

# THE ADVENT REVIEW, AND SABBATH HERALD.

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

VOL. II.

SARATOGA SPRINGS, N. Y., JANUARY 13, 1852.

No. 10.

JOSEPH BATES, HIRAM EDSON, } Publishing Committee.  
and J. N. ANDREWS.

JAMES WHITE, Editor.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY.

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

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

## THE LAW.

BY ROSWELL P. COTFRELL.

"And the temple of God was opened in heaven, and there was seen in his temple the ark of his testament." Rev. xi, 19.

When God "confirmed" his law to men,  
To Israel's waiting flock,  
He spoke aloud his precepts ten,  
And graven them in the rock.

Within the Tent's most holy place  
The law of God was laid:  
Within the sacred Ark's embrace  
It was deposited.

But God well knew, perdition's son  
Would ne'er his precepts love;  
He gave a duplicate alone,  
And kept his own above.

There, in the "Tabernacle true,"  
Pitched not by hands of men,  
The sacred law is kept in view,  
The holy precepts ten.

And when the seventh trump's behest  
Withdrew the veil between  
The holy and the holiest,  
The precious Ark was seen.

Then let us "serve the law" of love,  
And in it take delight:  
By day, obedience to prove,  
And meditate by night.

Mill-Grove, N. Y.

From the "Bible Advocate" of 1847.

## THE SABBATH.

BY C. STOWE.

"Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy."

BROTHER, SISTER:—Does a secret disgust arise in your heart, as you read the command adopted as a motto for this article? And are you inclined to turn away with indifference or contempt? Reflect; it is the command of Jehovah, uttered audibly, amid the thunders of Sinai; and if not *abolished, repealed, or amended*, it is still in force, and as fully binding on you, and on me, now, as it was on ancient Israel in the wilderness of Sinai; and will continue to be so, on all; 'till that same voice which then shook the earth, shall once more shake not the earth only, but also heaven; and the glorious rest, of which this is the type\* and earnest, shall dawn on the renovated earth, and its redeemed and blissful inhabitants.

'It is a principle which no proficient in the science of government, human or divine, will deny, that a law once enacted and in force' remains in force, 'till repealed or amended by the same authority which enacted it'; except when a law is enacted for a specific object, and a limited time, the object being accomplished, and the time expired, it has then fulfilled its design, and consequently null and void. As for instance the *ritual law*, which was a shadow, extending to the body, which is Christ; and which was abolished in his flesh. But it is a fact so evident as scarcely to need no proof, that the seventh day Sabbath had no such design or limitation. I ask any one who believes that the weekly Sabbath was one of the shadows thus abolished, to point out the particular ritual for which it was appointed,—Sacrifices were indeed, offered on that day, and so they were on every other day. (Num. xxviii. 3, 9.) But did not that change the character of the days, after those sacrifices ceased to be offered? Ask a child the simple question, whether the value of any number would be changed by adding a certain number to it, and then subtracting the same from it. His reply would be, that the original number remained

the same as before the addition and subtraction. So the days on which sacrifices were offered, remained the same after those sacrifices ceased, that they were before they were appointed. Those which were *common days before, were so after.* And that which was a *Sabbath before, must remain Sabbath after.* Indeed the Sabbath suffered no change at any time. It was no more holy, its rest no more sacred, under the Levitical law, than it was previously; when the Israelites were commanded to prepare all their bread on the sixth day, and to abide every man in his place on the seventh. Ex. xvi. 29. Consequently, the ritual law could not take from it, a sacredness it never imparted to it. As therefore the Sabbath has not been *abolished*, our next inquiry is, has it been repealed or amended, by the authority which enacted it? To this, there can be no other rational answer, than, that in the absence of any testimony to this effect, we have no right to infer that it has been thus repealed, or amended. God has given mankind a Sabbath of rest, particularly designating the day which was to be observed, with the reasons for the same, and the manner of observing it; and afterwards incorporated it into that law, which is holy, just and good; and which in the new covenant, he has promised to write, not in tables of stone, but in fleshly tables of the heart. How then, can any portion of this law, be repealed or amended by the unchangeable Jehovah? But admitting that he has done this, where in all his revealed will to man, shall we find a transcript or amendment? We look, and ask in vain. No one, I believe, pretends to bring positive evidence of such repeal or amendment from the word of God. *Human inferences from circumstantial evidence with the usages of the fathers*, is all which has been, or can be brought, to prove that the Sabbath has been repealed or changed. Have we any right on such grounds to 'change the ordinance, and break the everlasting covenant?' Is it not presumption thus to treat the positive commands and institutions of Jehovah?

But let us examine some of this inferential evidence, and giving it all the weight it will admit, see if it will justify an abandonment of the Sabbath, either with, or without a substitute. But here so many inconsistencies at once present themselves, that I hardly know where to begin. First it is contended, that Christ, in performing cures, and permitting his disciples to satisfy their hunger from the fields through which they passed, did as he was accused, that which is not lawful to do on the Sabbath; and that in his reply to the ever murmuring Pharisees, he intimated that it was not then in force. And at the same time it is asserted that he afterwards abolished it at his crucifixion: and again, that it was changed to the first day of the week, at his resurrection. Again that being abolished, Paul was afraid of those who observed it, and yet, that it is immaterial whether it be observed or not; only let every one be fully persuaded in his own mind. *Truth* is always consistent with itself, and with every other truth. But let me ask, which two of these four propositions can be harmonized? I think it is evident, not only that the above inferences cannot be harmonized with each other, but that neither of them, has any foundation in the word of God.

1st.—Christ did not *annul*, or break this command, for his own testimony is, 'I came not to destroy the law, but to fulfill.' Therefore, though Lord of the Sabbath, he did not make it void. But instead of giving any such intimation, he showed the Pharisees that in eating the ears of corn as they passed, they no more profaned the Sabbath than the priests did, in performing in the temple the labor necessary in preparing their sacrifices. And that in releasing the afflicted from disease and infirmity, he no more violated the Sabbath, than they did, in similar acts of humanity to their beasts. Thus exposing their inconsistency; and assuring them, that it was lawful to do well on the Sabbath; by which, he tacitly acknowledged its validity. (Mat. xii. 5—13.) Dare any infer from these circumstances, that the Saviour worked or broke any portion of that law, which he declared he came not to destroy, but to fulfill? Neither should such an inference be made from the circumstance of his omitting the fourth commandment in his reply to the young man, Matt. xix. 18, 19, for the *first, second, third and sixth* are also omitted.

Such an inference would also contradict another express declaration of his, Matt. v. 19, 'Whosoever therefore, shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven.' The 17th, 18th and 21st verses, show the ten commandments to be the ones intended. Campbell renders it, 'shall be in no esteem in the reign of heaven.' May we then be found humbly seeking to *know*, and faithfully striving to *do*, all the commands of God; and especially beware of encouraging any to break even the least of them.

2d.—The Sabbath has not been abolished, as has been already proved.

3d.—It cannot be a matter of indifference whether it be regarded or not. For if abolished or annulled, there is none to be regarded. A decision on its validity, must therefore, settle this point. If neither repealed nor abolished, it is still in force; and its observance every where represented in the Bible as a matter of the greatest importance. What day it was, that the Romans (chap. xiv) could not agree about observing, we are not informed. But its being ranked with the use of meats and herbs, is far from indicating it to be the Sabbath.

4th.—The law of the Sabbath was not *amended*, either by Christ, the Apostles, or the primitive Christians. 1st. Christ did not amend this law by substituting another day for the seventh. Or if he did, the Apostles never recorded it, and the women who prepared spices to anoint his body, did not know it, otherwise they would not have delayed that office of affection for their Lord, and 'rested the Sabbath day, according to the commandment.' 2d. The Apostles did not change the day, as we have any account; nor had they any right thus to invade the prerogative of God. 3d. Neither had the *early Christians* any authority to amend the law of God. If they did it, it is an evidence that 'the mystery of iniquity began to work, which thought to change times and laws.' That this leaven did begin to steal insensibly upon the church from the days of the Apostles, (as Paul affirms, 2 Thes. ii. 7,) we have evidence from the fact, that the early Christians began to observe the first day of the week as commemorative of the resurrection of Christ, though *not as the Sabbath*; 'till Constantine began to legislate in its favor. Eusebius says, (Life of Constantine, B. 4, ch. 18, Basle Ed.) that 'he, (Constantine) appointed as a suitable day for prayers, the Dominical day.' 'His body guard observed the day, and offered in it prayers written by the Emperor.' 'He determined that those obeying Roman power, should abstain from every work upon the days named after the Saviour; that they should venerate also the day before the Sabbath in memory as seems to me, of the events occurring in those days, to our common Lord.' Sozomen also says, (Ecc. Hist. B. 1, ch. 8) 'that Constantine also made a law that on the Dominical day, which the Hebrews call the first day of the week, and the Greeks the sun, and also in the day of Venus, (i. e. Friday) judgments should not be given, or other business transacted; but that all should worship God with prayers and supplications, and venerate the Dominical day, as in it Christ rose from the dead; but the day of Venus, as that on which he was fixed to the cross.' Sylvester, who was the Bishop of Rome, while Constantine was Emperor, changed the name of Sunday, and gave it the more imposing title of Lord's day.' Lucius Ecc. Hist. Cent. 4, p. 740. From this circumstance, and the custom thence derived, probably arose the impression that John in Rev. i. 10, applied the term Lord's day to the first day of the week:—while not an intimation is given in all the word of God, that the first day ever received that appellation, either from Christ or his Apostles. But God called the seventh day 'the Sabbath of the Lord'; 'the holy of the Lord'; 'my holy day,' &c., and Christ styles himself 'Lord of the Sabbath.' And in all places in the New Testament, where the Sabbath is named, reference is had to no day but the seventh. Matt. xxviii. 1; Acts xiii. 14, 27, 42, 44 and xvi. 13 and xviii. 4. The last of these references state that Paul reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath; and verse 11, tells how long he did so, viz., a year and a half. This was at Corinth. But we find, chap. xvii. 2, that he had been accustomed thus to do, in other places. The historical facts above ci-

ted, show the fallacy of substituting the usages of the fathers, (which at best are but the traditions of men,) for the commands of God; and the Scripture references prove, that in the New Testament the Seventh day is called the Sabbath, without intimating that there was any other. Had there been, they would have been distinguished as now, by the appellation, *Jewish and Christian*. But in fact, the Bible recognizes no *Jewish Sabbath*. But 'the Sabbath of the Lord.' 'My holy day,' and *the Sabbath*, in distinction from all others.

