

THE ADVENT REVIEW, AND SABBATH HERALD.

"Here is the Patience of the Saints; Here are they that keep the Commandments of God and the Faith of Jesus."

VOL. III.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., THURSDAY, JULY 22, 1852.

No. 6.

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

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY,
At No. 124 Mount Hope Avenue, Rochester.
Terms—GRATIS. It is expected that all the friends of the cause will aid in its publication, as the Lord hath prospered them.

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

THE SABBATH.

BY HARRIET N. STEVENS.

WELCOME, the Sabbath hour,
The holy and the blest!
With sweet, subduing power,
It calms the soul to rest;
And hope and love spring up anew,
To cheer us on, our journey through.

Our only care and aim
Throughout this hallow'd day,
To glorify thy name,
And grateful honors pay;
Advance the glory of thy cause,
And vindicate thy righteous laws.

Descend, Celestial Dove,
E'en while we wait and sing!
Come from the throne of love,
With healing on thy wing!
With ardent zeal each heart inspire,
The saints baptize with holy fire.

THE SABBATH.

LETTERS TO O. R. L. CROZIER.—NO. VI.

DEAR SIR:—From the heading of your sixth article, viz: "The Review's Direct Testimony," one might imagine that a spirit of candor had at length come over you; but the very first sentence dispels every such impression. To give a false idea, respecting the testimony presented, you commence with the quotation of part of a sentence from the Review, with the addition of such words as form a sentence to your mind. As I have had occasion in every letter to point out the unfairness of your course, and your unwillingness to state correctly the position and arguments of the Review, I regret that the first sentence of this article should exhibit the same lack of candor. I will not, however, say much by way of censure; for it is evident that the necessities of your case are great; nothing else could cause an honorable and high-minded man to resort to the unfortunate course pursued by yourself in this whole matter.

The review of your Bible class report, exposed the inferences by which you attempted to prove that God had abolished his constitution, the ten commandments. As you stated that Sabbath-keepers had nothing to present against such a doctrine, the Review remarked as follows:

"We offer the following direct testimony relative to the perpetuity of God's constitution, asking that C. will either refute it, or else withdraw his assertions."

You commence by saying:

"The Review says, 'We offer the following direct testimony'—of course to bear on the question at issue—the Sabbath. Well, this is all we ask. Give us 'direct testimony,' and we will listen."

You wish to give the idea that the point before us, was the separate perpetuity of the fourth commandment, and not what it really was, the perpetuity of the whole ten, the constitution of the Father. And the fourth commandment not being separately referred to in the texts quoted, you wish to convey the idea that they have no bearing upon the point before us.

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. xi, 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 God himself, 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 guilty man, and never intimate that his death blotted out that holy law, we can form some idea of the sacred and immutable character of that great constitution. You continue:

"It adduces 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 one 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 Paradise, [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 "doeth all things well," but you loathe it as Jewish. 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," &c. 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 from grace?

The character of the testimony borne by our Lord and his apostles to the perpetuity of his Father's constitution, will appear upon examination. After saying, "now let us hear the witnesses," you present the following:

1. "TESTIMONY OF OUR LORD. Matt. v. 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 shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.

'Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be

called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.'

Luke xvi. 17. 'And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail.

Matt. xxii. 35—40. 'Then one of them, which was a lawyer, asked him a question, tempting him, and saying, Master, which is the great commandment in the law?

'Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind.

'This is the first and great commandment.

'And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.

'On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.'

Who can see any 'direct testimony' on the Sabbath in these passages? Surely nobody, but the Review and those who sympathize 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 adduced 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 inexcusable."

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 ten. And that you thus understood it, appears from your own acknowledgment, that "It was the perpetuity of God's constitution they were adduced 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-enacted 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 abolishes will need re-enactment before any part of it can become his amended constitution!

(4.) But in your fifth article instead of teaching, as heretofore, that Jesus formed a new constitution for his Father, out of nine of the ten precepts, you say that he made it out of the two great ones! And in this your sixth article, as will presently appear, you

have him in strong contrast with the second precept of this new constitution!

If the *Review* has not been able to understand your position, after having the chance to see how many times you could alter it, perhaps it ought to be thankful that you have stated 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 did not do it abstractly; so they continued in force just the same as though they had not been abolished! But one of the ten (the fourth) he abolished abstractly, and thus put an end to a carnal ordinance, that had unfortunately, obtained a place in his constitution.

2 Cor. iii, then, does not teach that the ten commandments are abstractly abolished. No, it shows that nine 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?

Now let us weigh the testimony here presented by Jesus respecting his Father's law:

1. He did not come to destroy the law or the prophets; then he did not destroy them.

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 small point by which one of those letters is distinguished from another,] shall in no wise pass from the law till all 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. But 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 ordinances was blotted out, [Col. ii,] but not the point specified by Jesus, before which no part of this law shall pass. That point is explicitly stated: "Till heaven and earth pass." When is it that heaven and earth shall pass? Rev. xx, 11, answers: "And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heavens fled away, and there was found no place for them." This event has not yet transpired; hence a single precept has not passed from the law of God.

5. That our Lord refers to that "royal law" that "remaineth," or is not made "void" but "established," [James ii, 8-12; 1 John iii; Rom. iii,] and not to that hand-writing of ordinances that he did blot out, nail to the cross, take out of the way, abolish, &c., will be evident when we come to examine further the testimony of the chapter.

To fulfill the law of ceremonies, or to use your expression, "the Levitical ceremonies," appended to the constitution, is to become the antitype of all those types, the body that cast all those shadows. This renders it complete, and takes it out of the way. Heb. x, 1-10; Col. ii.

To fulfill the great constitution of holy principles, is to render *strict, entire, and perfect* obedience to every point of this royal law. The work of Christ in thus fulfilling the will of the Father, does not strike out of existence the precepts of the moral law. For the great object of his mission was to bring out a people in whom the precept of the law might be *fulfilled*. Whiting's translation of Rom. viii, 5; James ii, 8-12.

6. But we are not left in the dark as to whether the moral law was destroyed by the act of our Lord Jesus Christ in keeping it. John xv, 10. The verse which succeeds the statement respecting the passing of the heavens and the earth, speaks out in language not to be misunderstood, or explained away. "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." Note a few facts:

(1.) The word "whosoever" includes you and me.

(2.) The word "therefore" shows that this conclusion respecting the commandments, is something drawn from the premises just laid down, which were, He had not "come to destroy the law," and "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled."

(3.) It is a fact therefore that in the most solemn manner Christ enjoins the keeping of the commandments. The Messiah, the Prince, here lays open the purpose of his heart concerning the commandments of his Father. Would you with Paul, "have the mind of Christ" relative to them? It is expressed in simple language, easy to be understood, and most precious and blessed to obey. Keep the commandments and enter into life—be highly esteemed in the reign of heaven; break them and teach men so, [those who teach men so must contend that they are "abolished,"] and be of no esteem in the reign of heaven—be left without the gates of that city into which the commandment-keepers will enter, and remain with those who love and make a lie.

7. The law, then, to which Jesus refers, is the commandments.

8. But the translation of this portion of scripture by Campbell is worthy of notice:

"Think not that I am come to subvert, the law or the prophets. I am come not to subvert, but to ratify. For verily I say unto you, heaven and earth shall sooner perish, than one iota, or one tittle of the law shall perish without attaining its end. Whosoever, therefore, shall violate, or teach others to violate, were it the least of these commandments, shall be in no esteem in the reign of heaven; but whosoever shall practice and teach them, shall be highly esteemed in the reign of heaven."

9. 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. Whoever therefore shall break the least of these commandments, and teach men so, he will be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whoever shall perform, and teach them, he will be called great in the kingdom of the heavens."

