

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. II.

SARATOGA SPRINGS, N. Y., DECEMBER 9, 1851.

No. 8.

JOSEPH PATER, HIRAM EDSON, } Publishing Committee
and J. N. ANDREWS,
JAMES WHITE, Editor.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY.

TERMS.—*GRATIS.* It is expected that all the friends of the cause will aid in its publication, as the Lord hath prospered them.

For all communications, orders, and remittances, for the Review and Herald, should be addressed to JAMES WHITE, Saratoga Springs, N. Y. (post paid.)

"So will I seek out my sheep, and will deliver them out of all places where they have been scattered in the dark and cloudy day." *Eze. xxxiv. 12.*

Long upon the mountains, weary,
Have the scattered flock been torn;
Dark the desert paths, and dreary,
Grievous trials have they borne.
Now the gathering call is sounding,
Solemn in its warning voice;
Union, faith and love, abounding,
Did the little flock rejoice.

Now the light of truth they're seeking,
In its onward track pursue;
All the ten commandments keeping,
They are holy, just and true.
On the words of life they're feeding,
Precious to their taste so sweet;
All their Master's precepts heeding,
Bowing humbly at his feet.

In that world of light and beauty,
In that golden City, fair,
Soon its pearly gates they'll enter,
And of all its glories share.
There divine the soul's expansions;
Free from sin, and death, and pain;
Tears will never dim those mansions
Where the saints immortal reign.

Soon, He comes! with clouds descending!
All his saints, enthroned arise;
The redeemed in anthems blending,
Shouts of victory through the skies.
O! we long for thine appearing
Come, O, Saviour! quickly come!
Blessed hope! our spirits cheering,
Take thy ransomed children home.

A. R. SMITH.

WHAT IS 'BABYLON'?—THE FALL—COME OUT,
From the voice of Truth of Sept. 1844.
Come Out of Babylon!

Reader!—The subject we wish to investigate, is, COMING OUT OF BABYLON. You should not be prejudiced against the investigation; for it is a doctrine of the Bible. God has proclaimed it; and commanded us to obey his mandate—pronouncing the most dreadful woe upon all who shall knowingly disobey. Let us therefore fear not the result of searching for the truth on this as well as on all other subjects, nor dread the consequences of embracing and proclaiming it to others, when sure we have found it. With these preliminaries we will inquire,

1st. *What is the Babylon out of which God calls his people?* John answers the question. In Rev. xvii, 3—5, he says, "So he carried me away in the spirit into the wilderness; and I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet colored beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns. And the woman was arrayed in scarlet-color, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication. And upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH."

Here we are plainly told what is Babylon; yet a question arises whether the 'woman' which is called Babylon, and the 'beast which carrieth her' are to be identified as one and the same power; if so then it is contended that Papal Rome is the Babylon which this figure represents. But if they represent different powers, then Babylon, must be constituted of something more than the Church of Rome. That the woman represents one thing and the beast another, is clearly evident from the fact,

1st. *That their physical constitution is different.* One is a beast, having seven heads and ten horns; while the other is a woman having a golden cup in her hand.

2d. *Their seats are different.* The beast has the

seat of the Dragon, Rev. xiii, 2, which was at Rome but the woman has her seat on 'many waters, which are peoples and multitudes and nations, and tongues.' Compare Rev. xvii, 1, 15.

3d. *Their office is different.* The beast carries, while the woman is carried. Rev. xvii, 7.

4th. *They are intoxicated by different means.*—The Kings and inhabitants of the earth, represented by the ten horned beast, 'have been made drunk with the wine of her (the woman's) fornication'; but the woman was 'drunken with the blood of the saints, and martyrs of Jesus.' Rev. xvii, 2—6.

5th. *The woman committed fornication with the Kings of the earth (the ten horns of the beast.)* Did she commit fornication with herself? She did, if the woman and beast were but one power.

6th. *The angel describes them as two distinct powers.* He says, verse 7, 'I will tell the mystery of the woman, and of the beast that carrieth her.' Then in several verses which follow, a minute and distinct description of the beast is given; and the woman is not identified with the beast any farther than being carried by it. In verse 18 the woman is as distinctly or separately described. She is said to be 'that great city which reigneth over the kings of the earth.' It is admitted that the 'kings of the earth' are represented by the horns of the beast. How then can the woman be the beast, when it is said she reigns over it? They are doubtless two distinct powers, and in order rightly to understand the subject under discussion, it will be necessary to learn what each represents.

The beast in Chapter xvii and xviii, and the Dragon in the xiii, represent Rome under all of its forms, from its rise down to the final destruction of all earthly governments. The dragon, and the beast in both cases, bear nearly the same description. Each has 'seven heads and ten horns.' Consequently they must be symbolical of the same power. Rome is that power. It bore the character of the Dragon while Pagan idolatry was the religion of the nation, kingdom or empire. This continued until A. D. 503, when Paganism fell, and Christianity corrupted, soon became the religion of the state. At this time the seven headed and ten horned beast came up, Rev. xiii, 1. And A. D. 533 'the Dragon gave the beast his power, seat, and great authority.' Verse 2.—See the decree of Justinian, published in many of our standard works. This state of the beast was to 'continue forty and two months,' (Rev. xiii, 5,) or 1260 years. During this term of time the 'Beast,' which is always the representative of political power, holds the pre-eminence. It should not be overlooked that the beast wears crowns on his ten horns, during this 1260 years, see chap. xiii, 1. This shows that political power had the pre-eminence.

But when John saw the beast again (chap. xviii,) it is humbled—a woman is seated upon and guides it. It has yet its 'seven heads and ten horns,' but it has no crowns, and instead of having 'the name of blasphemy,' as in chap. xiii, it is now full of names of blasphemy." (Rev. xvii, 3,) clearly denoting it to be the last form of all earthly governments. It is the 'eighth' (verse 11) and last form of the beast, ready to 'go into perdition,' verse 8.

When does John see this 'eighth,' this last, this 'scarlet-colored,' 'seven headed and ten horned' beast, humbled, shorn of his crowns, and under the control of a dissipated woman, 'the mother of harlots?' It could not have been at any time during the '42 months,' or 1260 years from the time it took its seat in A. D. 533; for during that term of time the supremacy was vested in the beast, not in the woman; for John says, Rev. xviii, 7, 8, 'and power was given unto him over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations. And all that dwell on the earth shall worship him,' &c. And besides, during this time the beast wore crowns, verse 1. Then John's last view of the beast must have been after the close of the 1260 years of its supremacy. Well, when would that be? Count 1260 years from A. D. 533, and it brings us to 1793. What marked this period? The 'Beast,' POLITICAL ROME, was humbled at this time by the French, and its supremacy over the saints lost, never to be regained. The 'WOMAN' then took her 'seat' upon many waters, and since then 'reigneth over the kings of the earth.' Chap. xvii, 1, 15.

We view the case thus. Rome was symbolized by

the 'Great Red Dragon,' while connected with Pagan idolatry; by the 'crowned' ten horned beast, while connected with Christianity corrupted; and by the 'scarlet colored beast,' with no crowns on its horns, while under the guidance of the 'woman.'—The latter is the eighth and last form of the beast. Rev. xvii, 11.

Having as we believe, ascertained what the 'beast' is, we next inquire, what does the 'woman' symbolize? It symbolizes the nominal church. 'For the Lord hath called thee a woman'—Isa. liv, 6. A woman clothed with the sun—Rev. xii, 1. These and other passages speak of the church under the similitude of a 'woman,' which we think no one will deny. But is the harlot woman in Rev. xvii, the same with the 'woman clothed with the sun,' in chap. xii? We think they are the same, with the exception that her last state is a state of dissipated prostitution, or apostasy.

It is admitted, and long advocated by all Protestants, that the Church has apostatized from its primitive purity. Paul predicted that there should come a 'falling away' before the man of sin should be revealed, (2 Thess. ii,) and we think this same falling away is referred to by John in Rev. xii. in the history there given of the 'woman.' He first sees her 'clothed with the sun,' &c. But she soon 'flees into the wilderness,' a place of disorder and darkness, (Jer. ii, 31,) a fit place for the earth to help her.—God should have been her only help. Eagle's wings are also given her. The wings of an unclean, proud and destructive bird, such as were plucked from the proud king of Babylon Dan. xii. Did God give his pure church such wings that she might escape from her enemies into the wilderness? We cannot believe; it; neither does John say he did. But he says 'to the woman were given two wings of a great eagle.' Then who did give them? 'The earth helped the woman,' we think gives the correct answer.

All this we think took place under the reign of Pagan Rome; and that her 'wilderness,' state, the 'place prepared of God,' did not commence until the rise of the beast in chapter xiii, which was to continue forty-two months, the same length of time that the woman was to be in the wilderness. Doubtless both cases refer to the same time. The woman does not fly while in the wilderness, but 'fled into it.'—The wilderness is her place, prepared of God, where they 'shall feed her for a time, and times, and half a time,' or 1260 years.

It is thought by those of an opposite view, that the woman should be viewed in the light of purity while in her 'place,' the 'wilderness,' because God prepared it for her. But has not God 'prepared the place' for the 'devil and his angels'? Certainly; and must they therefore be pure? No one will contend for this: Neither do we believe the woman was pure while in 'her place' 1260 years. Far from it. She was holding unlawful connection with the beast, or kings of the earth, during this time.—'THEY fed her,' (Rev. xii, 6,) not God. With what did they feed her? 'And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus,' Rev. xvii, 6. Blood, then was her food! The beast shed it, and the woman drank and became intoxicated with it. She lived in a state of dissipation and fornication with the kings of the earth while in 'her place.' With whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication—Rev. xvii, 2. If this is not her character, why does John talk of her being the 'MOTHER OF HARLOTS,' verse 5? In her state or 'place' of concubinage, and since she has taken her seat on the beast, she has brought forth a numerous progeny of illegitimate daughters, who have soon imitated the example of their mother, or great grand-mother, and like her have become harlots.

We view the case of the woman (the nominal church) thus: She apostatized under Pagan Rome—entered upon her wilderness state A. D. 533.—Here John leaves her in her place for 1260 years, holding unlawful connection with, but subject to the kings of the earth. The beast during this time held the reigns of government: it wore crowns. At the end of the 1260 years, A. D. 1793, John is carried in vision, 'into the wilderness,' (Rev. xii, 3,) and sees the woman just where he left her in chap. xvii: but how wide the contrast between her first, and last

character and condition: At first she was clothed with the sun, the moon under her feet, and on her head a crown of twelve stars.' Rev. xii. She had no daughters—was a pure woman. But now she is a drunken harlot; a mother not of one, but of many harlot daughters, and guides the beast which carries her, or holds the supremacy over the state, just as an artful mistress controls the will and destinies of her deceived and fallen paramours. Has not the church held this station over the kings and rulers of the earth since A. D. 1798? The facts in the case prove that she has. She 'sits upon many waters,' (which 'are peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues'—Rev. xvii, 15,) and reigneth over the kings of the earth; not by physical power, but by artifice, cunning, and deception. Her influence is felt and submitted to in every legislative body of the world. Kings, Queens, and rulers whose aid and influence she seeks, and who are among her most liberal supporters, and actually 'carry her,' are nevertheless guided by her artful and polluted hand.

Having, as we believe, obtained a correct understanding of the 'beast' and of the 'woman' under consideration, we are prepared to consider the question.

What is the Babylon out of which God calls his People?

'The Advent Shield,' p. 116, answers this question in the following language:

'Babylon, then, is now comprised in the present kingdoms of the world—the peoples, and multitudes, and nations and tongues; the many nations which John saw, on which the woman sat—the kings of the earth,' over which 'that great city,' Rome, reigned. Babylon now, not only comprises all earthly power and dominion, but embraces everything which is anti-Christian in its tendencies.'

