in transgressing it, they broke some of the ten commandments. Now, were it not for this bone of contention, the Sabbath, I do not believe you would ever have doubted the existence of the nine from the beginning. And since we can prove the existence of the Sabbath from the creation week, why not drop this point by admitting that the nine, which all say are binding now, are as ancient and honorable as that?

5. How many precepts are there in "the law of faith," and "the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus"? What distinguishes them from the faith of Jesus? Does the phrase, "perfect law of liberty" imply a liberty to break one of the precepts of that ancient law, which David said was perfect converting the soul? We read of some who promise people liberty, while they themselves are the servants of corruption.

6. I will again attempt to show that Jesus did speak of the ten commandments, in Matt. v, 18. In drawing a conclusion in verse 19, from what he had said in the preceding verse, he changes the terms from law to commandments, showing that the law and the commandments are the same. He says, "these commandments," which must refer to a code then existing. Now go to Luke xvi, 17. "And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail." The law here mentioned is, most evidently, the same as in Matt. v, 18. "Whosoever putteth away his wife and marrieth another, committeth adultery." This fastens it to that law which forbids adultery: the ten commandments. Now mark what Jesus says, "Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall (future) teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven."

These scriptures most certainly prove that there existed at that time a code of commandments, known to Jesus and his hearers as *the law*. It was not some unknown, unembodied and unexpressed principles floating at random in the mental atmosphere, but a definite, well-known code, as familiar to the Jews as were the prophets mentioned in connection with it. What sane man will deny this? It would have been unjust to threaten wrath upon the violator of an unrevealed law. Again, it is equally certain that these commandments, whatever they were, were ratified to all people, in all future ages, as a test of character for the kingdom of heaven. "Whosoever therefore shall," includes everybody, and extends down through all time to the kingdom of God. "I am not come to subvert, but to ratify." (Campbell's translation.) The previously existing law is thus handed down to after generations, as the rule of Christ's house. Now I would ask, (if the ten commandments and what you are pleased to call "the balance of the Levitical law," expired at the cross,) of what law, existing in the form of commandments, did Jesus speak? If all laws then existing were limited in duration to three years and a half, why did our Saviour say, Verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass?

But it is claimed that the clause, Till all be fulfilled, limits the law to that period; that Christ fulfilled it and that put an end to it. If the law, only, is referred to in this expression, I can see no hint of its abolition. In what way can a law be fulfilled but by keeping its precepts? and does keeping the precept, Thou shalt not kill, abolish it? Jesus said to John, It becometh us to fulfill all righteousness. Did it become them to abolish all righteousness? But I would call your attention again to the fact, that the prophets, as well as the law, are the subject of discourse. Think not, said he, that I am come to destroy, the law or the prophets. I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. And it is perfectly reasonable to understand it, that nothing shall pass from the law, till all the prophets be fulfilled. Wesley's exposition, however, differs superficially from this, but when fathomed, completely agrees; for the prophets mark out the course of all things in heaven and earth. He says:

"One jot or tittle shall in no wise pass, till heaven and earth pass;" or as it is expressed immediately after, *eos an panta genetai*, till all (or rather all things) be fulfilled, till the consummation of all things. Here is, therefore, no room for that poor evasion (with which some have delighted themselves greatly) that 'no part of the law was to pass away, till all the law was fulfilled; but it has been fulfilled by Christ; and therefore now must pass, for the gospel to be established.' Not so; the word *all* does not mean all the law, but all things in the universe; as neither has the term *fulfilled*, any reference to the law, but to all things in heaven and earth."

It is absurd in the extreme to suppose that Jesus made this solemn and important declaration concerning a law which he knew would cease of obligation within four years. Equally absurd to think that he spoke of a law which was unknown to his hearers, and which, in fact, did not exist in the form of commandments. He came not to destroy the law; he did not do it.

If David, when he said, How love I thy law! and Paul, when he said, I delight in the law of God after the inward man, did not mean the ten commandments, what law did they mean? Do you say, "the balance of the Levitical law"? If David and James, in speaking of a "perfect" law, do not mean that law which Jehovah spake with his own voice, and wrote upon stone with his own finger, what do they mean? Some law that had never been published to the world, and of which David, certainly, knew nothing?

7. I will now look at the metaphor of Rom. vii. If you were discussing the life and death question, you would admit no inferences, drawn from parables, and metaphors, to weigh against the plain and positive declarations of the word of God. Bear this rule in mind while I examine your inference from this text.

In the figure, the woman is bound by the law to her husband, so long as he liveth. Not so long as the law liveth. There is nothing said about the law dying; but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law. Not because the law is dead, but her husband is dead. The law remains as it was before, but it does not condemn her as an adulteress, though she be married to another man. Then, in making the application, does the Apostle say that the law is dead, as you infer? By no means; but he tells his brethren, Ye are become dead to the law—the law is still holy, just and good, (verse 12,) but it does not condemn you, because your former husband, master and lord is dead.

I agree with you that the law here spoken of is the ten commandments; which is proved by the precept quoted, Thou shalt not covet. Paul had not known sin, but by this law. In verse 12, he acknowledges that this law and the commandment which condemned him, are holy, just and good, in the present tense. In verse 14 he says the law is spiritual, and in verse 22 he says, I delight in the law of God after the inward man. "If you can find two laws in these passages, you have a system of grammar with which I am unacquainted."

