

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. XIV.

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., FIFTH-DAY, JULY 28, 1859.

NO. 10.

THE REVIEW AND HERALD.

IS PUBLISHED WEEKLY

AT BATTLE CREEK, MICH.

J. P. KELLOGG, CYRENIOUS SMITH AND D. R. PALMER,
Publishing Committee.

URIAH SMITH, Resident Editor.

J. N. ANDREWS, JAMES WHITE,
J. H. WAGGONER, R. F. COTTRELL,
and STEPHEN PIERCE, } Corresponding
Editors.

TERMS.—ONE DOLLAR IN ADVANCE FOR A VOLUME OF 26 NOS.
All communications, orders and remittances for
the REVIEW AND HERALD should be addressed to URIAH
SMITH, Battle Creek, Mich.

THE LAW OF LOVE. 2 Kings iv, 3.

Pour forth the oil—pour boldly forth;
It will not fail, until
Thou fallest vessels to provide
Which it may largely fill.

Make channels for the streams of love,
Where they may broadly run;
And love has everflowing streams,
To fill them every one.

But if at any time we cease
Such channels to provide,
The very fountains of love for us
Will soon be parched and dried.

For we must share, if we would keep
That blessing from above;
Ceasing to give we cease to have:—
Such is the law of love.

[R. C. Trench.

HISTORY OF THE SABBATH AND FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK;

SHOWING THE MANNER IN WHICH THE SABBATH
HAS BEEN SUPPLANTED BY THE HEATHEN
FESTIVAL OF THE SUN.

BY J. N. ANDREWS.

CHAPTER VII.

CONSTANTINE'S SUNDAY LAW—IT WAS A PAGAN
EDICT—CONSTANTINE A HEATHEN AT THE
TIME—HIS FITNESS TO LEGISLATE FOR THE
CHURCH—HIS LAW RAISES SUNDAY TO HIGH
AUTHORITY THROUGHOUT THE ROMAN EM-
PIRE.

In the year 321 Constantine having ascended
the throne of the Roman empire, put forth the fol-
lowing edict for Sunday observance:

"Let all the judges and town people, and the
occupation of all trades rest on the venerable day
of the sun; but let those who are situated in the
country, freely and at full liberty attend to the
business of agriculture; because it often happens
that no other day is so fit for sowing corn and
planting vines; lest, the critical moment being let
slip, men should lose the commodities granted by
heaven.*

Another authority confirms this statement: "Con-
stantine the Great made a law for the whole em-
pire (A. D. 321), that Sunday should be kept as a
day of rest in all cities and towns; but he allowed
the country people to follow their work on that
day."†

Respecting this law Moshier bears the follow-
ing important testimony:

"The first day of the week, which was the or-

* Corpus Juris Civilis Constantino, Coss, 321.

† Encyc. Am. art. Sabbath.

dinary and stated time for the public assemblies of
the Christians, was in consequence of a peculiar
law enacted by Constantine, observed with greater
solemnity than it had formerly been."*

This is a striking confirmation of the testimony
already presented that the Sunday festival for a
long period was not a day of abstinence from labor.
The edict of Constantine gave full permission to
all sorts of agricultural labor on that day; yet
says Mosheim it caused the day to be "observed
with greater solemnity than it had formerly been."

The learned Mosier speaks very explicitly with
respect to Sunday observance prior to Constantine's
law. Thus he says: "The Lord's day had no
command that it should be sanctified, but it was
left to God's people to pitch on this or that day
for the public worship. And being taken up and
made a day of meeting for religious exercises, yet
for 300 years there was no law to bind them to it,
and for want of such a law, the day was not whol-
ly kept in abstaining from common business; nor
did they any longer rest from their ordinary af-
fairs (such was the necessity of those times) than
during the divine service."†

Such was the manner of Sunday observance
prior to the time of Constantine. As his law
caused the day to be "observed with greater so-
lemnity than it had formerly been" it is worth our
while to examine the character of this law. We
have the most direct testimony that this was a
pagan edict, and that it did not express the slight-
est regard for the day as a Christian festival. In
other words that it enjoined the pagan festival of
the sun, and did not make any allusion to the day
as a Christian festival. The law as already quoted
is express on this point. It is the venerable day
of the sun that he commanded men to observe.
That there may be no mistake respecting this im-
portant point we quote the testimony of Milman,
the learned editor of Gibbon. Thus he testifies:

"The rescript commanding the celebration of the
Christian Sabbath, bears no allusion to its peculiar
sanctity as a Christian institution. It is the day
of the sun which is to be observed by the general
veneration; the courts were to be closed, and the
noise and tumult of public business and legal lit-
igation were no longer to violate the repose of the
sacred day. But the believer in the new pagan-
ism, of which the solar worship was the charac-
teristic, might acquiesce without scruple in the
sanctity of the first day of the week."‡ And he
adds: "In fact, as we have before observed, the
day of the sun would be willingly hallowed by al-
most all the pagan world."§

We have already spoken of the fact that the
Sunday festival received its chief support from the
fact that the pagan world very generally observed
the day. Hence we see the venerable day of the
sun enjoined for the observance of the whole Ro-
man empire. First-day leaders had sufficient tact
to use this decree for their own especial advan-
tage. That the case may appear in its true light
let us suppose that instead of the first day of the
week, Constantine had enjoined the seventh. And
that instead of calling it the Sabbath of the Lord,
he had termed it by its heathen name, the day of
Saturn; (for this day was dedicated to Saturn by the

* Eccl. Hist. Cent. iv, Part II, chap. iv, § 5.

† Dialogues on the Lord's day, p. 233.

‡ History of Christianity, p. 289.

§ Id. p. 325.

heathens, as first-day was to the sun.) If the sev-
enth day had thus been forced on the world, would
it have been anything else than a heathen festival
to those who were thus compelled to observe it, and
would not the law be justly called a heathen law?
If by reason of such a law, the Sabbath-keepers in
the church had gained the ascendancy, would it
not be due to the power of a heathen law, rather
than to respect for the seventh day as a divine
institution? It was by virtue of just such a hea-
then law that Sunday obtained the pre-eminence
both in church and state. Professed Christians
had the same excuse for adopting it then, that
they have for retaining it now, viz., it was com-
manded by law, and observed by the world. And
they had the same reason for rejecting it then that
we have now, viz., it is a heathen festival that has
stolen the place of the Lord's Sabbath. Such be-
ing the case, even a ripe old age cannot mellow it
into a divine institution, nor make its observance
acceptable obedience to the fourth commandment.

In confirmation of what has been said of this
edict as a heathen law, we shall show that Con-
stantine himself was a heathen when this law was
enacted, and that he remained such for several
years. His pagan character is thus described by
Gibbon: "His liberality restored and enriched
the temples of the gods; the medals which is-
sued from his imperial mint are impressed with
the figures and attributes of Jupiter and Apollo,
of Mars and Hercules; and his filial piety in-
creased the council of Olympus by the solemn
apotheosis of his father Constantius. But the de-
votion of Constantine was more peculiarly direct-
ed to the genius of the sun, the Apollo of Greek
and Roman mythology; and he was pleased to be
represented with the symbols of the god of light
and poetry. . . . The altars of Apollo were
crowned with the votive offerings of Constantine;
and the credulous multitude were taught to be-
lieve, that the emperor was permitted to behold
with mortal eyes the visible majesty of their tut-
elar deity. . . . The sun was universally
celebrated as the invincible guide and protector
of Constantine."* In a note on the same page
Gibbon says: "The panegyric of Eumenus us,
which was pronounced a few months before the
Italian war, abounds with the most unexception-
able evidence of the pagan superstition of Constan-
tine, and of his particular veneration for Apollo,
or the sun."