10. 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 those who stand foremost in teaching men 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 they were abolished!"

We will now examine Luke xvi, 17, "And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass than one tittle of the law to fail."

1. Then it is easier for heaven and earth, than for one of the commandments of God.

2. How hard, then, must it have been for *every* precept of the great "constitution to be done away abolished," and for a new one to be established in its stead! Easier could heaven and earth be destroyed, and new heavens and new earth be created! When God shall abolish his constitution and establish another, it will not only be marked as distinctly as the establishment of the original constitution by himself in person at Sinai, but it will be even a more extraordinary spectacle for heaven and earth to flee from the presence of him that sits upon the throne!

3. But if we compare this text, with the one just quoted from Matt. v, we find that it is not only *easier* for heaven and earth to pass than for one tittle of the law, but that one tittle shall not pass till "the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up." Amen.

Whether this looks like the perpetuity or the abolition of the great constitution, I submit to yourself. However, the law here referred to, has such an intimate connection with Jehovah, that he could easier 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 necessary, and as heaven and earth could be struck out of existence easier than a fraction of the law in question could fail, it certainly required Omnipotence itself to destroy what God made into a Sabbath at the close of his Creation Week.

We turn to Matt. xxii, 35-40, and read that portion of Christ's language, which in your fifth article you adduced as proof that he established a new constitution. Whether it teaches the abrogation of God's constitution and the establishment of a better one, or whether it reads like the perpetuity of the one in existence, we now are interested to inquire.

On the two commandments here named by Jesus, hang all the law and the prophets. Such had ever been the case, such was then the case, and for aught that appears to the contrary in the word of God, they still hang there. Let us notice a few points:

1. The law here referred to, is, manifestly, that moral law of God which *defines* what it is to love God with the whole heart and our neighbor as ourselves, not that "hand-writing" in which were the carnal ordinances, the law of divorce, the law of retaliation &c.

2. The great constitution does define the first principles of man's duty to his God and to his fellow man. Ex. xx, 3-11; Eccl. xii, 14. Christ here states the two great reasons why man should obey these first principles. (1.) Because he should love God with all his heart; (2.) Because he should love his neighbor as himself.

3. The two commandments did not here take the place of the ten, for there is no intimation that Christ here wrought any change, whatever.

4. It is a fact that James makes his quotation of the second of these great precepts, not from the new constitution which you suppose that Christ here formed, but from "the Scriptures," the Old Testament.—He recognized the *original* precepts, he recognized *no change*.

5. The Great Jehovah has drawn out into four essential particulars, the great precept, "Love God with all thy heart." He has drawn out into six essential precepts, the great commandment, "Love thy neighbor as thyself." The two are the sum; the ten are the particulars that make up that sum. Rom. xiii, 9; 1 John v, 3; James ii, 8-12. Hence they are alike immutable. The New Testament neither abolishes the sum, nor the particulars which make up that sum. For its great design was to place man where he could fulfill "the righteousness [or precept] of the law."—You continue as follows:

"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 'direct testimony' to that point. It is only *inferred* that the 'law' in these passages was the decalogue. That it included the decalogue, there is no doubt, and it also included much more, as we shall see presently. The Jews regarded Christ and his gospel, as arrayed against Moses and the law. He endeavors to correct them on this point, and tells them that he came not to 'break' or 'destroy the law.'"

You object to the idea that these texts teach the perpetuity of the ten commandments, notwithstanding you stated in your last paragraph that you did not believe that God's constitution (the ten commandments) had been *abstractly* abolished.

As you fail to see any evidence in these texts let me bring it to your mind. Matt. v, 19, is "direct testimony" that the commandments are not abolished.—Those who keep them shall have life; those who teach men to break them (How can any do this without contending that they are abolished?) shall be of no esteem in the reign of heaven! And from Luke xvi, 17, we learn that it is easier for heaven and earth to pass than for one tittle of the law to fail. Then it is not a light matter for the Great Law-giver to "abolish, do away" all the precepts of his constitution! And from Matt. xxii, we learn that on the two great, unabolished commandments hang all the others.

Now we inquire, to what does the term law in these texts refer?

(1.) The law in Matt. v, 18, is the same as the commandments in verse 19.

(2.) The law here referred to, was not to be des-

troyed; but the hand-writing of ordinances was abolished, taken out of the way, nailed to the cross.

(3.) The law of ceremonies has been all abolished, yet heaven and earth have not passed.

(4.) It is EASIER for heaven and earth to pass than for one tittle of this law to fail. Yet the law of carnal ordinances was *disannulled* 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, condemned world, [1 John iii; Rom. iii.] and not that law of ordinances, which was blotted out by his death. Col. ii.

(6.) That law which hangs upon or is comprehended in the two great precepts, evidently has 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 as 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, have fallen into the same mistake that you say befell the Jews. 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 upon the mercy-seat—the top of the Ark, avails to take away sins. Hence the gospel offers pardon. If the gospel and the atonement be taken away, there is no hope for guilty man. If the law be taken away there is no necessity that men avail themselves of the pardon offered by the gospel. Like the attributes of justice and mercy, they stand united; and what God hath joined together let not man put asunder. Even the law of types, which shadowed forth the great salvation of the gospel, is thus shown to have an important meaning. Christ did not come to break or to destroy the law; hence he did not break it, he did not destroy it. You continue:

"But for what did he come? The *Review* would answer to keep it. But hold; does our Saviour say so? No! He says he came to *fulfill*—fill out, accomplish—the law and the prophets, so as to make them honorable, by demonstrating that they were true, in their typical and prophetic references. 'The law and the prophets' here is the same as 'Moses and the prophets' in Luke. xxiv, 27. The *fulfilling* of the law is evidently to be understood in the same sense as the *fulfilling* of the prophets: hence, of course, it has no reference to the *precepts* of the law, but to its fulfillment in the sense stated above. This left him free to change the preceptive portion of the law, which he did, as will be seen from the following table arranged from Matt. v."

According to yourself, then, the Saviour came to fulfill the typical law; but in thus stating the object of his mission he had no reference to the great constitution of his Father. Indeed he was left "free to change" that. Yet in your last paragraph you stated that that law which Christ said he came to fulfill, "included the decalogue."

Then if the fulfilling of a law does it away, the ten commandments were not done away by Christ, for according to yourself he did not fulfill them! He did not do them away by modifying them, for we shall presently notice that your effort to prove that he modified them, is an entire failure.

As you refer the law which Christ came to fulfill, to "the Levitical ceremonies" and to the law of types, I do not object to the use made of Luke xxiv, 27.

But mark the fact! the law, which Christ came to fulfill, [Matt. v, 17, 18.] is the same as the commandments named in verse 19. And these abide in full force, under his *fearful sanction*! Hence Christ has direct reference to the precepts of the moral law.—And that which Christ thus fulfilled, he did not abolish, but requires that his people, through grace, fulfill it also. Rom. viii, 4; James ii.

If you still contend that the typical law was that which Christ came to fulfill, then that abides in force under his fearful mandate. Matt. v, 19.

But before thus, lightly setting aside the moral law,

note two or three points: (1.) Since the fall of Adam, none have been able through the whole period of their lives to render complete, entire and perfect obedience to all its holy precepts, though it is the embodiment of the principles of God's own holiness. (2.) When Christ came, the law not only demanded this perfect obedience, but it demanded the death of all, for all were its transgressors. 2 Cor. v, 14, 15. (3.) Christ rendered perfect obedience to all its precepts through life. (4.) He then took upon himself its fearful curse, and died the just for the unjust. And having thus answered its demands, he offers pardon to the guilty, through his blood, and grace to fulfill the righteousness of the law.

