WELL OF BETHLEHEM.

"And David was then in an hold, and the garrison of the Philistines was there in Bethlehem. And David sent, and said, Oh that one would give me drink of the water of the well of Bethlehem, which is by the gate!"—2 Sam. xxiii, 14, 15.

In the Hold, long oppressed, by Earth's wearisome strife,
My soul is athirst, for the Waters of Life—Flow again;
Oh! who will break yon cistern, in the Strength of the Lord,
And send from the deep place, the Christian Church of the Lord.

Oh! who will "go up," and the Land now possess,
In the Name of the Highest his Sabbaths redress—
Till the Praise of that NAME in loud chorus shall rise,
From Mountain and Valley, from Ocean and Skies!

Oh! who shall between the bright Cherubims pass,
And Restore the lost Garden of beauty at last;
Who shall give to its long desert bowers its bloom,
And say to the Saved, and the Ransomed, RETURN!

For one we have waited, for one we have sought—
While lords and gods many, great wonders have wrought;
But NONE has brought forth—the Waters of Life flow again;
Oh! who will "come from Above," to流 the world.

His Name must be Jesus! no other we know,
Who can bid the wide Stream of Redemption to flow to
Who can break through the Host, the Inheritance bless,
And RESTORE the lost Children of Eden to REST.

THE PERPETUITY OF THE LAW OF GOD.

BY J. N. ANDREWS.

It is painful to witness the various inconsistent and self-contradictory positions, resorted to by those who reject the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. But of all the positions adopted, no other one seems equally dangerous, or fraught with such alarming consequences, as the view that the law of God by which the Sabbath is enforced, has been abolished, and that we are therefore under no obligation to "remember the Sabbath day." The question whether God has abolished his law or not, is indeed the main point at issue in the Sabbath controversy; for when it is shown that such law still exists, and that its perpetuity is clearly taught in the New Testament, it most conclusively settles the question, that the Sabbath is binding on us, and on all men.

Matt. v. The first testimony on this point was borne by the Lord Jesus in his sermon on the Mount. He says, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets." We believe therefore that he did not destroy them; consequently they are yet in force. He adds that not "one jot or title shall pass from the law till all be fulfilled." Hence no one of its precepts will cease before the rest. And that shall not be "til heaven and earth pass." Hence we say that the law of God extends through the Gospel dispensation to the end. He testifies that he came not to destroy, but to fulfill; and that he might stop the mouths of those who teach that his obedience to the law annulled it, he adds that "whosoever shall break one of these commandments," &c., "shall be called least in the kingdom of God," or, as Campbell renders it, "shall be of no esteem in the reign of heaven." And, that we might not mistake the commandments referred to, he proceeds to quote and comment on the law of the Decalogue, the ten commandments. This is a nail fastened by the Master of assemblies "in a sure place," and it is a clear proof that the mission of Jesus was not to destroy, but to "magnify the law and make it honorable."—Isa. xii, 21.

Matt. xxiii. Jesus teaches that on two precepts, viz., to lose God with all the heart, and to love our neighbor as ourselves, "hang all the law and the prophets." These two great commandments from their nature can never cease to exist, consequently the law and the prophets, which hang on them, can never fall,—can never be abolished. The law of commandments contained in ordinances has been abolished, that the ordinances of the Jewish church might make way for those of the Christian church. But that the ten commandments are comprehended in these two precepts, and are therefore inseparable from them, is clearly taught in James ii, 8—11; Rom. xiii, 9; 1 John v. 3.

It is a fact of much importance, that the ten commandments, though often quoted by our Lord, are never introduced upon a new account, but stand on their original basis, viz., as the law of God. It may be said, indeed, that the law of God had not expired before Christ's death, and that we should look to the writings of the apostles for the re-enactment of that part of it which is embraced in the New Testament. It is a sufficient answer to this, to reply that there is but "ONE LAW-GIVER," and if he has abolished his law, the apostles themselves, could not re-enact the smallest part of it. Therefore those who teach that the law of God was destroyed at the death of Christ, must, to carry out the sentiment, also teach, that we may violate any, or even all of its precepts, and be blameless.

The second chapter of Romans [verses 11—16] shows that all men are amenable to the law of God, whether they possess that law written in his word, or only on their hearts. To this point Paul testifies again, when he says, "that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law;" [to how many does the law speak?] "that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God." But the doctrine that the law of God was abolished at Christ's death, is contradicted also by the very writings of the Bible; hence it appears, that previous to his time, the world was without a written revelation of God's will. But that the law of God written in the heart, as expressed in this text existed from the beginning, is evident from these considerations. 1. "Until the law, sin was in the world, but sin is not imputed where there is no law."—Rom. v. 13.

Now if the work of the law had not been written in the heart before the giving of the written word, how could God have counted men sinners? For they would have had no law to transgress.

"Sin is the transgression of the law."—1 John iii, 4.

As the transgression of the law has existed from the beginning, it follows that its requirements have also existed from the same point. To conclude the argument from this chapter, we say that if the doctrine that the law of God was abolished at Christ's death, be carried out, its advocates must also teach that sin has not existed in the world since that point; for it cannot be shown that he has ever re-enacted one of its precepts. If therefore the world has been "without law to God," since the death of Christ, the whole world has also been "without transgression of the law," for "where no law is, there is no transgression."—Rom. iii, 9—31.

