

# THE ADVENT REVIEW, AND SABBATH HERALD.

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

VOL. V.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., THIRD-DAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1854.

No. 4.

## THE REVIEW AND HERALD.

TERMS.—See Last Page.

### CONSOLATIONS FOR THE LONELY.

THERE is a land where beauty cannot fade,  
Nor sorrow dim the eye;  
Where true love shall not droop, nor be dismayed,  
And none shall ever die!  
Where is that land, oh where?  
For I would hasten there.  
Tell me—I fain would go;  
For I am wearied with a heavy wo!  
The beautiful have left me all alone;  
The true, the tender, from my path have gone!  
O guide me with thy hand,  
If thou dost know that land,  
For I am burdened with oppressive care,  
And I am weak and fearful with despair,  
Where is it? Tell me where.  
Friend, thou must trust in Him who trod before  
The desolate paths of life;  
Must bear in meekness, as he meekly bore,  
Sorrow, and pain and strife.  
Think how the Son of God  
These thorny paths hath trod;  
Think how he longed to go,  
Yet tarried out, for thee, the appointed wo;  
Think of his weariness in places dim,  
Where no man comforted or cared for him!  
Think of the blood-like sweat,  
With which his brow was wet—  
Yet how he prayed unsaid and alone,  
In that great agony, "Thy will be done!"  
Friend, do thou not despair;  
Christ, from his heaven of heavens, will hear thy prayer!  
Mary Howitt.

### THE COVENANTS.

BY JOSEPH BAKER.

(Concluded.)

HAVING produced some arguments relative to the everlasting and Sinai covenants, we pass to notice some arguments which show that the Sinai covenant has been abolished, and the new, instituted.

Gal. iv, 30. "Nevertheless, what saith the scripture? *Cast out the bond-woman and her son: for the son of the bond-woman shall not be heir with the son of the free-woman.*" (It should be remembered that those two women with their sons, are said to represent the two covenants.) "So then, brethren, we are not children of the bond-woman, but of the free." The argument of the Apostle in this place, does prove the Sinai covenant abolished, and the new, instituted; or there is, in this connection, such an abuse of language, as no inspired writer could be guilty of. Again: see Heb. x, 8, 9. "Above, when he said, Sacrifice and offering and burnt-offerings and offering for sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein; which are offered by the law; then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. *He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second.*" Chap. ix, 1. "Then verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service," &c. Here the Sinai covenant is called the first; and from the foregoing quotation, we learn that Christ took away the first, that he might establish the second. Again: Chap. x, 28, 29. "He that despised Moses' law, died without mercy under two or three witnesses: of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sacrificed, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?"

The next passage to be examined may be found in 2 Cor. iii. Of this it is contended, that the ministration of death never was written on stone; but in a book. If so, I fail to see it. It is admitted that the penalty, together with the regulations of the administrator's office, were written in the book of the law. But does the administrator perform his office on the strength of the penalty, or on the strength of the law? We are told by the Apostle, that, "the strength of sin is the law." Therefore, it must be on the strength of the law, that he administers his office; and that was written on tables of stone; therefore, the ministration of death was written and engraven on tables of stone. We find quite as intricate a passage in Romans; there the Apostle says, "The commandment which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death." How did he find it out? By transgression, of course. But what produced death? did the penalty do it? No; for he found the very commandment which was ordained to life, to be unto death. The commandment without a penalty could not have done it. But if the penalty was written somewhere else, it is immaterial: the administration being on the strength of the commandment. And indeed, we cannot conceive how the term *law* can apply to moral agents without a penalty—it would be a nominal thing, for which we could not find a name. But the law is one thing, and the penalty is another. The question naturally suggests itself here, Why was not the penalty written with the law, on tables of stone? Ans. The law was endless—the penalty two-fold; temporal and eternal death. Therefore, the penalty, to accord with the ten commandments, was written in a book, the means for the preservation of temporal life, also. And as the ten commandments were liable to be violated again, an administrator was furnished, to meet such an emergency. But, I believe, all are agreed that Christ abolished temporal death, when he arose from the tomb; and that now, no temporal death, authorized by the Divine Being, is inflicted for any new violation of the ten commandments.

By the universality of this admission, (if what every one says is true,) one of two things is admissible.

1. That the ten commandments being written on stone, was the call for the administration of death; and, that now, that form only, is abolished; and not the ten commandments themselves; or, 2. That the promissory, the everlasting, covenant is at an end. (For if the ten commandments were the basis of the promissory covenant, and are abolished, then the everlasting covenant is at an end! But if their being written, was the call for the administration of death, now that *form* is abolished; and not the ten commands themselves.) Which horn of this dilemma will you take? The Scriptures plainly declare that the ten commandments were the basis of the promissory, the everlasting, covenant; and that their being written on stone, was the call for the administration of death.

With these remarks before us, we turn to Jer. iii, 16. "And it shall come to pass, when ye be multiplied and increased in the land, in those days, saith the Lord, They shall say no more the ark of the covenant of the Lord; [Jer. xxxi, 32, 33; 2 Cor. iii, 3, 6; Heb. viii, 6–8; ix, 1–4; x, 9:] neither shall it come to mind, neither shall they remember it; neither shall they visit it; neither shall that be done any more." See Heb. x, 16–22. If this language does not express its abolition, I do not understand the meaning of terms. What was the ark made for? Certainly not to contain a verbal contract! but one written. This is provable

by the tables of stone being its chief contents. It is not to be visited; which proves its useless state, and the object for which it was given, accomplished. This the verses following, prove. Christ is given: the object for which the multiplication of Abraham's natural seed, and Canaan were promised.

Now, then, look up, and call Jerusalem, or the free-woman, the throne of the Lord. Again, I say, Look up; for under this dispensation, the ten commandments are to be impressed on thy heart, by the Spirit of him who dwelt in the bush, and in the sanctuary of Israel, and had his throne in old Jerusalem; but now in the Jerusalem above, which is free, and the mother of all that believe.

By the free-woman and her son, the Apostle undoubtedly meant to convey the idea of the new covenant, or gospel dispensation, as being a part of the promise to Abraham, and his seed. And how the notion came into existence, that the gospel was a distinct system, embracing a different object, I cannot conceive: unless it was among the fables collected from spurious and apocryphal writings, canonized by superstition; or the offspring of the deliriums of pious visionaries, early converts from heathenism, from which they imported this part of their creed. There is not one text of scripture, legitimately interpreted, that gives the least countenance to this dogma.

The new covenant referred to in our text, and mentioned in Hebrews, is expressed by way of promise in Jer. xxxi, 31–34. "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord; but this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for they shall all know me from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord; for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more." Paul, in reference to this covenant, says, "In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old, is ready to vanish away." Heb. viii, 13. From the preceding chapter, it is evident that the Apostle considered that the first covenant was abolished; and from the tenth, it is equally certain that the new is instituted; and that all that was expressed in the promise in Jeremiah, was literally fulfilled. For though the promise was given in view of the new earth, yet, the new earth is not expressed in the promise; neither has it any reference to what it would ultimately do; but only has reference to its formation. What this covenant will do, may be understood by referring to the promise of it, given to Abraham. We shall take it for granted, therefore, that every part of the promise made to Israel through Jeremiah, has had its literal fulfillment. And therefore, we would refer all those who contend that Israel is to say to his neighbor, or Gentile, [Eze. xvi, 61,] Know the Lord, to Heb. x; where this point is clearly illustrated, and testified to, by the holy Ghost. John vi, 45; 1 John v, 20.

Permit me here to quote a few passages as a specimen of many, to show the law on the heart, according to the promise. Rom. vii, 22. "For I

delight in the law of God after the inward man." Gal. vi, 8. "But he that soweth to the Spirit, shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting." 2 Cor. iii, 6. "Who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament; (i. e., covenant,) not of the letter, but of the Spirit." Verse 8. "How shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious?" Also iv, 6. "For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." Again: Chap. iii, 3. "Forasmuch as ye are manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshy tables of the heart." Nothing can be plainer than these passages: they prove that it was the same law, that by the finger of God was written on tables of stone, that now is written by the Spirit of God on the heart.

As the words, new covenant, and gospel, are generally used as synonymous terms, [Rom. i, 16; Acts iii, 25, 26; xiii, 26, 32, 33, 46, 47; Eph. ii, 12-22; Jno. viii, 56; 1 Pet. i, 4, 10-12; Luke i, 46-55; ii, 28-32,] we shall in the remaining part of our subject, generally use the term, gospel, instead of covenant; as it will better accommodate the age in which we live. We now proceed to define the word, gospel. And an appeal might here be made to the most learned critics and lexicographers, who have given the definition of the word, and also to the etymology of the word, both in the English and original languages; and in either case, the decision would, most certainly be in favor of the gospel's being a system of *good news*. But it has become so fashionable for every man who knows the names and characters of the Greek alphabet to turn critic, and question the authority and learning of all the literary world, that the unlearned know not what to decide upon. They either conclude that there is no dependence to be put upon any of them, and therefore none upon the Bible; or they adopt such translations as suit their particular creed, and with these rest satisfied. Waiving therefore, all argument founded upon the authority of the learned, or the derivation of this word, its meaning may be determined by an appeal to the Apostle who says that the "gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek." Rom. i, 16; also see Acts iii, 26, 38, 46, 47. The same may be said of the meaning of the word, Jesus; which signifies, Saviour. Matt. i, 21; Acts v, 30-32; xiii, 38, 39; Luke ii, 10, 11; iv, 17-21; viii, 1. Therefore the gospel must certainly be considered a system of good news; or, salvation from sin, or the transgression of some law; "for sin is the transgression of the law."

