

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, AUGUST 5, 1852.

No. 7.

JOSEPH BATES, J. N. ANDREWS }
and JOSEPH BAKER, } *Publishing Committee.*
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.)

HAVE COURAGE.

BY R. F. COTTRELL.

O, LIFT up your heads, your redemption draws near,
Let nothing discourage, or cause you to fear;
Our Saviour is faithful, his promise is sure
To all who bear trials, hold fast and endure.

Well may you have courage, your cause is the Lord's,
Attested by signs, and with Scripture accords;
And though all the powers of the Dragon assail,
The truth, it is mighty, 't will surely prevail.

Hold fast what thou hast, nor e'er lay it down;
Firm endure to the end, that none take thy crown;
The spirits of darkness will seek to devour,
But Jesus and angels excel them in power.

Rich promise to all who shall now overcome!
To be a firm pillar in God's sacred dome,
Inscribed with his name and the Son of his love,
And that of the City which comes from above.

Mill Grove, N. Y.

THE SABBATH.

LETTERS TO O. R. L. CROZIER.—NO. VII.

(Concluded.)

DEAR SIR:—In exposing the folly of the view that God abolished the ten commandments, and then re-enacted nine of them, the review of your Bible class report spoke as follows:

"No man has yet explained how, or by what means the law of God was re-enacted. Most have taken it for granted, because the last six commandments are several times quoted in the New Testament, that they are certainly re-enacted. But notice these points:—(1.) The first four are not quoted in the New Testament. Then they are not re-enacted. (2.) The last six are several times quoted. Then they are several times re-enacted. (3.) When Christ quoted from the law of God, it was not in the form of a re-enactment; but as a quotation from the law of Jehovah. (4.) But since Christ quoted a part of the law, the whole law has been abolished. (5.) When the apostles quoted the law of God, they quoted from the original law and not from a revised edition of Jehovah's constitution. And their quotations are proof, not of the re-enactment of God's law, but of its perpetuity.—Rom. vii, 12; Eph. vi, 2; James ii, 8—12. (6.) There is no re-enactment of God's law recorded in the Bible. Hence, if the law of Jehovah has been abrogated, there is no moral law! We now request C. to explain how men are as much under moral restraint as before the royal law of the King Eternal was annulled."

Your seventh article commences with a notice of this language. It will be seen, however, that you do not attempt to meet the exposure of this folly, but merely quote a single sentence, and do not notice the points presented in the *Review*. You speak thus:

"The *Review* says, 'The first four of the ten commandments are not quoted in the New Testament.'—If this is so, then certainly the Sabbath commandment is not quoted in the New Testament, for that was the fourth of the ten. But its object is, to place the fourth commandment on precisely the same footing as the first three; and as they are by universal

consent established by the New Testament, in which, as the *Review* would have us believe, they are incorporated only by implication, it hopes to bring in the fourth on the strength of the first three. This is a tacit admission of what we have stated, viz: that there is not a precept or statement in the New Testament that enjoins the observance of the Sabbath. On what authority then does the *Review* enjoin it?"

I pass over your misstatement of my "object," viz: an exposure of the folly of those who teach that God abolished the ten commandments and re-enacted nine of them,—and remark that your further statement is absolutely false. We have never taken the ground that any of the commandments rest upon implication, but have repeatedly shown that they were not only the unabolished commandments of Jehovah, (a fact that clothes them with all possible authority,) but that they were also solemnly enjoined by Christ.—This is the authority on which we enjoin the fourth, and all the other commandments.

But I inquire into the manner in which the first three commandments exist. That they rest upon one of two foundations, may be seen at a glance.

(1.) On their original authority as the unabolished commandments of Jehovah.

(2.) Or they have been abolished, and now rest upon re-enactment as their authority.

But in the whole New Testament, there is nothing that looks like their re-enactment; and in your third article, you expressly denied such a doctrine. Hence, they exist on their original authority, or they do not exist at all. But if they exist upon their original authority, the decalogue has not been abolished! We shall presently notice the manner in which you enforce the commandments. Your next statement, which is also false, is as follows:

"But it will reply, Then the first three are not enjoined by the New Testament. Let us see if the New Testament treats the first three commandments as it does the fourth."

We have never rested the authority of a single commandment upon its re-enactment in the New Testament; for no such re-enactment exists; but have ever rested them upon the original authority of God, the Father, who gave them; yet the New Testament does solemnly enjoin obedience to the commandments.

But you rest the commandments upon "re-affirmation," and present, as proof, that the New Testament re-affirms the first commandment, Luke iv, 8; words, which in resisting the Devil, Christ quoted, not from the commandment, but from Deut. vi. And as further proof, Rev. xix, 10; xxii, 8, where the angel forbids the worship of himself, and commands John to worship God.

If the first commandment was "abolished, done away, superseded," it is certain that what is here presented, would but poorly supply its lack. The words used by our Lord, in resisting the Devil, are the only words of his that you produce as proof, that Christ re-affirmed the first commandment, and they are not quoted from the decalogue, but from something else! Christ's act of establishing the new constitution by "naming and enforcing" the first commandment, is certainly very vague, consisting only of the quotation of a text in resisting the Devil, and can hardly, even in your own estimation, justify your doctrine that the commandments are done away by a better law!

But in showing the re-affirmation of the second commandment, you do not attempt to offer any thing from the words of Christ, (notwithstanding, you stated in your report, that Christ named and enforced all the commandments but the fourth,) but you cite

as a re-affirmation of it, the words of the apostles, [Acts xv, 20, 29; xvii, 16—31; 1 John v, 21,] spoken from 20 to 30 years after the crucifixion.

Now, with regard to these texts, I remark, that the apostles either forbade idolatry on the authority of the second precept of God's great constitution, or they believed that that precept had been abolished, and proceeded to enact one to take its place in the new constitution.

If you take the first of these positions, then the original constitution had not been "done away, abolished;" but if you take the second, then a space of from 20 to 60 years elapsed between the abolition of the second commandment of Jehovah, and the establishment of this apostolic precept in its stead! Whether this could be called Christ's "better law," given to supersede the original precept of the Father, I leave to yourself.

But to what law were men amenable, with reference to idolatry, in that period of 20 years between the abolition of the ten commandments, and the enactment of this precept by the apostles?

For a re-affirmation of the third commandment, you quote the words of the Lord's prayer, [Matt. vi, 9,] "Hallowed be thy name;" an expression of reverence and filial awe on the part of those who approach Jehovah. But if the precept forbidding the profanation of the name of God, were "done away, abolished," how sadly would its loss be felt for all that the Lord's prayer contains to supply its place. And how evident it is, that this very expression "grows out of the unabolished commandment, which says, 'Thou shalt not take my name in vain.' You have, also, another evidence that Christ re-affirmed the third commandment, and that is the very evidence, which, in your sixth article, you adduced as proof, that he "placed himself in strong contrast" with it, "set it aside, superseded it!" You refer to Matt. v, 33—37. The precept, however, which Christ referred to, was not the third commandment, but was a statute from Lev. xix, which forbids a false oath.

You next ask for the re-affirmation of the fourth commandment, and assure your readers that they need not keep that commandment unless the New Testament gives it again.

This is but dodging the real question. It is not, Has God re-enacted either or all of the commandments? but, Has he abolished them? This is the point, and on this I need not say you have most signally failed. The Sabbath is binding without re-enactment in the New Testament:

(1.) Unless it can be proved that the ten commandments are abolished.

(2.) Or the fourth one changed.

(3.) Or God's object in making the Sabbath in Paradise for the human family defeated by the gospel, and only a portion of our race have it.

But mark a few of the facts already noted:

(1.) There is no text in the New Testament that tells us that God's constitution is abolished, or that either of the ten commandments are done away.

(2.) But the New Testament does teach the perpetuity of the great constitution.

(3.) And it does solemnly enjoin the keeping of the commandments.

I pass over the testimony of Christ, that the Sabbath was made for man, also Luke's recognition of the fourth commandment [Luke xxiii, 56] many years after you say that it was abolished, and if I may use your expression, point you to Christ's solemn "re-affirmation" of all the commandments. Matt. v, 19; xix, 17.

The fact that the Sabbath was instituted at Creation, is proof positive that it was made for Adam and his posterity, and that it was not made in the wilderness of Sin for the Hebrews!

In examining your position on Rom. xiv, the *Review* presented as worthy of notice, the remarks of Dr. Edwards in his *First-day Sabbath Manual*.—Your reply to them consists in pronouncing them of no consequence, mere assertion, and the like. And you affirm that Sabbath-keepers are driven to a fearful extremity to support their views. But if your course of argument is a proper one, any theory could be maintained without difficulty, as any one could suppress the arguments of an opponent, and pronounce them mere assertion. But I commend to you the following from the *Sabbath Manual* as worthy of a better reply:

"Some, after they embraced the Gospel, thought that the ceremonial as well as the moral laws were binding. Others, more enlightened, thought that they were not. This led to contention among them. Paul, in the fourteenth chapter of Romans, presented such considerations as were adopted to lead them, in this matter, to a right decision.

"One man," he says, "esteemeth one day above another. Another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it." Both mean to honor God, and he will accept them. But what day does he speak of?—'The Sabbath' of the fourth commandment, associated by God inseparably with the moral laws? Read the connection. What is it? Is it, one man believeth he must worship Jehovah; another who is weak, worshipeth idols? One believeth that he must not commit murder, idolatry or theft, and another thinks he may? Were those the laws about which they were contending, and with which were connected the days that he speaks of? No: about those laws there was no dispute.

But, "one believeth that he may eat all things," (which are nourishing, whether allowed in the ceremonial law, which regulated such things, or not,) "another, who is weak, eateth herbs. Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not; and let not him that eateth not judge him that eateth, for God hath received him." These were the laws about which they were contending, and with regard to which the Apostle was giving them instructions. It was not the moral, but the ceremonial laws; and the days spoken of were those which are connected, not with the former, but with the latter.

So, in the second chapter of Colossians, "Let no man judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbaths."—The sabbaths spoken of, are not 'the Sabbath' associated with, Thou shalt not commit murder, or adultery, or theft; but the sabbaths associated with meats and drinks, and new moons, which were, indeed, shadows of things to come. But to take what he said about these sabbaths which were associated by God with ceremonial laws, and which the Apostle himself in this very discourse, associates with them, and apply it as some have done, to 'THE SABBATH' which God associated with moral laws, is wrong." Pages 134, 135, 136.

