

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. V.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., THIRD-DAY, JANUARY 24, 1854.

No. 1.

THE REVIEW AND HERALD.

TERMS.—See Last Page.

FIRST-DAY, NOT THE SABBATH OF THE LORD.

BY J. N. ANDREWS.

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

In this text we are assured that every word of the Sacred Scriptures was given by the Holy Spirit; that every doctrine which men should believe, is therein revealed; that every fault is therein reproofed; every error is corrected by its words of truth; and that perfect instruction in all righteousness is therein given.

The design of its Author in providing such a book, was that the man of God might thereby be made perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works. This is the treasure which God has given to his church. Nor is this all that he has done. To those who are willing to obey the teachings of his word, he has promised the Spirit to guide them into all truth.

To men thus situated, Jehovah thus speaks: "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." 1 Thess. v, 21. That is, bring every part of your faith and practice to the test of God's sure word; ask the Holy Spirit's aid, that your mind may be delivered from prejudice, and your understanding enlightened in the word of truth. Then what you find revealed in that word hold fast; it is of priceless value; but relinquish at once every precept or doctrine not therein recorded, lest you make the doctrines of men of equal weight with the commandments of God. What is the chaff to the wheat? saith the Lord.

As the first day of the week is now almost universally observed in the place of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, we design in this Tract to examine the grounds on which this observance rests. Those who are willing to submit their opinions to the test of scripture and of reason, are invited to unite with us in the examination of this subject. For what reason do men prefer the first day of the week to the ancient Sabbath of the Lord? On what authority do men continually violate the day which God sanctified, and commanded mankind to keep holy? Come, now, and let us reason together. Here is the commandment which it is said has been changed:—

"Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day, and hallowed it." Ex. xx, 8-11.

That this commandment requires men to remember, and to keep holy the Rest-day of the Creator, which he hallowed at the close of the first week of time, none can deny. We now ask for the authority for the change of this commandment.

Papists believe that their church had power to change the fourth commandment; and, on that authority, alone, they are perfectly satisfied in observing the first day of the week.

Protestants deny the authority of the church of Rome, and attempt to vindicate the change of the Sabbath, by an appeal to the Bible. This is what we wish them to do. We ask them, therefore, to present a single text in which it is said that God has changed his Sabbath to the first day of the week.

The advocates of the change have none to offer. If they cannot present such a text, will they give us one which testifies that God ever blessed and sanctified the first day of the week? Its observers admit that they have none to present. But will they not give us one text in which men are required to keep the first day holy, as a Sabbath unto the Lord? They acknowledge that they have none. How then do they dare to exalt the first day of the week above the Sabbath of the Lord, which the commandment requires us to remember, and keep holy?

The Bible thoroughly furnishes the man of God unto all good works. Can Sunday-keeping be a very good work, when the Bible has never said anything in its favor? Or if it is a good work, can men be very thoroughly furnished in its defense, when God has said nothing in its favor? Instead of being a good work, must it not be a fearful sin against God to thus pervert the fourth commandment, when once the mind has been enlightened on the subject?

But there are several reasons urged for the observance of the first day of the week, which we will here notice.

FIRST REASON. Redemption is greater than creation; therefore we ought to keep the day of Christ's resurrection, instead of the ancient Sabbath of the Lord.

Where has God said this? Sunday-keepers are compelled to admit that he never did say it. What right, then, has any man to make such an assertion, and then to base the change of the Sabbath upon it? But suppose redemption is greater than creation, who knows that we ought to keep the first day of the week on that account? God never required men to keep any day as the memorial of redemption. But if it were duty to observe one day of the week for this reason, most certainly the crucifixion-day presents the strongest claims. It is not said that we have redemption through Christ's resurrection; but it is said that we have redemption through the shedding of his blood. "And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof; for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation." Rev. v, 9. "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace." Eph. i, 7; Col. i, 14; Heb. ix, 12, 15.

Then redemption is through the death of the Lord Jesus; consequently, the day on which he shed his precious blood to redeem us, and said "It is finished," [John xix, 30,] is the day that should be kept as the memorial of redemption, if any should be observed for that purpose.

Nor can it be plead that the resurrection-day is the most remarkable day in the history of redemption. It needs but a word to prove that in this respect it is far exceeded by the day of the crucifixion. Which is the most remarkable event, the act of Jehovah in giving his beloved and only Son to die for a race of rebels, or the act of that Father in raising that beloved Son from the dead? There is only one answer that can be given: it was not remarkable that God should raise his Son from the dead; but the act of the Father in giving his Son to die for sinners, was a spectacle of redeeming love on which the Universe might gaze and adore the wondrous love of God to all eternity. Who can wonder that the sun was veiled in darkness, and that all nature trembled at the sight! The crucifixion-day, therefore, has far greater claims than the day of the resurrection. God has not enjoined the observance of either; and is it not a fearful act to make void the commandments of God by that wisdom which is folly in his sight. 1 Cor. i, 19, 20.

But if we would commemorate redemption, there is no necessity of robbing the Lord's Rest-day of its

holiness in order to do it. When truth takes from us our errors, it always has something better to take their place. So the false memorial of redemption being taken out of the way, the Word presents in its stead those which are true. God has provided us with memorials, bearing his own signature; and these we may observe with the blessing of Heaven. Would you commemorate the death of our Lord? You need not keep the day of his crucifixion. The Bible tells you how to do it.

"For I have received of the Lord, that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take eat; this is my body, which is broken for you; this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death, till he come." 1 Cor. xi, 23-26.

Would you commemorate the burial and resurrection of the Saviour? You need not keep the first day of the week. The Lord ordained a very different, and far more appropriate memorial. "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection." Rom. vi, 3-5. "Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead." Col. ii, 12.

It is true that the professed church has changed this ordinance to sprinkling, so that this divine memorial of our Lord's resurrection is destroyed. And that they may add sin to sin, they lay hold of the Lord's Sabbath, and change it to the first day of the week, thus destroying the sacred memorial of the Creator's rest, that they may have a memorial of Christ's resurrection! "The earth is also defiled under the inhabitants thereof; because they have transgressed the laws, changed the ordinance, broken the everlasting covenant." When will the professed church cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord? Not until "the inhabitants of the earth are burned, and few men left." Isa. xxiv, 5, 6.

SECOND REASON. The disciples met on the day of our Lord's resurrection to commemorate that event, and the Saviour sanctioned this meeting by uniting with them. John xx, 19.

If every word of this was truth, it would not prove that the Sabbath of the Lord has been changed. But to show the utter absurdity of this inference, listen to a few facts. The disciples at that time did not believe that their Lord had been raised from the dead; but were assembled for the purpose of eating a common meal, and to seclude themselves from the Jews. The words of Mark and of John make this clear. "He appeared in another form unto two of them, as they walked, and went into the country. And they went and told it unto the residue: neither believed they them. Afterward he appeared unto the eleven, as they sat at meat, and upbraided them with their unbelief, and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen." Mark xvi, 12-14. John says: "Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you." John xx, 19.

It is a fact, therefore, that the disciples were not commemorating the resurrection of the Saviour; it is equally evident that they had not the slightest idea of a change of the Sabbath. At the burial of the Saviour, the women who had followed him to the tomb, returned and prepared spices and ointments to embalm him; the Sabbath drew on; they rested the Sabbath-day according to the commandment; and when the Sabbath was past, they came to the sepulchre upon the first day of the week to embalm their Lord. Luke xxiii, 55, 56; xxiv, 1. They kept the Sabbath according to the commandment, and resumed their labor on the first day of the week.

THIRD REASON. After eight days Jesus met with his disciples again. John xx, 26. This must have been the first day of the week, which is thereby proved to be the Christian Sabbath.

Were it certain that this occurred upon the first day of the week, it would not furnish a single particle of proof that that day had become the Sabbath of the Lord. But who can be certain that "after eight days" means just a week? It would be nearer a literal construction of the language to conclude that this was upon the ninth day. As an illustration, read Matt. xvii, 1. "And after six days, Jesus taketh Peter, James, and John," &c. Now turn to Luke ix, 28. "And it came to pass, about an eight days after these sayings, he took Peter, and John, and James," &c. Then "after six days" is about *eight days* in this instance. But if "after eight days" means just a week, how does this prove that Sunday has taken the place of the Lord's Sabbath? Rather how does it prove that Sunday has become the Christian Sabbath, when there is not a particle of evidence that either Christ or his apostles ever rested on that day? There is no such term as Christian Sabbath found in the Bible. The only weekly Sabbath named in the Bible is called the Sabbath of the Lord.

Was the act of Christ in appearing to his disciples sufficient to constitute the day on which it occurred the Sabbath? If so, why did he next select a fishing day as the time to manifest himself to them? John xxi. If it is not sufficient, then the Sunday on which he was first seen of them, the fishing day on which they next saw him, and the Thursday on which he was last seen of them, may not be Sabbaths. It was not very remarkable that Christ should find his disciples together, inasmuch as they had one common abode. Acts i, 13.

FOURTH REASON. The Holy Spirit descended upon the disciples on the day of Pentecost, which was the first day of the week. Therefore the first day of the week should be observed instead of the Sabbath of the Lord. Acts ii, 1, 2.

Admitting that the day of Pentecost occurred upon the first day of the week, it remains to be proved that it thereby became the Sabbath. But that it was the feast of Pentecost, and not the first day of the week, that God designed to honor, the following facts demonstrate.

1. While the day of Pentecost is distinctly named, the day of the week on which it occurred is passed in silence.

2. The disciples had been engaged in earnest prayer for the space of ten days; for the day of Pentecost was fifty days from the resurrection of Christ, and forty of those days he spent with his disciples. Acts i. Forty days from his resurrection would expire on Thursday, the day of his ascension. A period of ten days *after* his ascension on Thursday, would include two First-days, the last of which would be the day of Pentecost. If the design of God had been to honor the first day of the week, why did not the Holy Ghost descend on the first of those First-days? Why must the day of Pentecost come before the Holy Ghost could descend? This answer is obvious. It was not the design of Heaven to honor the first day of the week, but to mark the antitype of the feast of Pentecost. Hence the first day of the week is passed in silence.