The apostle in this chapter, has stated more fully the argument noticed in chapter second. "We have before proved," says he, "both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin." He did this by showing that the doctrine of the law of God was abolished at Christ's death, had at least the work of the law written in the oracles of God, had at least the work of the law written in their hearts; and as all men have transgres-
The sum of our duty, and at the same time reveals the source of our sins, and points us to the same holy, just, and spiritual law, as the Law does. We bring forth "the fruit of the Spirit" unto God. The first covenant we bring forth fruit unto death; by the second covenant we bring forth the righteousness of God's law, and with the promise of a Savior, somewhat obscurely expressed, through whom we could hope for pardon. Salvation by faith in Jesus, was more clearly revealed to Abraham. After four hundred and thirty years, the written law was given to Israel, as the basis of a covenant, which should last "till the seed should come to whom the promise was made." [Gal. iii, 19] 

In the Providence of God, man has had a fair trial of his ability as dying with him. [Rom. vii, 9, 10] Thus in the Providence of God, man has had a fair trial of his ability as dying with him. Then the Law, as the means of bringing men to the realization of the need of a Saviour, was given. It did not fail to teach us of our present obedience can justify, but to teach that our present obedience can justify, and yet live in violation of God's law. By faith, as the means of bringing men to the realization of the need of a Saviour, was given. It did not fail to teach us of our present obedience can justify, but to teach that our present obedience can justify, and yet live in violation of God's law. Thus God is just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus. That we can be justified by Christ, and yet live in violation of God's law, no one can maintain; but to teach that our present obedience can justify, or one for our past offences, would be an equal absurdity. Hence we conclude that our justification in the sight of God, is solely on account of faith, and not on account of works. By faith, as the means of bringing men to the realization of the need of a Saviour, was given. It did not fail to teach us of our present obedience can justify, but to teach that our present obedience can justify, and yet live in violation of God's law. By faith, as the means of bringing men to the realization of the need of a Saviour, was given. It did not fail to teach us of our present obedience can justify, but to teach that our present obedience can justify, and yet live in violation of God's law. Thus in the Providence of God, man has had a fair trial of his ability as dying with him. 

The Law reveals and makes us know our duties to our God we owe; but "in the Gospel must we know Where lies our strength to do his will." 

VERSE 31. "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea we establish the law." 

Rom. vii. This chapter opens with the assertion that the law claims obedience through life. This fact is illustrated by the marriage covenant. As that cannot cease but with the death of one of the parties, so more could the first covenant with the people of God. Now as this covenant did not at Christ's death, you could cease only with the death of one of the parties, the question arises, which of the parties died? The fourth verse answers, not the law, but ourselves. As Christ died to atone for our sins, we are, in the sense of this portion of the Scripture, represented as dying with him. [Rom. vii, 6, 7] Then mark, the law still lives. The dissolution of the first covenant, does not abolish the law of God, as we shall hereafter show. The sixth verse may be adduced as proof that the law is also dead. But the marginal reading shows that this text refers not to the law itself but to ourselves. The translations of Macknight and Whitby both render it thus. It is further evident from the fourth verse, which, as we have already seen, states the fact as it is given in the margin of this text. [See also Gal. ii, 19, 20] And it is still more evident from the fact that the death of one party, only, is required in order to dissolve the covenant. In verse the justification of the two covenants is contrary to the plain sense of the text. The first covenant we bring forth fruit unto death; by the second, we bring forth "the fruit of the Spirit" unto God. The first points out our duty, but leaves us unable to perform it; the second points us to the same holy, just, and spiritual law, as the sum of the Ten Commandments, and at the same time reveals the source of our strength to keep its requirements, viz., the grace of God, through faith in Jesus. Thus we "serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter." In proof of this, contrast the remainder of this chapter from verse 7, with chapter viii. The manner in which the law convinces of sin is shown in verse 7. In proof that the ten commandments are the Ten Commandments, see the close of this verse where the tenth commandment is quoted. Paul has elsewhere said, that the law was our school-master to bring us to Christ. The remainder of this chapter gives us his experience in that school. Verses 8—11, show Paul's efforts to live by the law, and also his utter inability to keep its precepts, and satisfy its demands. Verse 12. He acknowledges the holiness, justice, and goodness of the law. Verse 13. But through his inability to keep the law, sin works in him death by its means. Verses 14—25. He wills that which is good, and even delights in the law of God, but how to perform that which is good he finds not. "The schoolmaster seeth him the righteous requirements of God's law, and with unrelenting severity, as he is not able to keep it, compels him to exclaim, "O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death!" He is now convinced that he cannot be justified by the deeds of the law, and in his despair, he flyers to Christ. The next chapter shows him delivered from "the earthen mind" by the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, and having obtained power to obey, as well as for-giveness for past offences, he exclaims, "There is therefore, now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus; for what the law could not do in that which the flesh doth, God sent forth his own Son, born of a woman, and under the law, in the likeness of sinful flesh, and by a sacrifice of sin, [margin,] condemned sin in the flesh; that the RIGHTEOUSNESS OF THE LAW MIGHT BE FULFILLED IN US." Rom. viii, 1—7.

II Cor. iii. The testimony of this chapter has an important bearing on the subject. As those who teach the abrogation of God's law regard it as their most important evidence, we will briefly state and examine their position. It is as follows:—1. The Law of God written on tables of stone constituted the first covenant. 2. This covenant is here called "the ministration of death" or "ministration of condemnation," and is abolished or done away in Christ. Verses 7, 13, 14—18. The abrogation of the covenant annulled the law of God. To the first point we answer, that a covenant is a mutual agreement between two parties; or, according to its second definition, it is a writing containing the terms of agreement. 