You affirm that the *Review*, in introducing the expression in Ex. xvi, that the people should gather a certain quantity of manna "every day," as calculated to throw light on the expression, "another esteemeth every day alike," has been guilty of perversion. Your reason is, that while verse four says that the people should gather a certain rate every day, verse five says that on the sixth day they should prepare that which they bring in, and it should be twice as much as they gather daily. And verses 25 and 26 except the Sabbath, on which they should not gather at all.

But to show how little sincerity you could have in pointing out the double quantity, on the sixth day as an exception to the act of gathering a certain rate every day, I need only remark, that you believe that they gathered the same on the sixth day as on the other days, and that God miraculously doubled it! And

with regard to the seventh day, on which they were not to gather, I remark, that such a statement was not made to the people until the Sabbath itself drew on.

I believe, indeed, in accordance with verse 22, that the children of Israel voluntarily gathered a double quantity of manna on the sixth day; but it is evident from verse 23, that Moses had not previously said any thing of the kind to them; so that the direction that they should gather a certain rate EVERY day had not been qualified to the people, and yet it did not authorize them to violate the Sabbath.

This chapter was referred to as direct proof that the expression "every day," does not necessarily include that day, which at Creation Jehovah hallowed and reserved to himself. We shall presently notice that the expression as used by Paul is necessarily limited by the subject of discourse.

I pass over your remarks respecting the folly, blindness and perverseness of the *Review*, merely remarking that such is a cheap method of supplying the lack of Bible argument.

You speak of the meaning of Rom. xiv, 5, as obvious and plain. I answer, yes. And the subject of discourse is such that it is highly unreasonable to apply these remarks to the moral law.

If there is any propriety in applying the words of Paul, in Rom. xiv, to the abolition of the great constitution, then you have not perverted them. But if his whole subject is the law of carnal ordinances, as in Col. ii, then you have greatly erred.

Now what is Paul's theme in Rom. xiv? Is it the commandments of God? Not a word respecting them. He says, "One believeth that he may eat all things, another who is weak eateth herbs." And in verse 14 he declares that there is no distinction between clean and unclean meats. Now there was a law which made such distinctions; but that was the middle wall of partition between Jews and Gentiles, [Eph. ii,] and not the constitution of God's religious system, which said nothing on the subject. Connected with these meats, drinks &c., were many days of feasts, new moons, annual sabbaths and the like, which had no other existence than that which the law of carnal ordinances gave them. Hence, the same act that destroyed the distinction between meats, clean and unclean, destroyed all the authority on which these things rested. Thenceforth they were matters of indifference.

Now the whole subject of Paul's discourse forbids the idea that he had the great unabolished constitution of Jehovah before him; for that had nothing to do with these matters. But in the preceding chapter he does quote its last division, and acknowledges its authority.

When Paul speaks of those who "eat not" and that put a difference in days, and of those that do eat, and do not put this difference in days, reason, as well as Scripture requires that we understand him to refer to that law which regulated all this. And when it is further seen that every fact in the New Testament shows that God's great constitution is unabolished, the character of the effort that would break down its fourth precept, may be seen in the true light.

With how much propriety do you attempt to prove the abolition of the fourth commandment, by citing a portion of Scripture whose very face points us to the law that regulated meats and drinks?

Your eighth article opens with further remarks on this chapter. You quote a single sentence from the *Review*, and, overlooking the fact that the *Review* has shown from the entire testimony of the New Testament, the perpetuity of God's constitution, you affirm that I have hunted through the whole book for a single text with which to correct Paul. The following is a good specimen of your candor:

"As a last resort, it flees to the mystic isle of Patmos, and there it hears the beloved disciple say, that while he was wrapt in the visions of the future he 'was in the Spirit on the Lord's day.' By the aid of its fancy it conjectures that the venerable prophet meant the Seventh Day Sabbath; and the necessity of the case transforms this conjecture into a direct and positive testimony" that in reading Paul's language in Rom. xiv, 5, we must make an exception so as to

make it enforce the observance of the Seventh Day Sabbath. And so confident is it in the correctness of its conjecture, that it is ready to judge the whole world by it: as though great boldness in a doubtful position would make it certainly correct, or at least, make others think it correct."

With these remarks of yours, please contrast the words of the *Review*. How little propriety there is in your affirmation respecting "conjectures," "judging" &c., appears from its words, which are as follows:

"But as a direct and positive testimony that when he saith 'every day alike' Jehovah's Rest day is excepted, we introduce Rev. i, 10. 'I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day.' This is a direct testimony to the fact that in the GOSPEL DISPENSATION, one day is still claimed by God. As we do not read in any place (except in the 'FATHERS' who prepared the way for the great apostasy by adding tradition to the word of God) that Jehovah has 'put away' his holy day and chosen another, we submit the following testimony as to what is the Lord's day. Gen. ii, 3. 'God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it.' Ex. xvi, 23. 'The rest of the Holy Sabbath unto the Lord.' Ex. xx, 8. 'Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy.' Isa. lviii, 13. 'My holy day.' 'The holy of the Lord, honorable.' Mark ii, 28. 'The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath.' Rev. i, 10. 'I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day.'"

But as it is necessary for you to explain away this testimony in some manner, you undertake to prove that the day is a mystic day, just as you call the isle, a mystic isle.

You state that this is the only instance in which the phrase occurs in the New Testament, but that it occurs frequently in the Old Testament, and means a season of special visitation, or the great day, yet to come. Wherefore you conclude that it means in this text, the great day of God's wrath,—the thousand years.

Your mystic isle, and mystic day, are in admirable keeping, and nothing is wanted to complete the picture except to present us also with a mystic John.—But let us see if you have not made some false statements.

(1.) You state that the phrase Lord's day occurs frequently in the Old Testament. This statement is false; though it is a fact that the Old Testament tells us what day God calls his, [Isa. lviii, 13,] and also how it happened that he reserved one day to himself. Gen. ii, 1—3; Ex. xx, 8—11.

(2.) But if you say that the Lord's day means the same as the day of the Lord, and that the latter phrase often occurs in the Old Testament then I remark, that you have made a false statement respecting the New Testament as it there occurs several times. 1 Thess. v, 2; 2 Pet. iii, 10, 12.

In what sense John could, according to your theory, have a vision on the great day of the Lord—the thousand years, which are even yet future, we now proceed to inquire.

(1.) It is not only impossible for a prophet 1800 years since to be in vision on a period of time not even yet arrived, but I know of nothing in all the Bible, to justify such an idea.

(2.) That John was not standing in vision mid the events of the day of God is evident from the reading of the first chapter. The single word "hereafter" in verse 19, which included the events of the future down to the eternal reign of the saints, ought to correct for ever this strange idea.

(3.) But to see the events of the day of the Lord pass before one in vision, and to be in vision on that day, are two widely different things. The first is frequent in God's dealings with the prophets; the last is utterly impossible until that day actually arrives.

(4.) The place and the date as given by John are simple and literal. He was in vision in the isle of Patmos, on the Lord's day.

But as if you anticipated that such a strange doctrine would be exposed, you remark, that if in a subordinate sense, this is applied to one of the days of the week, you think there is better reason to apply it to Sunday than to any other day, because on that day Christ was raised from the dead. And it is proper to

obey the laws of the land, and needful to be uniform in the day of worship, &c.

It is a fact that the term Lord's day is now applied to Sunday; few persons, however, are aware who gave Sunday this appellation. "The history of the Sabbath" on the authority of Lucius' Eccl. Hist. Cent. 4, p. 740, makes the following statement:

"To give the more solemnity to the first day of the week, Sylvester, who was bishop of Rome while Constantine was Emperor, changed the name of Sunday, giving it the more imposing title of Lord's day."

The masses have followed in the wake of the great apostasy, [2 Thess. ii.] and hence "the laws of the land" uphold this papal institution, and the body of professed Christians are united in its observance.—You attempt to justify the act of following a multitude to do evil, [that is, to reject the commandment of God in order to keep in its place this tradition of the Elders,] by saying that Christ was raised from the dead on that day.

But were you on the opposite side of the globe where the mass observe Friday, the sabbath which Mahomet instituted, you could raise just as good a plea for violating the fourth commandment to follow them, by simply asserting that Friday on which Christ poured out his most precious blood for our redemption is the Lord's day.

But as God has said nothing of the kind respecting either of these days, those who thus plead to justify themselves in following Mahomet or "the beast," are not to be regarded.

The Lord of the Sabbath was crucified between two thieves; in like manner has the Sabbath itself been crucified between two thieves, the sixth and the first day of the week.

The Scriptures are explicit respecting the day, which, in the beginning, God reserved to himself, and thenceforward throughout the Bible calls his holy day. Gen. ii, 1—3; Ex. xx, 8—11; Isa. lviii, 13; Mark ii, 27; Rev. i, 10. If you have any proof that Jehovah has put away his holy day and chosen another, I call upon you to present it. But as I know well that you can present nothing of the kind from the Bible, I call upon you to cease this unholy warfare upon the "Holy of the Lord and Honorable," the Sabbath.

Rev. i, 10 contains, therefore, direct testimony that John did esteem one day the Lord's day, and did not "esteem every day" such. Now one of two things are certain: either the Lord's day is excepted by Paul, or Paul and John stand in array. You can pour out your ridicule and anathemas upon John if you wish; the *Review* only believes his testimony. But in the language of J. B. Cook, I remark, "All the Bible is all the truth."

I agree with you that it is necessary to have a stated day for worship. But it is not necessary, in order to have this, that we take the day set apart by "the beast;" no, the Sabbath of the Lord made for man, is quite as good.

You ridicule the *Review* for referring Paul's language in Rom. xiv, to the hand-writing of ordinances, that regulated meats, and drinks and days, and not to the great, unabolished constitution. And finally you exhort your "dear reader trust not your salvation in such reckless hands." The "reckless hands" referred to, would do and teach the commandments, the one who utters such an exhortation, would break them and teach men so. The reader can choose for himself.

In your sixth article, after attempting to prove that Christ placed himself in strong contrast with the decalogue, and did it away, or superseded it, you remarked that this justified Rom. xiv. Fearful justification! purchased at the expense of the commandments of God. But your whole effort was exposed in my last letter; hence, your use of Rom. xiv, is unjustifiable.