We ask if salvation from sin is not good news? Again: Is this *good news* a law of itself? If so, what may we expect from it, if Paul has given a right definition of the term, gospel? Certainly, salvation from its transgression. With this expectation, how unmeaning the sanction it contains! viz., "He that believeth not shall be damned!" This is not good news, and cannot be applied to the gospel without making Paul's definition chimerical or absurd, if the gospel is not founded on law; for it is said that "sin is not imputed (charged) when there is no law." Therefore the gospel must be based on law, or there is no sin. Indeed, the passages already quoted show the existence of a law written by the Spirit of God on the heart; and this too, to accord with the gospel, which purports to save from the condemning power of the law. Hence the salvation expected from the gospel, is, salvation from transgression of the law.

The preceding reasonings are founded on the supposition, that the gospel saves from condemnation only. And as good news of salvation never could be rejected, abstract from depravity, therefore the term salvation, is unmeaning in its application to the gospel, abstract from its foundation.

As the preceding reasonings are founded on the supposition, that the gospel saves only from condemnation, and that it cannot even do this, without being founded on law, we will now briefly consider the guilt of the transgression causing condemnation. And we not only accumulate guilt by

transgression, but while neglecting salvation from this transgression of the law, there stands a blank, where duties were required, and none performed; and this must so corrupt the fountain, that all its streams will be impure. And, as no being can cleanse his own infected nature, or undo the criminal acts which he has already done; the gospel therefore, must possess power to deliver and re-instate or make the fountain pure, or the plaster is not as large as the wound. Can good news do this, and at the same time be a law? We answer, It cannot. But as it admits the thundering sanctions of law, its basis must be law.

Now as the gospel proffers salvation to those only, who believe, hence, where faith is wanting the law of ten commandments, admit of the full administration of the penalty previously affixed, notwithstanding the gospel of good news. They run therefore to the extent of the promises, and are made appropriate to each dispensation under which they pass: having the affixed rules of that dispensation. Hence there were appendages affixed, to make them appropriate to the peculiar situation of Abraham and his seed, and under the Sinai, they were written to accord with that dispensation; but under the gospel, which is not to be superseded by another, in time, they apply to the heart, where the whole system of the gospel applies.

Now we learn from each dispensation, appropriate rules of application: Under the Sinai, killing maliciously was by those rules of application, considered murder; but under the gospel rules, to hate our brother without cause, is murder. 1 John. iii, 15; Matt. v, 21, 22; xv, 18, 19. Thus we might enumerate the ten commands, and we should find gospel rules, applying them to the heart.

O. Scott, in quoting from Mr. Wesley, makes him say, that we are "as really preaching Christ when saying, 'The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the people that forget God,' as when saying, 'Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.'" But to my mind, the former is preaching the sanctions of law, the gospel, (abstract from its foundation,) has no such sanctions. It is therefore evident that it has law for its foundation.

O. Scott, makes Dr. A. Clarke say, "The gospel is a law for it imposes obligation from God, and prescribes a rule of life; and it punishes transgressors, and rewards the obedient." This must be a gross mistake and is self-contradictory; for the term gospel, will not admit (separately considered from its foundation) of any such sanctions. Also, it is a palpable contradiction of a sermon of A. Clarke's which I hold in my possession, and from which I shall take the liberty to make an extract. Page 32. "Hence the gospel proclaims both pardon and purification; and they that believe are freely justified from all things, and have their hearts purified by faith. Thus the grand original law is once more written on their hearts by the finger of God; and they are restored both to the favor and to the image of their Maker." If under the gospel, this is the privilege of those that believe, what must be the fate of those who do not believe, but to remain under the condemning power of this same law? the sanctions of which are recognized by the gospel. For the gospel having law for its foundation, or basis, supposes the most awful sanctions. "He that believeth shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Here we see that faith in Christ, is a condition of salvation, from the condemning power of the law. Therefore this law, the penalty of which, (under the gospel,) is eternal death is permitted by the gospel to have its full condemning power on those who do not believe. (But "because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the heart of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil;" but "vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord.") The commission given to the disciples, cannot be regarded in any other light.

I have yet to learn how Christ can be preached without preaching the gospel. And I am equally at a loss, to know how the full commission given to the disciples could be fulfilled, without proclaiming the basis of the gospel; for this commission, embraces one of the most awful sanctions: "He that believeth not, shall be damned!" which par-

takes not of the nature of good news, but of the rigors of law. This, therefore must show the gospel built on law; otherwise this threatening would be contradictory and absurd. For gospel, abstract from law, has no penalty: it being simply, good news. And the law abstract from the promise to Abraham, has nothing to do with Christ. But who does not see that this promise embraced Christ, and that it was founded on the ten commandments? Now, therefore, Christ cannot be preached, without showing the fulfillment of a gracious promise. And yet, a promise, resting on the ten commandments, (its basis,) yet remains to be given through Christ; and this, the renewed earth. Therefore, how can Christ be successfully preached, without proclaiming the consequences of rejecting him? And as this gospel precedes, to prepare for the fulfillment of the promise of the renewed earth; and as judgment precedes the reception of the new earth, the consequence of rejecting the gospel, must be looked for, in the sanctions of law; which leads to the inevitable conclusion, that the ten commandments are the basis of the gospel.

It can but be admitted that the gospel permits the promulgation of sanctions the most awful imaginable; yet they cannot partake of the nature of good news. Hence these spurs to duty, these incitements to obedience, are the results of law. And as they make up a considerable part of the New Testament, therefore the new covenant or gospel must be based on the ten commandments, as this is the only *unaltered law* contained in the Bible.

It has been urged in some preceding remarks, that why the penalty was not written with the ten commands on stone, was, that the nature of the penalty was two-fold; and that the penalty under the gospel was only eternal death. Now, therefore, they might be recorded (under the new covenant or gospel dispensation) with their penalty. They are so recorded. And too, proceeding on the principle that the gospel is in substance one of the promises, and has for its foundation the ten commandments, it may admit of the most awful sanctions, and condign punishment to be executed on the gospel rejectors, and at the same time be a system of good news, or salvation from sin, on the easy condition of simple faith in Christ. Who could measure the guilt accumulated by rejecting Christ, but God! and where should the penalty for this guilt be recorded but with the gospel? though it partakes of the nature of law? God's threatenings are by no means to be cast out of the New Testament, or rejected because they are not good news; neither are they to be considered abstract from his promises, for these promises were founded on law. And Christ being included in one of these promises, we may, therefore, hear from his mouth, and from the apostles, the most terrific thunders of wrath, roaring louder, tenfold, than from the law of Moses; describing the damnation of hell; painting in colors of the deepest dye the agonies of the damned, and the horrors of the bottomless pit; a burning world, the Judge coming down, the parted skies in flaming fire, the dead rising, the amazing throng divided; and the wicked sentenced to eternal death. Are such representations admitted by the gospel? then the gospel must be based on law; as it abstractly considered could not admit of such sanctions.

Again: the gospel proceeds on the principle of a revelation from God; and this perfectly accords with the ten commandments being written on the heart. This is expressed and illustrated by Christ in his question to the disciples, and answer to Peter. Matt. xvi, 15-18. "And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church." . . . i. e., upon this principle of revelation from God, will I build my church; not on Peter; but on the principle of revelation from God. 1 Cor. ii, 10-13; Prov. xx, 27; Jno. xiv, 15-17, 23-26; xv, 26, 27; xvi, 7-15; Rev. viii; 1 Jno. iii, 24; iv, 6; v, 6.



But we are told that "God acts on the scale of general good; therefore the gospel can hold out the most awful sanctions, and thereby deter men from violating it, and thus promote the general good." But this idea burlesques the Scriptures. The threatenings admitted by the gospel, mean what they say; and must be permanently built, either on gospel or on law; and as it has been proved, that they are the sanctions of law, therefore the gospel must be based on law.

It is said that "nine precepts are sufficient." We ask, Why were not nine sufficient to have based the promises upon? and especially the promise of the new covenant, or gospel dispensation? Infinite wisdom never acts without sufficient reasons; therefore the new covenant or gospel dispensation is based on ten commandments. Christ was given to build upon the foundation which God had laid, and this was the ten commandments. Therefore he found ten, and built upon ten.

In reviewing the subject, we would say that it has been proved that the fulfilment of the promises to Abraham, were conditions on the part of God; and, that living in obedience to the ten commandments, were conditions on the part of Abraham and his seed. And that both, or either might with the strictest precision, be called a covenant; that the promises were made to Abraham, not for his benefit alone, but for his seed also; that his seed, until we come to the new covenant, or gospel dispensation, consisted in his natural seed; and, that the land promised, was Canaan; which also was typical of the new earth; that also Christ, the new covenant, and the renewed earth, were included in the promissory covenant; and, that the promises, (i. e. the promissory covenant,) singly and collectively, were based on the ten commandments; that consequently, while a single promise remained unfulfilled, (whilst heaven and earth remain, Matt. v, 18,) the basis or ten commandments must remain unbroken and unabridged; therefore the ten commands came under the new covenant, or gospel dispensation with all their native force: the covenant being *endless* as a whole.