[Noah Webster.] The first covenant, according to the first definition, is called the covenant, viz., the ten commandments, as the terms of the mutual agreement already entered into. The covenant or mutual agreement is one thing, the terms of that agreement, though closely connected with it, are quite another. We say then that the first covenant was strictly speaking the mutual agreement entered into by God and his people, the ten commandments being its terms of agreement. Mark this.

To the second point we answer that the word ministration signifies "the act of performing service," or "service itself;" consequently it is not the words "written and engraven in stones" to which the apostle refers, but to the "ministration" or service of those words. [Please note the use of the word where it occurs.] The careful reading of this chapter shows that its subject is a comparison of the ministrations of the two covenants. A full account of the ministrations of the first and second covenants may be read in Heb. vii, viii, ix, x. The Levitical priesthood with its ordinances of divine service, is contrasted with the ministration of the first covenant. The "more excellent ministry" of Christ, including all its branches, fulfills the ministration of the second. And it is a fact of much importance, that the ark of God's testament is found in the heavenly tabernacle, where Christ is ministering, [Rev. xi, 19] as well as in the earthly tabernacle; that it is clear that the tables of the testament are still the foundation of
The divine government. —Then the law of God given to Israel as the basis of the first covenant, is clearly shown to be distinct from his "ministration," as given in the written law of God. As the services of the first covenant meet their counterpart in Christ's administration, how natural the language, that the ministration of condemnation had no glory by reason of the glory that excelleth; the glory of the shadow being swallowed up in that of the substance. Then it is clear that that which is on the children of Israel, denotes the typical service or ministration of condemnation, which was abolished, or done away in Christ. If you say that it is God's law which was abolished or done away in Christ, then you teach that Christ destroyed the law. [Mal. vi, 17].

To the third point, we answer, that the first covenant ceased because its conditions were not kept. We have already shown that the law of God was given to Israel, as the conditions of the covenant between God and his people. The terms of agreement having been broken, the covenant based on them must naturally cease. But to teach that the abrogation of the covenant, intimated the law of God also, would in reality be saying that God abolished his law because men would transgress it!—Our opponents teach that the law of God is abolished, and that those precepts which are not re-enacted in the New Testament, have ceased. The former part of this blow is false. The Sabbath is to be observed, but if carried out, its effect would be to overturn the whole law of God. "The law," say they, "was abolished at Christ's death." We know that the New Testament dates from the death of the testator, the precise point where the first covenant ceased. [Gal. iii, 16; 17; x, 9, 10]. Now God abolished his law at Christ's death, he could afterwards write in the hearts and minds of his people according to the promise, as given in Heb. vii, 10? How could this be done unless his law first re-enacted it? And we challenge you to show that God has ever abolished a law, and then re-enacted it. The word of God is not yet, and may never have this meaning. Next, further, as the new covenant begins at the precise point where the first ceased, your position requires you to believe that God abolished the ten commandments, and in the same moment re-enacted nine of them to write on the hearts of his people. Deny this if you can. Do you say that it is the law of the New Testament, or law of grace, which God writes on the hearts of his people? We answer that you cannot show the existence of such a law, distinct from the precepts of the decalogue. Besides the precepts of the Decalogue are abolished, even its principles cannot now exist without a re-enactment. If you could carry out this sentiment you would also that the ten commandments are all abolished; hence the law of God is destroyed; hence also the moral government of God is destroyed, and men are left without prohibition against any species of wickedness. Do you say that God abolished his law, and then re-enacted all of its precepts, a law of Sabbath commandment? We answer that your unwillingness on your part to subsist to the law of God, shows that you possess "the carnal mind," which is "enmity against God," which is "not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." Jesus has said that "not one jot or tittle shall pass from the law till all be fulfilled," but you, to avoid the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, teach us that that commandment has been struck out of the law. Such then is your absurd and dangerous position. Will you still cling to it? We invite the attention of the candid reader to "a more excellent way."—We have shown the existence of God's law from the beginning, and that its observance constituted the conditions, or terms of agreement, on which the first covenant was based. The first covenant ceased because its conditions were not kept; Heb. vii, 9. But the dissolution of this covenant could not abolish all law, which had been handed down by ordinances, hence we believe that the law of God did not cease with the first covenant, but that it continued in full force, ready to be written by the Spirit in the hearts of God's people. See the promises, Jer. xxxi, 31; Heb. vii, 10. There is therefore no such absurd doctrine, that the law of God, as written in the written law of God, was written in the hearts of God's people, as was the written law of God, nor do we believe that God abolished his law, and at the same moment re-enacted a part of its precepts. Our faith may be expressed in a single sentence: "God's law covers all time, and under all dispensations it stands out before men as the rule of their conduct and the sum of their duty to God. The full of man's "law of the work of the word," written in his heart, though faintly indeed..."
the Scripture hath concluded all under sin. Again, Rom. iii, 19:

Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law, that every mouth may be stopped, and every heart be brought back before the Lord.

To the third point we reply, that God made his law the condition of the covenant into which he entered with the literal seed of Abraham. Thus was an addition made to the Abrahamic covenant, to continue till the seed should come, to whom God made promise. But to teach, that the law itself expired, that point would be a plain contradiction of clear testimony. Matt. v. 17-19; Think not that I come to destroy the law. Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled. Rom. iii, 11; Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law.

