But the perpetuity of the great constitution, the perpetuity of the commandments of God, the perpetuity of that which was deposited in the ark [Deut. x, 1-5; Rev. x, 19] is, in reality, the most direct and positive testimony to the perpetuity of each of the ten words of Jehovah.

And as we shall presently notice that Christ enjoins the keeping of them as the condition of entering eternal life, and affirms that those who break even the least precept, shall be of no esteem in the reign of heaven; and as we shall further notice that the apostles quote from the original version of God's constitution, as written by His Hand, and not from a revised edition of it, and in addition to this, that they distinctly recognize the perpetuity of that law which caused the Son of God to pour out his soul even unto death for guilt and sin, and presently intimate that his deathblotted out that holy law, we can form some idea of the sacred and immutable character of that great constitution. You continue:

"It addresses the testimony of four witnesses—our SAVIOUR, PAUL, JAMES and JOHN. The united testimony of those four witnesses is certainly enough to establish any point; we will agree, however, to close the controversy and keep the Sabbath, if the direct testimony of either of them can be produced in its favor as a gospel institution. Is not that fair?"

As the testimony of Christ and his apostles relative to the commandments of the Father, may not be of any importance on this point in your estimation, that testimony shall be set aside.

If a gospel institution is one made at the commencement of the gospel dispensation, and designed for that alone, then the Sabbath is not a gospel institution.—But if an institution established by the Creator in the beginning, Gen. ii, 2, 3; Ex. xx, 8-11, and designed for the whole race of man, consequently covering all dispensations, even that which succeeds the resurrection, Isa. lxvi, 22, 23, then the Sabbath is a gospel institution.

On this point I offer the direct testimony of one of the witnesses, viz: the Lord of the Sabbath.

"He testifies respecting it, "That the Sabbath was made for man." Then it was made for that portion of the human race that live during the gospel dispensation, as really as for that portion, that lived prior to it. Hence this testimony gives the Sabbath to the whole human family. And as the gospel of the Son of God does not destroy that which the Great God made for our race, the Sabbath abides in the gospel dispensation.

I would ask you to delight in the Sabbath made by Him, who "doth all things well," but you lose it as a "Sabbath." I would ask you to keep the commandments as uttered by the voice of Jehovah, and written with his finger, but no, they are "abolished, done away," etc. If I should not keep nine of them, however, you would pronounce me a wicked person; but if I keep ten of them, you say that I shall fall short of grace.

The character of the testimony borne by our Lord and his apostles to the perpetuity of his Father's constitution, is so strong as to appear upon examination. After saying, "Now let us hear the witness," you present the following:

1. "TESTIMONY OF our Lord. Matt. xvi, 17-19."—"Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle, the same shall not pass, from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.'

2. "TESTIMONY of the prophets. 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 answered 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. Who can see any direct testimony on the Sabbath in those passages? Surely nobody, but the Review and those in sympathy with it. They say nothing about it either way: if we get any testimony from them, we must infer it. So the Review fails here again: and these passages, it regards as its strongest holds. But it may answer, It was the perpetuity of God's constitution they were adumbrated to prove. Please notice: we have never intimated that the constitution of God's religious system, in the abstract or in a general sense, was abolished. This the Review knows well, and its perversion of our language is inexculcable.

The misrepresentation with which you commenced, appears again. The texts were not offered as pointing to the fourth commandment, but as bearing directly upon the continued existence of the Sabbath and that you thus understood it, appears from your own acknowledgment, that it was the perpetuity of God's constitution they were adumbrated to prove.

But you say that you have never intimated that God's constitution in the abstract was abolished, and that the Review's perversion of your language is inexcusable.

Let us see how many positions you have taken on this.

1. In your Bible class report, you stated that the ten commandments were once the constitution of God's religious system, and that they were "done away," "abolished." And you then teach that Christ made a new constitution out of nine of the commandments.

2. But to avoid the absurdity of teaching that God re-constituted nine of the commandments, which he had abolished, you say in your third article that the abolition of the decalogue, did not necessarily involve the abolition of every precept in it that had existed before the time referred to. This saves nine of them for the new constitution. The statement amounts to this: God abolished the ten commandments, yet nine of them remained unabolished, for they had existed prior to the Exodus, and it was the fourth one, only, (viz. the one that traces its origin back to Paradise,) that was abolished, for it originated after the departure from Egypt.