Moshier bears an important testimony on this
point. It will be noticed that he placed Constan-
tine's conversion two years later than his Sunday
laws. Thus he says:

"After well considering the subject, I have
come to the conclusion, that *subsequently to the
death of Licinius in the year 323 when Constan-
tine found himself sole emperor, he became an ab-
solute Christian*, or one who believes no religion
but the Christian to be acceptable to God. He
had previously considered the religion of one God
as more excellent than the other religions, and be-
lieved that Christ ought especially to be worshiped:
yet he supposed there were also inferior deities,
and that to these some worship might be paid, in
the manner of the fathers, without fault or sin. And
who does not know, that in those times, many others
also combined the worship of Christ with that of
the ancient gods, whom they regarded as the min-

* Dec. and Fall of the Roman empire, chap. xx.

isters of the supreme God in the government of human and earthly affairs."*

Marsh, in his *Ecclesiastical History* speaks of Constantine's religious character as follows: "The religious sincerity of the man, who in a short period effected such amazing changes in the religious world, is best known to Him who searches the heart. Certain it is that his subsequent life furnished no evidence of conversion to God. He waded without remorse through seas of blood, and was a most tyrannical prince."†

If any further confirmation of the pagan character of his Sunday law is asked for, we cite two or three items relating to it. Thus Gibbon says: "He artfully balanced the hopes and fears of his subjects, by publishing in the same year two edicts; the first of which enjoined the solemn observance of Sunday, and the second directed the regular consultation of the *Aruspices*."‡ And in the margin of that page he says: "Constantine styles the Lord's day *dies solis*, [i. e., day of the sun,] a name which could not offend the ears of his pagan subjects." In other words, the same year that he enjoined the solemn observance of the venerable day of the sun, he directed the regular consultation of the *Aruspices*, i. e., divination by examining the entrails of beasts slaughtered in sacrifice to the gods? A noble set of well-matched edicts.

Of this latter edict Jortin says: "There is a law of Constantine, which shows that himself was not altogether free from pagan superstition, in which he orders the *Aruspices* to be consulted if any public edifice was struck with lightning."§

And Milman says of it: "In case of the royal palace being struck by lightning, the ancient ceremonies of propitiating the deity were to be practiced, and the *Aruspices* were to declare the meaning of the awful portent."||

That this Sunday legislator deserves the appellation of heathen rather than of Christian will hardly be disputed. A few words respecting him as a man will complete our view of his fitness to legislate for the church. This man when elevated to the highest place of earthly power caused his eldest son Crispus to be privately murdered, lest the fame of the son should eclipse that of the father. In the same ruin was involved his nephew Licinius, "whose rank was his only crime, and this was followed by the execution perhaps of a guilty wife."¶

Such was the man who did more than any of his predecessors to elevate Sunday to that rank which it has since possessed. The dragon of the Apocalypse thus issued its edict, and the world has bowed before it. In subsequent chapters we shall trace the persistent efforts of kings, emperors, popes, and councils to compel the world to submit to this pagan institution. We shall find at a period a little subsequent to the Reformation, that grave doctors of divinity come forward to prove that Sunday-keeping is acceptable obedience to the fourth commandment. During all this period we shall find a remnant still retaining the ancient Sabbath of Jehovah.

CHAPTER VIII.

KIND OF SUNDAY OBSERVANCE WHICH OBTAINED AFTER CONSTANTINE—AN OBSOLETE SUNDAY ARGUMENT—SABBATH IN THE FOURTH AND FIFTH CENTURIES—DECREES OF EMPERORS AND COUNCILS IN BEHALF OF SUNDAY.

It is very evident that Sunday became a day of rest from secular business after centuries of effort to bring about that result. Kitto speaks thus of Sunday observance in the period of the ancient church, and the ages following:

"Though in later times we find considerable reference to a sort of consecration of the day, it does not seem at any period of the ancient church

to have assumed the form of such an observance as some modern religious communities have contended for. Nor do these writers in any instance pretend to allege any divine command, or even apostolic practice, in support of it. Chrysostom (A. D. 360) concludes one of his Homilies by dismissing his audience to their respective ordinary occupations. The council of Laodicea (A. D. 364), however, enjoined Christians to rest [σχαλᾶσθαι] on the Lord's day. To the same effect is an injunction in the forgery called the *Apostolical Constitution*, (vii, 24), and various later enactments from A. D. 600 to A. D. 1100, though by no means extending to the prohibition of all secular business."*

In the fifth century Sunday labor was not deemed any violation of the day. St. Jerome speaks thus of the lady Paula, his especial disciple: "Paula with the women, as soon as they returned home on the Lord's day, sat down severally to their work, and made clothes severally for themselves and others."†

Morer justifies this Sunday work with the frank confession that the number of hours assigned for piety was not then well explained. That is, the church had not yet legislated sufficiently upon this subject. Thus he says:

"If we read that they did any work on the Lord's day, it is to be remembered that this application to their daily tasks, was not till their worship was quite over, when they might with innocency enough resume them, because the length of time or the number of hours assigned for piety was not then so well explained as in after ages."‡

Morer bears the following important testimony concerning Jerome's time: "Christianity had got into the throne, as well as into the empire. Yet for all this, the entire sanctification of the Lord's day proceeded slowly: and that it was the work of time to bring it to perfection, appears from the several steps the church made in her constitutions, and from the decrees of emperors and other princes, wherein the prohibitions from servile and civil business, advanced by degrees from one species to another till the day got a considerable figure in the world."§

It seems that at this time there were two classes of Sunday teachers; the one strenuously laboring to make Sunday a day of entire abstinence from business; the other wishing it to be kept as a festival in which, when not assembled for worship, it should be proper to engage in usual business. The festival party in the third provincial council of Orleans obtained an enactment (canon 21) which "allowed many sorts of innocent work to be done upon the day. This was in the reign of Childebert."||

But the stricter sort were not to be put down in this manner. Lacking scripture to sustain themselves, they presented the following weighty argument, which from some cause, modern first-day advocates have forgotten. For their benefit we present it in the words of Morer: "Yet still the others went on their way; and to induce their proselytes to spend the day with greater exactness and care, they brought in the old argument of compassion and charity to the damned in hell, who during the day, have some respite from their torments, and the ease and liberty they have is more or less, according to the zeal and degrees of keeping it well."¶

And not satisfied with this most powerful argument, they back it up with miracles, and as we shall presently see, with judgments and calamities also. Thus Morer testifies: "For fear the doctrine should not take without miracles to support it, Gregory of Tours furnishes us with several to that purpose."**

That the Sabbath was very generally observed at the close of the fourth, and the commencement of the fifth, century, is evident from the following

*Cyclopedia Biblical Literature, art. Lord's day.

