

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. III.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., THURSDAY, JUNE 10, 1852.

No. 3.

JOSEPH BATES, J. N. ANDREWS } Publishing Committee.
and JOSEPH BAKER,
JAMES WHITE, Editor.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY,

At No. 124 Mount Hope Avenue, Rochester.

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, should be addressed to JAMES WHITE, Editor of the Review and Herald, Rochester, N. Y. (post-paid.)

THE SABBATH.

BY ANNIE R. SMITH.

COME peaceful Day! Divinely blest!
Sweetly thy glories would we sing—
Memorial of that Sacred Rest
Of Creation's Mighty King.
This hallowed time to man was given—
A foretaste of the bliss of heaven.

Ye saints awake, with joyful lay,
Behold its rising light, divine;
To God your grateful homage pay,
Its radiant beams around us shine.
Welcome the day he calls his own,
And fervent worship at his throne.

Hark! Through the shining courts above,
What rapturous praises echo now!
Around that Holy Law of Love,
Seraphs in adoration bow.
Let earth, responsive to the strain,
Exalt alone Jehovah's name.

All hail! Thou bright Immortal Day!
When at His Temple all adore
His scepter's universal sway—
Observed in glory evermore;
When Zion shall in triumph reign,
And Eden bloom on earth again.

THE SABBATH.

LETTERS TO O. R. L. CROZIER.—NO. III.

DEAR SIR:—The remarks with which you open your third article, do not seem to be much to the point. Very few of those who do not love the fourth commandment will object to reading whatever may be written to show that the commandments are abolished; and if it be such a fearful heresy "to do and teach" the fourth, with all the other commandments, that those who are thus engaged will "fall from grace," (rather, have already fallen,) those of your readers who thus believe will rejoice to find some one zealous to put down such a delusion, and to shunt that flood-gate of error that the observance of the fourth commandment is so likely to open.

I say this from your point of view. But should it prove after all that it is a dangerous and fearful course to break the commandments, and to publicly teach men so, when our Lord did not come to destroy, but to fulfill them, and testifies that he had kept them, and utters a solemn warning against the act of breaking them and teaching men so, then an apology is indeed needed, not a slight excuse, but reasons of the strongest kind. The following retrospective paragraph exhibits your opinion of your own articles in an amusing light:

"We have followed the *Review* through the Old Testament, and, as we think the reader will admit, it has been routed in every position it has taken, and every position of ours it has attacked has been defended by plain Scripture and fair argument."

Such being your statement of the subject, it may not be out of place to revert briefly to the manner in which you have accomplished this triumphant refutation.

What gives your remarks a ludicrous aspect is the fact that though you have carefully kept my arguments out of sight of your readers in your reply thus far, you now request them to decide whether you have not perfectly routed the *Review* in every position it has taken. If you have been as careful to keep my arguments out of your own sight as you have to keep them out of the sight of your readers, you may perhaps suppose, as honestly as some of them, that nothing remains of my position, and that in every point it has been routed. But we will briefly recur to the argument as it stands thus far, and let that speak for itself:

1. My position on the first question is, that the seventh day became the holy Sabbath, or sanctified Rest-day of the Creator, at the close of the first week of time, when he rested from his work of creation on that day and hallowed it.

2. Your position on the same question is, that the seventh day became the holy Sabbath, or sanctified Rest-day of the Lord, in the wilderness of Sin, though you are not able to point to any act that made it such, save the statement of Moses on the sixth day, "Tomorrow is the rest of the Holy Sabbath unto the Lord."—To look at particulars:

1. You attempt to "route" the position of the *Review*, that the seventh day became the Sabbath of the Lord when he rested upon it and hallowed it, because that Moses in recording that fact in Gen. ii does not there use the word Sabbath. But Moses in giving us the words of the Decalogue, where the account of the week of Creation is rehearsed by Jehovah, expressly applies the term to the seventh day at that time.—Light a thing as it may be to route the *Review*, it is a fearful position to deny the plain and unequivocal language of Almighty God.

2. You object to the institution of the holy Sabbath at the time when Jehovah "consecrated" and "set apart to a holy use" the day of his rest, because that an express precept for its observance is not also recorded. But this objection bears with equal weight against nine of the ten commandments. As we find but one of the precepts of the Decalogue existing as a precept in the sacred record prior to the departure from Egypt, we may with propriety say that men in that period had the same right to indulge in idolatry and blasphemy, that they had to profane that day which Jehovah had consecrated, and set apart to a holy use.

3. But as God's act of sanctifying and hallowing his Rest-day means something, you undertake to explain it away by introducing Heb. iv, which does not speak of any such act. Would it not be better to believe Ex. xx, 8—11, which makes that event the foundation of Sabbath observance?

4. But the Sabbath is not mentioned in the history of the patriarchs, which you say "makes the conclusion inevitable that it was not known during that period."—Its institution is given before the patriarchs existed, [Gen. ii, 1—3; Ex. xx, 8—11,] and the fact that it is not afterward mentioned in the brief record of Moses in Genesis, is no evidence that it did not exist; and certainly it is not more remarkable than that it should not be mentioned from the days of Joshua to the days of David, a period of some hundred years in which it was enforced by the penalty of death.

5. As you have not deigned to answer the scriptural testimony presented to show that you had misapplied Col. ii, and as you state that I have nothing to offer on the point but assertions, the reader is requested for the sake of brevity, to turn to that part of my first letter to you that speaks on the point. Your professed candor can there be seen in the true light.

6. Having exposed your perversion of my remarks on James ii, I pass it, and state briefly that James not only quotes a part of the ten commandments in giving his account of the royal law, but declares that he who violates one has become guilty of all.—Your position is, however, that the royal law means only the precept named in verse 8, and is not the same law that is acknowledged in verses 9—12.—And all this in the face of your own position that there is *but one law*!

7. In your report of the Bible class, you stated that the Testimony (not then in existence) was spoken of IN THE WILDERNESS OF SIN "even more familiarly than the Sabbath." In reviewing you I pointed out the fact that Ex. xvi could not have been written until about forty years after the departure from Egypt, as it contains a record of events extending through that entire period. Verse 35. So that its mention of what finally became of the manna, [verse 34,] furnishes no proof whatever that the Testimony was even thought of in the wilderness of Sin. Instead of confessing that you have made a false statement, you try to evade the point by saying that I have not disproved the statement "that the Testimony is spoken of in Ex. xvi even more familiarly than the Sabbath."—This had not been the point between us, but it is a good illustration of your manner of defending your position "by plain scripture and fair argument."

8. Your effort to explain away the voluntary act of preparation for the seventh day, on the part of the people, [Ex. xvi,] by introducing two miracles, needs not to be stated again. Its folly is sufficiently "manifest." Your attempt to prove from Ex. xvi that God made the seventh day his holy Rest-day in the wilderness of Sin having been exposed in detail, that I be not tedious, I will request the reader to refer to that part of my communication to you, as I have taken pains to state your argument as well as my refutation, a thing which you *carefully* avoid.

9. In your remark on Ex. xx, you state that the time "when the Sabbath was instituted" is a "very plain matter." In this I agree with you. Had it not been such, I am sure that J. B. Cook in his sermon, May 9th, against the observance of the holy Sabbath, would not have stated:—"I present you the original institution of the Sabbath. It is found in Gen. ii."—I was much struck with the remark. Were you not also?

10. To be as brief as possible, I ask, Why, in your act of "routing" the *Review*, did you not explain away the direct evidence of Ex. xx, 11, that God hallowed the Sabbath at Creation?

11. As space forbids an extended mention of all the points that you have "routed," I ask you to look over the several inferences which you have presented from Deut. v, and from the rudiments of the world, the tradition of men and not after Christ, and at their exposure in the *Review*, and then answer me, Have you any thing here that you will point to as "plain scripture and fair argument?"

12. In concluding our discussion on the first two questions as stated by yourself, I inquire, Is it not a scriptural, legitimate and unavoidable conclusion, that God sanctified the Sabbath at Creation "for the Man?" Gen. ii, 1—3; Ex. xx, 11; Mark ii, 27.

The third question, as stated by yourself, is, "Does the New Testament require us, as Christians, to keep the Sabbath?"

You request that inasmuch as all are, or have been, from education, prejudiced in favor of the Sabbath, that they will lay this aside, so that should they find that it will not endure the rigid ordeal of the Bible, and

particularly of the New Testament, it can be cast away in the category of immortal-soulism, &c. (It happens, however, that this prejudice is in favor of that day which "the Popes sabbatized," and is strongly against the day which was made the Sabbath by the Creator.) You think it "honorable and Christian" to cast away error for the truth, and very dishonorable to cling to an error through pride of opinion, when convinced that it is such.—Very good, I think just so.

Now I will test you. Will you be "honorable and Christian" enough to confess that God sanctified his Sabbath at Creation for ~~THE~~ man, which is a "great truth plainly stated," or will you through pride of opinion cling to your unwarrantable inferences which have been already exposed, and affirm that God made the Sabbath near Horeb for the Hebrews only?