To this answer we offer the following objections;

1st. If, as the 'Shield' says, the 'kingdoms of the world' are 'comprised in Babylon,' how can the 'woman,' that great city, **BABYLON**, reign over those kingdoms? It is folly to talk of a city reigning over itself.

2d. The kings of the earth 'committed fornication with' the woman, or Babylon—Rev. xvii, 2. If the 'Shield' is correct, the kings committed fornication with themselves!

3d. 'For ALL NATIONS have drunk of the wine of the wrath of HER fornication'—Rev. xvii, 3. If, as the 'Shield' says, the kingdoms are 'comprised in Babylon,' then they have drunk of their own, not of another's wine.

4th. The kings of the earth are to bewail the final fall of *Babylon*—Rev. xviii, 9, 10. But if the 'Shield' is correct, she will bewail her own fall!

5th. John makes a clear distinction between the kings or kingdoms of the earth, and Babylon, (see Chaps. xvii and xviii,) but the 'Shield' makes none.

These objections we deem sufficient to settle the point, that the 'Shield' has not given the correct answer to the important question under consideration; we must therefore look for another answer.

Mr. Hotchkiss, of this city, in a recent discourse defined Babylon to be exclusively Papal Rome. Not a few adopt his views; and we believe they are now generally entertained by the different Protestant sects. To this answer we object:

1st. Because Rome *papal* does not answer the definition of the term, *babylon*. As Mr. Hotchkiss justly contended, Rome, or the Catholic Church, is a 'unit.' She is one in name, doctrine, ordinances, and all her work. But *Babylon* signifies 'confusion or mixture.' It cannot therefore be applicable, exclusively to the Catholic Church. It should not be forgotten that there is meaning in the name, *Babylon*; God has given the name, and rightly applied it: It does not fitly apply to the Catholic Church.

2d. The catholic church, abstractly, has its seat at Rome; but Babylon has her seat upon 'many waters,' Rev. xvii, 1.

3d. The catholic church, abstractly, does not reign, neither has she ever reigned over the whole earth; but Babylon, or 'where the whore sitteth, are peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues,' (Rev. xvii, 15,) which embrace the whole earth.

4th. If the 'mother of harlots,' the church of Rome, abstractly considered is Babylon, then her harlot daughters are left out of the question. Then why did John call her not only 'MOTHER,' but 'mother of harlots?' As well might a mother be called the whole family, as to call the church of Rome, Babylon.

Having shown what we think **BABYLON** is not we will attempt to tell what we believe it to be. We believe it IS THE NOMINAL CHURCH.

In Rev. xii, John saw the women (the church) fly into the wilderness—the next time he beholds her, she has upon her head 'MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH.'

In explaining what this woman is, in Rev. xvii, 5, the explaining angel says in verse 18, 'And the woman which thou sawest is that great city which reign-

eth over the kings of the earth.' This explanation is the strongest proof that those present, who believe 'that great city' is literal Rome. They say the woman is a figure, the explanation is literal, therefore the city must be literal—it must be Rome. Their reasoning would be good if the explanation told us that, 'that great city' was Rome; but as it does not, neither is Rome anywhere in the Bible called 'Mystery Babylon' nor 'that great city'; therefore it is a mere assumption to say that Rome is that great city.

What then is that great city which reigneth over the kings of the earth? If the angel was talking of what then existed, it could not have been the city of Rome; for the kings of the earth did not then exist; for Rome was in its imperial form and the kingly form did not arise until some centuries after John saw this vision. And certainly the literal city of Rome does not reign over the kings of the earth now, neither is there any propriety in calling it 'Mystery Rome or Babylon,' nor 'that great city.' There are other cities far greater than Rome; and it would be as proper to call them Mystery London, Mystery Paris, Mystery Peking, Mystery Vienna, Mystery New-York, &c., as to call the literal city of Rome a Mystery; there is no more mystery about it than any other city or town built of wood, brick and stone.

The angel says, the woman is 'that great city'—but does not tell us in the explanation, what that great city is. To ascertain this fact we must consult other portions of the divine oracles. Under the seventh vial we are told, Rev. xvi, 19, that 'the great city was divided into three parts, and the cities of the nations fell; and great Babylon came in remembrance before God, to give unto her the cup of the wine of the fierceness of his wrath.' It is true that we are not here told what 'that great city' is, only that it is 'great Babylon'; but we are clearly taught that the 'cities of the nations are one thing, and 'that great city' or 'great Babylon' is another thing. 'The great city was DIVIDED,' but the 'CITIES of the NATIONS FELL.' Rome is one of the cities of the nations, and cannot, therefore, be 'that great city.'

In Rev. xiv, 8, 'that great city' is brought to view. 'And there followed another angel, saying, Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city, because she made all nations drink of the wrath of her fornication.' We admit that in this case we are not told what Babylon is but we are taught that it is not identified with the 'ALL NATIONS.' The city of Rome is identified with one of the 'all nations,' and cannot therefore be 'that great city,' which has 'made all nations drink her wine.'

Again, in Rev. xi, 8—13, speaking of the two witnesses, John says, 'And their dead bodies shall lie in the street of the great city, which is spiritually called Sodom and Egypt, where our Lord was crucified.' 'And a tenth part of the city fell.' There can be no dispute but that the 'great city,' in this case is Babylon; so our brethren have preached and published to the world; and they have taught us that the 'street of the city,' and the 'tenth part of the city which fell,' was France. They have also taught that it fell in A. D. 1798, or near that time. If France was a tenth of Babylon in A. D. 1798, what were the other nine tenths? Why, our brethren have taught us that the other nine divisions or the Roman Western Empire, constitute the other nine tenths of the great city. How then, can the city of Rome be that great city? It cannot. Neither can the Catholic Church, exclusively, be that city; for at the time the witnesses were slain in one of the streets of the city, and a tenth part of it fell, at that time, a part of the ten divisions were Protestant in their religion; and a part Catholic. We then learn of what Babylon was constituted in A. D. 1798. It was all the Protestant and Catholic religions embraced in the ten divisions of the Roman Western Empire, which includes all the Catholic and Protestant churches of the world. They constitute 'that great city' or 'Mystery Babylon,' represented by the Mother of Harlots, and her apostate daughters.

Once more: In the text under consideration John says, 'the great city' is spiritually called Sodom and Egypt, where also our Lord was crucified.' The city of Rome is no where either literally or spiritually called thus, neither was our Lord crucified there; but we do find that the nominal church is called Sodom and Gomorrah, and no one will deny that our Lord was crucified by the church. Speaking of the church in her apostacy, Isa. (v, 10,) says, 'Hear the word of the Lord, ye rulers of Sodom; and give ear unto the law of our God, ye people of Gomorrah. And in verse 12, he says, 'How is the faithful city become an harlot! it was full of judgment; righteousness, lodged in it; but now murderers.' For this, judgments are threatened, and a purging away of her dross is promised; and in verses 26, 27 and 28, the prophet adds, 'And I will restore thy judges as at the first, and thy counsellors as at the beginning; afterward thou shalt be called, the city of righteousness, the faithful city. Zion shall be redeemed with

judgment, and her converts with righteousness, and the destruction of the transgressors and of the sinners shall be together, and they that forsake the Lord shall be consumed.'

Here God's people, or 'Zion' is represented as once being the 'faithful city'; but has become 'an harlot,' or as John says, the 'Mother of harlots,' 'Mystery Babylon,' 'Jezebel' and her 'children,' the 'great whore,' * * * 'that great city,' 'spiritually called Sodom and Egypt,' or as Isaiah says, 'Sodom and Gomorrah.'

Apply these titles to Rome, and all is darkness, and insurmountable difficulties rise before us; but apply them to the *nominal church*, which is composed of all human ecclesiastical organizations, and all is clear; the fallen condition of that body perfectly answers the character these titles give; and the reasons come home to God's people, with redoubled force, why they should fully separate themselves, or come out from such corrupt influences.

There can be no question but that the 'woman' is symbolical of the church, and as she is called *Babylon*, there can be no dispute but that the church is Babylon. What church? We can make no distinction no farther than the figure will justify. It is a mother and her daughters—a family of harlots.

We admit the mother represents the Catholic Church the eldest member of the family; and we believe the daughters symbolize the Protestant sects. If they do not, pray what do they represent? No one of an opposite view has yet been able to answer this question. We can see no resemblance between the 'mother,' a *unit*, and a 'great city.' But the 'whole family' most strikingly represents that city. Take the whole and the figure is perfect; leave out the children and it is imperfect.

This view of the subject we think is strengthened by what is said relative to the church in Thyatira.—In chapter ii, mention is made of that 'woman Jezebel,' 'her fornication,'—'her great tribulation'—and it is said, 'I will kill her children with death; and ALL THE CHURCHES shall know that I am he which searcheth the reins and hearts; and I will give unto every one of you according to your works. Here the 'children' of the 'woman' are identified with 'ALL THE CHURCHES,' which are to be 'KILLED WITH DEATH,' and to 'every one of you' [the churches] will be given according to your works.

We believe the 'woman Jezebel' and 'her children,' in chapter ii, and the 'mother of harlots' and her daughters, in chapter xvii, are symbolical of *all the churches*, and as the mother of harlots is called *Babylon*, it is evident to us that 'ALL THE CHURCHES' constitute the Babylon out of which God now calls his people.

But the question may arise, how can the daughters be included when the name Babylon is *exclusively* inscribed on the head of the mother? The same objection, with nearly, if not the same propriety, might be offered against the 'beast' representing all the kingdoms of the world. It had its origin—received its power—and has its seat at Rome, yet no one denies but that it symbolizes *ALL* the kingdoms of the world. So with the 'mother of harlots'—she is the chief tower in the city, or member of the family, and it was proper to inscribe upon her head the name of the fraternity or city.

Babylon comes from *Babel*, and signifies 'confusion, or mixture,' Gen. x, 10, and xi, 9. The account there given will illustrate the case under consideration. Chapter xi, begins with an account of the earth being of one language; and goes on to tell that the people journeyed eastward—they came to a plain—made brick to build them a tower and city—God confounded their language, and 'scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of all the earth. And the name of it (the tower) was called, Babel,' or as the margin reads 'confusion.'

It should be remembered that the tower was called 'Babel' or 'confusion.' With this inscription upon it, we will suppose a traveler understanding the meaning of terms, visits the tower. He sees the inscription in large capitals, and expects to find the tower answering to the name it bears: but his disappointment is great, when instead of 'confusion,' he finds perfect, order, system, and mechanism, in the formation of the brick, the plan and construction of the tower. Why, says he, there is no 'confusion' here, and the name the tower bears is inappropriate indeed. But, cries the voice of Him who inscribed it, 'Therefore is the name of it called Babel; because the Lord did there confound the language of all the earth and from thence did the Lord scatter them abroad upon the face of all the earth.' Gen. xi, 9. Ah! cries the traveler, I perfectly understand it now. The name is truly appropriate, and has its location where it properly belongs. It is inscribed on the tower, because 'THERE' God confounded the language of the PEOPLE, and from 'THENCE' were they scattered. The confusion therefore must be looked for among the people scattered over the whole earth. The application is easy. The church commenced

building her a tower and a city, under the influence of Catholicism. God confounded her language and scattered her; or different sects have sprung up; each has built a tower, and attempted to build a city; they too have been confounded and scattered. Hence the work of tower and city building, confounding and scattering, has gone on until perfect confusion reigns throughout Christendom. The great city is complete; and reaching far above its many towers is seen the one first reared by the 'mother' of the city. And upon her tower the name of the city is properly inscribed, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS, AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH. It is inscribed upon the 'mother's' tower, because, as in the case of Babel, the type, 'THERE' the work of confounding, and from 'THENCE' the scattering commenced.