The review of your Bible class report exposed at some length your remarks on the two laws. This you pass in silence.

In order to show the character of your reply, it is necessary to present next, an extract from the *Review*. It begins with an extract from your report, and appends a reply. It is as follows:

"In reference to the position of the New Testament on the Sabbath question, two points were made: 1.

Neither the Saviour nor any of his apostles ever enforced the Sabbath precept. 2. In all the catalogues of sins contained in the New Testament, Sabbath-breaking is not once named.—In view of these facts, it was claimed that no Christian could be required to keep the Sabbath day."

(1.) The above reflects much greater credit upon the shrewdness of the writer, than it does upon his candor in summing up so important a question. The fourth commandment is a part of the royal law, and it is his part to get it out, not ours to insert it a second time. The idea that the moral law of God needs to be enforced by the Son of God, or by any of his apostles, is a singular, and in the highest degree absurd idea! Christ often took the law of God to enforce what he said himself, and so did the apostles!

But as marvels will never cease, we are given to understand that what Christ and his apostles did not enforce, is not binding on us as Christians. And the Sabbath precept having never been quoted directly by Christ or his apostles, we are not as Christians under obligation to keep it. Those who make this assertion seem not to have weighed it very well. The first four are not quoted; and we as Christians are not "required to keep them!" But to show how little weight it would have, had our Lord quoted the fourth commandment several times, we add, that the last six, a part of which he quoted several times, are all abolished, together with the first four which he did not quote, all of which they attempt to prove from 2 Cor. iii. So that since that time we have a new law of God. That God who gave his holy law in person and himself wrote it, has abolished it, to reenact it either through Christ or his apostles. Not approving the expression, we do not say that Christ and his apostles enforced the law, for how could the Son who says, "My Father is greater than I," much more how could the apostles who were not so great as him who sent them, enforce the law of Jehovah? But on the strength of their testimony, we do declare that they most solemnly teach its perpetuity, and its immutability. Matt. v, 17—19; xxii, 35—40; Luke xvi, 17; Rom. iii, 31; vii, 7—25; viii, 1—7; 1 Cor. ix, 21; James ii, 8—12; 1 John iii, 4, 5.

(2.) The catalogue of sins named in the New Testament, contain nothing that the law of God does not show to be sinful. But they may be used to justify other sins as well as the sin of Sabbath-breaking.—The sin of slave-holding is not named, unless by implication, the sin of Polygamy is certainly not noticed distinctly, yet both these sins were very general in the apostles days, and certainly very heinous. The New Testament never yet offered its catalogue of sins as a complete list, for some omit to name many grievous sins, and all omit some that are very heinous.—But mark! there is a standard somewhere by which these things are shown to be sins. We ask, what is it? Now will you agree to believe the New Testament? If so, we pledge ourselves to show that it is that much hated law of God.

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. iii, 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 never can be improved, even by Omnipotence. Ti. i, 2; Rom. vii, 12.

It is enough that the apostles have told us what the standard is by which sin is shown; we take the standard, and tell any man who breaks the law of God, either the fourth, the seventh, or the eighth commandment, he is a sinner, and 'the wages of sin is death!' We do not rebuke a man for an act of sin, by turning to any of the catalogues of sin; we take the standard by which those acts are shown to be sinful and read to him, 'thus saith the Lord!'

Let me repeat the doctrine: The law of God is the only standard by which the acts of men as moral beings, are shown to be either righteous or wicked in the sight of God. ~~Those~~ Those who can present any other standard are requested to do it. (1.) The

New Testament distinctly teaches the doctrine. Rom. iii, 20; vii, 7; 1 John iii, 4. (2.) It pronounces this standard perfect. Rom. vii, 12; James ii, 8—12; i, 25. (3.) But for the benefit of those who claim that the New Testament furnishes us with another standard by which sin is shown, besides the law of God, we ask that this imaginary standard may be tested with this question: Does the New Testament show it to be wrong for a man to marry his sister, or his daughter? Shall I be answered as I was sometime since, 'Such an act would not be sinful?' Those who wish to see this subject defined, can read it at length, in Lev. xviii. That the abominations there described are not mere Jewish pollutions, is evident from the fact that the land of Palestine was said to vomit out its first inhabitants on account of these things!

With the following points from the New Testament, we submit the question:

1. The perpetuity and immutability of the law of God is distinctly taught.
2. The Law of God is made the standard by which sin is shown.
3. Redemption from its fearful condemnation by the death of God's only Son, lays us under infinitely stronger obligations to keep it."

In replying to the above, you quote the extract from yourself, and the first short paragraph from the reply of the *Review*; (the longest extract, however, which you have ever made;) but you keep out of sight all the leading arguments of the *Review*, and not even notice one of the brief points made by it in summing up the matter.

Because I stated in the paragraph which you quote, that the moral law which Christ came to obey in all its requirements, and then to submit to its curse and die for the unjust, did not need to be enforced by him, as it already possessed the highest authority and himself was made under it, you affirm that I concede that the New Testament does not require the keeping of the fourth commandment. Those who will read the above extract from the *Review* can judge for themselves.

You next quote from the second paragraph its first sentence, and then attempt to wrest it. Willfully overlooking the statement in the same paragraph, that Christ solemnly taught the perpetuity and immutability of the commandments. Your language, that blind superstition will carry its willing victim to fearful lengths, is not inappropriate to your own case.

You cite the words of the Father requiring us to hear the Son; also the words of Moses to the same effect. Acts iii, 22—24.

I answer, we have ever manifested a willingness to hear him as the great expounder of his Father's law. He says that "the Sabbath was made for man;" which gives us a definite idea of its great design, and causes us to love it as something made for us. He says again, "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments. We have heard him in this; but those who will not hear him as affirmed in the text just quoted by yourself, shall be destroyed from among the people. He says, also, that those who do and teach the commandments shall be highly esteemed in the reign of heaven; we have heard him in this, and his words encourage us, as we are compelled to meet the scorn of those who break them and teach men so. And now if you have heard him say that we need not keep the fourth commandment, we will act accordingly. But as you cannot produce such a text will you as he has said, "keep the commandments?"

You next style the *Review*, Moses' disciple. I answer, No Sir. In doing and teaching the commandments we are the disciples of Jesus Christ. But those who break them and teach men so, are neither the disciples of Moses nor of Jesus.

You are the one that refuses to hear Christ on the commandments; and even his statement respecting the design of the Sabbath, is of less importance with you than an inference from the words of Moses.

In keeping "the commandments of God and the testimony of Jesus Christ," we are, according to yourself, rushing "madly back from the light of the gospel to the cloudy Sinai;" but according to the word of God, we are on our way to the Holy City. "Let God be true, but every man a liar."

Your remarks that we reject Christ's testimony, and admit that we have a different gospel from Christ and his apostles, are false. And with this you attempt to comfort "fearful souls!"

To those of your readers, who would say, with the man in the parable, "I pray thee have me excused," it is doubtless very comforting to be soothed with the idea that they need not obey the cross of present truth. But it will not be comforting to awake in the day of God to the fearful fact that they were soothed with a falsehood, comforted with a lie.

The language of the *Review* can be wrested only in a willful manner. Christ acknowledged the authority of the moral law, and solemnly enjoined obedience to the commandments.

In the preceding extract from the review of your report, you were requested to present another complete standard of holiness beside the moral law. You think that you did this in your sixth article, where you endeavored to place Christ in strong contrast with the sixth and seventh precepts of the decalogue, and also with the second of the two great commandments. The character of your effort was shown in letter vi.

Styling the ten commandments the law of Moses, you next remark:

"We are under the law to Christ, but if we are under the law of Moses we are under the curse." Gal. iii, 10.

I answer, those who are living in violation of the law of God, are under the law, and under its fearful curse. Rom. iii, 19. Those who have been pardoned through the blood of Jesus, are UNDER THE LAW to Christ, and live, through grace, in the fulfillment of its righteous precepts. Rom. xiii, 8-10; viii, 4; James ii, 8-12.

You quote the following sentence from the *Review*, and append to it the remark which follows it:

"We ask C. if Christ did not break the law in violating the fourth commandment before it was abolished?"
No, Christ was never subject to the Sabbath; he was its Lord."

Let me illustrate the above: Jesus Christ is the Lord of the Sabbath; therefore, he was at liberty to violate the fourth commandment. Answer: God is the "God of truth;" but is he, therefore, at liberty to violate the truth? No, Sir. He is the God of truth, indeed, but for that very reason, "God cannot lie."

Without notice, you next pass over something more than a column of the review of your report, in which several of your statements, little short of direct falsehood, were exposed. You then cite a remark of the *Review*, respecting the unfairness of your report; and reply, that the *Review's* distorted expositions, groundless inferences, and unreasonable assertions have not much enlightened you. I need only reply to this, that it is a thankless task to expose the errors of any man, and I did not expect your approbation as my reward. You next speak as follows:

"We confess we cannot see the Sabbath in the word 'law' wherever it occurs, like the *Review* can: hence, we did not notice every text that has that word in it. Nor did we suppose that the word 'law' in the New Testament, always means God's law in the sense of the *Review's* language above. If we had, we should have noticed and enforced the following: Acts xiii, 39; xv, 5, 24; xxi, 20; xxii, 3, 4; Rom. ii, 25."

Now it is a fact, that one of the same apostles, who did not give commandment concerning the observance of circumcision and the law of Moses, did give commandment concerning the royal law, in which are the commandments of God. Compare Acts xxi, 18-25; James ii, 8-12. You confess, indeed, that you cannot see the Sabbath in these texts; hence, an extended notice is unnecessary.

You cite me, also, to Rom. iii, 20; vii, 4. But if I rightly understood your sixth article, you there affirmed that the law in Rom. iii, and vii is the law of Christ, to which, you say, we are amenable.

You cite me to Rom. iv, 14. This text evinces that poor, guilty man can never be counted righteous in the sight of God, without the grace of God in Christ Jesus. But if it proves that the law of God is abolished, the next verse, which asserts that "where no law is there is no transgression," is positive proof that sin does not now exist. 1 John iii, 4.

You present, also, Rom. ix, 31, 32; Gal. ii, 16; iii, 2, 10, 11. The theme of all these texts is not that the holy, spiritual and just law of God, his great standard of right, has been abolished, but that sinful man, condemned and shown to be guilty by it, must find something to avail for him, or he must receive in his own person, its fearful curse. Christ took its curse upon himself, and by his death, opened the fountain of mercy and salvation for the lost.