We believe in the "one Law-giver, [Jehovah,] who is able to save and to destroy." James iv, 12. And that from him emanated the great "CONSTITUTION." Ex. xx. But we do not believe that either the servant, or the Son, ever set aside or abolished the constitution of Jehovah.

You make a statement of several points, which you think show conclusively that Christians are not under obligation to keep the fourth commandment. The first point presented by yourself is this:

"The New Testament does not command any to keep the Sabbath-day."

Now let us weigh this assertion, and judge respecting its real character.

1. The fourth commandment was given by God the Father, at the same time and under the same circumstances that the precept "Thou shalt have no other gods before me" was given. Hence *until its abolition is proved*, it abides in force as the commandment of the Father, and needs re-enactment no more than do the precepts, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me; Thou shalt not bow down to graven images; Thou shalt not blaspheme, &c."

2. But while our Lord does not quote the words of either of the first four commandments, (our duty to God,) but repeats verbatim only the last six, (our duty to our neighbor,) he does in the most solemn manner teach the duty of keeping, not merely the ones quoted, but *the whole of them*. After saying that he had not come to destroy but to fulfill them, and that till heaven and earth pass one jot or one tittle should in no wise pass till all be fulfilled, he adds: "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: but whosoever shall do, and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." Matt. v, 19.

3. When Jesus was asked the way to enter eternal life, he answered, "If thou wilt enter into life keep the commandments," referring directly to the ten. There is no way that you can get the fourth excepted, unless you take the ground that when Christ proceeded to call the young man's attention to the commandments in which he was specially deficient, (his duty to his fellow man,) those which he did not name were not binding; but this would leave out the whole of the first four, (our duty to God.) Matt. xix, 16—22.

4. But lest you should say that Jesus gave this direction respecting the entrance into life eternal, before the commandments of the Father were abolished, I ask you to hear this same Alpha and Omega, in the year 96, lay down the condition of entering into life. Mark, it is Jesus that speaks the words of Rev. xxii, 13—16, and he speaks not of his own commandments, but of "his," the Father's: "Blessed are they that do HIS commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city."

5. The validity of the fourth commandment is recognized this side of the crucifixion. The women that followed our Lord to the tomb returned and "rested the Sabbath-day" (not in an ignorant, presumptuous or superstitious manner, but) "according to the commandment," which says, "Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy."

6. The institution of the holy Sabbath in Eden, having been clearly established, I here remind you of a statement in your second article, that the endless

perpetuity of the Sabbath, necessarily grows out of its institution before the fall of man.

7. As the fourth commandment is, according to the statement of your Bible class report, one of the ten precepts that composed "the constitution" of the great Jehovah, it ABIDES until that constitution is abolished, and another established in its stead.

8. In conclusion, I ask, How much stronger are the last six commandments which Jesus quoted, than are the first four which he did not directly quote, inasmuch as (according to your view) they have since that all been abolished together?

From these facts, and many others which will be noticed hereafter, we conclude that the fourth precept of God's great CONSTITUTION stands on the same foundation with the other nine; and that they all abide until the Infinite Jehovah abolishes his constitution and forms another in its stead.

The second statement on which you rely as proof that the fourth commandment is abolished, is this:

"It [the New Testament] does not name Sabbath-breaking as a sin."

Your attention is invited while the amount of proof contained in this statement is weighed.

1. That the sin of Sabbath-breaking is not named in the catalogues of sins in the New Testament, is only inferential proof that it is no sin to violate the fourth commandment and to "teach men so."

2. The New Testament does not present these catalogues of sins as complete lists; for some omit to name many grievous sins, and all omit to name some that are very heinous. Witness the sins of slave-holding and of Polygamy, both of which were common in the days of our Lord and his apostles, and certainly very out-breaking.

3. But mark! There is a standard somewhere by which these acts are shown to be sins. God has erected such a standard; and the New Testament points us to it, as *nothing* else than that holy law which you are trying to prove abolished. Hear the beloved disciple; "SIN is the TRANSGRESSION of the LAW." 1 John iii, 4. Now hear Paul tell how sin is made manifest: "BY THE LAW IS THE KNOWLEDGE OF SIN". Rom. vii, 20. Hear him again: "I HAD NOT KNOWN SIN BUT BY THE LAW." Rom. vii, 7, 13. This is the only standard by which sin is shown. It is the embodiment of God's own principles of holiness, and it is therefore perfect. It is enough that the apostles have told us what the standard is by which sin is shown; we take this standard, and tell any man who breaks either the first, second, fourth, or eighth commandment he is a sinner, and "the wages of sin is death." Rom. vi, 23. Your third statement reads as follows:

"What it [the New Testament] says on the subject, goes to show that the Sabbath was abrogated with the law of Moses."

This statement lays the subject open for discussion. You affirm; I deny.—You commence by objecting to, and finding fault with the remarks of the *Review* on the question as stated by yourself. You think that they are uncandid and were made to forestall fair investigation by changing the point at issue. In this you are entirely mistaken. They were made to call attention to the fact that until the abolition of the ten commandments is proved, we are not under obligation to show the re-enactment of a single precept.

We have never claimed that the New Testament enacts the fourth commandment a second time. We deny that it was the design of the New Testament to re-enact the holy, just, spiritual and perfect law of God; but on the contrary, that law having shown the whole world to be condemned and guilty before God, the New Testament comes in to present a hope of pardon, without dishonoring God or making void his law. And that the New Testament in offering pardon to fallen, guilty man, does it for the very reason that the law of God condemns the whole world, and shows all mankind guilty before God, and exposed to his wrath. Rom. iii. Instead of assuming that whatever is not re-enacted in the New Testament, is not binding, you are requested to prove the abolition of the commandments of God, or else to render obedience to them.

I can assure you, that having the utmost confidence in the perpetuity and immutability of God's constitu-

tion in general, and of each of its ten articles in particular, I have no occasion to resort to "silly expedients" "to obscure the light" of truth. I thank God that I was enabled to expose "the silly expedients" to which you resorted in your Bible class report, to prove that Christ and his apostles broke the Sabbath. A few of these will be noticed in their place. You speak of the Review as follows:

"Its nice discriminations about the law of God and the law of Moses are all fancied; as though God and Moses had separate interests in the Bible!"

Had you done me the justice to use the terms that were used by me, and then have shown that they meant one and the same thing, you would not have struck like one beating the air. My expressions were scriptural: "The hand-writing of ordinances" is abolished; "the royal law" remaineth. You are requested to prove that these are but one law, or else to take back your assertion.

It is very true that circumcision was called an everlasting covenant between God and the posterity of Abraham; and the like expressions are used with reference to other ceremonies. But it was not made for man at Creation as was the Sabbath; it was not one of the holy, just and spiritual laws which Jehovah spake from heaven, and which composed his constitution. Consequently there is no propriety in classing circumcision with the Sabbath of Jehovah. The sign of circumcision was given to Abraham, as a seal of the righteousness of his faith, when he was yet uncircumcised, that he might be the father of those that should believe even though they should not be circumcised.—Thus this rite itself showed that the time would come when it would not be required.

You assert that "the language of the New Testament abolishing the Sabbath is more abundant and explicit than that abolishing circumcision."—Let us contrast the statement of the New Testament respecting circumcision, with one of the most prominent texts urged by no-Sabbath teachers against the fourth commandment. Paul speaks of circumcision as follows: "If ye be circumcised Christ shall profit you nothing." Gal. v, 2. This testimony is very "explicit." Now we will look at Rom. xiv, 5, which you think refers to the observance of Jehovah's Sabbath. It reads thus: "One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. *Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.*"—Now admitting that Paul in Rom. xiv is classing the abolition of the fourth article of God's constitution, with the abolition of those carnal ordinances which stood only in meats and drinks and divers washings, (a thing in the highest degree unreasonable and absurd,) I ask, Can you not perceive a vast difference between the expression, "Christ shall profit you nothing," and the direction, "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind?"

In order to avoid the absurdity of teaching that God abolished his law and then re-enacted it, you say that God abolished that which was written on the tables of stone, "but that did not necessarily involve the abolition of every precept in it that had existed before the period referred to." The idea that the ten commandments could be abolished, and yet a part of the ten still remain in force, seems to be somewhat original with you.

Let us look at the idea a moment. Prior to the account of the departure from Egypt, we find but one of the precepts of the Decalogue recorded in the scripture, as a direct commandment. Gen. ix, 5, 6. But the existence of all those holy principles from Creation to Sinai you will not deny, the Sabbath precept excepted, as it is indispensably necessary to have them exist in this dispensation, some how or other.