Again, God calls HIS PEOPLE out of Babylon. Rev. xviii. 4. Where are his people? Until quite recently they were in the different churches; some doubtless are there yet—many, thank the Lord, have come out in obedience to his call. Babylon, then, must be that place where God's people are found at the time they are called to come out of her; and as they were in the churches with scarcely an exception, at the time the cry to come out was made, the conclusion is irresistible that the churches are the Babylon under consideration.

The influence the church has over the world, is a strong evidence in our favor. She dictates its laws, and guides its destinies by her deceptive hand. No one of the sects does this work alone; it is done by the influence of them all. It is the whole 'great city which reigneth over the kings of the earth'—Rev. xvii. 18. She reigns by artifice, cunning, and deception, as an artful woman rules her deceived and fallen paramours.

That the churches are Babylon is further evident from the fact, that no other view of the subject makes a perfect harmony in the prophecies of John. With this view we can see 'the woman' go into the wilderness A. D. 538; and remain there 1260 years, until A. D. 1793; when she takes her seat upon the 'beast,' a dissipated harlot, surrounded with a family of daughters of like character; all of which constitutes the corrupt influence which now controls the affairs of the nations of the globe, and will, until the great city they represent, together with the kings of the earth over which she reigns, be destroyed at the coming of the Lord of glory.

Finally, the facts in the case answering to the strict definition of the term *Babylon*, is conclusive evidence that the churches, or nominal church constitute the Babylon under consideration. When we look at the confusion or mixture in the names, creeds, doctrines, worship, ordinances, practices, and so forth of the sects, we involuntarily exclaim, oh! what a Babylon! And when we see her corruptions, we wonder not that God calls his people out of her, and threatens, in the most fearful language, her speedy and everlasting destruction.

The Fall of Babylon.

Having shown that the nominal church, comprising all human ecclesiastical organizations, is Babylon, out of which God calls his people, the next point to be considered is the fall of Babylon.

The 'Advent Shield' places this event in the future, to take place at the actual coming of Christ. On pages 116 and 117 it is said, 'that the fall of Babylon is the end of Satan's supremacy in the earth, when Michael will stand up to reign.' And in speaking of 'coming out of Babylon,' on page 118, it is said, 'Thus when the wicked are to experience the fierceness of the wine of the wrath of God, the righteous will all receive the invitation to meet their Lord in the air, and will not suffer for the sins of the wicked, nor receive of her plagues.'

We are constrained to take a different view of the subject, because,

1st. *Babylon exists after her fall*; for after her fall is announced, in the same verse it is said, 'and is become the habitation of devils,' &c. Rev. xviii. 2.—Her fall, then, could not, as the Shield says, 'be the end of Satan's supremacy.'

2nd. God's people are called upon to come out of her after the fall and deep corruption of Babylon are announced, (verses 2 and 4.) But, according to the Shield, that call must be made at or before the fall.

3d. After her fall, Babylon proudly says, 'I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow,' (v. 7.) If the Shield is correct, she says this before her fall.

4th. The call, 'Come out of her, my people,' clearly implies a voluntary act on the part of those who hear; it is optional with them to come out or remain in Babylon, for to the call is added, 'that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues,' (verse 4.) But there can be no option, or volition, with the creature in his resurrection, change from mortality to immortality, and being 'caught up

to meet the Lord.' The two cases are entirely different in their nature. The call 'Come out of her' implies a voluntary act; while being 'caught up' implies a passive act. The Shield makes both to be one, and a passive act.

5th. The Shield blends all these events in one—places them in the future, at the actual coming of Christ. Hence Babylon has not yet fallen, and 'become the habitation of devils'; and the voice 'Come out of her, my people,' has not yet been heard. But John makes a clear distinction in the events, as the following testimony will show:

After telling what Babylon is, in Rev. chap. xvii, commencing with the 18th chap. John says, 'And after these things I saw another angel come down from heaven, having great power, and the earth was lighted with his glory. And he cried mightily, with a strong voice, saying, 'Babylon the great is fallen is fallen! and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and the cage of every unclean and hateful bird. For all nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication, and the kings of the earth have committed fornication with her, and the merchants of the earth have waxed rich through the abundance of her delicacies, (or "power," as the margin reads.) And I heard another voice from heaven, saying, Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues. For her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities. Reward her even as she rewarded you, and double unto her double according to her works: in the cup which she hath filled, fill to her double. How much she hath glorified herself, and lived deliciously, so much torment and sorrow give her; for she saith in her heart, I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow. Therefore shall her plagues come in one day—death, and mourning, and famine; and she shall be utterly burned with fire: for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her.'

1st. We learn from this testimony, that Babylon was first to fall, and become deeply corrupt; verse 2.

2d. After that fall and corruption, God's people are commanded to 'come out of her,' verse 4.

3d. After that call is given, Babylon becomes proudly exalted, and contemplates 'no sorrow,' but undisturbed dominion as a queen of universal power; verse 7.

4th. But at this time of her proud expectations, she is to be 'utterly burned with fire,' or finally destroyed; verse 8.

That the fall of Babylon, and her destruction, are different events, is evident from what John says of her, after the occurrence of each of those events.

He speaks of Babylon after her fall, as having 'become the habitation of devils'—of God's people being called out of her—of her being threatened with plagues—her sins reaching to heaven—God remembering her iniquities—and of her glorifying herself, and saying in her heart, 'I sit a queen, and shall see no sorrow;' see Rev. xviii. 2-7. All these things are said of her after her fall has taken place. Surely, then, her fall cannot be her destruction. But of her destruction it is said, 'She shall be utterly burned with fire, and shall be found no more at all,' verses 8 and 21.

The fall of Babylon, we consider, consists in her final rejection of the truth; and her destruction will be her punishment for that rejection and her corruption. But it may be asked, Can a power fall, and not be destroyed? One example, of many which might be named, will show that it can. The Jews, as a nation, fell before their destruction. They rejected Christ; who told them the last time he left the temple, that their house was left unto them desolate. And again, 'If thou hadst known, in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace; but now they are hid from thine eyes.' But Paul speaks directly to the point: 'Have they stumbled that they should fall?' Now if the fall of them be the riches of the world,' (Rom. xi. 11, 12.) When did the Jews fall? At the time salvation came unto the gentiles. 'Through their fall, salvation is come unto the gentiles.' Rom. xi. 11. When did salvation come unto the gentiles? All admit it came at the first advent of Christ. When were the Jews, as a nation, destroyed? Near forty years after they fell, or their final rejection of the truth. Their fall was gradual; but final, when they rejected the Son of God.

So with Babylon, or the nominal church—its fall has been gradual. Truths after truths have been presented to the church, but she has rejected them, until the last and most glorious of all—the SECOND COMING OF CHRIST—has been treated with as much contempt as was the doctrine of his first coming by the proud and sin-hardened Jews. And since this last, this crying sin, the fall of the church has not only been visible to others, but its chief organs have proclaimed the mournful fact throughout Christendom. We give the following testimony in justification of our position:

Elder R. Turnbull, missionary in Europe, says, "everywhere—in France, Italy, Switzerland, Germany—a dead formality seems to prevail. The heart of religion has been worn out by speculation, or benumbed by constant iteration of mere forms and ceremonies; the consequence of which is, that in most places, it is nothing more than a hideous *religion*, hung up in terror, or exhibited to the people as a curiosity."

Such is the condition of the church in the eastern world; and is it any better in our own boasted land of Bibles? Our opponents being judges, it is not.—A late number of the Congregational Journal remarks as follows:

CHURCH OF THE REV. ALBERT BARNES.—At a recent meeting of the Presbytery of Philadelphia, Rev. Mr. Barnes, pastor of the 1st Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia, whose notes are so extensively used in our families and Sabbath schools, stated, that he had been in the ministry for twenty years, and never, till the last communion, had he administered the ordinance without receiving more or less to the church. But now there are no awakenings, no conversions, not much apparent growth in grace in professors, and none come to his study to converse about the salvation of their souls. With the increase of business, and the brightening prospects of commerce and manufactures, there is an increase of worldly-mindedness. Thus it is with all denominations.

'Thus it is with all denominations; and will they deny the charge? Let them speak for themselves:

"The Puritan (Orthodox) of this city, (Boston) not long since informed its readers that there had not been known such a state of coldness for some twenty years. Zion's Herald made a similar statement, and endeavored to fix the blame upon 'Millerism'; and we have been told that at the recent protracted meeting held by Mr. Knapp, at the Tremont Baptist (Mr. Colver's) church, the failure was ascribed to the same cause."—*Ad. Herald*.

The Christian Palladium for May 15th speaks in the following mournful strains:

'In every direction we hear the dolorous sound, wafting upon every breeze of heaven, chilling as the blasts from the ice-bergs of the north—settling like an incubus on the breasts of the timid, and drinking up the energies of the weak; that lukewarmness, division anarchy and desolation are distressing the borders of Zion. Perhaps it is so. What then? Do we well, like the howling women of ancient days, to rend our flesh—our hair, and fill the whole atmosphere with our wailings?

'It is but a few passing months since the whole extent of our wide spread country rang with triumphant peals of joy borne upon the wings of numerous religious periodicals, and spontaneously overflowing from every Christian heart. Not a lip but was shouting the victories of the cross, or joining in the triumphant songs of the redeemed. And is the whole scene now so changed? Is God's whole Israel routed and flying before their uncircumcised enemies? And is it to be at the end of long years that Zion's walls are again to be built? I do not believe it. I cannot think that God's hosts are thus broken, routed and flying from an overpowering foe.'

The next point in order to be noticed, is the call for God's people to

Come Out of Her.

1st. That the Bible does speak of a call for God's people to come out of "Mystery Babylon" is evident from the following testimony: "My people, go ye out of the midst of her, and deliver ye every man his soul from the fierce anger of the Lord." Jer. li. 45. If this testimony refers directly to "Mystery Babylon," (and there is very good reason that it does) then the proof is clear that such a call is made; but if it refers to literal Babylon, the testimony is not invalidated; for there can be no dispute but that literal Babylon was a type of mystery Babylon, and by comparing the above command with one which there can be no dispute about its applying to mystery Babylon, we find the type and anti-type perfectly agree. In reference to mystery Babylon it is said, "And I heard another voice from heaven, saying, come out of her, my people that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." Rev. xviii. 4. This testimony fully settles the point that the Bible speaks of a call for God's people to come out of Babylon.

2nd. *The nature of the call.* We say call, but it is more properly an imperative command, given by the Most High to his people; threatening the severest penalty in case of their neglecting or refusing to obey it. Hence, Jeremiah, li. 45, assigns as a reason why God's people should "go out of her," that every man might deliver his soul from the fierce anger of the Lord. And John says, come out of her, "that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." Rev. xviii. 4. Also, we think the same penalty is threatened in Rev. xiv. 9-10. After the fall of Babylon is announced, the third angel followed saying with a loud voice, "If any man worship the beast and his image and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb."

[Concluded on page 64.]

THE REVIEW AND HERALD.

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

SARATOGA SPRINGS, TUESDAY, DECEMBER 9, 1931.

Review of O. R. L. Croster on Rev. xiv, 1-13.

BY BRO. J. N. ANDREWS.

