

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. IV.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., THIRD-DAY, NOVEMBER 15, 1853.

No. 19.

THE CHRISTIAN'S HOPE.

As when the weary traveler gains
The height of some commanding hill,
His heart revives, if o'er the plains,
He sees his home, though distant still.

So when the Christian pilgrim views,
By faith, his mansion in the skies,
The sight his fainting strength renews,
And wings his speed to reach the prize.

The hope of heaven his spirit cheers,
No more he grieves for troubles past;
Nor any future trial fears,
So he may safe arrive at last.

'Tis there, he says, I am to dwell,
With Jesus in the realms of day;
Then I shall bid my cares farewell,
And he shall wipe my tears away.

THE LAW OF GOD.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE TESTIMONY IN BOTH TESTAMENTS.

BY J. H. WAGGONER.
(Continued.)

In our examination thus far we have seen *first*, that the law existed before the *Jewish dispensation*; hence, it cannot be peculiar to that dispensation; and *second*, by the relation that we sustain to the promises of God having the law for their basis, or condition, that it comes down unchanged into the present dispensation; and there is a perfect harmony in the writings of the Old and New Testaments on this subject. We will here place some of their testimony side by side:

OLD TESTAMENT.	NEW TESTAMENT.
Deut. viii, 1.—All the commandments which I command thee this day shall ye observe to do, that ye may live.	Matt. xix, 17.—If thou wilt enter into life keep the commandments.
Ecc. xii, 13.—Fear God and keep his commandments, for this is the whole duty of man.	Rom. vi, 13.—The doers of the law shall be justified.
Ps. xix, 7, 8.—The law of the Lord is perfect con-verting the soul; the statutes of the Lord are right—the commandment of the Lord is pure.	Rom. vii, 12.—Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good. Gal. iii, 24.—Our schoolmaster, to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified through faith.
Ps. cxix, 7.—I delight in thy law; also, verses 16, 24, 35, 47, 77, 92, 127, 143, 174.	Rom. vii, 22.—I delight in the law of God.
Eze. xx, 19, 20.—Walk in my statutes and keep my judgments, and do them, and hallow my Sabbaths, and they shall be a sign between me and you that ye may know that I am the Lord your God.	1 John ii, 3.—And hereby we do know that we know him if we keep his commandments.
Isa. xlii, 21.—The Lord is well pleased for his righteousness' sake; he will magnify the law, and make it honorable.	Rom. iii, 31.—Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law.
Eze. xx, 11.—I gave them my statutes and shewed them my judgments, which if a man do he shall even live in them.	Rom. vii, 10.—The commandment was ordained to life.

Prov. xxviii, 9.—He that turneth away his ear vain they do worship me, from hearing the law, teaching for doctrines the even his prayer shall be commandments of men. abomination.

Beginning with the Abrahamic Covenant we find a mass of testimony which it is impossible to evade, that the law of God, the ten commandments, are ever binding—that under all dispensations mankind are under the same obligation to observe them, and that they are viewed in the same light by the writers of both Testaments. But the "carnal mind" is particularly manifested in opposition to the fourth precept, and we will further notice some of the reasons why it should be observed, and the objections urged against it.

In Ex. xxxi, 13, the Sabbath is declared to be a sign between God and the children of Israel, that they might know that he was the Lord that sanctified them. An objection has been urged here that this referred to none but the children of Israel, and can have no reference to Christians of Gentile birth. Who, then, are the children of Israel referred to in this scripture? Certainly, not rebellious, unconverted Jews; for they are not sanctified, and, therefore, are not entitled to the sign thereof. Not all the literal descendants of Jacob; for "They are not all Israel which are of Israel." Rom. ix, 6. "Neither because they are the seed of Abraham are they all children." Verse 7. Jacob was the first that was called Israel; but he was not called Israel till he prevailed with God. Gen. xxii, 28. Then it is evident that they who prevail with God are truly Israel—they are sanctified. Compare Gen. xxi, 12; Rom. ix, 7, with Matt. iii, 9; John viii, 39; Rom. iv, 11; Gal. iii, 7, 9. But it must be evident to every one that the rebellious, "carnal mind," cannot keep the Sabbath "according to the commandment." See Ex. xx, 8; Isa. lviii, 13.

If this sign (the Sabbath) was only given to the Jews, as some claim, then those who live in the present dispensation should not boast over them, as some do, since they enjoyed one privilege or blessing that nothing revealed compensates for the loss of; namely, the possession of a sign, and thereby the certain knowledge of their sanctification. Strike this from existence, and we search the sacred page in vain for its equivalent. How many are "deceiving and being deceived" in this day of strong delusions; and how precious to the humble soul the God-given sign of sanctification! In the light of this fact we could no sooner think that the Sabbath was a Jewish institution, than that sanctification was a Jewish grace, not fitted for the "Christian dispensation." It is, also, urged that the *reason* given for the observance of the Sabbath was one bearing only on the Jews; viz., deliverance from bondage; [Deut. v, 15;] but it is evident from the reading of the passage that Moses was rehearsing to them matters with which they were already acquainted. Thus in verses 4, 5, he says the Lord talked with them, and he stood between the Lord and them; and in verse 12, he tells them to keep the Sabbath-day to sanctify it, as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee; and that the Sabbath should be observed "that thy man-servant and thy maid-servant may rest as well as thou." This he urges on them by the consideration that they were servants in the land of Egypt—but this does not argue that the Sabbath was not "made for man," as the obligation to give rest to "thy man-servant, and thy maid-servant," is stated in the command as given by Jehovah. Ex. xx, 10. The Israelites had received the institution of the Passover to com-

memorate their deliverance from Egypt; [Ex. xii,] and Moses does not, in Deut. v, speak of observing the Sabbath as a memorial of that event. God speaks his law for "all the world," [Rom. iii, 19,] and, therefore, does not mention the deliverance from Egypt in the fourth commandment, but the creation of heaven and earth, and the rest and sanctification of the Sabbath, at the end of the first week of time.

But whatever may be urged against the fourth commandment on the ground of its being Jewish, may also be urged against other commandments, and with equal force. The Sabbath was "made for man" at creation; it was blessed and sanctified at that time; [Gen. ii, 1-3;] its sanctity was declared, and its observance enforced before the other precepts of the law were given from Mount Sinai. Ex. xvi. When spoken there it was called the Sabbath [Rest] of the Lord—not of the Jews—because he rested, before any distinction of Jew and Gentile could be known. Ex. xx, 11. It was made a sign of the knowledge of God, and their sanctification. Ex. xxxi, 13. After the passion of our Saviour is foretold in Isa. liii, and through him the faithfulness and surety of God's promises, [chap. liv,] the invitation is given to every one that thirsteth to come; and "nations that know not thee shall run unto thee;" [chap. lv,] therefore "the son of the stranger" may join himself to the Lord, and be brought to his holy mountain, and made joyful in his house of prayer, by keeping the Sabbath from polluting it, and taking hold of his covenant, for his house shall be called an house of prayer for all people; [chap. lvi,] after their unfaithfulness is re-proved, [chap. lvii,] and their hypocrisy, [chap. lviii, 1, 2,] he promises that they shall delight themselves in the Lord, and feed on the heritage of their father Jacob, [Israel,] if they turn away their feet from the Sabbath, from doing their pleasure on his holy day, &c. Verses 13, 14. Thus the Sabbath is brought down, by the prophets, beyond the first Advent of Christ, and to the coming of the nations to him, in the present dispensation. Christ never broke the Sabbath, though often falsely accused by the Jews, of so doing. And it is well worthy of note, that, while the Jews were untiring in their efforts to sustain charges against his disciples, no accusation of Sabbath-breaking was made after the crucifixion.

With this testimony compare the evidence for the fifth commandment. There is only one place, [Gen. ix,] from which even an inference could be drawn that this commandment was known before the Israelites came to Sinai. Here it was given, (as our opponents claim,) not to, or for, the world, but the Jews alone; consequently the motive presented for its observance must be peculiar to the Jews. And as the objection claims that the Sabbath was only for them, as they alone had been delivered from Egypt; so the fifth was only for them, as they alone were brought into the land of Canaan. See Ex. xx, 12. Paul speaks of this in Eph. vi, 2, as the "first commandment with promise;" but no promise is referred to but that given to the Jews on their way to Canaan. Can this be enforced on Gentiles in this dispensation, any more than the fourth commandment? And why need it? If fathers may break, with impunity, the fourth precept in God's holy covenant, may not their children, with equal propriety, break the fifth? See Mal. i, 6; ii, 7.

Again, it may as well be claimed that the second commandment is "modified" or "relaxed" under this dispensation, if not entirely "done away."

Idolatry may be manifested in various ways—the first commandment forbids it in general, the second in one particular. Then the argument may be stated thus, in the language of our opponents:—"These particular forms of prohibition were well enough for the Jewish dispensation, where they, no doubt, served their purpose; but they are altogether unsuitable for the present dispensation. If it is wrong to make and worship graven images now, that fact must be plainly stated in the New Testament. But the declarations of the Apostle forbid such an idea: he plainly declares that 'covetousness is idolatry,' and we do well not to be 'wise above what is written.'" It must be evident that those who endeavor to prove the abolition of God's holy Sabbath, cannot from the scriptures, enforce obedience on the part of their children, or convince the Pagan or Papist of sin. All the arguments generally used against the fourth commandment may also be urged against the first. Then the first, second, fourth and fifth would meet a like fate at the hands of those who, to avoid the observance of God's holy day, strike a death blow at his holy law, and endeavor to detract the justice and judgment which are the habitation of his throne.