We refer to Romans vii. where the apostle says, that “condemnation” and “death” were there; for we pointed out the distinction between a law, and the ministry of a law. With reference to the words engraven on stone, we say, that “condemnation” and “death” were there; for if the law had not known sin, except the law had spoken, Thou shalt not covet. We here inquire, how an abolished law could convict a man of transgression? And further, how the apostle could hold such a struggle with the law as he describes in Rom. vii., when that law had ceased to exist? Further, how can the royal law convince men of sin as transgressors, after God has abolished it? See James ii, 8-11. A law, embodying the moral perfections of the infinite Jehovah, must from its nature be unchangeable and immutably like its author.

The sum of our opponents position may be fairly reduced to this proposition: The Jews were only people among whom the law of God. Hence, we say that our opponents show them to be the only transgressors. For it is clear that those only, who have the law, can be capable of transgressing it. To carry this point further, we say that not only does this view make the Jews the only sinners, but it would show them to be the only persons redeemed by Christ. For he died to redeem them who were under the law,—Gal. iv. 5; iii, 13. But the question, Who has abolished the law? becomes deeply interesting. We ask, who? Surely not the apostles. Such power was never delegated to men. Not the Son of God. He was “made under the law,” and himself informs us that he did not come to destroy it. Gal. iv; Matt. v. 17-19. There is but one being in the universe who can be supposed to possess this power; we mean the great “Law-giver.”—James iv. And it would be well for our opponents to show how the Most High can take back a law which is perfect, spiritual, holy, just, and good? How can we abolish a law, which says, Thou shalt have no other gods before me? How can he take back the statute, which forbids the worship of idols? How can he say to man, I repeal the law which forbids you to take my name in vain? How can give men the license to profane the day, which he has sanctified as a memorial of himself? Or, which is the substance of his law? How can he abolish the great commandment, which says, “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind”? For on this great commandment hang those precepts which contain our duty to God.

But we leave the question, how God could take back a law which is perfect, spiritual, holy, just, and good?has the divine “Law-giver” abolished his own law? Our opponents affirm, we deny. Let us listen to their proof.—1. God gave the law for a limited period, which expired at Christ’s death.—Gal. iii, 19. Hence, the law expired by limitation. 2. He has abolished the law at the crucifixion. If Cor. iii: these two testimonies are the most important ones offered to sustain the position. To this view we reply, that if the law expired by limitation, then it could not be abolished. If it was abolished, then it did not expire by limitation. The language of Scripture being true, and its statements not inconsistent with themselves, we must conclude that presumption is unsound which would destroy such other. In an examination of the first of these proofs, we pointed out the distinction between a law, and the ministry of a law. With reference to the words engraven on stone, we say, that “condemnation” and “death” were there; for what shall the condemned and made guilty the whole world, they could not, without the law, give life to sin. Rom. v. 20; Gal. iii, 24, 25; Gal. iii, 10. The law was for a limited period, which expired at Christ’s death. If such a view makes God altogether such an one as ourselves, we ask, how can he abolish the great commandment, which says, “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind”? For on this great commandment hang those precepts which contain our duty to God.

But we leave the question, how God could take back a law which is perfect, spiritual, holy, just, and good? Has the divine “Law-giver” abolished his own law? Our opponents affirm, we deny. Let us listen to their proof.—1. God gave the law for a limited period, which expired at Christ’s death.—Gal. iii, 19. Hence, the law expired by limitation. 2. He has abolished the law at the crucifixion. If Cor. iii: these two testimonies are the most important ones offered to sustain the position. To this view we reply, that if the law expired by limitation, then it could not be abolished. If it was abolished, then it did not expire by limitation. The language of Scripture being true, and its statements not inconsistent with themselves, we must conclude that presumption is unsound which would destroy such other. In an examination of the first of these proofs, we pointed out the distinction between a law, and the ministry of a law. With reference to the words engraven on stone, we say, that “condemnation” and “death” were there; for what shall the condemned and made guilty the whole world, they could not, without the law, give life to sin. Rom. v. 20; Gal. iii, 24, 25; Gal. iii, 10. The law was for a limited period, which expired at Christ’s death. If such a view makes God altogether such an one as ourselves, we ask, how can he abolish the great commandment, which says, “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind”? For on this great commandment hang those precepts which contain our duty to God.

But we leave the question, how God could take back a law which is perfect, spiritual, holy, just, and good? Has the divine “Law-giver” abolished his own law? Our opponents affirm, we deny. Let us listen to their proof.—1. God gave the law for a limited period, which expired at Christ’s death.—Gal. iii, 19. Hence, the law expired by limitation. 2. He has abolished the law at the crucifixion. If Cor. iii: these two testimonies are the most important ones offered to sustain the position. To this view we reply, that if the law expired by limitation, then it could not be abolished. If it was abolished, then it did not expire by limitation. The language of Scripture being true, and its statements not inconsistent with themselves, we must conclude that presumption is unsound which would destroy such other. In an examination of the first of these proofs, we pointed out the distinction between a law, and the ministry of a law. With reference to the words engraven on stone, we say, that “condemnation” and “death” were there; for what shall the condemned and made guilty the whole world, they could not, without the law, give life to sin. Rom. v. 20; Gal. iii, 24, 25; Gal. iii, 10. The law was for a limited period, which expired at Christ’s death. If such a view makes God altogether such an one as ourselves, we ask, how can he abolish the great commandment, which says, “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind”? For on this great commandment hang those precepts which contain our duty to God.