A series of articles from the pen of "C." in the "Harbinger," for a few weeks past, seems to demand a brief notice. The writer attempts to show that Rev. xiv. 1-13, is but one view or vision, beginning with the reign of the Lamb on Mount Zion, and extending forward for a space, in the Millennial state. He also proceeds to show that the proclamation of the everlasting gospel, is made AFTER the end of the present age or dispensation; and the second angel's message, or proclamation, "Babylon is fallen, come out of her my people," [Rev. xiv. 8; xviii. 2-4] is given AFTER the saints have been caught up to meet their Lord in the air, and have actually begun to reign with him in his kingdom; the third proclamation follows, containing a most solemn warning against the worship of the Beast and his Image, and refers directly to the period when the Two-horned Beast shall require on pain of death, that men shall worship the Beast and his Image and receive his mark. Compare Rev. xiv. 9-11, with xiii. 14-17. The penalty of this worship is given in language of solemn and fearful import. They "shall drink the wine of the wrath of God," and they "shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels and in the presence of the Lamb." The torment with fire and brimstone is explained in Rev. xxi. 8; xx. 9, 10; the wrath of God threatened by the third angel is filled up in the seven last plagues, [Rev. xv. 1] which are certainly future when the third angel's message is given. For further proof on this point, notice the fact that the FIRST PLACED is poured out on the very class which the third angel threatens. Rev. xvi. 2, xiv. 9, 10. The everlasting gospel preached AFTER the end! Matt. xxiv. 15. The people of God in Babylon AFTER they have been caught up to meet the Lord in the air, to be forever with him! 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17; Rev. xviii. 2-4. The triumph of the Beast and his Image, and the pouring out of the seven last plagues in the Millennial state! Rev. xx. 1-4. The absurdity of this view, it might be supposed, would be its own refutation. But we notice in this place one fact which directly refutes this view. A comparison of Rev. xiv. 9-11; xv. 1; xvi. 2, shows clearly that the third angel's proclamation precedes the seven last plagues. Now mark! AT LEAST SIX OF THE PLAGUES PRECEDE THE COMING OF JESUS. Rev. xvi. 12-15.

The reasons offered to substantiate this application, are in substance these: 1. Rev. xiv. 1-13, is one connected vision; hence the three messages are not heard until the commencement of Christ's reign on Mount Zion. 2. The theory which would locate any of these messages in the past, makes Zion, Babylon, the penalty of worshipping the Beast, the one like the Son of man, mean something different from the plain import of the language. 3. The third reason is found in the fitness of the application of these messages to the events of the future.

1. Let us weigh these reasons in the light of scripture testimony. We inquire then, is Rev. xiv. 1-13, one connected view? If we do not mistake greatly, the sixth verse introduces a new vision or view. The language is this: AND I SAW ANOTHER ANGEL FLY IN THE MIDST OF HEAVEN. That this language is repeatedly used in the book of Revelation to introduce a new view is evident to all who will examine a few passages. "And I saw another mighty angel come down from heaven." Rev. x. 1. "And I saw another sign in heaven." xv. 1. "And I saw heaven opened." xix. 11. "And I saw an angel standing in the sun." xix. 17. "And I saw the Beast and the kings of the earth." xix. 19. "And I saw an angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit, and a great chain in his hand." xx. 1. "And I saw a great white throne and him that sat on it." xx. 11. "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth." xxi. 1. These quotations show that the expression, "And I saw," is repeatedly used by the beloved disciple in recording a new view. The argument, therefore, that Rev. xiv. 1-13, is one connected view, rests not on proof, but on assertion. The arguments adduced to prove that Christ's reign on Mount Zion is future, we do not call in question. None of us believe that that reign is in the past. Relative to Mount Zion itself, we offer one text from the New Testament which brother C. overlooks. "But ye are come unto MOUNT ZION, AND UNTO THE CITY OF THE LIVING GOD, THE HEAVENLY JERUSALEM." Heb. xii. 22. The 144,000 who were shown to John, upon Mount Zion, were shown to him in the seventh chapter, whilst in the present state. Just before the four winds were loosed, an angel was commissioned to seal

the SERVANTS OF GOD." When this work was accomplished, 144,000 were found to be sealed. This company, therefore comprises the servants of God at a certain period. That period as shown by the connection, is not the days of the first Advent, but the days of the second. See Rev. vi, vii, viii.

2. We do not admit the truth of the charge contained in the second reason. We believe that Zion is real, and literal and intimately connected with the HEAVENLY JERUSALEM. Heb. xii. 22. As expressed by Macknight's version, we believe that we "Shall come to Mount Zion, and to the city of the living God, the Heavenly Jerusalem." We believe in Babylon, and in its fall as described in Rev. xviii. "The penalty of the Beast worshippers," which is the seven last plagues, and a part in the lake of fire, we believe to be real, literal and dreadful. The one like the Son of man is Jesus. Rev. i. 13-18.

3. The fitness of the application of these messages to the future, next claims attention. The first view presented in this application is this: The proclamation of the everlasting gospel "to every nation and kindred and tongue and people, saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgment is come," is located AFTER the end of the present, and in a future dispensation! The gospel which was committed to the apostles, was to be preached "in all the world," to "all nations," and then the end should come. Mark, xvi; Mat. xxviii. The preaching of the gospel was committed to Paul in common with the other apostles; [1 Tim. i. 11, 12; ii. 7] and we hear him preaching that God "now commandeth all men everywhere to repent; because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness." Acts xvii. 31. The gospel committed to Paul extended no further than to "the end." "A gospel" that should be preached in the "day in the which God shall judge the world by Jesus Christ," is "another gospel," than that preached by Paul, "and one that has no Saviour in it." We would seriously, yet kindly, inquire whether the language of Paul is not strictly applicable in this case; "But though we, OR AN ANGEL FROM HEAVEN, preaching any other gospel unto you than that we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." Gal. i. 8.

It is evident, however, that the proclamation of the first angel, pertains to the last great work of salvation, the finishing of the proclamation of the gospel of Jesus. In other words, it evidently synchronizes with what Christ terms "this gospel of the kingdom," which was to be preached in all the world for a witness, and then the end should come. That this proclamation of the coming kingdom, and that the hour of God's judgment is come, has been made through the world, is a fact well established. It rests upon the most weighty testimony viz: the prophetic history of the world, Dan. ii, vii, viii; Mat. xxiv; Rev. vi, viii, ix, xi; the prophetic periods, Dan. viii, xii; Rev. ix, xiii; and the signs of the times, Mat. xxiv; Luke xxi; 2 Tim. iii. It has been attended in the most wonderful manner by the power of the Holy Spirit. We would rather by far be joined with those Pharisees and Lawyers who rejected the counsel of God against themselves, not being baptized of John, than to be with those who have rejected this solemn proclamation. Mark the language. It does not read, the judgment has come,—but, THE HOUR OF HIS JUDGMENT IS COME; implying that a brief space in which mercy yet lingered, remained to the unprepared.

Nor does the quotation from Isaiah [lii. 7.] avail much for Brother C. If the apostle Paul is correct in his application of this text, it is evident that the proclamation of "the glad tidings of good things" is made in the present dispensation and not after the gospel shall have ended. Read Rom. x. 11-17, and answer, does not this portion of scripture apply to the preaching of the gospel in the present dispensation?

The second angel's message is next applied. Babylon is the literal city of Rome. The seven heads of the Beast on which the woman, or Babylon sits, are the seven mountains on which Rome is built. The fall of Babylon, is the overthrow, or burning of Rome. Such, in a few words, is the "literal" position of brother C.

The reason offered to prove that Babylon is a literal city, is this: The angel in his application of the woman, styles her a city; and, (to express his idea in words) the explanation of a symbol is never given in symbols, but is always literal. That this is not a universal rule, is evident from Rev. xi. 3, 4. The two witnesses are there explained to be "the two olive trees, and the two candle sticks;" which explanation cannot be understood literally. The meaning is transferred to other symbols, which symbols are elsewhere, clearly explained. Jer. xi. 16, 17; Rom. xi. 17-25; Rev. i. 20. So in this case. When the angel tells John that "the woman is that great city which reigneth over the kings of the earth," we understand him to refer to that same "great city" which an angel had just before pointed out to

John. Rev. xi. 8-13. In the street of this great city the witnesses were to lie three years and a half. And in verse 13 we read, that a tenth part of the city fell. This event is included in the second v.c.e. No one, it is believed, applies the great city in Rev. xi, to Rome, or to any other literal city. We will notice this point again.

The seven heads are seven mountains. This explanation, according to brother C., must be literal; that is, the heads of the Beast are seven mountains of earth! If so; they are quite unlike the four heads of the Leopard, [Dan. vii.] which denoted the four kingdoms, into which Grecia was divided. Nor does this view make very good sense when it is applied to Rev. xiii. "I saw one of his heads," says John, as it were wounded to death; (margin, slain;) and his deadly wound was healed." Can any one tell how, or when one of the seven hills of Rome received a deadly wound by the sword? And how, and when was that mountain healed? There is literality about this to be sure; it is literally an absurdity. The version of Prof. Whiting, however, makes this subject entirely plain. "The seven heads are seven mountains, and they." (the seven mountains) "are seven kings." Thus the angel gives a double explanation to the symbol used. It is easy to understand how one of the seven kings or kingdoms could receive a deadly wound.

This view demonstrates the fact that a literal city was not intended by the angel. For a literal city cannot sit upon symbolic mountains. A woman being the acknowledged symbol of the church, [Rev. xii; Eph. v. 22-32; 2. Cor. xi. 2; Jer. vi. 2,] and the church being compared, by Christ, to a city, [Math. v. 14] we understand the woman seated upon the Beast, to denote the corrupt church united to the civil power.

The fall of Babylon, brother C. explains to be the destruction of Rome. This fact is to be "announced by the second angel throughout the earth." A voice from heaven (see Rev. xviii. 2.) follows this announcement, saying "Come out of her my people." We would inquire with all candor, how the people of God can be called out of Rome after it has been destroyed? And how can they escape the plagues that were to come on Rome, by coming out of her, after she has been destroyed? Verse 4. And how comes it that the people of God are in Rome, after they have been caught up to meet the Lord in the air, to be forever with him? Or, as expressed in Chap. xi, the servants of God are around his throne, when they witness the smoke of her burning. But perhaps brother C. will vary his application of the term Babylon, and make it include the Papal church; so that when Rome shall have been burnt, after the Advent, there shall be a great call to come out of the Papal church. But Papacy and its kindred abominations are to be destroyed by the brightness of Christ's coming. 2 Thess. i. 7-10; ii. 7, 8.

How much more natural is the plain account of Babylon's fall in Rev. xviii. The fall of Babylon renders her the hold of foul spirits, and a cage of unclean and hateful birds. This shows that it is not her destruction, but that it is a moral fall, and denotes her rejection and perfect apostasy.—The people of God are then called upon to flee out of her, lest they receive of her plagues, and be overwhelmed in her destruction. Who, that will compare the corrupt bodies described in 2 Tim. iii, and in Rev. xviii, can doubt their identity? And how evident it is that we now stand, where but a brief space, intervenes between us, and the pouring out of Babylon's Plagues.

The writer next proceeds to notice the third angel. He presents no arguments to show that this applies to the future, but in view of what he has already said, treats it as an established fact. Let us examine the propriety of this application. That the solemn warning against the worship of the Beast and his Image, and the reception of the Mark, refers to the period when men will be required to do these things, on pain of death, cannot be doubted by those who will take pains to compare Rev. xiv. 9-11, xiii. 14-17. What a period must "the times of the Restitution" be, if such a scene as that described in Rev. xiii. 14-17, is to be realized in it! How much more befitting is such a scene, for that time of trouble such as never was! But by turning to Rev. xx. 1-6; it will be seen that the period of triumph to the Beast and his Image, and the reception of the Mark, precedes, but is not cotemporary with, the reign of the saints. See also Rev. xv. 2. The penalty of this worship is too clearly described in the Book of revelation to be doubted, or set aside. The wrath of God is described in Rev. xv. 1. The torment with fire and brimstone is described in Rev. xxi. 8.