Another method of avoiding the fourth precept in God's law, is to say that it was all the law of Moses; and Christ came and died to abolish it, and free us from its yoke. But I am unable to discover that Christ either came or died to abolish any law whatever. Would it not be a truly singular fact that God should give a law as a rule whereby moral agents were to develop their characters, so unfitted to the end for which it was given, that he was obliged to send his Son to die and release us from the obligation to keep it? This is not only making God such an one as themselves, but it is bringing him, unchangeable as he has declared himself to be, far below our sense of right and justice. But there is no such thing found in the Word of God. "Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures." Sin existed before the Levitical law. To say that Christ died to abolish the law of Moses, is like saying that the traveler pursues his journey expressly to pass the mile-stones. He travels to reach a certain destination, and the mile-stones must necessarily be left behind. That was a system of types and shadows—when the substance is reached we follow the shadow no further. But there must be a substance before a shadow can be cast. Christ was as a lamb "slain from the foundation of the world." Rev. xiii, 8. He did not come to die, merely because that system of types was instituted; and needed to be removed; but that was instituted because he was coming to die. The objection reverses the true order of things, by placing the cause for the effect; and must arise from taking a very superficial view of the work of our Saviour. In connection with this, it has been said that the law which governed men under the former dispensation was faulty, and Christ came to take it away and introduce a better. This objection is raised from a perversion of Heb. viii, in making the "first covenant, read *first law*. We have before shown that the term covenant is used in different senses, and the remarks of the Apostle on the two covenants, which may be noticed hereafter, forbid the idea that any candid searcher for truth should be so mistaken. Before his death the Saviour prayed, "O, my Father if it be possible let this cup pass from me." But it was not possible. He drank the cup prepared and embittered by our sins. But if our sins were the transgressions of an imperfect, faulty law, all must admit that the law might have been got aside, and the transgressor freed from its yoke, without the death of the Son of God. And indeed it admits of a query, whether the transgression of a faulty, good-for-nothing law is morally wrong.—In such a case the fault need not be reckoned on the part of the transgressor, but on the part of the Law-giver. If God gave man a faulty, imperfect law, which had a curse necessarily attached to it, as some claim, and man failed to develop a perfect, moral character under it, and was thereby lost, where would the blame rest? And would not God, under such circumstances, be unrighteous in taking vengeance? Rom. iii, 8.

That the law of moral precept, the transgression of which produced the death of the Son of God, is distinct from that law of types and shadows, which was instituted in view of his death, is so plainly revealed in the scriptures, that it would seem impossible for any candid Bible student to deny it.—Yet it is denied; and as we have quoted passages to show the perfect agreement of writers and speakers of the two testaments, when referring to God's holy law, it may be profitable to show their different methods of speaking of that and the ceremonial, or Levitical law.

MORAL LAW.

Ps. xix, 11.—In keeping of them. (commandments) there is great reward.

Ps. xix, 7.—The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul.

Matt. v, 19.—Whosoever, therefore, shall break one of these least commandments and teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do, and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.

Ps. cxix, 152.—Concerning thy testimonies, I have known of old that thou hast founded them forever. See verse 160.

Rom. vii, 14.—For we know that the law is spiritual.

If one and the same law is spoken of in all these passages, then we may well despair of ever arriving at correct conclusions from such contradictory statements. By comparing Matt. v, 19, with Acts xv, 24, it will be seen that if the same law is referred to, the Apostles have deprived themselves of the promised blessing "in the kingdom of heaven;" but when we consider that the "law of Moses" was the subject of debate in the Apostolic council, all is plain. See Acts xv, 5-10.

It is plain that Christ did not die to abolish any law; [Matt. v, 17-19;] but to redeem us from the transgression of his Father's law, that the sinner condemned to death, [Rom. vi, 23,] should not perish, but have everlasting life. John iii, 16.—If the next position of the objector is true, viz., that he came to introduce a new and better law, then we may safely say his mission was completely a failure; for no such law is found in the teachings of Christ or his apostles. Here we will venture the assertion that *no new principle of morality is taught in the New Testament*. Then where is that law better than the perfect one previously given? None of the scriptures pretend that Christ came as a law-giver, but as a Saviour from sin.—Neither can it be true that he altered or relaxed the law of God in any particular. But if that was abolished, what became of the first commandment? The answer to this question, as an opposer gave it to me, was, that only the ceremonial part of the law (the fourth precept) was abolished, and the remainder greatly enlarged—that the principle of the first commandment could be discovered in the writings of the apostles. Then in the former dispensation, it was fully declared in definite terms: in the present, we must endeavor to trace the principle in the writings of the apostles, who do not make any particular mention of it. An enlarge-

CEREMONIAL LAW.

Heb. vii, 18.—For verily there is a disannulling of the commandment going before for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof.

Heb. x, 1.—For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offer year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect.

Acts xv, 24.—Forasmuch as we have heard that certain which went out from us have troubled you with words, subverting your souls, saying, Be circumcised and keep the law, (see verse 5,) to whom we gave no such commandment.

Heb. ix, 10.—Which stood only in meats and drinks, and carnal ordinances imposed on them till the time of reformation.

Heb. vii, 11.—Who is made, not after the law of a carnal commandment.

ment truly from definite to indefinite! Part of a perfect law abolished—other parts obscured, and thus it is incomparably better than it was before! But inasmuch as that is the only moral code ever given, and the New Testament brings to light no new principles of morality, but only ratifies and establishes those taught in the old, [see Matt. v, 17-19; Rom. iii, 31; 2 Tim. iii, 15-17,] can those who say that law was for the Jews only, show that any moral law was ever given to the Gentiles? or prove that the Gentile world was ever designed to be placed under moral restraint? And if the offence of the Jews, as has been shown from the scriptures, was the transgression of that law, what hinders their restoration to the favor of God, if that law is abolished?

But if it could be shown that another law had been given in the New Testament, why should it be called a *better law* than that given on Mount Sinai? Could it be more just in its nature?—That was perfect. Could it be more replete with moral obligations? That embraced the whole duty of man. Could its observance tend to better results? That was ordained to life. Rom. vii, 10; Lev. xviii, 5; Eze. xx, 11; Matt. xix, 17. Is it contended that that produced the death of the transgressor, [Rom. vi, 23,] inasmuch that it is even called death, [2 Cor. iii, 7,] because all have transgressed it? Rom. iii, 23. We would then inquire, Has God ever promised life to the disobedient, even in the New Testament? Does the Gospel justify all, without distinction of character?—They boast of the Gospel of Christ as though it was impossible for the most incorrigible sinner to die, since the ushering in of the present dispensation. But can they show that the law would ever curse those who obeyed it? Or, that the Gospel will save those who disobey it? 2 Thess. i, 7, 8. The light of the Gospel results in the condemnation of those who reject it. John iii, 19. Jesus said, "If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin; but now they have a cloak for their sin." John xv, 22. Could not the Jews, therefore, claim, with equal propriety, that the Gospel of Christ was a curse unto them? Again, Paul says of himself and fellow-laborers in the Gospel, [2 Cor. ii, 15, 16,] that they are unto God a sweet savor of Christ in them that perish—even the savor of death unto death. Why do not our opponents reject the Gospel for all these things? But further, if that law was perfect, embracing in its requirements the whole duty of man, (and so it must have been, or the scriptures are not true,) then every principle of morality that could arise out of our relation to God or our fellow-men must have been embraced in it. To suppose otherwise, were to suppose that God did not require holiness under the past dispensation; but this supposition is contradicted by his Word. Lev. xi, 44. If all the moral duties growing out of our relation to God and our fellow-creatures were included in that, then none remained to be added thereafter; and if that be abolished, and another substituted, the one substituted must be as extensive in its requirements as that was, or else it would not include the whole duty of man, and hence would be imperfect; but such a law (an imperfect one) will not be contended for. Therefore we will consider it granted that the *new law* must be as comprehensive as the old one. But it is not possible to even imagine how such a thing can be, unless the two laws are exactly alike! I can no more comprehend the existence of two complete, perfect rules of moral action, both embracing the whole duty of man, yet different, than I can comprehend the existence of two supreme Deities, both essentially holy in their natures, yet not alike.—And we hazard nothing in saying that it is just as impossible for God to create two different, complete rules of moral action, as to create a duplicate of himself. An examination of this declaration is only needed to satisfy any one of its correctness.

The Apostle Peter, exhorting to obedience and holiness, says, [1 Pet. i, 15, 16,] "But as he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation. Because it is written; Be ye holy, for I am holy." See Lev. xi, 44; xix, 2; xx, 26. Is not the requirement for holiness the same in both Testaments? We are required to be

holy, because God is holy, and we are to be like him. So the Saviour said: "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." Matt. v, 48. And this is not an unreasonable requirement—only equivalent to that of loving God with all the heart. It is an acknowledged law of the human mind that man is assimilated to the object of his worship. If he worships a being of a depraved character, the more he contemplates the character of that being—the more he loves it, the more degraded and depraved he becomes.—Witness the heathen nations, who worship monstrous beings of various kinds, and themselves become monsters of depravity. On the other hand, if the object of his worship is possessed of a pure and lovely character, the more worshipful and devoted he is, the more loving he will become in temper and disposition. An intelligent being, possessed of creative power—in other words, being supreme—must have the right to command the worship of his creatures; and if so, to prescribe also the form of worship; (without which the command would be a nullity; his own character being an index to the form of worship prescribed.—The character of God is declared in the passages referred to—he is holy; and also in 1 John iv, 8, "God is love." These declarations of the character of God, are a sufficient guarantee that a system or form of worship, or rule of action, required by him, would be perfect, holy, like his own character, the embodiment of love. For such a being to require the creature to love and adore him, is only to provide for the creature's own best good—to point out the way whereby the created being may be like his Creator—pure, lovely, holy, and of course, happy. The idea of obedience to right laws tending to the happiness of the moral agent, has been beautifully illustrated by a late writer:

"Happiness depends on the state of our minds, and the feelings which are prevalent there. Now the law of God prescribes exactly that class of affections, and that only, which invariably and necessarily produces enjoyment in the existence and exercise of them—Love. 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, with all thy mind, and with all thy strength; and thy neighbor as thyself.' And so 'love is the fulfilling of the law.'