†Dialogues on the Lord's day, p. 234.

‡Id. p. 236.

§Id. pp. 236, 237.

||Id. p. 67.

¶Id. p. 68.

**Id. p. 68.

language of the historian Socrates, who lived at that time. He says: "For although almost all churches throughout the world celebrate the sacred mysteries on the Sabbath of every week, yet the Christians of Alexandria and at Rome, on account of some ancient tradition, refuse to do this. The Egyptians in the neighborhood of Alexandria, and the inhabitants of Thebais, hold their religious meetings on the Sabbath, but do not participate of the mysteries in the manner usual among Christians in general."*

And Lardner adds: "Sozomen, about the same time, says likewise, that at Constantinople, and almost everywhere, except Rome and Alexandria, Christians assembled on the Sabbath, as well as on the first day of the week."†

It will now be proper to trace the edicts of emperors and kings in support of Sunday; then we will notice those of the councils of the church.

Constantine's law, A. D. 321, which was the first of the kind, has been noticed already. "About the year 381," says Morer, "Gratian, Valentinian, and Theodosius being emperors, an edict came forth to prohibit all shows on the Lord's day."‡

A. D. 469. The emperor Leo published an edict in which he says: "The Lord's day we decree to be a venerable day, and therefore free it of all citations, executions, pleadings, and the like avocations. Let not the circus or theatre be opened, nor combatting with wild beasts be seen on it. . . . If any will presume to offend in the premises, if he be a military man, let him lose his commission; or if other, let his estate or goods be confiscated." And this emperor determined to mend the breach in Constantine's law, and thus prohibit agriculture on Sunday. So he adds: "We command therefore all, as well husbandmen as others, to forbear work on this day of our restoration."§

Morer says of Burgundy and France: "In the year 588, Gunthrum, king of Burgundy, and about two years after, Clotaire, king of France, and two centuries forward, Pepin, another king of France, made laws to the same effect."||

Ninth century. Various Sunday laws were enacted in this century. Thus Morer says that Charlemagne "published this edict: We do ordain, as it is required in the law of God, that no man do any servile work on the Lord's day. . . . This law was backed with the authority of the church; yet in a little time, by the remissness of Lewis his successor, it became very feeble. Thereupon an address was made to the emperors, Lewis and Lotharius, that they would send out some precept more severe than what was hitherto extant, to strike terror into their subjects, and force them to forbear their ploughing, pleading, and marketing, then grown again into use; which was done about the year 863; and to that end a synod was called at Rome under the popedom of Leo IV.

"In this century the emperor [of Constantinople] Leo, surnamed the philosopher, restrained the works of husbandry, which, according to Constantine's toleration, were permitted in the east. This same care was taken in the west, by Theodorus, king of the Bavarians, who made this order, that 'If any person on the Lord's day yoked his oxen, or drove his wain, his right side ox should be forthwith forfeited; or if he made hay and carried it in, he was to be twice admonished to desist, which if he did not he was to receive no less than fifty stripes.' About the year 1174, the emperor Emanuel Comnenus, [of Constantinople,] confirmed the decrees of his predecessors."¶

It is a first day historian who writes the above. He adds: "Thus the civil power proceeded. Nor was the church backward to assist in a point that so much concerned her well being. And therefore we find a great many canons [of councils] on the same subjects. . . .

"About the year 364 sat the council of Laodicea, which required Christians not to Judaize in keeping the Sabbath, but prefer the Lord's day before it, and thereon rest from labor, if they could."**

*Ecl. Hist., Book v, Chap. 22.

†Credibility of the Gospel History, Vol. x, Chap. 85.

‡Dialogues on the Lord's Day, p. 258.

§Id. pp. 259, 260.

||Id. p. 260. ¶Id. pp. 261, 262. **Id. page 262.

*Historical Commentaries, Cent. iv, § 7.

†Period iii, Chap. 5.

‡Dec. and Fall, Chap. xx.

§Ecl. Hist., Vol. i, § xxxi.

||Hist. of Christianity, p. 290.

¶Dec. and Fall, Chap. xviii.

This law of the church against Sabbath-keeping shows that there were observers of the Sabbath at this time, and also indicates a stricter observance of Sunday.

Morer proceeds: "About the year 401 was held the fourth council of Carthage, which punished those with excommunication, who, neglecting the solemn worship of God on this and other sacred times, spent the day in plays and the like diversions. And in another council in the same city not long after, it was the request of the bishops to the emperors, 'that all sights and shows should be laid aside on the Lord's day.'

"Under Clodovius, king of France, met the bishops in the first council of Orleans, where they obliged themselves and their successors, to be always at church on the Lord's day except in sickness. . . . By a council at Arragon about the year 518, it was decreed that no bishop should pass judgment in any civil controversy on the Lord's day. . . . The third council of Orleans resolved that men should rest on that day, from husbandry, dressing vines, sowing, reaping, hedging and the like. . . . "And because, notwithstanding all this care the day was not duly observed, the bishops were again summoned to Maseon in Burgundy by king Gunthrum, and there they framed this canon: 'Notice is taken that Christian people, very much neglect the Lord's day, giving themselves as on other days to common work, to redress which irreverence, we warn every Christian who bears not that name in vain, to give ear to our advice, knowing we have a concern on us for your good, and a power to hinder you to do evil. Keep then the Lord's day, the day of our new birth.'

"About a year forward, there was a council at Narbon, which forbid all persons of what country or quality soever to do any servile work on the Lord's day. But if any man presumed to disobey this canon he was to be fined if a freeman, and if a servant, severely lashed. . . . In the year 590 a synod was held at Auxerre in Champain, where it was decreed that "no man should be allowed to plow nor cart or do any such thing on the Lord's day.' . . . The third council of Toledo took notice in their canons of a great neglect of the Lord's day in Spain."*

Gregory the great was pope from 590 to 604.† He exhorted the people to "expiate on the day of our Lord's resurrection what was remissly done for six days before."‡

Morer may be allowed to continue this account. He says: "At Chalons in Burgundy, about the year 654 there was a provincial synod which decreed that 'none shall plow or reap on the Lord's day, or do any other thing belonging to husbandry on pain of the censures of the church;' which was the more minded, because backed with the secular power, and by an edict menacing such as offended herein; who if bondmen, were to be soundly beaten, but if free, had three admonitions, and then if faulty, lost the third part of their patrimony, and if still obstinate were made slaves for the future. . . . The twelfth council of Toledo in Spain forbid the Jews to keep their own festivals, but so far at least observed the Lord's day as to do no manner of work on it whereby they might express their contempt of Christ or his worship."§

These were weighty reasons indeed for Sunday observance. Nor can it be thought strange that in the dark ages a constant succession of such things should eventuate in the universal observance of that day. Even the Jews were to be compelled to desist from Sabbath observance and to honor Sunday by resting that day.