But let us now examine your effort to set aside the great constitution by teaching that Christ modified and changed it. You present what you call a series of antitheses, between Moses and Christ. The first is Matt. v, 21, 22, and reads with your heading thus:

MOSES.—"Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill, shall be in danger of the judgment."

CHRIST. "But I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause, shall be in danger of the judgment; and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of the fire of gehenna. Therefore . . . be reconciled to thy brother, &c."

The first thing that strikes the eye in this alleged contrast, is the fact that Christ, instead of placing himself in opposition to the sixth commandment of the Father, which you head "Moses," was speaking with direct reference to the manner in which the Pharisees, thought to keep the commandments. Verse 19 solemnly enjoins the keeping of the commandments. Verse 20, which is intimately connected to verse 19 by the conjunction "for," shows that such obedience as that which the Pharisees rendered, which was a mere observance of the letter, without any idea that the commandments were "spiritual" and "exceeding broad," was not that obedience that the law of God required.

Christ does not here abolish the sixth commandment; he does not re-enact it; he does not lessen the obligation to obey it; but in the most solemn manner, he points out its spirituality, and shows that it may be violated by the act of the heart. Hence, to "fulfill the righteousness of the law" was something far beyond the poor obedience of the Pharisees. Verse 22 therefore does not modify, nor stand in array against the commandment in verse 21. But you have another contrast with which to "modify," "do away" or "set aside," the great constitution. It is from verses 27 and 28, and reads thus:

"Thou shalt not commit adultery."

"But I say unto you,—That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart."

If you are in earnest, in saying that Christ modified this commandment, then your position is one to be ashamed of, certainly.

These two precepts are the only ones quoted from the decalogue in this table of comparison. The precepts quoted are shown to be spiritual and to refer to the thoughts and motives of the heart. Hence, your effort to prove that Christ established a new constitution by modifying the original precepts is not sustained by any evidence. The only way that you can claim that Christ modified these commandments, is to take the ground that once the law of the All-Seeing Jehovah referred only to the outward act, and that when Christ came, he added the spiritual meaning and application to such of the precepts as he suffered to exist! Such a position, however, is "blasphemous enough to make one tremble!" Your next contrast [verses 31, 32] is as follows:

"Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement."

"But I say unto you,—That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery."

Now it will be noticed, that, instead of quoting from the great constitution, which is the only thing that you are anxious to set aside, you have presented for contrast with the words of Christ, that precept which

he said was given because of the hardness of the hearts of the Hebrews. Matt. xix, 7, 8. Observe, that instead of showing that this was spiritual and binding as the rule of men's lives as he did the two precepts quoted from the decalogue, he shows that it was not of such a character, and would not be continued in force. The difference in his language is very significant. Your next contrast [verses 33, 34] is as follows:

"Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths."

"But I say unto you, Swear not at all, &c."

Some have referred this precept to the third commandment, others to the ninth. The third commandment reads, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain;" but this precept is, "Thou shalt not swear *falsely*." The one forbids blasphemy, the other forbids a false oath. Hence, they are not the same. The ninth commandment reads, "Thou shalt not bear false witness." It might be supposed that this was the same as, "Thou shalt not swear *falsely*." But it is certain that an oath is not a necessary part of bearing witness. And if they are the same, then Christ forbids us to bear witness at all, for he adds, "Swear not." And if it be thus understood, he violated this his own direction, himself, for he said, when before the high-priest, to one that smote him, "If I have spoken evil, bear witness." John xviii, 23.

But the first part of the above is quoted from Lev. xix, 12. The last part may be read in Num. xxx, 2; Deut. xxiv, 21—23. Hence, we have not yet been able to discover Christ's act of "doing away," setting aside, abolishing, his Father's constitution, and establishing a better. But you have another contrast to present. See verses 38, 39. It is this:

"An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth."

"But I say unto you,—That ye resist not evil, &c."

It is sufficient, perhaps, to remark that the law of retaliation is not a part of the great constitution which you are so anxious "to do away, set aside, abolish," 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 "superceded the constitution of God's religious system?" (the decalogue.) But you have one more contrast to offer. Verses 43, 44. Perhaps this one will help you. Let us see:

"Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy."

"But I say unto you,—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, &c."

I might turn this last contrast upon yourself.—For instead of its being a contrast with one of the ten precepts 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. But I forbear, and remark, that the sentence appended, which is not to be found in the law, is the point that Christ corrects. 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, between the *Law* and the *Gospel*, and so strong are some of them, that the precepts of the law are *negated* by those of the gospel, and Jesus *forbids* a literal obedience of Moses, as in swearing, in retaliation, and in hating an enemy. And it should be noticed, that he quotes indifferently from the decalogue and from the book of the law, treating the one no more reverently than the other, but placing himself in strong contrast to both. He makes no distinction between them, but regards them as constituting only one law."

To the above remarks, I reply:

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.

3. But if you wish to maintain that Christ placed himself in strong contrast with the great precept, "Love thy neighbor as thyself," which you say is a part of the constitution which Christ established for the gospel, you are at liberty so to do. But if you say "no, he placed himself in contrast with the words appended to it," then you yield all argument on the point.

4. Although Christ has not mentioned the distinction between the great constitution and the law of carnal ordinances, divorce, retaliation &c., nor even intimated that the great precept quoted by him, was the sum of the last six commandments, [Rom. xiii.] and a part of the royal law, [James 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. But 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 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 it is against the original which you wish to abolish. For you have arrayed Christ in strong contrast with one of the two great precepts, (which you say form the present constitution) as well as in the same 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 James quotes from the Old Testament, and to 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 but one law! Then you will be kind enough to take back the statement in your second article, that the *Review* had 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 he wrought in the perceptive portion of the religious system that had been in vogue with the Jews from the departure from Egypt. Others are noticed elsewhere in the New Testament; as, that covetousness is idolatry; hating a brother, murder, &c. These specimens establish a rule of interpretation, and justify 2 Cor. iii; Rom. xiv., and Col. ii."

Recollect a few things:

1. 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 exceeding broad. Ps. cxix, 96; li, 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 them, and made them exceeding broad. This is in admirable keeping with the doctrine that the penalty of the law was once nothing but temporal 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 men 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. To your remarks respecting covetousness, hating a brother, &c., I answer, that the law of God had taken cognizance of these things before the first Advent, or it had not. If it had not so done, then men in that period, could hate 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 act thus, then the New Testament in stating the fact, merely lays open a truth as old as Creation.

It is by such specimens that you establish a rule of interpretation, and justify 2 Cor. iii; Rom. xiv; Col. ii. The chapters need no justification; 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 Rom. xiv, 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:

"Now in the light of these facts, we ask, Did not Christ remodel the religious system? Did he not supersede the law, with its constitution, the decalogue? No one can deny it: it is too obvious to be doubted.—'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. Now it is a fact that you have presented better evidence that he superseded one of the two great precepts, than that he superseded either of the ten!

There was a law that regulated the earthly priesthood in every particular; it was the law of carnal ordinances. There was a law that made an atonement and a priesthood necessary; it was 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 of the race of Aaron is necessarily changed; but no necessity is created that the moral law of God 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 written in the hand-writing of ordinances, I answer, that every thing which you could adduce as proof, has been weighed, and the assertion stands before us unsupported by evidence. And in taking leave of the testimony of our Lord, I may be allowed to repeat his answer to him who sought the way of life: "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." You next speak as follows:

"We will now hear the other three witnesses.

2. TESTIMONY OF PAUL. (1.) He testifies what is abolished. Eph. ii, 14—17; Col. ii, 14—17; Heb. ix, 10. (2.) He testifies to that which is not abolished. Rom. vii, 7—25; viii, 1—7; Eph. vi, 2, 3; Rom. iii, 31."