But there is "another law" mentioned towards the close of this chapter, and I would suggest that it is the husband referred to that ought to be dead—the only thing that stands in the way of our being freed from the condemnation of a holy law by means of the crucified body of Christ, and being married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead. Verse 23. It is the law in the members, warring against the law of God, which is approved of the mind, and bringing the person into captivity to the law of sin, and consequently to the law of death, the wages of sin. What is sin? Transgression of the ten commandments; for Paul had not known himself a sinner, had the law been minus the tenth precept. He had led a life so exemplary, he was not conscious of having broken any other. But sin against this commandment slew him. Verse 11. The good, unabolished law would never have harmed him, but for sin. Verse 13. Now if he can become dead and buried with Christ, he will be freed from sin. The law cannot touch him now; for he is not under the law, but under favor. Now shall he sin (transgress the law) because he is not under the law, but under favor? God forbid! If he yields himself to sin again, he will be the servant of sin. The former master or husband will revive, and the same law will condemn. Chap. vi, 1-16.

Now, friend Miller, if there is in you a law warring against the holy law of God, written in the fleshly tables of the mind, you are indeed in captivity—in bondage to a cruel husband. In that case, the best advice I can give you is to crucify the old man with his deeds; become dead indeed to sin, and put on the new man; be married to him who is raised from the

dead, and bring forth fruit unto God. Then you can say with the Apostle, There is, therefore, now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit; for the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death.

In conclusion I wish to address a few words to the "inward man;" for that delights in the law of God. You can see how we can be freed from a good, holy unabolished law; that (sin) wherein we were held, being dead by the body of Christ, who suffered the penalty of sin to save us, not from obedience to his Father's law, but from our sins. You can also see that the law of ten commandments is the only real code mentioned in this connexion; the law of sin and death, and the law of the spirit of life having no more precepts than the law of gravitation. The ten commandments then are spiritual, holy, just and good. Your inference from 2 Cor. iii, is equally baseless. I have not examined that chapter because it has been so frequently discussed in our publications, to which I would refer you for an answer. The Bible nowhere declares that the law of God, or one of its precepts is abolished; on the contrary, Jesus Christ, our only hope of salvation, has affirmed it stronger than the pillars of the universe. What a fearful position then you occupy, while you assert, upon groundless inferences, that the whole code has ceased of obligation. If this is the case with the "whole code," it is the case with each of its precepts. But your inward man tells you that nine precepts, at least, of that law never did cease; and why should the other? Why should that precept which requires especial honor to our Parent and Creator be labeled "Jewish" and thrown aside? The Law-giver knew where to place it; and then if he had wished it removed, he could have told us plainly, and not left us to infer, from metaphorical expressions, that the whole ten were abolished to get rid of the one. Is this wisdom from above? Is it not rather from the carnal mind, which is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be? With feelings of unfeigned love, I entreat you, as you desire salvation, to look at this subject seriously, and try that spirit which rises in opposition to the unpopular, down-trodden fourth commandment, and, to attain its unworthy end, dares to say, with impious tongue, that the entire code of the Great God, the only code of morality he ever gave to man, is dead! Crucify that spirit, I entreat you, and then you can say with David, All his commandments are sure; THEY STAND FAST FOREVER AND EVER. Ps. cxi. Come, taste of the sweets of obedience.

Yours, striving to keep the ten commandments of God, and every requirement of the faith or gospel, given by Jesus and his apostles.

R. F. COTTRELL.

Mill Grove, Erie Co., N. Y., Jan. 8th, 1854.

Rules for Home Education.

1. From your children's earliest infancy inculcate the necessity of instant obedience.
2. Unite firmness with gentleness. Let your children always understand that you mean what you say.
3. Never promise them anything unless you are quite sure you can give them what you promise.
4. If you tell a little child to do something, show him how to do it, and see that it is done.
5. Always punish your children for willfully disobeying your commands, but never punish them in anger.
6. Never let them perceive that they can vex you or make you lose your self-command.
7. If they give way to petulance and temper, wait till they are calm, and then gently reason with them on the impropriety of their conduct.
8. Remember that a little present punishment, when the occasion arises, is much more effectual than the threatening of a greater punishment, should the fault be renewed.
9. Never give your children anything because they cry for it.
10. On no account allow them to do at one time what you have forbidden, under like circumstances it another.

11. Teach them that the only sure and easy way to appear good, is to be good.

12. Accustom them to make their little recitals with perfect truth.

13. Never allow tale-bearing.

14. Teach them that self-denial, not self-indulgence, is the appointed and sure method of securing happiness.

15. Guard them against the indulgence of an angry and resentful spirit.

If these rules were reduced to practice—daily practice—by parents and guardians, how much misery would be prevented, how many in danger of ruin would be saved, and how largely would the happiness of a thousand domestic circles be augmented. It is lamentable to see how extensive is parental neglect and to witness the bad and dreadful consequences in the ruin of thousands.—*Sab. Recorder*.

Blasphemy.

It is said of the beast having seven heads and ten horns, that he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his Name, and his Tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven. Rev. xiii, 6.

There are three ways by which God is blasphemed.