Now if nine of the ten commandments could survive the abolition of the Decalogue, Why cannot the Sabbath, which was instituted at Creation, survive that abolition also? And if the abolition of the Decalogue (a thing that never yet was proved) leaves a part of the ten commandments still in force, the fourth commandment may be one of them. And if God could abolish the ten commandments and yet nine of them remain unabolished, Why cannot ten?

When any evidence is presented to prove that God has abolished a part of his constitution, and modified

a portion of the remainder, it shall be duly considered. If the subject of keeping the commandments of God and the duties of refraining from idolatry, blasphemy, murder, theft, false witness &c., was the theme of Paul's discourse in Rom. xiv; Col. ii, there would be some propriety in concluding that God's Rest-day, which stands associated with these commandments, was there referred to. As his subject is the use of meats, drinks &c., it is an unwarrantable inference that his language refers to the Sabbath made for man, as it manifestly refers to the sabbaths, feasts and new moons of the hand-writing of ordinances. You continue:

"The Review says: 'Please notice, he passes over Matt. v, 17-19, where our Lord in his first sermon speaks out in distinct terms on the real point at issue.' Where in that sermon does our Lord 'speak out in distinct terms on the Sabbath?' for that is the only 'point at issue.' The Sabbath is not once named nor alluded to in that whole sermon! Yet the Review finds it there 'in distinct terms!' Just so it finds it in the 'royal law.' James ii, 8. Dear reader, dare you trust such an expositor of the word of God? That cause must be desperate that needs such support, and fearful, fearful will be his account who lends it."

Your attention is called to the subject while I briefly notice the above:

1. In my review of your Bible class report, I called attention to the fact that the abolition or the perpetuity of the commandments of God, was the real question in the New Testament; and that it was not whether the New Testament re-enacted the fourth commandment or not. Consequently, I remarked with reference to your first argument in the New Testament as follows: "Please notice, he passes over Matt. v, 17-19 where our Lord in his first sermon speaks out in distinct terms on the real point at issue, and begins with the accusation of Sabbath-breaking, presented by the Pharisees, and refuted by Jesus Christ."—Our Lord in the text cited, does speak in distinct terms respecting the perpetuity and immutability of the commandments of God; consequently your effort to ridicule the Review because the fourth commandment is not cited in particular, evinces a serious lack of sound argument.

2. James, in giving his account of the royal law in chap. ii, 8-12, introduces two of the original ten commandments, with a statement that he who should keep the whole law and yet fail in one precept, has become guilty of all. The way you get rid of this testimony respecting the commandments of God, is, I think, rather novel. You limit the royal law to the precept named in verse 8, and exclude the law and commandments named in verses 9-12. And while your unfortunate position compels you thus to wrest and mangle the word of truth, you elsewhere ridicule me for believing that the hand-writing of ordinances is distinct from the royal law. I cannot refrain from smiling, as I read your pathetic warning to your dear readers, to put them on their guard against what I may write. But I have sufficient respect for them to believe that it will not throw dust enough in their eyes to prevent them from seeing your real dilemma. As you and I shall be judged by this law in the day of God, [verse 12,] we shall then be convinced whether it is a light thing to violate one of its precepts or not.

In exposing your effort to prove from Matt. xii, that Christ justified the violation of the fourth commandment, I used the following language:

"In order to aid the mind of the reader, and also to make C. speak out plain, we offer him one of three positions:

1. Christ excused his disciples by referring to others who had done wrong. (A poor excuse truly.)

2. Or the law had always been relaxed, changed, superseded, or abolished. (Then it was not relaxed by Christ.)

3. Or the acts of the priests, the act of David, and the acts of the disciples, were not, under the circumstances in which they were placed, contrary to the law of God.

The first two positions being too absurd to need refutation, all must agree upon the third. Now look at the facts in the case. What said the law of God respecting the Sabbath? 'Six days shalt thou labor,

and do all THY work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work.' Were the priests in their act of offering up sacrifices upon the Sabbath, at work for themselves, or for God? Not for themselves, but to obey God. Num. xxviii, 9, 10. They were not doing what could be called 'thy work.' But had they been engaged in slaughtering animals for their own use on that day, would they have been guiltless then? Verily not. Look at the case of David. 1 Sam. xxi.—He was fleeing for his life from Saul, the king of Israel. 'He had need' and as an act of mercy 'for there was no bread there but the shew-bread,' the priest gave him of it to eat. This, as an act of mercy, was according to the law. 'The WEIGHTIER matters of the law' were 'judgment, MERCY and faith.' Matt. xxiii, 23. Under other circumstances, though not expressly forbidden, it would have been wrong. Christ appealed to these circumstances to show that the disciples in satisfying their hunger from the heads of wheat, were guiltless. Was there any chance 'to answer him again?' I trow not. But how 'unreasonable' it is for C. to insinuate from this chapter that any amount of labor would have been 'guiltless' on the part of the disciples. If David and the priests would, under other circumstances, have been blameless in acting as they did, then might C. offer this chapter as proof, not merely that the law was slackened up in the days of Jesus, but 'that it always had been! Is it not 'hard for thee to kick against the pricks?' 'Mercy and not sacrifice' was not a new doctrine. Hos. vi, 6. It was one of the weightier matters of the law. Matt. xxiii, 23."

As a matter of curiosity to the reader I present your reply. Whether you have defended your position by "plain scripture and fair argument," or have dealt only in common-place assertion the reader will determine:

"Matt. xii, 1-8 does not present the only instance of apostolic disregard for the Sabbath: this is in keeping with the uniform treatment that institution received at the hands of Christ and his apostles whenever it came up for special notice. They always, when speaking of its authority, treat it as a superannuated institution. In its day, it could no more be disregarded with impunity than circumcision, or any other ordinance of that period: but its age was expiring and a better one was dawning, distinguished by institutions broader in their scope and more obviously merciful in their genius. Our Saviour seems some times to have almost sought opportunity, if not to violate, at least to expose and correct the Pharisees' superstitious veneration of the Sabbath."

Perhaps one or two remarks on the above may be in place.

1. According to yourself, Christ and his apostles, when speaking of the fourth article of God's constitution, treat it as a "superannuated" thing. We may conclude then, (if the reader can pardon what looks so much like blasphemy,) that the government of the Infinite Jehovah was, in the days of our Lord's ministry, in an unsettled state as his constitution was being abolished, and a broader and more merciful one about to be formed.

2. Once the fourth precept of the great constitution was of as much importance as circumcision and other ordinances; but its age was expiring and institutions broader and more merciful than the Sabbath which "was made FOR the man" at Creation, were to take its place. Is not the utterance of such sentiments as these, presumptuous trifling with the word of God?

3. Our Lord's exposure of the superstition of the Pharisees, is what you grasp as proof that he "almost sought opportunity" to show his disregard for the fourth commandment. John xv, 10. To break the commandments, and to teach men so, is fearful business, and needs some better apology than such assertions and inferences as these.—Your next remarks are as follows:

"If the Son of man was Lord of the Sabbath to 'cherish, protect and defend it,' as the Review says, why did not he and his apostles defend and enforce it? They speak of marriage, and enforce respect to the mutual duties and obligations of husband and wife; and not a word is said by which it could be inferred that they had become less stringent than formerly.—But the reverse is true of the Sabbath."

The following are the remarks of the Review to which you refer:

"The Son of man is the Lord of the Sabbath, even as the husband is the lord of his wife. See Mark ii, 27, 28; 1 Cor. xi, 9; 1 Pet. iii, 6; Gen. xviii, 12.—Not to abrogate, abolish,—put away, or destroy, but to cherish, protect, and defend. He is the Lord of his people—he is our Lord Jesus Christ. Not to abolish—not to abrogate—not to destroy us—but to lay down his own life for us, and to 'come again,' and take us to himself. Rom. xiv, 9; John xiv, 1-3.—'God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.'—Matt. xxii, 32. Jesus Christ is not the Lord of dead types and shadows, but of 'the lively oracles!'—Amen."

In taking leave of Matt. xii, we ask, Whether an act shown by our Lord Jesus Christ to be in accordance with that WEIGHTIER matter of the law, MERCY, and therefore no violation of the law, will justify C. in open, willful violation of the fourth commandment? If he be 'weighed in the balances' of Matt. xii, his own chosen scales, will he not be 'found wanting?'"

To the above a few remarks should, perhaps, be added.

1. It was written in answer to the objection so often urged, that if our Lord was the Lord of the Sabbath, he certainly put it away and chose another, or else he abrogated and destroyed it. The facts cited above show that the term implies the reverse of all this.

2. But our Lord did the same thing to the institution of the Sabbath, that he did to that of marriage. To correct the light esteem in which the Pharisees held the latter, he calls their attention to its original institution at Creation, and thence shows its real object and sacred character. Matt. xix, 3-8. To correct the superstitious ansterities with which they had loaded the holy Sabbath, he points them to its original institution also, at Creation, in an answer that alike shuts the mouths of those who would cumber the Sabbath of Jehovah with superstitious observances, and of those on the other hand, who teach that it is one of the things AGAINST us and CONTRARY to us, which he took out of the way. Col. ii. "The Sabbath," says he, "was made FOR the man and not the man for the Sabbath: therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." Mark ii, 27, 28. Satan has cared little whether men have added to, or made void the law of God.