That "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness," [Rom. x, 4, 5,] is no evidence that he abolished that law which defines a righteous character, as some vainly imagine; nor yet does it prove that Christ is the end of the law so far as obedi-

ence is concerned. The end of the law, that is, its great design, or object, viz: a character perfectly holy, just and righteous in the sight of God, is obtained by faith in him, whom God hath set forth as a propitiation; and in this sense, charity is said to be the end of the commandment; not the abolition of the commandment, but its great design or object. 1 Timothy i, 5.

Mark, Christ's death avails thus for those only who "believe;" but those who do not avail themselves of his atonement, are left in their sins, under the sentence of the law, and awaiting its penalty—the second death.

Paul teaches the doctrine of justification by faith, but justifying faith did not, in his estimation, set aside the law of God.

"Do we, then, make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law." Rom. iii, 31.

And James shows that such faith must perform the righteous acts of God's law, or it is no better than the faith of devils. James ii. You speak again as follows:

"The *Review* would have its readers believe, that because we advocate the abolition of the Sabbath and the equality of days, we have turned *deists*, or worse, and believe that God has abandoned the whole universe to chance! If it had evidence and argument to defend itself in its position, it would not resort to such means, and hold up such false frights."

I am not certain to what you can refer, as I said nothing about your believing that God had abandoned the Universe to chance. Perhaps, however, you said this to help yourself over the following points in the *Review*:

1. The doctrine of the destruction of the wicked rests upon the perpetuity of the law of God. The wages of sin is death. Rom. vi. Sin is the transgression of the law. 1 John iii; Rom. iv, 15.

2. If the death of Christ destroys the moral law, then the human family are delivered from its fearful sentence, whether they repent or not. This makes the atonement unconditional, hence, it is the real foundation of Universalism. 1 Cor. xv, 3; Matt. xx, 28; John iii, 16.

3. The doctrine that temporal, instead of the second death, is the ultimate penalty of God's law, is the real foundation of the non-resurrection of the wicked. For after the penalty of the law has been inflicted, those who have suffered it, cannot be raised to suffer something else."

If you will disprove either of these points, the *Review* would be interested to see you do it.

It is not necessary that I should again notice your perversion of Col. ii. Your final conclusion is as follows:

"We are now done. The Sabbath brethren rely on a multitude of inferences that have no bearing on the subject; but as they are of importance to them, we felt bound to notice them: this has protracted our articles more than we intended. We had designed to close with a general summary of the evidence on the Sabbath question, but must omit it for the present."

Such a statement as this of yours, comes with but ill grace from one who has kept out of sight nearly every leading argument of the *Review*. Your testimony, however, will doubtless satisfy many, that the *Review* has nothing but inferences to offer. Had you presented its arguments, they could have judged then for themselves.

Deeply have I regretted the course pursued by yourself, yet that the blood of souls be not found upon me, I have deemed it duty to expose it. I know very well that such men as J. B. Cook, yourself and others, who have drawn back from obedience to the fourth commandment, can exert a greater influence against it than those who have never obeyed it. I have loved you both, for the testimony you once bore to the truth of God. My heart has bled to witness your strange course since. But I leave you to the mercy of that God, whose commandments you dare to fight.

If you are resolved to continue in disobedience to God, I respectfully invite you to present, as proposed by yourself, a summary of the evidence on which you rest your hope; but would it not be far better to obey HIM, who said, "REMEMBER THE SABBATH DAY TO KEEP IT HOLY?"

J. N. ANDREWS.

Port Byron, Cayuga Co. N. Y., July, 1852.

OUR WORK is to teach the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus, and from this work, we are determined not to be diverted by those who would preach us.

We cheerfully publish Bro. Bates' reply in this number, that the wrong statements published in the *Harbinger* may be corrected; yet we regret that the space it occupies cannot be filled with matter calculated to feed the flock.

We see by the *Harbinger* for July 31st, that Bro. M. E. Cornell, of Plymouth, Mich., is made to feel the spirit of the "little horn" through that paper. And what has he done?—He has renounced the no-Sabbath heresy, and says, "I see the importance of the third angel's message."

We have not the least idea that he has, as intimated by the *Harbinger*, renounced as "erroneous" the "life and death question, all that his old brethren have written on the advent of Christ, the kingdom, &c." We hope he will let the readers of the *REVIEW AND HERALD* know his real position.

THE REVIEW AND HERALD.

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

ROCHESTER, THURSDAY, AUGUST 5, 1852.

THE FAITH OF JESUS.

"HERE is the patience of the saints, here are they that keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus." Rev. xiv, 12. Perhaps no text of scripture comprises more than this.—The points of vast importance which it contains are, first, the patience of the saints, second, the commandments of God, and third, the faith of Jesus.

It is evident that the time of the patience of the saints is a definite period, as much so as the First, or Second Advent.—And in the prophetic chain of Rev. xiv, its place is after the Judgment hour message, and also that of the second angel.—Its place is after the great disappointment relative to the time of the Lord's coming. Says Paul, "For ye have need of patience, that after ye have done the will of God, ye might receive the promise. For yet a little while and he that shall come will come, and will not tarry." Heb. x, 36, 37. This text is the binder, which fastens the time of the patience of the saints to the period after their disappointment relative to the time of Christ's coming. This waiting, watching period, in which great patience is needed, is however to be but "a little while," and then the opening heavens will reveal Him that is to come and reign. The waiting, watching ones, who have kept the word of his patience, will then shout, "Lo this is our God, we have waited for him, and he will save us." Isa. xxv, 9. In this period of patient waiting, those who "live by faith," keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. The Jews in their blindness reject the faith of Jesus, while many professed Christians in this period of apostasy, on the other hand reject and make void the commandments of God. Both are far from the truth, and if they remain in unbelief must sink to perdition. But says the third angel, "Here are they that keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus." This is the only true and safe position for God's people. "Do we then make void the law [commandments of God] through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law." "For the law is holy, and the commandment holy, just and good.—Among the fables and damning heresies of the last days, is the doctrine that the faith of Jesus abolishes and makes void the commandments of God. Those who advocate this heresy, teach that the commandments of God, mentioned in the New Testament, are not the commandments of God, but the commandments of Christ. But the distinction made by the third angel between the commandments of God [the Father] and the faith of Jesus [the Son] is too plain to be misunderstood.

The faith of Jesus is to be kept, as well as the commandments of God. "Here are they that keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus." This not only shows the distinction between the commandments of the Father and the faith of the Son, but also shows that the faith of Jesus to be kept necessarily embraces the sayings of Christ and the apostles. It embraces all the requirements and doctrines of the New Testament, peculiar to this dispensation. Then the waiting saints, under the message of the third angel, were to keep the Father's ten immutable commandments, also, the sayings of the Son, and his inspired apostles.

We are told by those who teach the abolition of the Father's law, that the commandments of God mentioned in the New Testament, are not the ten, but the requirements of the gospel, such as repentance, faith, baptism and the Lord's supper. But as these, and every other requirement peculiar to the gospel, are all embraced in the faith of Jesus, it is evident that the commandments of God are not the sayings of Christ and his apostles. To assert that the sayings of the Son and his apostles are the commandments of the Father, is as wide from the truth as the old trinitarian absurdity that Jesus Christ is the very and Eternal God. And as the faith of Jesus embraces every requirement peculiar to the gospel, it necessarily follows that the commandments of God, mentioned by the third angel, embrace only the ten precepts of the Father's immutable law which are not peculiar to any one dispensation, but common to all. Having settled this important point and shown the clear distinction between the two, we will now dwell upon the faith of Jesus. Here a wide field opens before us; and may God help us to present the truth with clearness and faithfulness.

We are aware that the faith of Jesus embraces the sufferings, death, resurrection and ascension of Christ, also his priesthood in the True Tabernacle above, including his work of cleansing the Sanctuary since the termination of the 2,300 days, and his coming the second time in glory to reign in judgment. But all this we must pass over at present, and dwell upon that portion of the faith of Jesus that shows our present duty.

We may be instructed relative to our duty, and what is pleasing in the sight of Heaven, by Christ's Sermon on the Mount. Let us weigh well every sentence of the following from the lips of our divine Lord, and see if our lives and acts are such that we may reasonably expect the promised blessings.

"And he opened his mouth, and taught them, saying, blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted.—Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth. Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled. Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy. Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God. Blessed are the peace-makers, for they shall be called the children of God. Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad, for great is your reward in heaven; for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you.

Ye are the salt of the earth; but if the salt have lost its savor, wherewith shall it be salted? It is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men.

Ye are the light of the world. A city that is set on a hill cannot be hid. Neither do men light a candle, and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick, and it giveth light unto all that are in the house. Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven." Matt. v, 2—16.

If we as a people, in all the walks of life, manifest the spirit and good works here approved by our Lord, then we are indeed the "salt of the earth," the "light of the world," a "city that is set on a hill." But if we do not, then we do not keep the "faith of Jesus," and dishonor the cause we profess to love.

Mark well the language of the last verse quoted. "Let your light SO shine before men, that they may see your GOOD WORKS, and glorify your Father which is in heaven."—Many who have light upon the precious truths of the Bible, are so far from God that they do not present them with the tender spirit of Christ; and their own daily walk and conversation is so unlike their Master, so far from the bible standard, that others around them are led to think lightly of the holy religion of Jesus. Such are only a curse to the cause of vital piety, and it would have been better if they had not espoused it. Such let their light so shine before men that they, seeing their bad works and unholy lives, are led to slight God and neglect their own soul's salvation.

Never was there a period when the words of our Lord, "Ye are the light of the world," &c., applied with greater force than at the present. This is an age of apostasy, when the mass of professed Christians are enveloped in gross darkness and drunk with the wine of Babylon. God's holy law is impiously trampled underfoot, and the commandments and traditions of men are exalted in its place. 'O, if ever the disciples of Christ should be a bright light in this benighted world, it is now in this last message, in infinite mercy sent out to rescue souls from the approaching storm of wrath, and fit a people to stand in the day of God.