We know that Christ has said, "All power is given unto me, both in heaven and earth;" but are we to infer from this mode of expression that he had power to dethrone God? or abolish his promise of a new earth? Would it not be more with the analogy of the Scriptures to suppose that he had sufficient power to accomplish the work assigned him to do? and that the work said to be done by Jehovah alone, never has been assigned over to another? or been affected by delegation? It has also been proved that a violation of the conditions on the part of the covenanters, would subject them to a loss of the promises; and, that they might be restored, and again become Abraham's seed, by a temporary covenant, which is true of the Sinai, but that it could ensure them no more than temporal life, and could extend no further than to the first advent of Christ; there it must cease, having accomplished the object for which these promises, the multiplication, and the gift of Canaan, were given: and that the temporality of the first, was the cause of the call for the new covenant. It has been proved, also, that the Sinai did not alter Israel's relation to the Abrahamic: it being given only to bring them back to a relationship with Abraham, according to the covenant; that this relationship involved all their former liabilities; and the fact that the ten commands were written on stone, by the finger of God, and carried with them, is sufficient proof that they were among their former liabilities; and that they could not be abolished without destroying the strength of the promise of a new earth. To abolish the Sinai, was the work of Christ; and that has been accomplished: leaving God's promise of a new earth, standing on its original basis. All therefore, who live under the gospel dispensation, may view the ten commands in all their native beauty and strength, bringing back to Christ the first dominion, according to the promise in Mic. iv, 8, and all those who are obedient to them, and through faith in his blood are made heirs with him. Hence their application must be to the heart, to accord with the last promise, which is immortality.

The Sinai depended on outward evidences; but the new covenant, applies them to the thoughts, and intents of the heart: our Lord's sermon on the Mount, being a specimen, where he takes the liberty to correct their application under the Sinai dispensation, and applies them to the heart, giving rules for their application to this effect. Whatever light therefore, the Scriptures afford, showing the new covenant a part of the Abrahamic, must be regarded as proof that the ten commandments are its basis; and, in their examination, we have found this point abundantly substantiated; for Christ and his works were promised at a very early date, especially to Abraham, through his seed. Gal. iii, 8. "And the Scriptures foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed." "That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ." . . . "And this I say, That the covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ," &c. It was the promise of God to Abraham, that God confirmed through Christ; therefore the new covenant, with all its privileges and blessings, was included in the promises given to Abraham. Indeed, the Scriptures in too many places to be at this time recited, show the new covenant to have been included in the promissory, and hence its basis, running parallel, must be here. And it has been proved that when God formed the new covenant or gospel dispensation, he wrote ten moral precepts on the heart; and, that on this principle of revelation from God, Christ built his church. But now, where is the fourth command? There are only *nine*, and a *substitute*, taught by the opponents. Who has effected this change? It could not have been done by the promised seed, or his disciples; for he and they, kept his Father's commandments, and must, in order to teach by revelation. And as this law was to be sealed among his disciples, they could not have violated that which was requisite for translation, without setting an unworthy example for the last generation. It must be, therefore, something that has been effected since the days of Christ, and of his apostles.

If man could be translated with this man-made substitute, there would be a jargon in heaven; part keeping the fourth command, and part the substitute, as the gospel was introduced with ten; and if God would accept of a substitute for the basis of the gospel, he might on the same principle, accept of another gospel; which accords very well with the new revelation given by the "Spirit Rappers," who introduce a new way of getting into heaven: one aside from the one revealed in the Bible. Again: if the promise embraced the new earth, and the ten commands were its basis, they must remain until the consummation of that promise, or judgment at least; and for this reason attempts have been made of late to do away the idea of a judgment altogether; and of what use is a trial, without a law, on which to found a penalty? That the gospel is a law of itself, is so contradictory and absurd, that only one man has ever (to my knowledge) attempted to raise any arguments in its favor; and he was fairly met, and his arguments put down by an able hand, at the outset. Since it must be granted that there is a future judgment, the gospel must either be a law of itself, or be based on law; and as it has been proved that it cannot be law, therefore, it must have law for its foundation. The testimony of James [Chap. ii, 12, 13,] is to this point. "So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty; for he shall have judgment without mercy that hath showed no mercy." "So then, brethren, we are not children of the bond-woman, but of the free." i. e., We do not belong to the Sinai covenant; for Christ has redeemed us from that, "being made a curse for us; for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." So then, the blessing of Abraham has come on the Gentiles, through Jesus Christ; and they have received the fulfilment of the "promise of the Spirit through faith." Gal. iii, 13, 14.

The way is now paved for the third angel's message; which should be regarded, not so much for its proof of the existence of the ten command-

ments, under the present economy, as to show our whereabouts in this world's history; and taken in this light, it is a subject, the most momentous, that ever arrested or interested the attention of man. To the men of this generation, it speaks in tones of thunder, saying, Here are they that keep the conditions on which the last promise is based: the commandments of God, in connection with the faith of Jesus, who has lived, our example, and has died, our sacrifice; who has ascended to the first apartment of the heavenly Sanctuary, and removed to the Most Holy, and there commenced his last work. The faith of these things being predicated on good authority, how awfully solemn their appeal. We are looking for him to come the second time to raise the dead saints, to change the living, and to renew the earth, according to the promise of God to Abraham. "So then, brethren, we are not children of the bond-woman, but of the free."

*Lebanon, N. H., Jan. 18th, 1854.*

P. S. The preceding Discourse was not written to express any man's sentiments; but to speak out the sentiment of the Book of books on this subject, in accordance with the rules laid down by Bacon, and successfully followed by Newton; which is, to "trace facts up to first principles, and not to assume first principles, and from these infer facts."

"IF I WILL THAT HE TARRY TILL I COME."

"So, when they had dined, Jesus saith to Simon Peter, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, Feed my lambs. He saith to him again the second time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, Feed my sheep. He saith unto him the third time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? Peter was grieved because he said unto him the third time, Lovest thou me? And he said unto him, Lord, thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love thee. Jesus saith unto him, Feed my sheep. Verily, verily, I say unto thee, When thou wast young, thou girdedst thyself, and walkedst whither thou wouldest; but when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldest not. This spake he, signifying by what death he should glorify God. And when he had spoken this, he saith unto him, Follow me.—Then Peter, turning about, seeth the disciple whom Jesus loved following, which also leaned on his breast at supper, and said, Lord, which is he that betrayeth thee? Peter seeing him, saith to Jesus, Lord, and what shall this man do? Jesus saith unto him, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? Follow thou me. Then went this saying abroad among the brethren, that that disciple should not die: yet Jesus said not unto him, He shall not die: but, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?" John xxi, 15-24.

SOME precious references to the Lord's coming have been lost by the habit into which many believers have fallen of understanding some plain passages in a figurative sense. Passages where Christ's coming is referred to have been considered as referring to the *destruction of Jerusalem*. Perhaps the verse that has given apparent countenance to this idea more than any other is that in John xxi, 21. The Lord had foretold what should be Peter's lot on earth; and by what death he should glorify God. Peter thereupon was emboldened to ask similar information regarding John, thinking (it appears) that Jesus, who loved him so peculiarly, and who had whispered to him who the traitor was at the last supper, (v, 20) would surely be willing to say something about the future career of one so favored. But Jesus refused to gratify needless curiosity. "Jesus saith unto him, *If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?* Follow thou me." It is evident, we think, that our Lord by that reply meant to make a wide supposition of what he could do, if it seemed right to him, not of what he meant actually to do. He said, "Were it my will, he might remain on earth without tasting death until I come again the second time,—but what is that to thee? Follow thou me."

Here, then, let us ask a few questions:—

1st. Did the ten disciples understand "Till I come?"

to mean the destruction of Jerusalem? No; the thought never seems to have crossed their minds. They said, "Our Master means to save his beloved disciple from the pang of dying!" The saying went abroad among them that he should not die! How, then, could they extract such a meaning from the Lord's words but by their having understood him to say, "He shall tarry till I come the second time." They overlooked the "If I will," and concluded that Jesus meant to say that John would abide on earth till his Lord returned. Had they understood the words to be, "He shall tarry until Jerusalem is destroyed," in that case they could only have said, "This disciple shall live long,"—but how would they arrive at the conclusion, "He shall not die?" But no; they were putting the obvious sense on the words "Till I come," but omitting to notice the clause "If I will."

2d. Did John himself understand this saying to refer to the destruction of Jerusalem? No; for he explains in v. 23 where the mistake of the brethren lay. It did not lie in their attaching a wrong sense to "Till I come," but (says he) it lay in not observing that Jesus only said "If I will that he tarry." They were wrong, he says, in saying he would not die, not because the words referred merely to such an event as Jerusalem's destruction,—no, for he really did live after that event,—but they were wrong in thinking that our Lord had asserted anything positive in regard to him; he had only made a supposition with the view of showing that disciples must submit to their Master's will, whether he reveals much or little.