3. Christ lays down the keeping of the commandments of God as the condition of entering eternal life. The fourth and the seventh are alike included. Matt. xix.

As you have made no effort to redeem the "expedients" to which you resorted in your Bible class report, to prove that Christ and his disciples violated the fourth article of God's constitution, I will, for the sake of brevity, pass over the rest of them, and request you to recur to the Review in which these expedients are exposed. Your concluding remarks on the Gospels are as follows:

"We have never 'charged Christ and his disciples with the sin of Sabbath-breaking.' The Pharisees did that to them, as the Review does to us: but it cannot quote the example of Christ or any of his disciples in making such a charge. As the time had come for the abrogation of the Sabbath, it was no more a sin to disregard it than to disregard circumcision and sacrifices: and as they were sometimes observed without sanctioning their perpetuity, so of the Sabbath. What is said in reference to the perpetuity or abrogation of either must decide that point."

Before quoting the language of the Review to which the above refers a few remarks may be in place:

1. You have attempted to prove that the disciples violated the fourth commandment, and that Christ justified them as its violators; and that the sin of Sabbath-breaking did not rest upon them, because it was no sin to violate the fourth commandment, though that commandment was not abolished till his death.

2. But the charge of breaking the fourth commandment, was made by the Pharisees against our Lord falsely: for I ask you as a candid man to answer the question, which of them convinced him of sin, (the transgression of the law,) or what one of their number was able to show that he had not kept his Father's commandments? John viii, 46; xv, 10.

3. But in grasping the accusation of the Pharisees as good and valid, (provided that our Lord held himself amenable to his Father's law,) and in over-looking his repeated declaration that what he did was *lawful*, (that is according to the law,) I ask, Do you not stand on the side of the Pharisees in their opposition to the Son of God?

4. Will you please listen to the words of the Apostle. "Sin is the transgression of the law." 1 John iii. Then that is its definition. "By the law is the knowledge of sin." Rom. iii. Then that is the way that it is made known. "I had not known sin but by the law; for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." Rom. vii, 7. This is the testimony of Paul, years after the law is said to have been abolished. And he quotes from the ten commandments. Now if you openly and wilfully violate the first, second, third, fourth, or any of the commandments, Are you not a sinner, exposed to the penalty of the law—the wages of sin—which is the second death? Rom. vi, 23; Rev. xx, 14, 15.

5. If the law of God was not abolished until the death of our Lord, it was a sin to violate it before that time, as it was yet in force. But if it was abolished at the commencement of our Lord's ministry, Was it also abolished at his death? In your second article you informed your readers that Sabbath obligation terminated at the crucifixion; how you have it terminate at the commencement of Christ's ministry. As it is difficult to occupy two contradictory positions, Will you please to select the most tenable one? If the "time had come for the abrogation of the Sabbath" at the commencement of our Lord's ministry, Will you prove the point by plain Scripture and fair argument?

6. It is worthy of notice that your concluding remark states the question in the very form for which I contended.

In conclusion I append the words of the *Review* to which you refer:

"We take leave of the position of C. relative to the Gospels, with these remarks:

1. Christ came to 'magnify the law, and make it honorable,' [Isa. xlii, 21,] but he relaxed its obligation, even before God had abolished (?) it!

2. He 'came to fulfill' the law, yet justified the violation of its fourth precept!!

3. He did more against the law than its worst enemy could have done; for while it was yet in existence, (as all must admit,) he justified its violation, and then relaxed its claims so that it could not take hold on its transgressor.

4. James says that whosoever 'shall fail with respect to one precept hath become guilty of all.' [Macknight.] Jesus himself failed with respect to the fourth commandment and became guilty of all!!!

5. 'Sin is the transgression of the law.' According to C., [note also John ix, 24,] Jesus was a sinner. But according to the beloved disciple, 'In him is no sin.' 1 John iii, 4, 5.

But as it was a mistaken notion with the Pharisees in regarding the 'mint, anise, and cummin' of the law, as above its 'weightier matter,' *μεγερν*, that led them to make those charges against him who had kept his 'Father's commandments,' and had ever done 'those things that please him,' we ask if C. may not be laboring under a similar mistake?—Whether or not that which C. has presented from the Gospels, will cause Jehovah to 'have him excused' from obeying the fourth commandment, is now submitted to the reader."

In view of what has been said thus far from the New Testament, I submit to you the following question: Did our Lord keep the commandments and teach men so, or did he violate them and teach others so to do? J. N. ANDREWS.

Rochester, N. Y., June 1852.

The following we copy from the *Advent Herald*, taken from the "London Quarterly Journal of Prophecy."

"During the six days man was to show how he could serve and glorify God in the common duties of life; on the Sabbath he was to show how God was to be served and glorified by acts of direct and unmingled worship. This is the principle of the great Sabbath-institute—a principle which runs through all ages—more so than ever in these last days, when men are either denying religion altogether, or endeavoring to eject it from every-day life, and confine it to a peculiar region of its own.

This seventh day God 'blest.' He uttered his mind concerning it, calling it a day of blessing, and in so doing, communicated to it (as it were) the power to impart blessing, that is, he made it the day in which he would specially give blessing. This is, then, the primary meaning and object of the Sabbath. It is the day on which God specially blesses man.—But more than this. It is added, he 'sanctified it.' He marked it off from all other days, as the tabernacle was marked off from all the tents of Israel. He drew a fence around it, which was not to be broken through. He set it apart for himself, just as he set the six days apart for man. It was to be his day, not man's, just as the altar was his altar, the laver his laver, not man's. And when, or where, or how has God's claim to a Sabbath been renounced? When has his setting

apart been done away? Men speak and act as if this 'blessing,' this 'sanctification' of the day were a yoke not to be borne; as if the Sabbath were a curse, not a blessing; as if the Gospel had at length broken fetters forged in Eden by God for man! But no. The Sabbath was set up by God, and by him only can be taken down."

Knowledge of the True God.

It was said of Paul, by certain Epicurians, and Stoics, that he seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods. And when he found an altar with this inscription, TO THE UNKNOWN GOD, and wished to declare him in an intelligent manner, the Apostle could do it with no greater clearness than by quoting the language of the fourth commandment, the only one that informs us who the living and true God, to be worshiped is, viz: the Lord of heaven and earth, that made the earth and all things therein.

No one will deny that the Athenians were infidel in the extreme. Acts xvii, 16. The city was wholly given to idolatry, therefore Paul's spirit was stirred within him, to present one of the greatest truths of God's word, and thereby give them right conceptions of the Great Creator.

So we see the conclusion is irresistible that the knowledge of the true God is found alone in the reason for keeping the Sabbath. Mark the language and compare it well. "For [because] in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day &c."—Ex. xx. 11. If the race of Adam had always observed this institution, would there ever have been an infidel in the universe? If not, Has God abolished the only institution that commemorates the Creation, and recognizes the living and true God, that should be worshiped! If this be answered in the affirmative, then God has abolished a knowledge of himself in the earth.

E. R. SEAMAN.

Rochester, N. Y., June 10th, 1852.

THE REVIEW AND HERALD.

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

ROCHESTER, THURSDAY, JUNE 10, 1852.

BABYLON.

"And there followed another angel, saying, Babylon is fallen, is fallen, &c." Rev. xiv, 8.

The subject of the Babylon of the Revelation, its fall, &c. being the link that connects the past with the present, the first angel of Rev. xiv with the third, it is of the greatest importance that the correct view of Babylon should be given. For if the testimony of the third angel be presented to those who investigate subjects, and who must see good reasons before they can believe, they will most certainly wish to first understand the testimony of the angels that precede it. Those who might embrace the third message without inquiring for the first and second, would not be likely to stand a very fierce storm of opposition against the truth. Hence, those who teach the third message should be able to clearly define the first and the second. Certainly, if the period has arrived for the followers of Christ to have their attention called to the third message, the former ones may be understood.

It is not our design at this time to take up the two former messages, but only to notice briefly some points of importance relative to Babylon, which is the subject of the second, angel.

"Babylon comes from Babel, and signifies 'confusion or mixture.'" See Gen. x, 10; xi, 9. In this respect, at least, it well applies to the many religious sects, so widely differing in their creeds, and each professing to be the true church of Christ.—We are aware that this application of Babylon will appear harsh and uncharitable to many. But let such compare the one, united church of Christ, as set forth in the New Testament, separated from the world, with the many sects of the present day with all their confusion of doctrines, and united with the world, and we think they will no longer object to this application.