The truth may be preached with clearness and power, but if the church do not live it out in their lives, our influence as a people, will be nothing. The most powerful preachers are those humble devoted disciples that show by the words of their mouths, the works of their hands, and in their very countenances, that the natural man has been subdued by divine grace, and that they have put on Christ. Such are "manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ." They are living, walking epistles, "read and known of all men." And by their godly lives, unspotted from the world, they carry a mighty influence in favor of the holy religion of Christ. Our strength and only hope of benefiting others, is in being humble and holy, that we may have power with God, and in showing by our daily walk that religion has done something for us. Then our light will so shine before those we hope to benefit, that they, seeing our good works, will be led to glorify God by obeying all the precepts of his holy law.

Our Lord, in his sermon, continues: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets, I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.

Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called 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.—For I say unto you, that except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven." Matt. v, 17—20.

Our Lord well knew that some would think and teach that his coming to this world to die for man, who had broken the Father's law, and was bound by its condemning power, would destroy that law, and therefore instructs to leave off such thoughts. Either God's Son or his law must die, to release man from death. But as his law is as immutable as himself, to maintain his honor, and yet make a way possible to save man, he gave his only begotten Son to die in man's stead, while his law remains unchanged and unabolished, as firm as

the Eternal Throne. Heaven and earth will pass, but God's law will stand the assaults of hell, the malice of apostates, and the wreck of worlds. "One jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass" from it, for it came forth from the mouth of Jehovah.

The Scribes and Pharisees observed the letter of the law of God, yet our Lord declares that unless our righteousness exceeds theirs, we can in no case enter the kingdom of heaven.—He then, in verses 21—37, shows the spiritual character and extent of that law, that it reaches even to thoughts and motives. Thus Christ came, not to destroy the Father's law, but to magnify and make it honorable.

None ever preached closer than our Lord in this sermon.—Hear him: "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect." Verse 48. Christians certainly may not expect to attain to all the perfections of God, or of angels; but rich grace through Jesus Christ is fully sufficient to enable them to render perfect obedience to the will of Heaven. There is, in no case, a reasonable excuse for sin. This making so many excuses for natural infirmities, and fellowshiping those who give way to unholy passions, pleases the Devil, and will prove the damnation of thousands. Every lover of truth and holiness should protest against lowering the standard here raised by Christ.

[To be continued.]

DUTY OF PARENTS TO THEIR CHILDREN.

"TRAIN up a child in the way he should go; and when he is old, he will not depart from it." Prov. xxii, 6. Much is said in the Bible, respecting the duty of parents to their children. But it would seem, by the manner in which this duty is neglected by most of parents, that they do not understand what the Bible teaches on this subject.

I have often been pained to see how this important duty is neglected, even by those who profess to be keeping all the commandments of God. I have earnestly desired of late, that something might be said, or written on this subject; something that would stir up parents to look at these things, and to feel the responsibility that rests upon them, to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. Eph. vi, 4. I fear but few parents, (even among Sabbath-keepers) realize how far they have departed from the word of God in this respect. Perhaps but few are aware how much is said in the Bible on this subject. I will here quote a few passages of Scripture which are to the point. "He that spareth his rod, hateth his son: but he that loveth him chasteneth him beatimes." Prov. xiii, 24. "Chasten thy son while there is hope, and let not thy soul spare for his crying." Prov. xix, 18.—"Foolishness is bound in the heart of a child; but the rod of correction shall drive it far from him." Prov. xxii, 15.—"Withhold not correction from the child; for if thou beat him with the rod he shall not die. Thou shalt beat him with the rod, and shalt deliver his soul from hell." Prov. xxiii, 13, 14. "The rod and reproof giveth wisdom; but a child left to himself, bringeth his mother to shame. Correct thy son and he shall give thee rest; yea, he shall give delight unto thy soul."—Prov. xxix, 15, 17.

It seems to me, that in the passages I have quoted, the duty of parents to their children, is clearly and plainly pointed out. It seems, from the word of God, that the rod is to be used (and that not sparingly) in the government, and correction of children, in bringing them into perfect subjection to their parents. But how seldom is the rod seen and much more seldom used by the professed people of God at this day. Many seem to think that they are serving God, doing those things that are pleasing in his sight, while in a measure, if not wholly, they are neglecting to govern their children, and bring them to yield that obedience to their parents, that the word of God requires. But this is a mistaken idea and a snare of Satan into which the whole world, with few exceptions, have fallen, in these "perilous times." But my prayer is, that God would deliver his people out of this snare, and give them to see and understand their whole duty to their children.

I understand this subject like this; that parents stand in the place of God to their children, until they become old enough to know and serve God for themselves. And that parents are required to see that their children yield the same obedience and submission to their will, that parents yield to God. And if this duty is performed by parents, then they can claim in faith and confidence the blessing of God upon their children. But if this duty is neglected by parents, it seems to me certain that God will hold them responsible, and the blood of their children will be required at their hands.

It is the height of folly in parents to suppose that their children can be saved while living in willful disobedience to their parents, and being possessed of a spirit and temper that is ungovernable, wicked, and devilish. As well might parents expect to be saved while possessing the spirit of Satan, and living in disobedience to the commandments of God. But this is not so. No one with an understanding of the Bible, can expect to be saved without yielding perfect obedience to God, and partaking of his Holy Spirit. For this cause our heavenly Father has to chasten and scourge us, (and many times sorely,) and bring us under strict discipline, in order to humble us and subdue our stubborn wills and unholy tempers, and bring us where we can

yield a sweet and humble submission to his holy will. This is the way that God deals with his children, and that too, because he loves them, and that they may be partakers of his holiness."

Many parents in these days, (and I am sorry to say that it is even so among Sabbath-keepers,) instead of causing their children to submit unto their will and judgment, submit to the will of their children, and in many instances, become complete slaves to them. This is not right. It is reversing God's order. And if continued, will certainly ruin their children, if not parents also. It is mockery for parents to pray for God to bless and save their children, while they themselves are neglecting their duty to them.

I feel an interest in the welfare of the children, and am glad they are to have a paper for themselves; but, still, for the children to be really benefited, I think "the axe must be laid at the root of the tree;" that is, the work must begin at home. Parents must do their duty, before God can consistently work for their children.

Dear brethren and sisters, you that are parents of children, I beg of you, as you love your children, and desire their salvation, that you wake up to this important duty of governing your children, and subdue their wills and unholy temper, and bring them where God can work for them. Unless you do, you will certainly see your children cut down in the time of trouble. Oh! what anguish it will cause parents, to witness the "plagues" poured out upon their children, and realize that it is because they have neglected their duty to them.

ELIAS GOODWIN.

Oswego, July 30th, 1852.

ALBION, WIS., CONFERENCE.

This Meeting continued three days with deep interest.—The brethren from five, thirty, and seventy miles, came on foot and in wagons to meet with those of like precious faith.

Bro. N. A. Perry, who made the arrangements for the Conference, obtained the use of the house of worship, occupied by the Seventh-day Baptists of Albion. He, with others, also fitted up a place of worship in a delightful grove by the meeting house in which about four hundred people (as it was judged) were convened on the Sabbath to listen to the reasons of our hope. The interest of the meeting continued to the last moment. At the close, the ministers of the Seventh-day Baptists, and many of their members expressed a wish to hear further on this subject. We explained the faith of Jesus, in the third angel's message. A deep interest seemed to be awakened in many minds. Bro. Perry was greatly blessed for his labor of love. He and his companion confessed the present truth, having never been established in it before. His eldest son and daughter confessed that God had forgiven all their sins, and were happy in the Lord, and are to be baptized by Bro. Case who holds a meeting in Albion this evening. Bro. Case of Jackson, Mich. Phelps and Waggoner of Wis. were present, and took a part in the meeting.

At the close of the public services, the scattered flock held a meeting at the house of Bro. Perry, for the purpose of forming a more intimate acquaintance for carrying forward this last message of truth and mercy. Here many things respecting the Press, the Paper, and books, their design and object, and our duty, &c. were explained, and the state of the cause among their brethren in the East.

Deep interest and harmony prevailed, with a fixed purpose to do their duty and carry out the purpose of God in this last message. Many professed to be greatly blessed by the meetings, and were fully settled in the present truth.

I was solicited to make an appointment to give a few more lectures in Albion. I therefore spent the last Sabbath with them, and found several families deeply interested, and searching for the truth. One young man said this was the first time he ever heard on the subject of the Advent of Jesus, and requested an interest in our prayers. During the week the messengers took various directions to hunt up the scattered sheep. In Union we found some precious souls, and baptized three youths, and left them rejoicing in the Lord. We are now about to start for Beloit to visit Bro. Brown and others. From thence, to Alden, Ill. to attend our appointed Conference, which convenes day after to-morrow.

JOSEPH BATES.

Janesville, Rock Co., Wis., July 28th, 1852.

THE CONFERENCE AT CAUGHDENY, July 24th and 25th. was indeed a refreshing season. It was held in Bro. Ladd's mill, where about 150 believers assembled on the Sabbath.—A portion of those present came from twenty to sixty miles to meet with their brethren; but most of them live in the vicinity of Caughdeny.

We were happy to meet with Bro. Rhodes and Holt at this meeting. They are much worn with constant labor, yet happy in hope, cheerfully wearing out in the cause of truth.

On First-day several hundred came to hear, and the word of the Lord had free course.

THE first No. of the YOUTH'S INSTRUCTOR will be sent to most of our readers next week. Those who wish it, will inform us immediately.

IS SUNDAY THE TRUE SEVENTH DAY?

A LETTER from a brother beloved in the Lord, in which he incidentally notices the case of certain friends, who think that the "true seventh day" comes on Sunday, suggests the following remarks. They are respectfully addressed to those who thus believe.

As it is presumed that no one denies that those who kept the Sabbath according to the commandment, after the death of the Lord Jesus, [Luke xxiii, 55, 56,] did actually keep the day which the fourth commandment required, viz: that day which was blest and set apart at Creation, [Ex. xx, 8—11; Gen. ii, 1—3,] I begin this side the crucifixion and inquire:

(1.) In what year of the Christian Era did all Christendom change the reckoning of the week, and thenceforward call the seventh day of the week the first day?

What historian records this extraordinary event?

If there is such a writer, how does he explain that all the jarring sects and contending factions of the professed church, scattered over the face of the wide earth, and fiercely warring with each other, should by a simultaneous mistake, without a dissenting voice, adopt the idea that the seventh day was in reality the first day of the week?

As there is no such writer, who knows that such an event ever did happen?