1. By blaspheming his Name. The Papal beast did this by applying those titles to mortal men which belong exclusively to God. For example: the Pope has been titled, His Holiness, The Lord God the Pope, &c. The effects of this blasphemy may be seen even among Protestants. Whenever men take to themselves titles calculated to cause their fellow-men to look up to them with veneration, as possessing superior holiness, they detract from him whose name alone is to be exalted. The inspired Psalmist, in speaking of Jehovah, says, "Holy and reverend is his name." Ps. cxi, 9. Here is the only place in the Bible where the term, reverend, is used; and it is applied to God alone. Those who dispute the right of the Pope, to assume the title of Holiness, should not prefix "Rev." to their own names.

2. By blaspheming his Tabernacle. The Sanctuary or true Tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man, is in heaven. This has taken the place of the earthly sanctuary which was a pattern of the things in the heavens, and now there is no holy place on earth. When Jesus was crucified, the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom, and now the Christian's mind is pointed to the anti-type in heaven. But that blasphemous power has erected his sanctuaries on earth, and diverted the minds of men from the true, so that the latter has been almost entirely lost sight of. How often have we heard men speak of going to the sanctuary on the Holy Sabbath, when they meant nothing more nor less than going to the meeting-house on the first day of the week! And when men have been reproved for their pride in building costly houses of worship, how often have they plead as an excuse the magnificence and splendor of the temple built by Solomon, as though they were building the antitype of that temple, or forgetting that it was a shadow, pointing us to the true! Is not this blaspheming the Tabernacle?

And then the house must be dedicated, and the minister reads the prayer of Solomon at the dedication of the temple, asking God to hear their prayers, when they should pray towards the temple. Do they desire the people to look towards the meeting-house when they pray?

My mind was lately called up anew to this subject by seeing a new meeting-house built by one of the most enlightened denominations, or perhaps I might say the most enlightened. Above the spire, and surrounding the lightning-rod, was what I understood to be a representation of the seven golden candlesticks—seven small pillars, overlaid, probably, with leaf gold. Had they but known how soon the Lord will come, and remove those candlesticks out of their place, they might have saved themselves the trouble of building this new house, and worshiped God more acceptably in the old one, the little time we have remaining here.

But thanks be to God, we have a Tabernacle to which we may look, and beauty and strength are there. The Lord send us help from the Sanctuary, and strengthen us out of Zion. Amen.

3. Those that dwell in heaven are blasphemed. Jesus and the holy angels dwell there. Jesus is our High Priest, and the only mediator between God and men. The beast, in causing men to confess to priests on earth, to gain their intercessions in their behalf, has blasphemed the Minister of the Sanctuary in heaven. Angels are ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation. The Holy Spirit says by David, The angel of the Lord encampeth round about them that fear him, and delivereth them. Is not the doctrine that the spirits of the dead are our guardian spirits, blaspheming against the true ministering spirits—"them that dwell in heaven," and consequently against God? The Catholics pray to Mary and the "saints," and others talk of the dead—those who were so weak as to fall by the hand of the destroyer—as being our guardian spirits, interposing their strength (?) to save us from destruction! R. F. COTTRELL.

A CHURCH IN THE AIR.

ONCE wandering through the land of dreams,
In search of something new,
A church,—'twas on a Sabbath morn—
My curious notice drew;
And thinking I should see the mode
Of Christian worship there,
I entered just in time to hear
The closing hymn and prayer.

The church was rich without display;
From gorgeous colors free;
Through unstained glass the light of heaven
Was shining cheerfully.
And rich and poor sat side by side;
I saw no cushioned pews,
Whose doors the meanest of the flock
An entrance might refuse.

And when the hymn was given out,
With what astonished face
I watched a lady clad in silk
Bend forward from her place,
To share her book with one whose robes
So scanty were and mean,
No maiden form of earthly mould
To greet her would be seen.

And yet I saw not that the deed
Lessened a single grace,
But rather that a sweeter look
Beamed on the maiden's face.
And while I pondered in my mind,
How such a thing could be,
The whole assembly joined to sing
Some time-worn melody.

Vainly I strove with modern ear
To catch the organ's tone;
These simple Christians swoll the praise
Of God by voice alone.
And here no fashionable airs,
The tedium to beguile,
Are set to solemn hymns of praise,
And sung in opera style.

And yet the music of that choir
Right pleasant was to hear,
Though nothing in the strain I found
To please a critic's ear;
But childhood joined in ringing tones
With those of faltering age,
And rich, and poor, and old and young
In the blest work engage.

I listened, and my thoughts recurred
To many a boasted choir
In city church, who weekly meet
To praise the Lord for hire;
And well, thought I, the church of God
This mockery might spare.
I ceased—for every head was bowed
In reverential prayer.

And all in spirit seemed to join,
Nor could I well forbear,
For Christ, and not the minister,
Was most apparent there.

Its words of charity and love
Did the whole world embrace,
Unfettered by the love of sect,
That modern Christian grace.

And little did I care to know
If Old the School or New,
From whence the soul of such a man
Its rich instruction drew,
His teacher none could well mistake;
Only one can impart
Lessons of wisdom that can guide
A sinful human heart.

Too soon that fervent prayer was o'er,
The benediction asked,
And slowly down the spacious aisles
The congregation passed.
Slowly, as one might turn his back
Upon the gates of heaven,
After a taste of angel's food
Unto his soul was given.

And now kind greetings were exchanged,
With many a friendly word,
And Christians met as Christians should
Who serve one common Lord.
One heart, one mind, one earnest will
Seemed to inspire the whole,
As friend to friend with freedom told
The welfare of his soul.

Strange, though it seem, no single word
These curious folks did say,
Of "politics," of rise in stocks,
Or gossip of the day,
Not only did they "shut up shop,"
And lock the office door,
They turned the key on worldly thoughts,
Till holy time was o'er.