But we leave the question, how God could take back a law which is perfect, spiritual, holy, just, and good? Has the divine “Law-giver” abolished his own law? Our opponents affirm, we deny. Let us listen to their proof.—1. God gave the law for a limited period, which expired at Christ’s death.—Gal. iii, 19. Hence, the law expired by limitation. 2. He has abolished the law at the crucifixion. If Cor. iii: these two testimonies are the most important ones offered to sustain the position. To this view we reply, that if the law expired by limitation, then it could not be abolished. If it was abolished, then it did not expire by limitation. The language of Scripture being true, and its statements not inconsistent with themselves, we must conclude that presumption is unsound which would destroy such other. In an examination of the first of these proofs, we pointed out the distinction between a law, and the ministry of a law. With reference to the words engraven on stone, we say, that “condemnation” and “death” were there; for what shall the condemned and made guilty the whole world, they could not, without the law, give life to sin. Rom. v. 20; Gal. iii, 24, 25; Gal. iii, 10. The law was for a limited period, which expired at Christ’s death. If such a view makes God altogether such an one as ourselves, we ask, how can he abolish the great commandment, which says, “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind”? For on this great commandment hang those precepts which contain our duty to God.
A CHRISTIAN CAVEAT TO THE OLD AND NEW SABBATARIANS.

The following article is taken from the fifth edition of a work with the same title, printed in London, 1653. The book was written in defense of the "orthodox doctrine of the Church of England," against the "Sabbatarians novelties," as they were called, of the Puritans. While it denounces the claims set up on behalf of the Sabbath or Lord's Day, it fully establishes the claims of the Sabbath or seventh Day. And it is worthy of note here, that it is not possible to refute any of the erroneous views in regard to the Sabbath and Lord's Day, without taking positions which necessarily lead to the observation of the Seventh Day. How much easier it would be to fathom the claims of the Sabbathistic institution upon the consciences of men, if we were satisfied to take the fourth commandment as it reads, and enforce it by the words of the Lord.

"Thus saith the Lord:"

The third opinion is, of the new Sabbatarians, who dream of a middle way between a Jew and a Christian; and thus they usually lay down in two propositions. The first is, That the Lord's Day, or first day of the week, namely Sunday, was called the Sabbath: the next is, That the observation of the Lord's Day is a moral duty, enjoined by God himself, and declared both by the doctrine and practice of Christ and his apostles. The first appearance of this kind of teachers was in the reign of Queen Elizabeth; and because they are neither able to produce direct support to their conceits by fallacies, falsities, and wrestings of God's holy word, as upon scanning their proofs will manifestly appear, they usually lay down in two propositions. The first is, Because the Sabbath is a religious name, signifying the Sabbath day, the day on which he rested, to be kept holy, but the seventh day, the day of the week; that so the Lord's Day was by God appointed to be kept holy, then we may set apart any other day, or any other day of the week, to God's service, as well as Sunday; and so, by their own argument, the Lord's Day is no more moral than any other day of the week. Their third proof is from the title or name, Lord's Day, which (say they) cannot be for any other reason, but because it was dedicated to the Lord; as we commonly say, St. Mary's Church, or St. Peter's Church; which name no man did ever imagine was built or founded by St. Mary or St. Peter.

Near the close of his book, after having examined each one of the positions here referred to, he comes directly to his design, and says—"It is vain, therefore, it is, and most absurd, for you our opponents to charge us with befouling and misleading the people. Your own practice, your own doctrines, shall bear witness against us.

"You who say one while, that God did not appoint the seventh day, the day on which he rested, to be kept holy, but the seventh day of the week, namely, the Lord's Day, and so one day in seven be observed, no matter which of the days; another while, that by this commandment God enjoins us to keep holy the first day of the week on which he began his work of creation—Do not you befool and mislead the people?

You who forgetting your own doctrine of the fourth commandment, do teach, that the keeping holy the first day of the week, or Lord's Day, was appointed and practised by Christ and his apostles, yet cannot produce so much as one example for it, much less a precept—Do you not befool and mislead the people?

You who infer, because St. Paul and the disciples at Troas, spent the whole night of the first day of the week in praying, preaching, and heavenly conference, in regard he was to leave them and depart on the morrow; therefore, St. Paul and the disciples at Troas met that night to keep holy the day past; therefore the disciples at Troas met every first day of the week, to keep that day holy; therefore the Church at Philippi, the Church in Cilicia, and all Christian Churches, did then keep holy the first day of the week; therefore all the apostles did constantly keep holy that day; therefore Christ and his apostles adopted the first day of the week to be forever celebrated, as the day of the Sabbath—Is not this pitiful logic? Do you not befool and mislead the people?

You who tell stories of an old Sabbath and a new Sabbath, a Jewish Sabbath and a Christian Sabbath, a Sabbath of the seventh day and a Sabbath of the first day of the week; and so you may ally fix the name Sabbath on the Lord's Day, and then persuade the simple and ignorant that all those texts of Scripture wherein mention is made of the Sabbath day, are intended for the Lord's Day; and where indeed to call the Lord's Day the Sabbath, is as senseless as to call Sunday, Saturday; as the first day the last day of the week; when throughout the Old and New Testament we have not the least intimation of any other weekly Sabbath, save the old, Jewish, seventh day Sabbath; when you yourselves confess that the name Lord's Day is more proper and particular, and less obvious to exception, than the name Sabbath; and that the name Sabbath is in dignity inferior to both Lord's Day and Sunday—Do you not befool and mislead the people?

You that condemn the yearly observance of Christ's birthday as heathenish, yet acknowledge this feast to be an institution of the ancient primitive Church—Do you not befool and mislead the people?