3d. Is it at all natural to understand the words to refer to the destruction of Jerusalem? Surely not. For in that case the Lord would really be found revealing the time of John's death,—which was the very thing he declined speaking of to Peter. And after he had been so often with them, "speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God," (Acts i. 3,) and no doubt showing them clearly that he must first ascend and then return in glory, how natural was it, tacitly referring to some such conversations, to use his own language, "If I will that he tarry till I come." There is something very beautiful in his mode of declining to tell the future career of his disciple. "If it were my will that this disciple, who has leant on my bosom so often, and whom I have loved so peculiarly, if it were my will he should not die at all, but be caught up, like Elijah or Enoch, at my coming again, what is that to thee?" The sovereignty of our Master's will, even in his acts of tender love, must be acknowledged and implicitly relied on. Let us learn this lesson better, and go on "following the Lamb."

Had it been possible, we believe there are some who would have escaped the objections that are conclusive against referring the words to Jerusalem, by saying "Christ's coming often means death." But they cannot think of that here; for the disciples all agreed in inferring from the words that John should not die. It is well worthy of observation that life, not death, was suggested to believers by the mention of Christ's coming in those early days. To them the mention of Christ's coming never seems to have suggested anything connected with death, except the victory over it, "the swallowing up death in victory." To speak to the early Christian of the Lord's being at hand, was equivalent to pointing him upwards to the clouds, not downward to the tomb. A reference to his "coming" suggested not "the night, wherein no man can work," but "the day," when every saint's work shall be rewarded,—not the laying of the body in the cold grave, but the raising it up in glory, like Christ's own glorious body.

We might show, in like manner, that the words of our Lord, given by three Evangelists, regarding "some not tasting death till they should see the kingdom of God come with power," (see Matt. xvi. 28; Mark ix. 1; Luke ix. 27,) have as little to do with Jerusalem as this passage of John. They all refer to our Lord's Transfiguration, about "an eight days after"—when he did show a specimen of his future kingdom—himself the grand centre of attraction, the light and sun of all,—while his saints, now glorified, were beside him,

and earth beneath his feet. The same Peter, whose question led to that interesting passage regarding John, has opened to us his Lord's meaning on the holy mount. For, in his Second Epistle, (i. 16, 17,) he says of that scene, that he was an eye-witness of his Lord's majesty, such as shall be displayed hereafter. We made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, are his words in referring to that scene, which he mentions as having been given to assure us of what shall yet be. And so truly was it a specimen of the coming kingdom, that he hesitates not to say that he was an eye-witness of the Lord's majesty, just as he said (1 Pet. v. 1) that he had been a true witness of his sufferings.

Yes, truly, a Saviour coming to us is widely different from our going to him at death. And a Saviour coming to be glorified in his saints, and to give the troubled rest, is widely different from that same Saviour overruling all things by secret providence.—*Advent Tracts Vol. I.*

## THE REVIEW AND HERALD.

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

ROCHESTER, THIRD-DAY, FEB. 14, 1854.

### OSWEGO MEETING.

FOR some time past the cause has not been as prosperous in the vicinity of Oswego, N. Y., as in many other places. We felt when we made the appointment that our labor would be principally for the church. But when we arrived in the city we found hand-bills up for lectures on the Sabbath and First-day.

The brethren came in from the region round about, and on Sabbath morning we assembled in a small, commodious Hall in Bro. Carpenter's new building. Our number on the Sabbath was about 150, with very few exceptions, professed believers in the present truth. Bro. S. W. Rhodes was present. The day was spent in plain, close remarks relative to what constitutes a Christian, and our present duty. It was plain to be seen that the church was on the back-ground, and we trust that all felt it.

The principal causes of the low state of the church we consider to be these: first, leading brethren have erred which has lessened confidence, and has had a scattering, saddening influence; and second, brethren have not always taken a scriptural course relative to little differences of opinion, and little trials arising among them. As to the first mentioned cause, full confessions of wrongs have been made, and humiliation has been manifested, sufficient to restore full confidence. Relative to the latter, the whole congregation of saints covenanted together, henceforth to follow strictly a scriptural course in all differences and trials arising among them, and to have no fellowship for an unscriptural course in such cases.

In all cases of private differences and trials among individual brethren, the course stated by our Lord is the only safe one, and must be strictly followed.

"Moreover if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church; but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican. Matt. xviii. 15-17.

The great object of our Lord in presenting this course evidently was to save the church, especially the young and the weak, the burden of hearing all the little trials that might arise among brethren. In most every case, this course will prove effectual in settling all differences; it will restore confidence with those concerned, in each other, and the church will be saved a burden.

But it is a shame, and a disgrace to many who profess to be Bible Christians, and the followers of Christ, that they will disregard this rule of Him whom they style their Lord, and if they feel that their brother or

sister is in the fault, and has wronged them, instead of going directly to them, as the Lord directs, they will go to all the church first and magnify the supposed fault of a brother or sister. Such a course is calculated to produce hard feelings with the one supposed to be in the wrong, bring the whole church into trouble, discourage the weak, and drive away those who come to inquire for the truth.

The church in Oswego and vicinity have solemnly covenanted to take a scriptural course in these things in the future. If this covenant is kept, and if the faith of Jesus (all the principles of the New Testament) is lived out by them, they will be saved many unhappy trials, they will grow in grace, the power of God will be with them, the servants of God will have freedom when they visit them, (and not have to labor with burdened souls most of their time for the church,) many souls will be anxious to hear the truth, and there will be strength in the church to bring them out into the freedom of the truth.

We will here notice another passage from the lips of the great Teacher, in his sermon on the Mount. "If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift." Matt. v. 23, 24.

From this we learn, that if a brother comes into the assembly of the saints, and there remembers that one of his brethren has something against him, he is not to take a part in the exercises of the meeting. His prayer or exhortation would not be acceptable to God in such a case. Or, rather, we learn from these words of our Lord, that the saints should have such tender watch-care over each other, as to lose no time and spare no pains in removing all trials from each other, so that when they assemble to worship God, love and unity may prevail, and their united worship ascend with acceptance, a sweet-smelling savor before the Almighty. But there have been too many cases in the vicinity of Oswego, as well as some other places, where brethren, who neglected their duty out of meeting, have come together professedly to serve God, have talked out each others' faults, which has grieved the Holy Spirit away from them. Those who have thus trampled on the mercy of God, and the plain teachings of Christ, and have repeatedly grieved and driven from them the Holy Spirit, are very weak, and seem to be void of judgment in the things of the Spirit of God. Although they may have professed the truth for years, many who have just been converted are able to instruct them in the first principles of religion.

The brethren in the vicinity of Oswego have now taken a good stand in favor of gospel order and discipline, and we may hope that these unpleasant things will forever cease from among them. Heaven grant that it may be so. Notwithstanding this sad state of things, several have recently embraced the truth.

On First-day we gave two lectures. The Hall was filled with attentive hearers. The prospect now looks fair for a good work. If the church gets right, and keeps right, the Lord will work for them, and raise up a people for his name in Oswego.

### The Apostle Paul

HATH said, [1 Thess. v. 22,] "Abstain from all appearance of evil." He mentions this among other important duties, such as, "Pray without ceasing," and "Quench not the Spirit." The precious cause of our Lord has often been wounded, and the good of his people has been evil spoken of, for this reason: Many of the professed followers of Christ have not been on their watch to "Abstain from all appearance of evil." It is not only the duty of God's people to depart from all evil, and live holy in the sight of Heaven, but they must watch with the greatest care, especially when in the presence of the ungodly, to abstain from all appearance of evil.

But it may be asked, How do you understand verse 26? "Greet all the brethren with an holy kiss." We answer, this text must be understood in



manner to harmonize with verse 22. The Apostle has not here advanced contradictory sentiments. He would be understood that the salutation was a sign of Christian fellowship, not to be given before the ungodly." He calls it a "holy kiss," therefore, not to be frequently and commonly given. It is a sin to be ashamed of any portion of God's Word. It is no less sin, through carelessness and ignorance, to make a bad use of it, and make common what the Holy Ghost has called "holy."

"Abstain from all appearance of evil. And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit, and soul, and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. Faithful is he that calleth you, who also will do it. Brethren, pray for us. Greet all the brethren with an holy kiss. I charge you by the Lord that this epistle be read unto all the holy brethren. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you. Amen." 1 Thess. v, 22-28.

#### Why can we not Believe in the New Time?

THERE are many and definite reasons why those who hold the views we hold, cannot believe in time: so many and so definite that we shall consider ourselves safe in the following positive declaration:

It is utterly impossible for those who believe in "present truth," to believe in the new time.

A few reasons for this assertion, we shall now attempt to present; and in order to come at the question at once, we will notice briefly our position on those points which have any direct bearing on time.

1. We believe that the prophetic period of 2300 days given to Daniel, did commence at the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem, in the 7th of Artaxerxes, B. C. 457, and that it consequently did terminate in 1844. 2. We believe that the Sanctuary is in heaven where our great High Priest is ministering for us; the great antitype of the sanctuary which was upon the earth from Moses to Christ; that its cleansing is, not by fire, but by blood, as we are taught in the type; that Christ at the end of the 2300 days entered into the Most Holy Place, and commenced the final work which is termed, the cleansing of the Sanctuary, as was shadowed forth by the ministration on earth. Hence we find there was no failure in the passing of the time in 1844: we only mistook the event to transpire, in misapplying the term, Sanctuary. 3. We believe that the three angels' messages, [Rev. xiv.] are distinct messages to be fulfilled, in order, just previous to the coming of the Son of man. We believe that the first and second had their fulfillment in the mighty move which spread throughout the world, especially during the years of 1843-4. We believe that we are now living under the third and last: "If any man worship the beast and his image," &c.