The sermon, while a group discussed,
I listened in amaze,
And marvelled at the words they used,
When speaking in its praise.
They did not call it "great" or "deep,"
"Ingenious," "witty," "smart,"
Or "thank their stars they had a man
After the people's heart."

But whispered low, with moistened eyes,
"How precious was the word;
How full of hope the promises
Their strengthened souls had heard;"
And murmured blessings on his head,
Who, laboring by their side
In all simplicity and truth,
Preached Christ the crucified.

I heard and could not silence keep,
"Thrice happy souls!" I cried,
"Am I in heaven?" With sudden start
My eyes I opened wide—
Looked round a moment in amaze—
Saw my mistake with pain,
And never since have dared to take
A nap in Church again.

[Hartford Courant.]

The Minister's Might in God.

PHILIP HENRY thus wrote upon a studying day:
"I forgot when I began, explicitly and expressly, to
crave help from God, and the chariot wheels drove
accordingly. Lord, forgive my omission, and keep
me in the way of duty."

Another old divine observes: "If God drop not
down his assistance, we write with a pen that hath
no ink. If any in the world need walk dependently
upon God more than others, the minister is he."

It was once said to a minister of Christ, whose labors
had been abundantly successful. "Sir, if you did
not plough in your closet, you would not reap in your
pulpit."

The eminent author of "The Saints' Rest," being
reminded of his labors on his death-bed, replied, "I
was but a pen in God's hand, and what praise is due
to a pen?"

"After having composed and delivered a sermon,"
says Bishop Horne, "I have often thought of and re-
peated the following lines of Thompson:—

'Be gracious, Heaven! for now laborious man
Has done his part. Ye fostering breezes blow!
Ye softening dews, ye tender showers descend!
And temper all, thou world-reviving sun,
Into a perfect year.'

A minister has no ground to hope for fruits from
his exertions until in himself he has no hope; until
he has learned to put no faith in the point and ener-
gy of sentences; until he feels that a man may be
mighty to compel the attention, and mighty to regale
the imagination, and mighty to silence the gainsayer
and yet not mighty to the pulling down of strong
holds."

COMMUNICATIONS.

As Communications of esteemed Brethren sometimes con-
tain expressions which we choose not to use, and sentiments
which we would not advance, we would say, that we are not
responsible for what appears under this head.

The Scarlet-Colored Beast.

BY J. M. STEPHENSON.

THIS is evidently the last phase of the Papal beast;
[Rev. xiii, 1, 2;] for, first, he has the same number of
heads; second, the same number of horns; third, the
same location, i. e., the city of Rome; and, fourth, the
same Papal, Anti-Christian church, is allied to both.
The seven heads and ten horns of the red dragon,
[Rev. xii, 3,] refer to the same facts in the world's
history.

These three beasts represent all the phases the
fourth universal monarchy (i. e., the Roman Empire)
will present, from its establishment, to its utter
and entire subversion by the "stone cut out of the
mountain without hands," and the establishment of
the Kingdom of God under the whole heavens. If so,
we must find the facts in the history of that Empire
analogous to the seven heads and ten horns. We
have them. They are these: 1. The Roman Empire
has had seven distinct forms of government, or has
presented to the world seven phases. We find a clue
to this exposition in Rev. xvii, 10. "And there are sev-
en kings: five are fallen, and one is, and the other is
not yet come." Five of those forms had past at the
time John had his vision: the sixth was then in exist-
ence, i. e., the Imperial: the seventh (i. e., the Papal)
had not yet come. The seven mountains (Rev. xvii, 9)
mark the city of Rome as the seat of all these beasts.
That the foregoing view of the seven heads is correct,
is evident from the relation the sixth and seventh
heads sustain to each other, and to the facts in the
case. The dragon gave his power, (civil power,) and
his seat, (the city of Rome,) and great authority, to
another beast, having the same number of heads,
horns, and the same location. Rev. xiii, 2. The facts
are these: The Imperial form of the Roman govern-
ment in the West, gave place to the Papal form of the
same government. This took place A. D. 538, when
the Roman Emperor invested the Pope with civil
power to correct heretics, and gave him his seat in
the West.

But John saw one of this last beast's heads, as it
were, wounded to death. Verse 3. If these heads
represent forms of the Roman government, which of
those forms received the deadly wound? Ans. The
seventh, or Papal. This was fulfilled A. D. 1798,
when one of Napoleon Buonaparte's generals deposed
the Pope; led him captive into France, where he was
retained until his death: thus he who had led mil-
lions of God's people into captivity, was, in his turn,
led into captivity. See verse 10. His successor sur-
rendered to Napoleon his civil power, except a small
vestige in Italy. The life of the Papal head consist-
ed in civil power to suppress heresy; consequently
the deprivation of that power would constitute a
deadly wound. But has the deadly wound ever been
healed? I think not. That power which constituted
the original life of the Papal head, and the depriva-
tion of which inflicted a deadly wound, has never been
given back. Napoleon did not give it back: nor did
the world's alliance: hence it must be a future event.
The fact that John saw the wound healed, previ-
ous to his vision of the two horned-beast, is no objec-
tion to this view. We are in this, as in many other
prophecies, dependent on the chronological order in
which the events occur, for their prophetic order.
John saw in one vision the whole history of the beast.