The *Review* quotes Col. ii, 14—17, to show "what is abolished." The passage reads as follows:

"Blotting out the hand-writing of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross;

"And, having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them in it.

"Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days;

"Which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ."

Very good; then upon its own showing, the Sabbath 'IS ABOLISHED'! This, remember, is "direct testimony."

To this I answer, that Paul recognizes a plain distinction between that law which caused the death of the Lord Jesus, and that law which his death blotted out. Rom. iii; Col. ii.

God's Sabbath was sanctified and hallowed by him; consequently it stands in the midst of the nine precepts of his moral law. The annual sabbaths of the Jews were never sanctified and hallowed by him, consequently, they were placed with the feasts and new

moons of the hand-writing of ordinances. Lev. xxiii, 24, 32, 39.

The hand-writing of ordinances, which Christ blotted out, is the decalogue, or it is not. If it is the decalogue, then I inquire, how could Paul speak of meats, drinks, new moons, holy days, [literally festival, Macknight,] and sabbaths, [plural,] as there is nothing of the kind in it? But if you say that it does not refer to the decalogue, but to those carnal ordinances which regulate all these matters, then you yield all argument from this text.

But you may take still another position and say, (notwithstanding no one of the things here mentioned as abolished is to be found in the decalogue,) that the hand-writing of ordinances included the decalogue. Let us test it. If it did include the decalogue, then the blood of Jesus "blotted out" the precepts which forbid idolatry, blasphemy, disobedience to parents, murder, adultery, theft, false-witness, and covetousness! And that which the blood of Christ blotted out has never been re-written!! Is not such a doctrine most shameful, inasmuch as it not only delivers men from the sentence of God's law, whether they repent or not, but it makes the great salvation of the gospel to consist, not in deliverance from sin, but in deliverance from every principle of morality that God ever laid down!! But if the ten commandments were not among the ordinances that Christ blotted out, then you fail of any proof, whatever, from this text!

Whatever was contained in the hand-writing of ordinances was "abolished abstractly," and entirely, and not left in existence, as the abolition of the decalogue left nine of the commandments, according to yourself!

But if you say that the hand-writing of ordinances included only a part of the ten commandments, (in order to avoid the absurdity that the whole ten are utterly destroyed by the blood of Christ,) then I ask you to show your authority! If you say, because that the term "holy-day" occurs, I answer, that Wesley, Macknight, and the Doway version render it feast day, festival, festival day; and that they render it rightly is evident from the fact that it is the same word that is thus rendered in Luke ii, 21; xxii, 1; John xiii, 1; 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 the hand-writing of ordinances included at least four annual sabbaths. Lev. xviii, 24, 32, 39.

But when God uses figures, does he not use reasonable ones? And what idea can you get of blotting out words engraven in stone? And what a figure to speak of nailing tables of stone to a cross!

Your "direct testimony," therefore, that the Sabbath of Jehovah, embodied in the fourth commandment, is abolished, is obtained, like your other proofs on the same point, by wresting the scriptures, and particularly the words of Paul.—You speak again:

"3. TESTIMONY OF JAMES. 'If ye fulfill the royal law, according to the Scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, ye do well:

'But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

'For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all.

'For he that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law.

'So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty.'

What "direct testimony" is there here for the Sabbath? Not a particle: there is no allusion to the subject. If it is claimed that the Sabbath is "one point" in the "law" to which James refers, we reply: This is only an inference, and we demand proof that such is the fact. The law here in James is "the law of Christ," and not "the law of Moses;" So in Rom. iii, 31; vii, 7—25; viii, 1—7, and Eph. vi, 2, 3—texts quoted by the *Review* to show what is not abolished—the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus' gives freedom; but this is not the law of Moses."

It is an important fact that James quotes, not from a new edition of the law of God, called by yourself "the law of Christ," but from the "Scripture"—the Old Testament—and from that law [see margin] which was composed of the commandments.

Having heretofore pointed out the defects in your argument from this text, a few words are all that is now needed. He that shall "offend in one point, [precept, Macknight] he is guilty of all."

The "ALL" here referred to, means one of two things: (1.) It means only those precepts which James has quoted, which makes "the whole law" to consist of the three precepts here cited, and leaves us at liberty, not only to violate the fourth commandment, but also the first, second, third, fifth, eighth, ninth, and tenth, and even the first of the two great ones!—Strange liberty! And you have not offended in a single point!

(2.) Or the "ALL," to which James points, includes the ten precepts from which he quotes, and he that violates one has transgressed them all!

The second is the position of the *Review*; the first is left for those who break the commandments, and teach men so!

But Paul in Rom. iii, 31, refers to "the law of Christ" does he? This is a virtual admission that the law there referred to is *not abolished*. We inquire, then, whether Paul refers to the original, unabolished law of Jehovah, or to some other law. Verse 19 shows the whole world condemned and guilty before God in the sight of this law. Verse 23 gives the reason. Verses 24—26 shows that by faith in the atonement, the shedding of the blood of the Son of God, guilty man may be pardoned.—And verse 31 shows that salvation through the great propitiation, does not make void the law, but establishes it!

These facts point us to a law in existence before the first Advent of the Messiah, and not to one enacted by him after his coming. To the law which made an atonement necessary, viz: "the ten words" shut up in the Ark, on 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. Its top is the mercy-seat from which we receive pardon; the testament within it is the holy, unabolished constitution of the Father.

You also attempt to set aside the law in Rom. vii, 7—25, as "the law of Christ." For it is manifest that the law there noticed is an unabolished law. But this is a failure, for several reasons. (1.) The words purport to come from the law, an expression never used with reference to the words of Christ. (2.) The words in verse 7 are a *literal quotation* from the decalogue; but as Christ never used the expression, and never quoted the tenth commandment, they are not a quotation from what you call "the law of Christ." (3.) But there is direct proof in verses 22 and 25 that Paul refers to "the law of God." Hence Paul did quote from the decalogue in the year 60, and recognized it as *unabolished*.

And as we read forward in chapter viii, we find that the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus, delivered him, (not from the law of God, as some vainly imagine, but) from that other law of sin, which in chapter vii, 7—25, he represents as baffling all his efforts to keep the law of God. In the third verse he offers praise to God for the atonement; (just as in chapter iii); and in the fourth verse he testifies that the righteousness [precept, Whiting,] of the law can now be fulfilled in us. For he is delivered from the carnal mind, which is enmity against God, and which is not subject to his law; (the same that now leads men to fight the commandments of God.)

Now, we inquire, from what law does Paul quote in Eph. vi, 2, 3. You think that he quotes the commandment from the law of Christ, and not from the law of Moses, a term which you delight to apply to the commandments of God. Let us test this also. It is a fact, that though Christ has quoted this commandment, he has never appended a promise to it; much less has he added the one here quoted by Paul. But it is also a fact that this commandment does stand in the decalogue, not only as its first commandment with promise, but with the very promise in question annexed! Hence it is a fact that Paul quotes from the decalogue, which you say is abolished; and not from the law of Christ, which, according to yourself, Christ established by amending his Father's commandments! Hence it is a fact that the decalogue is not abolished! You continue, and conclude as follows:

"TESTIMONY OF JOHN. 'And every man that hath this hope in him, purifieth himself even as he is pure.

'Whoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law; for sin is the transgression of the law.

'And ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin.' John iii, 3—5.

'And the dragon was wroth with the woman; and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ.' 'Here is the patience of the saints; here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus.' 'Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city.'—Rev. xii, 17; xiv, 12; xxii, 14.

What 'direct testimony' is there in these passages in favor of the Sabbath, or of the law of Moses, or of the decalogue?—There is none at all.