3. But in your fourth article you say that the ordinances engraven in stone, were abolished. You have applied the word ordinances to the ten commandments without limitation, and say that they are abolished. This does them away effectually, and was probably written to give the idea that Col. ii applies to the Decalogue. But what God abolisheth will need re-enactment before any part of it can become his amended constitution.
have him in strong contrast with the second precept of this new constitution. The truth is, he never gave an ability to understand your position, after having the chance to see how many times you could alter it, perhaps it ought to be thankless, for you have either it once more.

According to your present statement, God has abolished his constitution, but he has not abolished it abstractly. That is, God abolished nine of the ten commandments, but had not done it abstractly; so they continued in force just as the same as though they had not been abolished. But one of the (the fourth) he abolished abstractly, and thus put an end to a cruel ordinance, which, unfortunately, obtained a place in his constitution. 2 Cor. iii, therefore, does not teach that the ten commandments are abstractly abolished. No, it shows that none of them are abolished, but not abstractly, but the fourth is abstractly abolished! All thanks for so much light! But where did you find this doctrine in the Bible? If you did not find it there, on whose authority does it rest?

Let us see the testimony here presented by Jesus respecting his Father's law:

1. He did not come to destroy the law or the prophets; but he came to fulfill.
2. He came to fulfill; then he did not violate or transgress them.
3. One jot, [the smallest letter of the Hebrew alphabet], or one tittle, [the smallest point by which one of those letters is distinguished from another], shall not pass from the law till all shall be fulfilled. Then one part shall not pass and leave another in existence. But if one precept has gone, and nine abide, more than a jot or tittle has passed from the law, certainly!
4. There is a point of time specified, before which, one jot or tittle shall not pass. "O, yes," say you, "that point is the crucifixion." I answer, No, Sir, that was the point at which the hand-writing of the decalogue, there is no doubt, and it always included those which you adduced as proof that he 'established a new constitution and be of no esteem in the reign of heaven.'

Think not that I am come to annul the law or the prophets: I am not come to annul, but to fulfill. For truly I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one point will by no means pass away from the law, till all shall come to pass. Whether shall break the least of these commandments, and be of no esteem in the reign of heaven—be left without the gates of that city into which the command-keepers will enter, and remain with those who love and make a lie. The law, then, to which Jesus refers, is the commandments.

5. The translation of this portion of scripture by Campbell is worthy of notice:

"Think not that I am come to annul the law, or the prophets: I am not come to annul, but to fulfill: For truly I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one point will by no means pass away from the law, till all shall come to pass. Wherefore shall break the least of these commandments, and be of no esteem in the reign of heaven—be left without the gates of that city into which the command-keepers will enter, and remain with those who love and make a lie."

6. The translation of this text by Whiting is as follows: "Think not that I am come to annul the law, or the prophets: I am not come to annul, but to fulfill: For truly I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one point will by no means pass away from the law, till all shall come to pass. Wherefore shall break the least of these commandments, and be of no esteem in the reign of heaven: but whoever shall perform, and teach them, he shall be called great in the kingdom of the heavens."

7. But as you affirm that this is direct testimony in the estimation of the Review and its friends, only, I remark, that in conversation some time since with one of these friends, he said: "If you admit that, unless they break the commandments, they will fall from grace, he admitted that Christ here enjoined obedience to all the commandments, "But" said he, "This was before the crucifixion." We will now examine Luke xvi, 17, and it is easier for heaven and earth to pass one tittle of the law to fail. Then it is easier for heaven and earth, than for one of the commandments of God.

8. But it will say, these texts prove the perpetuity of the ten commandments. Do they say that? Not one of them; hence they contain no such testimony "that the commandments are not abolished."—James ii, 8-12; 1 John iii; Rom. iii.