He subsequently speaks of the beast as he saw him in vision, without any reference to the order, or the time in which the events would occur.

Now, I believe the scarlet-colored beast, and the woman who is riding him to judgment, symbolize the last phase which Papacy will present after the deadly wound is healed. This woman is analogous to the Papal part of the wild beast. The ten horns of both these beasts, together with those of the dragon, the fourth beast of Dan. vii, and the ten toes of the image, [Dan. ii,] all represent the ten kingdoms into which the Western Empire of Rome was broken, between A. D. 353 and 483.

The deadly wound consisted in the separation of Papacy from a beast with ten horns. The ten horns represent ten kingdoms. The ten kingdoms the civil power, or life of the beast. Now, if the dissolution of the union between Papacy and those ten horns constituted the deadly wound; then their re-union would be a healing of the deadly wound. This re-union, or alliance of Papacy with the original ten kingdoms, is shadowed forth by a woman riding (in alliance with) a scarlet-colored beast, having seven heads and ten horns. Rev. xvii, 3.

We are emphatically told that the ten horns of this beast are ten kings who have received no kingdoms as yet. Verse 19. These must be kings who shall be appointed (doubtless by Absolutists, after the now reigning kings, of the ten kingdoms, shall have been deposed by their Republican subjects, and those Republican armies shall have been defeated by the combined forces of Absolutists) to reign over the original ten kingdoms; for the image is to have but ten toes, the fourth beast of Daniel but ten horns, when Christ comes. To have twenty kingdoms in the dominion of the Papal beast would destroy the harmony of prophecy in reference to that power. But the following view is natural and easy, and in harmony with all the prophecies. Those ten kings who have received no kingdoms as yet, will be appointed to reign over the original ten kingdoms; and when they receive their kingdoms, they will agree, and give their power (civil power) and strength unto the beast, (Papacy,) and thus heal the deadly wound. See verse 12 and 17. "These have one mind and shall give their power and strength unto the beast; for God hath put it into their hearts to fulfill his will, and to agree, and give their kingdom unto the beast, until the words of God (what words? evidently that the deadly wound shall be healed) shall be fulfilled." Here is a literal fulfillment of the prediction, that the deadly wound was (shall be) healed: an event yet future. This beast was, (Papacy united with a beast of seven heads and ten horns) and is not, (Papacy separated from the above named beast,) and yet is (or shall be) (Papacy re-united to the same beast. See verses 3, 12, 13, 17) verse 8. He is of the seven, (i. e. the same Papal church which was allied to the seventh. See Rev. xiii, 1-10) and is (shall be) the eighth, (a new alliance, or the eighth phase of the seventh beast) and goeth into perdition. [Verse 16] see verse 11. This alliance will continue one hour. (15 days.) The manner in which those ten kings [Rev. xvii, 3, 7, 12, 13, 17] come to their end, is analogous to the destruction of the ten toes of the image. Compare Rev. xvii, 14, with Dan. ii, 34, 35, 44, 45.

Metomen, Fond du Lac Co., Wis., Dec. 18th, 1853.

From Bro. Abbey.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—We are still striving to overcome by the blood of the Lamb and the word of our testimony. We still feel like trying to go forward in the strength of the Lord, and make our way through this wilderness, to that land of rest, which will be given to the saints when the earth is made new. We are living in very solemn times, and when I have a sense of it, (as I do sometimes a little,) I feel as though I ought to live soberly in this present evil world. When I think how much the Saviour has done for me, and then think how far short I come of imitating his example, I am led to exclaim. Shall I ever reflect his lovely image? Shall I ever be permitted to dwell with the redeemed of all ages, and with angels; and, above all, with the dear Saviour, who has given

his life that I might live. When I think of these things, it is too much. But my heart cries out, I want to go—my whole being says, I want to be there—I must be there; and by the grace of God I will try to be there! Heaven is worth striving for; 'tis worth sacrificing every thing else for; 'tis worth every thing. I have seen the importance of late more than ever, of living so before the Lord that, let us be called into any emergency, we can go before the Lord with confidence and ask for help.

ALONZO ABBEY.

Hubbard's Corners, N. Y., Jan. 1854.

From Bro. Rockwell.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—In the love of the truth, I wish to say to the brethren and sisters who are striving to keep the commandments of the Father and of the Son, Fear not; ye are of more value than many sparrows. He knows his own and is known of them. Yes, his sheep hear his voice, and follow him; and a stranger they will not follow; and he giveth unto them eternal life; and none is able to pluck them out of his hand.

Let us cast our care on him; for he careth for us: he will surely bring us off victorious, if we believe and obey him.

I am now at Bro. Jarvis' in Melbourne, C. E. He and his family join with me in saying, May peace, love and truth, be multiplied to you all.

Still hoping to overcome, that we may inherit all things.

N. W. ROCKWELL.

Melbourne, C. E., Jan. 15th, 1854

From Sister Brudage.

DEAR BRETHREN AND SISTERS:—Not having the privilege often to meet with those who, it is evident are the Salt of the earth, I write a few lines to the readers of the *Review*.

Brethren, can we for a moment doubt that we are living in the time alluded to by our Saviour when he said, "Behold I come quickly; and my reward is with me to give every man according as his work shall be." Do we not see in every thing around us a fulfillment of prophecy? So plain it is, that I hardly know how any one can fail to see.