'We cover the whole ground of these passages when we acknowledge ourselves to be 'under the law to Christ,' (1 Cor. ix, 21,) without acknowledging the present authority of the law of Moses; and by 'doing the commandments' of the New Testament. If we thus continue faithful to the end, 'under

the law to Christ,' and 'doing his commandments,' we cannot be convicted of sin, nor excluded from the tree of life."

Before calling attention to the defects in your argument from these texts, I notice one or two facts.

(1.) You have not succeeded in establishing a new constitution, or in modifying the original. (2.) You have not succeeded in establishing a new law, in place of the holy and just law of God. Hence the commandments of God remain unamended and unabolished. Let us examine the scriptures quoted.

1. John shows that the law still exists.

2. Sin is the transgression of it.

3. Christ was manifested not to take away the law, but to take away sin, the transgression of it. Hence this is the original law of God, one that existed before the Advent of Jesus, and one that rendered his death necessary, as shown in Rom. iii. It still exists, and whosoever breaks the commandments of God is convicted by it, as a sinner. The blood of Jesus did not blot it out. But say you, "Love is the fulfilling of the law." So it is, but what is love? John answers: "This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments." 1 John v, 3. Such love does indeed fulfill the law of God, and any thing less, no matter what the profession, is not the love of God!

The book of Revelation speaks on the commandments of God. At the very end of time John saw the dragon and the last fragment of the church contending. Listen: "And the dragon was wroth with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ." What is the feature by which the remnant are distinguished? The keeping of the commandments of God! What was done to them? The dragon made war with them, for he was wroth. Will the powers of this earth make war on the remnant for not worshipping other gods, not bowing down to idols, not blaspheming? No, they recognize them as right thus far. Will they be offended with those who do not dishonor their parents, or murder, or commit adultery, steal, or bear false witness, or covet? No, they imprison those who do thus. But those are only nine of the commandments of God. The fourth commandment is the precept that brings out the ire of the dragon.—When the remnant take hold of this precept, which the dragon has with such care been laboring to change, the wrath of worldlings, Catholics, Protestants, and even of Adventists, is roused to crush them, and to check the work, "that it proceed no further!" What is the trouble? O, they are keeping the commandments as God gave them, and they condemn us!—Will the enemies of God succeed in destroying the remnant? No!

"The remnant in these latter days

Will triumph sure; give God the praise!

They, of the beast refuse the mark,

They keep God's law—they have the Ark!"

The wrath of the dragon, already beginning to be stirred, will doubtless increase until that "time of trouble such as never was." And some perhaps with whom the remnant have taken sweet counsel, will be left to think that in killing them they are doing God's service.

But John sees them again. "Here is the patience of the saints; here are they that keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus." But when is it that John sees the commandment-keepers this time? In the patience of the saints, (waiting with hope long-deferred,) and under the message of the Third Angel. Then those who live in the period referred to, will have much to say about the commandments of God. And those who oppose will doubtless attempt to prove that they are abolished, or that they have been superseded by the testimony of Jesus Christ. But the saints of God, not heeding this folly, will keep both. But does not John see them again? Yes. He sees the commandment-keepers enter the holy city, while those who love and make a lie, are left without. Christ had said, "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments;" John sees such enter into it!

This is direct testimony that the commandments of God are not abolished. It is direct testimony that they have not been superseded by the testimony of Jesus Christ.

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 to Christ" will do as he has directed, viz: "Keep the commandments." The commandments of Jesus have not taken the place of the commandments of God, as you try to give the idea. They stand together—they are inseparable. How long wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?

J. N. ANDREWS.

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

"They that forsake the law, praise the wicked; but such as keep the law contend with them." Prov. xxviii, 4.

"For to be carnally minded is death, . . . 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.

THE REVIEW AND HERALD.

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

ROCH) ST) R. THURSDAY, JULY 22, 1852.

THE PATIENCE OF THE SAINTS.

"HERE is the patience of the saints; here are they that keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus." Rev. xiv, 12. This verse closes the message of the third angel.—The time having come when the truths contained in this message are present truths, it becomes us to study them well.

Much is being said relative to the commandments of God mentioned by the third angel, but comparatively little is said upon the patience of the saints, and the faith of Jesus. These subjects we intend to present, but shall give only a few thoughts at this time upon the patience of the saints.

But where shall we apply this text that speaks of the patience of the saints? In the future age? Nonsense! to talk of a period when immortal saints will be so immersed in perplexing trials as to make it necessary to exercise great patience! This text can be applied to no other period only when they are groaning beneath the infirmities of mortality, and subject to the temptations, and fiery darts of Satan and his children.

Such a period the Apostle points out in a clear manner in Heb. x, 35—39, "Cast not away therefore your confidence, which hath great recompense of reward. For ye have need of patience, that after ye have done the will of God, ye might receive the promise; for yet a little while, and he that shall come will come, and will not tarry." What is the subject of Paul's remarks? Answer, the coming of the Lord; and they can apply to no other period than that when Christ's coming is to be in "a little while." Then the exhortation, "Cast not away, therefore, your confidence," &c., refers to those who have had great confidence in Christ's coming, but have been disappointed. Such are told that they would need patience after they had done the will of God.

"Here is the patience of the saints," says the third angel. Their position is one of peculiar trials. In publishing the first and second messages, they did the will of God. While fulfilling the Word they received divine approbation. But a period of trial of faith, the waiting, watching time must also come to fulfill the Word. These fulfillments are all perfectly plain.—The first message, based on time, has been given. The second, separating the Advent people from the churches, is also in the past. And it is equally as clear that the period of the patience of the saints has been since the great disappointment in 1844.

But the Apostle continues: "Now the just shall live by faith." This, by no means, is a period of reformation and religious excitement, when thousands who have but little or no real faith, may be borne onward by a strong current of salvation setting heavenward, as in days past; but is a period of apostasy and death-like stupidity, when there are a thousand influences calculated to drag the soul down to perdition. Therefore, those who live to God at all, must live by naked faith.—Faith in the fulfillment of prophecy in the Advent movement in the past, and that "He that is to come will come" in a "little while," and faith that conveys present saving power to the soul.

"But if any man draw back my soul shall have no pleasure in him. But we are not of them who draw back to perdition; but of them that believe to the saving of the soul." Mark this: the only thing introduced here by the Apostle, from which there is danger of drawing back, is the "confidence" once enjoyed in the hope of the coming of Christ. This being the subject of his remarks, it follows that we are exhorted not to cast away our confidence, which has been pleasing to God, while doing his will in giving the former messages. And it is evident, also, that this period of the patience of the saints is in consequence of their disappointment relative to Christ's coming, and the trials of their waiting, watching position. These being the facts in the case, it is perilous to doubt, it is perdition to draw back, and fully deny and trample upon the advanced position once occupied by the whole Advent body.

THE interest and usefulness of the REVIEW AND HERALD greatly depends upon the communications from the scattered brethren. A good brother suggests that the portion of its columns devoted to letters, should be something like a conference-meeting, where all have a chance to speak.

Let those not accustomed to writing much, write in a natural, humble style. It is a good time to write, after holding sweet communion with God in prayer, when imbued with the Holy Spirit.

But there are brethren and sisters who have written considerable, but neglect to furnish matter for the REVIEW AND HERALD. A variety of matter from their pens would add much to its usefulness.

Those who have shared the blessings of the present truth, should testify the same to others. A sketch of the experience of such, would doubtless cheer many lonely brethren and sisters who are separated from those of like precious faith.

Brethren and sisters, speak out, and let others know what the Lord has done for you, and let God be glorified for his abundant mercy.

LETTERS.