The language of verse 12, "HERE, IS THE PATIENCE OF THE SAINTS: here are they that keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus," entirely overthrows the application of these messages to the period when the saints shall receive their REWARD. The SAINTS are in their PATIENCE, at the close of the third angel's proclamation. "Ye have need

of patience," says Paul, "that after ye have done the will of God, ye might receive the promise." Heb. x. 35-39. "In your patience," says Christ, "possess ye your souls." Luke xxi. 19. Be patient therefore brethren unto the coming of the Lord." James v. 7. Can any one believe that the saints will have to possess their souls in patience, in the kingdom of God? or that they will "have need of patience," AFTER THEY SHALL HAVE RECEIVED THE PROMISE? [1 John ii. 25.] or that they will be required to exercise patience AFTER THE COMING OF THE LORD? Yet if brother C. be correct in his application, this period of the saints' patience refers to the future period of their reign with Christ! Rev. xx.

"Here are they that keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus." How evident it is that this refers to the period when "the remnant" (on whom the dragon is yet to make war) are KEEPING "THE COMMANDMENTS OF GOD" and the faith of Jesus; [Rev. xii. 17;] and not to the period when those who keep them shall have entered in through the gates into the City. Rev. xxii. 14. Or to the period when the saints are living by faith, [Heb. x. 38, 39,] and not to the period when they shall have received "the end of their faith, the salvation of their souls." 1 Pet. i. 9. And we would here inquire whether this company is composed of those who do and teach the commandments, or of those who break them, and "teach men so?" Math. v. 17-19.

But verse 13, which pronounces a blessing on the "dead which die in the Lord from henceforth," contains a testimony that cannot be evaded. It shows that this vision relates to a period prior to the first resurrection. Rev. xx. 4-6. No one, it is believed, who credits the word of God, expects that the saints will die after they have put on immortality, which event occurs at the last trumpet. 1 Cor. xv. 51-56. Bro. C. perceives that this is fatal to his theory, and attempts to evade it, by saying that this is not a part of the vision, but an unconnected sentence, "a declaration of a great and glorious truth." His whole theory rests upon the position that Rev. xiv. 1-13, is but one connected view and this assumption he is now obliged to abandon.

We cannot forbear an expression of sorrow and regret that such arguments as these should be brought to oppose the truth. Not only do they show a disposition to break down those prophecies which describe the Advent Movement, but even the hope of the church, immortality, the kingdom, deliverance from persecution, and the recompense of the reward,—all, all are dissipated into thin air. Or, rather, instead of having, those who have gotten the victory over the Beast and his Image, live and reign with Christ a thousand years, they are, after the coming of Christ, still in Babylon, exposed to the wrath of the Beast and his Image, still in the period of their patience, and yet liable to the grasp of death! Well is it for the church of Christ that her hope is laid up in heaven, [Col. i. 5,] and that it is not in the keeping of frail men. We hope for the things promised—the kingdom of God, the first resurrection, immortality, to reign with Christ a thousand years in triumph over the Beast and his Image! And the things for which we hope, we are also waiting for with patience. God grant that our hope may be like an anchor to the soul, and that by it, having laid hold on the reality, we may hold it fast until Christ our Life shall appear.

Jackson, (Mich.), Nov. 21st, 1851.

THE SABBATH.

We see by the late numbers of the "Harbinger and Advocate," beginning with Nov. 1st, that M., the editor, is replying to our review of his article entitled "Seventh Day Sabbath Abolished."

In our review of M. we quoted largely and fairly from his article, and endeavored not to mis-state his position, but show from the Bible that it is incorrect. And we think that it deserves a more candid and fair reply than the remarks of M. We think the spirit of his reply really bitter, and some of his unkind, denunciatory assertions unlike the professed motto of the "Harbinger," which is, "Speak the truth in love." Let the sincere judge.

To this portion of the remarks of M. we make no reply. It needs none. It must condemn itself in the estimation of every honest seeker for truth. But, as we have before stated, we are happy to meet our opponents on bible ground, and candid investigation is our hope for the final triumph of the Sabbath of the Lord. While we thus speak we feel our own weakness. Our trust is in God. We fully believe that the time for the commandments of God to be clearly understood has come, and the Sabbath of the fourth, observed by the people of God; therefore, every reasonable objection can be, and should be answered scripturally, and in the meek spirit of the gospel.

It is stated by M. that we mistake "in blending Sabbath and Seventh day in one and the same meaning, whereas

they are of different significations." This we have not done. The "mistake" is with M. Who does not know that the seventh day of the first week of time signifies the seventh in order, and that Sabbath signifies Rest? That the Sabbath was instituted, or "made for man," at the close of the first week of time we fully believe, and, we think, from the best authority. The plain facts in their order are as follows: First, the work of creation was in six days; second, God rested on the seventh day; and third, he "blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested." God did not first sanctify and bless the seventh day, and then rest upon it, neither did he sanctify and bless the day by resting upon it; but he first rested upon that day, and then "blessed the seventh day and sanctified it" for the spiritual benefit of man, and his own glory, "because that in it he had rested from all his work." The seventh day is the Sabbath (Rest) of the Lord, because God rested on that day. Then God blessed and sanctified his Rest-day, and gave it to man to observe as a weekly memorial of the Living God that made heaven and earth.

The fourth commandment fully confirms this position. God's reason in that commandment for observing the seventh day is as old as the world. He says, "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day, and hallowed it." Ex. xx. 11. Here are some things worthy of special notice. First, the given reason for the sanctification of the seventh day is, because God rested upon it after the work of creation in six; second, "the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day and hallowed it," at the close of the first week of time, and nowhere else; and third, the seventh day is called the Sabbath-day at the time when God sanctified and blessed it. No one will say that Gen. ii. 3, contains an account of God's blessing the seventh day after the world was 2500 years old; neither can it be shown that God "blessed the Sabbath-day and hallowed it" at any other time than at the close of the first week.

"The seventh day is the Sabbath (Rest) of the Lord thy God." It is the Creator's Rest-day that man is required to commemorate. But M. says that God could just as well have constituted either of the other days a day of rest, as the seventh, but in his wisdom he saw fit to select the seventh for this purpose." Will M. please to read the fourth commandment, and in the place of the "seventh day" substitute the first, second, third, fourth, fifth or sixth day, and see what perfect nonsense it will make of the commandment of God. It is evident that if another day had been selected, another commandment would have been given, another reason assigned for the institution.

But M. objects to the Sabbath being made at the close of the first week of time, because man was then in Paradise. And as he had not then sinned, and did not obtain his bread by the sweat of his brow, he needed no Sabbath. He says:

"Man, before he sinned, did not have to gain his bread by the sweat of the brow, hence he needed no Sabbath; all days were alike to him then; and doubtless would have continued so to his posterity till now, had sin never entered. To say there was a Sabbath before the fall of Adam, is the same as to say sin, toil and wearisome labor existed before that time. No, no; these things did not exist in that pure state, but they were witnessed after that time; and poor fallen man has had to pursue a course of tiresome labor ever since, to gain a living."

If the Sabbath was made merely because man needed a day of rest from wearisome labor, as taught by M., then the view that it was made before the fall is incorrect. If it was made because man sinned, and was driven from Paradise, where he had to "gain his bread by the sweat of the brow," then it follows of necessity that the Sabbath is needed from Paradise lost at the fall, to Paradise gained in immortality. And if, as taught by M. the Sabbath was made because of the curse, then it necessarily follows that the Sabbath should run parallel with that curse. This view locates the necessity of the Sabbath at the fall of man, and extends it quite through the period of man's toil and wearisome labor, to immortality, when freed from the curse. If we are not very much mistaken as to the position of M. here, it is perfectly destructive of his main position, that the Sabbath was a Jewish institution, designed for the Jews alone for about 1,600 years, only a little more than five-twentieths of the long period in which "poor fallen man" needed a Sabbath to rest from wearisome labor! Mark well the assertion of M. as follows: "To say there was a Sabbath before the fall of Adam, is the same as to say sin, toil and wearisome labor existed before that time." No one will fail to see that M. has the Sabbath inseparably connected with wearisome labor; therefore, according to his position, to say that "toil and wearisome labor" has existed for 6,000 years, is the same as to say that the Sabbath has existed ever since the fall of Adam. Thus M. establishes the existence of the Sabbath from the fall of man,

which destroys his main position that the Sabbath is a Jewish institution.

But M. evidently mistakes the design of the Sabbath of the Lord. We know of no scripture testimony to show that it was given because man needed a day to rest from toil, when weary. Men have argued the necessity of the Sabbath because man needed rest; but setting the law of the Sabbath, and its great and glorious object, aside, would it not be as well, or even better for man to rest one seventh part of each day, than one whole day in seven?

God rested from his work on the seventh day, or ceased from creating on that day; and man was to rest, or cease from the work assigned him, on the same day of each week. But M. will not say that the Creator was tired, and rested because he was weary! Neither should he suppose that the Creator gave his Rest-day to man merely because he needed rest from toil. The law of Moses required that the "land" should "rest" and keep a sabbath unto the Lord one year in seven, [Lev. xxv. 1-5,] yet the land could not be weary; it only ceased to be sown, reaped, &c. The sabbath of the Jewish law frequently occurred on the sixth day of the week, therefore the Jews did not rest on the seventh day, or Sabbath of the Lord, because they were weary, having rested the day before.

But when we view the institution of the weekly Sabbath in its true light it will be seen that its grand and glorious design was the honor of the Creator, and the spiritual good of man. Before the fall, man was placed in "the garden of Eden to dress it, and to keep it;" and although he knew no thing then of wearisome labor, any more, perhaps, than his Creator, yet for the glory of God, and his own spiritual good, he could cease from the work assigned him, and rest on the seventh day, as God rested on that day from the work of creation. In the original design of the Sabbath we view man's rest of the same nature of the Creator's, but its object different. God rested to set an example, and to lay the foundation of a holy institution, while man was to rest in honor of his Creator, and for his own spiritual benefit. If man's spiritual good was not in danger, then why did he ever fall? If he was in no danger of, in some sense, forgetting Him who said, "in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," why did he listen to him who said, "ye shall not surely die"? And what could better keep fresh in the mind of man the Great Creator's power, than for him to cease from his appointed work, on the seventh day, in honor of Him who first rested on that day after the work of creation in six days? But, although God set bounds for man, and sanctified his Rest-day, a weekly memorial of Himself, for man's benefit, yet he sinned, and was driven from Paradise.

And when we look down through the long period of toil, while the curse rests upon man, and the earth, we see additional necessity of the Sabbath, to keep in memory the living God that made heaven and earth. And then in the restitution we see it in its Eden glory, observed by "ALL FLESH." No discord there, but all the redeemed family of that New Earth, with holy awe, and in sweet submission will bow to this institution of Jehovah, See Isa. lvi. 22, 23. If the Sabbath will not then be for man's spiritual benefit, it will certainly be for the glory of the Creator. But as "ALL FLESH" are to "come to WORSHIP" before the Lord, "from one Sabbath to another," we conclude that it will be for the delight and benefit of the redeemed, as well as the honor of God.

To say that the Sabbath was made merely because man needed rest from toil, is degrading this holy institution, and bringing it down to the very dust. But when we see that it is the sanctified Rest-day of the Almighty that man is to celebrate, for his own spiritual benefit, and the honor of the Creator, then the institution appears in its glory and greatness, what it really is, the Holy Sabbath of the Lord our God. What a connecting link between God and man, Heaven and earth! How perfectly calculated to keep fresh in the memory of man the power of the Eternal God. What a safe-guard against infidelity and idolatry! And how much higher the object of the Creator in making the Sabbath, than merely because man needed to rest from toil! We say, as much higher, as heaven is above the earth, or as man's eternal welfare and the honor of God are above man's temporal wants.