9. But so many of the commandments are abolished, that it is not a light matter for the Great Law-giver to establish a new constitution and be of no esteem in the reign of heaven! In the presence of him that sits upon the throne! Hence a single precept has not passed away, nail to the cross, take out of the way, abolish, he., rendered it complete, and takes it out of the way. Heb. iv, 2-13; Rom. iii, 21, 22, 25; 2 Pet. iii, 10. Hence a single precept is abolished, and for a new one to be established in its stead! Easier could heaven and earth be destroyed, than to destroy the works created by himself, than to destroy the smallest fraction of it. As the abrogation of the Sabbath makes the destruction of the whole constitution unnecessary, and as heaven and earth could be destroyed by a change more than man could ever dream of, unless they break the commandments, they will fall from grace, he admitted that Christ here enjoined obedience to all the commandments, "But" said he, "This was before the crucifixion." That is, God abolished nine of the ten commandments; hence the precept of the law might be fulfilled. This was before they were abolished!"
troved; but the hand-writing of ordinances was abolished, taken out of the way, nailed to the cross. This has been all abolished, yet heaven and earth have not passed. 

(4.) It is EASIER for heaven and earth to pass than for one titlle of this law to fall. Yet the law of carnal ordinances was fulfilled for the WEAKNESS and unprofitableness thereof.

(5.) The law which Christ did not destroy, is that law which caused him to lay down his life for a guilty world. He did not destroy the law, Rom. vii., for he said, "I did it not mine own self, but the sin shall be imputed to me, because I did it not mine own self."

(6.) That law which hangs upon or is comprehended in the decalogue. The ten commandments have direct reference to the precepts of the great constitution which define what it is to love God with all the heart, and our neighbor as ourselves, and not to that law of retaliation, "an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth," and the law of carnal ordinances, which was imposed only until the time of reformation.

(7.) But we shall presently notice the distinction made by our Lord in the continuance of his discourse in Matt. v.

Those who now attempt to array the gospel of the Son of God against the commandments of the Father, in order to mistake that which their own fall will fulfill. Look at their harmony. The law of God in the Ark of his Testament, shows all men to be sinners in the sight of God. The blood of Jesus sprinkled on the mercy seat—"the tops of the horns that were to take away sins.

And thus it is, that the great constitutions of God's moral system, which, according to yourself, form the Great Decalogue, have all been fulfilled, and therefore are negatived of such a character, and would not be continued in future, under the New Covenant. Otherwise he could not have said, "For I say unto you, that same which is written after the face of men, shall be come to pass in that place.

Your next contrast [verses 33,34] is as follows: "Then shall not ye bring false witness against your neighbors."

Some have referred this precept to the third commandment, others to the ninth. The third commandment reads, "Thou shalt have no other gods before the Lord thy God;" and is not included in the commandments which are to be obeyed under Christ's terrible sanction. What proof does this contrast furnish that Christ superadded the constitution of God's religious system (the decalogue)? But you have one more contrast to offer. Verses 33, 34. Perhaps this one will help you.

Let us see:

"Then shall you love thy neighbor, and hate thy enemy."

"But I say unto you,—Your love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you." I might turn this last contrast upon yourself—For that is being a strong contrast to the ten commandments of the original constitution, it looks more like a contrast with one of the two great commandments, which, according to yourself, form the Great Law-giver's amended constitution. I forbear, and remark, that the sentence appended, which is not to be found in the law, is the point that Christ cor-rects. The Pharisees had such an imperfect idea of the great precept quoted, that they thought that it would allow them to hate their enemies. Christ's act of correcting them does not abolish the commandments of his Father. Your next remarks present your idea of the above contrasts. You speak as follows:

"Here are six antitheses, drawn by our Saviour himself. He contrasted the Levitical ceremonies to the law of Moses."

1. Your attempt to make Christ stand in strong contrast with the sixth and seventh commandments is an entire failure, as we have already seen.

2. Your contrast between Christ and the law of
divorce, of forswearing, and of retaliation, does not bear against the great constitution. 

"Love thy neighbor as thyself," which you say is a part of the constitution which Christ established for the royal law, is not to do. But if you say "so," he placed himself in contrast with the words appealed to, then you yield all argument on the point.

The changes that Christ placed himself in strong contrast with the great precepts, the love of the neighbor as thyself, which you say is a part of the constitution, which Christ established for the royal law, is not to do. But if you say "so," he placed himself in contrast with the words appealed to, then you yield all argument on the point.

