

# 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. VI.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., THIRD-DAY, OCTOBER 10, 1854.

No. 9.

## THE REVIEW AND HERALD.

IS PUBLISHED WEEKLY

At South St. Paul-st., Stone's Block,  
No. 23, Third Floor.

TERMS.—One Dollar a Year, in Advance.

J. N. ANDREWS, R. F. COTTRELL, URIAH SMITH,  
Publishing Committee.

JAMES WHITE, Editor.

All communications, orders, and remittances should be  
addressed to JAMES WHITE Rochester, N. Y. 109 Mon-  
roe Street, (post-paid.)

### Leading Doctrines.

*The Bible, and the Bible alone, the rule of faith and duty.  
The Law of God, as taught in the Old and New Testaments,  
unchangeable.*

*The Personal Advent of Christ and the Resurrection of the  
Just, before the Millennium.*

*The Earth restored to its Eden perfection and glory, the fi-  
nal Inheritance of the Saints.*

*Immortality alone through Christ, to be given to the Saints  
at the Resurrection.*

### RELIGIOUS LIBERTY ENDANGERED BY LEGISLATIVE ENACTMENTS.

*An appeal to the Friends of Equal Rights and  
Religious Freedom, in the United States, from  
the Seventh-day Baptist General Conference.*

FELLOW CITIZENS:—

We fully agree with you in the popular senti-  
ment of our nation, that liberty is sweet—to men  
of noble minds, much more precious than estates,  
or treasures of silver and gold—dearer than our  
reputation and honor among the despots of the  
world. Was it not this sentiment, firmly rooted  
in the minds of the Fathers of our National Inde-  
pendence, which led them to stake their "lives,  
their fortunes, and their sacred honor," rather than  
be the serfs of a British king and his aristocratic  
Lords? Applauding their spirit, we know that  
you will agree with us in the sentiment, that the  
preservation of that liberty which they achieved  
and perpetuated in our ever-glorious Constitution,  
is the highest civil duty which we owe to our-  
selves, to our posterity, and to our nation. All  
but coercionists will agree with us, that the pres-  
ervation of our religious liberty is a sacred duty,  
which we owe alike to the cause of truth and our  
political happiness.

Give us your candid attention, then, while we  
present a brief statement of the wrongs we are  
suffering in these United States, despite the  
principles of the National Declaration of Indepen-  
dence, and the guarantees of our National Consti-  
tution.

Believing in the integrity of the provisional  
Government which made the Declaration of Inde-  
pendence, our fathers and predecessors in faith,  
fought side by side with yours for the liberty which  
that instrument declares to be the inalienable right  
of all men. They were equally zealous parties to  
the adoption of the Constitution of the United  
States—that Constitution which says there shall  
be "no law respecting an establishment of religion,  
or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;" "and the  
judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any  
thing in the constitution or laws of any State to  
the contrary notwithstanding." Although our  
brethren at Ephrata, in Pennsylvania, regarded  
warfare and the shedding of blood as inconsis-  
tent with the Christian profession, yet they were no  
less ardent admirers of those national instruments  
by which American liberties were asserted and es-  
tablished. Of this they gave ample proof, in the  
unwavering support which they ever voluntarily  
rendered to the National Government and its troops,  
by all the peaceable means at their command.

History records an act of patriotism and piety,  
which reflects everlasting honor on their names.  
They voluntarily and compassionately received, at  
their establishment, between four and five hundred  
wounded Americans who had fallen in the battle  
of Brandywine, fed them from their own stores, and  
nursed them with their own hands, for which they  
never received nor asked a recompense of the  
American Government or people. It was enough  
for them, that they were their fellow men. But it  
stirred their hearts the deeper, that they knew they  
were bleeding in the cause of sacred liberty.

We are the descendants and successors in faith  
of these parties. We hold the same sentiments,  
and cherish the same principles, which they did at  
that time. Is it not surprising, then, that within  
seventy years after the signing of that Declaration,  
and in little more than half a century after the  
adoption of the Constitution, the lineal descendants  
of these parties, and their successors in faith and  
principles, should have their liberties so abridged  
by state authorities, as to give occasion for an ap-  
peal to the citizens of the whole nation, from  
whom the sovereign power emanates, for a redress  
of their wrongs? But so it is. Religious zealots,  
in our State Legislatures and on the Judicial Bench,  
have violated the Constitution of the nation, estab-  
lished an article of their religious creed, and made  
it penal for others of different sentiments to follow  
out their own honest convictions of duty to God.  
The consequence is, that eight of our brethren are  
at this moment under judicial sentence for their re-  
ligious sentiments, and condemned to pay four dol-  
lars each, with costs of prosecution, or suffer im-  
prisonment in the common jail. It is not pretend-  
ed that they have injured the persons, or wronged  
the estates or interests of any of their fellow-citizens.  
Neither is it pretended that they are lewd or in-  
temperate persons, or profaners of churches. The  
only pretense is, that they have injured the reli-  
gious feelings of some others by peaceably work-  
ing upon their own farms on the first day of the  
week, in obedience to the dictates of their own con-  
sciences and the law of God. And this is the sec-  
ond time, within the space of one year, that the per-  
secution of these otherwise unoffending men, has  
been approved by the courts of Pennsylvania. In  
four other States of the Union, in defiance of the  
National Constitution, our fellow-citizens have  
suffered prosecutions, fines, and imprisonment,  
within the past year, upon similar charges. Be-  
side this, in the States where toleration is provided  
for labor on our own farms, and in our own work-  
shops on the first day of the week, all contracts,  
legal and commercial transactions, if done even  
among ourselves, are declared null and void by the  
State Statutes. So that, even in these States, we  
are deprived of our constitutional and inalienable  
right to use one-sixth part of our time for com-  
mercial, legal, and judicial transactions; and then  
are tied up to our own premises, as though we were  
as dangerous to the religious interests of our fel-  
low-citizens, as rabid animals are to their persons.

Applications were made to three State Legisla-  
tures during the Winter of 1845-6, for relief from  
these odious statutes. But those applications were  
all repulsed with supercilious denials. Forbear-  
ance is no longer a virtue. A succession of abus-  
es and usurpations of our rights, has compelled us  
to take measures to resist, with all the legal means  
in our power, and with all that we can honorably  
acquire, whatever laws abridge the rights or co-  
erce the consciences of ourselves or our fellow-citizens  
on religious or sectarian considerations. Appeal-  
ing to Jehovah and his holy law for the rectitude

of our principles and the righteousness of our cause,  
we have implored, and shall continue to implore,  
the interposition of his Providence to succeed our  
efforts.

Without wishing to disturb the peace of society,  
or wantonly to overturn the existing order of things,  
but actuated solely by a sense of duty to main-  
tain the integrity of God's law, and preserve unim-  
paired our religious privileges, we appeal to you,  
fellow-citizens, in defense of the justice of our de-  
mands, by a fair representation of our Constitution-  
al Rights.

The sixth article of the Constitution of the Uni-  
ted States, section 2d, says, "This Constitution,  
and the laws of the United States which shall be  
made in pursuance thereof, . . . shall be the  
supreme law of the land; and the judges in every  
State shall be bound thereby, any thing in the con-  
stitution or laws of any State to the contrary not-  
withstanding."

Section 3d, says, "The members of the several  
State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial  
officers, both of the United States and of the sev-  
eral States, shall be bound by oath or affirmation  
to support this Constitution; but no religious test  
shall ever be required as a qualification to office or  
public trust under the United States."

In the amendments to the Constitution, article  
1st, it is written, "Congress shall make no law  
respecting an establishment of religion, or prohib-  
iting the free exercise thereof."

In view of these sections of the fundamental law  
of the nation, what can be more palpably uncon-  
stitutional than those State statutes which are so  
framed as to declare and establish the first day of  
the week as "the Christian Sabbath," or holy day.  
The State statutes which subject any citizen to  
fine or imprisonment for labor, or any legal trans-  
action, on the first day of the week, as far as their  
influence extends, make void God's everlasting  
law, and subject the conscientious servant thereof to  
punishment for a strict conformity to it. The  
State statutes violate the Constitution of the Uni-  
ted States in two respects. 1st. They violate that  
part of the Constitution which forbids the enact-  
ment of any "law respecting an establishment of  
religion;" because by them the religious observ-  
ance of the first day is made a State establishment  
of religion as really and arbitrarily as the law of  
Constantine made it a part of the religion of the Ro-  
man Empire. 2d. They violate that part of the  
Constitution which forbids the making of any law  
"prohibiting the free exercise" of religion; because,  
by forbidding labor on the first day of the week,  
they prohibit a strict conformity to the law of God  
which says, "Six days shalt thou labor and do all  
thy work, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the  
Lord thy God." With this view of the subject,  
we submit it to the common-sense of candid men to  
say, if every judicial officer who convicts or passes  
sentence upon his fellow-citizens for disobeying these  
arbitrary statutes on a charge of Sabbath-breaking,  
is not a perjured man. He swears or affirms to  
"support the Constitution of the United States, any  
thing in the Constitution or laws of any State to the  
contrary notwithstanding;" yet he administers a law  
which establishes a sectarian article of religion, and  
punishes conscientious men for a free exercise of their  
own religious opinions, and for doing what they es-  
teem to be their duty to God.

Heretofore we have asked only for exemptions  
from these odious statutes for all such as observe  
the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath, and we  
have generally been permitted to pass peaceably along.  
But of late our growing numbers, and our increasing

influence in the nation, together with the use of the public press in defense of our sentiments, have seemingly made us too odious in the eyes of some of our fellow-citizens to be suffered peacefully to enjoy our rights. Powerful efforts are being made to inflame the public mind against us, to influence the magistracy to enforce the Sunday laws now existing, and if possible to procure the enactment of others more stringent and restrictive. These things have thrown us unavoidably upon our constitutional rights. Experience teaches us that our peace and liberty are continually jeopardized by the existence of statutes which can be so construed as to coerce us contrary to our consciences, to do reverence to the first day of the week as a holy day. We therefore demand the entire repeal of all laws for coercing the observance of the first day, as being contrary to the spirit and the letter of the Constitution of the United States.