Let us now hastily glance at some of the circumstances from which the first day is inferred to be the Sabbath. First, it is said that the Saviour rose the first day of the week, thus completing the work of redemption, and as this is more important than that of creation, therefore we shall honor Christ more by observing the first day. Ah! human wisdom. 'Shall mortal man be more just than God?' 'Shall a man be more pure than his maker?' Shall we attempt to instruct the Almighty, and to amend his work, and think thus to honor Christ?—Behold, to obey, is better than sacrifice. If the Lord had seen fit to appoint a day to commemorate his resurrection, still, it would have been a new institution having altogether a different design; and would in no wise affect the Sabbath. But he has no where given any intimation of the kind. And any such addition or substitution by human authority or tradition, might with the same propriety be followed; the celebration of the day of his nativity, Good Friday, and all the other festivals by which the Papal church seeks to honor Christ, and to 'change times and laws.' Let us beware that we 'partake not of her sins.' Neither the *resurrection of the Saviour* on the first day of the week; *his appearing to his disciples*, who were to be witnesses of the same, in that day; their being assembled on the evening of the same day; *Paul's meeting his brethren* to preach to them, and to *break bread* just before leaving them, occurring on the evening of the first; nor their being requested to *lay by their contributions* on that day, can prove it *the Sabbath*, when not even an intimation of it is given; unless it can also be proved, that the Saviour should rise, or give proofs of his being alive on no day but the Sabbath; that the disciples assembled on no other day; and that it was customary to break bread, and to attend to such acts of benevolence on no other; while there are considerations in the *circumstances themselves*, which are unfavorable to such a conclusion.

In the first case, two of the disciples had spent a considerable part of the day in other business; traveling 60 furlongs to Emmaus, and returning the same distance after it was 'towards evening, and the day far spent'; then attending the meeting of the disciples and while relating their interview with Jesus on the way, he appeared in their midst. Luke xxiv, 30, 31, 33, 36. Again, the breaking of bread at which Paul presided, did not take place 'till past midnight, consequently not 'till the second day;—and lastly, their contributions were not to be brought together, but to be laid by in store; which to say the least, might be done with as much propriety on any other day as the Sabbath. And now, could we divest ourselves entirely of prepossessions contracted by early instruction, and confirmed by long custom, and the influence of public opinion and example, where I ask, in all these circumstances or any others furnished by the word of God, should we discover that the Sabbath was changed from the seventh to the first day of the week? That myself, with all who may read this may be constantly found among those who call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord honorable, and who shall honor him, not finding their own pleasures, speaking their own thoughts on his holy day; yea, by doing all his commands, we may have right to the tree of life, and soon enter on that rest typified by the Sabbath, is the fervent desire and prayer of

C. Stowe.

\* We believe the view of the Sabbath being a type incorrect. See "Review and Herald," Vol. II, No. 6, p. 44, last column.

### Popular Objections Answered

It is not uncommon for those, upon whose attention the claims of the seventh day are urged, to attempt to escape the force of truth by a variety of objections. This is often done by such as are convinced that the Scriptures require the observance of the seventh day and not the first. It is a remarkable feature of these objections, that they are totally unlike and destructive of each other. But as they are often presented and much relied on, we will mention a few of them.

1. "The original Sabbath cannot be observed in different parts of the earth, as the day begins at different points of time." This objection if it were of any force, would affect the observance of the first, or any other day of the week, equally with the seventh. It is, therefore, an objection to the appointment of any particular day, and of course charges

God with folly in giving the commandment. All that can reasonably be inferred from the difference of time, is that the original Sabbath was not observed at exactly the same time in all parts of the world. And since all the nations of the earth agree in the numbering of the days of the week, no practical difficulty could ever arise from this.—The same may be said in regard to "sailing around the world." If it is really an objection, it lies against the appointment of any day. Those, therefore, who acknowledge the wisdom of God, should be slow to make such an objection to his commandment. Those who object to the seventh day because they *can* gain or lose a day by sailing around the world, may consistently with themselves call two nights and an intermediate dark day *one* night. The *truth* does not require that men should thus "put darkness for light," and so "wrap it up." A cause which demands it, ought for this reason to be abandoned.

2. "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Jews." It is not uncommon, in discussions on this subject, to speak contemptuously of the seventh day as the Jewish Sabbath. An enlightened person, however, will look upon this as the fruit of ignorance or mulice. The Sabbath was given long before the existence of the Jewish nation, and is in the Scriptures often called *the Sabbath of the Lord*, never the Sabbath of the Jews. It is true, we are told by one of the prophets that the Lord made known to Israel his holy Sabbath; but if this makes a Jewish Sabbath, then the other nine precepts of the decalogue are Jewish, and may with the same propriety be reproached as such. This conclusion would reach still further, make the Scriptures Jewish, and the Saviour of men and his salvation Jewish. Such, therefore, as consider this an objection to the seventh day, to be consistent with themselves, should reject the religion of Jesus altogether. But how does it correspond with the spirit of Christ thus to reproach and speak contemptuously of a people to whom we are so deeply indebted, and of whom, as concerning the flesh Christ came? "Boast not thyself against the branches; for if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee." \* \* \*

3. "The first day of the week is so generally observed." It is often said, If the first day be not the Sabbath, why do so many observe it? With equal pertinence might we ask, If all the systems of religion which heathen men have lived and died by are false, why have they been suffered so to abound as to swallow up almost every vestige of true religion? Why have the disciples of Mahomet been suffered to exceed in numbers the professors of Christianity? Why is the purest denomination of protestants permitted to bear such a disproportion to the church of Rome? The reason is obvious; truth is not more easily propagated than error, and pure religion has always been connected with persecution and reproach. If we are to determine between truth and error by the "show of hands," we shall be compelled to adopt the greatest absurdities. The number of these who observe the first day, therefore, can be no evidence for or against its claims.

4. "Whether Christians ought to observe the seventh day or not is a doubtful question; and therefore inquiry on the subject is unprofitable and ought to be avoided." It would be wrong for disputants to cherish an unchristian spirit in the discussion of this question, and it would be equally wrong to neglect honest and thorough inquiry on the subject. To consider both sides of a question involving religious duty, with moderation and candor, is safe and profitable. The fact that some doubts are connected with it, is the very reason why it should be examined. That which at first seemed doubtful may thus become clear and certain. The noble Bereans were commended for their spirit of inquiry, and in this respect they should be an example for us. The assertion that inquiry in regard to things revealed is unprofitable, implies that we ought not to concern ourselves about what is our duty, and is contrary to the exhortations of Scripture to add knowledge to faith and virtue, and to grow in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour. "Buy the truth, and sell it not," is the advice of the word of God. We should not therefore, be hindered from our inquiries by any earthly considerations.

5. When the claims of the original Sabbath are plainly presented, many seem to be convinced of their justness, but, at the same time, think that a general return to the seventh day is impracticable. They allege that the custom of keeping the first day has been so long and generally maintained—that it is so intimately wrought into the habits, calculations and business of life—that it has received such explicit sanction from the civil powers, and is so often and ably vindicated by ministers and commentators that it is in vain to expect a change, and that the cause of Sabbath-keeping is rather retarded than promoted by efforts to promote a change.—The principle of expediency here acknowledged is at war with the

Bible, and extremely dangerous. When men can gravely question whether it is better to follow their own customs than to return to the law of God, their case is critical. God delights not in such. He will dwell only with those who "tremble at his word." Not those who say "Lord, Lord," but those who "do his will," are accepted of him.—Again, if the views here expressed had been adopted in other cases, what would have become of the various reforms which have already blessed the world? What would have become of the whole subject of Protestantism? There is nothing more impracticable in a Sabbath reform, than in any other reform. In other cases, difficulties which at first seemed insurmountable, have given way to laborious and prayerful effort; so may they in this. At any rate, we ought to "obey God rather than man." [*Sabbath Vindicator*].

### Who has left the Sure Word?

We are often charged with following our experience, instead of the unerring word of God; but such a charge is unjust and untrue. It is true that we "hold fast" our advent experience in the past, which has so perfectly fulfilled prophecy; but in so doing, we do not neglect nor depart from the sure word. The Bible is our chart, our guide. It is our only rule of faith and practice, to which we would closely adhere.

In order to show the fulfilment of prophecy, we have to refer to history. To show the fulfilment of prophecy relating to the four universal kingdoms of the second and seventh chapters of Daniel, we have to refer to the history of those kingdoms. Deny the history, and the prophecy is of no use. Just so with the prophecies relating to the advent movement.

If we deny our holy experience in the great leading movements, in the past, such as the proclamation of the time in 1843 and 1844, then we cannot show a fulfilment of those prophecies relating to those movements. Therefore, those who deny their past experience, while they were following God and his holy word, deny or misapply a portion of the sure word.

It is cruel and unjust to represent us as having abandoned the precious book or books, the Bible, to follow impressions, fancies &c. when we have done no such thing, and when those very men that charge us thus leave or misapply a portion of the sure word. Once, the whole advent host believed that the parable of the ten virgins applied exclusively to the advent movement; and that the first going forth, in the parable, was fulfilled by us, as we came up to the first specified time; and that the cry in the parable, "Behold the bridegroom cometh, go ye out to meet him," and the trimming of lamps &c. were also fulfilled by us, as we gave the seventh month cry. We still believe what the whole host once believed, and with holy confidence and energy published and preached to the world. And strange to tell, many of those who have abandoned the fulfilment of prophecy in our past experience, are ready to brand us with fanaticism, and rank us with Shakers, &c. for believing what they once believed, and for carrying out and showing a consistent fulfilment of the parable, in all its parts.

These men should be the last to oppose our views, and complain of a lack of charity on our part, when they, in such an unsparing manner, rank us with apostates for holding fast and carrying out what they once believed and boldly proclaimed. When we in 1843 sang, "My Bible leads to glory," we sang a true sentiment. It did not stop in 1841, and "lead" us back around another way, no, no; but it led onward through the waiting time, and keeping of "the commandments of God," into the kingdom. Glory to God, "My Bible leads to glory." Amen.

The truth, in answer to the question, "Who has left the sure word," is that we closely adhere to the sure word of God, which plainly marks out our holy experience, and acknowledge the mighty work of God in calling out the advent people from the world and fallen church; while those who deny this work of God and their own experience have "left" those portions of the "sure word" which relate to the advent movement. While standing on the sure word, and acknowledging our experience, wrought in us by the living word of God, and while keeping the commandments of God, we are safe—yes, we are safe. Let the storm of persecution rise, and the fiery darts of the wicked fly all around us, thus armed with holy truth, we are safe. Glory to God, we are on the Rock. My spirit grows warm, as I contemplate this glorious theme.

"For He has been with us—still is with us,  
And He's promis'd to be with us to the end."

[*Present Truth*].