"Take ye heed; these are not small matters; consider well with yourselves what it is to slander guiltily before God of betraying Christ and his apostles, and willfully wresting the Holy Scripture, and by folly and ignorance to mislead the people—Do you not befool and mislead the people?"
tian practices and principles; lest the heavy judgment of seducers, to wax worse and worse, fall upon you, and God in the end deliver you up to such strong delusions that you should believe your own lies."—Sabbath Tract No. 9.

THE REVIEW AND HERALD.

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

PARIS, JANUARY, 1851.

The Chart.—We stated in our last that "about 240" would cost "near $250." But we have since seen Bro. Nichols, and he has ascertained that 200, (the number to be published,) will cost not less than $100. Of this sum, Bro. Nichols pays $75. As the Chart costs so much more than we anticipated, it is necessary that the price should be more than was stated in No. 4. The price, therefore, will be $2.00 each, a small sum for such a treasure. Bro. Nichols has spared no pains to have the work done correctly and well. We are much pleased with the arrangement of the Chart, and the execution of the work; and we are satisfied that it will be a great help to those who touch the present truth, and prove a blessing to the scattered sheep. Those whom God has enabled to give the message of the third angel, can have it free. Those who wish, can send in their donations, and if more is received than enough to pay for the Chart, it will be used in publishing the "Review and Herald." All letters relative to the Chart should be addressed to Otis Nichols, Durchester, Mass. (Post Paid.)

Conference at Melbourne, C. E.—This meeting commenced Friday, Jan. 11, and closed Sunday evening. A goodly number of brethren and sisters were in attendance. Here we met Brn. Bates, and liis, who are laboring much in the Lord. The solemn presence of God rested down upon us, whilst we listened to the important truths of the Bible, relative to our present position. Some things not in the order of the Gospel were happily corrected, and a stronger bond of union, we trust, cemented together the hearts of God's people. The word of God had free course in our midst and was glorified. May the blessing of Almighty God rest upon the dear brethren in that place and vicinity.

J. N. ANDREWS.

Dear Bro. White—I would be glad to say a few words to the dear brethren and sisters, who have not, as yet, embraced present truth. In my intercourse with them, I am often met with the following objections.

1. If I have Christ formed within, is it enough?—It is Christ that saves, not the belief of Christ formed within. If we go by outward observances or outward forms, we shall make an end of all forward work. The Spirit guides into all truth, and you Sabbath folks require an assent to your faith and practices, making the commandments of God, and the faith, or teachings of Jesus, and other Saviour; lessening the importance of vital piety; the truth, was making the merits of Christ of none effect. Getting up spiritual test of salvation. I wish to inquire of these dear brethren, if they would consider the following quotations. Who that has not been dead, and knew not why or how, its she afterwards expressed, the power of the truth, was making the merits of Christ of none effect. Getting up spiritual test of salvation. I wish to inquire of these dear brethren, if they would consider the following quotations.

During the time of the publication of the Voice of Truth, March 19, 1845, says: "I am and have been convinced, that the great High Priest did not on that very day accomplish all that the type would justify us to expect. We now believe he did." George Needham, in Rimes, Adv. Her., Dec. 11, 1844: 'We have done our work in warning, for months after the passing of the time, believed their work for the world was done. And as Bro. Miller expressed it, in his letter to Bro. Hughes, Adv. Her., Dec. 11, 1844: 'We have done our work in warning, and to create a formal church. God in his Providence has struck the Dooms.' You say, in the Voice of Truth, Nov. 7, 1844, in describing our position: 'We cheerfully admit, that we have been mistaken in the nature of the event we expected would occur on the tenth day of the seventh month; but we cannot admit, that the Great High Priest did not on that very day accomplish all that the type would justify us to expect. We now believe he did.'

These quotations (you are aware) might be given to almost any length. But I forbear. I wish now to ask, whether Bro. Needham, or any of his brethren, is done. I must deny to strange guidances, and necessarily begetting a dogmatical, proselytizing spirit. How far from the reality. How different from the true effect of God's word upon the heart. But to make the subject clear, and show the importance of searching for truth, I would mention a personal acquaintance who "walked with God," and had long enjoyed close personal acquaintance with Him. When the "Advent near" was proclaimed, she loved it, but rested, having the witnesses that "Christ is mine now," and looking for the "Spirit to guide into all truth," without the act of "hearing" and examination on her part. She neglected to search diligently to see whether these things were so, and consequently suffered not the deep disappointment and reproach of God's people. But, she lost, and knew not why or how, as she afterwards expressed, the power she formerly had with God. Alas! she had not embraced what was then "present truth," had failed of its sanctifying influences, and was not prepared for that which followed. Of my dear brethren and sisters, next to the "Gift of His dear Son," I praise God that he has led me along step by step in my trying, saving truths of these last days, until I am now found under the third angel's cry, striving with my whole heart to keep the commandments of God, and the faith, or teachings of Jesus Christ. Not till the Midnight Cry did I fully realize the importance of the preceding messages. But O, then I felt how improbable it was, that those who rejected them would receive this. I saw that one only prepared the way for another, and thus it appears to me quite through the perfect chain. But I do rejoice that some have been enabled to embrace these truths as a great whole. May the Lord enable them, with those who have known this way, to stand, and enter into his rest. We hail with gladness the "Advent Review and Sabbath Herald," believing it just adapted to the wants of the household; and most sincerely hope each will contribute a "mite" by writing, that it may be known whether the commandments are to them "gracious" or not. Praise the Lord, my soul witnesseth, they are a delight. And here may I ask, does not holy writ (not we) make the keeping of them a condition of life? Yes, even the love of God itself? See John's Epistles. And if those that do them all of them blessed, "then shall they enter in through the gates into the city," &c. But it is argued, you thus make the righteous dead enter without having kept them. We answer, they lived up to the best light they had. Now the temple of God has been opened in heaven, and the clear light shineth. Be not slow to come to the light, that our deeds may be reproved, and we henceforth walk as children of the light. In hope.