"God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all churches of the saints." 1 Cor. xiv, 33. It was the plan of God, and his will, that his people should be one. For this, the Son of God prayed: "Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth." "Neither pray I for these alone; but for THEM ALSO WHICH SHALL BELIEVE ON ME THROUGH THEIR WORD; that they ALL MAY BE ONE, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be ONE IN US, THAT THE WORLD MAY BELIEVE THAT THOU HAST SENT ME." John xvii, 17, 20, 21.

Here is the great reason why the church should be one; that the world might believe that God had sent his Son to save lost men. But as the reverse has been the case, the confusion of this great Babylon has filled the world with infidelity.—There is another point of great interest in this prayer of the Saviour, as follows: "I have given them thy word, and the world hath hated them, because they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world." Verse 14. Here the true church of Christ is seen "not of the world," separated from it, consequently, hated by the world. This shows the worldly,

popular churches of this day, which are united with the world, and loved by the world, not to be the real church of Christ.—We, therefore, conclude that the various sects, united to, and loved by, the world, in their divided and subdivided condition, with their confusion of creeds, have ever been worthy of the name of Babylon.

As the husband is the head of the wife, so Christ is the only lawful head of the church. As the wife should look alone to her husband to be protected and cherished, so the church should lean on no other arm than that of her lawful Head. But the churches of this day have formed an unlawful connection with the world, have gone after other lovers, and they are worthy to be represented by the family of harlots, [Rev. xvii, 5,] the daughters of the old mother, the Roman Catholic church. And how these daughters resemble their mother! Some indeed are older than others, but as they grow in strength of years the resemblance is more striking.

Heaven has provided ample means to secure the purity and unity of the church; but that means has been trampled underfoot by the wisdom of men. Said the Son of God, "If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart I will send him unto you. And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment. * * * Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth." John xvi, 7—13.

God's revealed truth is a unit. It has not as many heads and horns as the symbolical beasts of Daniel and John, but is one. While error has a thousand crooked streams, truth flows onward in one strait, even channel. And the Holy Comforter is sent down to guide the followers of Jesus into all truth.—This was God's plan. And if Christ's professed followers had ever stood separate from the world as the Word requires, and had been humble, meek and lowly, like their Pattern, so that the Spirit of truth could abide with them, they would have been guided into the one channel of truth, consequently, been one. Then the prayer of Jesus would have been answered in his professed disciples, they would not have composed this great Babylon, and the world would not have been filled with infidelity by reason of their confusion of doctrines.

The gifts of the Holy Spirit were given to secure the purity and unity of the church; but many of these being rejected, as belonging to the apostles alone, the church has been left to form human creeds, and finite wisdom has led benighted souls in almost every direction excepting the channel of truth—Hear the great Apostle:

"And he gave some, apostles, and some, prophets, and some, evangelists, and pastors, and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ, till we all come in the UNITY OF THE FAITH." Eph. iv, 11—13. Is it said that the apostolic church came to this *unity of the faith*, and that these gifts have not since existed? To this we reply, that those who tear down the unpopular gifts, on this ground, tear down the ministry also, for Paul places them on the same ground, and shows them to be of equal duration. Hear Paul again:

"And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healing, helps, government, diversities of tongues," 1 Cor. xii, 28. If God has set these gifts in the church, who has taken them away? If they have all been taken away, then those who profess to be called of God as "teachers" in the church, are engaged in a calling that ceased about 1800 years since. But, if it be said that a portion of the gifts were to cease at the death of the apostles, we ask, who is prepared to decide this matter, and tell which gifts were to cease? God, the one that set them in the church, has not told us, neither has Christ, or his apostles. Ah! This cutting and carving for the Almighty, has deranged the gracious gospel plan, grieved the Spirit of truth almost entirely away from the church, and she has been left to the guidance of finite wisdom, to wander a thousand directions from the fold of Christ, and unlawfully unite with the world, and form this great Babylon.

It is vain to talk of union, permanent and scriptural, where there is confusion of views, and separate interests. How often have different denominations united in protracted efforts for the conversion of sinners; and all would go on well till the time came to bend the converts to the different man-made creeds; then what confusion has followed, and what wounds have been inflicted upon the cause of Christ. No wonder that men have doubted the reality of the Christian religion.

Look at the so-called Union Conference of Advent believers, held at New York City a little more than one year since.—That union not being in sentiment, but for objects understood by those acquainted with the state of the Advent people, was short lived. Some of the most prominent leaders in that Conference have since manifested extremely unkind feelings toward each other through the columns of the *Harbinger* and *Watchman*. We here give a few texts from the epistles of Paul which show the true, and only safe position for the church to occupy.

"Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there

be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment.—1 Cor. i, 10.

"Now the God of patience and consolation grant you to be like-minded one toward another according to Christ Jesus: that ye may with one mind and one mouth glorify God.—Rom. xv, 5, 6.

"If there be therefore any consolation in Christ, if any comfort of love, if any fellowship of the Spirit, if any bowels and mercies, fulfill ye my joy, that ye be like-minded, having the same love, being of one accord, of one mind. Phil. ii, 1, 2.

"Finally, brethren, farewell. Be perfect, be of good comfort, be of one mind, live in peace, and the God of love and peace shall be with you. Greet one another with an holy kiss." 2 Cor. xiii, 11, 12. See also, 1 Pet. iii, 8; Phil. iii, 16.

The Fall of Babylon

Is evidently a moral fall, and not her final destruction.—This may be seen from the order of events given, that she first falls, second, "becomes the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird," third, God's people are called out of her, and fourth, then her plagues are poured upon her, and she is thrown down with violence, "like a great mill-stone cast into the sea," and found no more.

"And after these things I saw another angel come down from heaven, having great power, and the earth was lightened with his glory. And he cried mightily with a strong voice, saying: Babylon the great is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird. For all nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication, and the kings of the earth have committed fornication with her, and the merchants of the earth are waxed rich through the abundance of her delicacies. And I heard another voice from heaven, saying, Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." Rev.—xviii, 1—4.

After Babylon falls, and then becomes the hold of every foul spirit, &c. God calls his people out of her, to escape her plagues, yet future. Now, if Babylon's fall is her utter destruction, we ask how can she become a hold of foul spirits after she is destroyed? How will God's people be called out of Babylon after she is thrown down, like a great mill-stone cast into the sea? And how are her plagues to be poured upon her after she is destroyed, and is "found no more at all?"—Will those who confound the fall of Babylon with her final destruction, please answer these questions?

If the term Babylon be applied to the Roman Catholic church alone, then we inquire, When did she morally fall? The fact that she has always been corrupt, and about as low as she possibly could be, forbids the application of this moral change, or fall, to that corrupt church. Again, Babylon, signifying 'confusion, or mixture,' cannot be applied to the Roman church, she being a unit.

If it be said that the city of Rome is this Babylon, and that her fall is the burning of that literal city, then we would ask, How can the city of Rome "become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird" after it is burned. And how is it possible for God's people to be in Rome, (in order to be called out,) after that city is burned, and is thrown down with violence, like a great mill-stone cast into the sea by a mighty angel, and "found no more at all." Will God's people be in Rome after that city is no more? Again, the people of God are called out of Babylon to escape her plagues. Rev. xviii, 4. But will they flee out of Rome after it is burned, to escape plagues, of which her being burned is her last plague? "Her plagues shall come in one day, death, and mourning and famine; and she shall be utterly burned with fire." Rev. xviii, 8.

The true application of Babylon is free from all these inconsistencies. The prophecy when rightly applied, will fit like the glove to the hand, being made purposely for it.

In our next we design to show, that the message of the second angel, "Babylon is fallen, is fallen, &c." [Rev. xiv, 8,] is in the past, and has been fulfilled in connection with the Advent movement, also the nature of her fall, and that the message of Rev. xviii, 1—4, "Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen, AND HAS BECOME [after her fall] the habitation of devils, and the hold of EVERY FOUL SPIRIT, &c." is yet to be given, to call out the 144,000 from the great Babylon of apostate Christianity, preparatory to the coming of Christ.

We are happy to publish the article from Bro. Cottrell, on another page, and hope our friends will do what they can to circulate the REVIEW AND HERALD among Sabbath-keepers not particularly interested in the advent doctrine.

The Seventh-day Baptists, seeing the proclaimers of the advent bowing to an institution of Papacy, were not well prepared to receive the message. And is it not the purpose of God that those who have come to the knowledge of the Sabbath, should spread the light of the advent before this people, as the way may open before them?

TO THE BRETHREN AND SISTERS.

As I have of late looked around to find the humble followers of the meek and lowly Jesus, my mind has been much exercised.

Many who profess to be looking for the speedy coming of Christ, are becoming conformed to this world, and seek more earnestly the applause of those around them, than the approbation of God. They are cold and formal, like the nominal church, that they but a short time since separated from. The words addressed to the Laodicean Church, describe their present condition perfectly. See Rev. iii, 14—20. They are "neither cold nor hot," but "lukewarm." And unless they heed the counsel of the "faithful and True Witness," and zealously repent, and obtain "gold tried in the fire," "white raiment," and "eye-salve," he will spue them out of his mouth.