"Allow the imagination to bring such a state of mind before you as your own; just try the experiment of imagining how you would feel, if every selfish, unlovely emotion, had become utterly extinct, leaving no trace behind, and pure love to all beings animated your breast; the heart filled with holy love and reverence for God, so that you exulted in your relation to him, and delighted in all his will; love to God supremely, and to all his creatures subordinately—why, your cup would be full to overflowing, and you would be ready to shout aloud for joy. Thus admirably is God's law adapted to secure the perfect happiness of every one that observes it. Thanks be to God for such a law!" *Dobney, pages 46, 47.*

That God designed that his creatures should ultimately be holy and happy, none can deny; and that observance to his law was the appointed means for the attainment of this very desirable end, is equally evident from the reasons and scriptures offered above, and other scriptures declaring that righteousness consists in keeping the law. Deut. vi, 25. His law is the transcript of his own divine mind—the revelation of his holy will. The keeping of his law is his own prescribed form of worship; and no worship is acceptable without it.—Therefore he says, "He that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer shall be abomination." Prov. xxviii, 9; see also, Matt. xv, 9. How can any one become like God—holy—without worshipping him? And how can any one worship him and not keep his commandments?—These contain his own prescribed rule, or standard of holiness. But if that law was the rule whereby man might become like God, holy, in the former dispensation, can any other rule be followed in this dispensation, and the agent still develop a holy character? Or in other words, has God's holiness changed in its nature, or is it the same that it was

in times past? Thus we see there is a material point at issue. As God requires his creatures to be holy, he must give them a rule whereby they may become holy. But if there are two rules essentially different in the two dispensations, then the holiness attained by the two must be essentially different, as it is impossible to arrive at the same point by going in different directions. Thus it is shown that a change of the moral law of God involves a change of the divine perfections, which is a manifest absurdity.

The testimony given to show that God's holy covenant of ten commandments reaches into the New Testament, we consider perfectly conclusive; while there is not the least evidence to show that Christ, in his teachings, referred to any other law than that spoken of by David, Solomon, and the prophets; nor that the apostles referred to any other (moral) law than that spoken of by the Saviour in Matt. v, and other places. As no line of distinction is drawn by any of them, it is evident that no distinction exists. It is spoken of in the same terms, as possessed of the same nature, its observance securing the same blessings, its violation attended with the same fatal consequences. Christ, in his teachings, never referred to any law to be developed in the future, but always spoke of one as then existing. In Matt. v, 17, he said that he came not to destroy the law or the prophets. The minds of the people who heard this sermon, [chap. vii, 28,] must have reverted to the law written in their scriptures, as readily as to the prophets in the same; and the more so as he quotes from the Decalogue, and declares that he who breaks the least of these commandments, shall be least in the kingdom of heaven. (Not the Jewish church or dispensation.)

Some stress has been laid on the word *fulfill*, as though in fulfilling the law he abolished, or did it away. But he said he came not to destroy it, and I am unable to discover any difference between abolishing a law and destroying it. When a law is abolished what further can be done to destroy it? Then it is supposed, or at least argued, that we are not under obligation to observe any part of the law that was not plainly re-established, or re-enacted since the crucifixion. We have already shown how fatal that would be to other moral precepts beside the fourth commandment. In Matt. vii, 12, the Saviour testifies to the perfect agreement between the law and the Gospel; and, also, in chap. xxii, 37-40, he shows that they are the same in essence—resting on the same fundamental principles. In chap. v, 17, he speaks of the law and the prophets in the same manner: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets. I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill." Then the same conclusion should be drawn in reference to the law and the prophets: if the law is abolished, so also the prophets; and we should no longer quote from the prophecies of the Old Testament, or only so far as they are re-established, in plain terms, in the New Testament. But this our no-law friends will not agree to: they quote as readily from the Old Testament to sustain their theories, as any other class. But the scriptures do not justify the conclusion that in fulfilling the law he did it away, abolished, or made it void; and those who urge an objection on the word *fulfill*, change the issue when they come to other passages. Thus, when James speaks of the "royal law," they deny that it means the Decalogue, but the simple declaration, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Then to bring their two positions together it would read thus: "If ye abolish the royal law according to the Scriptures, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, ye do well." See, also, Matt. iii, 15; Gal. vi, 2; Rom. xiii, 8-10. By an examination of the above scriptures, it will be seen, that any argument that would prove that Christ abolished the law, and released us from the obligation to keep it, by fulfilling it, would also prove a total release from all moral obligation, and that by our own action, independent of the assistance of our Saviour to abolish moral principles for us!

The words of our Saviour as recorded in Matt. xxii, 37-40, are often quoted to prove that he dis-

carded the old law of ten precepts or commandments, and substituted a new one of two precepts; but on examination it will be found that his words plainly prove the contrary. Instead of bringing in any new law or principles, he quotes Deut. vi, 5, and Lev. xix, 18, and says, *On these hang all the law.* He does not say, in this dispensation *these are all the law*; but that *all the law depends on them.* [Whiting, Campbell.] Then *all the law* must, of course, be something more than these.—Our opponents will doubtless admit that the first three, and last six commandments in the Decalogue naturally depend on these two principles. If a man says he loves his poor neighbor, and will yet see him suffer cold or hunger without giving of his abundance the things that his neighbor needs, we can have no confidence in his profession;—if he loved him he would minister to his necessities; [Jas. ii, 14-16,] and if *any one* of these six precepts is violated, it shows a want of love to our fellow-men; as these commandments grow out of our relation to one another. So it will be acknowledged that if any man breaks the first three commandments, or either of them, he is wanting in love to God, as they depend on this principle. But when the first three are fully observed, the principle of love to God is not yet fulfilled, as developed by the words of the Saviour above quoted. He says not that *three-fourths*, or *nine-tenths* of the law depend on these two great commandments, but *all the law*; and no one can deny that the Sabbath commandment is in the law. Hence, the Sabbath depends on those principles as surely as any other moral precept. And as the observance of the last six manifests our love to our fellow-creatures, growing out of our relation to one another, so the observance of the first four, shows our love to God, because they *all* grow out of our relation to him, as our Creator, and Supreme Moral Governor; and no one can show that the principle of this first great commandment would not be violated by polluting the Lord's holy Sabbath, as much as by profaning his holy name.

[To be continued.]

The seventh day of the week is the only weekly Sabbath of God's appointment.

My third reason for believing this proposition is, That Christ and his Apostles honored this day; and did not intimate that it would ever cease to be the Sabbath, but the contrary.

1. Christ honored this day.

Luke iv, 16. "And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up: and, as his custom was he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath-day and stood up for to read."

Luke iv, 30, 31. (See also Mark i, 21.) "But he, passing through the midst of them, went his way, and came down to Capernaum, a city of Galilee, and taught them on the Sabbath-days."

Luke xiii, 10. "And he was teaching in one of the synagogues on the Sabbath."

Mark iii, 1, 2. "And he entered again into the synagogue; and there was a man there which had a withered hand. And they watched him whether he would heal him on the Sabbath-day."

Mark vi, 2. "And when the Sabbath-day was come, he began to teach in the synagogue."

2. The Apostles honored this day. Read carefully the following passages and their contexts.

Acts xiii, 14. "But when they departed from Perga, they came to Antioch in Pisidia, and went into the synagogue on the Sabbath-day, and sat down."

Acts xiii, 44. "And the next Sabbath-day came almost the whole city together to hear the word of God." (That is, to hear Paul and Barnabas preach.)

Acts xiv, 1. "And it came to pass in Iconium, that they (Paul and Barnabas) went both together into the synagogue of the Jews, and so spake, that a great multitude, both of the Jews, and also of the Greeks, believed."

Acts xvi, 23. "And on the Sabbath we went out of the city by a river side, where prayer was wont to be made; and we sat down, and spake unto the women which resorted thither."

Acts xvii, 9. "And Paul, as his manner was,

went in unto them, and three Sabbath-days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures."

Acts xviii, 4. "And he (Paul) reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks."

Brethren, if you produce one solitary apostolic example of unnecessary labor performed on the seventh day, I will at once give up the argument in its favor.

3. Neither Christ nor his Apostles intimated that the seventh day would cease to be the Sabbath.

This being a negative assertion, I am not bound to prove it, of course. If you assert that they did, I demand the proof of it.

4. Christ very plainly intimated the contrary.

Matt. xxiv, 20. "But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath-day."