F. M. SHIMPER.

From the Harbinger and Advocate.

From Bro. E. P. Butler.

Dear Bro. Marsh:—I have almost from the commencement of your publishing the Voice of Truth, been a subscriber for your paper, but after much reflection, have concluded to stop it. I am a stranger to you, but have many times rejoiced for the acquaintance I have formed with you through your paper. I have never been in the habit of writing much (and especially for publication). I should shrink from the present task, did I not think required I should give you some reasons for my stopping the paper. And should the Lord enable me to convey to your mind the same friendly feeling which I have in my own breast, I shall not wrong your feelings; nor will you think me the less friendly. I leave it for others to keep praises and flatteries upon ministers and those to whom we look for instruction in spiritual things. From experience and observation, I have learned that they seldom (if ever) result in any good; nor are we disposed to use them, if our minds are deeply imbued with the Spirit of God: neither are the world nor nominal professors disposed to use them with those who are wielding successfully the sword of the Spirit.

I embraced fully the belief that the Lord was soon coming, in Jan. '43; and expected he would certainly come at the close of that Jewish year, and was greatly disappointed in not seeing him. And, like yourself and others, I was most piously disappointed; in not seeing the Savior coming in the clouds of heaven on the tenth day of the seventh month, (1844,) when the cry was made: Behold, the Bridegroom cometh.—Go ye out to meet him.

At the passing of this time, I believed the door was shut, nor was I alone in this belief. Yourself, and almost every other Advent believer, for months after the passing of the time, believed their work for the world was done. And as Bro. Miller expressed it, in his letter to Bro. Hughes, Adv. Her., Dec. 11, 1844: 'We have done our work in warning, and to create a formal church. God in his Providence has struck the Dooms.' You say, in the Voice of Truth, Nov. 7, 1844, in describing our position: 'We cheerfully admit, that we have been mistaken in the nature of the event we expected would occur on the tenth day of the seventh month; but we cannot admit, that the Great High Priest did not on that very day accomplish all that the type would justify us to expect. We now believe he did.'

These quotations (you are aware) might be given to almost any length. But I forbear. I wish now to ask, whether Bro. Needham, or any of his brethren, are wise enough to come to any other conclusion.—I am and have been convinced, that the Great High Priest did not on that very day accomplish all that the type would justify us to expect. We now believe he did. George Needham, in Rimes, Adv. Her., Dec. 11, 1844: 'We have done our work in warning, and to create a formal church. God in his Providence has struck the Dooms.' You say, in the Voice of Truth, March 19, 1845, says: 'I am and have been convinced, since the 10th day of the 7th month, that our work with the world and the foolish virgins, is done. I must deny that glorious movement as the work of God, or can come to no other conclusion.'

These quotations (you are aware) might be given to almost any length. But I forbear. I wish now to ask, whether Bro. Needham, or any of his brethren, are wise enough now to come to any other conclusion.—I ask, whether removing the bounds of time (the 2300 days) has had any other effect than to destroy or falsify in all these movements being of God. If we have not had the true midnight cry, when, and where, and how, can we have it?

Such has been the interest I have felt on this great subject, I have designed to neglect no means, nor refuse any necessary expense, to learn...
our true position and whereabouts. While the light was shining from our publications, I took all the Advent papers I had knowledge of, and there has been much good matter in them, but I have been constrained to believe that most (if not all of them) lost their light on our present position, soon after the 10th day of the 7th month. Is this the way of the just, that shieth more and more? We were in the love that existed among us, previous to the Albany Conference, or where the church of Brotherly Love, of which the Lord said: 'They lost a little strength, and has kept my word, and hast not denied my name!' Rev. iii. 8. And to whom will the 9th verse apply?

I think, Bro. Marsh, you might define the position, and mark the organization of the Laodicean church more definitely now, than you did in the Voice of Truth, Aug. 13, 1845. I am glad that you stood about from, and protested against, its organization. But I fear even you have too much conformed to the powers that be. Let us besit itself ourselves and repeat. Here is only hope. 'As many as I love, I reprove and chasten.' Those that are 'rich and increased in goods, and have need of nothing now, I fear will find, when it is too late, that they are 'wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked.'

We have another testing truth before us, viz: The Third Angel's Message. And I very much fear it will be too late a test for some of the teachers of the Advent movement. Leaders don't love the truth. But the Lord will raise the high, and exalt the humble. 'The last shall be first, and the first last.' I have been greatly blessed in meeting with the Seventh Day Sabbath and Shut Door brethren. They hold to the past and define our present position. I believe they have the truth, and that God is leading them by his Spirit.

Yours, in the bonds of love,

E. P. BUTLER.

Waterbury, Vt., Nov. 23, 1850.

SACRIFICY THEM THROUGH THY TRUTH, THY WORD IS TRUTH.