The slaying of the paschal lamb on the fourteenth day of the first month, had met its antitype in the death of the Lamb of God on that day. Ex. xii; John xix; 1 Cor. v, 7. The offering of the first fruits on the sixteenth day of the first month, had met its antitype in the resurrection of our Lord on that day, the first fruits of them that slept. Lev.

xxiii; 1 Cor. xv, 20, 23. It remained that the day of Pentecost, fifty days later, should also meet its antitype. Lev. xxiii, 15-21. The fulfillment of that type is what the pen of inspiration has recorded in Acts ii, 1, 2. God has spoken nothing in this place respecting a change of his Sabbath. Yet grave men, calling themselves Doctors of Divinity, consider this text one of their strongest testimonies for their so-called Christian Sabbath. They might be profited by this advice of the wise man: "Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar." Prov. xxx, 6.

FIFTH REASON. Paul once broke bread upon the first day of the week at Troas. Hence this day was observed as the Christian Sabbath. Acts xx, 7.

We answer, that at one period the apostolic church at Jerusalem broke bread every day. Acts ii, 42-46. If a *single* instance of breaking bread at Troas upon the first day of the week, was quite sufficient to constitute it the Sabbath, would not the continued practice of the apostolic church at Jerusalem in breaking bread *every* day, be amply sufficient to make every day a Sabbath? Moreover, as the act of the Great Head of the church in breaking bread, must be quite as important as that of his servant Paul, must not the day of the crucifixion be pre-eminently the "Christian Sabbath," as Christ instituted, and performed this ordinance on the evening with which that day commenced? 1 Cor. xi, 23-26.

But on what day of the week did this act of Paul occur? For, if it is of sufficient importance to make the day of its occurrence the future Sabbath of the church, the day is worth determining. The act of breaking bread was after midnight; for Paul preached to the disciples until midnight, then healed Eutychus, and after this attended to breaking bread. Verses 7-11. If, as time is reckoned at the present day, the first day of the week terminated at midnight, then Paul's act of breaking bread took place upon the second day of the week, or Monday, which should henceforth be regarded as the Christian Sabbath, if breaking bread on a day makes it a Sabbath.

But if the Bible method of commencing the day, viz., from six o'clock p. m., was followed, it would appear that the disciples came together at the close of the Sabbath, for an evening meeting, as the Apostle was to depart in the morning. (If it was not an evening meeting, why did they have many lights there?) Paul preached to them until midnight, and then broke bread with the disciples early in the morning of the first day of the week. Did this act constitute that day the Sabbath? If so, then why did Paul, as soon as it was light, start on his long journey to Jerusalem? If Paul believed that Sunday was the Christian Sabbath, why did he thus openly violate it? If he did not believe it had become the Sabbath why should you? And why do you grasp, as evidence that the Sabbath had been changed, a single instance in which an evening meeting was held on Sunday, while you overlook the fact that it was the custom of this same Apostle to preach every Sabbath, not only to the Jews, but also to the Gentiles? Acts xiii, 14, 42, 44; xvi, 13; xvii, 2; xviii, 4.

Paul broke bread on the first day of the week, and then immediately started on his long journey to Jerusalem. So that this, the strongest argument for the first day of the week, furnishes direct proof that Sunday is not the Sabbath.

SIXTH REASON. Paul commanded the church at Corinth to take up a public collection on the first day of the week; therefore it follows that this must have been their day of public worship, and consequently is the Christian Sabbath. 1 Cor. xvi, 2.

We answer, it is a remarkable fact that Paul enjoins exactly the reverse of a public collection. He does not say, Place your alms in the public treasury, on the first day of the week; but he says, "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you *lay by him* in store."

J. W. Morton in his "Vindication of the true Sabbath," pages 51, 52, says:—

"The Apostle simply orders, that each one of the Corinthian brethren should lay up *at home* some portion of his weekly gains on the first day of the week. The whole question turns upon the meaning of the expression, 'by him;' and I marvel greatly how you can imagine that it means 'in the collection box of the congregation.' Greenfield, in his Lexicon, trans-

lates the Greek term, '*by one's self, i. e. at home.*' Two Latin versions, the Vulgate and that of Castelleo, render it, '*apud se,*' with one's self, at home. Three French translations, those of Martin, Osterwald, and De Sacy, '*chez soi,*' at his own house, at home. The German of Luther, '*bei sich selbst,*' by himself, at home. The Dutch, '*by hemselven,*' same as the German. The Italian of Diodati, '*appresso di se,*' in his own presence, at home. The Spanish of Felipe Scio, '*en su casa,*' in his own house. The Portuguese of Ferreira, '*para isso,*' with himself. The Swedish, '*near sig stelf,*' near himself. I know not how much this list of authorities might be swelled, for I have not examined one translation that differs from those quoted above."

The text, therefore, does not prove that the Corinthian church was assembled for public worship on that day; but, on the contrary, it does prove that each must be at his own home, where he could examine his worldly affairs, and lay by himself in store as God had prospered him. If each one should thus from week to week collect of his earnings, when the Apostle should come, their bounty would be ready, and each would be able to present to him what they had gathered. So that if the first-day Sabbath has no better foundation than the inference drawn from this text, it truly rests upon sliding sand.

SEVENTH REASON. John was in the Spirit on the Lord's day, which was the first day of the week. Rev. i, 10.

This is the kind of reasoning which the advocates of Sunday are invariably obliged to adopt. But we ask, What right have they to assume the very point which they ought to prove? This text, it is true, furnishes direct proof that there is a day in the gospel dispensation which the Lord claims as his; but is there one text in the Bible which testifies that the first day of the week is the Lord's day? There is not one. Has God ever claimed that day as his? Never. Has God ever claimed any day as his, and reserved it to himself? He has. "And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." Gen. ii, 3. "To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord." Ex. xvi, 23. "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." Ex. xx, 10. "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day," &c. Isa. lviii, 13. "Therefore, the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." Mark ii, 28.

Then the seventh is the day which God reserved to himself, when he gave to man the other six; and this day he calls his holy day. This is the day which the New Testament declares the Son of man to be Lord of.

Is there one testimony in the Scriptures that the Lord of the Sabbath has put away his holy day, and chosen another? Not one. Then that day which the Bible designates as the Lord's day, is none other than the Sabbath of the fourth commandment.

From a Paper published at Lewiston, Fulton Co., Ill.

FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS REWARD.

TO REV. J. MCCANDLISH, PASTOR OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH AT LEWISTON.

CONSIDERING ourselves as having been repeatedly rebuked in public as Sabbath-breakers, in your discourses, particularly in that of yesterday, (Oct. 2, 1853,) in the school-house in our vicinity, we think it time that you forbear, or that we repent. You must be aware that, from some motive, we endeavor to sanctify the seventh or last day of the week, according to the manner enjoined in the Fourth Commandment, and practiced by Jesus Christ and his apostles. In so doing, we are aware that we shut ourselves out from many lucrative callings and honorable situations, which otherwise we might be as eligible to as others of similar abilities; but we do it, we think from the fear of God, and with regard to the retributions of eternity. But now, if you, or any other person, will make the way plain for us, so that we can, without conscientious scruples, devote to labor the seventh day, and also enable us to esteem the first day as "the holy of the Lord," we hope immediately to reform. The difficulties in the way may be gathered from the following queries:—

1. You told us that the ten commandments were delivered to more than two millions of hearers, by God's own voice, from the summit of Sinai, and now, we think, if one word is to be altered, it should be done in the same public manner. Will you show that "First-day" has been substituted for "Seventh-day" in such a public manner?

2. You showed that the ten commandments were engraved on tables of stone by the finger of God. Will you show that "seventh day" was not so engraved, but was only written with ink, that it might be blotted out in the fullness of time, like the Jewish ritual? or will you show how God can be "without variableness or shadow of turning," (James i, 17,) if he alter one word publicly proclaimed to millions, and twice engraved with his own finger on tables of stone?

3. If the seventh day observance was designed by God to be succeeded by the first day, we ask,

1. Why was not the Fourth Commandment excluded from the decalogue, like circumcision, and other observances, never intended for the Gentiles under the gospel? 2. Why are we informed, in the only place where the prophets intimate a change of times and laws, that the change should be by a power adverse to the Saints of the Most High, and that it should not be perpetual? (Dan vii, 25.) 3. If the Fourth Commandment was to be altered by divine authority, why did Jesus Christ say, It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail? (Luke xvi, 17.) Why are we constantly directed in the New Testament, to "follow Christ," who, as his adversaries had to admit, kept the Sabbath—the same seventh-day Sabbath that the Jews did, and never, so far as we are informed, observed the first day at all as a season of rest or a Sabbath. 5. If a commandment of the Decalogue might, under pretence of piety to God, be altered with impunity, why did our Lord prepare such a severe scourge for the perpetrators of such a deed, as is to be found in the 15th of Matthew and the 7th of Mark, where notice is taken of an infringement on the Fifth Commandment, with as plausible a reason, perhaps, as man could devise for infringing upon any? "Honor thy father and thy mother," said God; but hypocrisy said, Though your parents need your support, you may take the property you owe for their sustenance, and cast it into the treasury of the Lord, your great Father in heaven, and then say to your parents, It is corban, and then let them beg or die, but you are free. 6. Why did our Lord say, that on love to God and love to man, hang all the law, (Matt. xxii, 40,) if the seventh-day of the Fourth Commandment was not affixed thereto? 7. Why did he say, (Mark ii, 27,) The Sabbath (which he knew the Fourth Commandment declared to be the seventh day) was made for man, thus teaching that it was made for mankind in general, if He intended it to be superseded by another, the "first day," in a few years? And why did He own himself to be Lord of the Sabbath, thus making it the true Lord's day and Christian Sabbath, if it was not then so, and so to remain? 8. We are informed, (1 John iii, 4,) that "whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law; for sin is the transgression of the law;" and if Matt. vii, 23 is correctly rendered, it may read thus, "And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you; depart from me, ye that work transgression of the law;" and Matt. xiii, 41 thus, "The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them that do transgress the law." Is this true? And if so, why has Christ thus spoken, but to show that the law would be transgressed both by teachers and people, in his kingdom, at their awful peril, and his supreme displeasure?