The "flight" here spoken of was to take place about the time of the destruction of Jerusalem; and the Saviour admonishes his disciples to pray that it might not happen on the Sabbath-day. Now, if he knew that the Sabbath-day would be changed into the "Lord's day," forty years before the event he had just alluded to, why did he speak of it as a thing that would be then in existence? Many are the efforts that have been made to evade the force of the argument from this text; but they are all unavailing.

Matt. v, 17, 19. "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven."

It is almost universally admitted, that the Saviour, in these verses, refers principally to the ten commandments, which were then, as now, called, by way of preeminence, "the law."

That the fourth commandment enjoins the sanctification of the seventh day of the week, no man in his senses denies. But you alledge that that part of it has been taken away, so that it does not now bind us.

Now, in making this assertion, you either affirm what is positively denied in the above quotation, or you make this commandment at least partly ceremonial, and peculiar to the Jews. This will appear evident from the following considerations:

First—The command to keep holy the seventh day of the week, is far more than "one jot or one tittle" of this law. It could be no less, but it is much more. Indeed, it is very certain, that Adam considered it a very important part of the law; and so did Christ, when he uttered these words, for he kept the Sabbath as devoutly as Adam ever did.

Second—Heaven and earth have not yet passed away; but you say that this seventh-day law has; therefore, much more than "one jot or one tittle" has passed from the law—which is contrary to Christ's assertion.

Third—If you say that Christ has fulfilled this law, and so taken it away, you make it a ceremony, like the Passover. You know that Christ never fulfilled, so as to take away, any law but those that he "nailed to his cross," and that he never nailed to his cross any law that bindeth "all men in all ages." If, then, the law requiring the sanctification of the seventh day of the week has been nailed to the cross of Christ, it must have been a ceremony peculiar to the Jews, to which the Gentiles were never bound. Was Adam a Jew? Was Enoch a Jew? Were Noah and his sons Jews? But these all kept the seventh day, and no other.

Brethren, it has been proved, in the first chapter of this treatise, that the fourth commandment requires simply the observance of the seventh day of the week. I will not repeat what is there said. I now ask you, as candid inquirers after truth, to place this commandment and our Saviour's decla-

tions, quoted above, side by side, and see if your conduct is not at war with both. You neglect the only day that God's law requires you to remember, while Christ assures you, in the most solemn manner, that "one jot or one tittle" shall in no wise pass from the law, "till heaven and earth pass," or till time shall be no more.

There is a little commandment in that law that says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work."—Christ says, that whosoever doeth and teacheth this commandment "shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." But this hath been my only crime. God knows, and you know, that the only thing I have done to offend you is, that I endeavor to refrain from doing work on the seventh day, and to "teach men so." Yet for this I am declared to be the "least in the kingdom of heaven," and no longer worthy of a seat at the table of Him who said, that "one jot or one tittle" should in no wise pass from the law.

Blessed be God! it is a light thing to be judged of man's judgment. But I confess that sometimes my blood runs cold, when I think of this solemn declaration of the same "Lord of the Sabbath," (John xii, 48.) "He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day." "Never man spake like this man. O, brethren, are you ready for that awful judgment day? Nothing but God's word will avail you there. If you are determined to go on, appropriating the seventh day to secular purposes, and "teaching men so," I cannot help it; but I call heaven and earth to witness, that, in regard to every reader of these pages, my skirts are henceforth clear. On your own souls will rest the responsibility of rejecting these solemn words of Christ. And you who are ministers—how will you answer for the wanderings of those lambs of Christ's fold, whom you are leading into strange pastures?—From *Vindication of the True Sabbath*, by J. W. Morton.

THE REVIEW AND HERALD.

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

ROCHESTER, THIRD DAY, NOV. 15, 1853.

REVIEW AND HERALD.

WE call the attention of our readers to the terms of the REVIEW as stated on the last page. Our circulation is increased, so that if each subscriber should pay \$1.50 a year, our expenses would be met. With 4000 paying subscribers, we should be able to publish the REVIEW for \$1.00 a year.

Brethren and Sisters: The REVIEW list can be increased to 4000 in a short time, if you all will try to get one or more new subscribers. When this shall be accomplished you will be able to offer the REVIEW to such as choose to pay for it, for only \$1.00 a year. When we have 3000 subscribers, the price shall be changed to \$1.25 a year, and when it shall be increased to 4000, it shall be changed to \$1.00 a year. To accomplish this worthy object, let all the friends of the present truth do their best. We are certainly under the most solemn obligation to spread the truth as extensively as possible.

The Seventy Weeks.

The following is from a leaf entitled, *Word of Warning*, No. 1. It was published in 1843 by J. V. Himes.

"We claim that the ninth of Daniel is an appendix to the eighth, and that the seventy weeks and the 2300 days or years commence together. Our opponents deny this.

Again the writer says in No. 2:—

"THE SEVENTY WEEKS. This was given to Daniel, as recorded in Dan. ix, as an explanation of the 2300 days, from which they were cut off. Sixty-nine of these weeks, 7 multiplied by 69, equal to 483 years, were to reach to the Messiah, and to begin with the going forth of the decree to rebuild Jerusalem. This decree, according to Ezra vii, was given in the 7th year of Artaxerxes Longimanus, b. c. 457."

If the beginning of the 2300 days is not given in Dan. ix, is it any where given? If not given at all,

then of what profit are the 2300 days? If they reach to the second coming of Christ, and no starting point given in the Bible to reckon them from, shall we not have to wait till Christ comes before we can understand them—then count back 2300 years to find their beginning?!!

"All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable;" and was given for our profit before (not after) Christ comes. And in order for the prophecy of the 2300 days to profit, their beginning must be revealed.

The arguments in favor of the 70 weeks being the first 490 years of the 2300, and that they commenced b. c. 457, are unanswerable. This brings the end of the 2300 prophetic days in 1844. Christ did not then come as expected; but this does not prove that the days did not there end. The cleansing of the Sanctuary is the event to occur at the end of the days. This event is not the Second Advent, but an event preceding it.

EASTERN TOUR.

NEW HAVEN CONFERENCE. This meeting was held in the school-house near Bro. E. Everts'. As the weather was cold and stormy, but few of the brethren from other parts of Vermont assembled. The company present, however, was not small; about as many as could be entertained, and seated in the small school-house. The meeting at first moved quite heavily; but near its close the brethren began to get free. The Word was spoken with freedom. Our last meeting was indeed a precious season. The subject of going home, to the saints' eternal home, was dwelt upon by most of the many who spoke of their joys and their hopes. The meeting closed at half past eight in the evening, and the brethren went into Bro. Everts' house to consider some church matters; but two repenting, weeping sinners followed us. They wept aloud. We gave them a chance to speak, then prayed for them; and they prayed for themselves.—Again the Spirit of God was poured out upon us, and the brethren continued to speak and rejoice till about 11 o'clock. We then had a meeting of two hours, in which time the wants of the cause were considered. And it was decided that there were those present that should be ordained to the work of the Gospel ministry, and that there were those (not present) who profess to teach the present truth, who were not worthy of the confidence of the church, as teachers. At 1 o'clock at night we adjourned to 8 o'clock in the morning, when the subject of ordination was again taken up. And it was the unanimous expression of all present that our dear Bro. J. N. Andrews, A. S. Hutchins and C. W. Sperry, should be set apart to the work of the ministry (that they might feel free to administer the ordinances of the church of God) by prayer and the laying on of hands. And as Bro. Joseph Baker and the writer performed the solemn duty, the Holy Ghost came down upon us. There, bowed before God, we wept together, also rejoiced.

It was then decided that the cause in Vermont required that other brethren in different parts of the State, who labor more or less publicly, should also be set apart by the laying on of hands, that they might administer the ordinances of the gospel. It was the unanimous expression of all present, that Bro. E. P. Butler of Waterbury, Elon Everts of New Haven, and Josiah Hart of Northfield, should thus be set apart. And while engaged in this most solemn duty, the presence of the Lord was indeed manifested. We never witnessed a more melting, precious season.—The very atmosphere around us seemed sweet as heaven. How cheering to the Christian to know that his honest endeavors to do his duty are owned and blest of Heaven!

The brethren felt it their duty to express their opinion relative to Ezra Eastman and J. R. Towle, who profess to observe the Sabbath, and teach the present truth. All were agreed in expressing their disapproval of their past injudicious course, as they have traveled among the brethren; and that they do not consider them proper persons to teach the present truth. And while they travel from place to place

(doing no real good, but, rather, harm,) apparently to get their living, they are unworthy the confidence of the people of God.

Probably the cause has suffered more by individuals moving out of their place, and taking upon themselves the work to teach, than by any other cause.—Satan, doubtless, pushes out some to take this stand, while some others, less conscientious are tempted by the loaves and fishes to go from place to place among the brethren. The cause in Vermont has suffered in consequence of some such drones.

The brethren in the vicinity of New Haven have suffered severe trials in times past in consequence of the course pursued by Henry Allen, and Wm. Mayhew who is now in the West. Allen now teaches the no-Sabbath heresy. Our brethren in the West should understand that the brethren in Vermont have no confidence in Wm. Mayhew as a religious teacher.

Says Paul: "Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which ye received of us.

For ourselves know how ye ought to follow us: for we behaved not ourselves disorderly among you; neither did we eat any man's bread for nought; but wrought with labor and travail night and day, that we might not be chargeable to any of you. Not because we have not power, but to make ourselves an ensample unto you to follow us.