We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in your hearts. 2 Pet. i, 19.



## Remarks on 2 Cor. iii.

It is considered by some that this chapter produces positive proof that the law, or ten commandments that were written and engraven in the two tables of stone by the finger of God, are "abolished," "done away," when in fact it gives not the least intimation of the kind.

The apostle Paul in this chapter is contrasting the ministration of the old covenant under Moses, with the ministration of the new covenant under Jesus Christ. It is well known that there is an essential difference between a law, and the ministration of a law. A law is the constitution necessary for the government of the people. The ministry is the ordained powers to carry its laws into execution.

Verse 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." This verse declares the Corinthians to be the epistle of Christ ministered by us, Paul, Silvanus and Timothy. Chap. i, 19. It is not written with ink as it was by Moses in a book under the old covenant, "But with the Spirit of the living God." The ten commandments are not written in tables of stone as they were under the ministration of Moses, "But in fleshy tables of the heart." See Heb. viii, 10.

Verse 6. "Who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." The minister, or ordained power under the old covenant killed the transgressor of the law written on tables of stone. The man that broke the letter of that law was stoned to death. There was no promise of life to the sinner. It is properly called the ministration of death in the next verse. The minister administered death to the sinner under the old covenant. "But the Spirit giveth life." The minister under the new covenant administers life through Jesus Christ, instead of death. One is the ministration of the letter that killed, the other the ministration of the spirit that giveth life.

Paul considered "the ministration of death," when the law was "written and engraven in stones," a glorious one; but that "was to be done away," and the one that excelleth to remain. "For if that which is done away was glorious much more that which remaineth is glorious." What is "done away"? The ministration of death is done away, and the ministration of the Spirit, that giveth life, remaineth.

Verse 12. "Seeing then that we have such hope, we use great plainness of speech." Hope of what? Of life through "Jesus Christ who hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel" 2 Tim. i, 10. The glory of the latter ministration eclipses the glory of the former. The children of Israel could not see that death was abolished when they read Moses, because the veil was upon their heart; but "when it (the heart) shall turn to the Lord, the veil shall be taken away." That veil is the ministration of Moses, that would be taken away when they looked at the blood of Christ for the atonement that taketh away sin; and faith is revealed by the Spirit. "Now the Lord is that Spirit; and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." That is, if they have the spirit of Christ dwelling in them, they are free from the bondage of death and condemnation that they were under, while under the ministration of Moses; and while they are beholding the glory of the Lord, they are changed from glory to glory, by the spirit of the Lord.

Thus we see the difference of the two ministrations clearly taught in this chapter, and not the abolition of the Law of God written on the tables of stone. But the abolishment of death, and the bringing in of a better covenant, established on better promises, when the holy laws of God are written in the fleshy tables of the heart, and put in the mind by the holy Spirit. For, said Jesus, "the Holy Ghost shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." And under this covenant the promise of mercy through Jesus Christ, and life by the holy Spirit is a more glorious ministration. May we all with open face behold this glory, and be changed into the same image from glory to glory, until we are changed from mortal to immortality, and caught up to meet the Lord in the air, and behold the glories of the New Jerusalem, and the earth made new. Amen.

G. W. HOLT.

Rochester, (N. Y.), Dec. 18th, 1851.

## BABYLON.

BY O. NICHOLS.

The article in the last "Review and Herald" from the "Voice of truth of Sept. 1844," concerning "What is Babylon, her fall, and Come out of her my people," was read with much interest. It is the most excellent piece that I ever read on that subject.

The following language clearly defines Babylon: "The woman (Rev. xvii) is symbolical of the church, and as she is called Babylon, there can be no dispute but that the church is Babylon. What church? It is a mother and her daughters, a family of harlots. The mother represents the Catholic church, the eldest member of the family, and the daughters represent the Protestant sects. The whole family most strikingly represent a great city. Take the whole and the figure is perfect; leave out the children, and it is imperfect."

There are some things which we think are erroneous, which we will briefly notice.

1st. "The harlot woman in chap. xvii, and the woman clothed with the sun in chap. xii, are the same churches." There is a wide distinction in the character of the woman of Rev. xii, and the mother of harlots of chap. xvii. The latter is a cruel persecutor, "drunken with the blood of the saints." Verse 6. The woman which brought forth the man-child was persecuted, "and they loved not their lives unto the death." Chap. xii, 11, 13. Also, the dragon was wroth with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ. Verse 17.

This applies to the last state of the woman of chap. xii. The last state of the woman of chap. xvii is described in chap. xviii, and their characters are widely different. We believe the truth to be this: The woman of Rev. xvii, seated upon a scarlet beast, symbolizes the established church, incorporated and united with political governments; [the beast;] and when the church and state were united, they were emphatically one body, civil and ecclesiastical, symbolized by a beast. Rev. xiii, 1—10. The church symbolized by a woman, and the civil power which carried the church, by a beast.

The woman of Rev. xii we believe symbolizes a church of a different character: a holy people which are God's chosen witnesses to proclaim the simple truths of the Bible, and which would not conform to the established church, or follow their tenets and creeds, but chose the New Testament for their christian guide; and for so doing they were denounced as heretics, and were persecuted unto death. "They overcame him by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony." Chap. xii, 11. "All that will live godly shall suffer persecution."

God has in all ages had a holy peculiar people, that were persecuted for not obeying or following the tenets of the worldly church. It is not true that the woman of chap. xii has degenerated, "and become a fallen church." Neither is it true that "she was holding unlawful connection with the beast, or kings of the earth during the 1260 years" she was in the wilderness.

2d. "During the 1260 years the supremacy was vested in the beast, (the political power,) not in the woman," (the church,) of chap. xvii. Both the prophecy and history prove this incorrect. During this period of time, the woman was seated upon the beast, held the reins, dictated, guided, and was the mouth of the beast, (chap. xiii, 5,) had the "dominion" and reigned over the (ten) kings of the earth. The history of the Catholic church proves this to be literally true. She did actually have dominion over the crowned kings and emperors.

3d. "The chronology of the woman seated on the beast commenced at the end of the 1260 years, A. D. 1798, when she takes her seat upon the beast." "Now she is a drunken harlot, and guides the beast which carries her, or holds the supremacy over the state. Has not the church held this station over the kings and rulers of the earth since A. D. 1798? The facts in the case prove that she has. She 'sits upon many waters,' and reigneth over the kings of the earth; not by physical power, but by artifice, cunning and deception." The facts in the case forbid such an application. It cannot be demonstrated that either the Papal or Protestant churches have in any sense reigned over the kings of the earth or "held the supremacy over the state" since A. D. 1798.

To practice "artifice, cunning and deception" is one thing, but to "reign," or "hold the supremacy over the state" is quite a different thing. "To reign" signifies, 1st. "To exercise sovereign power or authority; to rule; to exercise government as a king or emperor; or to hold the supreme power" 2d. Reign signifies royal authority; supreme power; sovereignty. 3d. Reigning signifies "holding or exercising supreme power" &c. [Webster.]

"The woman is that great city which reigneth over the kings of the earth." That is the church or the Pope at its head, holding or exercising the supreme power over the kings &c. This is the only reasonable application of the word "reigneth" in this verse. Has the church exercised this supreme power over kings and rulers since 1798? Neither the Papal or Protestant church has had this power, but the reverse, since that period. The Papal church

did hold and exercise the highest authority and "dominion" over the kings for a long period during the 1260 years, and their "dominion" was taken away in 1798—9, and this church power has not been established since. But in instituting the "image" of papacy, I fully believe that Protestant church supremacy will be established, and "they will exercise all the power of the first beast," or Papal beast.

Rev. xvii, 16, 17, shows conclusively the chronology of the "whore" seated upon the beast, as it is described in verses 3—6, to be previous to 1798. "The ten horns shall hate the whore, make her desolate, &c. For God hath put in their hearts to fulfill his will." This has been literally true with regard to the Papal church supremacy. For the last 50 years the ten kingdoms have hated the temporal dominion of the Pope, who is the head of the Catholic church. The reign of Napoleon made her desolate and naked; "for God put in their hearts," to do this, to "fulfill his will."

The Protestant church authority is the last that will exercise dominion and she will be made desolate under the seven last plagues. Then the "great city" will be destroyed forever, and "found no more at all." The "great city" I understand symbolizes the church incorporated, and united to the state. Both the Catholic and Protestant are included. Its primitive existence commenced with the Catholic church, the "mother." The Catholic church as a "mother," or parent, exercised its authority during its appointed time, 1260 years. Then her daughters came on the stage, and as her children have been growing in strength, influence and power, the mother's power has been diminishing, as our parents naturally do, through enfeeblement by age. Take them as a whole, mother and children, they are one family, "that great city, Babylon" Rev. xviii.

Rev. xvii, I understand, is an explanation of chap. xiii, particularly the seven heads and ten horns. The beast is the same as in chap. xiii, 1, a symbol of the Roman Empire, while united with the Papal church.

Some think the woman on the scarlet beast applies in its chronology since 1798, because there are no crowns specified on the ten horns. There are no crowns specified upon the ten horns of the great red dragon, the symbol of Pagan Rome. Chap. xii, 3. But it is well known that those were ten crowned horns, or kings, under Pagan Rome; and they continued to be crowned kings throughout the 1260 years; but the Pope's crown was higher in authority and reigned over them; and the ten kingdoms have generally continued regal governments since A. D. 1798. [Crown signifies "royalty, regal government." Webster.] Kings, or crowns still continue in the old Roman Empire, and nothing can be shown from chap. xvii, to prove they will not still continue, until the battle of the great day of God Almighty See Rev. xvii, 12, 14.

It is true that the woman represents one thing, (the church power,) and the beast another, (the political power.) But when the church and state are united, or blended together by an act of incorporation by the state, do not these two powers become one? And as the beast, or civil power, has incorporated and united the church with their governments, hence the church becomes a part of their government, or a part of the beast, and is fitly called "the beast." All the authority that the church ever had, was given them by the civil government.

Dorchester, Mass.

## REMARKS ON THE LAW OF GOD.

How clear it is, not only from the scriptures of truth, but from the dictates of reason, that God's Law has eternally existed with himself. God is eternal. His throne is eternal. The "house" or "building of God not made with hands" is "eternal" See 2 Cor. v, 1; John xiv, 2. The Fathers house, or house of God, the place of God's throne in his house, [Heb. viii, 1, 2,] hence, a place to deposite his Law. We read, "justice and judgment are the habitation of his throne." Now common sense would dictate the question, how can there be justice without a law?