Do we not see that the multitude have willingly closed their eyes against the light? choosing darkness rather than light, their hearts have become hardened through the deceitfulness of sin, and the love of the world; and the praise of men, is, by most who profess godliness, better than the honor that comes from God only. Oh, in what an awful state is the world now standing! How unprepared for the time of reckoning which is near!

I feel truly thankful that ever my eyes were opened to see, and my heart to receive, the truth; and it is my desire to be sanctified through it. I feel assured that if I am one of the scattered remnant, I have the prayers of those who move the arm of God. He who once said, "Fear not little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom," is for us, and who shall be against us.

M. BRUDAGE.

Hammondsport, N. Y., Jan. 15th, 1854.

From Bro. Holt.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—I can safely say, that the truth is gaining ground, though slowly, in this part of the State. The brethren are growing stronger in the truth, and feel the importance of union and church order. The way is gradually opening into new places for the truth to be presented.

In Van Buren, I found some who love the Lord, and are willing to investigate the truth. In Peterboro we held several meetings at Bro. Hostler's, who has recently begun to obey God in the observance of the fourth precept of his law. Others became convinced of the truthfulness of our position, and intended to obey. Some are investigating, and wish the *Review* to aid them in the work. I trust they will soon be keeping the Sabbath of the Bible, instead of Pope's day, (Sunday.)

At Winfield, Herkimer Co., I found a light spot where the ark of the Lord has a resting place. Bro. Lawton is doing what he can to sustain the truth by distributing publications. Spiritualism has a strong hold here, as, also, in Peterboro. "The Signs of the Times" is a powerful weapon against this delusion of satan.—I hope they will be faithfully circulated by the brethren. Now is the time to do what we can to speed the light and truth, and if possible, save some from the strong delusion of the devil.

I was in hope that Bro. Baker would visit several counties in this part of the State this Winter, and still hope the Lord will direct his steps this way. There are many places open for the truth to be presented.

As regards myself, I feel very unqualified for this great work of the Lord. I often think, Who is sufficient for these things? I regret that I have not been

more humble and had more of the mind of Christ.

I still feel a great lack; but I am trying to overcome, and to get nearer the Lord, and live more to his glory. I have chosen the furnace of affliction, with tribulation, for my portion here; for I desire a better country. I want to be purified; and I see that I cannot be, out of the furnace. If I suffer with Jesus I have the promise of reigning with him. If I am like him, I shall have sorrow and grief; for he was a man of sorrow and acquainted with grief. I confess I am not worthy of such rich blessings as tribulation, temptation, affliction, suffering and grief.

I am sorry that I have not sympathized more with you in your trials, your prayers, and your tears. I regret that I have not always been in that humble attitude, as to weep with you and rejoice with you, and bear part of the burden. Dear Brother I ask your forgiveness, and if it was in my power, I would restore fourfold for all the injuries I have inflicted.

Your unworthy Brother, willing to suffer affliction until the voice of God turns the captivity of Zion.

G. W. HOLT.

Ply Creek, Otsego Co., N. Y., Jan. 20th, 1854.

From Bro. Camp.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—We are still striving for the kingdom. We believe we are living in the time of trial, when God's people will be tried, purified, and fitted to stand in that time of trouble that is just before us; and how much we need on the whole armor of God. Nothing but the truth will enable us to overcome, and we want the whole truth that we may be able to stand against all the wiles of the enemy, who has come down with great wrath, knowing that his time is short; but I rejoice that there is One stronger than the strong man armed, who will enable his children to stand amidst all the scoffs and opposition of this wicked world.

I believe we are living on the last fragments of time; when the work of our Great High Priest in the Heavenly Sanctuary is almost finished, when the last message of mercy will cease to fall upon the ear. Then he that is filthy will be filthy still, and he that is holy will be holy still.

I praise God that this world is not my home, and if faithful a few days longer, we shall be where the wicked cease from troubling, and the weary soul will be at rest; and when our dear friends who sleep in Jesus will awake in his likeness, and come forth to everlasting life. I bless the Lord that I am permitted to be numbered with the remnant who are keeping the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus.

Yours in hope of the soon coming kingdom.

WM. CAMP.

Chelsea, Vt., Jan. 9th, 1854.

P. S. Our dearly beloved and only daughter, Fanny Ellen Camp, sweetly fell asleep in Jesus, Aug. 9th, aged nine years, eight months and twelve days, after an illness of four days, with the typhoid fever.

She has ever manifested an interest in the truth, and a love for the Sabbath, and for those who observed it. Her funeral was attended on the 11th, by Bro. W. Morse, who spoke on the occasion from 1 Thess. iv, 14. "Even so also them that sleep in Jesus will God bring with him."

Her death was very sudden and unexpected; and while we mourn the loss of one we much loved, we sorrow not as those who have no hope. We believe the time is not far distant when she will come from the enemy's land. Glory to Heaven's King! Separation will then be known no more.

From Sister Edson.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—It is cheering to hear through the *Review* from the dear brethren and sisters scattered abroad, and that God is at work in different parts of his moral vineyard. The dear children of God that have been scattered in a dark and cloudy day are now being united under the third angel's message, and are coming into the unity of the faith. Jesus' prayer was that his people might be one, and I believe his prayer will be answered. Yes, praise the name of the Lord, although satan is permitted to work with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish because they will not believe the truth but had pleasure in unrighteousness. I praise the Lord that there is a remnant who are turning their ears away from the fables of these last days, to keep the commandments of God and the testimony of Jesus.