For even when we were with you, this we commanded you, that if any would not work, neither should he eat. For we hear that there are some which walk among you disorderly, working not at all, but are busybodies. Now them that are such we command and exhort by our Lord Jesus Christ, that with quietness they work, and eat their own bread. But ye, brethren, be not weary in well-doing. And if any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed." 2 Thess. iii, 6-14.

The good old gospel rule is certainly excellent in disposing of these weights and burdens to the cause. Says the Apostle: "Them that sin rebuke before all, that others also may fear." 1 Tim. v, 20.

We would not say a word to discourage the conscientious, trembling soul, who is being moved upon by the Spirit of God to labor publicly in the cause of God. We would say to such, go forward trusting in the Lord. Those called of the Lord, who are in the work, will desire to labor where the present truth has not been named, instead of entering into the labors of others. They will not spend their time in going from place to place among the brethren where there is little or nothing for them to do.

Brethren in Wisconsin.

IN the REVIEW for Sept. 8th, we mentioned the short notice of the Koskonong meeting, which caused Bro. Phelps and others a severe trial; also our many cares and trials upon us, with our poor health, as the cause of our mistake in the appointment in the REVIEW at so late a period. We also wrote a letter of explanation to Bro. Cornell for Bro. Phelps and others. We find among the letters received in our absence the following satisfactory and cheering statement from Bro. Phelps. May the Lord bless him and the dear brethren in the West. Brethren, let us stand together, with the armor on; the battle is short; victory is sure; and the reward, who can tell!

Letter from Bro. Phelps.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—I received a line from Bro. Waggoner's last Sixth-day, and with it your letter to Bro. Cornell, giving an explanation of matters concerning the appointment of our Conference at Koskonong, last June. It was satisfactory, perfectly so. We were disappointed at the time of the conference very much, that the appointment was not out. Some of the friends at the time put some blame on me for it; but I believe it is generally understood now, and all are satisfied. I feel to regret that I did not write immediately and let you know about it; for if I had, it would have saved you some trials of mind, and you could have given an explanation which would have been satisfactory. Will you forgive me for my neg-

ligence? I know that I have not at all times realized as I should the care which is upon you, or the trials through which you pass. I feel to press my way on and "never stand still till the Master appear."

WATERMAN PHELPS.

Oakhill, Wis., Oct., 1853.

THE TWO-HORNED BEAST.

BY N. MEAD.

"AND I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth, and he had two horns like a lamb, and he spake as a dragon. And he exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him, and causeth the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed." Rev. xiii, 11, 12.

After what time is he seen coming up? In this prophecy, John tells us that he saw a beast coming up out of the earth, that caused the earth and them which dwelt therein to worship the first beast. When does he, the two horned beast, cause them to worship the first beast? Evidently, after the first beast is wounded, and his deadly wound healed; as the last clause of verse 12, says, "And causeth the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed." Then he was seen by John, coming up, after the first beast was wounded. To learn when this was, we must ascertain when the first beast received a deadly wound. In speaking of the first beast, he refers to the beast he saw having seven heads, given in this chapter, verse 7. Verse 3, says, "And I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death; and his deadly wound was healed."

We will for convenience, term this the blasphemous beast, as it is called. It is our object in this article, more particularly to ascertain if we can from the symbols of this prophecy, which one of the seven heads of this blasphemous beast was made dead. Because after it is wounded, the two horned beast comes up. And it is after the wound is given, that the image to the first beast is made, spoken of in verse 14.

We have no means in this chapter by which to tell which head was made dead; because the heads of this beast are not explained here. We are not told here what these heads symbolize. We shall therefore, be obliged to find an explanation some where else. Verse 2, says, "And the dragon gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority." But when he did it, we cannot tell by this symbol alone. Whether he gave it to his fourth, fifth, sixth, or seventh head, we are not told here. There was but one of the seven heads wounded. We will now bring forward the dragon of chapter xii, of whom he gets his power.—The dragon symbolizes Pagan Rome, which exercised the authority, when the man-child was born who was to rule all nations with a rod of iron. Rev. xii, 5. The dragon is also given as having seven heads. But we are not told here what they represent. Therefore we cannot tell by him alone when he gives his power to the beast. We find in chapter xvii, the symbol of another beast, scarlet-colored, on which the woman sits, having seven heads and ten horns. Just the same number of heads and horns that the dragon and the blasphemous beast have each. And we conclude they represent the same on those two symbols first noticed, that they do on this beast. We would say here, that as the dragon was in existence when Christ was born, wishing to destroy him, we conclude he commenced with the rise of the Roman kingdom; or, at least, the seven heads did. And it is understood he symbolizes Rome in pagan form, or the civil power and their pagan religion united, he, of course, bears rule until he gives up his form of religion; and then he gives his seat to the blasphemous beast. It will also be understood that this scarlet beast commences with the rise of Rome.

Now for an explanation of the seven heads of the scarlet beast. The angel says, "The seven heads are seven mountains on which the woman sitteth, and they [Whiting's Translation] are seven kings: five are fallen, and one is, and the other is not yet come." Rev. xvii, 9, 10. How shall we understand the seven

heads which the angel says are seven mountains? Can they be literal mountains? The angel said, five had fallen. Had five literal mountains fallen on which Rome stood? If so, there was a mountain to come up after John had his vision: the seventh. Again: Could a literal mountain be wounded to death by a sword? No one for a moment will suppose them literal mountains. They are called seven kings also. Therefore the seven mountains and the seven kings, are of the same character as the seven heads, symbolizing the seven different and successive forms of government in the Roman kingdom. As we have learned what the heads are given to represent, we will now with the heads of the scarlet beast, try to ascertain which head of the blasphemous beast received power of the dragon. This we know: The dragon has the power first, as he gives it to the beast, or it could not be said he gave it to him. Now dear reader let us bring before our minds, the symbols of the two beasts, and also of the dragon; all three having seven heads. The angel said of the scarlet beast, "Five heads are fallen, one is, the other is not yet come."

1. Five are fallen. 2. And one is. 3. And the other is not yet come.

1. Of the five that are fallen. We learn that five had fallen before John had his vision, as the angel said. Then let us imagine five heads taken off from the symbol of the scarlet beast, five from the dragon, also five from the blasphemous beast. Then the rule of five heads of these symbols was in the past when John had his vision. Did the dragon give his power to the beast when his fifth head fell? He did not; as we shall find in noticing the sixth head.

2. Of the head that was, when John talked with the angel. If the fifth had fallen from all these symbols, the one that the angel said then was, must be the sixth head; and that one, the sixth, of the dragon, was the head or form of government, Imperial Pagan Rome, that sought to devour the man-child as soon as it was born: it being the dragon, or Pagan Rome, which put Christ to death; and his sixth head as we have shown by the head that then was, in John's day, on the scarlet beast, and also on the dragon, proves that when the fifth head of the dragon fell, he did not then give his power to the beast; because there was no change of religion in the sixth, from that of the fifth: both being pagan. We doubt not that John could say when he was put into the chaldron of boiling oil, the dragon had not given his power up, even then, in his day; and certainly not at the end of the fifth. The fifth, gave his power to the sixth. Now as the sixth existed in John's day, and that was Imperial Pagan Rome, as we know, the dragon had not given up his power then; but how shall we find it when the sixth falls. It will be seen that when the seventh head of the scarlet beast came, the sixth had fallen.

3. And the other is not yet come. Why? because the sixth was then ruling, and continued his rule through John's day; and after him more than four hundred years. After that the other, the seventh, came. We will now imagine the sixth head taken from our symbols, the two beasts, and also the dragon, and the seventh to appear. Shall we find a change of religion here in the Roman kingdom as we shall of the form of ruling? We shall. It is very well known, that when the form of rule which was in John's time, the sixth head, was changed, pagan religion ceased. Therefore the ending of the rule of the sixth head of the dragon, is the time when he gave his power to the beast. At that time he gave up his kind of religion, idolatry, and the beast gets the power, and sets up his religion. The sixth head of the dragon gave his power and seat to the seventh head of the blasphemous beast. Then the first six heads of the beast had no power; they were dead heads we may say; as his seventh was, after it was made so by the sword. So also we conclude, as the sixth head of the dragon gave his power, seat and great authority to the seventh head of the beast, his own seventh head is to be considered dead, not having the power. Then it was on

this wise: The emperors, the sixth head, were the last of the dragon's rule. Pagan rites and ceremonies were then taken away, and kingly rule and the papal religion established.

Read 2 Thess. ii, 3-7. Paul saw that the dragon then withheld the power from the beast. He (the sixth head) hindered, and would, until taken out of the way; and then he should give it to the one that exalted himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped. This is like the blasphemous beast, and the same. The seventh head, or Papacy, received his power, A. D. 538: the only head that had power on this beast; and it was the only head that could be wounded; for taking away what the dragon gave, was killing him; and restoring it again, was healing him. When was the seventh head wounded to death? Verse 5, says, "And power was given unto him to make war forty-two months." He received power 538; was to make war 1260 years; then he was to be killed with a sword: which brings us to 1798. It is well known that Papacy received its wound at that time. Although healed, he is not to make war with the saints after the forty-two months. We think it is evident which head was wounded; viz., the seventh; for the dragon had the power during his sixth head. But says one, perhaps not: how do you know but that it might be the fifth head of the dragon that gave his power to the beast? In this way we know: If the dragon's heads represent the same as the scarlet-colored beast, we know by what the angel said to John, as we have stated: we repeat it; said he, Five are fallen, and one is. Now if the fifth had fallen the one that then was, must be the sixth. Now apply this language to the dragon. Five are fallen and one is now; which was the sixth. And was it not the dragon and the same head of the dragon that sought to devour the man-child as soon as he was born, that was ruling while John was on the isle of Patmos. It certainly was. Then it is certain which head of the dragon gave his authority to the blasphemous beast. And as we know when the seventh head of the beast was wounded, we know after what time the two-horned beast exercises power; because it is not said that he exercised power before the first beast was wounded; and we know, too, that healing the first beast does not make another beast of him, having only two horns, as some say; but he has still ten horns. Still further; another, and a second, cannot be the first but altogether a distinct beast. Then after the wounding we may look for the two-horned beast, and not before.