The view which we take of this subject is not from a partial construction of the Constitution. That instrument has been so construed by impartial and competent authority. The following extract from a letter written by GEORGE WASHINGTON, while President of the United States, and who was President of the Convention for framing the Constitution, to a committee of a Baptist Society in Virginia, in answer to an application to him for his views of the meaning and efficiency of that instrument to protect the rights of conscience, decides the intent of the framers of the Constitution, and consequently the intent of the Constitution itself. The letter is dated August 4, 1789, and reads as follows:—

"If I had the least idea of any difficulty resulting from the Constitution adopted by the Convention of which I had the honor to be President when it was formed, so as to endanger the rights of any religious denomination, then I never should have attached my name to that instrument. If I had any idea that the General Government was so administered that liberty of conscience was endangered, I pray you be assured that no man would be more willing than myself to revise and alter that part of it, so as to avoid all religious persecution. You can, without doubt, remember that I have often expressed my opinion, that every man who conducts himself as a good citizen is accountable alone to God for his religious faith, and should be protected in worshipping God according to the dictates of his own conscience.

[Signed.] "GEORGE WASHINGTON."

The Congressional Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, to whom were referred certain memorials for prohibiting the transportation of mails and the opening of post offices on Sunday, in the 43d session of Congress, A. D. 1830, reported unfavorably to the prayer of the memorialists. Their report was adopted and printed by order of the Senate of the United States, and the Committee was discharged from the farther consideration of the subject. That Committee take the same view of the intent of the Constitution as did General Washington. They say:—

"We look in vain to that instrument for authority to say whether first day, or seventh day, or whether any day, has been made holy by the Almighty." . . . "The Constitution regards the conscience of the Jew as sacred as that of the Christian; and gives no more authority to adopt a measure affecting the conscience of a solitary individual, than that of a whole community. That representative who would violate this principle, would lose his delegated character, and forfeit the confidence of his constituents. If Congress should declare the first day of the week holy, it would not convince the Jew nor the Sabbatarian. It would dissatisfy both, and consequently convert neither." . . . "If a solemn act of legislation shall in one point define the law of God, or point out to the citizen one religious duty, it may with equal propriety define every part of revelation, and enforce every religious obligation, even to the forms and ceremonies of worship the endowments of the church, and the support of the clergy." . . . "The framers of the Constitution recognized the eternal principle, that man's relation to his God is above human legislation, and his rights of conscience inalienable. Reasoning was not necessary to establish this truth; we are conscious of it in our own bosoms. It is this consciousness which, in defiance of human laws, has sustained so many martyrs in tortures and flames. They felt that their duty to God was superior to human enactments, and that man could exercise no authority over their consciences. It is an inborn principle, which nothing can eradicate." . . . "It is also a fact, that counter memorials, equally respectable, oppose the interference of Congress, on the ground that it would be legislating upon a religious subject, and therefore unconstitutional."

Impartial Judiciaries have taken the same view of these provisions of the Constitution, and have declared the laws enforcing the observance of the first day of the week unconstitutional, as may be seen in

Judge Hertell's book, "The Rights of the People Reclaimed;" also in "An Essay on Constitutional Reform, by Hiram P. Hastings, Counselor at law."

On the 2d of October, 1799, at New Mills, Burlington County, New Jersey, a Seventh-day Baptist being indicted before a Justice of the Peace for working on Sunday, and fined, he appealed. At the trial in Court, the foregoing letter from General Washington was procured by the Judge, and read in his charge to the Jury. The result was acquittal by the Jury.

In the year 1845, the Court of Hamilton County, Ohio, made a similar decision in a like case, and on similar considerations.

A committee of the Common Hall of the City of Richmond, Virginia, to whom was referred the case of certain persecuted Jews, have made a like decision on the municipal laws of that City, which have been construed to enforce keeping the first day.

The Post Office Laws are framed in accordance with these provisions of the Constitution. The Act of March 3d, 1825, section 1st, authorizes the Postmasters to "provide for the carriage of the mail on all post roads that are or may be established by law, and as often as lie, having regard to the productiveness thereof, and other circumstances, shall think proper." Section 17th provides, "that every Postmaster shall keep an office, in which one or more persons shall attend on every day on which a mail shall arrive by land or water, as well as on other days, at such hours as the Postmaster General shall direct, for the purpose of performing the duties thereof; and it shall be the duty of the Postmaster, at all reasonable hours, on every day of the week, to deliver on demand, any letter, paper or packet, to the person entitled to, or authorized to receive the same. The laws against labor on the first day, in each State where they exist, are obliged to except the mail-carriers and the postmasters. But we ask our fellow-citizens to consider by what show of justice, any local tribunal can punish a private citizen for doing that on his own account, which the servants and officers of the United States are doing at the same time, for the use of the people, and by a law of the same Government? Suppose a carriage conveying the United States Mail, should enter the City of Philadelphia on Sunday; and another carriage, containing goods or wares for the next day's market, should enter at the same time and by the same route; with what show of justice shall the driver of the market carriage be put under arrest and fined, and the driver of the mail carriage go free? Or suppose there should be a postmaster assorting his letters on the first day, and a fellow-citizen selling pens, ink, paper and wafers, to write the same letters, in another part of the same building; with what show of justice shall the tradesman be fined and the postmaster go free? The officers of the United States Government have no national rights above the humblest citizen. The transgression of law by them is as really a crime as in the case of any other citizen. Our Government knows nothing of those kingly rights which set emperors, monarchs, and their servants, above law. If, therefore, there is no transgression of constitutional law in carrying the United States Mail on the first day, then there is none in a private citizen's following his otherwise lawful and peaceable occupation on the same day.

In some quarters during the last year, our motives and designs were grossly misrepresented by prejudiced persons, in our legislatures and elsewhere. We were represented as "wishing the legislature to change the Sabbath from the first to the seventh day of the week;" and were accused of "covertly wishing to compel our fellow-citizens to keep our Sabbath day." No insinuation could be more grossly deceptive—no accusation more flagitiously unjust to us as a people. We declare unequivocally, that we do not desire any such thing. We believe that keeping the Sabbath day is purely a religious duty. All we ask is, that our State Legislatures leave the matter where the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the General Government have placed it. They have no more right to determine this religious duty, than they have to determine the rites of Christian worship. We believe our fellow-citizens ought to be protected in the peaceable observance of their day of religious rest, as in the observance of

every other religious institution, except where such observance is made a sanctuary for crime. We ask the same protection for ourselves on the seventh day of the week, and nothing more.

If the Constitution may be infringed upon to put down the observers of the seventh day, no one can say how long it will be before other minor denominations may be put down too. Already attempts are making to exact a confession of faith, unknown to the Constitution, as a qualification for a legal oath. If the religious sanctification of the first day of the week may be enforced by statutory requirements, so may the forms and hours of worship. He who says, that there is no danger of the latter being enforced, while statutory regulations violate two of the most sacred provisions of the National Constitution, knows but little of the history of mankind, or pays but little attention to the tendencies of human nature. A single standing violation of the Constitution is an example and an authority for others to follow. One religious observance established by law, is the admission of the main principle of national hierarchy, and will come in time to be referred to as authority for similar infractions of the Constitution. The laws for the observance of the first day are in fact a union of Church and State. It is not pretended that they are designed to subserve directly a political or civil object. It is altogether a religious object which they subserve. It becomes every friend of equal rights, as he loves the Constitution of his country, to oppose these infractions of its just principles, until equal liberty is secured to all citizens by statutory provisions, as by the fundamental laws of the nation.

Our opponents often remind us of their pretence, that we are under no more restrictions than other citizens; we may do as we please about keeping the seventh day. To this we reply, that the tyrants of the Roman people deprived the Republic of its liberties by professing themselves the guardians of their interests. "By declaring themselves the protectors of the people, Marius and Cæsar had subverted the Constitution of their country." Augustus established a despotism by artfully affecting to be governed himself by the same laws which he procured to be enacted to take away the rights of the people. These are the same principles upon which religious coercionists conjure us to be quiet under the loss of our constitutional rights. The progress of these things towards despotism is as dangerous in the American Republic as in that of Rome, and may be as rapid. Their success would be as deadly to human happiness, and all the best interests of mankind, in the nineteenth century, as they were in the decline and fall of the Roman Empire. Human nature now affords no better guaranty for the safety of our national rights, than it did to the Romans at the summit of their greatness. Liberty can be preserved only at the expense of perpetual vigilance, and by popular support of individual rights. If ever the doctrine which has been urged before one of our legislative bodies, "The greatest good of the greatest number," should become a popular political axiom, to justify the course of many in taking away the rights of the few, the halls of legislation will become scaffolds for the execution of liberty, and that odious principle will be the shroud in which it will be buried. Despots may establish a round of religious observances, and exact an unwilling and insincere conformity to their arbitrary prescriptions; but they can never convince the understanding nor win the heart of one who knows the voice of truth. They can only make him a slave, while the effects of their arbitrary prescriptions on the popular mind will be to wither up all interest in the religious tendencies of an observance sustained only by the enactments of heartless politicians. All that makes religion vital and effective for its own holy objects, expires when the sword is drawn to enforce it. Liberty, humanity, religion, and our National Constitution, then, require that the laws enforcing the observance of the first day of the week should be repealed.

As American Citizens, as independent Freemen, and as responsible Stewards of the glorious heritage bequeathed to us by the Fathers of the Revolution, we shall, with the aid of the Majesty of Heaven, maintain unimpaired the high privileges secured to us by the Charter of our Liberties. We ask for no exclusive immunities. We disclaim all right of hu-



man government to exercise over, or fetter in the least, the religious rights of any being. Might is not right, neither does the accident of being a majority give any, claim to trample on the rights of the minority. It is a usurpation of authority, to oppress the minority, or set at naught their indefeasible rights. In civil affairs we respect the authorities that be, but in religious service, resent being forced to keep the commandments of men. We recognize the laws of the land in all secular matters, and the laws of God, and of God alone, in religious faith and practice. These are the inalienable rights of all the members of a Republic. These are rights reserved by the people to themselves, in the formation of our Government, which no power can legitimately wrest from us, and with the help of God none shall.