According to Morer the sixth general council at Constantinople in the year 692 decreed "that if any bishop or other clergyman, or any of the laity absented himself from the church three Sundays together, if a clergyman, he was to be deposed; if a layman, debarred the holy communion."|| And he adds:

*Id. pp. 263-266.
† Bowers' History of the Popes, Vol. I, pp. 390-424.
‡ Dialogues on the Lord's Day, p. 282.
§ Id. p. 267. || Id. p. 268.

"At Dingosolinum, a synod met about 772 which decreed that if any man shall work his cart on this day, or do any such common business, his team shall be presently forfeited to the public use, and if the party persists in his folly, let him be sold for a bondman. . . . Charlemagne summoned the bishops to Friuli in Italy where they decreed that all people should with due reverence and devotion honor the Lord's day. . . . Under the same prince another council was called three years later at Frankford in Germany, and there the limits of the Lord's day were determined from Saturday evening to Sunday evening."*

The five councils of Mentz, Rheims, Tours, Chalons and Arles were all called in the year 813 by Charlemagne. It would be too irksome to the reader to dwell upon the several acts of these councils in behalf of Sunday. They are of the same character as those already quoted. The council of Chalons however is worthy of being noticed in that, according to Morer,

"They entreated the help of the secular power and desired the emperor [Charlemagne] to provide for the stricter observation of it. Which he accordingly did and left no stone unturned, to secure the honor of the day. His care succeeded; and during his reign the Lord's day bore a considerable figure. But after his day it put on another face."†

The aid of the pope was very acceptable at this juncture. The same historian says in continuation of the story: "And thereupon pope Eugenius in a synod held at Rome about 826 gave directions that the parish priest should admonish such offenders and wish them to go to church and say their prayers, lest otherwise they might bring some great calamity on themselves and neighbors."‡

All this however was not sufficient and so another council was summoned. At this council the famous lightning argument of Justin Edwards was made use of. Thus our author continues: "But these paternal admonitions turning to little account, a provincial council was held at Paris three years after in 829, wherein the prelates complain that 'the Lord's day was not kept with reverence as became religion, which was the reason that God had sent several judgments on them, and in a very remarkable manner punished some people for slighting and abusing it. For (say they) many of us by our own knowledge, and some by hearsay know, that several countrymen following their husbandry on this day have been killed with lightning, others being siezed with convulsions in their joints have miserably perished. Whereby it is apparent how high the displeasure of God was upon their neglect of this day.' And they conclude that 'in the first place the priests and ministers, then kings and princes, and all faithful people be beseeched to use their utmost endeavors and care that the day be restored to its honor, and for the credit of Christianity more devoutly observed for the time to come.'"§

"It was decreed about seven years after," says Morer, "in a council under Lewis the godly, that neither pleadings nor marriages should be allowed on the Lord's day."||

Three years after this, in another synod at Rome under pope Leo IV it "was ordered more exactly that no man should from thenceforth keep or frequent markets on the Lord's day, no not for things to be presently eaten, nor to do any work belonging to husbandry."¶

A. D. 858. "The Bulgarians," says Morer, "sent some questions to pope Nicholas, to which they desired answers. And that [answer] which concerned the Lord's day was that they should desist from all secular work."**

A. D. 895. The council of Friburgh in Germany, under pope Formasus decreed that the

*Id. pp. 268, 269.
† Id. p. 270.
‡ Id. p. 271.
§ Id. p. 271.
|| Id. p. 272.
¶ Id. p. 272.
** Id. p. 273.

Lord's day men "were to spend in prayers and devote wholly to the service of God, who otherwise might be provoked to anger."*

A. D. 1050. A council was held at Coy in Spain, under Ferdinand king of Castile, in the days of pope Leo IX, where it was decreed that the Lord's day "was to be entirely consecrated to hearing of mass."†

"The council of Lyons sat about the year 1244, and it restrained the people from their ordinary work on the Lord's day, and other festivals on pain of ecclesiastical censures."

A. D. 1282. "The council of Angeois in France forbid millers by water or otherwise to grind their corn from Saturday evening till Sunday evening."‡

A. D. 1322. This year a synod was called at Valladolid in Castile, and then was ratified what was formerly required, that none should follow husbandry, or exercise himself in any mechanical employment on the Lord's day, or other holy days, but where it was a work of necessity or charity, of which the minister of the parish was to be judge.§

A. D. 1532. The council of Bourges uses this language: "The Lord's day and other festivals were instituted for this purpose, that faithful Christians abstaining from external work, might more freely, and with greater piety devote themselves to God's worship."|| They forgot, however, that when the fear of God is taught by the precept of men such worship will not be accepted. Isa. xxix, 13; Matt. xv, 9.

The council of Rheims, which sat the next year, made this decree: "Let the people assemble at their parish churches, on the Lord's day, and other holidays, and be present at mass, sermons and vespers. Let no man on these days give himself to plays or dances, especially during service." And the historian adds: "In the same year another synod at Tours, ordered the Lord's day and other holidays to be reverently observed under pain of excommunication."¶

A. D. 1534. In a synod which assembled this year the truth was thus confessed: "Let all Christians remember that the seventh day was consecrated by God, and hath been received and observed, not only by the Jews, but by all others who pretend to worship God; though we Christians have changed their Sabbath into the Lord's day. A day therefore to be kept, by forbearing all worldly business, suits, contracts, carriages, &c., and by sanctifying the rest of mind and body, in the contemplation of God and things divine, we are to do nothing but works of charity, say prayers and sing psalms."**

We have thus traced Sunday observance in the Catholic church down to a period subsequent to the reformation. That it is an ordinance of man which has usurped the place of the Bible Sabbath is most distinctly confessed by the council last quoted. Yet they endeavor to make amends for their violation of the Sabbath by spending Sunday in charity, prayers and psalms: a course too often adopted at the present time to excuse the violation of the fourth commandment. Who can read this long list of Sunday laws, not from the "one lawgiver who is able to save and to destroy," but from emperors and councils, without adopting the sentiment of Neander: "The festival of Sunday, like all other festivals, was always only a human ordinance?" The efforts to establish Sunday observance in England will next engage our attention.

*Id. p. 274.

†Id. p. 274.

‡Id. p. 275.

§Id. p. 275.

||Id. p. 279.

¶Id. p. 280.

**Id. p. 282.

God always proceeds orderly; to every thing there is a season and a time; he never sends an unseasonable trouble, nor an unsuitable mercy; trials and comforts are always well timed. Do you believe this?

THE REVIEW AND HERALD.

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

BATTLE CREEK, FIFTH-DAY, JULY 28, 1859

HISTORY vs. FORGERY.

THE reader is prepared this week to hear from "Awleph" a few more contradictions of plain statements of history, on a subject where passion and prejudice are allowed to supply the place of argument. We bring up the statements of this writer, while Bro. Andrews' history is before the reader, to show that it is not a man of straw that is being demolished by a disproof of the authorities upon which first-day observers usually rest, touching the history of their institution, by presenting a recent and actual example of the use that is made of them, and the confidence with which they are urged. Had "Awleph" been anything more than a servile copyist of the errors of those who have preceded him in blind devotion to tradition, he would have been saved from making the declarations he has. The danger of such a course is shown in the falsity of the testimony which has thus become current for the genuine history. Great must be their credulity who can imagine that a stream rising where the "mystery of iniquity" was already at work, and continuing through the dark ages of papal usurpation and superstition, can be otherwise than impure. The waters of this stream, we can assure them, are brackish; and no Elisha can be found to cast in the all-healing salt to render them sweet and pure.