From Bro. Holt.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—I reached home last evening, much fatigued in body, but strong in faith. Bro. Edson will probably reach home to-day. We have had some very interesting meetings since I wrote you from Irasburgh, Vt. We held meetings in Chateaugay, Sabbath and First-day, June 26th and 27th, which resulted in much good. Brn. Hollis and Ingraham were with us. An appointment was sent on for the meeting, but was not received in time to notify the brethren before we reached there on Friday.

There were two school-houses in the place where public meetings were held, but they were both taken up, one by an Advent preacher who had two meetings on Sabbath afternoon, and three on First-day. A portion of the brethren were desirous to hear on the subject of the Sabbath, and requested the preacher to give way for this subject to be presented or discussed. This he did not feel disposed to do. He and his associates were then asked, if we might unite with them, and improve part of the time? This they would not do, but chose a separate meeting. When this was decided, the Baptist preacher being present, arose and withdrew his appointment, and freely offered us the other house. We accepted the offer, and spoke to a crowded house, on First-day, that listened attentively to the subject of present truth. The result was, that several decided to keep the Sabbath of the Lord, and public notice was given for meetings on the next seventh day. We had interesting meetings with the brethren in Bangor and Norfolk. They are growing stronger, and the Lord is adding to their numbers.

Sabbath and First-day, July 3d and 4th, we held a conference at Bro. John Byington's in Potsdam. The brethren from different places met there. We had a time of refreshing, and we were much strengthened and encouraged.

Bro. and Sr. Byington and two others were baptized. Three had formerly been sprinkled. The other was a young convert. We passed through Lorain and Sandy Creek, and found the brethren in good spirits, united, and strong in the truth of God.

Oswego, N. Y., July 8th, 1852. G. W. HOLT.

From Bro. Upson.

DEAR BRO. WHITE: Since you was here, I have not been a little comforted and strengthened in the faith of Jesus, as the Apostle says, faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God, and as the Blessed Jesus says, man liveth not by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God. God's word is truth, and I feel that if we are ever fitted for heaven and glory, we must be sanctified through the truth. The Psalmist says, thy Law is the truth. Unless we keep the commandments of God, we can never have a right to the tree of life, and enter in through the gates into the City.

The three messages are just what the children of God needed, to bring them out of the errors of the nominal church and to bring them into the light and liberty of the gospel of the Son of God, and fit them for heaven. They are like leaven hid in three measures of meal until the whole was leavened. It seems to me that the light of revelation is now shining clearer to the children of God, than at any age of the world. Truth is powerful, and it will cut its way through to the hearts of God's people. God has sent out his servants to proclaim his word and to give the world the last warning message of the approaching judgment.—The prerogative of Satan is to counteract the truth of heaven, and deceive the world. Let us walk by faith and not by sight. Without faith it is impossible to please God, and there is no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit. The law is spiritual. It is the law of liberty that St. James speaks of, by which we are made free from condemnation, through Jesus Christ.

Yours in patient waiting for our coming Lord and King,
Cathin, N. Y., July 11th, 1852. DAVID UPSON.

From Bro. Case.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—I wish to say to the dear brethren scattered abroad, that God is 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 standeth sure, which no man can tear up, though they, like the Sodomites, work until they weary themselves. The bulwarks of Almighty God can never be battled down by all the forces that the puny 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 are determined to gird 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, 19. God works by means, and through his people he has accomplished many wonders, and will more, and it behooves us to be ready, and stand where God can use us to his glory. His work will go forward, and he that reapeth receiveth wages, 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.

An Arbor, Mich., July 8th, 1852.

From Bro. Ross.

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 fleshly tables of the heart of his 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 obeying the truth.

A conference was held at Coughdenoy, July 3d 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 ordinance 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 blasphemed 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.

Coughdenoy, July 6th, 1852.

From Bro. Flower.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—The Lord is still with the little remnant in this place. The conference here has just closed. Brn. 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 number manifested a desire for the prayers of the saints by rising.

The third angel's message is gaining ground here, notwithstanding there are many adversaries. It is the truth, and it will go forward. The Lord speed it on, is my prayer. Some are making up their minds, in this place, to keep the commandments of God.

The *Review and Herald* is received here with gladness. We hope you will visit us on your tour East. I feel that it is good for me to keep the Sabbath. It is not grievous. How sweet the promise in Isa. lviii, 13, 14:—

"If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord honorable; and shalt honour him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words:

"Then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it."

We wish to be remembered by all the faithful ones.

Yours in the love of the truth,

Ashfield, Mass., July 13th, 1852. H. FLOWER.

From Bro. Drew.

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 so deep hold of some of our former brethren, that it leaves but little ground to hope for them. 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.

LEBBEUS DREW.

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

From Sister Leadbeater.

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 my 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 Elijah. Holiness becometh thy house, O Lord. 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 kingdom.

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 much good to the household of faith.

MARY LEADBEATER.

Cincinnati, O., July 15th, 1852.

From Sister Washburn.

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 thanks to you, and gratitude to God, 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 privilege 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, Jesus, 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 into the City."—There are those who profess to love God that would gladly lead us from his holy Sabbath, to an institution of Papacy. 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,
While onward I journey and do not draw back.

My soul is enkindled with rapture and love,
I fain would ascend to my Jesus above:
But nay, I must follow in his humble track,
And prove my obedience by not drawing back.

Then on let us press, for Jesus is near,
And strengthen each other with words of good cheer;
With zeal ever buoyant and courage ne'er slack,
Let's be true to our King and never draw 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? My whole being says, Praise the Lord for what he is doing. The road looks plain. A wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein. It is my determination, God being my helper, to spend the remainder of my days in his service.

Yours, waiting for redemption at the appearing of Jesus,
CAROLINE A. WASHBURN.
Georgia, Vt., July 10th, 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 *Advent Harbinger* for December 20th, 1851, from the pen of Mary A. Seymour, on the death of P. Cook of Jackson, Michigan.

It seems that there is nothing, however absurd or false it may be, but what can find a place in that paper, if it is only in opposition to the Holy Law of God, or those who love and obey it.

The writer asserts that most "of his [C.'s] former brethren whom he much loved, having embraced the shut door, and its kindred doctrines, seemingly shut their bowels of compassion towards him, and others also who do not agree with them in faith. This to him was a very great grief. They did not as much as look at him. More than this, did the Priest and Levite."

As to the truth of the assertion, that he much loved his former brethren, let the reader decide; for he left them, and their meetings and united with the wicked world, and fallen church, for no other reason than that they opposed the idea of Christians voting for wicked rulers. It was about a year before we embraced the open and shut door of the heavenly Sanctuary, and the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, that Mr. C. left us; and although we entreated him time after time, and exhorted him in Christ's stead to be reconciled to God, yet all in vain. Still he stood opposed to the commandments of God. Not willing to give it up, I visited him again, when I was told by his wife, in his presence, that she wished I would go away, and keep away, and that he did not want to hear it (the present truth) any more than she did.—To this he kept silent. She further said that some of us were coming there every little while, and hanging

on to him, calling him Bro. Cook, and she wished we would keep away, and I left the house. I have stated the remarks of Mrs. C. as near as I can recollect, and I leave the candid to decide whether we could go there under such circumstances, or not.

I am one of his former brethren who have embraced the commandments of God, &c., yet, under all these circumstances, I was with him in his last illness, time after time, watched with, and 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, complied with the request. Mr. and I think Mrs. 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 this 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 bowels 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.

EXTRACTS OF LETTERS.

BRO. JOSEPH BATES writes from Galesburgh, Mich., July 12th, 1852:—"I have stopped at the Post Office to communicate a few lines. Bro. Dodge, of Jackson came here with me yesterday from Climax, 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 them, (R. H.) He charged the Sabbath-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 brawler. I told the man of the house I 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. There, I trust, a good work is done with Bro. Cornell's family and brethren. I wish I had time to give particulars."