4. If the Apostles knew that the first day was the Sabbath, or a Sabbath after the resurrection of Jesus Christ, why did Paul say, "The prophets were read to the Jews every Sabbath day?" (Acts xiii, 27.) And why did James say, [Acts xv, 21,] "Moses of old time hath in every city, them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every Sabbath day?" And why did Luke, the writer of Acts say, (Acts xviii, 4,) "And he reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath, and persuaded the Jews

and the Greeks?" Did the unbelieving Jews keep first day for the Sabbath, keeping as they did, every Sabbath day; or did these Apostles testify falsely; or do they who now say that first day became the Sabbath at the resurrection of Christ?

5. If the weekly return of the time of Christ's resurrection is to be kept holy, where is the precept for it, or where an example in holy record, and what was the hour and the moment? for it occupied not a day, like the example of Sabbath rest; for, at the rising of the sun, the event had already transpired.

6. If the weekly Sabbath is intended in Col. ii, 16, "Let no man judge you in respect to the Sabbath days," ought we not to disavow all human authority on the subject, and simply conform to the authority of God, and of Jesus Christ, as it is written, "We ought to obey God rather than man?" (Acts v, 29.)

7. As the mystery of iniquity (lawlessness) was at work in Paul's time, (2 Thess. ii, 7,) is it safe to follow the Fathers, as they were called, in anything at variance with the holy commandment delivered unto us?

8. When God says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath," will you show us how we can say The first day is the Sabbath, and neither lie ourselves, nor give God the lie?

8. When God says, "Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt do no work," (Ex, xx, 9,) will you show how we can live without transgression, if we refuse to work on either of the first six days of the week or refuse to rest on the seventh?

10. If the Apostles and primitive Christians left the observance of seventh day for that of first day, how happened it that those who contended so hard for circumcising gentile converts should not have one word to say on this subject? And why were they never accused, after Christ's resurrection, of being violators of the Sabbath, by unbelieving and persecuting Jews? Or how could Paul, (Acts xxiv, 14,) say he believed all things written in the law, if he did not believe that the seventh day was then the Sabbath? Or how say (Acts xxv, 8,) "Against the law of the Jews have I offended nothing at all?"

11. When you say that Christ, after his resurrection, repeatedly met with his disciples on the first day of the week, do you mean that he happened at any appointed meeting on that day? If so, where is the proof? Or do you simply mean, that on first day He showed himself first to Peter, second to Mary, third that he traveled sixty furlongs to Emmaus with two disciples, and, fourth, then returned to Jerusalem, and at evening showed himself to the ten, when they sat with closed doors for fear of the Jews? If this is all, please show us how it binds us to keep that day as a day of rest, more than the ninth day after, when he met Thomas with the rest of the Apostles, or more than to keep every day for forty days in succession, as he was thus seen of them. (Acts i, 3.)

12. You mention the meeting at Troas on the first of the week, "day" being, as you know, confessedly supplied, both here and elsewhere where first day occurs in our version of the Scriptures, as is shown by the translators placing it in italic. Now, can you prove that this meeting commenced before evening? If not, might it not have been the evening after seventh day worship, and Paul started on his journey on first day morning? As the Lord's Supper was instituted, in the evening, it seems not at all improbable that they attended to it in the evening on that account.

13. You farther mention 1 Cor. xvi, 2, "Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him," &c. Have you any proof that this service was not designed for the evening after the seventh day service? as they are said to have reckoned the day to commence at evening, as it is written, "The evening and the morning were the first day." (Gen. i, 5.) After their hearts had been warmed by the holy exercises of the church on the Sabbath, and the wants of the poor saints had been presented to their

minds, they might return home, and at evening, when the Sabbath was passed, sit down, and each look over his gain and loss, and without letting his left hand know what his right hand did, lay by him in store his charity, to be ready when called for. But how does the circumstance prove the day a Sabbath, or a worship day?

14. You say that John was in the spirit on the Lord's day. (Rev. i, 10.) Can you prove that that day was not the very seventh day Sabbath, of which Christ said that he was Lord? for you must mark, that he made the world (Heb. i, 2, John i, 3,) and rested on the seventh day, and afterwards made propitiation for our sins by his sufferings; and when it was finished, he bowed his head and gave up the ghost, and rested, according to general tradition, as well as the scriptures, on the seventh day from all his sufferings,—his body in the tomb, and his soul in paradise; and at the same time, his affectionate female followers rested the Sabbath-day according to the commandment. (Luke xxiii, 56.)

Are these all your scripture evidences for a change? and must we not be children, carried about with every wind of doctrine, to let them outweigh in our minds the united force of all the scriptures of truth?

15. The Sabbath you call also a figure of future blessedness. The Apostle Paul, it seems, taught the same sentiment, (Heb. iv 9,) saying, "There remaineth therefore (that is, because of this future rest or blessedness) a rest, (margin, a keeping of a Sabbath,) to the people of God." Then why should not that sabbath follow our toil, as we hope that blessedness will follow all the labors of life?—for to have our rest before our labor, might signify that, like the rich man, we have our good things in this life, and our evil things in the future.

16. What adverse power is that mentioned in Dan. vii, 25? And are we authorized to follow his change in times and laws?

17. Does spiritual fornication consist in embracing human authority, rather than that of God, or not?

18. What power is meant by the "mother of harlots," in Rev. xvii, 5? And what corrupt powers are the harlots? And should we not beware of being seduced, either by the mother or the daughters?

19. To close—is it wrong for us to assimilate to those mentioned in Rev. xii. 17; xiv, 12; xxii, 14, "who keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus?"

And now we offer, for the first written tract, to be presented to us on or before the first day of January, 1855, which shall so dispose of the foregoing queries, as to satisfy us that God, in the holy Scriptures, requires us to follow our labors on the last day of the week, and to rest on the first day of the week, the sum of five hundred dollars; and we implore editors of newspapers every where, who either fear God or love our Lord Jesus Christ, or have any regard for religious truth, or any sympathy for sufferers for conscience' sake, to give the foregoing a place in their columns.

Writers may address the subscriber, post-paid, Lewiston, Fulton Co., Illinois,

In behalf of the observers of the Bible Sabbath, in the vicinity of Lewiston, Ill.

WAITSTILL PHILLIPS, Scribe.

October 3, 1853.

A FIERY TRIAL.—The Hon. Rufus Choate, in a late speech in Boston, Mass., referring to the stormy aspect of the political horizon of Europe, said:—"It has seemed to me as if the prerogatives of crowns, and the rights of men, and the hoarded up resentments and revenges of a thousand years, were about to unshathe the sword for a conflict, in which the blood shall flow as in the Apocalyptic vision, to the bridles of the horses, and in which a whole age shall pass away—in which the great bell of time shall sound for another hour—in which society itself shall be tried by fire and steel—whether it is of nature and nature's God, or not!"

"Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful. But his delight is in the law of the Lord." Ps. i, 1, 2.

THE REVIEW AND HERALD.

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

ROCHESTER, THIRD-DAY, JAN. 24, 1854.

THE SABBATH.

"REMEMBER the Sabbath-day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates. For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day and hallowed it." Ex. xx, 8-11.

A REQUEST!

THOSE who teach that there is no Sabbath for the gospel dispensation, are requested to give us one plain text from the New Testament that teaches that the seventh-day Sabbath has been abolished. When any one will do this, we will notice it in the REVIEW.

This request has been repeated in eight or ten numbers of the REVIEW, the last four months, yet no one has presented the text or texts that declare the seventh-day Sabbath abolished.

Inferences from 2 Cor. iii; Rom. xiv; Col. ii, 14-17, which do not mention the Sabbath of the Lord, should not be allowed in a case like this. God gave the Sabbath law in the plainest language possible; and no man should be convinced that it has been abolished, unless he can find inspired testimony as positive and plain.

We teach the Weekly Sabbath of the Bible, the Sabbath of both Testaments. Let those who assert that it is abolished, produce one plain text to prove their assertion. This is a reasonable request. Will they produce the text?

ANOTHER REQUEST!

THOSE who teach that the Sabbath has been changed from the seventh to the first day of the week, are requested to give us one text from the New Testament that teaches such a change; or the example of Christ and the Apostles, recorded in the New Testament, favoring such a change. When any one will point out such a text and such example, it shall be given in the REVIEW.

NEW VOLUME.

WE are happy to commence Vol. V of the REVIEW free from debt and with brightening prospects.

We send this number to many who are not regular subscribers. If such wish to take the REVIEW, they will please inform us immediately. Now is a good time to commence taking the REVIEW, as the main reasons of our faith and hope will be given in this volume. Have not all, or nearly all, of our readers friends to whom they wish Vol. V sent? Please send their address with the small sum that the REVIEW costs for six months. You may feel rewarded a hundred times before the volume closes.

Those who may have received one or more volumes of the REVIEW, and do not embrace the views it advocates, who are able to help sustain it, and have done nothing, and do not intend to do anything, for its support, will please request the Post Master to return one paper to this Office, or to inform us by letter, that you wish your paper discontinued.

We are anxious to send the REVIEW to all who would read it with interest and profit; but do not wish to continue it to those who have no interest in the important Bible truths it advocates, after having a chance to learn our position.

Advent and Sabbath Tracts.

WE now design publishing a series of Tracts, with the above general title, embracing the reasons of the faith and hope of the body of Christians called Second Advent Sabbath-keepers. We have in contemplation twelve or fifteen numbers, from thirty-two to one hundred pages each.