The Lord is at work for his people, and he will accomplish the work gloriously. He is now in the Most Holy Place of the heavenly Sanctuary, and will now pardon all the transgressions of Israel, that they may be blotted out when the times of refreshings shall come. When Jesus leaves his mediatorial office, every case will be decided.

Jesus will soon finish his work, and O let us realize the solemn moment in which we live, and feel to humble ourselves before him, and seek meekness, that we may be hid in the day of his anger; for he says the meek he will guide in judgment, and the meek he will teach his ways. I rejoice in the bright prospect that lies before us. If faithful a little longer we shall outride the storm of affliction, and be where sorrow can never come. Let us then bear up under all our trials, and trust wholly in God, and he will keep us, and we shall come off victorious. His poor, despised children, that are despised by the world, and have all manner of evil spoken against them, falsely, for the sake of Christ will soon be gathered home, to inherit a rich reward, and possess the kingdom for ever and ever. Yes, soon we shall gain the victory over the beast and his image and stand upon Mount Zion and sing the song that no man could learn but those who were redeemed from among men. O glorious thought! Shall I be there with that happy number that shout victory on the sea of glass. We have but little time to work for God, and to prepare for the great and last conflict, when we shall need to have on the whole armor, that we may be accounted worthy to escape all things that are coming upon the earth and to stand before the Son of Man.

Your Sister, striving for the kingdom.

MARIA E. EDSON.

Ashfield, Mass., Jan. 15th, 1854.

From Bro. Chaffee.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—I read the *Review* with pleasure. It is comforting and strengthening to me to hear from those of like precious faith. I praise my Heavenly Father for the light of his word, which brings his commandments to view, the holy Sabbath not excepted. And also that my mind has been called to review my former position concerning the no-Sabbath. I did not understand Paul, in Col ii, 16. I now understand him to be speaking of feast-days.

There is a little band of us here in Salem, sixteen in number, who are trying to keep all the commandments of God and faith of Jesus, that we may be of that happy number who shall have right to the tree of life and enter in through the gates into the city. We have much opposition, and often hear the Dragon voice. We have meetings every Sabbath, and are often blessed with the Spirit of the Lord.

If any preaching brethren could make it convenient to come this way, we would be very glad, as we do not have much preaching. May God grant to assist his dear children every where to overcome through the blood of the Lamb is the prayer of your brother in Christ.

ALMON CHAFFEE.

Salem, Steuben Co. Ind., Jan, 12th, 1854.

Extract of Letters.

Bro. Loughborough writes from Milan, O., Jan. 16th, 1854:—"First-day, Jan. 1st, we spent in Smit's settlement, in the town of Clarksfield. While examining the subject of the two-horned beast, and his work, I spoke quite at length on the work of the rapping spirits. While quoting Rev. xvi, "spirits of devils working miracles," a medium was seized with the influence, and commenced to pound the desk, with her eyes fixed sternly upon me. The Lord rebuked the unholy influence, and I was enabled to go forward with the lecture. Some there I think will step out on the truth and aid in repairing the breach. Jan. 6th, we returned to Green Springs, to give our second course of lectures. Found seventeen in that vicinity keeping the Sabbath. Gave there eight lectures in a large Hall, to an audience of upwards of 200. Some more we trust will there see and embrace the truth of the third angel's message.

"Last Fifth-day we returned to Milan, held meeting with the brethren, Sabbath. Bro. Tillison came to the meeting and conveyed us to Oxford, where, to an attentive audience, we spoke five times. This Bro. Tillison was once a believer in the Advent doctrine; but the spirit manifestations found him with the scattered and torn flock. He has been for upwards of a year investigating their work, and became satisfied that there was a reality in spirit manifestations, but could not believe it to be the spirits of the dead, and made up his mind

that he would have no more to do with it. Just then he obtained the work on the "Signs of the Times," giving an exposition of the *spirit manifestations* as a sign of the near coming of Jesus. It awakened an interest in his mind again, he is much interested with the third angel's message. The way is still opening here in every direction for the spread of the truth. All around us the call comes to us like that of the Macedonians, "Come over and help us." O Lord raise up quickly and send forth more laborers is our cry."

THE REVIEW AND HERALD

ROCHESTER, THIRD-DAY, JAN. 31, 1854.

WE are sometimes brought into a trying place in this way—Beloved brethren write out their views, relating mostly to unfulfilled prophecy, and wish them published. We stand in doubt of their views of future events, and hesitate to publish them, fearing the result. And while we wait to consider, pray over the matter, and ask advice of the Committee, we are aware that those in favor of the views in question are in danger of being tempted, and tried with us. Now we love you all, brethren, and wish to serve and please you; but we had rather displease you all, than Him whom we supremely love, and endeavor to serve. God bless you, and give you all, patience, and may he give us wisdom to do right in the discharge of our duty.

NEW TRACTS.

REVIEW OF OBJECTIONS TO THE SEVENTH-DAY SABBATH—16 pages. This is the candid review of the objections of Eld. D. I. R., which appeared in the last *Review*, with extracts from Morton's *Vindication of the True Sabbath*. This is an excellent little work to circulate.

THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK NOT THE SABBATH OF THE LORD—16 pages. This contains the most important part of our 32 page Tract, with the same title. It is published in this size that it may be sent with other 16 page tracts at the low rate of postage of 12 ounces for six cents. We can send our 16 page tracts in packages of 50, and pay the postage, for 50 cents.