In the beginning of the world God made man, and gave him power to govern the whole animate creation, whether in sea air, or on the land. See Gen. i, 26; Heb. ii, 7, 8. How unreasonable to suppose that God gave man no Law by which he should be governed. God knew the end from the beginning. His Law is, and always was perfect; hence, there could be no alteration for the better. And he, knowing the natural disposition of man to evade it, hath said; "My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that has gone out of my lips."

God shew Moses in the mount the Law, and the place of its deposite, and told him to make a house and furnish it like the one shewed him in the mount. What infinite condescension with Jehovah to shew man the place of his throne, and to write for man his Law of justice. H. S. GURNEY.

# THE REVIEW AND HERALD.

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

SARATOGA SPRINGS, TUESDAY, JANUARY 13, 1862.

## "Call to Remembrance the Former Days."

It is good to obey this injunction of the Apostle, and call to remembrance past experience in the Advent cause. Those who believe it to be the cause of God, should not reject the means that has made it a separate cause. Those who talk much of standing on the "original faith," should be the last to trample under-foot that faith they have boldly defended, at the origin of the Advent cause.

The original Advent faith is not merely to believe in the literal coming of Christ, the resurrection and the restitution of all things at some future period, of which we can know but little or nothing about. Thousands believed all this, and believe it still, who are not, and have not been, connected with the Advent cause.

We say that the original faith is that which has made us a separate people. If we had never heard the judgment hour cry, which was based on definite time, we never should have been led to hear a testimony which, being rejected by our own brethren, made it necessary for us to separate from the churches. If the Advent people had closed their ears to the cry of the second angel, [Rev. xiv, 8,] they would, as a general thing, have remained in the churches to this day and would now be Baptists, Methodists, Christians, &c. And where would be the Advent cause, as it is called by some who reject the very means that has made it a separate cause? It would not be in existence.

That this may appear in its true light, please look at those Ministers and church members who went with us till the cry "Babylon is fallen" was given, or to those who have since returned to the churches. Some of them may take an Advent paper, but who believes they stand on the original Advent faith? No one. They have lost their faith, and now perhaps, preach, or hear those preach who teach the world's conversion prior to the Second Advent. And if the Advent people who are now a separate people, had not heeded the cry of the second angel, but had remained in the different churches they would, probably, have no more interest in the coming of the Lord, than those now have who staid in the churches.

We say that the Advent cause owes its very existence to the first and second angel's messages of Rev. xiv. Then why talk of the Advent cause being the cause of God, and at the same time call the means that gave it birth a mistake, some say, a lie, false excitement, or the work of man. Such had better, like consistent, honest men, retrace their steps, and go back to their former brethren in the churches, who were not led to take those steps in the Advent cause, which they attribute to an evil influence. We think that such a course would look far more consistent, and be less displeasing to God, than to profess great interest in the Advent cause, and at the same time trample down the very means that has given it an existence. "I would," says the True Witness to the Laodicean church, "thou wert cold or hot," Rev. iii, 15.

The following letter will show the position of the Editor of the "Advent Herald" in 1814, who was one of the last to speak in defence of the work of the second angel's message.

From the Advent Herald.

## Editorial Correspondence.

### SEPARATION FROM THE CHURCHES.

When we commenced the work of giving the "Midnight cry" with Bro. Miller in 1810, he had been lecturing nine years. During that time he stood almost alone. But his labors have been incessant, and effectual, in awakening professors of religion to the true hope of God's people, and the necessary preparation for the advent of the Lord: as also the awakening of all classes of the unconverted to a sense of their lost condition, and the duty of immediate repentance and conversion to God as a preparation to meet the Bridegroom in peace at his coming. Those were the great objects of his labor. He made no attempt to convert men to a sect, or party, in religion. Hence he labored among all parties and sects, without interfering with their organizations or discipline; believing that the members of the different communions could retain their standing, and at the same time prepare for the advent of their King, and labor for the salvation of men in these relations until the consummation of their hope. When we were persuaded of the truth of the advent at hand, and embraced the doctrine publicly, we entertained the same views, and pursued the same course among the different sects, where we were called in the providence of God to labor. We told the ministers and churches that it was no part of our business to break them up, or to divide and distract them. We had one distinct object, and that was to give the "cry," the warning of the judgment "at the door," and persuade our fellow-men to get ready for the event. Most of the ministers and churches that opened their doors to us, and our

brethren who were proclaiming the Advent doctrine, co-operated with us until the last year. The ministry and membership who availed themselves of our labors, but had not sincerely embraced the doctrine, saw that they must either go with the doctrine, and preach and maintain it, or in the crisis which was right upon them they would have difficulty with the decided and determined believers. They therefore decided against the doctrine, and determined, some by one policy and some by another, to suppress the subject. This placed our brethren and sisters among them in a most trying position. Most of them loved their churches, and could not think of leaving. But when they were ridiculed, oppressed, and in various ways cut off from their former privileges and enjoyments and when the "meat in due season" was withheld from them, and the syren song of "peace and safety" was resounded in their ears from Sabbath to Sabbath, they were soon weaned from their party predilections, and arose in the majesty of their strength, shook off the yoke, and raised the cry, "come out of her, my people." This state of things placed us in a trying position. 1. Because we were near the end of our prophetic time, in which we expected the Lord would gather all his people in one. 2. We had always preached a different doctrine, and now that the circumstances had changed, it would be regarded as dishonest in us, if we should unite in the cry of separation, and breaking up of churches that had received us and our message. We therefore hesitated, and continued to act on our first position, until the church and ministry carried the matter so far, that we were obliged in the fear of God to take a position of defence for the truth, and the down-trodden children of God.

### Apostolic Example For Our Course.

"And he went into the synagogue, and spake boldly for the space of three months, disputing and persuading the things concerning the kingdom of God. But when divers were hardened, and believed not, BUT SPAKE EVIL OF THAT WAY BEFORE THE MULTITUDE, he departed from them, and SEPARATED THE DISCIPLES, disputing daily in the school of one Tyrannus." Acts 19: 8, 9. It was not until divers were hardened, and spake evil of that way (the Lord's coming) before the multitude, that the brethren were moved to come out, and separate from the churches. They could not endure this "evil speaking" of the "evil servants." And the churches that could pursue the course of oppression and "evil speaking" towards those who were looking for "the blessed hope," were to them none other than the daughters of the mystic Babylon. They so proclaimed them, and came into the liberty of the gospel. And though we may not be all agreed as to what constitutes Babylon, we are agreed in the instant and final separation from all who oppose the doctrine of the coming and kingdom of God at hand. We believe it to be a case of life and death. It is death to remain connected with those bodies that speak lightly of, or oppose, the coming of the Lord. It is life to come out from all human tradition, and stand upon the word of God and look daily for the appearance of the Lord. We therefore now say to all who are in any way entangled in the yoke of bondage, "come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing, and I will receive you, and will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty." 2 Cor. vi. 17-18.

J. V. HIMES.

McConnellville, O., Aug. 29, 1814.

### COVENANTS.

BY G. W. HOLT.

I notice in the "Harbinger and Advocate" of Dec. 6th, 1851, the following statements by the Editor of that paper, in his article entitled, "Seventh-day Sabbath Abolished."

"God has not made two covenants yet: the Bible recognizes only two. One of these covenants was made with Israel at Horeb, and by Paul is called the old covenant or testament. But the other covenant has not yet been made. But it will soon be made with Judah and Israel—is called the new covenant or testament."

The Editor's statement, that the Bible recognizes only two covenants is certainly incorrect. I will here mention several of the many covenants recognized in the word of God.

1. The covenant made with Noah. "And God spake unto Noah, and to his sons with him, saying, and I, behold, I established my COVENANT with you, and with your seed after you. . . . And God said, 'This is the token of the covenant which I make between me and you, and every living creature that is with you, for perpetual generations. I do set my bow in the cloud, and it shall be for a token of a covenant between me and the earth.' Gen. ix, 8, 13.

2. The covenant made with Abraham. "And I will establish my COVENANT between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting COVENANT; to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee." Gen. xvii, 7. Then will I remember, my COVENANT with Jacob, and also my COVENANT with Isaac, and also my COVENANT with Abraham will I remember." Lev. xxvi, 42.

3. The COVENANT made in Horeb. Says Moses to Israel that came out of Egypt: "The Lord our God made a covenant with us in Horeb." Deut. v, 2. This was a mutual agreement between God and the people. See Ex. xix; Deut. xi; Lev. xxvi, 3-5. This covenant related exclusively to the welfare of the Jews in literal Canaan. The blessings named in the text referred to, were to be enjoyed by them on condition that they kept the ten commandments; therefore, the ten commandments were not the covenant, but the conditions of that covenant.

4. The COVENANT made with David. "Yet he hath made with me an everlasting COVENANT, ordered in all things, and sure." 2 Samuel. xxiii, 5.

5. The NEW COVENANT. "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 [ten commandments] in their inward parts, and will write it in their hearts, and will be their God, and they shall be my people," Jer. xxxi, 31-33. Heb. viii. 7-13; x, 16, 17.

The Editor of the "Harbinger," professing to be a teacher in Israel, before asserting that "the Bible recognizes only two covenants," should read that precious volume more carefully. If his readers had not the Bible to read for themselves, they would certainly be led astray.

The statement of the Editor, that the New COVENANT is not yet made, is in contradiction with the plain testimony of the word of the Lord. Paul, in his epistle to the Hebrews, speaks of two covenants. One he calls the "first covenant," also the "old covenant." The other is called the "new covenant," the "second," and "better covenant." The first, or old covenant is the one made in Horeb. That covenant had moral and ceremonial conditions. The moral conditions were the ten commandments engraven in stone. The ceremonial conditions of that covenant were written in a book, by the hand of Moses.—These ceremonies, performed by the Jewish priesthood in the worldly sanctuary, were imposed on the Jews until the time of reformation. Then the first covenant ceased, and gave place to the second, or better covenant established on better promises, of which Christ is a minister.

The Apostle states [Heb. ix,] that the first covenant had ordinances of divine service and a worldly sanctuary. He also shows that the better covenant has divine services performed by our High Priest, the Son of God in the Heavenly Sanctuary.

Now of the things which we have spoken this is the sum; we have such an High Priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; a minister of the Sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched and not man." Heb. viii, 1, 2. "But now hath he [the Son of God] obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant which was established upon better promises."—Verse 6.

Now as certain as the Son of God is a mediator, just so certain has the new covenant been made. No truth is more clearly stated in the Bible than that the new covenant commenced with the priesthood of Christ in the Heavenly Sanctuary. The Holy Ghost, on the day of pentecost, signified that the services of the first covenant, in the worldly sanctuary, were no longer of any virtue, and that the services of the new covenant in the Heavenly Sanctuary had commenced.