Such is the outline of our position on these points. If any require proof, they can be furnished with publications giving abundant and explicit testimony for these views. We shall not therefore present the reasons of our faith here, but proceed to inquire, Why cannot those who hold these views believe in the new time? We will present our answers to this question in order:

1. Because to agree with the new-time theory, the date of the 2300 days must be moved in order to make them terminate in the future. Their commencement, as we learn from Dan. ix, is from a commandment to restore and build Jerusalem: the 70 weeks being the first 490. But when we find that there is, in reality, no other decree for the restoration of Jerusalem than the 7th of Artaxerxes, [see Ez. vii.] we begin to suspect that that is the place for their commencement; and when we find that no other date will answer the conditions of the prophecy, in regard to the Messiah the Prince, the crucifixion—causing the sacrifice and oblation to cease—and the confirmation of the covenant for one week;—when we see that no other date will answer these conditions of the prophecy, we are positively certain that they can commence

no where else. Therefore to change the date from where it has been indisputably fixed, is all wrong.

2. If the preaching of time is right now, it follows that the preaching of time in 1843-4 was wrong. If the preaching of time was wrong then, and nothing accomplished by it, it follows that the first and second angels' messages were wrongly applied. If they were misapplied, or were not fulfilled in the great work which then took place, it follows that the whole Advent movement was a complete failure and the work of man. This, no one who was a partaker in it, or even a witness of its mighty power, should be willing to admit. If the two first messages were wrong, or have not been given, we cannot of course now be having the third; consequently our position in this respect is all false.

Thus by taking for a moment this ground, and following out the conclusions to which it leads, we find the whole system of the Advent faith completely demolished. And what have we in its stead? We have a theory in which the main pillar in prophetic chronology is wrested from its true foundation, and placed where there is no warrant for placing it; placed where it will not agree with the conditions of the prophecy, or harmonize with events along the stream of time. And why is all this? Simply that it may terminate yet future, and that people may hold the unnatural, and unscriptural view, that this sin-cursed earth is God's Sanctuary, that it will be cleansed by fire, and Christ will come at the end of the 2300 days; which views we have no warrant in the Word of God for believing. Infinitely better it would be to heed the harmonious and plain teachings of the Scriptures on these points; to believe that the purposes of God are fulfilling all about us; that his plans are moving on, and his work progressing to its final accomplishment; that what he has done is well done, and will stand forever. The mighty angel with one foot on the land and the other on the sea, [Rev. x.] has lifted up his hand to heaven, and sworn by him that liveth forever and ever, that there should be (prophetic) time no longer; and it is not for us to presumptuously array ourselves against his testimony, or recklessly exclaim, *The days are prolonged* and every vision faileth. Eze. xi, 22.

We consider our first proposition sufficiently demonstrated: that it is utterly impossible for those who believe in "present truth," to believe in the new time. We cannot hold one position and at the same time believe another, which directly contradicts and destroys it. We cannot serve *God and mammon*.

It has been asked if it was not "time" that roused the world in 1843-4; and, "What would have been accomplished without the preaching of time?" We admit that it was the preaching of time that accomplished the work then; and why? Because it was ordained of God and came in its appointed time and place; and as sure as it is that the preaching of time did the work then, so sure it is that it will never again rouse the world. Its mission is accomplished; and one fulfillment, only, to prophecy, is the order of an unchangeable God.

It has also been suggested that "the third angel's message when rightly understood stands intimately connected with definite time." We think not: the first angel, only, proclaims time: The hour of his judgment is come. The third brings to view the saints in the patient waiting time, keeping the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus.

The mighty move that roused the world in 1843-4, is not over yet. The Advent doctrine is not a doctrine to claim attention for a while and then pass off and be forgotten. People may think the past a failure, and that whatever theories are advocated now must be something distinct and separate from that; but not so. The position we occupy is no new position disconnected with the past. It is only a further development of that true Advent faith which has its immovable foundation on the Word of God—further developed as we have been led along down the track

of prophecy. And while we can trace to our joyful satisfaction every step through which we have been guided thus far, and see by the light of truth where we stand in the prophetic and moral history of the world, we are prepared to remain steadfast a little longer till the atoning work of our great High Priest shall be accomplished; till we see the end of the race, the close of the warfare, and receive our palms of victory and our crowns of life.

U. S.

#### The Hour of His Judgment Come.

BY J. N. LOUGHBOROUGH.

[We shall be pardoned for inserting the following in the REVIEW, though not written for publication; as it meets inquiries which have been presented to us.]

I shall dissent from the view taken by some, that the judgment referred to here, is the session of judgment on Papacy; and for so doing I will assign my reasons.

1. The three messages of Rev. xiv, are warnings of great events. God's order is to give the warning before the event comes; if it is not so in this instance then we have one inconsistent exception to the great general rule, and that exception one of the most important warnings this world was ever to hear, inasmuch as it heralded the great event which was to seal the destiny of thousands: "The hour of judgment come." If the judgment referred to, is the deadly wounding of the Papacy, then that message we see must necessarily have gone forth prior to 1798; for that is the point where the deadly wound was given. But we find upon close investigation, that the first angel's message could not go while the book was sealed, which that message was founded on, which was to be sealed until the time of the end. 1798. See Dan. xi; xii.

Again: If we should take the position that the first angel's message was to be given prior to 1798, when we look for its fulfillment we find no such message given there. Some of the Advent people have tried to claim that the reformers gave that message; but they gave no such message. The first angel's message is a definite one. Take the definiteness from it, and it would herald no new idea, but would only be "Fear God, . . . for the judgment is coming." Neither Luther, Wesley, or any of the reformers gave a definite proclamation in regard to the judgment. Said Martin Luther, "The judgment is not far off. I am persuaded the Lord will not be absent above 300 years longer." Let us see if he gave it.—"Fear God;" for the judgment is coming in 300 years. Is that the message? No. "The hour of his judgment is come." Wesley thought the Lord would come about 1836: not in his day. He did not give that message; neither did any one give it until the Advent proclamation of 1843-4 came out, claiming that the Lord was coming at the end of the 2300 days. Although they made a mistake in the event for which they looked, yet they gave that message. They supposed that judgment did not set until Jesus' second advent; and they preached that his second advent would take place in 1844. They gave a definite message. Not long since I was talking with an Adventist who said, "The first angel's message was only the agitation of the subject of the judgment, by the reformers." I asked, Was not that to be a definite message? He said no more on that point.

According to Paul, [2 Thess. ii, 3,] Christ's coming could not be until the man of sin had performed his work; and they were charged to let no man deceive them. Then if any man should come while Papacy was working and say, "The hour of God's judgment (or Jesus' coming) had come," it would be a deception, for Papacy was performing its work. But these are only incidental arguments. I will now try and come to the point.

What is meant by the hour of God's judgment? (first angel's message.) In order to ascertain this point, I shall claim that the Advent proclamation was the true first angel's message, and inquire, What great event was truly heralded by that proclamation?

The foundation stone which gave definiteness to that message, was the 2300 days, the great prophetic period of Dan. viii, which period ended 1844, as all just and true reckoning will show; and the event which took place at the end of that period was the cleansing of the Sanctuary, which was to be cleansed at the end of 2300 days from the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem, 457 B. C. the seventh of Artaxerxes. The Sanctuary to be cleansed we at once see is not the earth, but the one that our great High Priest ministers in. In the type the priest did not work 364 days in the first apartment of the Sanctuary, and then go off 1000 miles and clear the rubbish off of some patch of ground, (which would have been a type, we should think of cleansing the earth, if anything,) but he goes into the same building he has performed his 364 days' service in, and performs the work called cleansing. But our Advent brethren all admit that our great High Priest has been performing his ministerial office since he entered heaven: but when the time comes to cleanse the Sanctuary, he must leave heaven and come to this dark, sublunary globe, to cleanse the earth. *Nay, verily*, he will cleanse the Sanctuary he ministers in, if he carries out the type. O well, says the brother, it needs no cleansing. Strange wisdom, whence is it. Paul says, [Heb. ix, 23.] "It was necessary that the patterns of things in heaven should be purified" or cleansed. It is strange, that the patterns need cleansing, if the original does not. Yes; but Paul says they were to be cleansed with better sacrifices. Then it is necessary that the heavenly Sanctuary should be cleansed; and we proceed to inquire,

What was that work of cleansing? Is the work of cleansing the Sanctuary fitly heralded by the first angel's message? in other words, Is it a work of judgment? For light on this subject, we shall be obliged to go to the type. Let us look at the type. See the high priest preparing himself to cleanse the Sanctuary; almost the first thing he did was to gird upon him the breast plate of judgment. For what does he put that on? It certainly looks as though he was going to do a judgment work.

Again: his work was an atonement for the blotting out of sins. I often use the expression, "It is not common to blot out accounts until they are settled;" so our sins are not blotted out until the time of refreshing comes, which is when Jesus leaves the Sanctuary, and lays the blotted-out sins on the head of the scape-goat.