SABBATH AND ADVENT MISCELLANY.—This is eight of our small Tracts bound in paper covers—price 9 cents—postage 1 cent.

Appointments.

PROVIDENCE permitting, we will hold meetings at Oswego, N. Y., Feb. 4th and 5th; Lorain, the 7th, at 1 and 6 o'clock, P. M.; at the Christian Meeting-house, near Bro. Ira Abbey's in Brookfield the 11th and 12th; Lincklaen, where Br. may appoint, the 18th and 19th. It is expected that Bro. S. W. Rhodes will attend these meetings with us.

We shall take with us a quantity of publications, to save the Brethren the postage if sent by Mail. JAMES WHITE.

Bro. B. B. Brown.

WE are happy to hear from this dear brother again, and that his faith is growing stronger in many important truths connected with the third message. He must excuse us for taking the following paragraphs from his kind letter, dated, Beloit, Wis., Jan. 20th.

"You will feel interested to know what progress I am making in the 'present truth'; and I am sorry I cannot give a better account of myself than I am able to do; or at least, an account that would be more cheering to you. For, most certainly, my heart is with you, and others who are giving this last message of mercy to a dying world.

"Many, and various have been the trials of my mind since I last wrote you. I have examined, and re-examined, many times, the Sabbath question, and other kindred points which stand connected in the 'third angel's message.' At one time, as you very well know, I was almost inclined to give up the Sabbath, and of course, other features of the same message; yet, as I never act hastily in my conclusions, nor without very clear evidence, I could not do it without reviewing the subject, and faithfully searching the whole Word for the truth. I thought the truth was what I desired, and yet I very well knew

that my *temporal interest*, strongly inclined me to favor the No-Sabbath theory. By giving up the Sabbath, and paying homage to the First-day, I could gain both the friendship of this world, and more of this world's goods. The friendship, however, I could very easily give up. But there seemed a sort of necessity for my being in some lucrative business for the comfort of my family.

"These things, with many others that I might mention, have strongly inclined my mind to seek for truth in the opposite view. But still I am holding on to the Sabbath, and becoming more and more confirmed in other kindred doctrines contained in the present message. And it does seem to me that many of our Advent brethren, who now reject this subject, would see it as I do, if they could once get victory over their *inclination* to the other side. I love them as ever, and my desire and prayer to God is, that they may be saved."

"Here I am, an isolated individual, with no one around me of 'like precious faith,' with whom I can sympathize, in this hour of temptation. But in the Lord will I put my trust, and strive for the Kingdom of his dear Son.

"I ought not, and will not trouble you farther with my own trials, for I am aware that you have as many of your own as you can well bear. We are sure, however, that all these things will work for our good, if we love God and keep his commandments.—And soon 'We'll sing our trials ended.'

"I sympathize deeply with you in your work of publishing the *Review*, and wish I were able to do more for you than I can, to help sustain it. It is truly a welcome messenger, and the devout and able documents which come from the hands of many of our brethren, are like 'Angel visits.' Yet I often think that in their anxiety to prove their points beyond being controverted, they throw in much Scripture as proof texts, which have no bearing on the subject. Whenever this is the case, it serves to *weaken* the evidence rather than strengthen it. Especially whenever it is clear that Scripture is misquoted. Opposers will not fail to lay hold of *such texts*, to their strong prejudice against the truth, while they fail entirely, to see the argument."

THE SABBATH.—"Suppose," said one who was reasoning with a Sabbath-breaker, "suppose I had been hard at work all the week, and had earned seven shillings; and suppose I met a man in need, and gave him six of them; what would you say to that?" "Why that you were very kind, and the man ought to be very thankful." "Well suppose he was then to turn round and knock me down, and rob me of the other shilling." "He would be a wretch deserving only to be hanged." "Well," said the other, "this is just your case. God has freely given you six days of the week, and now, you are robbing him of the seventh."

Letters.

N. W. Rockwell, J. M. Stephenson, H. Woodruff, E. Pickett

Receipts.

L. J. Richmond, J. Whitmore, L. H. Prior, a Friend, (by E. Goodwin,) M. Brudage, D. R. Wood, a Friend, J. W. Stewart, Bro. Luddington, S. Nash, J. P. Weeks, each \$1. S. Sargent, F. M. Shipper, each \$2. J. Rathbun \$3. H. C. Crumb \$4. L. Woodworth \$4.75. B. B. Brown, J. Harroun, each \$1.75. L. O. Stowell, B. Darling, S. Chase, each \$1.50. D. Kent \$1.65. L. Chandler \$0.50

THE REVIEW AND HERALD

IS PUBLISHED WEEKLY

At South St. Paul Street, Stone's Block,

No. 23, Third Floor.

JOSEPH BATES, J. N. ANDREWS, JOSEPH BAKER,

Publishing Committee.

JAMES WHITE, Editor.

TERMS—We make no charges. Those who wish to pay only the cost of one copy of the *Review*, (as some choose to do,) may pay \$1.50 a year. Canada subscribers, \$1.75, when the postage is pre-paid.

That we may be able to send the *Review* to the worthy poor, and to many who have not yet embraced the views it advocates, it will be necessary for all the friends of the cause (who are able) to pay the cost of their own paper, and for many of our readers to pay for one or more others.

All communications, orders, and remittances should be addressed to JAMES WHITE, Ed. of *Review*, Rochester, N. Y. (post-paid.)