"The Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all [holy places, Macknight] was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing; which was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience, which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation. But Christ being come an High Priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building." Heb. ix, 8-11.

"And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, [covenant,] that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance. For where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. For a testament is of force after men are dead; otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth." Verses 15-17.

Christ, the Testator, is clearly shown to be the mediator of the new testament, or covenant, which become of force after his death. This covenant was to be confirmed for one week, [seven years,] and in the midst [middle] of the week, the Jewish "sacrifice and the oblation" was to virtually cease, by the death of the Testator. This covenant was confirmed three years and a half by the Testator, and then three years and a half by witnesses chosen before the death of the Testator, who were qualified by the descent of the Holy Ghost on the day of penta-



cost, when the new covenant was in full force, Says Paul. "Who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament; [covenant:] not of the letter, but of the Spirit," 2 Cor. iii. 6. This testimony shows that the new covenant has been made, and that the Apostles were ministers of it.

The Editor also states, that the "new covenant or testament," when made, "will be written on the heart, &c., is the ministration of the Spirit," and refers us to Jer. xxxi. 31-34; Heb. viii and ix.

Here let it be understood that it is not the new covenant or the ministration of the Spirit, that is to be written on the heart, as stated by the Editor of the "Harbinger"; but the law of God, according to the testimony of Jeremiah and Paul. And how absurd to place the ministration of the Spirit in the future, contrary to the teachings of Christ and his Apostles.

Said Jesus, "But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me: and ye also shall bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning." John xv. 26, 27.

The disciples were to tarry at Jerusalem until they were endowed with power from on high. Luke xxiv. 49. "And when the day of pentecost was fully come, they were all of one accord in one place.—And suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them, And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak, with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." Acts ii. 1-4.

Peter went to the house of Cornelius to preach the gospel to the Gentiles, and while he "spake to them the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word. And they of the circumcision which believed, were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost." Acts x. 44, 45.

The Editor also says, "If you read with an unprejudiced mind, we think you will learn to the joy of your heart, that the old covenant or ministration of death, is abolished, and that the new covenant, which will give life, is soon to be made with Judah and Israel."

That the old covenant is done away, and that the ministration of that covenant, which was death, is abolished is evident. It is also very evident that the new covenant has been made, and was confirmed by Christ and his Apostles more than 1,800 years since. By reading the New Testament we learn to the joy of our hearts that the ministration of the Spirit, which giveth life, has been enjoyed by the Church of Christ since the day of pentecost and may now be enjoyed, in all its fulness, by the humble followers of the Lamb, who keep the commandments of God and have the Testimony of Jesus Christ.

Oswego, (N. Y.), Jan. 5th, 1852.

### THE LORD'S SABBATH.

The following is from an interesting tract entitled, "An Appeal for the Restoration of the Lord's Sabbath, as Instituted in Paradise, and Enjoined in the Fourth Commandment, in an Address to the Baptists, from the Seventh-day Baptist General Conference." Pages 6-16. It will be read with interest and profit.

When we look over your large and influential denomination, we find, that, in reference to the subject upon which we now address you, you are divided into about three classes. I. Those who, acknowledging the perpetuity of the Sabbath-law, enforce the observance of the Sabbath by the fourth commandment, but change the day of its celebration from the seventh to the first day of the week. II. Those who see the impossibility of proving a change of the day, and, therefore, regard the commandments as abolished by the death of Christ. But, at the same time, they consider the first day of the week as an institution entirely new, to be regulated as to its observance wholly by the New Testament. III. Those who consider neither the Old nor the New Testament to impose any obligation upon them to observe a day of rest, and advocate one merely on the ground of expediency.

I. First, we address those of you who acknowledge the obligation of a Sabbath, but change the day of its celebration from the seventh to the first day of the week. We may be wanting in discernment, but it really appears to us, that in making the particular day to be observed to stand upon New Testament authority, and yet deriving all the obligation to sabbatize on that day from the Law, there is a departure from the great principle contended for by Baptists, that the extent and bearing of a law,

both as to the duties it enjoins and the objects on which it terminates, are to be learned from the law itself, and not from other sources. On this principle you reject the logic of Pedobaptists, who while they find the ordinance of baptism in the New Testament, go back to the law of circumcision to determine the subjects. You tell them, and very justly too, that the law of the institution is the only rule of obedience. But do you not fall into the same error, when the argument has respect to the Sabbath? We can see no more fitness in applying the law of the Sabbath to the first day of the week, than in applying the law of circumcision to the subjects of baptism. For the law of circumcision was not more expressly confined to the fleshly seed of Abraham, than was the law of the Sabbath to the seventh day of the week. The true principle is that every institution is to be determined by its own law. Therefore, if the first day of the week is an institution binding upon us, the law to regulate its observance should be looked for where we find the institution. Be pleased, brethren, to review this argument, and see if you are not treading on Pedobaptist ground.

In justification of the change of the day, we often hear you plead the example of Christ and his apostles. But where do we find anything to this effect in their example? Did the apostles sabbatize on the first day of the week? Did the churches which were organized by them do so? Observe with marked attention, the question between you and us is not, Did they meet together and hold worship on that day? but, Did they sabbatize? that is, did they REST FROM THEIR LABOR on the first day of the week? Did they observe it AS a Sabbath? This is the true issue. We have often asked this question, but, the only answer that we have received has been, that they assembled for worship. But this is not a candid way of meeting the point. It is in reality an answer to a very different question from the one we ask. Brethren, act out your own principles. Come up square to the question. When you ask a Pedobaptist, did Christ baptize, or authorize the baptism of little children? you expect him to make some other reply than, "He put his hands on them and prayed." When you ask, Did the apostles baptize infant babes? you are not well pleased with the reply, They baptized households. Your question was with regard to little babes—the baptism of them. If, therefore, when we ask you, Did the apostles and primitive Christians sabbatize on the first of the week? you merely reply as above, we do not see but you are guilty of the very same sophistry you are so ready to charge upon your Pedobaptist brethren. Your adroit evasion of the real question seems to place you much in the same predicament as were the Pharisees, when Christ asked them whence was the baptism of John. It appears as if you reasoned with yourselves, and said, "If we shall say they did sabbatize on the first day of the week, the evidence will be called for and we cannot find it; but if we shall say they did not, we fear the day will lose its sacredness in the eyes of the people." We do not by any means wish to charge you with a Pharisaic lack of principle, but we put it to your sober judgment, whether your position is not an awkward one. Brethren, reconsider this point, and see if you are not on Pedobaptist ground.

If the apostles did not sabbatize on the first day of the week, then it follows, as a matter of course, that whatever notoriety or dignity belonged to it, they did not regard it as a substitute for the Sabbath. Consequently, unless the Sabbath law was entirely abrogated by the death of Christ, the old Sabbath, as instituted in Paradise, and rehearsed from Sinai, continues yet binding, as "the Sabbath of the Lord thy God."

But more than this. Even if it could be proved that the apostles and primitive Christians did actually regard the first day of the week as a Sabbath, it would not follow that the old Sabbath is no longer in force, unless it could be proved that they considered the new as a SUBSTITUTE for the old; or, that so far as the particular day was concerned, it was of a CEREMONIAL character. But where do we find proof for either of these? In the whole record of the transactions and teachings of the apostles, where do we find this idea of substitution? No where. Where do we find evidence that

so far as the particular day was concerned, it was ceremonial, and, therefore, to cease at the death of Christ? Nowhere. The same argument that proves the Sabbath law not to be ceremonial, proves the same of the day. Did the Sabbath law originate in Paradise, when man was innocent, and had no need of a Redeemer? So did the day. It was then sanctified and blessed. Does the Sabbath law take cognizance of the relation on which all the precepts of the moral law are founded, viz., the relation we sustain to God as creatures to Creator? So does the day. It is a memorial of this relation, and of the rest entered into by God after he, by his work, had established the relation. It appears then, that neither the Sabbath law, nor the day it enjoins, was of a ceremonial character. True, it is not moral, in the strictest sense, but rather positive. Nevertheless, by divine appointment it belongs to the same category with the moral law, and must be considered a part of it. If this course of reasoning is correct—and if it is not, we hope you will point it out—it would not follow that the old Sabbath is done away, because Christ and his apostles sabbatized on the first day of the week; but only that there are two Sabbaths instead of one.

But we ask by what right could Christ or his apostles alter the law of the Sabbath? Do not be startled. We do not question our Saviour's divinity. We recognize him as over all, God blessed forever. But in all his ministry he acted under the appointment of the Father, and according to such restrictions as were contained in the law and the prophets. By those restrictions, no laws were to be set aside at his coming, except such as were peculiar to the Jewish Economy; such as "meats, and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed until the time of reformation." Heb. ix. 10. To set aside these, the law gave the Messiah an express grant. Heb. x. 9. But the very moment he should attempt to go beyond the limits of that grant, he would destroy all the evidence of his being the Messiah promised and appointed. For it was by his exact conformity to the law, that his claims were established. Hence early in his ministry he declared that he "came not to destroy the law or the prophets." Matt. v. 17. The divinity of the Saviour gave him no authority, therefore, to set aside any laws except those which were "a shadow of things to come." Otherwise we should have God denying himself!—God contradicting himself! On this account we say that neither Christ nor his apostles had any right to alter the Sabbath. The new Testament records not a single instance of Christ's claiming such a right. When he avowed himself Lord of the Sabbath, he claimed no such right. He only claimed to determine what was the proper method of keeping it, what were breaches of it, and what were not. The Sabbath was made for man, and consequently it was his prerogative to decide what acts and duties answered to the nature and design of the institution. THEREFORE, the Son of man is Lord of the Sabbath. Mark ii. 28. It is worthy of being observed, also, that our Saviour does not claim even this authority on account of his divinity, but AS the Son of man.

In regard to the obligation resulting from apostolic example, it appears to us that you have fallen into some errors. We are not convinced that the example of the apostles can be justly pleaded for anything else than the order and arrangement of the church. However proper it may be to imitate them in other respects—in the duties of the moral law for instance—yet, if it were not known to be proper, independent of their example, we cannot suppose their example would make it so. We must first ascertain, by some settled and infallible rule, whether their practice is worthy of imitation. In regard to the ordering of church affairs there can be no doubt, for they were sent upon this very errand, with the promise of the Holy Spirit to qualify them for the work. But the Sabbath is not a church ordinance. It is not an institution for the church as such, but for all mankind. All reasoning with reference to it, from apostolic example, must therefore be very inconclusive. Even if we should admit that the church is bound by such example with regard to the first day of the week, yet this is the utmost extent to which our admissions can go. We cannot see how the institution be-

comes binding upon the world at large. Consequently we are compelled to maintain that an institution which was originally given for all mankind remains unaltered. We are willing that the example and practice of the apostles should regulate the church as to its ordinances and government, and herein we claim to follow them as strictly as you do; but when they are pleaded for anything more, we want first to know whether they conform to the express law of God. Otherwise we must consider them as no more binding than an apostle's quarrel with Barnabas.—Acts xv. 39.