4. Although Christ has not mentioned the distinction between the constitution and the law of carnal ordinances, divorce, retaliation &e., nor even intimated that the great precept quoted by him, was the sum of the last six commandments, (Rom. xvi.) and a part of the decalogue, [Hagg. ii.] and one of the two, on which hang all the law and the prophets, [Matt. xxii.] yet this does not invalidate the scriptures in which these facts are stated. It is an obvious fact that he does recognize the widest possible distinction. Mark! the precepts of the decalogue he lays open as binding, as reaching even to the thoughts and motives of the heart! But the law of retaliation, &c., is the reverse of this, and is to be set aside. 

5. "But placing himself in strong contrast to both," that is, Christ not only stands in contrast with the law of retaliation, divorce, &c., but he also stands in strong contrast with the sixth and seventh, with all the commandments, and with the second of the two, on which all hang! But this blasphemous position is, in reality, as much against the new constitution which you wish to establish as the old original, which you wish to abolish. For you have arrayed Christ in strong contrast with one of the two great precepts, (which you say is the basis of the constitution,) as well as in strong contrast with two of the ten, which form the original constitution of God's religious system.

6. "He regards them as constituting only one law." Very well. Now let us see: here is the precept which demands a material sacrifice, and an immaterial one, which he applies the term, "royal law." Here are some of the precepts of the decalogue; here, also, is retaliation divorce, &c., and all constitute one law! Then you will be kind enough to take the statement in your second article, that the Decalogue has perverted the royal law, because it claimed that the commandments are in it. You have now admitted the ten commandments, and I know not how much more! —You continue as follows:

"These are only specimens of the changes which Christ wrought, were not in the constitution of God's religious system. The sixth and seventh, with all the other commandments of the holy, just, and perfect law, were always preceding broad. Ps. cxix. 10; ii. 6-11. But your position requires you to believe that the law of God once took cognizance of the outward act only, and that when Christ came, he enlarged him, and made them exceeding broad. This is in admirable keeping with the doctrine that the penalty of the law was once nothing but the death inflicted by the hand of man. But when it is seen that the eye of the All-Seeing Jehovah has ever taken cognizance of every departure from the holy standard of right, even those in heart, and that man will be judged by his law in the day of God, and then receive the great penalty—a part in the lake of fire—the law of God is magnified and made honorable.

2. Your remarks respecting covetousness, hating a brother, &c., I answer, that the law of God had taken cognizance of these things before the first Adam, or it had not. If it had taken cognizance of these, then men could not have loved each other, &c., and not be amenable to God for it! But if it had always been a crime in the eye of God's law to sin, then the New Testament in stating the fact, merely lays open a truth as old as Creation.

The changes that Christ placed himself in strong contrast with the great precept, the love of the neighbor as thyself, which you say is a part of the constitution, which Christ established for the royal law, is not to do. But if you say "so," he placed himself in contrast with the words appealed to, then you yield all argument on the point.

It is by such specimens that you establish a rule of interpretation, and justify 2 Cor. iii.; Rom. xiv.; Col. iii. 19. This is good no question; but the use you make of them needs a better justification than such perversions as these. Your use of 2 Cor. iii. in which you attempt to abolish the ten commandments, was noticed in my last letter. Your use of these facts, which you justify at the expense of the commandments of God, will be noticed in my next. Your use of Col. ii. will be noticed in this letter. You continue:

"New in order to maintain that Christ remodel the religious system? Did not Christ remodel the religious system? Did he not supersede the law, with its constitution, the decalogue? No one can deny the fact. For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law. Heb. vii. 12."

You say that it is so evident that the decalogue, God's constitution, has been superseded, that no one can deny it. It has been superseded of course, then, by the new constitution which you say Christ formed for the gospel system of religion, of the two great commandments.

There was a law that regulated the earthly priesthood in every particular; it was the law of carnal ordinance. There was a law that made a stoning a paramount and a prior right to the royal law; it was shut up in an ark. The one required that the priesthood be of the order of Aaron &c.; the other said nothing about priesthood. The one has been done away, because of the weakness and unprofitableness thereof, as its priesthood could never take away sins. The other law abides, even now in the Ark of God's Testament in his Temple in Heaven. And before it stands a great High Priest, whose blood can take away sins. The priesthood being changed, the law which required that it should be the race of Aaron is necessarily changed; but no necessity is created that the moral law should be changed also.

Let Heb. vii. speak for itself.