The time has come when a large portion of those who once rejoiced, and shouted aloud for joy, in view of the immediate coming of the Lord, are on the ground of the churches and world who once scoffed at, and derided them for believing that Jesus was coming, and circulated all manner of falsehoods to raise prejudice against them, and destroy their influence.—If any one longs after the living God, and hungers and thirsts for righteousness, and God gives them to feel his power, and satisfies their longing soul, by shedding abroad his love in their hearts, and if they glorify God by praising him, they are, by these professed believers in the soon coming of the Lord, often considered deluded, and charged with having mesmerism or some wicked spirit.

Many of these professed Christians dress, talk and act like the world, and the only thing by which they may be known, is their profession. Though they profess to be looking for Christ, their conversation is not in heaven, but on worldly things.

"What manner of persons" ought those to be "in all holy conversation and godliness," who profess to be "looking for, and hasting unto the day of God?" 2 Pet. iii, 11. "Every man that hath this hope in him, purifieth himself, even as he is pure." 1 John, iii, 3. But it is evident that many who bear the advent name, study more to decorate their bodies, and appear well in the eyes of the world, than they do the word of God, to learn how they may be approved of him.

What if the lovely Jesus, our pattern, should make his appearance among them, and the professors of religion generally, as at his first advent? He was born in a manger. Follow him along through his life and ministry. He was a man of sorrow and acquainted with grief. These professed Christians would be ashamed of the meek and lowly Saviour who wore a plain, seamless coat, and had not where to lay his head. His spotless, self-denying life would condemn them; his holy solemnity would be a painful restraint upon their lightness and vain laughter; his guileless conversation would be a check to their worldly and covetous conversation; his declaring the unvarnished, cutting truth would manifest their real character, and they would wish to get the meek Pattern, the lovely Jesus, out of the way as soon as possible. They would be among the first to try to catch him in his words, and raise the cry, Crucify him! Crucify him!

Let us follow Jesus as he so meekly rode into Jerusalem, when "the whole multitude of the disciples began to rejoice and praise God with a loud voice, * * * Saying, Blessed be the King that cometh in the name of the Lord. Peace in heaven, and glory in the highest. Some of the Pharisees from among the multitude said unto him, Master, rebuke thy disciples.—And he answered and said unto them, I tell you, that if these should hold their peace the stones would immediately cry out." A large portion of those who profess to be looking for Christ would be as forward as the Pharisees were, to have the disciples silenced, and they would doubtless raise the cry, Fanaticism! Mesmerism! Mesmerism! And the disciples spreading their garments and branches of palm-trees in the way would be thought extravagant and wild.

But God will have a people on the earth that will not be so cold and dead but that they can praise and glorify him. He will receive glory from some people, and if his chosen people, who keep his commandments should hold their peace the very stones would cry out.

Jesus is coming, but not as at his first advent, a babe in Bethlehem, not as he rode into Jerusalem, when the disciples praised God with a loud voice and cried, Hosannah; but in the glory of the Father, and with all the retinue of holy angels with him, to escort him on his way to earth. All heaven will be emptied of the angels. While the waiting saints will be looking for him, and gazing into heaven, as were the "men of Galilee" When he ascended from the Mount of Olivet.—Then, those only who are holy, those who have followed fully the meek Pattern will, with rapturous joy, exclaim as they behold him, "Lo, this is our God, we have waited for him, and he will save us." And they will be changed "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump," that wakes the sleeping saints, and calls them forth from their dusty beds, clothed with glorious immortality, shouting, Victory! Victory! over death and the grave. The changed saints are caught up together with them to meet the Lord in the air, never more to be separated from the object of their love.

With such a prospect as this before us, such a glorious hope, such a redemption that Christ has purchased for us by his own blood, shall we hold our peace? Shall we not praise God, even with a loud voice, as the disciples did when Jesus rode into Jerusalem? Is not our prospect far more glorious than theirs was? Who dare then forbid us glorifying God, even with a loud voice, when we have such a hope, big with immortality and full of glory? We have tasted of the powers of the world to come, and long for more. My whole being cries out after the living God, and I shall not be satisfied until I am filled with all his fullness.

The way to heaven is rugged. Briers and thorns are in the way; but we can with cheerfulness tread the rough pathway, knowing that Jesus, the King of glory, once trod it before us.

We will rejoice that we can follow in his footsteps, and be partakers with him of his sufferings, that we may finally partake of his glory.

What if reproaches are heaped upon me, even by those who profess to be looking for the Lord? What if falsehoods are kept in circulation by "whosoever loveth a lie" made ready to their hand? All this I can bear cheerfully. Why should I rejoice? My Master, the King of Glory, was treated a thousand times worse than I have been, and can I, a poor, unworthy creature, expect any better treatment in following Jesus, than he received? Shall I complain, when Jesus bore the scoffs and derision of his own people, the Jews, and was finally rejected and crucified by them for me? For my sins he bore all this. No, I will not complain; I will rather rejoice and be exceedingly glad that I am accounted worthy to suffer for Christ's sake, that my reward may be in heaven. Only let me have an inheritance in glory, and it will be enough. For that, I can endure anything and everything. Heaven, sweet heaven—

"I long to be there, and the thought that 'tis near, Makes me almost impatient for Christ to appear, And fit up that dwelling of glory so rare—

The earth robed in beauty—I long to be there."

Let us, dear brethren and sisters, crave the suffering, crucifying part of religion. For we are to be purified and fitted for the kingdom through suffering. We must keep separate from the world, if we would have the love of God abide with us. As soon as we begin to be conformed to this world, just as soon God's Spirit begins to depart from us. But if we keep humble, live holy, harmless and separate from sinners, we shall see of the salvation of God. Let us strive to be Christians (Christ-like) in every sense of the word, and let our dress, conversation and actions preach that Christ is formed within, the hope of glory, and that we are looking for that blessed hope and glorious appearing of Jesus. Let us show to those around us, that this world is not our home, that we are pilgrims and strangers here.

My affections, interest, treasure, all, is in the bright world to come. I long to see the King in his beauty, whom angels adore, and as they bow, cast their glittering crowns before him, and then touch their golden harps, and fill all heaven with their rich music.

Let those who break God's law and teach others to do so, denounce us as fallen from grace because we keep all ten of his immutable precepts, it will not harm us. We have the satisfaction of knowing, that while they curse, Jesus has pronounced a blessing. Says the true Witness, the only Begotten of the Father, "Blessed are they that do his [the Father's] commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the City." Rev. xxii, 14.

Think ye that the commandment-keepers will be sorry, and mourn when the pearly gates of the Golden City of God are swung back upon their glittering hinges, and they are welcomed in? No, never. They will then rejoice, that they are not under the bondage of the law, but that they have kept God's law, and therefore are free from it. They will have right to the tree of life, a right to its healing leaves. They will hear the lovely voice of Jesus, richer than any music that ever fell on mortal ear, saying, There will be no more sorrow, pain or death; sighing and crying have fled away.

"Our eyes shall then, with rapture,
The Saviour's face behold,
Our feet, no more diverted,
Shall walk the streets of gold;
Our ears shall hear with transport
The hosts celestial sing,
Our tongues shall chant the glory
Of our Immortal King."

ELLEN G. WHITE.

To Correspondents.

Bro. B. B. Brown—We sent you a Chart by the mail to Beloit, Wis., about the middle of April; also a letter. Were they received? Please write.

Bro. DARIUS MYERS—We were happy to hear from you, dear brother. Have sent a very few small tracts; will send more if you wish. The Chart can be sent by Mail. Shall send it otherwise if possible.

To Sabbath-keepers who have not heard The Third Angel's Message.

DEAR BRETHREN:—The Lord will soon come.—To those who look for him and love his righteous appearing, these few words are addressed. We, that have long observed the Sabbath of the Lord, have been looking forward with great desire to the time when this commandment of Jehovah, so long trodden down by the power that should "think to change times and laws," should be restored. We have expected to see the Sabbath triumph. Perhaps we have expected too much from this sinful world.—The great mass even of professors of religion, will never yield obedience to this oracle of God. But after seeing the clear light upon it and rejecting it, their house will be left unto them desolate.

But rejoice with me, brethren, the truth is even now triumphing with the honest. Those who love our Lord Jesus Christ, and are looking, and longing for his glorious appearing, and wish to be found of him in peace, without spot or wrinkle, are being led to see that they must keep all the commandments of God, that they may have right to the tree of life, and enter in through the gates into the City.