The state of the cause of present truth, we think, demands of us this effort, at this time. The number of efficient laborers now in the wide field, who are able to set the truth before the people, is indeed small; and they have so many calls to preach the word that they cannot generally remain in one place a sufficient length of time to give a full course of lectures. It is, therefore, of the highest importance that preaching brethren should have with them, publications covering the whole ground of our faith, to supply the people where an interest is awakened by their labors. After an interest is awakened by public lec-

tures, the mind is prepared to read with profit, and learn the truth more perfectly. The field of labor is so extensive, and faithful, judicious laborers are so few, that much of the great work before us must be accomplished by publications.

Small tracts are most generally called for, and most faithfully read; but in many cases it would be much better to have the main reasons of our faith in one or two volumes. We shall therefore publish this series of Tracts, each containing a separate subject, to suit the mass of readers; then, when the series is completed, bind a portion of the whole series in one or two volumes.

Number One of this series is ready. It is a Tract of thirty-two pages, entitled, *The First day of the Week Not the Sabbath of the Lord*. It is a most thorough refutation of the claims of Sunday-keeping to divine authority. It contains extracts from Catholic works, showing that Sunday-keeping is based only on the tradition and authority of the Roman Catholic Church. It also contains an excellent extract from J. W. Morton's *Vindication of the True Sabbath*, showing the falsity of the view that the fourth commandment requires only a seventh part of the time, instead of the seventh day.

This Tract is printed with new type, on good paper—price, \$1.00 per 100—25 cents per doz.—3 cents a copy—postage, one cent. With the increased price of paper, press-work, (most of which we have to hire done,) and the increase of other expenses, this will leave little or nothing for the author, who should be remembered. The author of our most carefully written publications has received nothing for many months of study and close confinement in preparing them, which has injured his health much. Friends of the present truth, forget not the labors of such, while you may be enjoying the evening prayer-meeting, or the social circle of christian friends, they are taxing the energies of the mind to the utmost, and, perhaps, continue their toil several hours after you are asleep.

It is designed that this series of Tracts shall be prepared in the most careful manner, that positions taken may be unanswerable. Those who prepare them must have books, and they have other expenses to meet, as well as men otherwise employed. Those therefore who wish to help in this important work, are invited, after examining new works, to forward their free-will offerings to this Office for the benefit of such. And especially remember the author of the *Sanctuary and Twenty-three Hundred Days*, Refutation of the Claims of Sunday-keeping, and many excellent reviews.

Those who are indebted to this Office for books will confer a favor by sending the pay at their earliest convenience. Those who order books will please send the money with the order if possible. This series of Tracts will cost about \$2000. As we go forward in this enterprise, we shall expect the prompt assistance of the friends of the cause.

The Two Laws.

God spake ten commandments with his own voice, and wrote them with his own finger in tables of stone. Moses wrote the ordinances of the Jewish church in a book. The first is called "the law of God"—"the commandments of God;" the second, "the law of Moses," and "the law of the Lord, given by the hand of Moses." The tables are called "the tables of the covenant;" the book is called "the book of the covenant" and "the book of Moses." Ex. xxxi, 18; Deut. xxxi, 24-26; ix, 9-11; 2 Chron. xxxiv, 30; Mark xii, 26.

The term law in the New Testament sometimes means one of these laws, and sometimes the other; the context always determining which is meant. Rejecting the idea of two laws, and claiming that the word law always means one and the same thing, will you show how to reconcile or harmonize the following scriptures.

The law of a carnal commandment. Heb. vii, 16.

We know that the law is spiritual. Rom. vii, 14.

The priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law. Heb. vii, 12.

Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Matt. v, 18.

Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances. Eph. ii, 15.

Think not that I am come to destroy the law. Matt. v, 14.

Thou camest down also upon mount Sinai, and spakest with them from heaven, and gavest them right judgments and true laws, (margin, laws of truth,) good statutes and commandments. Neh. ix, 13.

Because they had not executed my judgments, but had despised my statutes, and had polluted my sabbaths, (had done these things before the giving of the law at Sinai,) and their eyes were after their father's idols; wherefore I gave them ALSO statutes that were not good, and judgments whereby they should not live. Eze. xx, 24, 25.

Peter calls "the law of Moses" a yoke "which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear." Acts xv, 5, 10.

Paul says, I delight in "the law of God" after the inward man. Rom. vii, 22.

Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace. Gal. v, 4.

The doers of the law shall be justified. Rom. ii, 13.

When the priesthood was changed, from the typical to the antitypical, there was of necessity a change of the law. What law? Not the original, royal law of ten commandments; for that can never change.

[The following objections were presented to a brother in this city, by Bro. D. I. R., while laboring here. We give them, and the answers, for the candid consideration of Bible students.]

OBJECTIONS TO THE SATURDAY SABBATH TO BE CONSIDERED.

1. THE definite day—the seventh—is of the nature of a positive institute, capable of change, while the observance of a day of rest, and worship and commemoration, is moral and eternal.

2. The object to be obtained, of rest &c., can be as well carried out by the first day, now observed as by the seventh; being after six days of labor, and no difference but in the number and name. It is more convenient and can only be changed for Saturday with great difficulty.

3. The first day observance by Christ and the apostles, and John's calling it the Lord's day, gave it sacredness, and caused its observance among the primitive Christians, from the first century, and first writers that we have after the apostles.

ANSWERS.

1. I have ever doubted the right of any man, or body of men, to make a purely human assertion the basis of an argument for changing the word of Jehovah. I remain of the same opinion. Every "thus saith the Lord" is rock-bottom; and every doctrine which rests on such a foundation must stand. But that argument which is based on the assertion of men, has at best a very precarious foundation, however strongly it may be stated.

In the first objection, the writer asserts that the fourth commandment of the moral law is capable of being changed. In the second, he asserts that the commandment, when thus changed, would answer the divine purpose as perfectly as though it had not been altered. The third objection contains the writer's proof that the commandment has actually been changed. Let us candidly consider the first objection.

Whether this objection is just or not, none will deny that it rests wholly on the assertion of men. The writer—as many others have done—has here separated the fourth commandment into what he is pleased to call its moral and its positive parts.* The requir-

*Moral precepts, are precepts, the reasons of which we see: positive precepts, are precepts, the reasons of which we do not see. Moral duties arise out of the nature of the case itself: positive duties do not arise out of the nature of the case, but from external commands.

ment to keep a day is moral, and therefore eternal. But that part of the commandment which tells us what day it is that God would have us keep, is positive and therefore changeable. In other words, this argument may be thus stated: That part of the fourth commandment which designates the seventh day as the Sabbath has passed away and left only words enough in force, to require that some day be kept.

We now ask for the commission by which men have been authorized to cut in twain the fourth commandment. As the Scriptures do not furnish it, the answer must be that reason authorizes this act. Reason, then, is sufficient to prepare for destruction that part of the commandment which requires the observance of the hallowed Rest-day of the Creator. Let us try the same engine upon the remainder of the commandment, as follows:—

The duty to rest is no doubt a moral duty, and of an unchangeable character, but the requirement to devote a day to this "is of the nature of a positive institute capable of change" so as to require a *part of each day*, instead of the observance of any entire day!

If this same mode of reasoning does not as effectually destroy the remaining portion of the fourth commandment, as it does that part which it was aimed against, we certainly fail to see the difference. Indeed it shows that the one part of the commandment is equally as changeable and positive as the other. So that if it is sufficient to prepare a part of the commandment for destruction, it is of equal value to those who would destroy the remainder. When did God ever authorize men to take his commandments to pieces in such a manner? Is not this the very course which the Romish church has taken with the second and the tenth? Nay did not the Protestant church borrow this very argument from the church of Rome? Here are the words of the "mother church" on this point:

"As far as the commandment obliges us to set aside some part of our time for the worship and service of our Creator, it is an unalterable and unchangeable precept of the eternal law, in which the church cannot dispense; but forasmuch as it prescribes the seventh day in particular for this purpose, it is no more than a ceremonial precept of the old law, which obligeth not Christians. And therefore, instead of the seventh day, and other festivals appointed by the old law, the church has prescribed the Sundays and holy days to be set apart for God's worship; and these we are now obliged to keep in consequence of God's commandment, instead of the ancient Sabbath. *Catholic Christian Instructed*, page 204.

From what has been said, two important facts are made plain: 1. That this argument was invented by the church of Rome to justify the change of the Sabbath. 2. That if this argument be just, it proves conclusively that no part of the fourth commandment is moral, unless it be the requirement to rest.

This argument first cuts off from the commandment, the requirement to keep the seventh day, because that is positive and susceptible of change to another day; and it cuts off the duty of keeping any day, as such a requisition is also positive, and susceptible of being changed so as to require the observance of a *part of each day*. We think the fourth commandment has undergone a sufficient amputation to have nothing now left but its moral part. But what now remains? Alas, not enough to hold the form of a commandment together! In cutting off the seventh day from the fourth commandment, we cut off the term "Sabbath of the Lord," for that term is expressly applied to the Rest-day of the Creator, the seventh day. And when this has been severed from the commandment, no man can show that the requirement to keep any day remains behind. Here is the fourth commandment with the "positive" and changeable parts taken out:—

"Remember to . . . keep . . . holy. Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work: but . . . of the Lord thy God: . . . thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in x days the Lord made

heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested . . . wherefore the Lord blessed . . . and hallowed."

Like a building with its frame taken out, the fourth commandment is now only a mass of ruins. And even could we allow men to repair the commandment, by inserting the words, "first day of the week" where they have taken out the seventh day, it would only turn the truth of God into a lie, as the commandment would then require us to keep holy the first day of the week, because God rested upon that day from his work of Creation. Nor would there be any way to mend the matter, except to strike out the reason on which the fourth commandment is based; viz., "for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day, and hallowed it," and to insert instead, these words: "Jesus arose from the dead on the first day of the week; wherefore the first day of the week is the Christian Sabbath." The fourth commandment would then read thus:—

"Remember the first day of the week to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work: but the first day of the week is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for Jesus arose from the dead on the first day of the week; wherefore the first day of the week is the Christian Sabbath."

Here is the commandment as multitudes desire to have it read. As it requires the observance of a different day from the original commandment, and for a different reason from that which is there assigned, it leaves no part of the original Sabbath institution in existence and thus this matter ends in the total destruction of the fourth commandment.