(2.) But how did it happen that the Jews who had the knowledge of the true Sabbath as late as Jerusalem's destruction, [Matt. xxiv, 20,] and who were then dispersed into all nations under heaven, [Luke xxi, 24,] made a corresponding mistake?

Does not the fact that they have ever hated, with bitter hatred, those who have even nominally borne the name of Christ, forbid the idea that they would ever agree to such a change in the reckoning of the week?

If such an agreement was ever made between the parties, was it not on this wise: the Christians were to call the seventh day from thenceforth the first day of the week, and the Jews, out of respect to this new method of reckoning the week, were to take up the sixth day in the place of the seventh, which they then and there relinquished, and thenceforward call the sixth day the seventh, and observe it religiously, as such.

But as such an agreement never could take place, and certainly never did, will you say that both parties might make a mistake in the case?

Do you think it possible that every individual in every sect and order in the Christian world, could, at the same moment, make precisely the same mistake?—And as they had previously, according to this theory, kept Sunday because it was the seventh day of the week, how could they, after making the supposed mistake in the reckoning, go forward and keep it because it was the first day, and no one dissent or notice that any change had happened?

But is it not a still more extraordinary thing, that not only every Christian made a mistake in the reckoning of the week at the same moment of time, but every Jew, also, in every land under heaven, made at the same moment, precisely the same mistake?

Should you not think that if the idea of keeping Sunday as the first day of the week, did not bring even a single Christian to his senses, when before the time of this mistake all of them had kept it as the seventh day, I say, should you not think that when they saw the Jews keeping one day, and themselves observing another, (when before this mutual mistake, Jews and Christians, according to this theory, both kept Sunday as the seventh day,) that this would have led some of them to see that something was wrong?

Let me state this doctrine: Jews and Christians throughout the world, were once united in keeping Sunday as the seventh day. At a certain point of time, every professor of Christianity throughout the world mistook the reckoning of the days of the week, and, calling Sunday the first day of the week, thenceforward kept it because it was such! While every Jew throughout the world, at the same time, by mistake, called Sunday (the day which he had always observed) the first day of the week, and selecting the sixth day or Saturday, he thenceforward religiously observed it as the true seventh day!!!

(3.) But as there is still another witness, who has kept the reckoning of the days of the week, we inquire again. Perhaps, in the mouth of two or three witnesses, the point may be established.

The Mahometans keep a different day of the week from either Jews or Christians. Do they reckon the days of the week in the same manner that Jews and Christians do?

Mahomet selected the sixth day of the week as a Sabbath for his followers. Is it not a remarkable fact, that the sixth day of the Mahometan week corresponds exactly to the sixth day of the week as reckoned by Jews and Christians?

If it can be supposed that all who bear the name of Christians, of every sect, and in every land, could all make the same mistake at the same moment, and no one of them perceive or rectify it; if, in addition to this, we can go another step and conclude that the Jews, who are dispersed in every corner of the habitable earth, could all, without dissent, at the same time, make a mistake that should exactly correspond to that of their hated and hating Christian brethren, have we not gone as far in believing absurdities as you can ask us to go?

But when we have agreed to all this, you require us to take another step in absurdity. The Christians, to a man, made this mistake in the reckoning of the week; at the same time, and to a man, the Jews made a mistake that precisely corresponded; and to crown the whole, the Mahometans made a mistake in the reckoning of the week that precisely corresponded to that of the Jews and Christians! "Believest thou all this?"

If a mistake had been made, is it not absolutely certain that there would be a discrepancy somewhere? As there is no such discrepancy, is it not absolutely certain that no such mistake exists?

We can hardly find it in our power to believe that the inhabitants of a single district could, at the same point of time, make a mistake in the days of the week, and to heighten the wonder every one make precisely the same mistake! But when we extend this simultaneous act to all the districts in a town, thence to all the towns in a county, thence to all the counties in a state, and thence to all the states in the Union, we have carried the matter almost an infinite distance beyond reason or credibility.

But as there are three vast bodies who have kept the reckoning of the week, we will introduce two other nations, that each witness may be represented.—We will begin with England. At the same time when every individual in this nation (in the case supposed) made a mistake in the reckoning of the week, every individual in England made a mistake on the same point, so as to correspond exactly to the mistake made here. (Else a discrepancy in the reckoning would show an error at once.) And at the same moment, every individual in France made a mistake corresponding exactly to the mistake made by every individual in England and the United States. And so perfectly deceived was every one of these persons, that they continued their dates, records, &c., and never mistrusted that a mistake had been made!

But all this is not so remarkable as the supposed mistake of Jews, Christians, Mahometans and all nations! That these classes, each composed of many millions, not confined to any country, but scattered in every land under heaven, should all make a mistake—should all make the same mistake, and should all make the same mistake at the same time, and no individual of the number ever discover, or ever suspect, that such a mistake had taken place, is a theory not only absolutely unreasonable and in the highest degree absurd, but it is positively beyond the power of those who would, to credit it!!

But, say you, though we have no history that records any such event, as the mistake in question, [the inhabitants of the globe were all asleep when Mahomet wrought his miracle on the moon,] yet we have "plain Bible testimony" that establishes the fact that Sunday is the seventh day. Here it is:

"For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of man be three

days and three nights in the heart of the earth."—Matt. xii, 40.

It is made to prove the point in this way: Christ was crucified on Friday, lay in the grave this period in full time, was raised on Monday, which is thus shown to be the first day of the week; hence Sunday is certainly the seventh day.

An indirect method of establishing a theory that involves the most extraordinary difficulties. But the evidence mentioned shall have all possible weight allowed it.

The "three days and three nights" shall be reckoned in full time, though there are certain facts that seem to modify this, which may be noticed in their place.

We inquire, then, respecting the evidence on which it is asserted that Christ was crucified on Friday.—It is answered, "Every one admits this fact." But why does every one admit this fact? There is but one answer that can be given: Christ was crucified the day before the Sabbath, [Mark xv, 42,] which, according to all records, Pagan, Mahometan, Jewish and Christian, comes on Saturday. For this one grand reason, it has been treated as an established fact, that the crucifixion occurred on Friday.

Now mark this point! In order to fill the space of two entire days between the crucifixion day and the day of the resurrection, which this theory presents, you say that two sabbaths came in connection, viz: the passover sabbath and the Sabbath of Jehovah. And that the crucifixion occurred the day before the passover sabbath, and two days before the Sabbath of the Lord.

Very well; have your own idea of this also. Now what have you gained? Simply this: the crucifixion did not occur on Friday, the day before the Sabbath, but it occurred on Thursday, two days before the Sabbath.

One plain fact ought to put this argument into oblivion for ever. It is this: The Sabbath is the fixed point which determines the day of the week on which the crucifixion occurred, and not the crucifixion day, the fixed point which may set the Sabbath forward or backward. Weigh this fact; its force will be seen.

The only way that the day of the crucifixion can be determined, is by its relative distance from the Sabbath; hence it is the height of folly to adjust the Sabbath by the day of the crucifixion. Is it not so?

The premises of our brethren who maintain this theory, sadly clash. Their evidence, when allowed in its full length and breadth, amounts to this: the crucifixion occurred on Thursday. But it is a fundamental point with them that it occurred on Friday. The argument at most can only claim to set the crucifixion back, and can never lay the least claim to having set the Sabbath and the resurrection forward. It destroys the very foundation on which it claims to rest! We bespeak serious attention to the point.

But we present two or three points as worthy of the attention of those who reckon this period in full time.

1. The theory which reckons the three days and three nights in full time, seems, at least, to contradict the multitude of texts that speak of the resurrection on the third day. For as He was buried before the close of the crucifixion day, he was in the tomb (if we follow this theory) a part of Friday, all of Saturday and Sunday, and a part of Monday; thus making a part of four days. How then could he be raised on the third day?

2. He was crucified on the fourteenth day of the first month, the antitype of the paschal lamb, [1 Cor. v, 7; John xviii, 28,] and raised on the sixteenth day, the "morrow after the Sabbath," the antitype of the first fruits. Lev. xxiii, 4—11; 1 Cor. xv, 23.

3. He was crucified the day before the Sabbath, [Mark xv, 42] and raised the day after the Sabbath. Mark xvi, 1, 2.

But does not this idea of making out Sunday the Seventh day, look much more like an ingenious excuse for breaking the fourth commandment, than a real, sincere effort to obey it?

On whom does the blessing of heaven rest? On those who obey the commandments, or on those who find an excuse for not obeying? J. N. A.

• LETTERS.

From Sister Kendall.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—I still feel that I am a pilgrim and stranger here in this world of woe, praying, thy kingdom come.

"O, I long to be there, and the thought that 'tis near,
Makes me almost impatient for Christ to appear."

But when I look around, and see many of God's dear people yet covered up under the rubbish and darkness, I feel as though I could stay until all the jewels are sought out and made ready for the Kingdom.

I am thankful that the work is moving onward.—My soul rejoices exceedingly in the light that is shining out from Rev. xviii. I have a long time looked for something to move those that were still in Sardis that have not defiled their garments. My soul has wept in secret places, and no one knows but my Maker, the feelings that I have had for the honest ones, while no one cares for their souls. Their own shepherds that they are following, do not care for them, and the truth has so much reproach heaped upon it, that they have truly thought it could not be the way. But the Lord has comforted my mind with such passages as these: "As a shepherd seeketh out his flock in the day that he is among his sheep that are scattered; so will I seek out my sheep, and will deliver them out of all places where they have been scattered in the dark and cloudy day." Eze. xxxiv, 12. I have rested on God's immutable promise, and have been watching to see his guiding hand, and when I see the mighty angel in the future, that will lighten the earth with his glory, my heart leaps forward at the thought. Bless the Lord for the light of his word to, cheer us on our pathway home. Have we not much to expect from the mighty and strong voice, and the glory that is to attend him? Has there been any thing in the past to compare fully with it? I think not. While it moves the opposition of the many, it will bear such strong marks of its heavenly origin that some precious souls will discover that it emanates from God himself.