[Note. We have given this appeal from the Seventh-day Baptists a place in the REVIEW, not because we approve of their purpose to resist by legal means the injustice and oppression, to which the observers of the Sabbath are subjected, but because it is an able exposure of the unjust character of those laws which enforce the observance of Sunday. As such, we request attention to it. Ed.]

#### Speaking Things not Understood,

We have been repeatedly impressed with the want of acquaintance with the things of which they speak, which is manifested in the conversation and writings of those who contend for specific points of time. As a case in point, we conversed lately with one who is justly reckoned by the timeists as one of, if not their most intelligent and respectable preacher, who was contending for the commencement of the seventy weeks A. C. 446, when said,

*We.* Commencing the 70 weeks so late as that, where do you reckon the epoch of the crucifixion?

*He.* In A. D. 37.

*We.* Have you authority of any kind for assigning so late a date for that event?

*He.* Dr. Jarvis gives that as the date of the crucifixion.

*We.* Does he? You are mistaken; for he gives A. D. 28 as the date of that event!

*He.* Dr. Jarvis states that Christ was in his thirty-seventh year when he was crucified.

*We.* Did you understand me to inquire what was the age of Christ at his crucifixion? If so, you did not apprehend my question, which was, not the year of his age, but the year of our vulgar era in which it occurred. Does Dr. Jarvis afford you any authority for placing it in A. D. 37?

*He.* If he says he was crucified in the 37th year of his age, is not that authority?

*We.* You don't mean that you are aware of no difference between the year of his age, and the year of our era in which Christ suffered?

*He.* I know that you make a distinction that is not very perceptible to the common people.

*We.* The difference has been plainly shown in the Herald too often for any intelligent reader to be left confused on that point.

[—Yes," said a third person present, whom we had never before seen, but who we understand is limitedly known by the sobriquet of the "learned blacksmith;" "and every time you write on it, you leave it darker than it was before." "That," said we, "depends on the intelligence of those who read." Resuming, we continued as before the interruption.]

You will not say that you are not aware of the justice of that distinction?

*He.* "A. D." means the year of our Lord; and if it don't mean the year of his age, then you give a different meaning to it than the common one.

*We.* No; I attach to it the common meaning and that only. No chronologer uses it differently, nor does any person who understands its import. Our common A. D. is called the "Vulgar Era," because reckoned, not from the actual birth of Christ, but from the place in the Julian Period where his birth was at first incorrectly placed—at the end of A. J. P., 4713. And when any chronologer, or any intelligent person, speaks of an event in any given year A. D., he reckons not from the actual birth of the Saviour, but from the commencement of our common era. The question is whether Dr. Jarvis gives you any authority for giving A. D. 37 as the date of the crucifixion? And he does not; for he places it in A. D. 28. Therefore are you justified in giving him as authority for A. D. 37 to those who, hearing you from the pulpit, take it for granted that you are profoundly familiar with the whole question?

*He.* I don't tell them that Dr. Jarvis places the

crucifixion in A. D. 37: but I quote his words, that Christ was crucified in his 37th year.

*We.* But is it just to your hearers to quote that from Dr. Jarvis, for the purpose of proving to them that A. D. 37 was the year of the crucifixion, without also informing them that the Doctor places that event nine years before the date to which you assign it? Have you any right to quote him respecting the Saviour's age, without also showing to the uninformed the difference which the Doctor makes between the birth of Christ and the Vulgar Era? placing it six years before the commencement of that era. You are aware, I suppose, that he gives A. C. 6, as the date of Christ's birth?

*He.* I know that he says something about six years; but does he say A. C. 6? Does not A. C. mean before Christ's birth?

*We.* It means before the Vulgar Era of his birth. B. C. ends with the year 4713 of the Julian Period; and A. D. begins with 4714. Dr. Jarvis reckons the birth of Christ six years before that epoch. And therefore when you quote him for the age of Christ at his crucifixion, does not justice demand that you show where he places Christ's birth, that it may be apparent where he dates his death?

*He.* It would be proper to explain that.

*We.* But you are also mistaken when you quote him as to the age of Christ. For as Dr. Jarvis places Christ's birth A. C. 6, and his death in A. D. 28 he makes the latter in his 34th and not in his 37th year.

*He.* I am very confident that he says 37, for I copied it from his work, and I have the page among my papers.

*We.* Will you show the place of this statement in his writings? for here are all his chronological works, (laying them before him.)

This he was unable to do; and we showed him, p. 475 of his 1st vol. of "Church of the Redeemed," when speaking of the passover at which Christ suffered, that Dr. Jarvis says: "The Passover, in the thirty-fourth year of our Lord's life, began on Thursday, the 25th of March," &c. Then said

*We.* Thus you have no authority whatever, from Dr. Jarvis, either for placing the crucifixion in A. D. 37, or for giving that as his age when crucified! Have you any other authority for placing the crucifixion in A. D. 37?

*He.* Yes, there was a passover full moon on Friday in that year, the same as in A. D. 33.

*We.* So has there been a Paschal full moon on Friday in many other years, without affording any evidence that the crucifixion was in either of those years. The dispute respecting that event does not extend beyond the years A. D. 28 to A. D. 34. The event must be found within that disputed period; for no writer, ancient or modern, places it this side of A. D. 34.

*He.* Do not some of the ancient writers place it in A. D. 40?

*We.* Some ancient writers surmised that the Saviour might be 40 or 50 years of age; but none of them placed his crucifixion in their chronological reckonings, this side of the year that synchronizes with our A. D. 35. And it was impossible for them to; for in A. D. 36 Caligula succeeded Tiberius in the empire; and it was in the reign of Tiberius that the crucifixion occurred. Therefore a paschal full moon on Friday in A. D. 37, would be no evidence of the crucifixion in that year—lacking as it would other elements necessary to its demonstration. But in this case as in the other, you are mistaken; for no Paschal full moon occurred on Friday in that year, as any one can see who is able to calculate the time of its full. And therefore that could not be the year of the crucifixion.

*He.* Well, I rest more on the 20th of Artaxerxes for the commencement of the 70 weeks, and that I am satisfied was in B. C. 446.

*We.* You cannot commence the 70 weeks so late as that, unless the date of the crucifixion will harmonize with it in its appropriate place in the last week. Commencing there, the last week does not begin till several years after the crucifixion must have taken place, which fact alone makes it impossible for the 70 weeks to have commenced at so late a date. Besides, no chronologer who reckons them from the 20th of Artaxerxes, places that year in B. C. 446, or later than the year 4260 of the Julian Period, which corresponds with our B. C. 454. Usher, and all who reckon from the 20th, place the crucifixion in A. D. 33, and end the 70 weeks in A. D. 37—where you end the 69! Thus you inconsistently refuse to follow any of those you quote as authority. Yet the manner in which you refer to them would convey the idea to your hearers that they sustain you in the commencement of the 70 weeks. And thus your hearers are deceived by your not showing wherein you depart from the teachings of those you quote.—*Ad. Herald.*

[From the Springfield Daily Republican]

#### Proofs of Immortality.—"Spiritualism."

To the Editors of the Republican:

PERMIT me, through your paper, to make public the following account of some very extraordinary occurrences which happened to me personally during the week passed. Before commencing my narrative, let me say that I do not come before the public from a love of notoriety, nor because I am over fond of ridicule, but because, knowing what I state to be true, I am willing to take up my cross for the sake of truth, and avow the facts without fear or favor.

On Monday last, Sept. 25, I called after tea at the house of my friend, Rufus Elmer, for the purpose of returning a book I had borrowed. Unexpectedly, I met there D. D. Hume, the "medium," who had just arrived from Boston. After conversing an hour or two, Mr. Elmer having to leave on the morrow on business, proposed a "circle" that evening. We accordingly sat down—Mr. E.'s family, Mr. Hume and myself being the only ones present. The occurrences, though very extraordinary, were similar to those already published, consisting of rappings and all manner of tipplings, &c. We were all touched by unseen hands, (the room being well lighted with gas,) a large bell was passed into our hands, &c. These things were new to me, and are not to the public. I will therefore pass them by.

Knowing that still more extraordinary "manifestations" at times occurred to Mr. Hume during the night, I incidentally mentioned that I would like to witness some of them. They urged me to stay and spend the night, and I did so.

After leisurely undressing, putting the light out and retiring, Hume said to me, "Now let's wish for them." Whether wishing helped the matter or not, we soon began to hear faint raps, which rapidly increased in power and number, till the walls, floor and bedstead seemed teeming with life. They came like a shower. Soon came other noises, and then the bed began to move across the floor. This seemed rather dangerous locomotion. It was the only thing that gave me any uneasiness. Having before witnessed so many wonders, I was not at all frightened. Hume seemed more scared than I, holding on to me with both hands, and begging with all his might that the bedstead should be stopped. They complied with his request, only to come in a more tangible form.

Soon I began to feel some one stepping on my feet and ankles, over the bed-clothes, but with a pressure different from that produced by any hard substance. Directly after came a hand on my head and forehead, as much like flesh and blood as any I ever felt, only somewhat cold. I began to ask questions, the fingers spating me on my forehead in answer. Several hands, touching me at the same time, claimed to be those of relatives of mine. Of this I have nothing to say. I merely state the facts as they occurred.

A strong hand claiming to be my grandfather, I asked, how am I to know that this is my grandfather? The hand moved from my forehead to my temple, over my eyebrow and eye, and then passed down over my face—the fingers patting me in the most gentle manner possible. At another time, at my request, they patted my forehead with such force that the sound could be heard, I am confident, in any part of the room. I would like to state more and fuller particulars of what occurred, but my space does not allow me.