2. Let us now examine the second objection. In this it is asserted that the first day of the week will answer the purpose of rest, worship and commemoration, equally as well as the seventh. We reply that so far as rest from toil is concerned, men may doubtless obtain this on the first day of the week; though the idea of a day of rest at the commencement of the week instead of one at its termination, is the very reverse of God's plan, not to say of propriety also. It is only by joining the last six days of one week to the first day of the following week, that men are able to hide this absurdity.

But we deny that the worship of God can be maintained as acceptable to him in the observance of a different day from that which he ordained, as in the observance of the right one. "God is a Spirit: and they that worship him, must worship him in spirit and in truth." John iv, 24. Those who make the commandments of God of none effect by their tradition, worship God *in vain*, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. Matt. xv, 3-9. That this is strictly true of Sunday-keeping, none can deny. It is a tradition of the elders that directly makes void one of the ten commandments. If God should pronounce it a vain oblation, and say in the day of judgment to its observers, "Who hath required this at your hands?" would they not be speechless?

But will not Sunday answer as a day of commemoration equally as well as the Lord's Sabbath? We answer that the fourth commandment requires us to commemorate the rest of Jehovah from the work of creation. The seventh day—the day of his rest—is the memorial of that event. Hence the commandment says, "Remember the Sabbath-day [literally the Rest-day,] to keep it holy." "The seventh day is the Sabbath [Rest-day] of the Lord thy God." The first day of the week can never become the memorial of the Creator's rest; for he began his labor on that day. It is not the memorial of Christ's resurrection, for the Lord never set it apart for that purpose, but ordained a far more appropriate memorial of that event, viz., baptism. Rom. vi, 4, 5. It is not a *divine* memorial of any event. If any one thinks that it is, let them tell us where God has said so.

The fourth commandment presents before us an important event which God would have commemorated.

It presents us also with the memorial by which he would have us commemorate that event. And it states distinctly how God made that memorial, and when. To insert Sunday in the commandment as the memorial of Christ's resurrection, not only destroys the divine memorial there given, but also destroys, as we have seen, the *reason* which God assigned for giving the commandment. Is there not a vast difference between the Sabbath of the Lord, and the human institution of Sunday, which effectually destroys the commandment of God? Can you not agree to say with John Bunyan:—

"Better, though *difficult*, the right way to go,
Than wrong, though *easy* where the end is woe."

3. The third objection contains the writer's proof for First-day observance. It asserts that Christ and the apostles observed the day, and that John called it the Lord's day. Did Christ observe the first day of the week? If he did this, when, where and how, did he do it? There is not on record a single act of our Lord on that day which could not with equal propriety have been performed upon any other of the six working days. To make the seventh day a sacred memorial for our race, God the Father, after resting on that day, put his blessing upon it, and set it apart to a holy use. But it is claimed that the Son of God, without doing anything of the kind to Sunday, and without speaking a word in its favor, or even mentioning the day, gave this day the place of the Rest-day of the Lord!

The resurrection of the Saviour it is true, occurred on this day; but this was not so remarkable an event as the sacrifice of the Lamb of God which occurred on another of the six working days. Jesus showed himself to his disciples on the day of his resurrection, and perhaps on that day the next week, though this cannot be claimed as *certain*. But to show that the day of his appearing was not thereby made sacred, the next time he appeared to them was a fishing-day, and the last time was on Thursday. John xxi; Acts i. This is all the evidence that can be brought to show that Christ observed Sunday!

Did the apostles observe the first day of the week? The first instance which is cited as proof, is this: The disciples sat at meat, and while thus engaged, Jesus came in and upbraided them for their unbelief respecting his resurrection. Mark xvi, 9-14. The next incident which is cited, was "after eight days" from the one just noticed. John xx. It is *possible* that this was on the first day of the week, but it is by no means *certain* that such was the case. But whether it was Sunday or not, nothing transpired which might not have occurred with equal propriety on any day.

Paul's act of breaking bread on that day may also be cited. But though he broke bread on that day—just as his Master had done on another of the working days, and as the apostolic church at Jerusalem had done every day—he never dreamed that it had become the Christian Sabbath; for as soon as it was light, he started on his long journey to Jerusalem! a positive proof that he did not consider that day the Sabbath. Paul commanded the members of the Corinthian church, every one to lay by himself in store on that day for purposes of charity. But this is the very reverse of a public collection, as each must be at his own home in order to obey.

John was in the Spirit on the Lord's day, but he does not say that the Lord's day was Sunday. The objector *says that* for him. The Bible many times calls the Sabbath, the Lord's holy day. It never tells us that he has put another day in its place. It never calls Sunday the Lord's day. Those, therefore, who affirm that the Sabbath of the Lord is not his holy day, and assert that Sunday is such, directly contradict the authority of the holy Scriptures.

OBJECTIONS.

1. To say that it was *first appointed*, or *caused to be observed* by Constantine, or *by the Pope* is historically false!

2. Or to say that "Pope Nicholas first called it the Lord's day" is *historically false*, as may be seen in *Bingham's Christian Antiquities*.

3. Constantine caused it by *law* to be observed by the *unconverted* and the *heathen* and *officers of gov-*

ernment; but it had been observed by the saints 150 years before, voluntarily.

4. And the councils which made canons on it, did not *introduce* it thereby, but only required *uniformity* not *introduce* it thereby, but only required *uniformity*, where there were some neglectful. For it was *generally* held sacred and observed from the first century.

5. It was also called Lord's day by A. D. 168, or the middle of the second century, by Dionysius writing to Pope Soter, and was thus in the second and third century distinguished from the Sabbath.

6. But the seventh Saturday Sabbath *never* was made a day of legal rest, nor strictly a rest by the church or councils; but a day of meetings only. Both were called "festivals," but the *first day* had the *pre-eminence*.

ANSWERS.

1. We have never said that the keeping of Sunday as a festival, began with Constantine, or originated from the law which he enacted in its behalf. On the contrary, we believe that the Papal apostasy, as stated by Paul, began even in the days of the apostles. 2 Thess. ii. Hence we are not surprised that some time after the days of the apostles, men began to pay some regard to Sunday, as also to good Friday and to holy Thursday. Dr. Chambers says, "It was Constantine the Great who first made a law for the observance of Sunday." But whether such a law had been made before his time or not, it is a fact, obvious to every reader of the New Testament, that Christ and his apostles never established such a precept. Not the first word was ever uttered by one of the apostles, enjoining Sunday-keeping. Hence the first-day Sabbath is a human institution which has usurped the place of the Lord's Sabbath, and which has nothing divine or apostolic about it.

2. The statement to which the objector refers was made in the "History of the Sabbath" published by the American Sabbath Tract Society. Here it is:

"To give the more solemnity to the first day of the week, (as we learn from Lucius' Ecclesiastical History,) Sylvester, who was bishop of Rome while Constantine was Emperor, changed the name of Sunday, giving it the more imposing title of *Lord's day*."

We understand the above extract to teach that Pope Sylvester, by *formal act*, christened Sunday with the name of Lord's day. But the same writer speaks of certain, who before the days of Constantine, regarded Sunday, not in the place of the Lord's Sabbath, but as a festival under the name of Lord's day, and who kept as equally sacred, good Friday, and holy Thursday.

3. If Sunday was observed 150 years before the edict of Constantine, this would only extend as far back as A. D. 171, *eighty or one hundred years this side of the apostles*. Whoever then observed it, did it as the writer has well expressed it, "*voluntarily*;" for they were doing what God had never required. Those who then kept Sunday as a festival, were careful to observe the Sabbath. Hence we cannot refer to such cases as a justification of those who now coolly violate the fourth commandment in order to keep a day which God never enjoined. And to say that the apostles gave a commandment for Sunday-observance which was not recorded, but which was handed down by tradition, is to say that the Bible does not contain all the commandments of God necessary to salvation; and to assert the right of men to supply from tradition that which the Bible lacks, and to correct by tradition that which is not right in the Word of God. As an instance take the fourth commandment, which men without hesitation correct by the tradition of the elders. In other words, this work begins by adding tradition to the Bible, and ends with correcting the Bible by tradition. This is the earliest and leading principle of the Papal apostasy.

4. The councils which have made canons respecting the change of the Sabbath, were engaged in a fearful work. They had no warrant from God to justify them in corrupting the fourth commandment, or to sanction their acts of bolstering up that which God had never ordained.

5. The following from the "History of the Sabbath" may be to the point:—

"We will notice but one more of these misinterpreted citations, and this is from Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, who lived a little after Justin. His letter to Soter, bishop of Rome, is cited as saying, 'This day we celebrated the holy Dominical day, in which we have read your epistle.' As given by Eusebius, it is thus: 'To-day we have passed the Lord's holy day,' &c. The only ground upon which this phrase can be referred to the first day of the week, is, that this day was at that time known by the same title that God has given to the Sabbath, [Isa. lviii, 13,] of which there is no proof."

6. The Lord's Sabbath is none the less sacred because that men have never made laws to enforce its observance. Neither is Sunday-keeping a divine institution, because the edicts of emperors and the canons of councils can be produced in its favor. A stream can never rise higher than its fountain. The command for keeping Sunday originated this side of the apostles: hence it follows that, although its observance should continue ten thousand years, it would never become apostolic or divine. J. N. A.

AGE TO COME.

BY J. B. FRISBIE.

SUPPOSE the "Age to come" theory true, and that a few of the nations are left after the great destruction, and a probationary time should be given to those nations after the Lord comes, what possible benefit can it be to those who neglect to keep the commandments of God and obey the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, in this present age? We believe it best to attend to the "Present Truth," in the present age, and let the age to come, take care of itself.

If there should be any such age of probation during a thousand years in which there should be a gospel ministry, a temple and sacrifices of beasts offered, the feast of tabernacles kept, mortals and immortals mingling together on earth during this length of time, we can say we would raise no objections to such an age to come if it was God's revealed plan. But then, we conclude that we will wait until we get there before we have anything to do with it if there should be anything for us to do.