What power was seen rising, at the time the beast received the wound, answering to the symbol of the two-horned beast? Could it in any way be the wounded beast restored? We answer, No, for this reason: It is said that the second beast works miracles in the sight of the first beast: showing two distinct beasts, both having power at the same time. Was it any government where either of the ten horns bear rule? It was not; for all ten rose before the first beast himself came into power, and before he was wounded, of course; because he could not be wounded until after he had received power. The ten horns came up during the rule of the sixth head of the dragon. Then no power was seen coming up at the time the beast was wounded, where these ten kingdoms exist.

It is evident that this power is none other than the government of these United States. It was at that time rising and has ever since been increasing in power.

We have been through with an examination of the symbols, and we see no difficulty in determining which head of the first beast received power of the dragon, and was wounded; also, when it was done. We believe the honest and inquiring saint need not be in the dark respecting this. That the two-horned beast comes up after the head is wounded, is according to the prophecy; and he makes the image to the first beast; which is yet to be done. As the saints who lived during the reign of the dragon, overcame him

by the blood of the Lamb and the word of their testimony, may the Lord grant us grace that we may overcome the blasphemous beast and also his image in the same way.

Washington, N. H., 1853.

A WORD FOR THE SABBATH.

CHAPTER III.

THE SABBATH A MEMORIAL.

THAT man, on earth and fading things below,
Might not his firm affections all bestow,
That he might not, buried in worldly care,
Forget who made the earth and sea and air,
But calm his soul with holy thoughts of heaven,
The Rest-day of the Lord was kindly given:
A blest memorial which to mind should bring
Creation's birth-day and creation's King.

Here Error, busy with her countless arts,
To weave her webs and hurl her poisonous darts,
Ceaselessly striving with her sorcerer's rod
To mar the beauty of the truth of God;
To make mankind through some false medium see,
Till all their vision shall perverted be,
Zealously strives, with energy not slack,
To switch men off on a fallacious track.
This is her plea, though false and most absurd,
'Tis yet entitled to a passing word:

When Israel's sons were slaves in Egypt's land,
Close-fettered in oppression's iron band,
When God deliverance brought and freed from
With mighty hand and with a stretched-out arm,
Therefore 'tis claimed, the Sabbath was designed,
Their great deliverance then to keep in mind:
A Jewish rite, memorial of the day
When they from cruel bondage fled away.

Now, then, shall reason and the Word declare,
How far with truth this theory will compare.

That they might ever cherish, fresh in thought,
The glad deliverance which for them was wrought,
And him who thus stretched forth his hand to save,
Two fit memorials Jehovah gave;
For oft as they the Passover observed,
So oft in strong remembrance they preserved, [nigh,
When God through judgment brought deliverance
And Egypt's first-born sons were doomed to die,
How the destroying angel, dark with wrath,
Passed o'er their dwellings on his fearful path.
And oft as they the Unleavened Feast prepared,
So oft, with this memorial, they declared
How the Egyptians, fearful of their stay,
With hastening hand then hurried them away.
And when at length their sons should wish to know
What means this service? what designed to show?
This was their answer: For with mighty hand
Jehovah brought us up from Egypt's land.*

Thus were two fitting, plain memorials given,
So to remind them of this work of heaven.
But such desires in some poor minds bear sway,
To get Jehovah's Sabbath out the way,
That they attempt, in furious strength to seize,
And crowd it in, and make it go with these!
Not satisfied with what God gives to man,
They must push in another if they can.
At once we see 'tis but an artful quirk,
And there's no fitness in such silly work.
A weekly rest, to keep in memory, clear,
A day that could come round but once a year!
Just as if we to celebrate should try,
Full once a week the fourth of our July!
But most in this propriety they crush,
They have a rest memorial of a rush!!!

'Twas meet that God, when he had bared his arm,
To heal their sufferings, and release from harm,
And brought them from beneath the oppressor's rod,
Where they could freely serve and worship God,
Should charge to whom they homage then should
And so remind them of the Sabbath-day. [pay,

And some there are who take no ground like this;
But still, take theories equally amiss.
Thus they contend: Since First-day was the day,
When from Death's bands our Saviour broke away,
Since then redemption's plan was made complete,
That is the day, henceforth, that we must keep:

*Ex. xii, xiii. †Lev. xii, 33.

Should keep, to bear in mind, in deed and word,
The resurrection of our blessed Lord.

First, then, in all sincerity, we seek
How you support the first day of the week,
And in all candor ask, Where do you find
Authority for changes of this kind?
Where, keep the Sabbath, does the Bible say,
To bear in mind the resurrection day?
Are not memorials already given,
Ordained, appointed and designed of Heaven?
For when we lay our bodies 'neath the wave,
Do we not emblem Jesus in the grave?
That as he from the dead arose, so we
Should rise, in newer life henceforth to be?
And oft as we, said Christ, the bread should break,
And in his memory should the cup partake,
So oft should we show forth, with symbols clear,
The death of Jesus till he should appear

Are not these then sufficient? must we bring
A third memorial so unlike the thing?
And no way fitted to recall to mind
The scenes for whose remembrance 'twas designed?
If God proposed the Sabbath-day to change,
It seems to me 'tis something very strange,
That he no record gave to set it right,
But left mankind to guess it as they might; [it,
For in God's Word, though men doubt seem to mind
There's no such record, and they cannot find it.

'Twas naught, at first, but God's almighty power,
That placed the blessing on the Sabbath hour;
Naught but his mandate that enforced its claim,
On all men equal, and on all the same.
Know then that his almighty power, alone,
Can change that day he once declared his own.
No less than his command, express and plain,
Must you produce, to prove your theory sane.
On human creeds then dare you longer rest,
Slighting the only day that God has blest!
On human theories dare you trust your all?
Remember, by God's law we stand or fall.

The Sabbath a memorial we admit,
But not of actions which it will not fit.
To try and make it signalize events,
To whose resemblance it has no pretence,
To use it where no meaning it conveys,
Stretched and distorted in a thousand ways,
Shocks every law propriety e'er gave,
And finds for fitness an untimely grave.

Rightly applied, harmonious and fair,
The Sabbath stands, and there is beauty there.
Grant it the place for which it was designed,
And it has lessons for each honest mind;
For thus our actions speak, while we protest,
After six days of toil, a day of rest,
In stronger terms than language e'er unfurled—
Jehovah rested when he made the world.
Plainly he's given what day that day shall be:
He rested on the seventh and so must we.

Where are the saints during the 1000 years?

John iii, 33. "Little children, yet a little while I am with you. Ye shall seek me; and as I said unto the Jews, Whither I go, ye cannot come; so now I say to you." verse 36. "Simon Peter said unto him, Lord, whither goest thou? Jesus answered him, Whither I go, thou canst not follow me now; but thou shalt follow me afterwards." John xiv, 2-4. "In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you unto myself that where I am there ye may be also. And whither I go ye know, and the way ye know." Verse 12. "I go unto my Father." Matt. vi, 9. Our Father which art in heaven. 2 Cor. v, 1. We have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." Verse 4. Not that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life. Or, [1 Cor. xv, 54.] "Death swallowed up in victory." "When this mortal shall put on immortality." 1 Thess. iv, 16, 17. "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain, shall be

caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord."

These passages show positively that the Lord, when he comes again, will not meet his resurrected or living saints on the earth. Neither can it be shown in the Bible, in my opinion, that our Lord will come at this time any nearer earth than the clouds in heaven. Acts i, 9-11. "This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven. Matt. xxiv, 30. "And they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory." Rev. xiv, 14. "And I looked, and behold a white cloud, and upon the cloud one sat like unto the Son of man."

Under the third angel's message, [Rev. xiv, 12,] is the patience of the saints, and they that keep the commandments of God, &c.

Rev. xxii, 12. And behold I come quickly, and my reward is with me to give every man according as his work shall be.

Verse 14. Blessed are they that do (or keep) his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, (Chap. ii, 7; 2 Cor. xii, 1-4. Paradise in third heaven,) and may enter in through the gates into the city. Now it is generally believed that the City, New Jerusalem, will not come down from heaven until after the 1000 years; but this entering into the City above is connected with the coming of Christ to mete out rewards; and that, in heaven. Matt. v, 12; Luke vi, 23.

Col. iii, 1-4. If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. Set your affections on things above, not on things on the earth. For ye are dead and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory.

Luke ix, 30, 31. Elias: who appeared in glory, in vision to the disciples; who was taken up into heaven by a whirlwind. 2 Kings ii, 1-11. Heaven is glory.