O! I dwell with delight upon this message. I feel like seeking meekness and being very humble in the sight of God, when I view his mercy towards his people, and I also feel encouraged. I feel as though the little flock that are on the third message, will never give over the struggle till they stand on the sea of glass, having got the victory over the beast and his image, his mark and the number of his name, singing the song of Moses and the Lamb. They have not come out a separate people for pastime, nor because others did, and it was popular. No, they have come out because God required it, and the truth required it, and the Lord will not forsake them. No, never! And I do not expect we shall ever forsake him, though the decree go out against us. Praise the Lord for ever and ever! He is strong and mighty to save. I rejoice in the prospect that lies before us. Though the day of trouble is near, yet the Lord hath spoken good concerning Israel. His truth will be our shield and buckler. L. B. KENDALL.

Granville, Vt., July 17th, 1852.

From Sister Shimper.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—We rejoice that the Lord has moved your heart, to put forth an extra effort for the salvation of the lambs of the flock. Said Jesus, "Feed my lambs;" and we have felt deeply of late, that this injunction of our Divine Lord and Master, should be more strictly obeyed, by faithfulness in gathering them to the house of prayer, and devoting at least, a small portion of holy time, especially to their instruction and benefit. The paper you design sending out, particularly the questions and answers, will be a great help in this matter. And if the whole church heartily cooperate in this labor of love, there can be no doubt but that it will be a means owned and blessed of God, to the saving of our children from the perils of the way, and of rescuing them from the impending storm of God's wrath, which will soon burst

upon a guilty world. I feel too, that our children who love the dear Saviour, and love to keep God's commandments, should feel their own responsibility, and that they too, have a part to act in the great work of preparation; and by intreaties and persuasions, as well as by a good example at all times, should strive to bring others to submit their youthful hearts fully to the truth.

While speaking on this subject with one of the youth, the other day, I asked him what he would do if he saw certain ones running toward a fearful precipice, and knew their destruction was sure, unless their course should be changed. "Why" says he, "I would lay right hold of them, and would hold them fast. I would not let them go." And should not this be our feelings, one and all, especially in much prayer to God in behalf of such as do not feel the power of these truths, which alone can shield and save them in the great day, which hasteth, and hasteth greatly.

You will be glad to hear that the children in this place are somewhat interested and some of them are much interested in the contemplated paper, and Sabbath lessons. Nine came together this forenoon for the purpose of reading, and instruction in God's holy word. The melting Spirit of the Lord was felt and we hope it will not prove a lost opportunity.

F. M. SHIMPER.

Granville, Vt., July 16th, 1852.

From Bro. Washburn.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—We are still striving to serve God in obedience to his commands, but we find many times we come short of serving him as we ought. I praise the Lord that he ever had so much mercy and compassion on such an unworthy worm of the dust as I view myself. I feel very dark and gloomy in my mind, sometimes, for we are deprived the privilege of meeting with the true followers of Christ, or conversing with those who keep the precepts of the Great King. But I am resolved to hold fast, and have faith in God, let the events be what they may. As for me and my house, we will serve the Lord.

I find we must expect troubles, and trials, and persecutions in this wicked, fading world. But what is this in comparison with a crown of life! O, a crown of life is worth a little self-denial in this world. Oh, yes, if we can but obtain that rich treasure which is laid up for all such as are willing to follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth.

I would say to all those who have started in the glorious way, be not weary in well doing, but press onward, for the prize is just ahead. May the Lord help us all, that we may hold on till the Lord shall call for us. Then shall the weary be at rest, and the wicked cease from troubling. That we may all live for Christ on earth, so that we may reign with him in heaven, is the prayer of your unworthy brother,

CALVIN WASHBURN.

No. 5, First Range, Me., July 17th, 1852.

From Bro. Marsh.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—I improve the present opportunity to direct a few lines to the scattered flock through the medium of the *Review and Herald*. I wish to say that I find it a welcome messenger to me in this lonely, desert world, as I can, in the most emphatical sense, say, that I am here in this part of the vineyard alone, having no one to sympathize with me concerning the present truth. But since December last, I have been trying to keep the commandments of God, and I find that in keeping them, there is great reward.

I have never heard but one sermon on the third angel's message, and have never had the privilege, but once, of meeting with the brethren on God's holy Sabbath since I saw that the seventh day was the Sabbath of the Lord our God, or in other words, that the first day was not the Lord's Sabbath, but that it was the Pope's. That meeting was with the brethren in Ashfield. Glory to God, that I ever went to that place, for there I heard, for the first time, the third angel's message. And now I feel strong in proclaim-

ing in the ears of the people in this place that the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord our God.

It does me much good to read the epistles from the dear brethren and sisters, and I am much pleased with the lengthy articles of Bro. J. N. Andrews, in the discussion of the Sabbath question. To me, it has opened a large field and much light. To God be all the glory.

I trust that we shall not be among those who say and do not, but as we are professing to keep God's commandments, [Rev. xiv, 12.] I do hope that we shall be enabled to keep them until Jesus comes, and takes the kingdom under the whole heavens, to reign for ever and ever.

I would that God would send some of his children here, so that I could converse with them on his holy law. And if any of the brethren come this way I hope that they will call and see me, and I will do by them according to the best of my ability. I am poor in this world's goods, but am looking for glory, and honor, and riches in the world to come. May God grant us an abundant entrance into his everlasting kingdom.

From one who is striving to keep God's holy law.

ZEBINA MARSH.

South Hadley, Mass., July 23d, 1852.

From Bro. Camp.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—I feel that it is time for God's people to stand firm on the truth, having on the whole armor of God, and to purify their souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit. I want, for one, to stand on the whole present truth. Present truth is what we want; truth on every point, that we may be enabled to meet our opponents on gospel ground.

We must have clean hands, and pure hearts to prepare us to stand when men's hearts are failing them for fear, and for looking after those things that are coming on the earth.

One year has passed away since I embraced the holy Sabbath, and God has blest me abundantly in trying to keep his commandments. They all look very precious to me. Christ said, "If ye love me keep my commandments," and he told his disciples to love one another, and said, "by this, shall all men know that ye are my disciples." But do we see that love exemplified in the lives of those that profess to be his disciples? I think that all will answer, no, not among the different sects, for there we see discord and confusion. But I can say that among those, as far as my acquaintance extends, that keep God's holy Sabbath, the spirit of love is manifest in their deportment, heavenly union prevails, and will among those that truly belong to Christ.

I feel like putting all on board, and going through to the kingdom. To me, the Sabbath is a delight, holy of the Lord and honorable, although some would fain have me follow the traditions of men. I have vowed to the Lord and cannot go back. I have read the *Review* with great delight. I feel greatly encouraged to persevere. I mean to strive to possess the kingdom with my brethren, and with them share its glories, and with them I expect to bear the trials and conflicts of the way, choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season.

We should be glad to have the brethren visit us, as we have but little opportunity of meeting with them. We should be happy to see any that will come bringing the present truth.

Yours in the hope of eternal life,

Chelsea, Vt., July 18th, 1852. WM. CAMP.

From Bro. Barr.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—I turn aside from the press of business, for a moment, to just say, that the cause of truth is moving onward in spite of all the powers of darkness combined. The living and true God is revealing himself mighty to save. Honest souls are being made to rejoice, after a long, gloomy night of sadness, to find themselves, at last, in the path of the just

which shines more and more unto the perfect day.—And so exceedingly near the City that earth loses its charms, while the whole soul is being satisfied with the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus.
ELI L. BARR.

Goshen Gore, July 1st, 1852.

Reply to Wrong Statements Respecting "Misrepresentations."

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—On my arrival at Albion, Wis., July 15th, I found the communication which you kindly forwarded me, a notice of which you had published in the *Review and Herald* the 8th, from C. W. Low, C. Crawford, M. Whitaker and N. Richardson.

As soon as an opportunity offered, after our series of meetings closed, I commenced a reply to them personally. Before I had finished my letter, the *Advent Harbinger* of July 10th was placed in my hand, showing that the article in question was published in that paper. I therefore change the order of my communication and send you the following for publication.

In the first place, allow me to say that whatever responsibility is thrown on you by the *Harbinger*, or from any other quarter, because you did not publish their communication without a more thorough knowledge of it, let it all be placed to my account. I am much obliged to you for sending me the communication and withholding the publication of it as you have. I will quote from their article which is headed, "Mr. JOSEPH BATES' MISREPRESENTATIONS."

"Mr. White, Sir: It is well known to the readers of your paper, that Mr. Bates in company with Mr. Edson, came to Fredonia last February and spent two Sabbaths there and in the adjoining town. The account of this meeting is given by him in the *Review and Herald* of May 6th, 1852. In that account there are a number of misrepresentations. The first is, that two local ministers (Bro. Low and Crawford) said they might occupy the forenoon. But they did not say so. They said they might preach, if they would give them the privilege of replying."

We reply that Bro. Hamilton's request for us to speak was complied with, that we might occupy the forenoon. After some moments, Bro. H. said, Bro. Bates, there is liberty, or you can speak. I then objected, because there was not sufficient time allowed me to present the subject which I had thought to speak from, and make it clear. Bro. Hamilton spoke again, and said, take your time, or your own time.—I know there would have been no necessity for the above remarks if they had not limited me to a particular time. That time, I say again, was the forenoon. I think it was then some fifteen minutes past eleven in the forenoon. I occupied from that time until near 4 o'clock P. M. As for their replying to me, it was not my prerogative to grant. They were in their own meeting, and acted their own pleasure. The second misrepresentation which they charge me with is as follows:

"As soon as Mr. Bates sat down, Bro. Hamilton arose and said that he rejoiced to have the privilege that he then had, and that he had seen so much light from God's word, &c. When he sat down, Bro. Low arose, the first minister Mr. Bates mentioned, and says that he followed him. Bro. Low did say that the Sabbath was not binding upon us, for it was given to the Jews, &c. Bro. Low said that the nine commandments are embodied in the gospel of the Son of God but the fourth is not."

The accusation against me here is, that Bro. Hamilton followed me and not Bro. Low. My own statement in the *Review and Herald* is as follows: "One of the ministers followed me in opposition to my subject." Bro. Hamilton's remarks, as above stated, were not in opposition to my subject, but Mr. Low's remarks were. Those that read will judge for themselves, which statement is right. The third misrepresentation which they charge me with, is as follows:

"Bro. Crawford arose and said it was time to close. At this Sr. Miller arose and said that she would like to make a few remarks. Bro. C. then set down while she spoke. He then arose, and Mr. Bates now says that Bro. C. commenced by saying, produce me a command of my Lord for keeping the Sabbath and I will keep it. This is another misrepresentation and utterly false, for Bro. C. commenced by reading Mr. Bates' text," &c.