But we are in serious doubt of any such "Age to come" as some are fondly looking for, for the following reasons:—

1. Because there is nothing but inferential proof, that there will be probation, and consequently salvation for any after Christ comes; when there is much plain proof to the contrary. Those places which speak of the few left of the nations, say nothing, as we can see, of their being preached to, seeking mercy and finding it; nothing of that kind; but it appears like this: rocks and mountains fall on us and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne and from the wrath of the Lamb.

Prov. i, 28. Then shall they call upon me but I will not answer; they shall seek me early, but they shall not find me. The reason is clear. Rev. xxii, 11, 12. He that is unjust, let him be unjust still. Behold I come quickly, &c. If probation ends just before Christ comes, how can any one believe it will extend after he comes? Luke xx, 34-36. The children of *this world* marry, and are given in marriage; but they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain *that world*, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage; neither can they die any more; for they are equal unto the angels and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection. This shows that those who obtain that world, can die no more, therefore are immortal; so this puts an end to probation in the Age to come.

2. The thousand years' "Age to come" probation, is mostly built upon an inference drawn from Rev. xx, 2, 3, where the devil and satan is to be bound a thousand years, in the bottomless pit that he should deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled.

The inference is, if satan is bound, there must be

nations on earth during the thousand years that he might deceive; when the fact is, the earth is the bottomless pit, out of which the nations will be destroyed which binds the devil; for he will have no nations to deceive during the 1000 years. For the devil will be cast out into the *earth* and his angels with him. Rev. xii, 9; Dan. vii, 2, 3; Rev. xiii, 1; xvii, 7, 8; xx, 3. The beast of seven heads and ten horns rose up out of the sea, or bottomless pit. (Great Abyss.) That is, governments coming up out of the nations. So when the nations are all destroyed from the earth, the bottomless pit, or this dark world, and the devil is then confined by the angel to this earth a thousand years, he then cannot deceive the nations any more, till the thousand years shall be fulfilled; and after that he must be loosed a little season, and shall go out to deceive the nations which are (then raised from the dead: the wicked) in the four quarters of the earth. After the beloved city has come down from heaven upon the earth, then will the wicked be devoured by fire which will be the second death. That we are not mistaken in our view of this subject, see Matt. xxiv, 37. But as the days of Noe were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be. For as in the days that were before the flood they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage until the day that Noe entered into the ark, and knew not until the flood came and *took them all away, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be*. Luke xvii, 28-30. Likewise also as it was in the days of Lot; they did eat, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded; but the same day that Lot went out of Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from heaven and *destroyed them all*. *Even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed*.

Question. After Christ comes and takes them *all away and destroys them all*, as in the days of Noah and Lot, how many probationers think you can be left during the thousand years?

3. In the destruction of the world by the flood, and Sodom by fire, there were eight saved in one instance, and three in the other. Isa. xxiv, 1, 3, 5, 6. Behold the Lord maketh the earth empty, and maketh it waste, and turneth it upside down, and scattereth abroad the inhabitants thereof. The land shall be utterly (completely) *emptied*, and utterly spoiled; for the Lord hath spoken this word. The earth also is defiled under the inhabitants thereof; because they have transgressed the laws, changed the ordinance, broken the everlasting covenant; therefore hath the curse devoured the earth, and they that dwell therein are desolate; therefore the inhabitants of the earth are burned and few men left. These few men left we consider to be the saints, when the land will be utterly or completely emptied of its inhabitants. But where are the probationers? 2 Esdras xvi, 22, 24, 32. For many of them that dwell upon earth shall perish of famine; and the other that escape the hunger, shall the sword destroy; there shall be *no man left* to till the earth, and sow it; and the earth shall be laid waste, and the fields thereof shall wax old, and her ways and all the paths shall grow full of thorns; because *no man* shall travel therethrough. Jer. xxv, 20-33; xxx, 7, 11, 24; Zeph. i, 2, 3, 14, 18; iii, 4, 6; Matt. xiii, 39, 40. The harvest is the end of the world, (or age.) As therefore the tares (the wicked) are gathered and burned in the fire, so shall it be in the end of this world. *All things that offend, and them that do iniquity shall be burned*. This does not look much like probation.

We now see the great mistake that many are in, in respect to the literal return of the Jews to build up their city and cultivate that land. Also the false theory of the Age to come (so called) in applying texts to this earth, which belong to the new earth; and in the application of conditional texts as if unconditional.

"But the meek shall inherit the earth; and shall delight themselves in the abundance of peace."

A Hard Case.

ONE Benjamin, who professes to be in the present truth and a preacher, called on me the night after the Sabbath, and introduced himself as a brother who kept the Sabbath, and wanted to stay over night. I told him he could stay. I had but a short conversation with him, before I began to be suspicious that all was not right. So I continued to question him until I was satisfied he was not one of the Lord's preachers, and understood but little or nothing about present truth. The next morning after breakfast I felt it duty to tell him my mind about him. I told him I did not feel free to harbor him any longer; that I thought he had imposed upon us in coming as he did, professing to be one of the Sabbath brethren. I further told him I did not feel under any obligation to assist him at all, and requested him to leave, &c. But he urged so hard to stay till next morning, (and said he would pay me for his board,) that I concluded to let him stay. The next morning at breakfast time I called him. He said he was not going to get up until 7 o'clock at any rate. I told him I wanted he should get up and eat his breakfast and pay his bill before I went to work. So after considerable trouble I succeeded in getting him up. After breakfast I said to him, Now you have had five meals, two nights' lodging, two sheets of paper, envelope, stamp, &c., how much do you think you ought to pay me. Well, he said he should not pay me anything, as I had misused him, &c. I saw there was no other way to get along with him but to deal pretty straight; so I stepped up stairs and took his carpet-bag and brought it down and told him when he paid me for his board he could have it, and not before. He stormed round considerably, and called me various names, such as robber, pickpocket, liar, and lastly, a hog, and, may the curse of God abide on you eternally, &c. After he found all did not avail anything, he paid what I charged him, (which was only fifty cents,) declared that it was outrageous. I then told him if he did not alter his course, I should have him published. Says he, "You publish me and I will whip you within an inch of your life," &c. After much ado I got him started, and he went straight over to Bro. Gorsline's and told him he wanted to stop with him for a while but had no money to pay for his board. Bro. G. told him if he only loved the Lord, he did not care for the money. I told Bro. G. of his actions at my house, and I guess he will not keep him long if he can get rid of him, which I think will be hard work unless he fairly turns him out of doors. ELIAS GOODWIN. *Oswego, Dec. 5th, 1853.*

[Bro. Goodwin writes that this Benjamin is imposing upon the Brethren in other places, and thinks he should be published. We have, therefore, given the above statement.—Ed.]

COMMUNICATIONS.**From Bro. Kellogg.**

DEAR BRO WHITE:—I am still trying to keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. The way grows brighter and the truth looks clearer, I feel sure that we have got the truth, and it is my desire to be sanctified through it. I feel that all I have is on the altar and I am willing that the sacrifice should be consumed. I am trying to be one of that number that will have my treasure laid up in heaven.

I feel glad that the subject of gospel order is being presented before the remnant, and I hope the time is near when it will be closely followed by all the messengers and all of our dear Brethren and Sisters. It is when we abide in Christ and his words abide in us, that we can claim his promises. O how good the Lord is, in having such a glorious truth as the third angel's message to call out his people from among the wicked, to prepare them to stand in the battle in the great day of the Lord, which is just before us. Is this truth having that sanctifying influence upon us that it should have. O how strait the way is. It is not enough that we keep God's holy Sabbath, but we must overcome every wrong word and action, and confess all our errors before Jesus leaves the Sanctuary; for then it will be too late. We ought to show, by our holy lives and godly conversation, that we are looking for the appearing of our blessed Lord.

I have noticed for some time that there has been considerable behind on the *Review*. Brethren, these things ought not so to be. Do we feel that this is the last message that is to be given to the world, and that it will soon close. I hope that all that are interested in the present truth will see the importance of doing something for the paper immediately, that the deficiency may be made up at once. If we cannot spare means without, we ought to be willing to make some sacrifice so that we can pay for one number of the *Review*. I hope that those of us that have recently embraced the third angel's message will realize how much our brethren have done for us, in providing

means to send out messengers and publications to get the truth before us. O brethren what we do must be done quickly. We can never gain that heavenly kingdom unless we are willing to sacrifice for the cause of God here.

Bro Bates met with the band here according to appointment. It was truly cheering to us to see him once more and hear him proclaim the present truth. His first discourse was on the sanctuary; and the Lord helped him to present it in a very clear and plain manner. I hope that the Lord will bless his labors abundantly here in the West. The way seems to be opening in different directions for the message to go, and I pray the Lord that he will send forth faithful laborers into his harvest.

Yours in hope,
JOHN P. KELLOGG.
Jackson, Mich., Jan 2d, 1854.

From Bro. Byington.

TO THE SAINTS SCATTERED ABROAD:—Our heavenly Father says to us, "Be ye holy; for I am holy." We have no confidence that the traditions of our fathers, or creeds of men, will ever accomplish this work. It must be done through the agency of the Holy Spirit applying the sanctifying power of truth to our hearts, and to all our lives. We profess faith in the Son of God, and also to walk as he walked. But are we careful to know that God means all he says in his Holy Word? Without me, says Jesus, ye can do nothing. If so, we should always be looking unto him by earnest prayer, till our hearts melt and humbly bow before the Lord. Does the rule our Saviour has given us, [Matt. xii, 36,] govern us in all our conversation? Please turn to it and read it. Add to this our Saviour's words, "Let your yea be yea, and your nay, nay; for whatsoever is more than these, cometh of evil." Oh how much evil is done by jesting, foolish-talking, and evil-speaking, and the pride of life! Dear brethren, do we escape this snare of the Devil?