BRO. W. MORSE writes from Royalton, 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 paper.

"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 for some who have been 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 Zion. I walked eight miles, last night, after doing a day's work, to see some that have been firm in the Advent faith, and found two that wanted the *Review* and *Herald*."

BRO. H. S. GURNEY writes from Fairhaven, Mass., July 11th, 1852:—"We have had a good meeting the day past. It is thought best 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 unworthy of being identified with his cause; but I do rejoice in the work."

BRO. R. MORAN writes from Lawrenceburgh, 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 C., in my judgment, are invaluable. If I had the means, after the series are finished, I would scatter them in pamphlets by the thousands. It does seem to me, that any person, to be honest before God, cannot withstand their force."

THE following from the *Sabbath Recorder* shows the painful condition of the Seventh-day Baptist Denomination. This people have necessarily been more separate from the world than others, in consequence of observing the true Sabbath; and have taken a bold stand in reforms, and to enfranchise the enslaved.

And if this sketch "is not in any particular overdrawn," what must be the condition of those popular Sects, closely united with the world, and stained all over with the sins of which this nation is guilty?

STATE OF THE DENOMINATION.

It is a solemn thought, that "judgment must begin at the house of God." What the end will be of those who compose the Seventh-day Baptist denomination, when the judgment shall have passed, it may not be easy to say; but no one, we presume, will accuse us of uncharitableness, if we say, they will "scarcely be saved." 1 Pet. iv, 17, 18.

The same inspired writer who teaches that the righteous will *scarcely* be saved, also informs us of a way in which we may have an entrance ministered to us *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 "so as by fire." 1 Cor. iii, 15. But what if the fire consume us, ere the hand 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 power of the ministry is waxing feeble, 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 excuse the liberty we take in publishing a part of his letter. Our readers will ponder 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.

"I feel exceedingly distressed. There are several stand-points from which, for a long time, I have been trying to take observations, which should neither exalt our position unduly, nor unjustly depress it. And the result of these observations has been to greatly distress me.

"First, let us look for one moment, into the condition of things as it respects the ministry. Our number is exceeding small. This itself is a circumstance of weakness, which is truly discouraging, when we

consider the amount of labor demanded at our hands. Then, what a large proportion even of these are barely supporting a nominal existence. They have a name to live, but how feeble and inefficient are they. Of the number that are somewhat active, how many are crippled for the want of education, and that thorough mental training which is requisite for the development of one's self, and for extensive usefulness in this age of gigantic intellectual strife. But, farther, how dismal the fact that some, who have been reckoned among our most useful and successful ministers, are now, by the decisions of our ecclesiastical bodies, *deposed* or *suspended*—justly threatened with the ban of excommunication. O, 'how is the gold become dim, and the most fine gold changed?' This is sad. Our candidates for the ministry, too, where are they? Indeed, have we any? Our young men of talent are turning their attention in other directions. For some cause, few hear and reply to the voice of the Lord calling to this work, 'Here am I, send me.' Either their hearts are not sufficiently imbued with the love of souls, or spiritual weakness, or some other cause, holds them back. This is to me a source of great anxiety; and whatever the cause of this delinquency may be, I would that it might be sought out, and remedied.

'Again, look at our churches. Now, it does not satisfy me, to say that 'it is a general time of backsliding and apostasy.' I take no comfort in that thought. Look, I say, at our churches. Several of the strongest of them are bound, hand and foot, by dissensions and internal broils—strong and leading brethren arrayed against each other—and this too in the kingdom of peace! In some instances, even church is arrayed against church, and others so far sympathizing with these that they are but little better off. What a sin and burning shame is this! Other churches are affected with a disease little less to be dreaded—*lukewarmness*. A death spell seems to have come over us; and so deep is this sleep, that even the thunders of Sinai do not disturb them! Or, if aroused somewhat, they immediately sink again to slumber, with the sluggards song upon their lips, 'A little more sleep'—'a little more slumber.'—Hence, we have no revivals, or but comparatively few. Backsliders and apostates increase upon our hands, while sinners grow bold, and scoff at Zion and her King. Our sons and daughters, our pride, and the hope of the church, and strength of the state, are drinking in scepticism and infidelity, are becoming wanton, and refuse restraint. As for the counsels of the Almighty, they despise them; and as for his reproofs, they will not bear them. As for the gospel, they are not sensible that they need it, for they know not that they are diseased.—Their depravity is so deeply entrenched in their natures, that its presence is not seen.

'Finally, our Home and Foreign Missions need replenishing and extending. But where are our materials for the work? We are limited and circumscribed, on the right hand and on the left. We have neither the men nor the means to accomplish the purposes contemplated.

'Now, I am satisfied that this imperfect and defective sketch is not in any particular overdrawn. If so, what shall we do? Shall we give up and die? O for faith in God!—for strong faith! I feel that I need this faith—faith mixed with ardent, undying love!—that can remove mountains—that finds its anchorage in the throne of the Eternal.'

Extract of a Letter from Bro. N. W. Rockwell.

DEAR BRO. WHITE: "Although we never saw each other, yet I trust that we are brought near by the bonds of unity in the glorious gospel of the Son of God. My soul is full of love and hope. I do hope to see you, and all the dear brethren and sisters, after our Lord comes and calls the sleeping saints from the cold embrace of death, and clothes them with immortality and eternal life, and changes the living saints in a moment in the twinkling of an eye. Oh, glorious hope that the same Spirit that raised Christ from the dead, shall also quicken our mortal bodies, and fashion them like unto his most glorious body. It doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that when he who is our life shall appear, we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is.

"The hope of an endless life in the presence of God and the Lamb, and among the just made perfect is blessed indeed.—But he that hath this hope in him, purifieth himself. How are we to do this, but by faith and unfeigned love of the truth, walking in all his commandments blameless? I pray that we may be sanctified through the truth, his word is truth, and sealed by the Holy Spirit unto the day of redemption. But we cannot expect to be sanctified or sealed in disobedience to his will, or in the neglect of any of his commandments. We know that the commandments are holy, just and good.

"But it is surprising how some who profess to be looking for and loving the appearing of our Lord, not only neglect, but fight against the keeping of the Sabbath. Now I do very much fear that it is for want of the love of the truth. An honest soul, that is willing and anxious to know and do the will of his Master, will not long confer with flesh and blood, in consulting with his interest, friends or ease, but will sacrifice all for the love of his Master and the truth. Pardon my frank-

ness in speaking thus freely. Some will appear to be willing to hear, and try to search for truth; others will fight against it, and when they fail in argument and inferences which they try to bring up to justify themselves in the error, will fly to slander and contempt, and name some one that they have heard of that keeps, or pretends to keep the seventh day, and ever come short in other matters. This will be a poor prop, or excuse for them in the great day of God's wrath, when those only, whose names are found written in the book shall be delivered.

"I feel greatly blest and strengthened in trying to keep the commandments. Our Saviour says, 'Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life,' &c. Here our Lord has referred us to the ten commandments of the Father—the immutable law of God.

"It is a pleasure, and I hope a profit, to have the *Review and Herald* I hope you will send it to me, and I hope to be able and willing to do my duty in sustaining you.

"I am very lonely, there being no one within twenty miles, with whom I can associate, that keeps the Sabbath. O, how glad I was to have Bro. Holt and Elson look after, and find a poor, unworthy sheep, in the wilderness, and feed me a portion of meat. I shall, in all probability, have to travel more than forty days on the strength of that meat, before I shall be again fed in the same way. But thanks to my Master, he feeds me himself, when no shepherd finds me, in my quiet retreat.

"Pray for me, that my faith fail not."
Farnham, C. E., July, 11th, 1852. N. W. ROCKWELL.