Again: it was a day of decision. On the morning of the day of atonement the trumpet was sounded which called the attention of the people to the sanctuary. They were required to gather around the sanctuary and afflict their souls; every one that afflicted his soul received the blessing of the high priest when he came out: those who did not afflict themselves, were to be put to death. The antitypical day of atonement has come. The third angel is commissioned to perform his work of measuring the temple of God and them that worship in it. His golden reed is the commandments of God, "better than gold, yea, more to be desired than much fine gold." As it was in the type, so now. Every one that did not heed the call on the day of atonement must die. So it is now: every one that hears distinctly the call and does not obey, there is no more mercy for them. In the type, men were not condemned because they were not around the sanctuary on the sixth or eighth days of the seventh month, because the time had not come. So in the antitypical work: we are not condemned for not having the light of the third angel's message, before that message comes; but when it comes, if we do not heed it, we must suffer the consequences.

Again: it was said to Daniel that he should "rest and stand in his lot at the end of the days," or prophetic periods. I can find none that extend beyond 1844. The periods of 1290 and 1335 days commence at the downfall of Paganism, 508: adding the 1290 years, they carry us to 1798, and 1335 full years would carry us to 1844, the last period. I know of no period that can be so reckoned as to come this side of 1844; so that the time Daniel was to stand in his lot at the end of the days was 1844. The word which is rendered *lot*, does not signify his redeemed state,

but, *chance*. Daniel should stand his chance. Why? Because his sins had been confessed, and on the day of atonement those sins which have been confessed are opened before-hand to judgment. Now read 1 Pet. iv. Verse 5 declares that Christ is ready to judge the quick and the dead. Verse 7. "But the end of all things is at hand." Verse 11. "If any man speak let him speak as the oracles of God." (Oracles—ten commandments. See Acts vii, 38.) Why speak as the oracles of God? Because the oracles are the duty brought out by the third angel's message. Verse 17. "The time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God: and if it first begin at us, what shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God." Verse 19. Commit the keeping of your souls to God. 1 Tim. v, 24. "Some men's sins are open before-hand going before to judgment." We see by this what the judgment is that the first angel of Rev. xiv, refers to.

#### Communication from Bro. Waggoner.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—On my return West, I stopped at Cold Spring Prairie, Illinois, and gave eight lectures. Some were much interested, and I hope good to the cause will be the result. Some of those calling themselves Adventists, refused to hear; they had a summary way of disposing of the whole matter, which was this: they knew the "Age to Come" was right, and that my lectures would contradict that theory; and of course they would be wrong. Therefore it was no use to hear. Babylon never gave a more arbitrary or unreasonable opposition to the doctrine of the Second Advent than this. But the god of this world has blinded their minds, and it is to be feared they will never awake to a sense of their condition until our High Priest has cleansed the Sanctuary, and comes to take vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Thinking that a more extended notice of my visit to Salem, Ind., might be of interest, I will mention some particulars. I arrived there on Fifth-day, Nov. 3d, and was informed that the next First-day was the time of the regular appointment of Eld. E. Miller Jr., that at his last meeting he had preached against the Sabbath, and had given notice that at his next appointment he intended to overthrow the whole theory by presenting positive testimony that the Sabbath was abolished. Being anxious to know what would be considered "positive testimony" on that point, I attended his meeting; but so far from redeeming his promise, he did not attempt to offer any "positive testimony" to that effect, but rested it on the sweeping declaration that "The whole code of laws from Sinai, moral, civil and ceremonial, went by the board." He made quite an effort to narrow down and contract that which the Word says, is "exceeding broad." Ps. cxix, 96. In order to show that the commandments of God do not include all moral duties he said that restoring four-fold was a moral duty not found in the Decalogue. But does the duty of restoring four-fold grow out of any proper or natural relation which we sustain to one another? We read in Ex. xxii, 1, thus: "If a man shall steal an ox or a sheep, and kill it or sell it, he shall restore five oxen for an ox, and four sheep for a sheep." The obligation to restore four-fold arises from the *transgression* of the commandment. It is truly singular that men will not see a difference between obedience to a law, and the restitution for disobedience. To avoid the necessary conclusion from a comparison of Gen. xxvi, 3-5; 1 Chron. xvi, 14-18, and Deut. iv, 12, 13, to wit: that the ten commandments existed as a law before given from Mount Sinai, he affirmed and re-affirmed that the covenant, (law) spoken of in 1 Chron. xvi, was the promise of the land of Canaan! Again, in commenting on Paul's epistle to the Romans, he said that Chaps. v and vi, were a digression from the main argument. The fallacy of such a position must be evident to every one who reads the first seven chapters. But he was under the necessity of making out a digression, or admit what the Apostle shows, that the transgression of "the law" of which he is all along speaking, was the introduc-

tion of sin into the world. In Chap. vii, he said that Paul, by a figure of speech, threw himself back under the law, to illustrate how the law worked when it was yet in force. Then when he said he delighted in the law of God, he must have meant that he would have delighted in it if there had been any such thing, and that the law *would be* holy, just, good and spiritual, if it had not "all gone by the board."

But the most strange and untenable views were held forth in his exposition of the New Testament law. To fill up the "gap" between the resurrection and day of Pentecost, he quoted 2 Thess. iii, 6, without, however, attempting to show what traditions Paul, or any of the apostles, delivered during the period in question. After stating that we were at liberty to do whatever is not prohibited by the apostles, he made use of the second commandment, as it stands in the Decalogue, to prove that it is wrong to make or worship graven images; and after repelling the charge, (said to have been made by some) that he advocated a "no-law" theory, he made the following singular declaration: "Christ never proclaimed a code of laws for the government of the world, either in person or by his apostles. At the present time he has no code of laws for the government of the world; saving this, to repent. He don't tell the world to do this or that, but to repent and become members of his body, and then fall in with a rule for Christians." This, it seems to me, is a bold and dangerous stroke at the authority of revelation. If this is true, the world can have no sin, for where no law is there is no transgression. If Christ has no code of laws for the government of the world, then the world is in greater safety than the church, because the church may lose some, but the world can lose none; the Christian may "fall from grace" and be condemned by the law for Christians, but the world cannot be condemned, for "Sin is not imputed when there is no law."

The investigation at this place was attended with the happiest results; as many by it were confirmed in the truth of our position, thinking truly that nothing but an extremity to save a sinking cause would lead any sane man to deny the plain distinction between a law and a promise, or affirm that a *digression* from an argument on *justification by faith*, should commence with, "Therefore being justified by faith," &c., or, again, that all the law, moral, civil, and ceremonial went by the board at the death of Christ, leaving us entirely dependent on the apostles for a rule of moral obligation, and that their first commandment inculcated *repentance*! If such are the strongholds of our opponents, surely "their rock is not as our rock." Many around us are laboring under equally erroneous impressions; and let us, dear brethren, awake to the importance of diligence in placing the true light before them, and ever praying that God may open their eyes to see the danger of their position.

Yours in hope, J. H. WAGGONER.  
Metomen, Wis., Jan. 22d, 1854.

#### THE ADVENT FAITH.

WITHOUT faith it is impossible to please God, or to receive his truth. The doctrine of the speedy coming of our blessed Lord is of God. It is a fundamental part of the Scriptures, and it cannot be received except through living FAITH in His word. It is not perceived nor retained by sight, or by the will or wisdom of man, but by implicit confidence in every word which God has spoken. Through prayerful and patient examination of the Bible, we find a REASON for our faith immutable as the promise of the Father, and sure as the eternal councils of his throne.

The traditions and opinions of men are alike conflicting and unsafe, but the word of the Lord abideth forever. The Son has said, "I will come again," and "surely I come quickly," and has given us data and signs by which we may know assuredly that he is near even at the doors. All these way-marks of the inspired text, and the increasing signs in our moral, political, and natural heavens, demonstrate the hour at hand, when we shall "see the Son of Man coming on a cloud with power and great glory." Having this confidence, we are not easily shaken in mind, nor discouraged by the SEEMING darkness or lateness of



the hour. We have placed ourselves upon the word of God and we are willing to abide the issue. Though the mountains pass on each side, the sea yawn before, and the scoffing enemy press behind, we fear not. He that is with us is mighty, Jehovah is his name, and at the appointed time he will surely deliver.

#### How to avoid Fretfulness.

[An esteemed brother has sent us the following for publication, from the *Golden Rule*. We shall do well to make an application of it, at home and abroad.]

"Christian! walk carefully—danger is near,  
Work out the journey with trembling and fear;  
Snarers from without, and temptations within  
Seek to entice thee again into sin.

Fretfulness or a spirit of complaining is a sin of all sins the most frequent, and destructive to domestic happiness. Indeed, we have known whole families rendered miserable from this source. Peevishness or a disposition to fret, even at little things is truly and emphatically the mischief maker, the apple of discord. 'Behold, how great a matter a little fire kindleth!'

Any rules, or antidote, remedying this prevalent evil will be considered a desideratum, more valuable than the philosopher's stone.

First, then, *stop!* stop short, the very instant you feel any risings of irritability or peevishness; *stop*, and reflect, how useless, unlovely, unavailable, unprofitable, yes, how hateful and very wicked it is to indulge in this habit. Think, how much it gratifies Satan, destroys your own peace and comfort, grieves the Holy Spirit and dishonors Christ.