Heb. iv, 10, 11, 14. For he (Christ) that is entered into his rest, he also hath ceased from his own works as God did from his. Let us labor therefore to enter into that rest, lest any man fall after the same manner of unbelief. Seeing then that we have a great High Priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus, the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession, that [Heb. vi, 18] we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge, to lay hold upon the hope set before us: which hope we have as an anchor to the soul both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the veil; whither the forerunner, (one who goes before another) is for us entered, even Jesus, &c. This conveys the idea to my mind that if the forerunner has entered the temple in heaven, that we shall follow him hereafter, as he promised Peter, when he should come again. Let us see if this is not so. Rev. xi, 19. And the temple of God was opened in heaven, and there was seen in his temple the ark of his testament. This took place in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he began to sound [Rev. x, 7; xi, 15;] which took place in 1844.

Rev. xv, 8. And the temple was filled with smoke from the glory of God and from his power; and no man was able to enter into the temple till the seven plagues of the seven angels were fulfilled. Then they will. Therefore are they before the throne of God, and serve him day and night in his temple: and he that sitteth on the throne shall dwell among them.—Rev. vii, 15. This temple and throne is in heaven.

Some, I know, think that Rev. xx, 4, teaches that the resurrected saints will live and reign with Christ, a thousand years on the earth; but it says nothing of their reigning on the earth, in this chapter; neither do they reign as kings in this 1000 years, but as priests to minister or officiate with Christ in judgment at this time. 2 Pet. iii, 8; 1 Cor. vi, 2. Saints shall judge the world. But we are referred to another chapter [v, 10] where it says, And hast made

us unto our God kings and priests, and we shall reign on the earth.

J. B. FRISBIE.

Battle Creek, Mich., Nov. 2d, 1853.

Prepare to meet thy God.

"Who may abide the day of his coming? and who shall stand when he appeareth?" Mal. iii, 2. It is indeed true, that when he comes again, it will be to execute judgment, because he is the Son of man, to gather the wheat into his garner, but to burn the chaff with fire unquenchable. To send forth that tremendous edict, Those mine enemies who would not that I should reign over them, bring hither and slay them before me. Would it not be wise to consider in time whether you are able with ten thousand to meet him that cometh against you with twenty thousand; or else to desire conditions of peace.—These conditions he not only freely offers you, but has sent his servants to beseech you in his stead to be reconciled unto God. For he hath made him who knew no sin, to be sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him. Let no feeling of past sin, however aggravated, deter you from coming, since it is written, that the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin. 1 John i, 7. Be no more a stranger and foreigner, but, accepting his offer, become a fellow-citizen with the saints, a member of the household of God; be content, with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all the saints of God, to confess yourself a stranger, and a pilgrim on the earth, and with them to look for a city that hath foundations whose builder and maker is God.

Perhaps, though not altogether regardless of divine things, you have been going about to establish your own righteousness, and have not submitted to the righteousness of God. Perhaps you have been saying in your heart, "God, I thank thee that I am not as other men are," or "I am rich and have need of nothing, and know not that you are wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked." No wonder, under such circumstances, that you do not desire to hear of the Lord's coming. If you think you can do well enough without him; if your salvation depends not on your union with him that is to come; if you feel not your present wretchedness, you cannot desire to exchange your "mourning for joy, or your spirit of heaviness for a garment of praise." If such you are, I beseech you to consider in time the sentence passed upon the guest whom the King perceived to be without a wedding garment; however you may be self-satisfied now, before Him that is coming you will be speechless, and the most appalling sound that ever vibrated in your ear, will be the words, "Bind him hand and foot, and take him away." Realize to yourself the idea of his speedy approach. His faithful messengers are saying, "Come for all things are now ready." He has provided for you the garment in which He expects you to appear, "even the righteousness of God, by faith of Jesus Christ, unto all, and upon all them that believe;" unto all as a gift, and upon all as a covering.—*Word of Warning*, No. 13

Luther's two Miracles.

On the 5th August, 1530, an awful crisis for the Reformation, when the firmest seemed to swerve and the boldest to tremble, Luther wrote thus to Chancellor Bruch: "I have recently witnessed two miracles. This is the first: As I was at my window, I saw the stars and the sky, and that vast and magnificent firmament in which the Lord has placed them. I could nowhere discover the columns on which the Master has supported this immense vault, and yet the heavens did not fall.

And here is the second: I beheld thick clouds hanging above us like a vast sea. I could neither perceive ground on which they reposed, nor cords by which they were suspended; and yet they did not fall upon us, but saluted us rapidly and fled away."

These miracles, as Luther called them, filled him with unconquerable trust and joy in God. Well they might. So may they us. We see them wrought before us every night and every day.

COMMUNICATIONS.

From Sister Waldorf.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—The experience of fourteen years has taught me that it is not a vain thing to serve the Lord; therefore I am not ashamed to confess Jesus before a gainsaying world. I know I am not my own; for I am bought with a price: my blessed Saviour purchased me with his own precious blood, when he gave his soul an offering for sin. O that I may love him more and more. He is my present Saviour, a Saviour from all sin. He has taught me to reckon myself dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God. His word, also, teaches me that "there is, therefore, now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit." Rom. viii. It teaches me also to set my affections on things above; not on things on the earth; for we are dead, and our life is hid with Christ in God. Col. iii, 1, 2.

The things of earth are fading and fleeting—they are transitory in their nature; therefore we should not set our heart upon them, lest they bring a snare upon us.

I feel truly thankful to my heavenly Father that I am a monument of his great mercy! Jesus is my friend, my elder brother! How sweet, how precious is his name! How good and kind he is to me! and not to me only, but to all who believe in him. His love abounds to all his dear children, who love and serve him here below. Truly he has done great things for us! O what a rich and glorious treasure he has laid up in store, for all who prove faithful unto the end! My desire is to live as though each day would be the last I should have to stay in this vale of tears. I want to live a life wholly devoted to the service of my Lord and Saviour, and to enjoy the sanctifying grace of the holy Spirit from day to day: to live above the world, and to be more spiritually minded, that I may be able to comprehend, with all saints, what is the length and breadth and depth and height, and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge, that I may be filled with the fullness of God.

For some time past my mind has been considerably wrought upon, with respect to the seventh-day Sabbath. For two years past I have heard a great deal about first-day Sabbath. I always believed in keeping one day as a Sabbath, or day of rest: in which faith I was strengthened by reading the Sabbath Manual.—A book, entitled, "The First-day Sabbath not of divine appointment," fell in my way: I read the most of it. I was taught from a child to remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy. But the author could see no necessity for keeping it holy. He said, "why keep it holy? it is no more holy than any other day of the week." As it regarded the changing of the day from the seventh to the first day of the week, I have tho't a great deal about it. Did men change the day?—Who gave them authority? They did not receive it from the great I Am! For in the beginning, when God made the heaven and the earth, and all things that are therein, he did it in six days. He rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. "And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." And is not the sanctifying of any thing, making it holy? it certainly is therefore, the day being sanctified was made holy. "This is that which the Lord hath said, to-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord." Ex. xvi, 23. In Chap. xx he says, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy—the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God, for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day and hallowed it." "But the seventh day is the Sabbath of rest, an holy convocation; ye shall do no work therein: it is the Sabbath of the Lord in all your dwellings." Lev. xxiii, 3.

Some presume to say, that when our Saviour rose from the tomb it was abolished, or that the apostles changed it by divine authority. If so, I would like to see the record; for I cannot find in all the Bible that they received such authority from their Lord, or that they ever did make such a change.

Again, Keep the Sabbath-day to sanctify it as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee. Deut. v. The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.—For he spake in a certain place of the seventh day, on this wise, And God did rest the seventh day from all his works. Heb. iv, 4.

Here is a blessed promise. Isa. lvi. Blessed is he that doeth this, and the son of man that layeth hold on it; that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it; and keepeth his hand from doing any evil. Verse 4. For thus saith the Lord unto the eunuchs that keep my Sabbaths and choose the things that please me, and take hold of my covenant, even unto them will I give in mine house and within my walls, a place and a name better than of sons and of daughters; I will give them an everlasting name, that shall not be cut off. The promise is, also the sons of the stranger that join themselves to the Lord to serve him, and to love the name of the Lord, to be his servants, every one that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and taketh hold of my covenant, even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer. Chap. lviii, 13. "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day, and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable; and shalt honor him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words," then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father, for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it. In Isa. lvii, 21, 22, 27, the Lord strictly enjoins the Sabbath, and tells his people what he would bring upon them if they refused to obey.

In Eze. xx, the Lord, through the Prophet, complains bitterly of the idolatry of his people, and of their polluting the Sabbath. He there tells them what he gave them his Sabbath for. In verse 12, he says, "Moreover also I gave them my Sabbath to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them." We plainly see that the Lord in reproving his people for the neglect of the observance of the Sabbath—does not call it their Sabbath, but his Sabbath. I cannot recollect of any passage of Holy Writ that says the Sabbath should cease to be kept or observed as a day of rest, holy unto the Lord, or that the first day of the week should take its place. I am of the opinion that men changed the day without any reference to divine authority. I believe the apostles always kept the Sabbath-day. Acts xiii, 42. The Gentiles besought the apostles to preach to them the next Sabbath. Verse 44. And the next Sabbath-day came almost the whole city together to hear the word of God. Acts xvii speaks of Paul's going in unto the Jews, and for three Sabbath-days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures. This, I apprehend, does not mean the first day of the week. Luke iv, 16, tells us, that Jesus (as his custom was) went into the synagogue on the Sabbath-day and stood up for to read. And Jesus himself said he is Lord of the Sabbath. I might cite many more passages from the New Testament concerning the Sabbath, which is proof to me that the apostles kept it, and did not do it away as some suppose.