Though the Sabbath was made for man, it is not called man's Sabbath, or the Sabbath of man, but it is styled as follows: "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the LORD THY GOD." "To-morrow is the rest of the HOLY SABBATH UNTO THE LORD." "THY HOLY SABBATH." "MY SABBATH." "MY HOLY DAY," and "THE HOLY OF THE LORD."

M. continues: "He has needed rest from his hard labors, and God in his good pleasure, in giving his law, the law of Moses, to his chosen people, provided a day of rest for them, and through them to all mankind who would submit to law. He made the Sabbath for man, and the scrip-

tures plainly tell us when it was made. It was made just at the time when we should suppose infinite wisdom would make it, namely, when he saw fit to give a law to his chosen people."

If man "has needed rest from his hard labors" ever since the fall, as stated by M., and if the Sabbath was given merely on that account, it really looks surprising that "Infinite Wisdom" should look on and see poor man toil 2,500 years without giving him that which he so much needed!

We cannot reconcile the statement of M. that "there is not a shade of evidence in the Bible" that the Sabbath was made before God gave the law of Moses, with the fact that the Sabbath was observed by Israel in the wilderness of Sin, and miraculously guarded by God in giving the manna, thirty days before Israel saw Sinai where the law of Moses was given. M. knows that the law of Moses was not given in the wilderness of Sin; he also knows that the Sabbath was observed there, and that the law of Moses was given at another place, thirty-two days afterward. Those who will learn the facts as recorded in Ex. xvi-xx, will not be deceived by this assertion of M. which is positively untrue.

And again, M. states that the Sabbath "was made just at the time when we should suppose infinite wisdom would make it." Now look at M's position as follows: The Sabbath a Jewish institution, therefore, "Infinite Wisdom" saw man toil 2,500 years without the needed day of rest. Then after the children of Israel were brought into the wilderness, where their bread was rained from heaven, and their clothes miraculously preserved, therefore they did not toil for either, consequently did not need rest from toil, *that* was the very place that "Infinite Wisdom" gave the Sabbath purposely for man to rest!! We fail to see "Infinite Wisdom" in this view of the subject, but finite weakness is very apparent. It is true that the people gathered and cooked their manna, and washed their clothes, but none will say that they needed a day to rest from toil. Then if rest from "wearisome labor" is the design of the Sabbath, it seems that "Infinite Wisdom" mocked the seed of Abraham forty years with a day of rest that they did not need!!

The Covenant Made in Horeb.

We first inquire, when was this covenant made? The covenant is mentioned in Deut. v, 2, 3; and verse 5, plainly shows where it was made, as follows: "I," says Moses, "stood between the Lord and you AT THAT TIME, to show you the word of the Lord; for ye were afraid by reason of the fire, and went not up into the mount." The "mount" referred to is Mount Sinai; therefore the covenant was made after the children of Israel came into the wilderness of Sinai, on the fifteenth day of the third month. Let this fact be clearly seen, that whatever may be understood by making the covenant in Horeb, it cannot be dated back one day prior to the fifteenth day of the third month.

We now inquire, what was the covenant made in Horeb? M. affirms that it was the ten commandments. To this view we object for the following reasons.

1. Because when the covenant was made, Moses took the words of the Lord and showed them to the people, which was not the case when the ten commandments were spoken from Sinai. God declared them with an audible voice to ALL THE PEOPLE.

2. Because the law of God existed before Israel came to the wilderness of Sinai. Though the ten precepts of that law were not previously written out in the form that they were written on the tables of stone at Sinai, yet to say that God's law did not exist in some form, is virtually saying that sin did not exist until 2,500 years after the fall of man, for St. Paul says, "where no law is, there is no transgression," Rom. iv, 15. He also says in Chap. v, 13, "For until the law, [when its precepts were written in stone,] sin was in the world; but sin is not imputed when there is no law." "Sin," says St. John, "is the transgression of the law." Therefore, as sin did reign "from Adam to Moses," God's law necessarily existed in some form during that time.

3. We object to M's position, because, if the covenant made in Horeb was the commandments of God, then they were all made there, and the Sabbath could not exist prior to the fifteenth day of the third month after Israel left Egypt. Now go back thirty days before this covenant was made, to the wilderness of Sin, [Ex. xvi.] and there you will see God raining manna from heaven for his chosen people. They gather an omer each day till the sixth day, then the people gathered two omers of manna for one man. And when the rulers told Moses, he replied, "This is that which the Lord hath said, To-morrow is the rest of the Holy Sabbath unto the Lord." He did not say, the seventh day will be the Sabbath, after the law shall be given at Sinai; but "is the rest of the Holy Sabbath."

On the Seventh day the heavens gave no manna. But

some of the people went out to gather, and they found none. "And the Lord said to Moses, How long refuse ye to keep my COMMANDMENTS and my LAWS? See, for that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath. . . . So the people rested on the seventh day." Ex. xvi, 23-30. Is it said that the people were then wholly ignorant of the Sabbath, and the other nine commandments, and that God made them in the wilderness of Sin? then we would call attention to the manner in which, as it is said, God first introduces them. "How long," says the Law-giver, "refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws? see for that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath." Who can for a moment suppose that God would introduce his law in this manner to a people wholly ignorant of it? This view makes God a tyrant, instead of a tender parent.

Again, if the commandments and laws of God, including the Sabbath, were made in the wilderness of Sin, and if they are the covenant made also in Horeb thirty-two days afterward, then they were certainly made twice! This is much like having the Sabbath abolished twice, first, before Christ began to heal on the Sabbath ("otherwise" he "became a transgressor," says M.) and then again at the cross. See Harbinger of Sept. 27, 1851, page 114, first column.

As the Sabbath was guarded by Jehovah in giving the manna in the wilderness of Sin, observed there by Israel, and as the violation of it was to "refuse" to keep God's "commandments and laws," how absurd the position that the covenant made thirty days later, in another place, was the commandments of God, one of which was the Sabbath! Here M. finds a serious difficulty which he tries to avoid by saying that the Sabbath "was not fully instituted until some days after it was given to the people." He has it "given" at the wilderness of Sin, we suppose, and then "instituted" at Sinai, thirty-two days later.

Query. Were the Israelites so weary, at the time that they did not have to labor for food or clothing, that "Infinite Wisdom" was moved to give them a day of rest thirty-two days before it was made for man? "It was made" says M. "just at the time when we should suppose infinite wisdom would make it, namely, when he saw fit to give a law to his chosen people." Was the law given in the wilderness of Sin? Certainly not; M. will say it was given at Sinai, thirty-two days after the manna was given. Yet he has the Sabbath given to Israel thirty-two days before "Infinite Wisdom" gave the law and made the Sabbath for man.

In another place M. says "that the Sabbath was not instituted until God gave it to the children of Israel." Here he has it instituted *when given*. And five lines only above this assertion, he states that it was given some days *before* it was instituted. The fact that the Sabbath was understood, and observed in the wilderness of Sin, is greatly in M's way. It is positive proof that his position is incorrect that the Sabbath was made thirty-two days afterward, when the covenant was made in Horeb.

Again, he refers to Neh. ix, 13, 14, where it is said, "Thou camest down also upon Mount Sinai, . . . and madest known thy Holy Sabbath." He thinks that this is certain proof that the Sabbath was not "instituted," or "made known," until that time. He then states that the Review contends that they knew all about it, and that it was instituted before that time, and adds, "Which will you believe? the Review, or Nehemiah?"

In trying to array Nehemiah against the "Review," M. evidently arrays the testimony of the prophet of the Lord against plainly revealed facts found in Ex. xvi. We inquire, When Moses said to the rulers, "To-morrow is the rest of the Holy Sabbath unto the Lord," did they not know something about it? And when they gathered and cooked two omers of manna for a man on the sixth day, that they might have one to eat on the Sabbath, and when they saw that none was given on the seventh day, were they ignorant of the design of God in this thing? And when God said, "How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws? see, for that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath," did not Moses and the people understand the Lord? The following shows that they did well understand the Sabbath. "So the people rested on the seventh day." Verse 30. Let it be understood that all this took place thirty-two days before the Lord came down on Mount Sinai.

The testimony of Nehemiah does not conflict with other portions of the Divine Record, nor the position of the Review. It is evident that the children of Israel understood the Sabbath when they rested on the seventh day in the wilderness of Sin. But when Jehovah descended in awful grandeur upon Mount Sinai, and spake the ten precepts of the "Royal Law," he then made known his Holy Rest-day in a manner calculated to deeply impress them with its importance.

The word of God plainly shows that the Sabbath was

understood in the wilderness of Sin; but M. has it "made for man," "instituted," "given," thirty-two days later, when the covenant was made in Horeb. We will not ask which will you believe, M. or the word of God; for we know our readers will all say in the language of the Apostle, "let God be true, but every man a liar."

But what was the covenant made in Horeb? and not with the fathers, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. A covenant is a mutual agreement between two parties, or, according to its second definition, it is a writing containing the terms of agreement.—Webster.

We say that the covenant under consideration, was, according to the first definition, a mutual agreement between God and his chosen people. The proposition on the part of God stands thus. "If ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then shall ye be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people, Ex. xix, 3-7. The answer of the people was as follows. "All that the Lord hath spoken we will do." Verse 8.

This mutual agreement between the two parties was the covenant made in Horeb. The ten commandments are also called a covenant, the ark of God is called the ark of the covenant, and the two tables of stone are called the tables of the covenant, because they, according to the second definition of the word, contained the terms of agreement. The Sabbath alone is "a perpetual covenant" that those who keep it may know that the Lord sanctifies them. Ex. xxxi, 16.

But M. states with much positiveness, [see Harbinger of Nov. 15.] and offers proof, that the ten commandments were God's covenant, written on the tables of stone, and that it embraced the Sabbath. All this we fully believe. But it by no means proves that the commandments of God was the covenant made in Horeb. What folly to assert that the law of God which embraces the Sabbath, was not made until thirty-two days after it was observed by the people, and its transgression rebuked by the Law-giver!

Let it here be understood that what was written in the BOOK of the COVENANT, [2 Chron. xxxiv, 30; 2 Kings xxiii, 21; Neh. viii, 1-3; Deut. xxxi, 21-26.] was called the covenant, and that which was written in the TABLES of the COVENANT, [Deut. ix, 9-11; iv, 13; Ex. xxiv, 12; xxxi, 18; xxxiv, 28, 29.] was also called the covenant. One embraced the mutual agreement between God and his chosen people, with all the ordinances of the Jewish religion, while the other embraced only the ten commandments. One was made in Horeb, or at Mount Sinai, consequently not made with the fathers; but the other containing the principles of God's moral government, must have existed parallel with the existence of man; therefore Abraham could keep God's "commandments statutes and laws," as well as Israel in the wilderness of Sin, before the covenant was made in Horeb.

Paul, in Rom. viii, is contrasting the old covenant with the new. No one will say that the new covenant here is the ten commandments; neither should they say that they are the old covenant. The conditions of the new covenant are to obey God's laws put in the mind, and written in the heart, while the terms of agreement in the old covenant was to obey them engraven in stones. This faulty covenant, made when God led his people out of Egypt was the covenant not made with the fathers. We inquire, were the ten commandments faulty? No one finds fault with any but the fourth, and M. should not find fault with that, seeing, as he states, that poor fallen man so much needed a day of rest from toil.

We understand by better covenant, and faulty covenant, that the promises on which the old was established are inferior to those on which the new is based. We will now look at some of the promises of the old.