If this argument is well founded, we are led to a very satisfactory disposal of a question often proposed, viz.: Why do we never read in the New Testament of Christian assemblies being convened *as such* on the Sabbath? For if the Sabbath be not a church ordinance, but an institution of mankind at large, it can be of no importance for us to know what Christian assemblies *as such* did with regard to it. All that is of real importance for us to know is the precise bearing of the institution upon man as man—upon man as a rational and accountable creature. On this point the information is clear and decisive.

The controversy between us and you appears to be brought down to a very narrow compass. Did the apostles and primitive Christians sabbatize on the first day of the week? And, *Is the world of mankind bound to imitate their example, or only the church?* If upon a solemn and prayerful consideration of this subject, you are persuaded that there is no proof that the early Christians regarded the first day as a Sabbath, (substituted in place of the seventh,) and will come out, and honestly avow your conviction, we have no fear that the controversy will be prolonged. For should you still be of opinion that some sort of notoriety was attached to the day, and that Christians met for worship, we shall not be very solicitous to dispute the point.—The apostolic rule, "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind," will then govern us.—(See Rom. xiv. 5, 6.) Our concern is not that you keep the first day of the week, but that you keep it *in place of the Sabbath*, thus making void the commandment of God. If once you discover, that Sunday is not the Sabbath by divine appointment, and therefore cannot be enforced upon the conscience, we are persuaded that your deep sense of the necessity of such an institution, will soon bring you to the observance of the ancient Sabbath.

II. But we proceed to address those of you who regard the sabbatic law as having been nailed to the cross, and consider the First Day of the Week as an institution entirely new, regulated as to its observance wholly by the New Testament.

You, whom we now address are exempt from some of the inconsistencies which we have exposed; but your theory labors under very serious difficulties, and is to be regarded, on the whole, as more obnoxious to the interests of religion, than the one we have been considering.

According to your position, the New Testament recognizes no Sabbath at all. Do not start at this charge. That it is repugnant to your feelings, we allow. You have never thought of anything else than *entire abstinence from labor* on the first day of the week. It is your day of *rest* as well as *worship*. But on what ground do you make it a day of rest? What *example* have you for doing so? What *law* of the New Testament requires you to lay aside all your secular business? Assin is the transgression of the law, and where no law is there is no transgression.—1. John iii. 4, Rom. iv. 15,—how do you make it appear to be sin to work on the day in question? It is by the commandment that sin becomes exceeding sinful.—Rom. vii. 13. By what commandment do you make it appear sinful to work on Sunday? These are questions of the highest importance.

Now suppose one of your brethren attends public worship on the first day of the week, and—to make his conformity to what is supposed to be apostolic example as perfect as possible—participates in the breaking of bread. He then goes home, opens his shop, and commences labor, or into the field to drive his plough. By what law will you convince him of sin? Not the law of the Sabbath as contained in the Decalogue, for that you hold to be abolished.

Not any law of the New Testament which says

"keep the first day of the week holy; in it thou shalt not do any work;" for there is no such law. Not the law of apostolic example, for there is no proof that the apostles ever gave such example. The very utmost that you can with any show of reason pretend of their example, is, that they met together for worship and breaking of bread. To this example your brother has conformed to the very letter—who can say, he has not in spirit also? What now will you do with him? "The Bible, and the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants." The Bible, therefore, is the Rule by which he is to be tried. Convict him of sin by this Rule, if you can.

But the case becomes still more difficult, when you come to apply it to those who are without the pale of the church. We have already seen that apostolic example concerns merely the ordering and arrangement of the church. Attempt now to convince the unbeliever of sin in working on the first day of the week. In order to do this, charge Apostolic example upon him. What is his reply. "I know not," says he, "that I am bound to imitate them in this matter. How does it appear that I am? I will admit for argument's sake, that they celebrated the Resurrection on Sunday by religious worship; but they also broke bread and partook of it by way of celebrating his death. If their example binds me in one particular, why not in the other?—'Prove to me,' says he, 'that any but the church assembled on the first day for worship, and I will do so too. But in the absence of all such proof I must conclude, their example has nothing to do with me; unless, indeed, you can make it appear, that their example and practice were in conformity to some law, which commanded them as rational creatures, independent of their relation to Christ and his church. When you can produce that law, then I will feel bound to obey it, and imitate the apostles in their obedience to it; but not till then.'" Such is the reasoning by which an unbeliever may set aside all your attempts to charge sin upon him. Where, brethren, is your law which, like a barbed arrow, pierces the very soul, and fastens guilt upon the conscience? Where is that law which speaks out its thunders, saying, thus saith the Almighty God, the Lord, the Maker of Heaven and Earth, it is the Sabbath day, in it thou shalt not do any work? To throw aside the law, which cuts and flames every way, reaching soul and spirit, joints and marrow, in order to deal with the ungodly by mere apostolic example, is like muffling the sword for fear it will wound. Apostolic example is indeed powerful with those whose hearts have been made tender by the Spirit of God, but with others powerless.

We are persuaded, brethren, that your conscientious scruples about laboring on the first day of the week, never resulted from the mere contemplation of apostolic example. Such example it is true, is all the law you acknowledge; but this is the theory you have adopted since you came to maturity, and began to think for yourselves. Your scruples have an earlier and different origin. They commenced with your childhood, when you were taught to consider the day as holy time. It was then impressed upon your mind, that God had, by express law, forbidden you to desecrate the day, and that you would incur his displeasure in case you should do so. The idea was then imbibed, that if you did not keep the day, you would violate the fourth Commandment. This idea has grown with your growth, and strengthened with your strength. It has obtained such commanding influence over your feelings, that you cannot forbear keeping a day of rest, though your theory does not require it. Even to this day a strong impression rests upon your minds, that the fourth Commandment contains much of moral excellence; too much to be thrown altogether away, notwithstanding your system of theology teaches its abrogation. Such is the true secret of your tenderness of conscience. Apostolic example has in reality nothing to do with it. Following the secret monitions of conscience, your prosperity is promoted in spite of your theological system. But sound reason discovers, that your experience and your theory are in opposition to each other. Some of the more thinking ones among you are aware of this, and are continually aiming at such a modification of their theory, that their experience will harmonize with it. But be as-

sured, here will be an everlasting conflict, until you come to acknowledge fully and heartily the claims of the sabbatic law.

We are aware of that system of theology, which regards the New Testament as furnishing the only code of laws by which men are bound since the death of Christ. We have looked at this doctrine with attention; and so far as the order, government, and ordinances of the church are concerned, we admit its truth. As the laws and ordinances of the Jewish church were determined by the Old Testament, so the laws and ordinances of the Christian church are determined solely by the New Testament. Therefore, we should say at once, the argument is yours, if the Sabbath were a church ordinance. In such case, however, none but the church has a Sabbath. But the question is not concerning church ordinances. In these we follow the New Testament as closely as yourselves. The question is concerning an institution which has respect to mankind at large;—to man as man; for the Saviour teaches us that the Sabbath was made for man. Now it will be a very hard matter to prove, that when men as rational creatures are concerned, the only code of laws by which they are bound, is the New Testament. Let us put the matter to the test. How will you prove that it is unlawful for a man to marry his sister, his daughter, or any other of near kin? The New Testament utters not a word on the subject. It is not enough to say, it is implied in the law which forbids adultery; for it must first be proved to be a species of adultery. Nor will it do to say, the common sense of mankind is a sufficient law on the subject. For the moment we suppose that its unlawfulness is to be determined in this way, we abandon the argument that the New Testament is the only code of laws, and resort to common sense of mankind as furnishing a part of the code. But if the common sense of mankind shall furnish a part of the code by which we are bound, who shall undertake to say how large a part? Besides, on this principle, the book of divine revelation is not complete and perfect. It is a lamp to our feet only in part, and the common sense of mankind makes out the deficiency! You are, therefore, driven to take your stand again upon the New Testament. Finding you there again, we repeat the question, *How do you prove by your code, that a man may not marry his sister?* It is impossible. You must, of necessity look to that division of the scriptures usually called the Old Testament; for the New says not one word about it.

Let us turn now to the 18th chapter of the book of Leviticus, and we shall find a collection of laws exactly to the point. "None of you shall approach to any that is near of kin to him," &c.—v. 6. The degrees of kindred are then expressly marked. Will it be objected, that these laws were given particularly to the Jews, and to no other people?—We admit they were given to the Jews, as indeed was the whole system of revelation in that age; but we cannot admit that they concerned no other class of people. For it is expressly shown in that chapter, that the matters of which they took cognizance, were regarded as abominations in the Gentiles. Because of such things, the fierce wrath of Jehovah came down upon the Canaanites, and they were cast out from the land as loathsomeness.—v. 24—30. If these things were viewed as abominable in the Canaanites, they surely were not ceremonial pollutions. They were not mere Jewish laws. The fallacy of the doctrine is therefore sufficiently exposed.

We think you have fallen into error concerning the nature and design of that division of the scriptures commonly called the New Testament. We regard it not as the *Law Book* of mankind, in the strict and proper sense; but rather as a *Treatise on Justification*, in which are contained such references to the law, and such quotations from it, as are necessary to the complete elucidation of the subject. The preparation of this treatise was of necessity delayed, until the great sacrifice for sin had been offered, and our High Priest had entered into the holy place. For as the sacrifice and intercession of our High Priest constitute the sole foundation of our justification, so "the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while the first tabernacle was yet standing."—Heb. ix. 8. So much of



the plan of justification was illustrated to the people as could be by means of the ritual service; and that, together with the prophecies, laid a foundation for them to believe that, *in some way or other*, they would be just before God. So that by *faith* the patriarchs were justified.—Heb. xi. They knew it was to be *somehow* through the work of Him, who was typified and promised as the great Redeemer. But understand the plan they could not, until the Redeemer came and died for them.

Because this treatise on justification could not be prepared until after the death of the High Priest, therefore it was not proper to organize gospel churches. The only church that was suitable for that age was found in the Jewish nation, and from its very nature was unfit for the world at large. It was, therefore, confined to that people. Moreover, because it was not proper to organize gospel churches, until the way of justification was fully laid open, it was also not proper to lay down the laws and ordinances of the church until that time. This accounts for the laws of the church being found only in the New Testament.