To your further assertion that in your remarks noticed above, you have presented direct evidence that the commandments have been done away, abolished by Christ's better law, and that the Sabbath has not escaped in this change, but has gone with the things of the decalogue. Let us now see the other witnesses which you adduce in support of your conclusion.

2. Testimony of James. If ye fulfill the commandments which are a shadow of things to come; but the same word that is thus rendered in Luke ii. 21; xxvi. 1; John xii. 3; Matt. xxvi. 5; xxvii. 15, &c. If you say that it is because the word sabbaths, [plural,] is used, I answer, that is slender proof, inasmuch as in the hand-writing of ordinances included at least four annual sabbaths. Lev. xxvii. 34, 39.

But when God uses figures, does he use reason-
Having hereof possested point out the defects in your arguments,-the words are now needed. He shall offend in one point, [except, Mendaciti] he is guilty of all.

The *all* here referred to, means one of two things: (1.) It is the same as the word Jesus has made "the whole thing" to consist of the three precepts here included, and leaves us as liberty, not only to violate the four commandments of the first, second, third, fifth, eighth, ninth, and tenth, and even the first of the two great sins—Strange liberty! And you have not offended in a single point.

(2) For the *all*, to which James points, includes the ten precepts from which he quotes, and he that violates one has transgressed all.

The second is the position of the Remnant: the first is for those who break the commandments, and teach men to do so. But Paul in Rom. iii, 11, refers to "the law of Christ!" doth he not make the remnant (John, the top of which was the mercy-seat where the blood of atonement was sprinkled. The Ark is in the true tabernacle where Christ is. It is the mercy-seat from which we receive pardon; the testament within it is the holy, unabolished covenant of this Father.

You also attempt to set aside the law in Rom. vii, 7—9, "as the sin of it is dead, that the law thereof is no more an abomina- tion. But this is a failure, for several reasons. (1.) The words purport to come from the law, an expression of very great reference to the law of God. (2.) The words are from a literal quotation from the desolations; but as Christ never used the expression, and never quoted the tenth commandment, they are not a quo- tion from what you call "the law of Christ." (3.) But there is direct proof in verses 22 and 29 that Paul refers to "the law of God," as Paul did from the desolations in the year 69, and recognized it as unabolished.

And we see brought forward in chapter viii, we find that the spirit of the life of Christ Jesus, delivered him, (not from the law of God, as some vaguely imagine,) but from that other law of sin, which in chapter vii, 7—15, he represents as baffling all his efforts to keep the law of God. In the third verse of chapter vii he gives God for the attonement of sin, which is the second chapter of job; and in the fourth verse he is the righteousness before God and him who is without, and that which is against God, and which is not subject to his law; (the same that no man is subject to the commandments of God.)

Now let us examine the scriptures quoted. In Romans ii, 11—12, you think that he quotes the commandment from the law of God, and not from the law of Moses, a term which you definitely attribute to the commandments of God. Such an interpretation is not a fair reading of this text. It is a fact, that through Christ Jesus has quoted this commandment, he has never appended a promise to it; much less attempted to set aside the commandments of God. You may attempt to set aside the commandments of God, as the law of Moses, or to teach that they have been superseded by the testimony of Jesus, but this will not avail. Those who are "under the law of Christ!" will do as he has directed: (3.) Keel the commandments. The commandments of Jesus are not to be set aside, but to be taken as the law of God, as you are to try to give the idea. They stand together—they are insepara- ble. How long will you not cease to perturb the right ways of the Lord?

J. N. Andrews.

Port Huron, Otsego Co. N. Y., July 15, 1852.

"There is that makes the law, the prince; but such as keep the law cost (with) them."—Prov. xxiv, 4.

For he is so terrible a law-breaker, because the carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." Rom. viii, 6, 7.
DEAR BRO. WHITE.—I wish to say to the dear brethren scattered abroad, as at work in the West, and the saints are rising. They have dug deep through the rubbish, dust, and shavings, and have found rock bottom, the commandments of God, and are trying to build on that foundation that stands sure, which no man can move, through which they live the God of the Sabbath, workmen, while they weary themselves. The bulwarks of Almighty God can never be battered down by all the forces that the pious arm of man can rally against them, though Goliath-like they may defy the armies of Israel and their King, and boast of "unanswerable arguments." We will trust in the God of David, and as our weapons of war are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds, we must be fixed to god on the whole armor, and take the sword of the Spirit, the Word of God, and go boldly without the camp and cry, the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus, until the scattered remnant are established on the commandments of God.