"If ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people." Ex. xix, 5.

"If ye walk in my statutes and keep my commandments and do them; Then I will give you rain in due season, and the land shall yield her increase, and the trees of the field shall yield their fruit. And your threshing shall reach unto the vintage, and the vintage shall reach unto the sowing time; and ye shall eat your bread to the full, and dwell in your land safely." Lev. xxvi, 3-5.

These promises and many others of the kind, were faulty or inferior, because they did not take hold of eternal life. They related only to the prosperity of God's people in Canaan, or in this life. And it will be seen that God's covenant of ten commandments was the terms of agreement in this, the first covenant.

The promises on which the new covenant is established are indeed better. They bring to view eternal life through the atonement of Jesus Christ. And the law of God, that was written in tables of stone during the old covenant, is now written in the heart, and contains the terms of agreement, or is the very foundation of the new covenant.

"For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my LAWS into their minds, and write them in their hearts; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people: And they shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more. Heb. viii, 10-12. Jer. xxxi, 31-34.

Jesus is the mediator of the new covenant. When one asked him, "What good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life," he replied, "If thou wilt enter into LIFE, keep the COMMANDMENTS." Jesus then quotes five of the ten, which shows that he referred to the commandments of God.

We may now see that the ten commandments are neither the old nor the new covenant, but the terms, or foundation of both. The covenant made in Horeb was certainly the old covenant. It was not made with the fathers, but after the children of Israel were brought to Sinai. The ten commandments being the foundation of that covenant, or terms of agreement, we see them referred to in Deut. v, 7-21, immediately after the statements, that the Lord made a covenant in Horeb, that it was not made with the fathers, and that Moses stood between the Lord and the people at that time, to shew them the word of the Lord. It is true that Moses did take the words of the Lord and shew them to the people when the covenant was made in Horeb, see Ex. xix, 3-8; xx, 18-22, but it is positively untrue that he did so with the words of the ten commandments. The Lord spake them to all the people with an audible voice.

We have not space to notice every particular in the articles of M., neither is it necessary. We have, we think, fully shown his main positions incorrect, and we close by calling attention to his exhortation to those who read the "Review and Herald," and are, as he thinks, in danger of a "fearful fall" from grace, "into irretrievable ruin," by the sin of Sabbath-keeping!! He says, "And so far as any now seek to be justified by that dead law, they are fallen from grace." To this we reply, first, that it is unjust to represent us as teaching the observance of the dead law of Moses. We humbly claim the right to teach and observe that law which Paul called "holy, just, good, spiritual, which he served and delighted in, twenty-nine years after the law of Moses was abolished, See Rom. vii. And, second, we seek for justification alone through Jesus Christ. "Do we make void the law through faith?" says Paul, "God forbid: yea we establish the law." We give a portion of M.'s warning against keeping the fourth commandment as follows:

"Pause in your course, and listen to the voice of truth! You may now retrace your steps, and again be established on the rock of truth, the plain word of the Lord. But if you turn a deaf ear to the voice of the Bible, and suffer yourself to be blinded to its clear light, by such darkness as envelopes the Review, and the mistaken theory that gave it birth, you will soon be beyond the reach of recovery, and will stumble into irretrievable ruin. O pause! in your mistaken course, and remember that without faith it is impossible to please God."

Here, a professed Minister of Christ, and a Christian Editor, raises his warning voice against keeping the fourth commandment! Certainly, one might think it a great sin, to keep *all* the commandments of God, that has called forth this warning. We are exhorted to pause in our course. Is it wrong to observe a day of rest which, according to M.'s position, poor fallen man so much needed? Why should those who are keeping the commandments of God "pause" and "retrace their steps?" Did not Jesus, the True Witness say, "Blessed are they that do his [his Father's] commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the City?" Is not the fourth commandment one of the Father's? It is.

No, we will not "pause." Our course is onward. We will not "retrace our steps" for just before us is the Golden City, and the Tree of Life. "If thou wilt enter into Life, keep the commandments." Though the dragon be wroth with the "remnant" which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ, [Rev. xii, 17.] yet they will overcome. Onward! Onward! is their course; for their object is Eternal Life.

It is our settled conviction, however, that no sane man really believes that a Christian will "fall from grace" into "irretrievable ruin" for observing the Holy Sabbath of the Lord our God, in connection with other Christian duties.

Reader, be not deceived by such misrepresentations. We exhort you to obey the word of God. And you are aware that both Testaments enforce the observance of the law of God. Misrepresentation, you know, has ever been a weapon used against unpopular truths of the Bible. We now refer you to the Advent, Sonship of Christ, and Immortality and Eternal Life alone through Christ. You may have stood

firmly on the word of God against the opposition and reproach that has arisen from receiving and advocating these precious doctrines, yet you may be in danger of being deceived here, and led astray from the commandments of God. May God save you from the soul-destroying influence of those who violate the commandment of God, and "teach men so."

The Angels of Rev. xiv--No. 3.

When we commenced this very important subject, in Nos. 2 and 3 of the present volume of the "Review and Herald," it was our design to publish an article in each paper. But being from home much of the time, and other subjects of importance calling our attention, we have not been able to write them.

In our first article we showed that the thirteenth chapter of Revelation, and the first five verses of the fourteenth, were one prophetic chain of the past and present, and reaching into the future to the complete redemption of the 141,000. Also, that the sixth verse of the fourteenth chapter commences another prophetic chain, relative to the Second Advent, and the duties of God's people in view of the great event.

In our second article we pointed out the facts, that the angels of Rev. xiv, must be symbols, that the first three were symbols of three distinct messages to be given to God's people in this mortal state, that they "followed" each other, and that these angels especially the first, applied to advent history, had been the opinion of the Advent body.

We now wish to call attention to the messages of the first three angels.

FIRST ANGEL. "And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, saying with a loud voice. Fear God, and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment is come: and worship him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of water." Rev. xiv, 6, 7.

This proclamation not only relates to the judgment, but also to the hour, period, or time of the judgment. It fitly applies to the proclamation of the judgment at hand, that has been given to the present generation, and it cannot possibly apply to any other period of the Church.

We say that this angel's message cannot be properly applied to the preaching of the apostles, because they did not preach that the period of the judgment had come. Paul reasoned before Felix of "righteousness, temperance, and JUDGMENT TO COME." Acts xxiv, 25. He declared to the Athenians that God "now commandeth all men everywhere to repent; because he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world." Acts xvii, 30, 31.

That the Thessalonians had received the idea that the period of the coming of Christ and the judgment had come, or was at hand, is evident. But Paul corrected this error, as will be seen from the following which we copy from his second epistle to them.

"Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand.

Let no man deceive you by any means; for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God." 2 Thess. ii, 1-1.

Paul here declares to the Thessalonians that the day of Christ was not at hand, and warns them against being deceived in this matter. He also shows that the period of the judgment was to be after the apostacy, and the 1260 years of triumph and blasphemy of the "man of sin," or the Papacy. It is clear, therefore, that the apostles did not give the proclamation, "the hour of his judgment is come."

Again, this first message is based on prophecies (the prophecy of Daniel in particular) which were to be "closed up and sealed" [Dan. xii, 4, 9] till the time of the end, which has been clearly proved by second advent writers to be since about 1798. How perfectly absurd then to suppose that the message, relating to the period of the judgment, should be given while the prophecies on which it is based, which show the relative distance of the judgment, are "closed up and sealed," so that they could not be understood. This fixes the message to the present generation.

And again, Christ has given signs of his coming, and of the judgment, in Matt. xxiv; Luke xxi, and Mark xiii, also Rev. vi. The object of these signs, in connection with the prophecies of Daniel and John unsealed, was, as stated by Christ, that his people might "know" that his coming was "nigh, even at the doors." This generation alone being able to "know" this, could give the judgment hour message, which no other generation could do. Therefore we are bound by the facts in the case, to apply

this angel's proclamation to the advent movement witnessed in our day.

The "Advent Herald" of Nov. 22d, 1851, speaking of the advent cause, says:

"It is the cause of God, and is a work that must be done in these last days," (Rev. xiv, 6, 7.) . . . We believe it to be the will of God that this class should maintain this position, for on it devolves the duty of giving to the church and world the final message—"The hour of His judgment is come."

We can not agree with the "Herald" that the first of the three, is the "final message." It cannot be the last, because two distinct messages follow it, prior to the Son of man taking his place on the "white cloud." But that it applies to the past proclamation of the Advent, we fully believe.

But some who profess to be looking every day for Christ's coming, and say, "he may come to-day, or at any time," object to the view, that the first angel is fulfilled in the past, for they think the "everlasting gospel" of the coming kingdom has not yet been preached sufficiently extensive to fulfil the prophecy of Rev. xiv, 6, 7. But if the prophecy is not fulfilled, then certainly they should not expect the Advent now. Those looking for the world's conversion, cannot expect Christ's coming now; neither should those who are looking for a much wider spread of the first angel's message profess to be looking for the Second Advent, until that work shall first be accomplished.

But when we look to the past mighty movement relative to the coming and kingdom of Christ, we see the prophecy fulfilled, the great work accomplished. Advent Lecturers and Editors have testified that Rev. xiv, 6, 7, was fulfilled. The "Voice of Truth" for Dec. 1814, says:

"No case can be more clearly demonstrated with facts than that this message has been borne to every nation and tongue under heaven, within a few past years in the preaching of the coming of Christ in '43 or near at hand. Through the medium of lectures and publications, the sound has gone into all the earth, and the word unto the ends of the world."

Our advent brethren well know that from about the year 1810 to 1844, the judgment hour message was given with astonishing success and power, and that the public mind was moved by it. They also know that the message has ceased to arrest the public mind, that the world and church have fallen asleep to the subject, and that those who profess to be giving this message now, have lost the energy and power they once had. With these facts before us we have no reason to expect that the first angel's message will again arrest the public mind. And those who are looking for a much more extensive proclamation of this message than the past movement, may as well look for the conversion of the world.

SECOND ANGEL. "And there followed another angel, saying, Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city, because she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication."

This angel did not go on his mission and deliver his message in company with the first, but "followed," after the first angel had delivered the burden of his message. The first message was to the churches; but soon their papers refused to publish it, and the doors of their houses of worship were closed against it. They rejected the good news of the coming kingdom, and Jesus and the Spirit of truth departed from them, as their present state plainly shows. The few living souls in all these churches, who had received the advent message, and who loved to talk of the Advent and the Restoration, were not allowed to speak freely of their faith and hope. Their testimony being crushed, the way was fully prepared for the second message, "Babylon is fallen," &c. This message we heard, our voices proclaimed it, and we saw its effect when the oppressed children of God burst the bands that bound them to the various sects.

We are happy to spread before our readers in this number, the lengthy article on this subject, from the "Voice of Truth" of 1844. Oh, how lamentable, that that sweet voice of truth, so distinctly and joyfully heard in 1844, should ever die away, and error's discordant notes be heard in its stead.

We would also call attention to the "Review of O. R. L. Crozier on Rev. xiv, 1-13," by Bro. J. N. Andrews, especially his remarks on Babylon and its fall. As this number contains much on this subject, we shall add but a few remarks.

The fall of Babylon is evidently a moral fall, and not its final destruction. This may be seen from Rev. xviii, 2, where it is stated that Babylon is fallen, and is become the hold of every foul spirit, &c. It must exist after its fall in order to be a hold of foul spirits after that fall. In its fall and becoming a hold of foul spirits is clearly seen a moral change.

If the term Babylon is applied to the Catholic church, then we inquire, when did that church meet with such a moral change? When did she morally fall? The fact that she was always corrupt forbids such an application.

[Concluded from page 59.]