Now, if the New Testament is to be regarded as a treatise on justification, with such references to the Old as are necessary for the elucidation of the subject, rather than as the Law-Book for mankind at large; the idea that the Sabbath ought not to be looked for in the Old Testament, falls to the ground. Nevertheless, to some minds it appears strange, that while the New Testament writers mention all the other duties of the Decalogue, this is apparently omitted. In speaking of the sins of which Christians were guilty before their conversion, not one word is said about Sabbath breaking, though upon other sins they dwell with emphasis. But this admits of a very easy solution. Those writers addressed two classes of converts; those from among the Jews, and those from among the Gentiles. As to the former, they were already rigid to an extreme in keeping the Sabbath. All that was necessary to do in their case, was to vindicate the institution from Pharisaic austerities, and determine what was lawful to be done, and what was not lawful. This was done by Christ. But as for the Gentile converts, to charge them with having been guilty of the sin of Sabbath breaking in their state of heathenism, would have been manifest impropriety.—For the Sabbath being for the most part a *positive* rather than a *moral* precept, it could not be known without a revelation. But as the Gentiles had no revelation, this is a good reason why the apostle dwelt not upon this sin to charge it upon them, but only upon those which were more obviously breaches of the Moral Law. Thus it appears, there was no necessity for any more particular mention of the Sabbath to be made in the New Testament, than what is made.

But it is not our object in this address to cover the whole field of argument. We design simply, by presenting some of the strong points, and exposing your inconsistencies, to stir up your attention to the subject. We are sure that the great majority of you have never given it a thorough investigation. For a complete discussion of the whole ground we refer you to our publications. Will you read them? Will you anxiously inquire, What is truth? Will you pray over the matter, saying, "Lord, what wilt thou have us to do?" Or, will you sleep over it, as if it were of no great, pressing, practical importance?

III. But we must address that class of Baptists who consider neither the Old nor the New Testament to impose any obligation to observe a day of rest, and advocate alone merely on the ground of expediency. In some sections of our country, Baptists would consider it almost a slander upon their denomination to intimate that there were persons of such anti-Sabbath principles, wearing their livery. But any one, who is conversant with the order at large, knows very well that it is no slander. There are those who boldly avow such doctrine, and many others who do not deny that it is their real sentiment, though they are not anxious or forward to proclaim it upon the house tops. Whether this class embraces a very large proportion of the denomination, it is not necessary to inquire. It is our impression that the proportion is sufficiently large, to justify an effort for their conversion to right views of Divine Truth,

If there is no day of rest enjoined by divine authority, and the matter rests wholly upon expediency, we see no reason, except that the voice of the multitude is against it, why you cannot as well observe the *seventh* as the *first* day of the week. There would be no sacrifice of conscience in so doing, while it would be a tribute of respect to those who feel that the keeping of the seventh day is an indispensable part of duty. But it is not on this principle particularly that we desire you to change your ground. Feeling that it is not *our party* that must be honored, but rather *divine truth*, and our party only for the sake of the truth, we would much rather correct your doctrinal views.

Of course, you do not deny that a day of rest was once enjoined upon God's chosen people. It is only under the gospel that you suppose all distinction of days to be annihilated. If then it is *expedient*, that a day of rest should be observed, it follows irresistibly, that the annihilation of all distinction in days by the gospel, was very *INEXPEDIENT*! And thus, whatever blessings the gospel dispensation brings to the human race, a strict following out of its principles would be *INEXPEDIENT* and farther, that the *Law*, which enjoined a day of rest, had more of an eye to expediency, than the *gospel* has! Consequently, that the gospel, though declared to be *faultless* and capable of *perfecting* those who believe, must nevertheless, for *EXPEDIENCY'S* SAKE, borrow a little help from the abrogated rites of the law! In other words, God, in setting aside a day of rest, committed an oversight, and left his work for man to mend!! Brethren, we see not how it is possible for you to escape such monstrous conclusions. They are the legitimate result of your principles. Such principles you must have adopted in hot haste, without considering where they would land you. For we are not disposed to believe you so completely destitute of piety, as willingly to abide by the result of them. We entreat you to reconsider them, and adopt such as are more in accordance with the spirit of our holy religion.

When you advocate the observance of a day of rest on the ground of *expediency*, we are persuaded that you do so in view of the bearing you perceive it to have upon the well-being of mankind. But still the question will arise, Has the gospel less regard to the well-being of mankind, than the law had? Look at the humanity of the institution. How necessary that both man and beast should rest one day in seven. How evident that they cannot endure uninterrupted toil. How perfectly well established, that if doomed to constant labor, they sink under the premature exhaustion of their powers. So well is this established, that we cannot put such a low estimate upon your judgment, as to suppose it necessary to enter upon any proof of it. But the question returns, Does the gospel breathe less humanity than the law? Or, consider the bearing of the institution upon the interests of religion. It affords opportunity for men to be instructed in the great things which pertain to their salvation; and unless they were thus called away from their labors, it would be impossible to bring religious instruction into contact with their minds. Does the gospel afford less advantage in this respect, than the Law did? Did the Law provide a season for instructing the people in religion as it then stood? and does the gospel provide no season for instructing them in religion as it now stands? Must they be instructed in *types*, but not in the *substance*?—in *prophecy*, but not in the *fulfilment* of prophecy? No one will be responsible for the affirmative of these questions.

If the new Dispensation actually has abrogated the Sabbath, we do not believe that it is *expedient* to observe it. We cannot believe, however, that an institution so important to the civilization, refinement, and religious prosperity of mankind, has been abrogated. We refer you to our publications, and to the publications of those who have, in common with us, defended the perpetuity of the sabbatic law; and we entreat you to reconsider your ground. The doctrine of expediency! What a fruitful source of corruption has it been to the church of God! Not an anti-Christian, popish abomination, but what pleads something of this kind. Do, dear brethren, let it be expunged from your creed.

"So shall I keep thy law continually forever."

From the "Sabbath Recorder."

## QUESTIONS.

[Prepared for the Buffalo Christian Advocate, but refused a place in that paper.]

1st. Which day of the week did our Creator designate, bless and sanctify, and make the Sabbath or rest-day?

2d. Which day of the week does the Law of God, the Ten Commandments, expressly say "is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God?"

3d. When the disciples of Christ "*rested the Sabbath-day according to the commandment*," (Luke 23: 56,) on which day of the week did they rest?

4th. Which day of the week does our blessed Saviour mean, when he says, "the Son of Man is Lord even of the Sabbath-day?"—"The Sabbath was made for man"—"It is lawful to do well on the Sabbath-day?"

5th. Which day of the week does the New Testament call the "Sabbath" some fifty-five times?

6th. Which day of the week did the Gentiles mean, when they wanted Paul to preach to them "*the next Sabbath*?" Acts 13: 42. The seventh day.

7th. Which day of the week would the people of Buffalo mean now, if they should ask a man to preach for them *the next Sabbath*? The first day.

8th. Does not this show that *Papal Rome* (or some other power) has "*changed times and laws*." (Dan. 7: 25,) so that the word *Sabbath* now means something entirely different from what the same word meant when the Acts of the Apostles were written?

9th. To which day of the week does the Apostle Paul refer when he speaks of "*every Sabbath day*," some twelve years after the resurrection of Christ? Acts 13: 27.

10th. To which day of the week did Luke refer by the expression "*every Sabbath*," some twenty-one years after the resurrection of Christ? Acts 18: 4.

11th. Is there any place in the New Testament where the term *Sabbath* or *rest* is applied to the first day of the week?

12th. Which day of the week do the Scriptures call "The Lord's day"—"My holy day"—"My Sabbath"—"The Sabbath of the Lord thy God"—the same which the Son of Man is now Lord of?

DARIEN, July, 1851.

Inasmuch as the above fair, simple, and candid questions could not find a place in the *Buffalo Christian Advocate*, I will here add a few quotations of Scripture which, in my humble opinion, are applicable to the case.

David says, "Thy law is the *truth*; all thy commandments are *truth*." Paul says, "They shall *turn away their ears from the truth*, and shall be turned unto fables." They have turned away their ears from this truth which says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath," and are turned unto one of the greatest fables that ever was taught in the name of the Christian religion, viz., that the first day of the week is the Christian Sabbath. Well hath Ezekiel prophesied, saying, "Her priests have violated my law, and profaned my holy things; they have put no difference between the holy and profane, and have *hid their eyes from my Sabbaths*, and I am profaned among them." They have violated the law in saying, "One day in seven" is the Sabbath, instead of "The seventh day." They have put no difference between the holy and profane—between what the Lord calls "my holy day," and a profane Sabbath, made by man. They have hid their eyes from the Lord's Sabbath—are not willing to examine the subject—no, not willing even to read a Sabbath Tract. Well hath Isaiah prophesied of these saying, "The earth also is defiled under the inhabitants thereof; because they have transgressed the laws, *changed the ordinance, broken the everlasting covenant*; therefore hath the curse devoured the earth." (Isa. 24: 5.) The words of our Lord Jesus Christ would seem to apply here, when he says, "Howbeit, in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. For, laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the traditions of men."

BENJAMIN CLARK.

## LETTERS.

From Bro. Bates.

DEAR BRO. WHITE: Since I started, in Oct. last, on my western tour, I have visited many places in western N. Y. Held protracted meetings in several places with our Sabbath brethren, who are loving the present truth more and more. In many places we found the brethren in deep trials; but prayer, and perseverance in the strait truths that the little flock, now see in their pathway soon triumphed over the Enemy, and our hearts were made glad and healed by the precious saving truths in the third angel's message.

Bro. Edson met me at Auburn, N. Y. We crossed the St. Lawrence, for Canada West, the last week in Nov., and have been working our way to the west, along the south shore of Lake Ontario, and wherever we have learned that there were scattered sheep in the back settlements north of us, we have waded through the deep snow from two to forty miles to find them, and give the present truth; so that in five weeks we have traveled hundreds of miles, and gained on the direct road westward one hundred eighty miles. We expect to close our labors here by the 5th, and then go north again to Lake Simcoe, where we learn there are some of the scattered flock. From thence it is probable we shall pass on the same course westward to the borders of Lake Huron and Erie. When we have finished our labors between these seas, we expect to return towards Rochester, N. Y.

The first twenty days of our journey we were much tried with the deep snow, and tedious cold weather, and with but few exceptions cold and impenetrable hearts. The truth was no food for them. Since that time the scene has changed and the truth begun to take effect, and some we trust are now searching for the truth. At Mariposa and Scwegog Lakes, thirty and forty miles in the back settlements, and about sixty from here, we found many hungry for the truth. Their minister, (Peter Hough,) objected to our message, and labored hard to do away the Sabbath of the Lord our God, and called upon his congregation to decide, concluding that his arguments were clear. About twelve out of twenty enlisted under the banner of the third angel, while but two I believe shewed a sign in his favor. The rest we left in a deep study, saying, they would examine the subject.