I wish, before I close, to add a few words, though I regret occupying so much room. To religious minds (strangely the most skeptical in this matter,) I have this to say: By what process of reasoning can you bring yourselves to disbelieve my testimony of what I know and have seen, and to believe the testimony of what John, Peter or Paul saw? I speak with all reverence—I doubt not their testimony; on the contrary I believe it now more than ever. But I know of no reason (my veracity being unimpeached) why my testimony of what I know and see is not as good as that of any other man, living or dead. And there are thousands who know these to be so, as well as I.

To our wise men, whose hobby is scientific investigation, I would say: Of what use is it for those who have gone through what I have, to read Dr. Dodd's book, Dr. Rogers' theory, to marvel over Prof. Faraday's discoveries? (He proved that when he pushed, he pushed!) Or how often shall we listen to the humbugs who lecture to hundred dollar houses, and where may be seen delighted groups of gentlemen with less than half a dozen capital D's and L's attached to their names?

My Editors—during the past week I have witnessed many "manifestations" (I do not like the word) as wonderful and more intelligible than those I have related. Others did the same. I may write you an account of them in a future article, if you

think best. To me it is immaterial. I know what I have written, and the public will have to "acknowledge the corn" sooner or later. It is but a question of time.

F. C. ANDREU.

## THE REVIEW AND HERALD

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

ROCHESTER THIRD-DAY, OCT. 10, 1884.

### "THERE IS ONE LAW-GIVER."

It is commonly supposed that Christ is the Christian's law-giver, and from this erroneous supposition grow incorrect views relative to the weekly Sabbath. It is first assumed that Christ is the law-giver, and has given, in person, or by the inspired Apostles, a perfect code of laws for the gospel dispensation; then it is asserted, that as the Sabbath law is not in the New Testament, the seventh-day Sabbath is not binding on Christians. We regard the assumption that Christ is our law-giver as one of the most dangerous errors of the times, as it leads men to trample on the authority of God; therefore shall expose it by the light of revealed truth.

Said Moses to the people, "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken." Deut. xviii, 15.

Said God to Moses, "I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him." Verse 18.

Peter speaking of Christ, says, "For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you, of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you." Acts iii, 22.

We will now inquire, Did Moses legislate? Did he make laws for the people? He did not. Neither did Christ. Moses received words from the mouth of God, and spake them to the people as such; so did our Lord Jesus Christ. "Hear him."—

"Jesus answered them, and said, My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me." John vii, 16.

"Then said Jesus unto them, When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I am he, and that I do nothing of myself; but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things." John viii, 28.

"For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak. And I know that his commandment is life everlasting: whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak." John xii, 49, 50.

"He that loveth me not, keepeth not my sayings: and the word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's which sent me." John xiv, 24.

Says the Father, [Deut. xviii, 18,] "He shall speak unto them all that I shall command him." Says the Son, [John xii, 49,] "The Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak." By these testimonies from the Father and Son we learn that it was not the work of our Lord Jesus Christ to legislate; but he received the doctrines which he taught from the mouth of the Father, and spake them to the people. In this respect, as a prophet, or teacher, he was like Moses. In both cases the Father is the law-giver.

The transfiguration is referred to as proof that Christ is the law-giver in the gospel age. It is said that the presence of both Moses and Christ, (the teachers of both dispensations,) and Moses being placed upon the back-ground by the voice from heaven, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased, hear him," shows that Christ is the law-giver in the present age.

But a very important personage in this scene is overlooked. It is the Father. Peter, referring to the occasion, says, "For he received from God the Father honor and glory." 2 Pet i 17.

It is also said, that to keep the ten commandments is going back from Christ to Moses.

Not so. Jehovah (not Moses) spoke the ten commandments in the audience of all the people, then wrote them in stone with his finger. He (not Moses) was the law-giver. He also appears at the mount of transfiguration as the commander and law-giver. His voice is heard, as the highest authority, "Hear Him!" He is the law-giver of both dispensations; while the Scriptures represent Moses and Christ as prophets, or teachers. True, we are to hear Christ; but what does he say of his doctrine? "My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me."

If Christ be our law-giver, who is our advocate? We have none. But the New Testament definition of sin, is, "the transgression of the law." 1 John iii, 4. And the Apostle says, "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." Chap. ii, 1. Here are three parties introduced, (1) the sinner, or transgressor of the law, (2) the Advocate, and (3) the Father, whose law the sinner transgresses. It is perfectly plain, then, that in the dispensation of the gospel, the Father is the law-giver; and Jesus is the advocate or mediator between the offending sinner, and an offended God.

But let us take the view of this subject with Christ for the Christian's law-giver. "Sin is the transgression of the law" of Christ. "And if any man sin, we have an advocate with" Jesus Christ. But who is this advocate? The Papist can answer, The Pope, while the Protestant has no reply.

All agree that nine of the ten commandments are binding on men in the gospel age. But if Christ be our law-giver, instead of the Father, how is it that nine of the former law-giver's precepts are binding on Christians? Is it replied that the new law-giver commanded nine of the old commandments over again? This we deny.

Christ has never given one of the ten commandments on a new account, as resting on his authority. Never. He quotes from the law of his Father, and leaves each precept resting on its original base. In proof of this position, we turn to Matt. xix, 16-23. "Good Master," says the young man, "what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life?" "If thou wilt enter into life," says the Master, "keep the commandments." The young man saith unto him, Which? Then our Lord quotes five precepts from the decalogue. Certainly there is nothing in all this that presents the least idea that our Lord is giving a new law, or that he is giving nine precepts of the Father's law over again. He mentions but five precepts.

But it may be said that Jesus gave two new and great commandments to take the place of the ten, as recorded in Matt. xxii, 35-40. "Then one of them, which was a lawyer, asked him a question, tempting him, and saying, Master, which is the great commandment in the law?"

Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets."

These two commandments are claimed to be new, and to take the place of the ten. But how new? What is the age of the first? "Hear, O Israel," said Moses, "The Lord our God is one Lord. And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might." Deut. vi, 4, 5. This commandment was at least 1400 years old when repeated by our Lord.

What is the age of the second? "Thou shalt not avenge, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people, but thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Lev. xix, 18. This was also 1400 years old when quoted by our Lord; yet modern theologians talk of these two commandments being something new, and taking the place of the ten. We would in-

quire, If all the law hangs on the two, how is it that the two have taken the place of the ten? If all the law hangs on the two, then we have it all, and not nine-tenths of it only.

Turn to the "Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to show unto his servants," &c. And mark: Jesus is the Revelator, and not John. "Hear him" "And the dragon was wroth with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ." Rev. xii, 17. The testimony of Jesus Christ embraces all the sayings of Christ and his inspired Apostles, peculiar to the gospel. The commandments of God are the ten, spoken by the Father and engraven in the tables of stone, and taught by Christ and the Apostles. See Rev. xiv, 12.

Hear the Revelator, as recorded in the last chapter of the Book of God. "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still: and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still: and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still: and he that is holy, let him be holy still. And behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last. Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." Rev. xxii, 11-14.

Here are most solemn declarations from the Son of God, which apply to that short period just prior to the Second Advent, when there shall be no "Intercessor," when Christ is to come quickly. O dreadful day of keenest anguish and black despair, to those who have broken the commandments of God. "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still."

But to the just it is said at that time, "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." Here are three parties introduced: (1) the commandment-keepers, (2) the author of the commandments, and (3) the speaker, which is the Lord Jesus Christ. Christ, then, is speaking of his Father's commandments, and pronounces a blessing on those who shall keep them. When the unjust take up the lamentation, that "The harvest is past, the summer is ended, and we are not saved," then those who keep the Father's commandments will be "blessed."

Reader, have you ever thought that this blessing, pronounced by the Son of God upon those who should "do his [the Father's] commandments," had a special application to the last days? Read carefully Rev. xxii, 11-14, and mark the connection of the sentences, and we think you will agree with us that it does. Is not the fourth commandment one of the Father's? It is. Can it be said that a man does "his" commandments, while he disregards the fourth? It cannot. Have those, then, who do not obey the fourth commandment any reason to claim the blessing promised by the Son of God in Rev. xxii, 14? And if they continue to tread under foot one of the commandments of God, have they not reason to expect to be finally classed with those commandment-breakers mentioned in verse 15? The reader will please answer the last two questions.

If it be said that the Apostles in their writing have given a code of laws for the gospel age, we reply, that this view makes twelve law-givers, whereas James says, "There is one law-giver."

Notice the commission to the eleven: "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Matt. xxviii, 19, 20. Christ taught them what he had received of the Father, and this they were to teach men to observe; therefore gospel truth proceeds from the Father.

Notice also the work of the Holy Spirit, and from whom it proceeds. "But the Comforter, which is



the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." John xiv, 26. "And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever." Verse 16. The Holy Spirit came from the Father, and one object for which it was sent was to call to the disciples' memory the words of divine truth which the Son had received of the Father and had spoken to them. We have, then, the plainest testimony that all revealed light and truth proceeds from the Father, who is the Christian's law-giver.

#### TRADITION.

THE traditions of the fathers have now become venerable in the eyes of thousands. Their words can be quoted to sustain a multitude of favorite doctrines and practices which the Bible does not sanction. Hence it is that the advocates of those respective doctrines, find the tradition of the elders an invaluable treasure. The fact that many of the most conscientious and upright persons have been bewildered by this fog of the enemy of truth, makes it important that we look into this subject with care.

What weight then should be allowed the traditions of the fathers? What degree of authority should be attached to their decisions respecting religious duties? Perhaps the following remarks will throw some light on this question.

1. A doctrine does not become truth by becoming ancient. Satan's lie to our first parents, is six thousand years old, and has not yet become truth.

2. Every doctrine or tradition had a commencement; and when it began it was either truth or falsehood, according as it agreed with or contradicted the Bible.

3. We have the Bible in our own hands and may bring these traditions to its test, and examine them in its light. If they agree with the word of God, they are truth; if they do not agree with its teaching, they are worthless fables.

The soundness of this reasoning cannot, we think, be invalidated. And were it not that men are naturally inclined to love darkness rather than light, we should hope that this would lead them to the Bible as their only standard.