God's people, who heard the first angel's message, and came out under the message of the second, were, prior to their coming out, in Babylon. Were they in the Catholic Church? And did they come out of that church? Certainly not. But we know that many thousands did come out of the Protestant Sects. As the Catholic Church has not morally fallen, being always about as low as it possibly could be, and as God's people were not there, we say that it cannot be the Babylon mentioned by the second angel.

It is said that the city of Rome is Babylon, and that her fall is the burning of that literal city. But can the city of Rome be a hold of foul spirits after it is burnt? And will God's people be called out of Rome, after it is consumed by fire? They are called out of Babylon to escape her threatened plagues, Rev. xviii, 4. But will they flee out of Rome after it is burnt to escape plagues of which her being burnt is the last? "Her plagues shall come in one day, death, and mourning, and famine: and she shall be utterly burned with fire," Rev. xxiii, 8.

Babylon, signifies "mixture or confusion," which well applies to the many sects, holding a great variety of sentiments. But Christ designed that his church should be *one*. We do not say that the sects became Babylon by falling. They, while in their divided and sub-divided state, and united with the world, were always Babylon. God permitted his people to remain there, until the first angel's message was rejected, then he called them out.

That the nominal churches have fallen, let their own admissions, and the facts relative to their present condition bear testimony. When their state is compared with what it was ten years since, their fall is clearly seen.

We think the "foul spirits" that Babylon was to become a "hold" of, after her fall, refer to the spiritual wonders of the present day, such as Mesmerism, Biology, Psychology, and the "Mysterious Rappings." And we think it is evident that just before the plagues are poured out, the voice from heaven, "Come out of her my people," will be heard as never before. This point we may notice in a separate article. In our next we design to examine the message of the third angel.

From Bro. Day, of Winchester, Mass.

DEAR BRO. WHITE: I wish to say that the Conference at Medford has proved a great blessing to the Church in this vicinity, for, where discord existed, owing to differences of opinion with regard to unfulfilled prophecy, as well as prejudice that had arisen from false reports, love and peace now prevail. Then, leanness and death pervaded our meetings, and we were continually wondering what could be the cause; but praise the Lord, it is not so now. God pours his Spirit upon us in a wonderful manner, sometimes more than we dare to expect. There has been three or four children converted to God, and the truth; and others have embraced the present truth, and those that attend our meetings are led to say that God is with us in very deed.

O, how evident it is that where there is union there is strength. Perfect harmony seems to pervade the meetings. And we feel that your coming among us, with our dear Bro. Holt, has been like the coming of Titus among his brethren. And I think it will be difficult for the Enemy to get in among the brethren again, especially in the same way that he did before. I am satisfied that the two former messages, in connection with the third, if rightly understood, and lived out, will unite the Church, or bring God's people into the unity of the faith, while other subjects will serve to distract and divide the dear children. This is my opinion, and I have had some little experience from which to form it.

When I first embraced the present truth, I knew of no difference of opinion among the brethren, and for a while my whole soul was in the work. So intensely was my mind engaged in it that I could hardly sleep; but at length one new view after another came up from good brethren, which somewhat arrested my attention, and took my mind off from present truth. My interest began, gradually, to decrease, until I lost much of my spiritual strength, and was tempted at times to believe that we needed something more to make the third angel's message interesting. But praise God I find that there is power in this message to interest all who come under its influence. It is my prayer that all the dear brethren will leave other subjects, and take hold of the present truth, and unitedly push the battle to the gates. Not with carnal weapons, but such as are mighty through God to the pulling down of the strong holds of the Enemy.

There seems to be quite an interest waked up in the minds of some in this vicinity to hear the reasons of our faith. And we hope that any of the dear brethren who can make it in their way, will call on us; and we shall always be glad to see any that may come bringing the present truth.

JOHN C. DAY.

The call then, is like any other of God's positive commands, addressed to his people as rational beings capable of obeying or disobeying the same, threatening the severest punishment to the disobedient, and promising the richest blessings to those who obey.—This view of the subject renders it highly important to inquire.

3d. *To whom is this call addressed?* Not to the incorrigible sinner—not to the graceless, formal, cold-hearted and worldly minded professor or church member or minister; but to God's people—his true people who are in Babylon, to them is this call made. Hear it in the words of Him who gave it, and obey when you hear. He says, MY PEOPLE, go ye out of the midst of her. Jer. li, 45.—Come out of her, MY PEOPLE. Rev. xviii, 4. Will God's people disobey this command? They will not—they cannot and long remain his people after they knowingly disobey. The blessings of having a right to the tree of life and of entering through the gates into the glorious city, are only promised to those who not only hear, but do the commandments of God. Rev. xxii, 14. Oh beware lest a love for remaining in Babylon, be the cause of your being forever shut out of the city of God. To more clearly show that this command is specially binding on God's people now, we inquire,

4th. *When was this call to be made?* It evidently was to be made shortly before the overthrow of Babylon, and soon after her fall. This is the order of these events as laid down by the divine writers.—In Rev. xviii, 2, 3, the fall, corruptions, and crimes of Babylon are named. In verse 4, the call to come out of her is given, and then immediately follows her exaltation and destruction. The same order is observed in chapter xiv. In verse 6 and 7, John "saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred and tongue, and people, saying with a loud voice, fear God and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment is come: and worship Him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters."

This "everlasting gospel," we believe to be the same which Christ calls, in Matt. xxiv, "This gospel of the kingdom," which was to be "preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations," first before the end of this world, "the hour of judgment," and the appearing of Christ and his kingdom. It has been preached for a few years past, by believers in the near coming of Christ, and has been rejected by the church. They have stumbled at this, to them, rock of offense, and fallen. And this fall is the next event which follows, as recorded by John in verse 8. He says, "And there followed another angel, saying, Babylon is fallen, is fallen." And the next event as recorded in verses 9 and 10, is, "And the third angel followed them, saying, with a loud voice, if any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God." And as we have shown in our previous remarks, that Babylon has but recently fallen in her corruption, there can be no reasonable doubt but that the present is the time for the cry, "Come out of her, my people," to be made. We offer the following facts in proof of this position.

1st. Just such a cry as the divine writers described has been made; it perfectly harmonizes with the order of prophetic events, and has been made in just such a state of the church as it was predicted she would be in at the time the cry should be given.

2d. The cry was given by many, obeyed by thousands of God's people, nearly, if not at the same time, in different parts of the country, without any knowledge of what each other were doing, or preconcerted agreement on the subject. The work evidently was and is of the Lord.

3d. The testimony of those who take a different view of this subject is evidence in our favor. Speaking of believers in the coming of the Lord, in Vermont, where many have left the churches, Bro. Litch says:

The Adventists in Vermont are an honor to any cause. For untiring zeal and fervent piety you will look in vain to find their superiors in any of the churches. The different denominations say, "You have enticed them away from us—you are breaking up our churches."

Speaking on the same subject, Brother Himes remarks;

We found that the friends and supporters of the Advent cause had, as a general thing, left their respective churches and declared themselves free and independent of all associations that stood opposed to the Advent at hand, whether they professed friendship or hostility. I could not learn that they rejected the idea of a true ministry or church, or the only creed—the Bible; but cling to all these with more interest than ever. They have regretted the necessity of this step. But it was a case of life and death—certain death, if they remained in the old organizations, deprived of their rights and

"meat in due season;" life if they gave up all for Christ and his truth. The fruit of this action has been, and still is, life—a vigorous and strong faith, and a more thorough consecration to God and to the Advent cause.

It has been said, that this movement was got up and carried forward by indiscreet men, disorganizers, come-outers, &c. That there may be some such persons among us we will not deny; but that the great body of the Advent believers who have left the churches are such, we do deny. We say, without fear of contradiction, that they are from among the most wise, judicious, and experienced members of the church. And more, that they are from among the most intelligent, pious, and devoted; and are carrying out the great principles of the gospel in lives of self-denial and consecration, that some of their accusers at least, would do well to imitate.—And though I may not perfectly accord with them in some applications of Scriptures to the Protestant church, which in all conscience are bad enough; yet I feel to stand with them in the humblest position, shoulder to shoulder, in sustaining the Advent cause, till it be consumed by the advent of our King.

The churches have taken such a course in relation to the advocates of the "faith once delivered to the saints," that they could not honestly live with them. And notwithstanding the remonstrances against leaving the churches, heretofore, God has led his people out into a large place, and into rich pasture; and we believe the hand of God is in this matter.

"If God has led his people out into a large place and the hand of God is in the matter," then the means by which this work has been effected must be of God also. Well, what have been those means? Nothing less nor more than the cry, "COME OUT OF HER, MY PEOPLE"—and the "intelligent" and "pious" have obeyed it. "It was a case of life and death, certain death, if they remained in the old organizations." But the fruit of coming out has been "life—a vigorous and strong faith, and a thorough consecration to God." Nothing but the truth can produce such glorious fruits as are here described. The truth enlightens, sanctifies and makes us free, in this as in every other case when it is obeyed. And if it is binding upon *one* it is upon *all* of God's people to obey it. And "death—certain death," will be the fruit of disobedience.

From the foregoing facts, it is evident that the true cry, "Come out of her, my people," is *now* being made. And considerations of the highest magnitude arise on every hand why this divine command should be obeyed. * * * * *

THE NEW CHART, published by Bro. Otis Nichols in 1850, has been found to be a great help in examining the evidences of our position, and in teaching them to others. We esteem it a TREASURE. It is valuable, because it beautifully illustrates the most sublime and important truths of Revelation, which are particularly applicable to the present time.

Those who wish to obtain this Chart should address Otis Nichols, Dorchester, Mass. Price \$2. If more is received for this Chart than its actual cost, it will be used in publishing the "Review and Herald." The publisher gives \$75.

From Bro. Hart.

DEAR BRO. WHITE: We have had a meeting at Bethel since you left here, and the Spirit of the Lord was manifest. Bro. Baker and Ingraham were present.

Last Sabbath our meeting was at Waitsfield. It was one of the best meetings we have ever had there. There are but few in this section of the country but are united in the third angel's message. As we believe the meetings you attended through this section were directed by the Lord, it does seem as though we had commenced on a new era in Vermont. Pray for us that we may ever be found in the work of the Lord, united and zealous for his truth.

There will be a meeting at Northfield, commencing Friday evening Dec. 18th. We expect a general meeting, and would earnestly request you to attend. Bro. Baker and Ingraham expect to attend.

Yours,
JOSIAH HART.

Northfield (Vt.), Dec. 2nd, 1851.

There will be a General Conference at Camden, (N. Y.) at the house of Bro. Ira Abbey, to commence Thursday evening, Dec. 25th, and hold about three days. Bro. Holt, and Rhodes and other ministering brethren are invited to attend.

We expect to attend the above Conference, and may be able to hold other Conferences in Western New York, if notices are sent in season to publish in our next number. Ed.

Letters received since November 21.

J. N. Andrews 3, S. W. Rhodes 2, N. Mead, H. Patten, C. M. Lockwood, S. Griggs, M. C. Prior, G. W. Holt, M. Leadbeter, J. Chapman, F. M. Shimper, S. L. Flagg, P. Gleason, E. Everts, R. Whitcomb, E. L. H. Chamberlain, J. A. King, J. C. Day, M. L. Bauder, J. Hart, O. Hewett, O. Nichols, C. B. Preston, S. Richardson.

Receipts.

C. Smith, \$10; S. Howland, S. Strong, \$5 each; J. A. Laughad, \$3; A. A. Dodge, a Sister, a Friend, \$2 each; H. Dunning, E. D. Cook, Wm. Camp, P. Gleason, \$1 each.

DAVISON'S PRINTING AND STEREO TYPE ESTABLISHMENT,
Saratoga Springs, N. Y.