But to the question. In last week's REVIEW the epistles of Barnabas, Pliny, Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Tertullian, &c., were expressly noticed. We find all these sources unsuspectingly appealed to by A., in favor of Sunday. Of Ignatius he speaks thus:

"Ignatius, who was born in Syria, educated under St. John, ordained bishop of Antioch by St. Paul, A. D. 67, and suffered martyrdom at Rome, A. D. 107, has written decidedly in favor of this change. In his epistle to the Magnesians, he declares it to be absurd and erroneous for a Christian to Judaize, that is, to keep the Jewish Sabbath, and after showing the difference between Judaism and Christianity, he expostulates thus: 'Let us not sabbatize, but keep the Lord's day on which our Life arose.'"

Last week the original of this testimony of Ignatius was given, which showed that the word day never would have appeared there if fraud had not placed it there. There is nothing said about the first day whatever in his testimony. Nevertheless, says "Awleph," he "has written decidedly in favor of the change."

He continues: "Barnabas, St. Paul's companion, says, 'We observe the eighth day with gladness, on which Jesus rose from the dead.' The early Christian writers often called the first-day Sabbath the *eighth day*, because it is the next day after the seventh."

The so-called epistle of Barnabas not only from its own inherent character, but from the testimony of many witnesses, is shown to be a gross forgery. But we must hear his version of Justin Martyr:

"Justin, surnamed the Martyr, one of the earliest writers of the Christian church, who was born at Neapolis, in the province of Samaria, converted to Christianity about A. D. 132, and beheaded for the Christian religion under Marcus Aurelius, 167, is very explicit on this subject. In his dialogue with Trypho, he says that the Christians did not keep the Jewish Sabbath; but in two places, in nearly the same words, in his apologies for the Christians, he speaks of the first day as the Christian Sabbath. In his first apology he says: 'On Sunday we all assemble and meet together, as being the first day wherein God, parting the darkness from the rude chaos, created the world, and the same day whereon Jesus Christ our Saviour, rose from the dead; for he was crucified on the day before Saturday, and the day after, which is Sunday, he appeared to his apostles and disciples.' Justin says again, 'On the day called Sunday we all assemble in one place, both those who live in the city, and they who dwell in the country, where the memoirs of the apostles and writings of the prophets are read so long as time permits.' He then gives an account of the sermon delivered by the bishop at the same meeting, the concluding prayer the

celebration of the Lord's supper, and the weekly collections for the support of widows and orphans, the sick, the poor, and all who were necessitous. This father often declares that it was the uniform practice of the Christians of his day, to observe the first day as their weekly Sabbath, but the seventh he says they did not observe."

The reader will recollect the extremely doubtful character of the works ascribed to Justin, and that he was a no-Sabbath man, heaping the most ridiculous abuse upon the Sabbath institution itself, and giving no divine reason for Sunday; yet, it is claimed that he is "very explicit on this subject."

"Awleph" also quotes from Irenaeus, Dionysius, Clement, Eusebius, Athanasius, &c., on the side of a Sunday Sabbath. But Sunday-keepers make a ludicrous mistake in this; for it must be confessed that the import of all their testimony is for no Sabbath. They speak of the Sabbath as abolished, and of the first day, not as taking the place of it, or engrossing the authority of the fourth commandment, but as directly opposed to, and contrasted with, it; which sufficiently attests the grievous wolfishness of their nature. Acts xx, 27. We have not space here to give any of their language; but whoever quotes them in support of Sunday as a divinely appointed Sabbath, knows not the work in which he is engaged.

Our quotations this week are from the "Wesleyan" of Aug. 4, 1858. In the number for Aug. 18, the writer introduces, as might be expected, fresh from Edward's Sabbath Manual, that famous quotation, "Dominicum servasti? &c. Hast thou kept the Lord's day? I am a Christian: I cannot omit it." This has long been bandied about like a poor orphan of whose pedigree people were either ignorant or ashamed. But the reader was last week made acquainted with its parentage. It was conceived and brought forth in fraud. Fraud was its father and mother; and being once fairly started in the world, ignorance has since been its nurse and supporter.

Thus we have spread before us the field usually entered by Sunday historians; and we know how to close it against them. Fraud or perversion may be stamped on nearly all their witnesses. But we will not anticipate the history. We are confident the reader will lose none of his interest in the subject as he continues to trace the steps by which Sunday, like an artful usurper, has made a shift, as occasion required to maintain its existence and supremacy.

SABBATH DISCUSSION.

HAVING learned that the Discussion on the Sabbath question between Bro. Waggoner and Eld. Stephenson at Crane's Grove, Ills., in Aug., 1858, was being published, we sent for a copy which after some delay has at length arrived. It is not our province to make remarks concerning it which would anticipate or interfere with what will want to be said by those more immediately concerned in this matter; but we trust we can without doing this give utterance to our first impressions on receiving it.

Considering the advertisement we had seen of the book, and the price at which it was set, *thirty-five cents*, we were astonished at its size and appearance. Containing 124 pages, though somewhat larger in length and breadth than our common book page, it has neither the amount of reading matter, nor the weight, of Sabbath Tracts Nos. 1-4, or the Atonement, books which this Office sells for 15 cents. *Thirty-five cents!* Stephenson and Collings, publishers! Surely, we can but exclaim, are these the men who have cried "Speculation" against this Office on account of the prices put upon its publications?

But to come to the discussion itself. We find Bro. Waggoner's opening speech of one hour, occupying about a page and a quarter. This the reporter excuses from his not being on the ground at the commencement. The remaining speeches occupy on an average about $3\frac{1}{2}$ pages each. One remarkable feature of these is that Eld. S.'s remarks occupy from one half to a whole page more in each instance than Bro. W.'s. It may be said that this is because Eld. S. was the most rapid speaker. Those who attempt to get over the difficulty in this way, will have to explain another anomaly; thus, we always supposed that the more rapid the

speech, the more imperfect the report, especially by an inexperienced reporter. On this ground Eld. S.'s reported remarks should be the most imperfect of the two, contain the most breakages, long dashes and omissions. Is this the case? So far from it, all these imperfections seem to have accumulated on Bro. W.'s side. We merely state these facts, and leave the reader to draw his own inferences as to their cause.

We can also judge something of the fullness of the report. The reporter states that in one instance Eld. S. reached the rate of 200 words per minute. At this rate, the most that is reported of any one speech could not have occupied in utterance over eight minutes. But we will allow the speakers a rate of only 150 words per minute, at which rate what is reported of each speech would have been spoken in about ten minutes. It can be read in that time, and was probably spoken as fast, if not faster, than one would naturally peruse it. We may therefore safely conclude, the speeches being each one-half hour in length, that we have about one third of what was uttered on the occasion. A report so meager can of course furnish no adequate idea of the arguments used.

Finally, we set out to read it. By dint of patience and perseverance we succeeded in reaching the 57th page, when we found our stock of interest so completely exhausted that we had to abandon all further attempts to finish it; and there it hangs by the gills. The reader has our experience in reference to the Crane's Grove Discussion.