Tradition does not rest satisfied with being equal to the Scriptures, but exalts itself above them. Men begin by adding tradition to the written word of inspiration, and end by correcting the written word by the added tradition. The following remarks will make this plain: The absence of any testimony that the Lord's Sabbath has been changed, is accounted for by many of its warmest advocates as follows:

There were many things that Jesus did which were not recorded, as the world could not have held the books, had all been written. John xxi, 25.—The change of the Sabbath was one of those acts, the record of which was unfortunately crowded out of the written word for want of room; hence it is proper, as well as necessary, that we should add to the records of inspiration, the traditions of the fathers, who have kindly preserved for us this important and valuable truth.

In reply to such reasoning as this, we state a few facts: 1. The foregoing reasoning is in direct contradiction to 2 Tim. iii, 16, 17, which affirms that the Holy Scriptures were given by inspiration of God, and are able to thoroughly furnish the man of God unto all good works. If this word is true, it follows that no necessity exists for adding tradition to the Bible, in order to obtain a perfect rule of faith and practice. And it further follows that as the Bible thoroughly furnishes men to ALL good works, that is not a good work for which the Bible furnishes nothing. 2. But men do not merely add tradition to the Bible: they correct the Bible by it. The word of God plainly says, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy," "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." These plain statements of the word of inspiration, men correct by the tradition of the elders: thus placing tradition above the word and commandment of Jehovah.

And what an humiliating confession do the advocates of the Sunday-Sabbath make, when they place the change of the Sabbath among the things that were not written. Jesus said, even to his trusting disciples, "O fools and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken." But were he now on earth, would he not add to that pointed rebuke, another equally strong: O fools and ready of heart to believe what the prophets never have written!

But why was the change of the Sabbath never recorded? Would a single verse stating that Sunday had become the Sabbath and requiring us to remember that day to keep it holy, have enlarged the Bible so much that the world would not have been able to hold so vast a book? The simple reason is that neither God the Father, nor his Son Jesus Christ, ever yet changed the holy Sabbath. The Bible was just large enough to contain all revealed truth: to have added a single error would have made it too large. This is the reason why the commandment to keep Sunday holy as a Sabbath unto the Lord was omitted.

But were the fathers, who furnish this lacking part of the Bible, inspired? No, they did not even claim it themselves. And those who virtually claim it for them would be ashamed to confess their faith in one tenth part of what these fathers have written. If the fathers, then, were fallible mortals like ourselves, even their advocates being judges, is it not reasonable to say that we will receive the word of the fathers just so far as it agrees with the word of Jehovah, and beyond that we will not go? If their testimony agrees with that which is infallible, we may safely receive it: if it contradicts that which came from Jehovah by the pen of inspiration, we may rest assured that it is rank poison.

Does the antiquity of certain fathers who have spoken in favor of Sunday, make them very venerable and sacred in your eyes? If so, please to take into the account the antiquity of the grand-fathers, the apostles, and the great grand-fathers, the prophets, all of whom have obeyed and taught the commandments of Jehovah. Antiquity and the ancients are on the side of the Lord's Sabbath; and it is an important consideration that those most ancient and venerable men to whom we have referred as bearing testimony in favor of the Sabbath, were divinely inspired, and hence infallible in their testimony; while not one person who has ever spoken in favor of the change of the Sabbath, had the least ground to claim divine inspiration. The Saviour's contrast between day and night, may without violence be applied to the Bible and tradition. Said Jesus, "If a man walk in the day, he stumbleth not, because he seeth the light of this world. But if a man walk in the night, he stumbleth, because there is no light in him." John xi, 9, 10. The man who feels competent to illuminate noon-day with the darkness of midnight, is the very person who should correct the Bible by the tradition of the fathers.

None are more exceedingly zealous of the traditions of the fathers in support of Sunday, than the Presbyterians. But the following extract will indicate their feelings when the fathers are used against the Presbyterians:

"They [Episcopalians] contend that bishops, in the sense in which they use the term, certainly existed in the churches as early as A. D. 160. They lay great stress on the writings of the Christian Fathers on this point, and in particular on Clement, and the epistles of St. Ignatius. The latter, in his epistle to the Smyrneans, calls upon Christians 'to obey their bishop, even as Christ obeyed the Father; to venerate the presbyters, as the apostles; and the deacons, as the commandments of God.' Presbyterians, and other Dissenters, however, demur as to this authority, and appeal to Scripture. They plead the great dissimilarity between this language and that of the apostles; and strongly suspect that these Ignatian epistles have either been forged, or greatly corrupted by the church of Rome, in order to lay a foundation for the authority assumed by the clergy, on the establishment of Christianity under Constantine."—*Goodrich's History of the Church*.—p. 230.

That the testimony of the early Christians has been corrupted by the church of Rome, and many shameful forgeries palmed off as their genuine teach-

ing, there can be no doubt. As an example, we will cite the epistle of Barnabas, the earliest father quoted to sustain the first-day Sabbath. Whoever will carefully read the ninth chapter of that epistle, cannot fail to satisfy himself, that that epistle is a wicked forgery. They would at least be prepared to appreciate the following from the "History of the Sabbath:"

"To this epistle it is objected, that there is no evidence of its genuineness. Eusebius, who lived near the time when it was written, mentions it as a spurious writing, entitled to no credit. Dr. Milnor says it is an injury to St. Barnabas, to ascribe this epistle to him. Mosheim says it is the work of some superstitious Jew of mean abilities."

Those who add tradition to the Bible, do so because they are not able to prove from the Scriptures all the doctrines which they choose to cherish. This is the case with the advocates of Sunday. Not being able to bring any testimony in its favor, but weak inferences, they resort to the authority of the fathers, and to the traditions of the elders. They leave the rule of the Protestants, viz., the Bible alone, and adopt that of the Papist, viz., the Bible and tradition. As proof read the following rules:—

THE RULE OF PROTESTANTS.—"All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." 2 Tim. iii, 16, 17.

THE RULE OF PAPISTS.—"All scripture, &c. Every part of divine scripture is certainly profitable for all these ends. But if we would have the whole rule of Christian faith and practice, we must not be content with those scriptures which Timothy knew from his infancy, that is, with the Old Testament alone; nor yet with the New Testament, without taking along with it the traditions of the apostles, and the interpretation of the church, to which the apostles delivered both the book, and the true meaning of it." Note of the Douay (Catholic) Bible on 2 Tim. iii, 16, 17.

In a word, Protestant Sunday-keepers are obliged to fight under the banner of the church of Rome. They cannot take the divinely inspired, all-sufficient book of God and sustain Sunday-keeping; hence they leave the ground of Protestants, and take that of the Papists—the Bible and the fathers. Romanists point to such conduct on the part of Protestants as a tacit confession that the Bible is not sufficient, and an acknowledgment that they are correct in joining the fathers to the Bible in order to supply what is lacking in that book, and to make it a perfect rule of faith. No stronger evidence need be adduced that Sunday-keeping comes from the Romish apostasy, than the fact that those who advocate it are obliged to adopt the Romist's rule of faith.

The apostate Jewish church, in the days of the Saviour, occupied the same position that the Romish church now occupies, and which every Protestant is obliged to adopt when he undertakes to prove the change of the Lord's Sabbath. They had buried the word of God beneath a vast pile of tradition. They had exalted their traditions to a place with the words of inspiration. They had taken their traditions and corrected the truths of inspiration by them. They had virtually annulled the fifth commandment, not to mention a multitude of like acts; and all of this they did under the appearance of the greatest godliness. Those who took the lead, and who emboldened the nation to such a course, were the very men who made the greatest pretension to religion.

Under the name of religion and zeal for the Lord, they added to his pure words a vast multitude of burdensome and rigorous ceremonies. The Sabbath of the Lord which was made for man before the fall, and which God designed as a delight, they had loaded down with numberless traditions, all of which were considered of equal authority with the commandments of God, or rather as forming parts of his commandments. These made the holy Sabbath in effect what its opponents now represent it, viz., a yoke of bondage. Our Lord who kept his Father's commandments, never sanctioned their traditions by paying them the least reverence. On the contrary, he evidently designed to teach them that the most profound reverence for the words of his Father, was

consistent with the total disregard of their traditions; nay, that reverence for the word of Jehovah forbid him to honor as its equal the words of fallible men.

Hence it was that our Lord was regarded as a Sabbath breaker and a sinner by those who acknowledged the authority of tradition. Their unjust accusation led him to make that remarkable defense, which is recorded, Matt. xv, 1-9. The character of their traditions was there uncovered. The fact that by following them, they were openly violating the ten commandments was exposed before all. And the solemn sentence of him who shall judge mankind at the last day was pronounced: "In vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrine the commandments of men." As the Protestant church at the present day makes void the fourth commandment on the authority of tradition, just as the Jewish church then made void the fifth, perhaps the following extract, showing the source from which the Jews claimed to derive their traditions may be of interest:

"The Jews believe that all the precepts of the law, given to Moses, were accompanied with an interpretation. They say, that God first dictated the text as it is written in the Pentateuch, and then gave Moses an explication of every part of it. It was commanded that the text should be put in writing, and the explanation committed to memory, to be communicated to that generation, and transmitted to posterity by word of mouth. Hence the former is called the written law, and the latter the oral law. When Moses came down from the mount, he delivered both these laws to the people. As soon as he was returned to his tent, he was attended by Aaron, who sat at his feet, and to whom he recited the text and taught the interpretation which he received from God in the mount. Then Aaron rising and seating himself on the right hand of Moses, Eleazar and Ithamar entered, and Moses repeated to them all that he had communicated to their father; after which they arose and seated themselves, one on the left hand of Moses, and the other on the right hand of Aaron. Then went in the seventy elders, and Moses taught them in the same manner as he had taught Aaron and his sons. Afterwards entered the congregation at large, or all of them who were desirous of knowing the Divine will; and to them also Moses recited the text and the interpretation, in the same manner as before. These two laws, as delivered by Moses, had now been heard by Aaron four times, by his sons three times, by the seventy elders twice, and by the rest of the people once. After this, Moses withdrawing, Aaron repeated the whole that he had heard from Moses, and withdrew: then Eleazar and Ithamar did the same; and on their withdrawing, the same was done by the seventy elders: so that each of them, having heard both these laws repeated four times, they all had them firmly fixed in their memories. Towards the end of the fortieth year after the departure from Egypt, Moses assembled the people, announced the time of his death to be near, directed those who had forgotten any tradition he had delivered, to come to him, that he might repeat it to them anew, and invited them to apply to him for a solution of all questions in which they found any difficulty. The last month of his life was employed in giving these repetitions and explications to the people, and especially to Joshua, his successor. Before Joshua died, all the interpretations which he had received from Moses were transmitted by him to the elders who survived him. These elders conveyed them to the prophets, and by one prophet they were delivered to another." *History of the Jews*—pp. 29, 30.