Extract of a Letter from Sr. E. Lindsey.

"I HAVE had some trials, but by patiently enduring them they have worked for my good. Praise the Lord, we have the promise, if we keep his commandments we shall abide in his love, so we have no reason to be discouraged. The Lord is with us, and we know we have the truth; and though we meet with trials and seeming difficulties, still we know the Lord has a tender care for his people, and if we are humble and obedient, he will draw his covering over us. And if we press our petitions to the throne, we shall receive answers of peace to our souls. I praise God that his truth looks brighter, clearer than ever, and is surely destined to triumph. I am thankful for the light that now shines upon his word. How sweet is holy communion with God's people, now while his law is shining in to our hearts.

"I want to be found with the humble few who are striving to keep the commandments. It is the law of God that will judge us at the last day, and how careful we should be to obey the truth, that shall make us free. I trust in the Lord, and expect, and receive strength from him. I do feel like pressing forward, and striving to overcome."

A stranger in this land of woe
I long have wandered here;
A treasure has my Bible been,
It speaks my Jesus near.

When Christ in glory shall appear,
To make this earth our home,
To change his waiting, living saints,
And wake those in the tomb.

O, then, with patience, let me wait,
Though long the way and drear;
For in his own appointed time
He surely will appear.

Melbourne, C. E., July 11th, 1852. E. LINDSEY.

Letter from Bro. Smith.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—The *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*, as I think, contains much important truth, for which reason I wish for the current volume, commencing with the first number, and I will pay you whatever you may write me is the actual cost. But much more than that you need not expect, if the truth is mixed with error, as I anticipate.

One believing in the *Ten Commandments*, (not nine,) and hoping for "an everlasting possession," not "in the air," not "in the clouds" only during the "storm;" but in this earth renewed, with ABRAHAM, ISAAC, and JACOB.

RICH'D SMITH.

Sherbrook, C. E., June 14th, 1852.

REMARKS:—We are encouraged, Bro. S., to learn that you think the *REVIEW AND HERALD* contains "much important truth." Some who have supposed that our views were all wrong, have since fully embraced them.

It is with pleasure that we send you the paper. The terms, you will see on the first page. But as you wish to pay the actual cost, we will make a statement of the cost of the paper; not for your benefit only, but for others also. One dollar a year, with our present list of names, should all pay, in no more than the actual cost. Including postage, which we have to pay on all papers sent to Canada East, it would cost us \$1.25 a year. The cost of a paper is affected by the circulation that it has. As the circulation of the *REVIEW AND HERALD* is not yet large, it costs as much as some papers two or three times as large.—If 2400 persons will each pay us \$1 a year we can send them the paper weekly.

We are glad that nine-tenths of God's law does not satisfy

you. It is all "holy, just, and good." Yes, brother S., the saints' possession will not be above the heavens, nor in the heavens. But "the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom, UNDER THE WHOLE HEAVENS, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High." Never, till the whole earth is made new, will Abraham, Isaac and Jacob receive the "everlasting possession."

☞ We would suggest the propriety of holding meetings, where circumstances will admit, twice the length of time they are usually held. It is often the case that lecturing brethren labor hard against a tide of opposition all through a meeting of two or three days. And when the opposition is broken down, and the way is open to accomplish great good, they leave to attend other appointments, and leave the ground for the opposers of our faith to cast a blighting influence, before the work has taken deep root. Whereas, if they had remained sufficient time to give more fully the reasons of our hope and faith, those interested would have been enlightened and strengthened so as not to be affected either by the sophistry or slander of those who teach the abolition or change of God's law. We give it as our opinion that in many cases meetings should hold one week.

The Cause in the West.

We are happy to hear that the cause of present truth is progressing in the West. And we would advise the friends of the cause to secure, if possible, the faithful labors of Bro. Joseph Bates who is now in that wide field.

Bro. Bates writes, July 15th, 1852:—"I wrote you a few days since, giving the time of Conferences in Milan and Cincinnati, Ohio. I have since learned of many more places in Wis. and Ill. to visit than I then knew of. I feel unsettled as to my labors this way, and probably shall till after the Conference here [Albion, Wis.] which commences to-morrow."

The Sabbath Recorder.

We have received several numbers of this weekly paper, published at No. 9 Spruce-Street, New York. It "is devoted to the exposition and vindication of the views and movements of the Seventh-day Baptist Denomination." Of its efforts to build up a particular denomination we have nothing to say.—Our views on this subject may be seen in the *REVIEW AND HERALD* Nos. 3 and 4 of the present volume. But we have been highly gratified with the scriptural and able manner in which the *Recorder* has defended the Sabbath of the fourth commandment.

THE NEW HYMN BOOK is now ready. It contains 112 pages. Price—Well bound, 30 cents, in paper covers, 20 cents.

The postage on those sent by mail, which we shall have to pay, will be three or four cents, within 500 miles.

We design to send a quantity by Express to Jackson, Mich. where the friends in the West may obtain them of Bro. A. A. Dodge.

Appointments.

PROVIDENCE permitting, I shall attend Meetings in the following places: West Hartford, Vt., July 24 and 25; Northfield, Vt., July 31 and Aug. 1; Morrisstown, Vt., Aug. 7 and 8; Irasburg, Vt., or vicinity, Aug. 14 and 15. JOSEPH BAKER.

I PURPOSE to meet with the Bro. in Bennington, N. H., at the house of Bro. Martin, July 24th, and 25th; at Bro. Whitcomb's, in Munsonville, July 31st, and Aug. 1st.

Brothers, let us come together strong in the Lord.

SAMUEL EVERETT.

[Bro. Everett's appointment came one day too late for our last paper.]

☞ AFTER attending our appointment at Coughdenoy, we shall be obliged to return home, and not go East at present as we intended. If arrangements can be made so that we can leave the Office about the middle of August, notice will be given in the next paper.

Letters received since July 5th.

R. F. Cottrell, E. Harmon, O. Nichols, J. C. Bowles, J. Lindsey, R. Smith, E. Wheeler, S. Everett, E. A. Miller, J. N. Andrews 3, E. L. Barr, S. Howland, W. Morse, R. A. Sperry, S. W. Rhodes, H. A. Churchill, M. C. Andrews 2, G. W. Holt 2, Joseph Bates 2, L. Drew, H. S. Case, C. Bourn, J. A. Loughhead, J. Hart, L. Mead, H. S. Gurney, N. N. Lunt, D. Upson, J. Lindsey, F. Strong, C. A. Washburn, E. P. Butler, W. Morse, M. R. Bates, Wm. A. Raymond, J. Abbe, R. Moran, W. P. Andrews, J. Hart, W. Bryant, Wm. S. Ingraham.

Receipts.

N. Luther, O. Frizzle, J. C. Claxton, D. Barnes, H. Hopkins, R. Moran, E. L. Smith, J. Pomroy, L. Edmunds, H. Patten, E. Farnsworth, J. Whipple, J. Day, H. Flowers, M. Edson, E. Richmond, E. Eastman, Sr. E. Potter, E. A. Poole, C. Glover, N. W. Rockwell, each \$1.
B. Bryant, D. Daniels, B. Stillman, P. Folsom, E. Lothrop, L. Hastings, E. Taylor, L. J. Hall, J. G. Heath, C. S. Hulbert, each \$2. J. Barrows, \$3; A. B. Pearsall, S. W. Flanders, each \$5. P. Lamson, P. Collins, D. R. Wood, each \$1.25.
C. Gould, Sr. Graeger, L. Johnson, M. S. Davis, each 50cts.

For Printing Materials.

Lucinda Woodworth, \$2; C. B. Preston, \$4; Edwin Lothrop, \$4; Horace Patten, \$5; Robert Barnes, \$5.