A CONTRAST.

THE Psalmist said that the dead praise not the Lord; [Ps. cxv, 17;] and Peter and Paul both teach that the saints are crowned at the appearing of Jesus. 1 Pet. v, 4; 2 Tim. iv, 8. Mark the contrast between this inspired testimony and the following extract from a sermon of Rev. Mr. Cowan, a Presbyterian minister at the funeral of Mr. Benton, at St. Louis.

"Dear friends, your loss is his infinite gain. He is now perfectly and for ever free from sorrow, toil and pain. His sun has risen to set no more. His day has dawned never to be succeeded by another night. The last storm has spent its fury upon him. The sea of life he has crossed, and is now safely moored in the haven of eternal rest. His bliss is complete. His coronation day is passed. A crown of glory is his.

"He has been attired from heaven's wardrobe. He is clothed in peerless, spotless white. He has joined the choir of the redeemed. He has attuned his voice to the sweet music of the skies.

'Hark! the thrilling symphonies
Scem, methinks, to sieze us.'"

See *Christian Watchman and Reflector*, May 6, 1858.

J. N. A.

TENT MEETING AT DELTA, OHIO.

OUR meetings commenced here under somewhat unfavorable circumstances, on account of the slanderous reports circulated against us. The youth took advantage of the reports thus raised against us, and made so much noise and disturbance that we could be heard with great difficulty. This, however, was mostly corrected by those who saw the reproach it would bring on the community; and finally, our lectures on Spiritualism completely removed the feeling against us, as it was on this point we had been particularly assailed.

Mr. Bowman, the editor of the *Truth Seeker*, of Angola, Ind., attempted to defend Spiritualism, but an exposure of his perversions of Scripture made the triumph of the truth more complete. From this time on the attendance and interest were good, not only from the village, but from the surrounding country, notwithstanding the extreme heat and hurry of the harvest came on in the midst of our meetings. Some farmers, after the labors of the day, came six miles, and females attended almost regularly, walking four or five miles, and returning in the same manner.

Eld. Collier, of the M. E. church, from Toledo, took occasion to express his grief at our course in endeavoring, as he claimed, to destroy the influence of those who are preaching the gospel in its purity, and thus bringing in the millennium! In closing he said if Sunday-keeping was a tradition, it was attended with good results, as might be seen in the harmony and progress of this *great people*, all in the observance of the first day of the week.

We briefly replied to his statements, that the millennial theory was a fable, according to the declarations of Christ and his apostles; that by their inconsistencies they were destroying, or had destroyed, their own influence, as they opposed by argument and practice the keeping of the fourth commandment, the perpetuity of which his own church endorsed; and that every argument used to prove that Sunday was the Sabbath, was no better than an announcement to the world that the plainest declarations of the Bible may be evaded. We closed by appealing from the *custom of a great people to the law of the great God*, and invited all to meet the question on this issue!

Others have promised to prove the propriety of Sunday-keeping at some future time, but will not say a word while we are here. But the people's eyes are open to the reason of this course.

About twenty-five have firmly decided to keep the Sabbath, and many others are well convinced and deeply convicted of duty. Of some of these we have hope that they will yet obey the truth. The interest is still such that we do not feel warranted in entirely leaving the field, and have therefore concluded to not pitch the tent till next week. By that time the press of labor will be over, and a better attendance may be expected.

Seven were baptized yesterday.

J. H. W.

TENT MEETING AT RICHMOND, IOWA.

THIS meeting continued over three Sabbaths, and most of the time there was good attendance and a good interest manifested. Much of the time the weather was very rainy, and the wind very hard. Our stakes gave way once, and the tent top was torn the entire length, and once the center pole was thrown down by some enemy's cutting a rope in the night. We were several times interrupted by ministers contradicting and speaking out or whispering to the annoyance of both speaker and hearers. They sent for the most talented Methodist minister in the State to come and take up against us; but he condescended to such low black-guard and slang that even many of his own members were disgusted with his sermon. The cause of truth was advanced by the effort.

On the last day of the meeting a vote was taken to know how many were willing to acknowledge that we had preached the truth there, and about fifty rose up. Then all were requested to rise who were decided to keep the Sabbath, and only about fifteen or twenty new ones arose. About six or seven hundred persons were present and most of them repaired to the water to witness the baptismal scene, which was one of unusual solemnity. Many were affected to tears while humble souls bowed to the yoke of Christ.

After returning from the water we found the interest so great that Bro. Hull concluded to stay another week, and occupy one of the two-meeting houses which were freely offered. It is due that we here state that the regular Baptist minister of the place, from the beginning pursued a course in relation to our meetings every way becoming a gentleman and a Christian. He supplied himself with our publications for investigation, and it is to be hoped that he will come out on the right side. About \$15 worth of books were taken, and eight subscribed for the *Review*. Bro. Hull will finish the report after his meetings are through.

M. E. CORNELL.

BRO. HULL'S REPORT.

DEAR BRO. SMITH: While awaiting the arrival of the stage I thought I would write a few lines to the brethren.

I am fully persuaded that the Lord is willing to work in this State. 1st. From the fact that freedom is given them in speaking. 2d. From the interest manifested to hear, and 3d, from the wrath of the dragon.

After the tent was taken down in Richmond, I was, by the solicitation of many citizens, persuaded to stay one more week and preach in the Baptist church. The result was good. The Lord's Spirit was present from first to last, and notwithstanding the weather was very hot the church was crowded every night. Some others decided to keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. Our Sabbath meetings were well attended, and filled with good testimonies from those who have just started in the good way. To the Lord be all the praise.

The behaviour was generally good, with the exception of two or three ministers who were evidently in much trouble on account of their craft. One Methodist minister broke in upon me as many as twenty times in my last discourse. The reason was obvious. He had preached a discourse in the forenoon on the change of the Sabbath which I was reviewing, and of course it made him uneasy. But the very large audience which were in attendance could see where the testimony and Spirit of the Lord was.

One man (Campbellite) who has been following us for six months with a challenge to debate the Sabbath question, came with the endorsement of his party, and I consented to spend one day in debating with him. I am certain that the congregation could see, notwithstanding he had the counsel of the leading ministers of three denominations, that he failed to prove the abolition of all, or either one, of the ten commandments. Although the man with whom I debated seemed to be a candid man, his friends manifested their faith in the abolition of God's law by bearing false witness against their neighbors. They put in circulation some of the most barefaced falsehoods they could think of. But even this resulted in good. M. HULL.

Washington, Iowa, July 11th, 1859.

MARK OF THE BEAST, AND SEAL OF THE LIVING GOD.