My reply is, that Mr. C. might possibly have spoken of my text first. If he did, I do not remember it. I pencilled in my note book what I considered the most important sentences that the two ministers uttered. I read some of them to the ministers afterward in the meeting. At first some of them were objected to, but when it was stated by one in the meeting, that, that was the language uttered, Mr. Low acknowledged that he did say what they have all acknowledged, viz: "Bro. Low said that the nine commandments are embodied in the gospel of the Son of God," &c. When I wrote the article they refer to, it was some weeks after the meeting. I then had recourse to my notes of the meeting to see what Mr. C. stated. The first sentence under his name, stands as I have stated. "Produce a command of my Lord for keeping the Sabbath and I will keep it." I know not how to state it differently, even now. If it shall hereafter come to my knowledge that Mr. C. did speak of some passages of Scripture, as he and his three associates say he did, before he spoke the sentence, "Show me a command of my Lord," &c. then I shall most readily acknowledge that he did speak some other words first.

"Finally, Mr. Bates says that these two ministers put on their overcoats and left the meeting in disorder. Here is another statement that is not true."

We answer, the meeting came to its end as we have stated. Mr. C. said it was time to close before Sr. Miller spoke. He himself spoke after this and some others, but they did leave the meeting without uttering a prayer, benediction, or even so much as to say the meeting is closed. If this was not a disorderly way of closing a religious meeting, then I do not understand the signification of order.

But after charging me with another falsehood for thus saying, they ask,

"What was that disorder? It could not consist in their abruptly leaving the meeting, as though Mr. Bates had whipped them out as he represents." (Those who wish to know, can read my article and see if I have so represented.) "Mr. Bates was the very man that commenced it. How? by breaking in upon Bro. Low when he was talking. * * * Now then instead of the rebuke of which Mr. Bates speaks, resting upon the heads of Bro. Low and Crawford, it will rest upon his own head in the day of judgment, unless he repents and confesses his false statements and misrepresentations. If Mr. Bates had stated the plain facts in the case they would not have been noticed. But as he has not, we think that justice to God and humanity, &c. demands that a correct state of the facts in the case be made and published."

The disorder of the meeting, was not as they have stated, neither is it according to the statement of C. Crawford Jr. in the *Harbinger* of July 17th, 1852, "that Mr. Bates began it by breaking in upon Bro. Low when he first spoke." When Mr. Low was speaking the first time, he said in a very vehement manner, (referring to my discourse,) that it was a dishonest way of presenting the fourth commandment, and called for an open rebuke from heaven. I then spoke these words, *Amen, let it come where it belongs.* Bro. Edson responded. These were the only words that I have the least knowledge of uttering, during, his severe and unjust remarks, and if I am in any way capable of judging when men are in anger by their words and gestures, then was Mr. Low angry. But our amen did not even check the sentence which he carried out, for he continued: "We do not now live by the law. The nine commandments are embodied in the gospel of the Son of God, but the fourth is not." &c.

Mr. Crawford in his remarks said, "The nine commandments are embodied in the sayings of our Saviour."

In their statement they leave this out, and endeavor to cover it up by saying, Mr. Bates represents here as though the gospel of the Son of God was simply the sayings of our Saviour, &c.

As soon as a fair opportunity offered, I asked the privilege of presenting a few questions for the meeting. Will you said I, please to read the text from the New Testament to prove where the Saviour has embodied the first commandment of his Father. 1 Cor. viii, 6 was read by Mr. C. We asked if that was the testimony of Jesus. An attempt was made to prove that Paul's argument here was the same as that of Jesus. As he had said that "the nine commandments are embodied in the sayings of our Saviour." I asked them to read the first one to the meeting, and for holding them to this point, or a qualification of it, the disorder arose by their breaking in upon me, instead of my breaking in upon them. When they attempted to change the subject, I asked for a reply to my question, and stated that I had more questions to ask. After they had put on their overcoats and got to the outside door to go out, I followed them, and pressed them for an answer.—They did not give it. This then is where I believe that the rebuke fell on their heads, and they are endeavoring to shift it upon me.

If they will prove what they then asserted, and show how Jesus has embodied the first commandment of his Father in his sayings and also the second and third, and left out the fourth, or confess their error, then they will begin to get out of the difficulty they are now in, and not before. I quoted Matt. xxii, 36—40, to show that Jesus had given them all there, they would not admit that, if they had I suppose they see at once they could not leave the fourth out.

As to their sweeping remarks respecting our practice, faith and teaching, we say that we teach no doctrine but what we can prove by the Bible; neither have we the slightest fear that men can overthrow our position. Victory is certain to those who rally under the banner of the third angel's message.

Our illustration of the black flag of Papacy is used like other illustrations to give a clearer idea of our subject. Mariners can appreciate it better than landmen.

The 144,000 being sealed under the sixth seal, and while the four angels are holding the four winds, is clear bible doctrine, according to the revelation of Jesus Christ. The ending of the 2,300 days of Daniel's vision is a clear bible doctrine connected with the history of the church in 1844. The Seventh-day Sabbath is a sign and a seal of the living God to those who keep it faithfully.

We do not teach that those who keep the first day of the week have the mark of the beast. The testimony is, "if any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark &c." If you will reject the commandments of God in which is the true or bible mark, and receive the mark of the beast understandingly, then you have it.

We do not teach that we are judging or condemning the world by the doctrines we preach; neither are we in any way connected with, nor favoring S. S. Snow's doctrine, nor Shakerism, nor any other class of people that are not willing to keep the commandments of God.

JOSEPH BATES.

Janesville, Wis., July 27th 1852.

BABYLON.

The following extract is from the *Advent Harbinger* of May 29th, 1852, headed, "Second Advent Meetings."

"Auburn—Advent Hall, over H. G. Vananden's Drug Store, every Sabbath.

Canandaigua—Atwater Hall, twice every Sunday, and on Tuesday and Friday evenings.

Honeoye—Hazen's Hall, every Sunday.

Oswego—Franklin Hall, Woodruff Block, every Sabbath.

Manlius—Advent Hall, every Sunday.

Victor—One held twice on the Sabbath in Advent Hall.

Liverpool—Temperance Hall, every Sunday, and Wednesday evenings.

New York—Corner of Grand and Elizabeth streets, three times on the Sabbath."

If I understand the *Harbinger*, it teaches that there is no Sabbath under the gospel dispensation. But it would seem, from the above extract, that its friends were about equally divided on that question. I suppose, however, there is no real division, but their language is confounded. Anciently, when men attempted to climb up to heaven "some other way" than by obeying God, their language was confounded; and it would be well for modern builders to follow their example—"they left off to build."

While these men say, there is no Sabbath, they seem willing to have one, provided it fall on that day of the week "which the popes have Sabbatized." They can be obliging enough, notwithstanding they know better, to apply that title to the first day of the week, which is so pleasing to the public ear.

R. F. COTTRELL.

Mill Grove, Aug. 1, 1852.

THE NEW HYMN BOOK can be had at this Office, of Bro. A. A. Dodge, of Jackson, Mich., or H. O. Nichols, of Dorchester, Mass. We hope to sell \$200 worth of this book, immediately, to pay what we owe for paper, &c. Postage, four cents each, within 500 miles.

☞ We hope to be able to leave the Office to attend the Conference at Boylston the 20th. If possible we will go from that meeting to St. Lawrence Co., Vermont and Maine. If so, our appointments will be given in the next paper.

Appointments.

BRO. H. EDSON and J. N. ANDREWS may be expected to hold meetings at Fredonia, N. Y., Sabbath, August 14th, and longer if thought best. They intend visiting several places in that vicinity.

THERE will be a General Conference at Boylston, N. Y., to commence Friday, August 20th, at 2 o'clock P. M., and hold several days. The Brethren will prepare a suitable place to convene those who may come to hear. A general invitation is extended to the scattered brethren and sisters, and those who wish to hear the reasons of our faith, to attend this meeting.—Bro. Rhodes, Holt and other preaching Brethren intend to be present.

THERE will be a Conference at West Lincklaen, Chenango Co., N. Y. to commence Friday, August 27th, at 10 o'clock A. M., and hold Sabbath and First-day. G. W. HOLT.

S. W. RHODES.

IN accordance with the request of the Brethren, I appoint Conferences to be held in the following places:

Jackson, Mich. August 13th, 14th and 15th.

Milan, Ohio, August 20th, at 2 o'clock P. M., and continue over Sabbath and First-day.

Cleveland, Ohio, August 27th at 2 o'clock P. M., and hold over Sabbath and First-day.

Cincinnati, Ohio, September 3d, at 2 o'clock P. M. and hold Sabbath and First-day.

All who feel interested to hear the reasons of our present position, living in the vicinity of the above named Conferences are respectfully invited to attend. If the Lord will, I shall attend them.

JOSEPH BATES.

PROVIDENCE permitting, I shall attend Meetings in the following places: Morristown, Vt., Aug. 7 and 8; Irasburg, Vt., or vicinity, Aug. 14 and 15.

JOSEPH BAKER.

Letters received since July 23d.

O. Nichols, A. Ross, D. E. Ford, C. Washburn, Asa Hall, M. L. Dean, G. W. Stockings, H. Bouffe, M. Leadbeater, O. Hewett, H. Lothrop, F. M. Shimper, J. Bates 2, J. Heber, M. A. E. Townsend, R. F. Cottrell 3, J. Hamilton, H. O. Nichols, E. Barrows, E. Goodwin, H. Edson.

Receipts.

A. Rice, L. B. Kendall, Wm. Camp, Wm. Treadwell, D. Arnold, A. Sanders, Wm. Carpenter, A. M. Lindsey, L. M. Locke, E. R. Seaman, E. Scovill, C. S. Fox, S. Flanders, N. N. Lunt, J. Mills, each \$1.

A. G. Phelps, C. Tucker, A. Barnes, each \$2.

Wm. Lawton, S. Gove, each \$3; E. Everts, \$5.

D. Robbins, \$1.40; D. Slanson, \$1.20; A. Brunson, 70 cts.

Z. Marsh, 65 cts; G. Sanders, 50 cts; D. Hewett, a Friend, each 25 cts.

For Printing Materials.

D. Robbins, \$2; Wm. Camp, \$1; J. Hamilton, \$1; Rebecca Smith, \$1; a Friend, 50 cts.