Even *one* word, while in a fretful, angry frame, will 'set on fire the course of nature, and it is set on fire of hell!' *Stop! stop!* 'leave off contention before it be meddled with.' 'If a man offend not in word, the same is a perfect man.' Therefore, again:

2. We say *stop!* The very moment you feel any disposition to fret—*stop!* keep silence, keep your mouth as with a bridle, set a double guard at your lips, bar them, lock them up, utter not a syllable, a single *thought*, till there is a cooling off, time for reflection and prayer—raise your heart to God, for conquest.

3. Besides this profound silence and ejaculatory prayer, plead the promises. 'Blessed is the man that endureth temptation,' &c. See James i, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. Also 1 Cor. x, 13.

4. Endeavor, at all times to cultivate a spirit of calmness and self possession under all circumstances of provocation, and trial. 'Let your moderation be known to all men; the Lord is at hand.'

5. Think of your own misdoings, how much you cause others to be displeased at your behavior. No one that duly considers his own faults and aberrations will be likely to fret at the misconduct of others.

6. Consider the Providences of God. Nothing does or can occur except under the direct or indirect control of infinite wisdom and benevolence.

7. Think, much on the goodness and forbearance of God, his infinite patience and long suffering under the most atrocious and aggravating insults.

8. Let the example of Christ be vividly and constantly before your mind.

'Consider Him who endured such contradiction of sinners against himself lest ye also be wearied and faint in your minds.'

Especially remember, that while enduring the agonies of the cross, He prayed, 'Father, forgive them.' &c.

9. Accustom yourself to look chiefly on the bright side of things, not on the dark. Dwell mostly on the good qualities of those with whom you associate, not on the bad. Make due allowances also, for the varied temperaments, circumstances, education, &c., of evil doers.

10. Pray for those tempters and evil doers, with whom you come in contact. You can never fret against those, for whom your soul is burdened, for whose salvation you feel a deep, longing, prayerful interest.

11. Finally: seek earnestly for a baptism of the Holy Spirit, a holy, sanctified soul, a deep and lasting sympathy with Christ. This entire consecration to

God, praying *always*, in the Spirit, is the only sure safeguard against fretfulness and all other sins.

Christian! walk prayerfully—oft wilt thou fall,  
If thou forget on the Saviour to call,  
Safe shalt thou walk through each trial and care,  
If thou art clad in the armor of prayer."

#### THE ADVENT CROWN.

THE sight of those who gaze with an unwavering heart on the glory and brightness of our coming Lord, becomes strangely dim to the fascinations of earth. They lose much of themselves, that they once valued, and the love of sense and self vanishes in the sunlight of his perfections. They feel poor in spirit, and hunger and thirst after greater conformity to his image. They begin to cry from the heart, "Let them kingdom come;" and they are looking for and hasting unto the day of the Lord. Paul once said, "There is laid up for me a crown of RIGHTEOUSNESS, which the Lord the righteous Judge shall give me in that day, and not to me only but to all them who love his appearing." By these words the humble and confiding are encouraged, and though they feel most unworthy of a crown, they know that they love the doctrine of his appearing, and therefore hope to receive it, for it is RIGHTEOUSNESS. They long for the glorious hour, when with the elders, they shall cast their crowns at the feet of him who sitteth on the throne, saying, "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honor, and power, for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created."

Let us then be diligent, and comfort our hearts with one of his last injunctions—"Behold I come quickly, hold that fast which thou hast, that no man take thy crown. Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of my God, and he shall go no more out, and I will write upon him the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, which is New Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from my God, and I will write upon him my new name." Amen, even so come, Lord Jesus.

#### COMMUNICATIONS.

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

##### From Bro. Tollman.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—Bro Waggoner came last Fall into our neighborhood and gave us a course of lectures on the prophecies, the commandments, and the present truth of the third angel's message; and we feel to rejoice and praise the Lord for the light that shines so bright. Four of us immediately embraced the truth; and since that time two more have joined us in the faith, and another has commenced keeping the Sabbath.

As the *Review and Herald* comes to us richly laden with blessings, we hail it with joy, not only for the truth it contains, but also to learn the position of those who are looking for Jesus the second time without sin unto salvation to all those that love his appearing, and to reward them with a crown of righteousness that fadeth not away; also to give unto those who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory honor and immortality—eternal life.

As we meet from Sabbath to Sabbath, our faith grows stronger in the Lord, and in the Scriptures of divine truth, which are given by inspiration of God, and are profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.

The publication on the Sanctuary and 2300 days we have carefully read, and think it affords the right explanation of the mistake in the past. We believe that Jesus is in the Most Holy Place of the heavenly Sanctuary, and will soon come out to bless his people, that where he is, there they may be also, and behold his glory.

Jesus said, Then shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins, which took their lamps and went forth to meet the bridegroom; and five were wise and five were foolish, &c. Did he say that they

would not be disappointed? No: he said that they would be disappointed, in consequence of which they would slumber and sleep. Neither did he say that the bridegroom would come, when the cry was made, Behold he cometh!

Babylon seems to be getting angry as we talk of the third angel's message, and of keeping the Sabbath of the Lord our God, and of the literal signs, the fulfillment of prophecy. The signs in the religious moral and political world show beyond controversy that Christ is near even at the door.

When we present these important truths in some of the First-day meetings in order to avoid hearing on these subjects they will close their meetings. Now in so doing, do they not fulfill the saying that is written: They have eyes, but they see not; ears have they but they hear not; hearts, but they understand not.

Not long since I was talking with a Baptist minister on the subject of the Sabbath. He being a Latin, Greek and Hebrew scholar, undertook to support the Christian Sabbath; and when he failed to do so, at last said, before some six or eight, that he did not believe in keeping any Sabbath. Now is he not giving the lie to his own profession? or how can they who hear him make such denials of the Sabbath, have confidence in him? But this is come to pass, which is spoken, They are willingly ignorant.

As we are living in perilous times in which false teachers and their false doctrines shall abound, in whom shall we put our trust? In the arm of flesh? No; but in God who made the heavens, the earth, the sea, and the fountains of waters, and rested the seventh day from all his work.

I often fear for the danger I am in with the rest of my fellow-creatures, of being overtaken with our sins upon us when Jesus shall make his appearance in the clouds of heaven. Awful day to a wicked world! Then he which is filthy will be filthy still; he that is righteous will be righteous still. If we are of the righteous, with what joy shall we hail his appearing, when he shall descend in all his grandeur and power, with all his holy angels, taking vengeance on them that know not God and obey not the gospel, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power. O who would not embrace the truths of the gospel, and be able to stand before the Son of man.

Yours in the blessed hope, striving to keep the patience of the saints, the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus.  
LEBBEUS TOLLMAN.  
Dellona, Sauk Co., Wis., Jan. 22d, 1854.

##### From Bro. Bates.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—I have been laboring in this North-west corner of Ill., since the 17th of Jan. last. The interest of the last message of mercy is deepening and widening all around. Souls are embracing the Sabbath of the Lord our God, saying it is the truth. Others are inquiring and calling for books, and you will see by the names I send that these inquirers after truth, are anxious to have the *Review and Herald*, and the *Youth's Instructor* for their families. The district school houses are open for the message, and when the weather is mild enough to attend, the people hear, and many are anxious to have more meetings.

I had quite a large box of books, but I already begin to fear I shall not have enough to supply half the demand. Work enough in the western field. The harvest is ripening. God speed the messengers to fill their stations in his wide-spread harvest-field. How evident that God is gathering his army for the battle of the great day.  
JOSEPH BATES.  
Green Vale, Jo Daviess Co., Ill., Feb. 2d, 1854.

##### From Bro. Paine.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—While we yet remain in this world of trial and peril we love the truth better and better, and are more fully established that we are on the direct way to the city of God where the pure in heart will have admittance. I have attended meetings some seven or eight Sabbaths at Springfield with the brethren since conference. They are giving evidence that *rock bottom of truth* is their foundation. Two or three have been added to the church here since the conference. Several have embraced the truth in Brookfield, Mass., where Brn. Daniels and Hunt have been presenting the truth.

Yours in love,  
LUTHER PAINE.  
Ware, Mass., Jan 31st, 1854.

## THE REVIEW AND HERALD.

ROCHESTER, THIRD-DAY, FEB. 14, 1854.

## Thoughts for Consideration.

[THE following was received from H. Barringer with the accompanying note:—

BRO. WHITE:—With your permission I will suggest through the *Review* the following thoughts for consideration, and see what conclusions they will lead to.]

1. If the seventh day is still in force, is not the first also? and are not two days in the week therefore set apart for religious exercises by divine command and apostolic example?

2. If the seventh day was still in force after Pentecost, why was the first day only mentioned in the epistles as a day for congregational duties?

3. If the Lord's supper, and other congregational duties, were attended to on the seventh day, would Paul have chosen that day to reason with the Jews in the synagogues?

4. In the transition period between the full end of the Mosaic, and complete beginning of the Christian dispensation, were not both days observed or chosen more or less for religious exercises, preaching, &c.; and did not the first day, later in time, become the only day for congregational religious exercises?

Yours in the gospel hope, H. BARRINGER.  
Troy, N. Y., Feb. 2d, 1854.