UPON the announcement of this subject, the objection may arise in the mind, that we cannot tell what the mark of the beast is—that there are various opinions respecting it, and that we cannot settle down with assurance and certainty upon anything in relation to it. In reply to this it is sufficient to say, that God has given, in his word, a most solemn warning against the reception of the mark of the beast, accompanied with the most awful threatening of his unmingled wrath against all who do not heed the warning. Rev. xiv, 9-12. It would be unjust in God thus to threaten men, while it is impossible for them to ascertain the meaning of the terms of the warning. Hence, with the full assurance of the justice and reasonableness of all God's requirements and threatenings, we unhesitatingly say, we can understand what the mark of the beast is. The word of God, with the fulfillment in history of some of its prophecies, amply furnish us in this matter; so that we can arrive, not merely to an opinion, but to full assurance of faith. No matter if your learned minister can give you no light on this subject. He may possibly be of that class of shepherds described by the prophet Isaiah: "shepherds that cannot understand." Chap. lvi, 9-12. Or, as Paul expresses it, "ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth." 2 Tim. iii, 7. But the angel declared to Daniel, concerning these last days, "The wise shall understand." Chap. xii, 10. "The time of the end" has arrived, and the warning voice of the third angel [Rev. xiv, 9-12] is already being heard. Consequently the time is fully come for us to know what the mark of the beast is, that we may avoid it, and escape the threatened wrath.

The terms, mark, and sign, are synonymous in signification, both being defined, by Webster, by the word token. The scriptural use of the term seal is the same. In proof of this we refer to Rom. iv, 11, where Paul affirms of Abraham, that "he received the *sign* of circumcision, a *seal* of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised." Again, the word rendered *seal* in Rev. vii, 2, common version, is rendered *sign* by other translators: "having the *sign* of the living God." Verse 3. "Hurt not the earth, neither the sea, nor the trees, till we have signed the servants of our God in their foreheads." But in Eze. ix, 4, we read, "Set a *mark* upon the foreheads of the men that sigh and cry for all the abominations that are done in the midst thereof."

Thus these terms are used interchangeably in the Scriptures. Hence, the mark of the beast is his sign, seal or token; and the seal of God is his mark or sign. These are not literal marks in the flesh, of course, but religious institutions or observances which will serve as marks of distinction between the worshipers of the beast and the worshipers of the true and living God; and, as we shall see in the sequel, they are institutions that stand, as rivals, directly opposed to each other. Therefore we treat of them in connection.

The sealing of the servants of God is the last work to be done for them in this probationary state—a work

which is to prepare them to stand in the great day of wrath. The opening of the sixth seal, as recorded in Rev. vi, brings us to the day of wrath. Its commencement is indicated by those signs in the natural heavens which are the precursors of the second advent and the day of wrath, when it will be said, "The great day of his wrath is come, and who shall be able to stand?" Here, at the commencement of chap. vii, the sealing of the servants of God is introduced. The winds are held—the pouring out of the vials of wrath is staid, till the servants of God all receive a mark in the forehead, to distinguish them from the worshipers of the beast, who have the mark of the beast in the same place. One hundred and forty-four thousand Israelites indeed are found, (not literal Jews, whose unbelief has kept them separate from Christians—the true Israel of God; but those that are Jews inwardly,) who are accounted worthy, through faith in Christ, to pass through the day of wrath, and be translated to heaven without tasting death. The translation of the 144,000, distinguishes them from the saints who have fallen by death, whose resurrection follows the sealing of the former. Says John, "After this I beheld, and lo, a great multitude that no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands." Verse 9. The immortal state follows; for it is said of these, "They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more," also "God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes." Verses 16, 17.

In another prophetic chain of the book of Revelation, the 144,000 are again noticed. This chain, commencing with chap. xii, and ending with chap. xiv, 5, brings to view all the great persecutions of the saints during the gospel age, and the deliverance of those that are alive and remain to the second advent. The three great persecuting powers are symbolized as a great red dragon, a beast with seven heads and ten horns, and an image of this beast, which is formed by the false prophet, or a beast with two horns like a lamb, but that spake as a dragon. This image—the last persecuting power, issues a decree of death against all that will not worship the beast, and receive his mark in their forehead or hand. Of course the saints of God will not give up the truth, and follow after the beast and receive his mark. They will sooner die the death threatened. But do they die? No, indeed. Christ comes and delivers them, and takes them up to mount Zion, to the heavenly Jerusalem. "And I looked, and lo, a Lamb stood on the mount Zion, and with him an hundred forty and four thousand, having his Father's name written in their foreheads." They have the seal of God, and not the mark of the beast, in their foreheads. They heeded not the threatening of death, and they are delivered without seeing death. They sing a song that no man could learn but the hundred and forty-four thousand, "which were redeemed from the earth." It is said also that "these were redeemed from among men;" by which expressions, in connection with the revealed fact that the Christians, living at the time of Christ's second coming, will not die, we learn that they are translated from among living men upon the earth.

The sealing of the saints being the last work done for them in their probationary state, before their final deliverance, it must be accomplished by the preaching of the last message of mercy to man. Consequently the third angel's message, [Rev. xiv, 9-12,] is the sealing message, containing the seal of the living God. There can be no message later than this, for it decides the destiny of all that hear it. All who reject it must suffer the unmingled wrath of God. And it is followed by the coming of the Son of man.

From the fact that the third angel warns against the reception of the mark of the beast, we may readily infer that he bears the seal of God, which stands in direct opposition to that mark. Men are to choose between the two, and this choice decides their destiny. O, solemn message! Our eternal all is depending upon the choice we make! And we are the people to whom this message is sent. The last call of mercy has reached our ears! Save thy people, O Lord!

The two opposing marks are to be received in the forehead, which is a symbol of the mind and affections, since the forehead is the seat of the intellectual faculties. The seal of God can be received nowhere else. He accepts of no obedience but that which is from the heart. But the beast seems to

be more accommodating. If you do not choose his mark in your forehead, you may receive it in your right hand. If you do not believe and love his institutions, you may obey them outwardly—carry out his requirements with your right hand, which is a symbol of outward actions. The Devil does not care for sincerity of heart in his service. If he can hire us to fall down and worship him, or in any way cause us to disobey God, his object, which is our ruin, is accomplished.

Those who receive the seal of God, have the Lamb's "Father's name written in their foreheads." Rev. xiv, 1. Those who receive the mark of the beast, receive "the mark of his name." Verse 11. Name is used in a figurative sense to denote authority. In the name of the people, in the name of the king, signify by the authority of the people, or of the king. In the name of Jesus Christ, means by the authority of Jesus Christ. Hence, the mark of the beast is a sign or token of his authority, standing in opposition to the sign of the authority of the Father.

The third message warns us against submitting to the authority of the beast and receiving the mark of his authority, and presents us the "commandments of God (the Father) and the faith of Jesus," (the Son.) The seal of God, the token of his authority, must be found in connection with his *commandments*, though it is received through faith in Jesus, and applied by the Holy Spirit, "whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption."

A law, in order to have any force to impel obedience, must have a seal, which is a sign of the authority of the law-giver, indicating the extent of his dominion and, consequently, his right to rule. For example: The president of the United States issues an order to the army, and simply signs it with his name—*James Buchanan*. No officer in command under him would dare to obey the order. Why not? Because the document is wanting in an important particular. It does not tell us which of the James Buchanans is its author. The title and seal are wanting. But let him add to his name, President of the United States, and affix the seal of the government, and the order will be obeyed. This addition is the mark of his name or authority. It tells who James Buchanan is. He is president. It gives us the extent of his jurisdiction—the United States; and, being the rightful ruler, he must be obeyed.