They speak of the first day, and tell us what they did upon that day. The disciples met together to break bread. Acts xx, 7. They were to lay by in store as God had prospered them. 1 Cor. xvi, 2.—This was a collection for the needy; it was not to be done on the seventh day, but the first day of the week.

The Sabbath was classed with the commandments, written on tables of stone; and I cannot believe that it was ever the design of God to change or abolish the law of the Sabbath; if it had been so, we should not have been left in the dark respecting it. Again, if the Sabbath was done away, as some assert, then, of course, the other nine commandments must also be done away; because it is classed with them; and if so, then, there is no moral obligation. But the object

or is ready to exclaim, The nine are not done away! No, indeed! neither is the Sabbath; for it is just as much a part of the moral law, as the other nine are. In reading the sacred Scriptures, I have not learned that the Sabbath was classed with the hand-writing of ordinances, which Paul said was against us; which Jesus took out of the way, by nailing them to the cross.

"If ye would enter into life, keep the commandments."

MARY A. WALDORF.

Conotton, Ohio, Oct. 27th, 1853.

From Bro. Moran.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—On the 9th ultimo, our dear Bro. Bates very unexpectedly dropped in upon us, and gave us one lecture, which was of great interest to Bro Gould and myself. His lecture and private conversation, was to us of great profit. R. MORAN.
Lawrenceburgh, Ind., Nov. 5th 1853.

THE REVIEW AND HERALD

ROCHESTER, THIRD-DAY, NOV. 15, 1853.

New Works.

THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES.—This is a book of facts for the people at the present time. Eleven signs of the near approach of the day of the Lord are presented. The signs in the sun, moon and stars fulfilled, show that Christ is "at the door." The gospel of the kingdom preached in all the world, therefore we may expect the end. Spiritualism a subject of prophecy; and its rapid spread a startling sign that the day of wrath hasteth greatly. Cry of peace and safety. Iniquity abounds. Two angels of Rev. xiv, in the past, and the third fulfilling. The next event in the prophecy, is the Son of man on the white cloud. These are the principle subjects of this work of 124 pages—Price 8 cents, or \$6 per hundred.

Under a deep sense of duty to our fellow-men, exposed to the fatal snare of Spiritualism, and asleep to the doctrine of Christ's immediate coming, we have prepared this little work. And now we invite our friends to assist in giving it a wide circulation. Have you not a special duty to act in this matter? The price is put very low to encourage quick sale, and extensive circulation. We have sold 3000 copies the last ten weeks. Those who have friends exposed to Spiritualism, can place this exposure of the heresy, and word of warning, in their hands. The work can be had, also other Tracts, of Herman Churchhill, Stowe, Vt., Elias Goodwin, Oswego, N. Y., C. Smith, Jackson, Mich., Brn. Phelps and Waggoner of Wis., and at this Office.

THE SABBATH, BY ELIHU.—This is a Tract of 16 pages. Price, 75 cents per hundred, or one cent single copy. It is an excellent little work for distribution. As the postage on this very small Tract is one cent a copy, it should be kept by all our book agents, and circulated by traveling brethren. Those who have ordered it, will please state how it shall be sent.

THE YOUTH'S INSTRUCTOR, Vol. II, No. 1, will probably be out by the first of January. We design that our young friends shall have it by the first day of 1854. Good matter, original or selected will be very acceptable.

We have a few hundred of the Signs of the Times neatly bound, at 20 cents a copy.

Appointments.

PROVIDENCE permitting, I will hold meetings as follows: Laoni, N. Y., Nov. 19th and 20th. As the brethren at Norwalk and Milan, O., may appoint, Nov. 26th and 27th. I design spending three or four weeks in Ohio, and would be glad to spend the 26th and 27th in some new place.
J. N. LOUGHBOROUGH.

PROVIDENCE permitting, I will meet with the brethren at New Shoreham, R. I., Sabbath and First-day, Nov. 26th and 27th. Bro. Steadman and others will please circulate the appointment. Also, at Dartmouth, Mass., where Bro. Collins and others may appoint, Dec. 3d and 4th.
FREDERICK WHEELER.

BRO. A. S. HUTCHINS will meet with the Brethren at Potsdam, N. Y., Nov. 19th, and 20th; Lorain, or where Bro. A. S. Robinson may appoint, 26th and 27th; Oswego, evening of the 29th; Rochester, Sabbath, Dec. 3d.

BRO. JOSEPH BAKER and A. S. HUTCHINS intend to labor in the State of New York the coming Winter. Those desiring their labors can address them at Rochester, N. Y.

We hope to be able to visit the Brethren in different parts of the field the coming Winter, and hope to see the cause move forward more rapidly in this State. Ed.

To Correspondents.

J. S. MALTRY.—You did not name the State in giving Bro. Wade's P. O. address. Please give us the State, and we will send the REVIEW.

H. W. LAWRENCE.—We sent the books the 8th, as ordered

BRN. SHEFFIELD and McLELLAN.—We sent the Chart the 7th

BRO. GIBSON and others.—We have all the help in the Office and in our family that we need at present.

THE Post Office address of Bro. S. W. Rhodes, for the present, is Hubbard's Corners, Madison Co., N. Y.

Letters.

H. Lothrop, L. E. Bates, H. W. Lawrence, S. R. C. Denison, G. W. Holt, G. H. Knight

Receipts.

M. Cramer, A. Miller, J. Hamilton, H. Jenney, D. Upson, J. Swan, C. Oshorn, E. Wild, a Friend, L. Glover, B. Allen, R. Stephenson, J. Allen, Wm. Glover, Sr. C. Allen, H. Blinn, Wm. Treadwell, G. Palmiter, each \$1.
M. L. Bartlett, a Friend, E. Pierce, A. Allen, H. Clark, each \$2. S. Allen, J. Bezzo, Wm. Hills, each \$3. H. Drew, \$5. A Bro. in Conn., \$10.
A. Havens, P. Nichols, O. Davis, each \$0.25. S. C. Cottle, F. Edson, each \$0.50. A. N. Curtis, A. Ross, each \$0.75.
\$165.28 behind on the REVIEW.

Publications.

THE Sanctuary and Twenty-three Hundred Days—76 pages—price 7 cents—postage 1 cent.

Review of O. R. L. Crozier on the Sabbath—48 pages—price 5 cents—postage 1 cent.

A Refutation of the Claims of Sunday keeping to Divine Authority; also, a lengthy extract from the History of the Sabbath—40 pages—price 4 cents—postage 1 cent.

The Sabbath by "Elihu"—16 pages—price 1 cent—postage 1 cent.

Volume I, II and III of the REVIEW, bound in paper covers—price 40 cents for Vol. I and II, and 80 cents for Vol. III. Youth's Instructor, Vol. I, in paper covers—price 25 cents. Signs of the Times—124 pages—price 8 cents—postage 2 cents.

Our collection of Advent and Sabbath Hymns, with the Supplement bound with it—144 pages—price 30 cents—postage 5 cents.

Time and Prophecy—a Poem—120 pages, well bound—price 25 cents—postage 5 cents.

THE CHART—A Pictorial Illustration of the Visions of Daniel and John and their Chronology—price \$2. It can be had of Otis Nichols, Dorchester, Mass., or at this Office. It can be sent by Mail without rollers for the same price.

AGENTS.

MAINE.	Portland.	S. Willey.	Wheelock
N. N. Lunt,	Portland.	CONNECTICUT.	EL H Chamberlain Md'town.
S. W. Flanders,	Canaan.	A. Belden,	Keenington.
Cyprian Stevens,	Paris.	NEW YORK.	W. S. Ingraham, Bath.
S. Howland,	Topsham.	A. Ross,	Caughdenoy.
W. T. Hanniford,	Orrington.	David Upson,	Morland.
Wm. Bryant,	Wilton.	R. F. Cottrell,	Mill Grove.
NEW HAMPSHIRE.	Washingt.	John Wager,	Orangeport.
J. Stowell,	Washingt.	L. Carpenter,	Oswego.
S. Bunnel,	Claremont.	A. H. Robinson,	Sandy Creek.
MASSACHUSETTS.	Dorchester.	E. A. Poole,	Lincolna.
O. Nichols,	Dorchester.	J. A. Loughhead,	Elmira.
O. Davis,	N. Fairhaven.	John Hamilton,	Fredonia.
L. Paine,	Ware.	MICHIGAN.	Albert Avery, Locke.
Wm. Saxby,	Springfield.	J. P. Kellogg,	Tyrons.
VERMONT.	Johnson.	Ira Gardner,	Vergennes.
R. Loveland,	Morrisstown.	David Hewett,	Battle Creek.
H. Bingham,	Wolcott.	C. S. Glover,	Sylvan.
S. H. Peck,	Hardwick.	A. B. Pearsall,	Grand Rapids.
Lewis Bean,	Stowe.	A. A. Dodge,	Jackson.
H. A. Churchill,	Waterbury.	Wm. M. Smith,	PENNSYLVANIA.
E. P. Butler,	Northfield.	M. L. Dean,	Ulysses.
Josiah Hart,	Waitsfield.	RHODE ISLAND.	Ransom Hicks, Providence.
R. G. Lockwood,	East Bethel.		
W. Morse,	Charlston.		
L. Titus,	Derby Line.		
Alonzo Lee,	Vergennes.		
E. Everts,	Panton.		
H. Gardner,			

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 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.)