How full and comprehensive is the prayer of our divine Lord and Master, for the sorrowing disciples, as he was about to leave them for a season; though sweetly assured that he will come again and take them to himself, yet, in the interval they have need not of the comforter only, but also, of the sanctifying power of truth. Of this the 'Good Shepherd' was aware, and consequently prays, sanctify them through thy truth; and O praised be his name forever, he praised them not for themselves, but for all who should believe on him through their word. Dear brethren and sisters, do we know in our own souls the answer to this all important petition, as God has made it our privilege, nay more, our duty to know it. Even though we proved all the consecrating power of the gospel to the 10th of the 7th month, '44, there laying ourselves, our self, in holy dedication on the altar, yet, in the deep anguish of that disappointment we have not almost turned back, thinking there is no more truth for us, and perhaps now begin to feel that there is need of no more. But the time of profoundest, dear brother, dear sister, and look within. Upon close examination do you find all that deadness to the world, and life in Christ, you would desire in view of eternal scenes! Is every passion subjugated, and every feeling in sweet union with the bright spirits of the better land, or in other words, in accordance with the pure principles of the gospel. Ah, no. Methinks the result of heart-searching, is, I am far from what I should be, and what I must be to enter into life. If so, let us praise God that there is more truth for us, yes, glory to his ever blessed name, even for us. The favored Jews saw a third angel which followed the two, whose messages in the time of their proclamation, were attended with great power, (as our own and thousands of souls witnessed,) and how fully adapted to the wants of the scattered flock, in their patient waiting time, is the burden of this third angel's message:—

"The commandments of God and the faith of Jesus." Truly the former cries brought us out here, and the third makes plain our duty, while waiting the return of the Nobleman.

F. M. SHIMER.

DEAR BRO. WHITE—Although a stranger to you, yet I take the liberty of writing you a few lines. I should have written you before now, but I am a man that follows the water for the support of my family; therefore, I am absent from home the greater part of the sailing season. I have now just returned home (having been about six months) to stop through the winter. Since my return, I have been reading a small book, the "Advent Review," and another, the "Present Truth," and think your views in regard to certain prophecies being fulfilled in '43 and '44, are correct. I do not hesitate to receive your views in regard to the judgment hour cry, the tarrying time, and the Midnight Cry. I believe that many of the Adventists have been, and still are in an indifferent state; and I think the most of them might with propriety claim the Laodicean state for their position. For myself and family, I can only ask the Lord to grant me patience until life. I feel very thankful that you have been so kind as to forward me your paper. I think it is meet in due season, and feel to praise the Lord for it.

I should be glad, Dear Bro., to have your paper continued, but my limited means will not admit of it at present, and to ask it gratis is more than I can do. If you can do me the kindness to continue the paper, as soon as the means is in your hand you shall have it.

Yours, J. B. SWEET.

Oxford, Ohio, Dec. 24th, 1850.

Bro. Lewis Martin, of Bennington, N. H., writes, Jan. 1st, 1851:

"Bro. White—We receive your paper, and we are highly pleased with it; for it is just what we believe, and what we have experienced. I thank and praise God that I have not forgotten the Cry that was made in 1844, "Behold the Bridegroom cometh, go ye out to meet him."—That was the true Midnight Cry. I thank God that he gave me a disposition to hear that Cry. I have just read Bro. Bates' article in the last "Review and Herald." It is good. There is a few of us here strong in the faith that the parable in Matt. xxv. was fulfilled in the fall of '44. That is, it ended there, down as far as the shut door. We are endeavoring to keep the Sabbath of the Lord our God "according to the commandment."

Sister M. Ashley, of Dartmouth, Mass., writes,—"I do find in my heart a love for God's precious truth, and I rejoice that the poor lost sheep are being gathered. Truly, God has set his hand to the work, and it will be done. Every 'jewel' will be gathered for the second 'casket,' and not one be lost. Glory to God, he has some precious 'jewels' in old Dartmouth, and they now begin to shine. Your books are doing much; do send more."

DUTY TO OUR CHILDREN.

"Remember ye the law of Moses my servant, which I commanded unto him in Horeb for all Israel, with the statutes and judgments. [See Deut. v, 1.] Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord: and he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers, lest I come and smite the earth with a curse." Mal. iv, 4–6.

There is no doubt but what we are living in the very time of the fulfillment of this prophecy. How important then, that parents, who keep the statutes and judgments, turn their attention to their children, and teach them the commandments of the Lord; that they wish them "may enter in through the gates into the city." The parents must feel the responsibility that now rests upon them. The salvation of their children depends on their strict attention to cultivate their minds to serve God, by precept and example. All that are saved now, must keep the commandments of God, in accordance with the third angel's message.—Rev. xiv. 12. No matter how much else we do, if this third and last message is unheeded, we cannot be saved, any more than those who are now condemned for rejecting the first and second messages in verses 6—8. When the Master of the house (the Lord Jesus) rose up and shut to the door, all honest believers, that had submitted to his will, and children that had not arrived to the years of accountability, were undoubtedly borne in on his breast-plate of judgment which is over his heart.—The names of all that fully keep the commandments are retained. Those that do not, will have their names erased before Jesus leaves the Holiest. The children, that are taught, and that keep the commandments of God, as they come to the years of accountability, are believers just as fully as adult persons, that are now embracing all the commandments, in addition to what they believed before.

It is true, some persons that are ignorant of this message may, and undoubtedly will be saved if they die before Jesus leaves the Holiest. I mean those that were believers before 1844. Sinners and backsliders cannot get their names on the breast-plate of judgment now. God in infinite mercy has borne with our ignorance on this subject until now; and our children have been neglected as they should not have been.—Let us then all do that our hands find to do towards their education,
ATTITUDE IN PRAYER.

"I will therefore that men pray everywhere, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting." I Tim. ii, 8. There is much Scripture testimony for this position in prayer. When Moses was too look to God to stay the mighty thunders and hail from Egypt, he went out "and spread abroad his hands unto the Lord; and the thunders and hail ceased.""