We should now each one stand at our post, for the enemy has come in like a flood, and the standard must be raised against him. This, God has promised, should be done. See Isa. lix, 18. God works by means, and through his power and mercy, and many wonders, and will more, and it behoves us to be正当 and stand where God can use us to his glory. His work will go forward, and he that receiveth reward, and that reward is glorious. See Dan. xii, 3. I feel to rejoice that the truth is gaining ground, and that God is visiting his humble truth-seeking people in this State. He has been pleased to send our dear Bro. J. Bates to us, and he has come richly laden with the truth, and our hungry souls have been fed.

Yours in hope,

H. S. CASE.

From Bro. Dore.

DEAR BRO. WHITE.—Since you left here I have been to Rushville, Canandaigua, and Seneca Falls. In all these places I can but hope there are some that will receive the truth. The age to come theory is taking such deep hold of some of our former brethren, that many but little good has been accomplished. The book of Revelation they apply principally to the 1000 years, especially chap. xiv. But if they are right now, then they were wrong in giving the judgment hour cry when they did.

I still believe that the judgment hour message was given in the right time, and I will bless and thank God's holy name for granting me patience so long. My faith never was stronger than now. The third angel's message has done a great work for me, and some of my children. My brethren, I see nothing discouraging. God is for us, who can be against us? Our meetings in this place have been crowned with heaven's blessings.

Pulley, N. Y., July 6th, 1852.

From Sister Landwater.

DEAR BRO. WHITE.—I feel to thank and praise my Saviour that he has opened my eyes to the present truth. It seems plain that Jesus is beginning to reach out his arms to gather his people into one spirit and one faith; and it becomes us to keep pace with the unfolding truth of the blessed Bible. I received your last paper yesterday, and was greatly strengthened and encouraged in reading so many interesting letters from the brethren scattered abroad. Truly, the Lord is at work, and blessed be his name. Although it is not my privilege to meet with them, yet it rejoices me very much to hear from them through the Review and Herald.

Dear brethren and sisters, having the hope we profess, let us purify ourselves even as he is pure. We should be following the Lord fully, as did Caleb and Joshua, and walking with him as did Enoch and Elias. Holiness becometh the priest, and King. Without it we shall not see thee.

My prayer is, revive us, cheer us, strengthen us, and purify us, and save us at thy coming, and king.

I approve very much of your idea of getting up a paper for the children. I hope God will enable you to be instrumental in his hands of doing good not only to the children of faith. MaryLeadbeater.

Cincinnati, O., July 10th, 1852.

From Bro. Case.

DEAR BRO. WHITE.—The Lord is still with the little remnant in this place. The conference here has just closed. Bro. Baker, Wheeler, and Wyman attended. The word preached was backed up by the energies of the Holy Ghost, and we trust that much good will be the result of the meeting. A moral manifestation and desire for the prayers of the saints by rising.

The third angel's message is gaining ground here, notwithstanding there are those who are rising. They have dug deep through the rubbish, dust, and shavings, and have found rock bottom, the commandments of God, and are trying to build on that foundation that stands sure, which no man can move, through which they live the God of the Sabbath, workmen, while they weary themselves. The bulwarks of Almighty God can never be battered down by all the forces that the pious arm of man can rally against them, though Goliath-like they may defy the armies of Israel and their King, and boast of "unanswerable arguments." We will trust in the God of David, and as our weapons of war are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds, we must be fixed to god on the whole armor, and take the sword of the Spirit, the Word of God, and go boldly without the camp and cry, the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus, until the scattered remnant are established on the commandments of God.

We should now each one stand at our post, for the enemy has come in like a flood, and the standard must be raised against him. This, God has promised, should be done. See Isa. lix, 18. God works by means, and through his power and mercy, and many wonders, and will more, and it behoves us to be正当 and stand where God can use us to his glory. His work will go forward, and he that receiveth reward, and that reward is glorious. See Dan. xii, 3. I feel to rejoice that the truth is gaining ground, and that God is visiting his humble truth-seeking people in this State. He has been pleased to send our dear Bro. J. Bates to us, and he has come richly laden with the truth, and our hungry souls have been fed.