You doubtless remember the cry that went through the world, that the Lord would come in 1843. This message was derided under the name of Millerism, but not by those who loved the Lord and believed his word. He promised, before he left the world, to come again; and none who love him and understand his word, will ever scoff at the idea of his coming.—Just such a proclamation as this, is symbolized by an angel having the everlasting gospel to preach to them that dwell on the earth, saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgment is come. Rev. xiv, 6, 7. Brethren, inquire carefully whether this scripture was not then fulfilled. Perhaps you are ready to say that the proclamation was false, because the Lord did not come, and therefore cannot be the fulfillment. To this I answer, that the Author of the prophetic word is not answerable for the mistakes of fallible humanity. His children oft fulfill his word, when they do not understand all about what they are doing. Concerning what took place when Christ rode into Jerusalem, which was a fulfillment of prophecy, it is said:—

"These things understood not his disciples at the first; but when Jesus was glorified, then remembered they that these things were written of him, and that they had done these things unto him." John xii, 16.

So the people of God, in giving this judgment hour cry, in connection with the termination of the 2300 days of Daniel, for lack of knowledge, said, then the Lord will come. But the Prophet said, "Unto 2300 days, then shall the Sanctuary be cleansed." And the Revelator saw two other messages follow the judgment hour cry, before he saw the Son of man on the white cloud. Rev. xiv, 14. The error in regard to the event to take place at the termination of the days, does not prove that the preaching of time did not fulfill the prophecy of Rev. xiv, 6, 7, any more than that of the disciples, in supposing that Jesus would at that time restore the kingdom to Israel, proved that they had nothing to do with the fulfillment of that prediction in Zech. ix, 9.

It is not my intention to argue this question, but only to awaken in your minds the spirit of inquiry that you may examine the subject for yourselves.—The Holy Spirit, by the prophet Daniel, has given us definite time. Was it intended that we, in these last days, should "understand" this time, and be benefited by it, or is it impossible for us to understand it in this mortal state? If the last supposition is true, why was it given to us? And ought not Paul to have accepted this, when he said, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable?"

An angel was sent to inform the prophet Daniel, that seventy weeks were determined upon his people, and told him that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem, unto the Messiah, should be 69 weeks. If Jesus was the Christ, these weeks were weeks of years. From the going forth of the decree, B. C. 457, to three years and a half after the crucifixion, (which was "in the midst of the week,") is 70 weeks, or 490 days.—

(years.) Ought not the Jews to be convinced from their own scriptures, that the Messiah has already been manifested? Most certainly. And yet they are looking to the future for their Messiah. Very well. If Jews ought to be convinced of this fact by time, surely Christians ought to know that the remainder of the 2300 days, from which the seventy weeks were "cut off," are also ended. Take 490 from 2300, and we have 1810. To A. D. 34 add 1810, and we have A. D. 1844. "Then shall the Sanctuary be cleansed." It is not a matter of small importance, thus anciently, and definitely foretold. Then it behoves us to inquire the meaning of cleansing the Sanctuary.

I would like to say more on the subject of time, but the limits I have prescribed for myself forbid. I wish, however, to call your attention to the effect produced by preaching definite time. It awakened a spirit of inquiry in regard to bible truth. They took their lamps and went forth to meet the Bridegroom. And though the lamps of the foolish have gone out, for want of oil in their vessels, those of the wise shine more and more, and will continue to shine till we come to the perfect day.

The judgment hour cry was opposed by the churches. They, who professed to love the Lord, began to disfellowship those who proclaimed him near. Meeting-houses were closed against this message. And they, who scarcely thought of a separation from the churches, were compelled as it were, to give the second angel's message, viz: "Babylon is fallen, is fallen." Rev. xiv, 8. I remember well of hearing that the churches in the Eastern States were being torn in pieces by the advent doctrine. And why were not the churches which kept the Sabbath equally effected with the rest? Because they stood upon a truth which was not held by those who were preaching the Advent.

But those who loved the Lord, and wished to be found of him without spot and blameless, in searching the sure word, began to see that there was no authority in that word for a change of the day originally sanctified by God as the Rest-day. When honest people see this, they obey God rather than man. So they were led along down the track of prophecy to the third angel's message. Rev. xiv, 9—12.

"And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast, or his image, or receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God," &c. "HERE is the patience of the saints; HERE are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus."

In this message is brought to view two classes.—One class worship the beast and receive his mark; the other keep the commandments, (not nine of them only,) and have the faith of Jesus. If you examine this subject, you will see clearly that the mark of the beast is that institution of the beast by which he attempts to set aside the commandment of the Most High, thinking himself able to "change times and laws."

But I was about to tell you the result of preaching definite time. It has finally resulted in turning hundreds, and perhaps I might say thousands, to the Sabbath of the Lord. This you will say is good fruit.—Very well. Can a corrupt tree bear this good fruit?

Now I know you will wish to examine the subjects here briefly hinted at. You will make known your wishes by addressing a letter to JAMES WHITE, editor of the ADVENT REVIEW AND SABBATH HERALD, Rochester, N. Y., "Terms—Gratis." It is expected that all the friends of the cause will aid in its publication, as the Lord hath prospered them."

Listen to no cry of "fanaticism," or, "shut door," but send in your names for the paper.

Yours for the truth,

ROSSELL F. COTTRILL.

Mill Grove, N. Y., May 25th, 1852.

"AND to them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." Heb. ix, 23.

"If, therefore, thou shalt not watch, I will come upon thee as a thief, and thou shalt not know what hour I will come upon thee." Rev. iii, 3.

LETTERS.

From Bro. Ingraham.

DEAR BRO. WHITE: I have returned from my tour south, in connection with Bro. Baker, and will give you a brief account of the meetings we held in different places. I did not attend the conference at East Bethel, from the fact that the appointment did not reach me until it was too late, but was informed by the brethren that the Lord was present to help and bless his people. I met with Bro. Baker in Lebanon, N. H., and started with him for Unity, according to appointment.—Our meeting in this place was somewhat interesting. One came in for the first time to hear the truths relative to our position, and became much interested in the third angel's message. From Unity we journeyed to Ashfield, Mass., and found a few brethren strong in the present truth, and hungry to hear the word of the Lord. The saints of the Lord in this place were strengthened, and our souls refreshed.—Others were convicted, and we were in hopes there would be an addition to the little company. We visited an adjoining town, (Hawley,) and held one meeting, and left them fully satisfied. Something remains to be done by some of God's servants in that vicinity. On our way to Ware, we stopped with Bro. S. Everett over night; found them somewhat afflicted. His daughter, Bro. Higgins' wife, had been sick for some time. God heard prayer in her behalf, and she was enabled to walk about the house when we left.

Our meeting in Ware was one of trial, but in the midst of discordant notes, some were enabled to understand the voice of the good Shepherd, and came out in favor of the truth. A number of preachers came out to hear during our stay in this place. Is it not astonishing to find our Advent preachers taking the position of the no-Sabbath. They have been driven from the first-day by arguments deduced from God's word, and to avoid the conclusion to which we have come, a refuge must be sought somewhere.

If the lot of our Advent preachers should be among the Turks, undoubtedly they would contend for the observance of the sixth day of the week; but as this is not the case, and as they dread to take a public stand so singular and peculiar as the observance of the Lord's day would place them in, the next subterfuge is the no-Sabbath ground. I am glad we have found the through train, and if we continue faithful, we'll sing among the redeemed in the kingdom of God, beyond this world's confusion.

On our return from Massachusetts we visited the brethren in Atholl. We had an extra time there, some embraced the truth. God will raise up a good company in that place. We shall soon visit the brethren in Canada if the Lord permit. The appointment will be given through the REVIEW AND HERALD.

Tonching my own prosperity, I would say, I have made some advancement in the heavenly way of late. Never did the way look more narrow to me than now. Sometimes when I have a view of the way, my soul cries out, Let the saints go through; but as for me it is a doubtful case. But when I view the City just before us, and compare it with this world, where confusion is trampling on the heels of confusion, my soul cries out, By the grace of God I'll conquer the world, the flesh and the devil, escape the plagues of the damned, and shout victory with all the saints in the City of our God.

WM. S. INGRAHAM.

Woolcott, Vt., May 15th, 1852.

From Bro. Edson.

DEAR BRO. WHITE: Our Conference in this place has just closed. The meeting has been one of much interest and profit to the dear saints in this place. The company of believers are united, and firmly settled in the present truth. The Word has had free course, and has run and been glorified. The blessing of heaven has rested upon the meeting. The sweet Spirit of the Lord has rested upon his people, and the melting power of his love has caused them to rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory, and to offer the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving to God. An addition was made to the number of Sabbath-keepers.

Some came with their minds prejudiced against his way which is every where spoken against, but felt their prejudice in a measure give way, and some confessed that God was with this people of a truth. The standard is planted here, and we are sure that the saints of God will rally around it. The Lord is at work in this region of country, bringing out, and making manifest his people. May the Lord speed the truth is my prayer.

HIRAM EDSON.

Bangor, N. Y., May 31st, 1852.

From Bro. Holt.