## Conclusions which they Lead to.

1. IT is a declaration of the Prophet, [Amos iii, 7,] that the Lord God will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets. Where has it ever been revealed that *two days* would ever be enjoined upon men by divine command, or apostolic example? There was one definite day set apart by the great Creator, to be observed and kept holy by men; and for a definite purpose: but we know of no passage that teaches that the first or any other day would ever be raised to equal honor with it; much less be established in its stead.

The objection under consideration, assumes that we have "divine command and apostolic example" for the religious observance of the first day; and hence if the original seventh day is still binding, we must keep them both. But we find no such command or such First-day-observance. On this point our opponents seem not well to understand the position they occupy and what devolves upon them to be proved. When a point is indisputably established and fixed forever, it should be considered as settled and not be again called in question. Since, therefore it has been repeatedly and abundantly proved that there is *no divine command*, and *no apostolic example* for Sunday-keeping, it is not for our opponents to assume these points and then build their inferences thereon. Let them first produce the command or the example, and then will their deductions be entitled to our consideration.

2. One would infer from reading the book of Acts that the Sabbath or seventh day was still in force, after the day of Pentecost, and not that "the first day only," was observed for congregational duties. We find that they had Moses and the prophets read every Sabbath-day. Acts xiii, 27; xv, 21. We find Paul entering into the synagogue and preaching on the Sabbath-day, and the *Gentiles* beseeching him that the same words might be preached to them the *next* Sabbath. Acts xiii, 14, 42, 44. We find him abiding in one place a year and six months, reasoning in the synagogue every Sabbath and persuading the Jews and Greeks; [Acts xviii, 4, 11;] while we cannot gather either from the writings or practices of the apostles, that the first day was devoted to religious exercises.

3. Paul did reason with the Jews in the synagogue on the seventh day; and it is a significant fact that this day and this *only* is called the Sabbath throughout the Scriptures. Now why did Luke, the writer of the Acts, a preacher of the gospel, so long after the seventh-day Sabbath ceased, if it ceased at all, call this day the Sabbath, and thus throw us who live under the gospel in suspense and doubt in regard to what day we should observe in honor of Him who made heaven and earth, and thus render obedience to one of his express commandments? Why, I say,

did he thus speak of it, if the seventh day was not the Sabbath for Christians then?

Provided the "Lord's supper and other congregational duties" were not attended to on the seventh day, what difference would that make? It matters not if Paul was engaged in such duties day and night from one week to another, that would not make a Sabbath. That institution must come from higher authority. There never has been but one Sabbath: that was made in the beginning by the King eternal, and man cannot annul it.

4. In the "transition period," as it is termed, we are satisfied of one thing, that the seventh day remained in all its original force, and was observed by Christ and his disciples; hence this cannot be true of the first day. We will nevertheless admit that at a later period that became the day generally observed for "congregational religious exercises;" but it was not until that man of sin had been revealed, the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; not until he, in his presumptuous exaltation, had seized the law of God, robbed the fourth commandment of its glory and sanctity, and palmed off upon the world his counterfeit substitute. U. S.

## DISHONESTY.

It is a singular spectacle to observe the course which the advocates of the first day Sabbath are compelled to adopt. After having proved the change of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week, by a number of absurd inferences, which apparently settle that question to their satisfaction, they find themselves in an exceedingly awkward position. Sunday has now become the Sabbath, but where is the commandment that obliges men to keep it holy? Where is the precept which teaches men *how* to observe this new Sabbath? It will do very well for the advocates of Sunday to resort to the fathers for proof that the Sabbath has been changed to that day, but to produce from the fathers, the commandment for Sunday-keeping is rather too hazardous an imposition to be attempted.

What then shall be done? To acknowledge with frankness that God has never given any precept or commandment for the observance of this new Sabbath, would also be acknowledging that its observance is not a part of man's duty. Eccl. xii, 13. This therefore will not do. In this emergency a lucky expedient seems to have suggested itself. It was this: "Sunday has become the Sabbath, and as it lacks a commandment to enforce its observance, and must have one, we will employ the fourth commandment for this purpose. There can be no harm in this, for the commandment says 'Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy,' and the seventh day has ceased to be the Sabbath, and therefore needs this commandment no longer while the first day of the week has become the Sabbath, and is in perishing need of something of this kind."

Whether the advocates of Sunday-observance held any of this plausible reasoning with their own consciences or not, we are unable to determine with certainty. But with regard to the acts which they have performed, or rather attempted to perform, we are able to speak without hesitation. They have seized the Lord's Sabbath, which is the seventh day of the week, and stripped it of the fourth commandment, as the soldiers stripped Christ of his robe when they were about to crucify him. Having done this they consign the Sabbath of the Lord to destruction, and choosing in its stead the first day of the week, as the Jews chose Barabbas the robber, instead of Christ the Lord of the Sabbath, they array their new Sabbath in the stolen fourth commandment.

This conduct may enable Sunday-keepers to deceive those who employ their ministers to do their reading of the Bible, and their thinking for them. But God, let it be remembered, is not deceived by all this; and the day of judgment will show that men cannot mock God with impunity. Ministers of the gospel, and religious teachers, have so long and so generally

taught men that Sunday was the Sabbath, and have repeated with so much assurance, the fourth commandment in support of the observance of that day, that the deception seems almost complete in the case of thousands. Take heed that no man deceive you. J. N. A.

## Appointments.

PROVIDENCE permitting there will be a Conference of four days at the house of Bro. S. Gillett, in Green Vale, Jo Daviess Co., Ill., to commence on Thursday, March 2d, at 2 o'clock P. M., and continue to the evening of the 5th. Also a Conference of three days at Plumb River, Jo Daviess Co., Ill., commencing March 10th, at 2 o'clock P. M., and continue over the Sabbath into the evening of the 12th. The brethren coming on the Galena and Chicago Union R. R., will stop at Nora, four miles east of the terminus of the road, and six miles north-east of Bro. S. Gillett and W. Bates', via Green Vale P. O. Nora is sixteen miles north-east of Plumb River.

If any of the Sabbath brethren in this region wish for a general meeting, if they will give me notice by the 10th of March, I will endeavor to serve them if it is practicable.

My Post Office address for the present will be Green Vale, Jo Daviess Co., Ill., care of Wm. Bates. JOSEPH BATES.

## To Correspondents.

1. In writing to this Office, let everything of a business nature be put on a part of the sheet by itself, or on a separate sheet, so as not to be mixed up with other matters.

2. Be careful to write all names of persons and places, plainly and distinctly.

3. In all cases give the name of the Post Office, County and State. When a Town or Village is called by one name, and the Post Office by another, be sure to give the name of the Post Office.

4. When the direction of a paper is to be changed, do not forget to name the Office to which it has been sent.

5. Let everything be stated explicitly, and in as few words as will express the writer's meaning.

6. In writing texts of scripture, be sure to copy from the Bible correctly. It is no small sin to carelessly mangle the Word of God, as some do.

If the above directions are complied with, we shall be saved much time and perplexity, and be less liable to mistakes in transacting the business of the Office.

## Business.

J. HARROUN.—Your money is receipted in No. 2. We have forwarded the paper according to direction.

A. S. HUTCHINS.—The books were forwarded the 9th inst., to Ulisses, as ordered.

A. M. CURTIS.—In answer to your inquiries we would refer you to the article in this No. entitled, The Hour of His Judgment Come.

C. A. OSGOOD.—We have not had time yet to notice your questions. They shall be examined at our earliest convenience.

## Letters.

L. Drow, S. Willey, H. Barringer 3, J. B. Frisbie, J. Harroun, A. S. Hutchins, B. M. Adams, J. Bates, J. Baker, J. N. Andrews, J. Marsh, E. Nash.

## Receipts.

L. Glover, W. S. Lane, S. Griggs, J. Locke, C. Davis, C. Washburn, L. A. Washburn, M. Ricker, J. Benson, A. Heald, G. Widrick, H. Patch, O. Benson, I. Snow, each \$1.

E. S. Lane, Geo. Mayhew, U. Bucklin, A. Wiley, O. Nichols, N. Davis, C. P. Finch, A. Ross, each \$2.

C. G. Cramer, \$3; a Bro. in Conn. \$10. J. P. Kellogg \$9—75 cts. for each of the following names: J. Kellogg, D. Kellogg, S. Rice, J. Kellogg, Jr., N. Chapin, G. Kellogg, M. S. Kellogg, P. R. Chapin, A. Call, M. Owen, C. Riche, E. Perkins.

J. Noyes, \$4.50; D. C. Demerest, \$3.50; H. G. S. Rathbun \$1.91; B. Tishnor, A. Sanders, B. Landon, S. T. Cranston, H. Lillis, Sr. Hunt, each \$1.50. C. S. Glover, H. S. Wells, each \$0.90. S. Snow, \$0.86; P. W. Green, P. Burdick each \$0.75; T. Finch, \$68; E. A. Poole, O. D. Eastman, S. Ross, each \$0.50; E. L. Bond, \$0.25.

## THE REVIEW AND HERALD

IS PUBLISHED WEEKLY

At South St. Paul Street, Stone's Block,  
No. 23, Third Floor.JOSEPH BATES, J. N. ANDREWS, JOSEPH BAKER,  
Publishing Committee.

JAMES WHITE, Editor.

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

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

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