The difference between Jewish and Protestant followers of tradition is simply this: the Jews claimed that their traditions were handed down to them from Moses; the Protestants claim that their traditions have been handed down from Christ. Both parties, while mutually condemning, each the other, agree in exalting tradition above the ten commandments. The Protestant acknowledges the wickedness of the Jew in violating through tradition the fifth commandment; yet takes the same course with the fourth commandment, and for the same reason.

If a son made a formal devotion to sacred purposes of those goods which he could afford for the relief of a parent, the Jews considered him as exempt from the duty of succoring his parent: thus encouraging a direct violation of the fifth commandment, and in so doing destroying morality at its very source. Their authority for thus openly violating the commandments of God, we have just read. Protestants no

less openly violate the fourth commandment; and this they do without any other license than tradition. The Jews incurred the fearful rebuke of the Son of God; yet the Jews could present a far more venerable and imposing tradition than Protestants are able to show. What then shall we say respecting these professed followers of Christ? They acknowledge the authority of him who exposed the wickedness of the Jew's tradition, and yet with less reason, and against far greater light, they obstinately continue to make void the commandment that they may keep their own traditions. Would to God that men might realize the sinfulness of such conduct, and show the sincerity of their repentance by turning to God with full purpose of heart.

Rochester, N. Y.

J. N. A.

#### Tent Meeting at Shelby, Mich.

THIS meeting was one of interest, from the commencement to the close. Our tent was pitched in a beautiful place, and the weather was very favorable; so that on First-day about fifteen hundred came out to hear the testimony. A good interest was manifested during the day, and order was observed. After the last discourse, the tent was taken down, and we continued our testimony during the week, in the Academy near by. The interest was such, and the weather so fair, it was thought best to pitch the tent again, for meetings on the following Sabbath and First-day, and we advertised accordingly, and called upon the professed watchmen in that vicinity to come out and acknowledge our testimony true, or try to show it false, and point out the better way: giving any minister the privilege of preaching a sermon in the tent, and presenting the opposite of any of our positions. A Baptist minister consented to give his opinion of what he had heard. Said he had been much interested in the subjects presented; that he believed in the literal, personal, second advent of Christ; that his coming was near; that the saints would all receive immortality at his coming, and all the living wicked be destroyed, and live not again until after the one thousand years, when they would be resurrected and punished according to their deeds, and receive their doom which is death. Concerning the Spirit Manifestations, he had not given them an investigation; but if there was any spirits about them, he believed they were all of the Devil. Concerning the Sabbath, if there is any Sabbath in this dispensation, one day more than another, it must be the original seventh day. He regarded the efforts of Protestants to show divine authority for Sunday-keeping, "one universal quibble." He believed that in the former dispensation, God had but one law, and that was nailed to the cross, &c. In our review we contrasted the two laws, and showed clearly that Christ destroyed one, but the other "he came not to destroy," &c. At the close of the discourse, the Elder reminded the people of the fact that Jesus was that Prophet like unto Moses, and we should listen to him, &c.; that if we could show from the New Testament a definite Sabbath or Lord's day, one day more than another, he would keep it. This was done by reading Matt. xxiv, 20, and Rev. i, 10. If there was not a definite day, in the year A. D. 96, known as the "Lord's day," and every day was known to be alike, John certainly must have been ignorant of the fact, and his statement that he was in the Spirit on "the Lord's day," was entirely superfluous. This we cannot believe.

This public investigation before the people was conducted in such a manner that no evil can result from it. Each party presented their views in a candid manner, with a manifest desire to have the truth found out, and understood by all. We expect to see this watchman, together with many others like him, engaged ere long with us in calling God's people out of Babylon, for the following reasons: 1. The truth is so plain that a man of his ability cannot fail to see it when he has once investigated. 2. He has been in the habit of changing his position when convinced of error. 3. He, professing to be an honest, independent, free man, for the Lord, will stand boldly for the truth when he sees it. 4. An honest man

will no sooner hold on to an error in regard to the Sabbath, in order to be popular, than in regard to Baptism. 5. Any man, after a candid, thorough investigation, without prejudice, cannot fail to see that Sunday-keeping, sprinkling for baptism, and infant sprinkling, all came from the same source, viz., the Catholic church.

The truth has taken deep root in Shelby. About \$20.00 worth of books were sold at this meeting: making in all about \$70.00 worth sold in that town. Operations with the tent are now closed for the season. God's blessing has attended our efforts with the tent, for which we praise his name. We believe that much prejudice has been removed, and the way prepared for a good work to be done the coming Winter.

M. E. CORNELL.

J. N. LOUGHBOROUGH.

#### Death by Crucifixion.

In various countries crucifixion has been a mode of inflicting capital punishment upon transgressors. Among the Jews it was sometimes spoken of as hanging. It was a cruel and disgraceful death to die, as Cicero says in his oration against Verres. "The worst possible punishment," Ulpian calls it; and other ancient writers speak of it in the same terms. It was in practice among the Persians, and the Greeks, and the Romans with peculiar refinement of torture, according to the taste of the people, or the degree of guilt for which the victim suffered. Kitto has compiled a great many facts respecting this dreadful punishment, which cannot be read without deep emotion, when we remember that this was the death of the Lord Jesus. Herodotus says that Darius crucified three hundred persons after the siege of Babylon. Alexander nailed two thousand captives to as many crosses, by the sea-side, after the capture of Tyre. The Romans scourged the criminal before they crucified him. Thus they treated our Master.

The Hebrews derived the punishment from the Romans. The upright beam was let into the ground, and the criminal being raised up, was fastened to the transverse piece by nails driven through his hands, sometimes through his feet also; and often the feet were crossed, and one nail driven through both. The feet were sometimes bound to the cross by cords. A small tablet, declaring the crime, was placed on the top of the cross. The victim died under the most frightful sufferings; so great, that even amid the raging passions of war, pity was sometimes excited. The wounds were not in themselves fatal. A raging fever soon sets in, and the victim complains of throbbing headache, intense thirst, and pain.—When mortification ensues, as is sometimes the case, the sufferer rapidly sinks. He is no longer sensible of pain, but his anxiety and sense of prostration are excessive; hiccup supervenes, his skin is moistened with a cold clammy sweat, and death ensues. The duration of life under these agonies varied with the constitution of the sufferer, and the state of the weather. Death was hastened by the heat of the Sun and the exposure to the cold night air, but it did not ordinarily come to end the wretchedness of the victim until he had hung for thirty-six or forty-eight weary hours! Richter states that some survive on the cross for three, four, and even for nine days.

Our blessed Lord is believed to have died in about six hours from the time of being nailed to the cross. He gave up the ghost. He laid down his life. The historians speak of him as if he yielded up his breath when his work was done. But a dreadful death it was to die. And for us!

"Was it for crimes that I had done  
He groined upon the tree?  
Amazing pity, grace unknown,  
And love beyond degree!"

Ch. Penny. Meg.

As long as the waters of persecutions are upon the earth, so long we dwell in the ark; but where the land is dry, the dove itself will be tempted to a wandering course of life, and never to return to the house of her safety.

Live not so much upon the comforts of God, as upon the God of comforts.

## Important Extracts.

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

"We think you have fallen into error concerning the nature and design of that division of the Scriptures commonly called the New Testament. We regard it not as the *Law Book* of mankind, in the strict and proper sense; but rather as a *Treatise on Justification*, in which are contained such references to the law, and such quotations from it, as are necessary to the complete elucidation of the subject."

"Now, if the New Testament is to be regarded as a treatise on justification, with such references to the old as are necessary for the elucidation of the subject, rather than as the *Law-Book* for mankind at large; the idea that the Sabbath ought not to be looked for in the Old Testament, falls to the ground. Nevertheless, to some minds it appears strange, that while the New Testament writers mention all the other duties of the Decalogue, this is apparently omitted."

In speaking of the sins of which Christians were guilty before their conversion, not one word is said about Sabbath-breaking, though upon other sins they dwell with emphasis. But this admits of a very easy solution. Those writers addressed two classes of converts; those from among the Jews, and those from among the Gentiles. As to the former, they were already rigid to an extreme in keeping the Sabbath. All that was necessary to do in their case, was to vindicate the institution from Pharisaic austerities, and determine what was lawful to be done, and what was not lawful. This was done by Christ. But as for the Gentile converts, to charge them with having been guilty of the sin of Sabbath-breaking in their state of heathenism, would have been manifest impropriety. For the Sabbath being for the most part a *positive* rather than a *moral* precept, it could not be known without a revelation. But as the Gentiles had no revelation, this is a good reason why the apostle dwelt not upon this sin to charge it upon them, but only upon those which were more obviously breaches of the Moral Law. Thus it appears, there was no necessity for any more particular mention of the Sabbath to be made in the New Testament, than what is made."

"He that is content with just grace enough to get to heaven, and escape hell, and desires no more, may be sure he hath none at all; and is far from being made partaker of the Divine nature." Ps. li, 6; xl, 8; 1 John iii, 3. Jno. Janeway.

## JERUSALEM MY HAPPY HOME.

Jerusalem! my happy home!  
When shall I come to thee?  
When shall my sorrows have an end?  
Thy joys when shall I see?

O Happy harbor of the saints,  
Oh sweet and pleasant soil,  
In thee no sorrow may be found,  
No grief, no care, no toil.