In Reach, eight more confessed the whole truth, and three other families admitted the Sabbath to be right. In both of these places they are united in their monthly meetings. Their meetings were appointed for the last Sabbath. They have hopes of their other brethren, because they know them to be honest. These two companies of brethren and sisters seem strong and united, and remind me very much of the Melbourne and Eaton companies in Canada East, that were so prompt and decided to move out on the Lord's side as soon as the truth was presented.

You will see by the list of names for the paper, and also other names that we send in with those, that they are hungering and thirsting for the truth in the last message. We believe that God has precious jewels in Canada West. We have no misgivings about this being the field of our labor for the present. O, God speed the work of gathering the 144,000 here, and all over the field. Amen.

Toronto, (C. W.), Jan. 1st, 1852.

JOSEPH BATES.

From Sister C. M. Coburn.

DEAR BRO. WHITE: I write a few lines to let you know that we are growing stronger and stronger in the present truth, and are endeavoring "to walk in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord's house blameless." Although we are separated from those of "like precious faith," yet the Lord remembereth us, and verifies his promise, that where two or three are gathered in his name there is he in the midst. His down-trodden commandments are very precious to us, and we find it good to obey the Lord and call upon his name.

Our dear Bro. Wheeler visited us recently, and we had a profitable interview. Though short, yet it was blessed of the Lord.

Since I attended the meeting at Royalton I have enjoyed my mind far better than before. O, praise the Lord, the true light is shining, and I desire to receive the light, and walk in it, and be sanctified through obeying the truth, so as to perfectly overcome every wrong word and action.

The paper is a great comfort to us, and we truly feel that it is "meat in due season." I would ask an interest in your prayers that we may be faithful, and endure even unto the end.

Yours in hope of immortality at the appearing of Jesus.

CALISTA M. COBURN.

Rochester, (Vt.), Dec. 27th, 1851.

## Extracts of Letters.

Bro. H. Bingham writes from Morristown, (Vt.), Dec. 21st, 1851: "Through the mercy of God I enjoy a good hope, that through the offering of our blessed Saviour, I shall be permitted to receive life eternal in the restored kingdom.

"I believe the little band in this place have a good share of the spirit of sacrifice, and are steadfast in their purpose to honor God's Royal Law, by observing its just and rightful claims, and try to exercise living active faith in a coming Saviour.

"Here and there is found one with an enquiring mind for truth; but the multitude entirely reject the present truth, and choose some favorite fable to follow.

"May the Lord save all the honest ones from destruction, is the prayer of your unworthy yet hoping brother."

Bro. J. Y. Wilcox writes from Cromwell, (Conn.), Dec. 23d, 1851: "I take the present opportunity to inform you that through the abundant goodness of God, I am trying to hold fast the truth.

"I can say as said Moses, that he chose rather to suffer affliction with the people of God . . . esteeming the reproach of Christ to be greater riches than the treasures of Egypt; for he had respect unto the recompense of the reward. Truly the feelings of my heart are expressed in these few lines."

Sister L. B. Kendall writes from Granville, (Vt.), Dec. 1851: "I feel lonely in this dark world, and long for a brighter and better land, where the curse is forever removed. I long for the redemption of the purchased possession, where, with all the little flock, who have been willing to suffer for the sake of Jesus, I may be gathered to sing the song of Moses and the Lamb.

"My heart is with the humble few, who are striving to keep the commandments of God, and my desire is to share in their joys and sorrows, their trials and sufferings, and at last share in their certain victory.

"I feel thankful that I have ever heard the present truth, and O, that it may have its sanctifying effect on my heart, to fit me to stand in the day of battle.

"We need to be very humble in view of the mercy of God toward us. O, that the work of the Lord may go on, till all the precious jewels are sought out and fitted for the 'second casket.' My heart truly feels for those that have been scattered in the 'dark and cloudy day.' While there has been so much to distract and divide I wonder not that many have been covered under the rubbish of the world; but the Lord knows every honest soul, and he will seek them out."

Bro. H. P. Wakefield writes from Newport, (N. H.), Dec. 30th, 1851: "We cannot do without your paper. We believe the subject matter directly adapted to the wants of the household." In these days of degeneracy, we certainly need something to cheer us on our lone pilgrimage to the Holy City. The third angel's message was just what we needed to define our first position, and give as a bright and shining light to lead us onward to the kingdom of God. God's people are now being tried; but O, if they endure the trial, they will soon see Him who is invisible. Glory to his holy name.

"Bro. Baker and Hart were with us a short time since. We were glad to see them, but rejoiced still more to know they were walking in the truth. We praise God for union. If ever the servants of God should be united, it is in proclaiming these last glorious truths. Union is strength.

"Heaven is worth seeking, yea striving for. We are willing to bear the reproach, if we can share the reward with those that stand on Mount Zion with the Lamb. If we can but have the approving smiles of Jesus it is worth more than all the honors of the world. We had rather, by far, be a door keeper in the house of God, than dwell in the tents of wickedness. We want to keep all the commandments, that we may stand in the battle of the great day of God Almighty. May the Lord guide us in the truth, and we at last share in his kingdom."

Bro. S. W. Rhodes writes from Lawrence, (N. Y.), Dec. 28th, 1851: "I find a few who are waiting for redemption, and who know the joyful sound, and are willing to follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth.

"Salvation is coming. O, how my soul is filled with joy while I write. I have by faith a faint glimpse of the power of the latter rain, which lights up the sacred spark of holy joy in my soul, and gives me a foretaste of that which I love most, salvation.

"Salvation is for us, full and free, and we shall reap an abundant harvest if obedient to him who has called us to grace and glory. Be of good cheer, for Christ has overcome the world, and he will lead his army on to sure victory."

## DREAMS.

It becomes our duty to speak plainly against the course pursued by some relative to dreams. That God has in all past time revealed to his people in dreams we fully believe. And that he is to especially instruct the ignorant and erring through this medium in the *last days* is evident from Joel ii, 28-32; Acts i, 17-21. But we do object to the course of some in relating all their dreams as special revelations from the Lord, as a rule of duty for themselves or others to walk by. We consider such in the snare of the devil, exposed to his deceptive power.

"Now the just shall live by FAITH;" but he that undertakes to walk by the light of dreams will sooner or later, stumble and fall. The Bible is a complete rule of faith and practice, a sure guide from earth to heaven. In that precious Volume the man of God is thoroughly furnished, and those who look for another guide will surely be led astray. But if we, while walking by faith, taking the Bible as our guide, praying for the Spirit of truth to enlighten our understandings, honestly err from truth or duty, and are in danger of being lost, then we may hope that God in mercy will do more for us than the common means of grace are designed to do. Our extreme necessity may move the High and Holy One to send an angel to especially reveal to us.

But he who supposes that his general course may be marked out by dreams, and that in this way the particulars of his duty should be revealed, not only exposes himself to be perplexed by those dreams that come "through the multitude of business," [Eccl. v, 3,] but also to be deceived, led astray, and ruined by dreams directly from Satan. See Deut. xiii, 1-5; Jer. xxiii, 25-28; xxvii, 9; xxix, 8; Zech. x, 2; Jude, 8. Man's extreme necessity alone, being in great danger of ruin, is God's opportunity to give special revelations. The following may be a rebuke to those who are forward to relate the multitude of their dreams, as revelation from God.

Says the prophet. "Keep thy foot when thou goest to the house of God, and be more ready to hear, than to give the sacrifice of fools; for they consider not that they do evil. Be not rash with thy mouth, and let not thine heart be hasty to utter any thing before God; for God is in heaven, and thou upon earth; therefore let thy words be few. For a dream cometh through a multitude of business; and a fool's voice is known by multitude of words." Eccl. v, 1-3.

The following from Ecclesiasticus xxxiv, 1-8, is to the point.

"The hopes of a man void of understanding are vain and false; and dreams lift up fools. Whoso regardeth dreams is like him that catcheth at a shadow, and followeth after the wind. The vision of dreams is the resemblance of one thing to another, even as the likeness of a face to a face. Of an unclean thing what can be cleansed? and from that thing which is false what truth can come? Divinations, and sooth sayings, and dreams, are vain; and the heart fancieth, as a woman's heart in travail. If they be not sent from the Most High in thy visitation, set not thy heart upon them. For dreams have deceived many, and they have failed that PUT THEIR TRUST in them.

THE LAW shall be found PERFECT WITHOUT LIES; and wisdom is perfection to a faithful mouth." Eccl. xxxiv, 1-8.

"The prophet that hath a dream let him tell a dream; and he that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully. What is the CHAFF to the WHEAT? saith the Lord." Jer. xxiii, 28.

God's word is a solid rock. On that Word alone, our faith is based. And we exhort the scattered brethren to take the Word as the only rule of faith and duty. The Lord may give dreams to comfort the individuals who have them, when in distress or to correct the erring; but when they are compared with the word of God they are like the "CHAFF" to the "WHEAT."

The above is the position of the church at Oswego, (N. Y.).

G. W. HOLT.  
JAMES WHITE.

There will be a Conference at Topsham, (Me.), at the residence of Bro. Stockbridge Howland to commence Friday Jan. 30th, at 6 o'clock P. M., and hold over the Sabbath and First-day. We hope there will be a general attendance of the brethren in that vicinity. Bro. G. W. Holt may be expected to be present. Other ministering brethren are invited to attend.

Bro. G. W. Holt intends meeting with the brethren in Boston, Sabbath, Jan. 24th.

## Letters received since December 23d.

S. W. Rhodes 3. M. L. Bauder 2. H. S. Gurney. E. L. H. Chamberlain. E. Cray, J. G. Foy. G. W. Holt. C. M. Lockwood. R. F. Cottrell, H. O. Nichols. E. Foster. J. A. King. L. O. Stowell. C. M. Coburn. C. W. Sperry. M. Leadbeater. D. D. Cocornan. J. Bates. J. S. Speights. N. N. Lunt. H. P. Wakefield. W. G. Kendall. L. B. Kendall. O. H. Curtiss. N. A. Hollis. A. A. Dodge. H. Royal.

## Receipts.

C. Smith \$10; J. Y. Wilcox, H. Bingham, \$5 each; N. Mack, \$4; H. Chase, J. Fitch, \$2 50 each; A. Woodruff \$2; D. Kellogg, H. Dunning, G. Cushman, H. S. Gurney, O. Davis, W. Bryant, E. Hardy, D. Wakefield, E. Flanders, O. Hewett, W. W. Simpkins, H. C. Robbins, H. Abbe, E. Scoville, \$1 each.