DEAR BRO. WHITE: The Conference in this place has closed. This meeting I believe was of divine appointment, and the blessing of God attended it. A goodly number came together in the spirit of meekness, union and love. There are more Sabbath-keepers in this region than I expected to find, and the number is increasing. Some at the meeting confessed their faith in the present truth for the first time, and their intention to obey it. The work of the Lord is moving forward gloriously; the truth has taken deep root in some hearts, and others are under deep conviction. The heart of the fathers are turned to their children, and the heart of the children to their fathers.

The Conference was held at the house of Bro. Lewis Haskell. Bro. and Sister H., with their four daughters, are all in the truth. The Ark of the Lord rests in their house. The truth of God had free course, the Spirit was poured out freely, and the brethren were much blest and encouraged. Finally the truth bore away the victory, and the children of the Lord triumphed.

Bro. and Sr. Penoyer have been afflicted by the death of their eldest daughter, aged seventeen years. She embraced the Sabbath last winter, after Bro. Rhodes had passed that way, and continued steadfast in the present truth until she fell asleep in Jesus a few days since.

G. W. HOLT.

Norfolk, N. Y., May 29th, 1852.

From Sister Dow.

DEAR BRO. WHITE: In conversation with a friend not long since, upon the importance of keeping the commandments of God, it was remarked as follows: "The seventh-day folks are calculating to be saved by the law. I look to the gospel for salvation." Now I would inquire, Can any one have a well grounded hope of salvation by the gospel, who does not yield willing obedience to the requirements of the gospel? And what are these requirements? Are they anything more or less than the "righteousness of the law fulfilled in those who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit?" Those who delight in the law of the Lord have no other gods before them, consequently, they are ever ready to make "a covenant with him by sacrifice."

Let us look at a few gospel requisitions, as expressed by the Saviour and his inspired apostles. Says Jesus, "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth;" "Sell that ye have and give alms;" "Be perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." Says the chief Apostle, "Set your affections on things above, not on things on the earth;" "Be not conformed to this world;" "Let each esteem others better than themselves;" "Look not every man on his own things, but also on the things of others." Hear also the disciple whom Jesus loved: "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world;" "He that saith he abideth in him, ought himself also so to walk, even as he walked."

Now methinks the individual who can cheerfully comply with the above, will find nothing grievous in

"The Law of Ten Commandments"

On holy Sinai given."

O, how delightful to contemplate those commands, as a wall of salvation beside the narrow way, "strait as a rule can make it." [Bunyan.] How safe to walk by such a rule, ever looking unto Jesus, without whom we can do nothing.

"O, may my feet ne'er turn astray,
Nor rove nor seek another way."

ELIZABETH DOW.

Newport, N. H., May 25th, 1852.

From Sister Peckham.

DEAR BRO. WHITE: I have been forcibly struck of late in witnessing the confidence some seem to have of entering the kingdom, while living in the violation of the fourth commandment.

I called upon a sick woman a few days since, who has been afflicted with swellings in the head, extremely painful, so that for seven weeks past she said she had realized but one night's natural sleep; and spoke of the wonderful manner in which God had sustained her. Said she had received grace just as she needed, and added, I have had the greatest evidence of my acceptance with God during my affliction that I have ever had; and quoted these words, "Before I was afflicted I went astray, but now keep I thy law."

I carefully introduced the Sabbath, and referred to her sickness as the means, perhaps, that God designed to bring her where these things might reach her. Her bosom began to swell with emotion, and she broke out, saying, "Christ! Christ! He is all to me. He is every thing. Your Sabbaths, away with them. If you have not got the love of God in your soul what good can these things do?"

I replied, we may have the love of God in our souls, and feel that Christ is all to us, yet search for the truth, and try to find out our own errors, that we may put them away. (It seems to me that the love of Christ will constrain us to these things.) She broke out in a strain louder than before, saying, "If I have Jesus Christ formed within, the hope of glory, what do I want more? What more can I have?" Another aged and honorable lady who sat by, joined with her, saying the same words. Now, then, if one commandment is to be discarded, as not worthy of our notice, then others may be disposed of in the same way, and finally no commandment be binding on us. (Under grace as some would have it.)

Another idea conveyed, is, that we cannot observe the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, and at the same time be in the possession of the love of God.—Now is it so, that obedience to God's commandments takes the place of love, and therefore love is made void? I do not understand it so. The Beloved Disciple, John, did not thus comprehend love; for he testifies, saying, "This is the love of God that we keep his commandments." Again, "He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him." And Jesus, himself, says, "If thou wilt enter into life keep the commandments." The apostle James understood it, for he said, Faith without works is dead, being alone. "Show me thy faith without thy works, and I will show thee my faith by my works." So say I.

Now I understand works to be the product of faith and love. We first hear, then believe, next obey.—And what does the keeping of his commandments signify, but to live them out. Then we must necessarily act, which produces works. It is nevertheless, the fruit of faith and love, (for a person would not be apt to bring forth fruit so contrary to the carnal nature if he did not love God,) and can be called nothing more nor less than obedience. Then if we must do the things he requires, in order to prove to God that we love him, I know of no way to excuse myself when he says, The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God, in it thou shalt not do any work; but to rest "according to the commandment." Neither dare I call the observance of the Sabbath "unnecessary works," that has been or ought to be done away.

I would ask how a person can, willingly or knowingly, reject even the least of God's commandments, and maintain justification through Christ. Did Jesus die to justify us in sin, or to justify for past sins, when we should have thoroughly amended our ways and our doings? To me the latter seems more reasonable. Paul says "sin is the transgression of the law." What law? It cannot be that law of rites and ceremonies which only pointed to Christ, of which he is the end for righteousness to every one that believeth, and which was nailed to his cross; but it must be that law which convinced Paul that he was a sinner, slew him, and led him to cry out, "O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" It convinced him of sin and justly condemn-

ed him, and he pronounced it holy, just and good, (yet it could not take away past sins; but Paul found a man that could, that man Jesus, who was crucified for our offences, that satisfied the claims of that law which required the death of every transgressor.)—Then if sin is the transgression of that law, how can we be justified from our sins until we cease to violate any part of it? If we would comprehend the extent, the length and breadth of the claims of that law on us, we must go to the life and teachings of Jesus. He fulfilled it, that is lived it out, and by so doing, magnified it and made it honorable. It does not say that he did it "away," but "made it honorable."

I praise the Lord that he lets a little light shine into my poor heart in this time of Satan's triumph.—One more idea from the expression, "If I have Jesus Christ formed within, the hope of glory, what more can I have?" While opposing some of his sayings, seems to me is flattering one's self that as soon as God has forgiven their past sins, and they are made to rejoice in Christ Jesus, because of his mercy towards them, they are then perfect in wisdom and knowledge, and are prepared to carry out the designs of God without further search.

Now it seems to me that then is the time that we should begin to search the scriptures diligently for truth, that we may obey and please him who hath called us to the fellowship of his Son, lest we be again brought into condemnation. Peter, no doubt, had Jesus Christ formed within, yet he was not perfect in knowledge or understanding. No doubt, however, but he was willing to be convinced of his errors, that he might repent of them. So must we be. I feel like trying every point, and every principle, and see if it is on a good foundation, that when the storm of the seven last plagues shall descend, to sweep away the refuge of lies and the hiding-places, my house may stand, being founded on the rock. O I do want to do his will, work for him, and have respect unto all his commandments, statutes and judgments. He is good and faithful in all his sayings. My soul is witness to it. His promises never fail. Whatever we ask we receive, because we keep his commandments, and he will withhold no good thing from them that walk uprightly.

S. PECKHAM.

Volney, N. Y., May 7th, 1852.

From Bro. Hutchins.

DEAR BRO. WHITE: Though not personally acquainted with you, yet I trust you will allow me a space in the columns of the *Review and Herald*, sufficient to declare some things that God has done for my soul within a few months past. For I fain would publish them from the burning equator to the icy poles! I have professed to be a follower of Christ for twelve years, and have had, within that time, some strong evidences that God, for Christ's sake, had forgiven my sins; and from a sense of duty, I have been preaching most of the time for five years past with the F. W. Baptist denomination.

Last July, I met for the first time with some of the dear brethren at Waterbury, who were firm believers in the third angel's message. Up to that time I had not so much as heard whether there was any third angel's message, having never formed much acquaintance with the Advent people or their views.—But one thing I did know, and had known it for years, that there was a famine for the bread of life in the land where I had traveled and lived.

Notwithstanding the idea of keeping the seventh day as the Sabbath, at that time seemed quite unnecessary to me. Yet I could not resist the impression that God was with, and blessed this people in their meetings of worship, abundantly. I was soon led to examine closely the evidence offered and urged for the observance of the first, instead of the seventh day, as the Sabbath; and to compare them with the plain declarations of God's holy word. And, as might be expected as a natural result, I was soon stoutly convicted in my heart, that "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord."

Sometime in the month of August, I listened with much interest, to two lectures delivered on the sub-