No dampish mist is seen in thee,  
No cold nor darkness night;  
There every soul shines as the sun—  
There God himself gives light.

There lust and lucre cannot dwell,  
There envy bears no sway;  
There is no hunger, heat, nor cold,  
But pleasure every way.

Jerusalem! Jerusalem!  
God grant I once may see  
Thy endless joy, and of the same,  
Partaker aye to be.

Thy walls are made of precious stone,  
Thy bulwarks diamonds square.  
Thy gates are of right orient pearls,  
Exceeding rich and rare.

Thy turrets and thy pinnacles  
With carbuncles do shine;  
Thy very streets are paved with gold,  
Surpassing clear and fine.

Thy houses are of ivory,  
Thy windows crystal clear,  
Thy tiles are made of beaten gold—  
Would God, that I were there!

Ah, my sweet home, Jerusalem!  
Would God I were in thee,  
Would God my woes were at an end,  
Thy joys that I might see.

Thy saints are crowned with glory great,  
They see God face to face;  
They triumph still, they still rejoice—  
Most happy is their case.

We that are here in banishment  
Continually do moan;  
We sigh and sob, we weep and wail,  
Perpetually we groan.

Our sweet is mixed with bitter-gall,  
Our pleasure is but pain,  
Our joys scarce last the looking-on,  
Our sorrows still remain.

But there they live in such delights,  
Such pleasures and such play.  
As that to them a thousand years  
Doth seem as yesterday.

Thy vineyards and thy orchards are  
Most beautiful and fair,  
And furnished full with trees and fruit,  
Most wonderful and rare.

Thy gardens and thy pleasant walks  
Continually are green;  
There grow such sweet and pleasant flow-  
As nowhere else are seen. [ers

Quite thro' the streets, with silver sound,  
The flood of life doth flow,  
Upon whose banks, on either side,  
The tree of life doth grow.

The trees forevermore bear fruit,  
And evermore do spring;  
There evermore the angels sit,  
And evermore do sing.

There David stands with harp in hand,  
As master of the choir;  
Ten thousand times that man were blest  
That might this music hear.

There Magdalene hath left her moan,  
And cheerfully doth sing  
With blessed saints, whose harmony  
In every street doth ring.

Jerusalem, my happy home!  
Would God I were in thee;  
Would God my woes were at an end,  
Thy joys that I might see!

We suppose the writer was looking forward and bringing the future into the present, otherwise he is not in harmony with the Scriptures. Ed.

## Recognitions at the Judgment.

ALL will be ineffably solemn. Many will be full of joy and others full of bitterness. Think of Cain, the first murderer, meeting the martyred Abel; and all murderers and the victims of their cupidity or hatred; heroes and despots meeting the millions who were slain in their battles or on whose neck they forged the yoke of oppression; popes and inquisitors confronting those whom they had murdered in the dark dungeon, on the rack, at the stake and elsewhere; iron-hearted oppressors standing by the side of the slave, on whom they had inflicted every injury that pride, anger and lust, could invent or perpetrate; rumsellers staring their slaughtered victims and the long train of widows and orphans; seducers and the victims of their falsehood, treachery and crime; false teachers and the souls they had led down to perdition; ungodly parents, and the children whom they ruined forever. Alas! what recognitions of woe will occur on that day.

But there will also be recognitions of gladness. The pious parent will meet with the redeemed child. The godly wife will there recognize her sainted husband. The emancipated from slavery, poverty, sorrow and sin, will there meet and bless those who prayed and laboured in their behalf. The Sabbath advocates, the watchmen in Zion, will there meet with immortal gems which they by God's blessing plucked from the mire of ignorance and crime. The missionary and the redeemed from paganism; the faithful pastor and the blood-washed flock; all the chosen ones of God who have been instrumental in turning souls to righteousness, will there recognize those saved ones. But how soon will all eyes be turned away from each other to look without a glass between, on the adorable Judge and Saviour.

Yours, knowing that by strict obedience we shall receive a crown. E. HARRIS.  
Vernon, Vt., Sept., 1854.

## COMMUNICATIONS.

From Bro. Bates.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—Since the 16th Sept., I have been holding meetings in Margaret, Green Springs, Ballsville, Green Creek, Fremont, Rollersville, and Muskerlunge, principally in Sandusky County, Northern Ohio. School-houses, and in some places Meeting-houses, are freely opened to hear the third angel's message. The most of these are new places where the message has never been explained. The people listened attentively. Some say "This is new doctrine, but they have got the right day; for if there is any holy day to be kept it is the seventh day, and not the first." Some say, "I want to hear more about this Sabbath question, I am not so clear. How is it that a few men know so much more than all christendom?" while others say, "The seventh day Sabbath is the right day to be kept, and I have wondered why it was not kept. I mean to examine this subject." They want the books that will enlighten them on this great question; also the *Review*, that they may learn weekly how the cause is progressing.

Some others have resolved to commence immediately; and thus Sabbath-keepers are increasing, and will continue to increase until Jesus leaves the mediatorial seat. There need be no misgiving on this all-absorbing subject of the work of God. In this great work, "His going forth is prepared as the morning." Victory is sure to all commandment-keepers that enlist under the banner of the third angel. Who that has been three, five, seven or nine years in this blessed cause, does not know without a doubt that this message has been, and is still increasing, and is destined to move all its votaries with power and strength, to a glorious immortality, and everlasting inheritance in the earth made new.

Bro. Hawkins, formerly a Methodist preacher in this place, has accompanied me to the last two mentioned places, and aided me in the work. I hope he will be a help to his brethren in this region.

JOSEPH BATES.

Fremont, Sandusky Co., Ohio, Oct. 5th, 1854.

From Sister Shoudy.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—Certainly we should be up and doing at present if ever. The world is noticing our conduct very closely; and we should endeavor to set an example before them which will be in accordance with our creed—the Bible. Precept without example



is of very little value. Brethren and sisters, let us set a good example before the world, that it may be said of us, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

Yours,

R. A. SHOURY.

Pompey, Sept. 27th, 1854.

From Bro. Loughhead.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—I still love the present sanctifying truths of the third angel's message, and the people that are keeping the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus; and by the assisting grace of God, I am determined to be numbered with them, and get the victory over the beast and over his image, and over his mark and over the number of his name, and sing the glad song of deliverance and praise to the Lamb. I feel that God is with the remnant preparing them for the final conflict with the powers of darkness. May the Lord help each and all of us to realize the time in which we live, and enable us to do those things that are pleasing in his sight.

Your unworthy brother striving to keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus.

J. A. LOUGHHEAD.

Elmira, N. Y., Oct. 1st, 1854.

From Bro. Day.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—There seems to be quite an interest on the part of some in this place to read on the subject of the Sabbath, also an inquiry in many thinking minds to know what these things mean, while they see the nations of the earth in commotion, preparing for the last conflict. Men's hearts are truly failing them for fear, and for looking after those things that are coming on the earth; and it would seem that God is preparing many minds for the loud cry of the third angel, so that they may take their stand with the children of God. All classes seem to be fitting up for the last great drama. Wickedness stalks in the street. The magician spirit has entered, and is entering, into every place. Yes, it may truly be said that Babylon is fallen, and is becoming the habitation of devils and the hold of every foul spirit and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird. How ought we to live who can see the state of the world, and what is coming upon the earth. O Lord awaken an interest in all our hearts, is my prayer.

JOHN C. DAY.

Rock Bottom, Mass., Oct. 1st, 1854.

From Bro. Cornell.

DEAR BRETHREN AND SISTERS IN CHRIST:—We have now passed by the great prophetic way-marks, until we can see clearly that the loud cry of the last message, must soon go forth. So many lines of prophecy centre right here, that there is no chance for doubt. When this last loud blast of the gospel trumpet is given, probation will end, and the eternal decree go forth. "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; he that is righteous let him be righteous still." The destiny of all will then be irrevocably fixed! Satan knows this; and of course he will devise every means to deceive and draw away the elect, before they get beyond his reach. The church have watchmen set, and the Lord says, "Let him declare what he seeth!" We look! and behold Satan busily engaged with his agents. He seems intent upon deceiving the elect if possible. His only hope of success now, is to divide the body; Therefore he now puts forth every effort to accomplish this object. As God's watchman, we give you the warning. While we see this sword (division) coming, we must give the alarm. Therefore we now say in the name of our Master, Watch! Guard against this fatal snare.

The Lord's hand has been set to the work of gathering the remnant, and it has been done right. Glory be to his name! While God's faithful servants have toiled on year after year, with all patience, Satan has tried all the way along to stop the work; but it cannot be done; for it is of God. And now as the light of present truth is set on the mountain-top, and the attention of all is about to be called by the loud cry of the third angel, Satan is rallying for the final conflict. He watches the little remnant while they are preparing to confront the world. He hears the command to them, "Set yourselves in order for battle!" These words strike him with dread; for he knows that if this little army once get into order, and are united, he cannot break their ranks. Therefore he determines that he will hinder the work. He says to one, "There is no need of order;" to another, "The work is all wrong from the beginning and you had better begin anew;" to another, "The time has not come to draw the line of Gospel Order." If these suggestions will take effect, he knows he will gain the time; but let the watchman cry, Order! Gospel Order! Union! Gospel Union! until the remnant stand firmly united, and prepared for the final struggle, having every door closed against Satan. He now works through agents. O then be united

and be decided! "And seeing ye know these things before, beware! lest ye also being led away with the error of the wicked, fall from your own steadfastness." But grow in grace, and in the knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus; "and the God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly."

"Now may the Lord of peace himself give you peace always by all means. The Lord be with you all." Amen!

Your servant in Christ for the truth's sake.

M. E. CORNELL.

Battle Creek, Mich., Oct. 2d, 1854.

#### FOREIGN NEWS.

The news possesses features of considerable interest—the most important of which is the announcement of the departure of the expedition against the Crimea. It sailed from Varna on the 4th inst., and was composed of 74,000 troops and about 700 ships, which would be before Sevastopol on the 10th. News of the landing may be expected to reach Varna on the 16th, and would be looked for with the greatest interest.