Milo Stowe, of Weybridge, in writing to a brother here, (who is somewhat convicted by the present truth,) says: "The seventh-day people are as proud as members of other churches." Will Bro. Everts, or some other brother ask Mr. Stowe where he discovers pride among us. By so doing we may convince him of his wrong, or be led to see our own; and if so, confess our faults by forsaking them. We must walk humbly before God and exemplary before the world.

Have any of us thought it is very convenient to have our paper sent to us free, without considering the burden those have had to bear who send it? There are the worthy poor, and I am glad they can have the paper free; but let us remember there is an honest claim on us here if we can consistently meet it. Every half-dollar spent for needless articles of dress, tea, tobacco, &c., could be put to a better use. Dear brethren, let us think of these things; and then let these words be written on our hearts: "Be ye holy; for I am holy." JOHN BYINGTON.
Buck's Bridge, N. Y., Jan. 4th, 1854.

From Bro. Cornell.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—Since my last, I have given several more lectures at Sylvan Center. Eight were baptized and three or four others observe the Sabbath. Many acknowledged the seventh day the true Sabbath; though but few were willing to bear the reproach. All manner of evil was spoken against me *falsely* during my lectures there. The Dragon was *wroth*; but the truth prevailed, and ten or eleven are keeping the Sabbath. Praise the Lord!

I gave three lectures two miles south of the Center. Several became interested, and the way is open for lectures there. I was requested to give lectures in Saline, about twenty miles from Sylvan, and gave seven lectures, with good result. Two families are keeping the Sabbath, and others are investigating. Here are openings in every direction. "Who is sufficient for these things." There is a great lack of laborers now in this part of the field.

We have been much strengthened by the word spoken by Bro. Bates. He carries with us but a short space; for he is hastening westward. A large field is opening West. The antitypical work is going forward. The day of atonement is almost finished. The sealing time will soon be over. The solemn decree will soon go forth: he that is filthy must be filthy still. The harvest will be past. The day of probation will soon be closed up forever. Then, oh solemn thought! *wroth* with no mixture of mercy. May the Lord help us to realize the importance of this time, that we may afflict our souls during the day of atonement, and work while the day lasts, and be hid in the day of the Lord's anger.

As Bro. Bates is very busy preparing to go west, to Battle Creek, according to appointment, I will make a brief statement concerning the meetings in Jackson and Sylvan, notified in the *Review* for Dec. 27th.

Notwithstanding the severe cold weather, snow and rain, believers and friends came several miles to hear our dear Bro. Bates, sound the alarm once more. The interest continued to increase till the close, and we trust much good was done.

At Sylvan, the subject of Gospel Order was considered, and, by the unanimous voice of the church, Bro. Charles Glover was chosen, and set apart, to act as Deacon of the church at Sylvan. While praying for wisdom, the Spirit of the Lord settled upon us, and thus the move was approbated. The believers are much strengthened and encouraged.

The church at Jackson has chosen and set apart Bro. Cyrenus Smith as Deacon. They are now well united and moving forward, and will no more be tossed to and fro, but will stand, being founded upon Jesus Christ and the apostles.

I believe the time has come for the remnant to "ask for the Old Paths, where is the good way, and walk therein," as spoken by the Prophet. Jer. vi, 16. That the church have gone astray, is evident from Jer. xviii, 15: Mal. iii, 7; and we are informed by the apostle Peter, that the times of blotting out sins, are times of "Restitution of all things spoken of by all the holy Prophets," &c. In Isa. lviii, 12, we have it spoken that paths are to be restored to dwell in. To establish Gospel Order in all the congregations, will be a very essential part of the Restoring of paths to walk in. May the Lord grant that there may be union in this great work, that it may be accomplished speedily. Amen.

Yours in hope and love,
M. E. CORNELL.
Battle Creek, Mich., Jan. 5th, 1854.

From Sister Porter.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—I can truly say, Thus far the Lord has been my helper. I can look back on my past experience and see how the Lord has opened the way for me to keep the commandments, and a thrill of joy runs through my soul. When I first became interested in the truth, it seemed that it was almost impossible for me to keep the Sabbath; but I felt that it was truth, and how could I reject it; for I had solemnly promised that I would obey God; and how could I be saved without it? I saw no way. I searched the Word by day and by night, and read every publication I could obtain, for and against, and compared them with the Bible, but still I could see no other way to obtain eternal life, only through obedience to the law of God.

But what could I do? I thought I should have to leave my home, my little family, and truly leave all for Christ. Could I bring my mind to this? Did God require it? Was it my duty? Thus I reasoned and prayed to know the Lord's will, that I might take no wrong steps, and resolved to do what I believed to be duty, if I had to leave every thing; for I knew that if it was truth, the Lord would take care of me. Oh how sweet were the promises of God to me, when I made this resolution! What light broke into my soul! How clear the Sabbath was to my mind! How I did long to see the poor, despised servants of God and hear them talk of the way of life! O, how it did cheer and encourage my heart; and I felt that nothing should separate me from the love of God.

I felt that I loved Jesus and his truth, and thought that those who nominally profess to love him, would love it to; and I longed to tell them what the Lord had done for me; but I soon found, that they did not wish to hear any thing about it. I was opposed on every hand at home and abroad. Some said I was crazy, and others, that I was deluded; and they tried every way to make me yield and to give up this strange doctrine. The Minister labored hard to convince me of my error, and made me a subject of prayer for some time, and my friends tried to stop me from meeting with them, and finally forbid my going with them; but this only strengthened and confirmed me in the faith. I had tasted the good word of God, and it was so precious that I could not give it up for any earthly happiness or gain.

I felt there was no peace like the peace of God; no love like the love of Jesus. Amid all this opposition I felt such sweet peace as I cannot describe. God was my refuge: in him was my strength: there was safety nowhere else: awake and asleep, bright visions of the glory of God would pass through my mind.

The Bible was my companion. In it were the words of eternal life. How comforting to the tried soul! How good the Lord has been to me! Praised be his name! He has brought me through many trials since that time; some have been severe; but I have been sustained and kept until this present time and am still trying to keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus, that I may at last reach fair Canaan's shore, where sorrow cannot come, and parting is no more.

Your unworthy sister,
J. M. PORTER.
West Rocky Hill, Ct., Dec. 1853.

From Bro Russell.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—I have been requested to write to you, relative to God's dealings with me; and thinking that it would encourage you, to hear that one more had embraced the truth, I have resolved to comply.

For nearly a year, I have been severely afflicted with the neuralgia, accompanied with violent spasms. I have had these spasms, I think, as often as once in three or four days, on an average, lasting usually two or three hours, but sometimes twelve or thirteen, and so violent that, sometimes, it seemed impossible for me to live through them. The pain that I, at times, endured was greater than could be described.

I was taken, while studying at Amherst College, with the ministry in view. As soon as I could be removed, I was taken to Stratford, Ct., where my parents reside. About a month ago, as my health had somewhat improved, I accepted the invitation of Bro. Charles Andrews, (my uncle,) to visit this city. I had often been disgusted with many things that I had seen in the churches, though I had long been a member of one of them; and felt dissatisfied with them and my own self also, and seeing the inconsistencies of professors of religion, I was often tempted to renounce it altogether. I saw that the nominal churches contended more for creeds, than for the truth, and I longed to find a church that took the Bible as their only creed. Thank God! I have found one at last. I was pleased when I found a little company here, who seemed to live religion and made the Scriptures their only rule of faith and practice.

My uncle and his family, consisting of Sisters Andrews and M. and D. Moody were faithful to present the truth to me; but my nerves were so weak, that I could not examine for myself, or listen to them, without having one of my spasmodic turns. We prayed that I might have strength and light given me. That prayer was answered; and I was enabled to some extent, to search the scriptures to see whether these things were so. As far as I was able to examine the points presented, I was convinced that they were true; such as, the unconsciousness of the dead; reckoning of 2300 days, as made by Adventists; the nominal church as the Babylon spoken of in Revelation; the seventh day the only Sabbath of the Lord; and the fulfilling of the signs that proclaim "the coming of the Son of man" to raise the dead, destroy the wicked, and reign on the New Earth. I was surprised at the beauty and simplicity of these truths, and to see what a key they were to scripture. But afterwards came the cross.

To renounce the church and be despised by relatives, friends and classmates seemed more than I could endure. I resorted to prayer; and blessed be God! he gave me the victory over my temptations, and I trust, the following original lines, that came to my mind, are the true sentiments of my heart.

Shall I refuse to bear the cross,
What'er that cross may be;
Since Jesus bore it all alone,
And died thereon for me?

Shall I, for fear of feeble man,
Though all the world deride,
Refuse obeying heaven's command
When God is on my side?

Shall I to gain the world's applause,
Or self-love gratify,
Refuse to own my Saviour's cause,
His sacred truth deny?

No! perish every earthly hope,
And each ambitious plan,
I'll bear my cross, obey my God,
And fear not mortal man.

Shall I because it's best for gain,
Forget the seventh day,
And thus respect the man of sin,
But God's law disobey?

Oh God forbid that I prefer,
A human law, to thine!
What could I answer at thy bar,
For such a heinous crime?

The struggle was as great, as when I first felt my sins forgiven, and the relief no less joyful. I now see why God laid his hand so severely upon me, and I thank him for it. It was to keep me from longer studying error, and to direct my steps where I might hear his truth.

I do not yet see every point clearly; and I am not able to study the Word as much as I would wish, but I hope to "go on to know the Lord" and practice what I know. Pray for me that this may be so.

Yours in search of the truth, J. RUSSELL.
New York, Jan. 2d, 1854.

Obituary.

DIED, in this city, the 16th inst., Sr. Mary Coles, aged 54 years. She had been a Second Advent believer for quite a number of years; and about two years since embraced the Sabbath of the Lord. She endured her last severe illness with great patience and reconciliation, and for several of her last days, was triumphant in God.

A DIALOGUE

Between an Adventist and a Sea Captain.

Adventist. Good morning, Capt., when did you arrive?

Capt. Yesterday. We left Liverpool just three weeks ago.