Yours in hope,

H. S. CASE.

From Bro. Upson.

Newark, Mich., July 8th, 1852.

DEAR BRO. WHITE.—Knowing that you, as well as others, feel a deep and an abiding interest in the welfare of Zion, I feel it a great privilege, as well as duty, to let you know how it is with us. Since I wrote you last, we have had a very interesting season, for the Lord has been manifesting himself in these parts in a wonderful manner, by writing his holy law upon the hearts of the people, so that they may keep his holy commandments in spirit, and in truth too, and follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth. The jewels are being manifest, and are purifying themselves by keeping the truth.

A conference was held at Conquelandi, July 3rd and 4th. Bro. S. W. Rhodes, the servant of the Most High, was with us in the fullness of the gospel of the third angel's message, as far as it is unfolded to the chosen few that are appointed heirs of salvation. Praise ye the Lord all ye his saints. The Lord met with us, as well as the dear brethren. Some from Oswego, New Haven, Volney, Albion, Sterling, and Syracuse were there. Yes, from Syracuse. The standard is raised there, and the Lord is bringing souls out of that place, and he is doing a great work here. Eighteen dear, precious souls, followed our Great Pattern in the holy ordination of baptism on First-day.—It surely was a time of rejoicing. I heard it remarked by a number that it was the best conference they ever attended, and I think I never attended where there was so few trials as at that meeting. Although Satan accused our brethren, and his host raged and blazed against the Holy Ghost, yet God's people, that confided in him, were secure. There is a coming up of the standard, at this time, of God's peculiar people, and full purpose of soul to do all that the Lord would have them to do. Three of the precious jewels have come into the liberty this morning, and are praying in the Holy Spirit to God for strength and wisdom to keep the commandments, who are my nearest neighbors.

ALEXANDER ROSS.

Conquelandi, July 6th, 1852.
THE REVIEW AND HERALD.

Dear Bro. White:—Although a stranger to you, yet I trust I am not a stranger to that Saviour who hath said, "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." I wish to express my gratitude to you for the instruction I have received through the Review and Herald. My knowledge of the third angel's message is confined alone to the word of God, and the light I have received from your paper. I do not have the privileges of meeting in conference with brethren and sisters of like precious faith. There is but one in this place, besides myself, that keeps the fourth commandment. James, the Faithful and True Witness, says: "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates of the city."—Revel. v, 11-24.

There are those who profess to love God that would gladly lead us from his holy Sabbath, to an institution of Popery. To such I can say:

"For Canaan I've started, and on I must go,
 Till all the bright glories of Eden I know;
 I've made no reserve, and I'm sure I'll not lack,
 For I'm following the sign of the Lamb's back.
 My soul is enkindled with rapture and love,
 I faim would ascend to my Jesus above:
 But say, I must follow in his humble track,
 And given obeying, from my word take back.
 Then on let us press, for Jesus is near,
 And strengthens each other with words of good cheer:
 With zeal over burnt and courage over fear.
 I'm doing, as such a one, as I have drawn back.
 I had rather suffer affliction with the people of God,
 Than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season. While we have Jesus for our friend, the Spirit for our guide, why need we fear? If God is for us, who can be against us? Let's be true to our King and never draw back.

Jackson, Mich., June 20th, 1852.

A. A. MARKS.

EXTRACTS OF LETTERS.

Bro. Joseph Bates writes from Galesburg, Mich., July 12th, 1852:—"I have stopped at the Post Office to communicate a few lines. Bro. Dodge, of Jackson, Mich., came here with me yesterday from Clinton, where we spent the Sabbath, at which place two brethren embraced the truth.

"We gathered a few friends here yesterday to listen to the truth: and one of the dark spirits from the East came with us and while the Sacred Harp-keepers with breaking up a band of Advent believers of about one hundred in number, in Roxbury, Mass. I told him it was the Sabbath-breakers that did that work. He afterwards acknowledged that he had kept the Sabbath a few years, just to please the rest; but he knows the commandments are all abolished. It is many years since I have heard such a perfect jargon as this man presented, after I closed, and a part of it while I was speaking. He is a real harper. I told him he should not preach in the evening if this man was allowed to brawl in this manner. So we left.

"I sent you five names, last week, from Plymouth, Mass. There, I trust, a good work is going on. Bro. Corrrell's family and brethren. I wish I had time to give particulars."