#### THE EXPEDITION TO SEVASTOPOL.

The armament consists of 26,000 French and nearly as many English. To these must be added a force of about 15,000 Turks or Tunisians, excellent troops, and likely to be most useful in a country where the spoken language bears much resemblance to their own. It is probable that, should events require it, an additional force of French will be directed to the seat of war, from the other points where they are at present stationed. The smallness of the French contingent is to some extent the effect of the terrible ordeal through which the army of the Marshal St. Arnaud has passed. The troops who left France and Algeria are stated to have attained the number of 73,000 men. Of these 7,000 are dead, and some 6,000 more are unfit for service. There are detachments at Athens, Gallipoli, and a few at Adrianople, and 26,000 will in a few days sail to meet the enemy. Those which remain in the country will, however, form a considerable force, from which re-inforcements may be drawn as the enterprise may require them. The spot intended for debarkation is still a secret. Supposing the army landed and unopposed, it remains to consider what it will attempt. Should an immediate attack on Sevastopol be the object of the commanders, it will be necessary at once to land the heavy siege train, which will be a work of perhaps a week. The Medway, which arrived on the 26th, and is now in Beicos Bay, brings out 10-inch mortars and large guns at the bottom of her hold. These heavy pieces occupied eight or nine days in the embarkation at Woolwich, and an equal length of time will probably be necessary for the more difficult operation of raising them from their present position. But from many incidents it seems likely that the first operations of the allies will be directed against the detachments or garrisons in the vicinity of Sevastopol, if any such are to be found, and that a regular attack on the fortress will not be attempted while the enemy is able to keep the field. The probability of the Russians opposing the landing is, of course, very great. It is of much importance that the expedition should have gained its destination before the great equinoctial gales sweep the Black Sea. Between the 15th and 25th of September these regions are annually visited by tempests of the most destructive kind.

THE BALTIC.—The total destruction of the forts at Bomarsund and the departure of the French troops for France is confirmed.

The fleet had gone from Ledsund to Narga.

Marshal Baraguay d'Hilliers had gone to Berlin.

It was reported that the Baltic fleet would return to England, and that Sir Charles Napier would resign the command. These rumors were considered very doubtful.

An Anglo-French detachment had landed at Ubricaborg, near Swenborg, destroyed some gun-boats, and set the town on fire.

THE DANUBE.—Count Coronini entered Bucharest on the 6th inst. at the head of 4,000 Austrian troops. They were well received by the population.

Dervish Pasha has established a Provisional Administrative Council, and named Prince Cantacuzene the president.

On the 1st Sept. the Russians completely evacuated Galatz and Ibrail.

The navigation of the Danube is free.

On the 4th inst. Gen. Luders removed his head-quarters from Galatz to Reni. Before leaving he blew up the fortifications and strand batteries.

It is reported that the Turks have entered Fockchamy.

ASIA.—The accounts from Erzerum, dated the 17th, state that the Russians having abandoned Bajazid it was again occupied by the Turks.

SPAIN.—The intelligence from Madrid is important. The republican party is extremely uneasy, and a new outbreak is considered near. It has been discovered that republicanism is extensively organized and almost ready for action throughout Spain.

GREAT BRITAIN.—The cholera continued its ravages in London, the deaths from that disease during the three weeks ending on the 8th inst., reaching four thousand.

FRANCE.—Military exercises continue at Boulogne. On the 13th inst. the Emperor reviewed ten thousand troops in camp at Ambletense.

#### Appointments.

Providence permitting, Bro. J. N. Loughborough will move with the church in Barre, Sabbath and First day, Oct. 14th and 15th.

#### Tent Meeting.

Providence permitting, there will be a Tent meeting at Topsham Me., near the house of Stockbridge Howland, half a mile from Topsham depot, to commence Oct. 20th, at 5 o'clock P. M., and hold over the Sabbath and First-day, and longer if thought best. Bro. Wheeler and Hart will be present. Other preaching brethren are expected to attend. A general attendance is expected.

S. HOWLAND.

#### Business.

H. H. Sedgwick:—We did not enter your name on the books—a mistake on our part.

#### To Correspondents.

1. In writing to this Office, let everything of a business nature be put on a part of the sheet by itself, or on a separate sheet, so as not to be mixed up with other matters.
  2. Be careful to write all names of persons and places, plainly and distinctly.
  3. In all cases give the name of the Post Office, County and State. When a Town or Village is called by one name, and the Post Office by another, be sure to give the name of the Post Office.
  4. When the direction of a paper is to be changed, do not forget to mention the Office to which it has been sent.
  5. Let everything be stated explicitly, and in as few words as will express the writer's meaning.
  6. In writing texts of scripture, be sure to copy from the Bible correctly. It is no small sin to carelessly mangle the Word of God as some do.
- If the above directions are complied with, we shall be saved much time and perplexity, and be less liable to mistakes in transacting the business of the Office.

#### Publications.

- Sabbath Tracts, Nos. 1, 2, 3 & 4—152 pp. 12½ cts.—postage 1 ct.
- The Law of God: Testimony of Both Testaments—132 pp. 10 cts.—postage 1 ct.
- Why Don't you Keep the Sabbath-day? Extracts from Catholic works—36 pp.—4 cts.
- THE Sanctuary and Twenty-three Hundred Days—76 pp.—8 cts.—postage 1 ct.
- Review of O. R. L. Crozier—the Sabbath—48 pp.—5 cts.
- The Signs of the Times; Spirit Manifestations a sign that the day of wrath hasteth greatly—124 pp.—10 cts.—postage 1 ct.
- The Two-borned beast, the United States—52 pp.—5 cts.
- Advent and Sabbath Hymns—30 cts.—postage 5 cts.
- Supplement to Advent and Sabbath Hymns—5 cts.
- Time and Prophecy—a Poem—25 cts.—postage 5 cts.
- A Word for the Sabbath—a Poem—6 cts.
- History of the Sabbath—40 pp.—4 cts.
- The 2300 days and the Sanctuary—32 pp.—3 cts.
- Christian Experience and Views—6 cts.
- Supplement to Experience and Views—6 cts.
- Solemn Appeal—Speedy Coming of Christ—32 pp.—3 cts.
- True Picture—state of the Churches—16 pp.
- The Sabbath by Elibu—16 pp.
- Both Sides—on the Sabbath—16 pp.
- The Sabbath by P. Miller Jr.—16 pp.
- First-day of the week not the Sabbath—16 pp.
- Review of Objections to the Sabbath—16 pp.
- Tracts of 16 pages each can be sent by mail for one half cent an ounce, in packages of not less than 8 ounces.
- Sabbath and Advent Miscellany—seven of the above Tracts bound with paper covers—10 cts.—postage 1 cent.
- Volumes I—IV of the REVIEW, bound in paper covers, Vols. I and II, 40 cts.; Vols. III and IV, 75 cts.
- Youth's Instructor, Vol. I, in paper covers—25 cts.

#### AGENTS.

MAINE.		RHODE ISLAND.	
N. N. Lunt,	Portland.	Ransom Hicks,	Providence.
S. W. Flanders,	Canaan.	NEW YORK.	
Cyprian Stevens,	Paris.	J. Byington,	Buck's Bridge.
S. Howland,	Topsham.	A. Ross,	Caughdenoy.
W. T. Hanniford,	Orrington.	David Upson,	Morland.
Wm. Bryant,	Wilton.	R. F. Cottrell,	Mill Grove.
NEW HAMPSHIRE.		John Wager,	Orangeport.
J. Stowell,	Washington.	L. Carpenter,	Oswego.
S. Bunnell,	Claremont.	A. H. Robinson,	Sandy Creek.
MASSACHUSETTS.		E. A. Poole,	Linclain.
O. Nichols,	Dorchester.	J. A. Loughhead,	Elmira.
O. Davis,	N. Fairhaven.	John Hamilton,	Fredonia.
Wm. Saxby,	Springfield.	PENNSYLVANIA.	
VERMONT.		M. L. Dean,	Ulysses.
R. Loveland,	Johnson.	J. H. Heggie,	Alleghany.
H. Bingham,	Morristown.	MICHIGAN.	
S. H. Peck,	Wolcott.	Albert Avery,	Locke.
Lewis Bean,	Hardwick.	Ira Gardner,	Vergennes.
Edwin Churchill,	Stoue.	David Hewitt,	Battle Creek.
E. P. Butler,	Waterbury.	C. S. Glover,	Sylvan.
Josiah Hart,	Northfield.	A. B. Pearsall,	Grand Rapids.
R. G. Lockwood,	Waitsfield.	A. A. Dodge,	Jackon.
Jesse Barrows,	Irashburg.	Wm. M. Smith,	"
Alonzo Lee,	Derby Line.	A. C. Morton,	Delhi.
E. Everts,	Vergennes.	OHIO.	
H. Gardner,	Panton.	J. B. Sweet,	Milan.
S. Willey,	Wheelock.	WISCONSIN.	
CONNECTICUT.		E. S. Sheffield,	Koskonong.
EL H Chamberlain	McTown.	T. R. Sheldon,	Rosendale.
A. Belden,	Kensington.	CANADA EAST.	
		B. Hills,	McTourow.

#### Letters.

R. F. Cottrell, J. B. Grams, E. Green.

#### Receipts.

E. Sanford, Wm. Bates, A. J. Rawlins, E. E. Sanford Geo. W. Sanford, A. Taber, F. Handy, L. Johnson, A. Friend, S. Miller, C. Sheldon, P. Brigham, H. Bertholf, J. Bennet, J. Giles, M. Cartwright, E. Harris, C. Corwin, H. Spencer, R. Coggeshall, N. P. Hathaway, J. C. Parker, T. S. Hawkins, E. Barnes, H. Simmons, each \$1. S. A. Snyder, I. D. Hough, each \$0.50.

#### To pay Arrears on Vol. V.

G. S. Miles \$2. H. Lyon \$0.50. C. Sheldon, C. Corwin, each, \$1. W. Perry \$2.