Adv. All good luck—and pleasant then, I suppose.
Capt. Very: excepting a day or two before we discovered land, it was foggy; but we knew by our reckoning that we must be near land, for by some means it was out three days before we arrived; so we kept a constant watch, with little sail, and steered by compass. The first sign of land we discovered, was the light at Sandy Hook: and about the same time a pilot came alongside. But how do you get along now with Millerism, your time is out—you said I should not have time to get back. But here I am. Now won't you give it up and be rational?

Adv. What would you have me to do? Give up the Lord's coming?

Capt. Yes. Or that he will not come in this day, nor for a thousand years.

Adv. Would you do so in a similar case?

Capt. Surely I would.

Adv. Let us see. Suppose you had said to all hands on board ship, one day before you saw the light at Sandy Hook; down sails—leave the helm, and let the ship go, we have sailed two days since our reckoning was out, there is no land, therefore, let her go. And do so in a way that would convince them that you were in earnest, and meant to be obeyed. What would they think, and what would they do?

Capt. Why they would think I was crazy, and would confine me.

Adv. We do not intend to act like crazy folks. The Lord's not coming quite as soon as we expected, does not convince us that He will never come—nor that his coming is not to be for a thousand years. But we are now placed in a situation similar to yours when your reckoning was out, and we mean to do as you did—keep a strict watch, with low sails, and steer by the Compass God has given, and we are confident that we shall meet with a similar result. The light house will soon appear, "the sign of the Son of man in Heaven," and the Lord in the clouds as sudden as the lightning, and his angels will come alongside and pilot us to glory.—Selected.

THE REVIEW AND HERALD

ROCHESTER, THIRD-DAY, JAN. 24, 1854.

To Correspondents.

1. In writing to this Office, let everything of a business nature be put on a part of the sheet by itself, or on a separate sheet, so as not to be mixed up with other matters.

2. Be careful to write all names of persons and places, plainly and distinctly.

3. In all cases give the name of the Post Office, County and State. When a Town or Village is called by one name, and the Post Office by another, be sure to give the name of the Post Office.

4. When the direction of a paper is to be changed, do not forget to name the Office to which it has been sent.

5. Let everything be stated explicitly, and in as few words as will express the writer's meaning.

6. In writing texts of scripture, be sure to copy from the Bible correctly. It is no small sin to carelessly mangle the Word of God, as some do.

If the above directions are complied with, we shall be saved much time and perplexity, and be less liable to mistakes in transacting the business of the Office.

Many thanks to dear friends at Bedford and Jackson, Mich., for the box of dried fruit, &c., received the 20th by the kindness of Bro. Lane.

We have Bro. E. Everts' Review of the New Time, and our article, headed "My Lord delayeth his coming," in the last Review, in a Tract of 16 pages.

Appointments.

PROVIDENCE permitting, we will hold meetings at Oswego, N. Y., Feb. 4th and 5th; Lorain, the 7th, at 1 and 6 o'clock, P. M.; at the Christian Meeting-house, near Bro. Ira Abhey's in Brookfield the 11th and 12th; Lincklaen, where Bro. may appoint, the 18th and 19th. It is expected that Bro. S. W. Rhodes will attend these meetings with us.

We shall take with us a quantity of publications, to save the Brethren the postage if sent by Mail. JAMES WHITE.

Publications.

The Sanctuary and Twenty-three Hundred Days—76 pages—price 7 cents—postage 1 cent.

Review of O. R. L. Crozier on the Sabbath—48 pages—price 5 cents—postage 1 cent.

A Refutation of the Claims of Sunday-keeping to Divine Authority; also, a lengthy extract from the History of the Sabbath—40 pages—price 4 cents—postage 1 cent.

Signs of the Times—124 pages—price 8 cents.

Our collection of Advent and Sabbath Hymns—144 pages—price 30 cents—postage 5 cents.

Time and Prophecy—a Poem—120 pages, well bound—price 25 cents—postage 5 cents.

A Word for the Sabbath—a Poem—price 6 cents.
The First Day of the Week Not the Sabbath—32 pages—price 3 cents—postage 1 cent.

Christian Experience and Views—price 6 cents.
Supplement to Experience and Views—price 6 cents.
Solemn Appeal—32 pages—price 2 cents—postage 1 cent.

True Picture—state of the Churches—16 pages.
The Sabbath by Elishu—16 pages.
Both Sides—on the Sabbath—16 pages.
The Sabbath by P. Miller Jr.—16 pages.

New Time Theory Reviewed—16 pages.
Volume I, II and III of the REVIEW, bound in paper covers—price 40 cents for Vol. I and II, and 80 cents for Vol. III.

Youth's Instructor, Vol. I, in paper covers—price 25 cents.
THE CHART—A Pictorial Illustration of the Visions of Daniel and John and their Chronology—price \$2.

Tracts of 16 pages each can be sent by mail for one half cent an ounce, in packages not less than 8 ounces. We will send 50 and pay the postage, to one address for 50 cents.

AGENTS.

The following is a list of Agents whose duty it shall be to forward the names and address (in plain writing) of all who should receive the Review; also, to give information of such to whom it should be discontinued. And to receive the free-will offerings of their Brethren and Sisters for the support of the Review and other publications, and forward them to this Office. The traveling Brethren are also solicited to act as agents.

MAINE.		S. Willey, Wheelock.	
N. N. Lunt, Portland.	CONNECTICUT.		
S. W. Flanders, Canaan.	E. L. Chamberlain, Middletown.		
Cyprian Stevens, Paris.	A. Belden, Kensington.		
S. Howland, Topsham.	NEW YORK.		
W. T. Hanniford, Orrington.	J. Byington, Buck's Bridge.		
Wm. Bryant, Wilton.	A. Ross, Caughdenoy.		
NEW HAMPSHIRE.		David Upson, Moreland.	
J. Stowell, Washington.	R. F. Cottrell, Mill Grove.		
S. Bunnel, Claremont.	John Wager, Orangeport.		
MASSACHUSETTS.		L. Carpenter, Oscego.	
O. Nichols, Dorchester.	A. H. Robinson, Sandy Creek.		
O. Davis, Fairhaven.	E. A. Poole, Lincklaen.		
L. Paine, Ware.	J. A. Longhead, Elmira.		
Wm. Saxby, Springfield.	John Hamilton, Fredonia.		
VERMONT.		MICHIGAN.	
R. Loveland, Johnson.	Albert Avery, Locke.		
H. Bingham, Morristown.	Ira Gardner, Vergennes.		
S. H. Peck, Wolcott.	David Hewett, Batle Creek.		
Lewis Bean, Hardwick.	C. S. Glover, Sylvan.		
H. A. Churchill, Stowe.	A. B. Pearsall, Grand Rapids.		
E. P. Butler, Waterbury.	A. A. Dodge, Jackson.		
Josiah Hart, Northfield.	Wm. M. Smith, "		
R. G. Lockwood, Waitsfield.	PENNSYLVANIA.		
W. Morse, East Bethel.	M. L. Dean, Ulysses.		
L. Titus, E. Charlston.	RHODE ISLAND.		
Alonzo Lee, Derby Line.	Ransom Hicks, Providence.		
E. Everts, Vergennes.	CANADA EAST.		
H. Gardner, Pantton.	B. Hills, Melborne.		

Letters.

D. Myers, H. A. Richmond, A. M. Curtis, S. T. Cranson, J. M. Stephenson, B. H. Walworth, J. A. B. Calkins, J. P. Kellogg, J. N. Andrews, J. M. McLellan, T. I. Giddings, J. R. Towle, J. Hart, W. Morse, E. W. Hunt.

Receipts.

A. Burwell, L. Avery, J. M. Porter, Sr. Marks, S. Trent, B. Nichols, W. T. Hannaford, D. Smally, R. Preston, E. Andrews, H. Ricker, A. T. Stevens, A. S. Stevens, P. R. Stevens, H. N. Stevens, F. J. Stevens, E. Richmond, H. Hooper, J. Orange, A. Osgood, J. W. Learned, H. Stocking, J. White-nack, G. Davis, J. Bailey, E. A. Cooper, E. A. Jenks, S. Elmer, D. Phillips, W. Kendall, A. Abbey, J. Wilcox, Sr. Sugar, E. R. Seaman, A. Fife, S. H. Peck, W. M. Smith, L. Smith, each \$1.

N. G. Needham, E. Picket, G. P. Cushman, O. Hart, a Brother, H. P. Wakefield, L. Thomas, T. Coburn, Wm. Dawson, L. Dickinson, M. Dickinson, E. L. Barr, A. Pierce, A. Chaffee, Wm. Camp, each \$2.

H. S. Gurney, J. Place, M. F. Wiswall, each \$3. W. Gifford, R. Coggsball, O. Davis, P. D. Lawrence, J. Hutchins, B. M. Adams, C. Chase, each \$1.50. S. Pierce \$8. F. H. Corwin \$5. D. R. Palmer \$4.75.

J. M. Avery, E. A. Poole, H. L. Dwinell, H. Elliot, O. A. Davis, J. Slawson, H. Page, Sr. Lee, each \$0.50.

W. McClenerthan, H. Cracker, M. Conklin, R. J. Kellogg, V. Peck, each \$0.75. A. L. Burwell \$1.30. R. Earl \$1.40. E. Emerson \$0.65. C. Smith \$1.75.

THE REVIEW AND HERALD

IS PUBLISHED WEEKLY

At South St. Paul Street, Stone's Block,

No. 23, Third Floor.

JOSEPH BATES, J. N. ANDREWS, JOSEPH BAKER,
Publishing Committee.

JAMES WHITE, Editor.

TERMS—We make no charges. Those who wish to pay only the cost of one copy of the REVIEW, (as some choose to do,) may pay \$1.50 a year. Canada subscribers, \$1.75, when the postage is pre-paid.

That we may be able to send the REVIEW to the worthy poor, and to many who have not yet embraced the views it advocates, it will be necessary for all the friends of the cause (who are able) to pay the cost of their own paper, and for many of our readers to pay for one or more others.

All communications, orders, and remittances should be addressed to JAMES WHITE, Ed. of REVIEW, Rochester, N. Y. (post-paid.)