Bro. W. Morris writes from Roanomet, Vt., July 12th, 1852:—"I feel very thankful for the effort you are making for the dear youth, in publishing a paper for their benefit. I send you a few names, and the enclosed for their paper. All I have seen seem much interested in the long.

"Our hearts are encouraged while we read in the Review and Herald the cheering account, from the brethren at a distance, of the state of the cause. We think much of Bro. Andrews' Letters to Crozier. I would not part with the papers that contain them for any price, unless I could obtain them again. I feel deeply interested in them with me in the former messages. I want them to share with me in finding a good foundation to stand upon. I want them to have the paper, receive the truth, and stand with us on Mount Calvary. We are the last to die, right after doing a day's work, to some of that holy experience which have been in the Advent faith, and found two that wanted the Review and Herald."

Bro. H. S. Gerney writes from Fairhaven, Mass., July 11th, 1852:—"I have had a good meeting here. We have shouldered the heavy past. It is time to have a conference at Bro. Collins' about the time you may be this way, and leave it with you to make the appointment.

"I thank God that the work is manifestly progressing, although I am unawary of being identified with causes, but I do rejoice in the work."

Bro. R. Moran writes from Lawrenceburg, Dearborn Co., Ind., July 11th, 1852:—"The Review and Herald comes regularly, in a day or two after its publication. Our beloved Bro. Andrews' letters to O., who oppose the condemned of God, &c., yet, under all these circumstances, I lay with him in his past illness, time in which I was allowed to look at him after watching, with took care of him, and when unable to watch myself, I have been after others to watch with him. The other brethren living about three miles off, and all of us being requested to keep away, and compelted with the request. Mr. R., and I think Mr. T. Seymour was knowing to the fact of my being with Mr. C. in his last illness, and yet they could make the assertion that we "did not as much as look at him, more than that did the Priest and Levite." But I submit the subject with the following questions. 1. Did he much love his former brethren? 2. Did they shut their bowls of compassion towards him? Was that to him a very great grief? 3. Did they not as much as look at him? I leave the candid to judge for themselves where the truth is in this matter.

"Yours in the truth, keeping the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus, A. A. MARKS."

Jackson, Mich., June 20th, 1852.

From Bro. Marks.

Let the Candid Judge.

Dear Bro. White:—I thought of saying a few words in relation to an obituary notice in the Climax, for December 20th, 1851, from the pen of A. A. Marks. The writer asserts that most "of his (C.’s) former brethren whom he much loved, having embraced the truth, are also who do not agree with them in faith: This to me was a very great grief." As to the truth of the assertion, that he much loved his former brethren, let the reader decide; for he left his former brethren, having embraced the truth, and leave it with you to make the appointment.

"The same inspired writer who teaches that the righteous will scarcely be saved, also informs us of a man, whom we may have hoped was saved, nor to be abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of Jesus Christ. 2 Pet. i, 11. It would seem, however, as if the most of us thought it quite enough to be saved as 'so by fire,' 1 Cor. iii, 15. But if the fire consumes us, are the hands of mercy snatch us as a brand from the burning? Let those who are content to have just religion enough to get to heaven, think of this.

Three of our Associations have now passed their anniversaries for the present year; and what do we learn from their statistics, of the state of the denomination? Alas! alas! We are progressing, but not in that which would be the life of the churches. We are advancing, but not in the work of subduing the world to Christ.

We are rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing. Probably, there never was a time, when we enjoyed greater prosperity in this world's good.—But for all that, we are "wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked." Worldly-mindedness has eaten up our piety. With here and there an exception, our churches have diminished in numbers, instances of backsliding have multiplied, family religion is deplorably neglected, the public place of ministry is waning foes, and there seems to be a prospect that God is about to send upon us the worst of all curses, "a famine, not of bread, nor of water, but of hearing the words of the Lord."—One of our ministering brethren, who has labored long and usefully, in a communication which, we suppose, was not intended for the public eye, expresses himself with much feeling on this point, and very appropriately. He will exx the liberty we take in publishing a part of his letter. Our readers will pardon the solemn facts upon which he dwells, and ask whether it is not time to clothe ourselves in sackcloth, and beseech God to take away our reproach.

T. B. B.
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