The law of God—the ten commandments—doubtless has a seal—a sign of the authority of the Lawgiver—some sign of royalty which distinguishes the true and living God from every other God or king in the universe. But what is it, and where shall it be found? Let us examine the law and see. Suppose you go on a mission to preach the gospel of salvation to a heathen nation. They are idolaters—worshippers of the sun. You must prove them sinners, or they can feel no need of salvation from sin. You cannot point out their sins, but by the use of God's law; for "sin is the transgression of the law." And in order to convince them of the sin of idolatry, you must point out to them the true God, and show them what he requires. You read to them the first commandment: "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." The question would naturally arise: Who is the god that gives this command? It may be the missionary for aught he can learn from the command. It may be the sun. Says one of your hearers, "I keep this commandment—I have no god but the sun. It is the most brilliant object that I can see, and I believe it is the only true god." You cannot convince him of his error by this precept, and you read the second. This forbids the worship of images as a sin against God, but gives no additional light by which we may distinguish the true God from anything but images. The heathen claims that he keeps this command also. He worships no images—he adores the sun, and only the sun. You read the third precept, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain; for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain." Still the heathen is unconvinced. He has not learned the true and living God, but is satisfied with the sun, and says he never pronounces his by name, but with the utmost reverence. You pass the fourth commandment as a Jewish law, abolished at the cross, and read the fifth. The name of God is found in it, but no more light on the identity of the law-giver, or his right to command our obedience. The re-

maining five commandments have not so much as the name of God in them. Where are the signature and seal of this law? or has it none? Please read the commandment you passed by, as out of date: "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 manservant, 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." Ah! here it is. In six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is. The MAKER of all things is the author of the law. Here is his signature, at the bottom of that table which teaches our duty expressly to him as our Maker. Here is the seal of the living God—a sign which distinguishes him from all "the gods that have not made the heavens and the earth." (See Jer. x, 10-12.) This shows the extent of his dominion, and his right to rule. He made the universe, and he has a right to govern it. This teaches the heathen that, not the sun, but the maker of it, is the true and living God. This gives authority to the law—it is the mark of God's name.

This reasoning seems plausible, and if we find it sustained by scripture proof, it must be admitted as true. We turn then to Ex. xxxi, 13. "Verily my Sabbaths ye shall keep; for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you." Verses 16, 17. "Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant. It is a sign between me and the children of Israel forever: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested and was refreshed." Eze. xx, 12. "Moreover also I gave them my Sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them." Verse 20. "And hallow my Sabbaths; and they shall be a sign between me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord your God."

These testimonies are to the point. The Sabbath is a sign between God and the people that know him. It is a sign of the knowledge of the true God. It is a perpetual covenant. It is a sign between God and the children of Israel for ever. It is not a sign that pointed to, and ended at, the cross; but it ever points back to the creation. "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and rested the seventh day." There are Israelites still upon earth, both the literal seed, and the true "Israel of God." Understand the term Israel as we will, the Sabbath is still obligatory upon them, and a sign of the knowledge of the true God.

Here I must digress a little to show who are the children of Israel. There is a class of persons that have a "veil upon their hearts," "in the reading of the Old Testament," which leads them to give the good promises made to the children of Israel, to the "sons of Belial"—to the literal seed or nominal Israel, that "are not of Israel." There was a clear distinction between these two classes, even in the old dispensation; and this is made so clear in the New Testament that those who will "turn to the Lord" can have the veil taken away. Jacob's name was changed to Israel because he had power with God and prevailed. Israel then signifies those that prevail with God. Says David, "Truly God is good to Israel." Who are Israel? "Such as are of a clean heart." Ps. lxxiii, 1. Says Paul, when speaking of those whose hearts are clean, "All Israel shall be saved." Rom. xi, 26. But when he speaks of nominal Israel, he says, "Though the number of the children of Israel be as the sand of the sea, a remnant shall be saved." Chap. ix, 27. "They are not all Israel that are of Israel; neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children; but, In Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God; but the children of the promise are counted for the seed." Verses 6-8. "And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise." Gal. iii, 29. Then those good promises to Israel will be fulfilled to the Christians. All Israel will be saved, and none but Israel will be saved. Not only so,

but the *tribes* of Israel will be saved; and all the good, whether Jews or Gentiles, whether serving their generation by the will of God in the former or in the latter dispensation, will be numbered in those tribes. James was an apostle of our Lord Jesus Christ, and no one can doubt that he wrote to Christians. Hear what he says. "James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ, to the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad, greeting. My brethren," &c. The names of the twelve tribes of Israel will be perpetuated to all eternity, on the gates of the city of God; and all those that prove themselves the children of Abraham by doing "the works of Abraham," [Jno. viii, 39,] will have right to the tree of life, and enter in through the gates into the city. See Gen. xxvi, 5; Rev. xxii, 14.

I have shown that the 144,000 are the "servants of God" of the last generation; that they are sealed just before the day of wrath; and that they are redeemed from among men. It is no wonder that they are of the tribes of Israel; for they are Israelites indeed. Jesus said of Nathaniel, "Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile!" John i, 47. Such is to be the character of the 144,000—"In their mouth was found no guile; for they are without fault before the throne of God." Rev. xiv, 5.

We have found that the Sabbath is the sign of the living God. It is a sign between him and his people, and the seal of his law. We now inquire, What is the sign of the beast? We agree with Protestants in general, that the beast is a symbol of the Papacy. The little horn of Dan. vii, 8, is a symbol of the same power. Their specifications are identical; consequently, the power signified is the same. Their great words against the Most High, or blasphemies; their war against the saints, and prevailing against them; and the period of duration given to each—time, times and a half, or forty-two months—amply prove the identity of the two symbols. Paul's man of sin, [2 Thess. ii,] who was to oppose and exalt himself above all that is called God, and sit in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God, is the same—the wicked Papacy. But how could he exalt himself above God so effectually, but by changing his law, tearing off its seal, trampling it in the dust, and giving to mankind a law upon his own authority and responsibility? This he has done. We might readily infer this from the message of the third angel, where the worship and mark of the beast are put in contrast with the commandments of God. But the testimony concerning this power, as recorded in Dan. vii, 25, plainly reveals the fact. "And he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws." The laws that he would think to change can be no other than the laws of God. To change human laws would not distinguish this power from any earthly government. All human legislators do this. But it is evidently an unchangeable law. The Douay version conveys this idea. It says he shall "think himself able to change times and laws." The laws of God are truly unchangeable, but this power attempts a change, and proffers to men his improved version of it, still claiming that the law thus modified is the law of God.

Now all that observe the first day of the week, or Sunday, instead of the seventh, must admit that there has been a change in the requirements of the ten commandments. Many of these still profess to hold to their immutability, but in works they deny their profession, for they practice a change. If the fourth commandment requires us to keep the first day of the week now, it required the same of David, Isaiah and Daniel; otherwise there has been a change in the law.

We inquire, By what authority has the change been made? Some say that Christ made the change, but the prophecy foretold that the beast—the man of sin—the little horn—should think to do this very work. Did Christ do the work foretold of anti-christ? Ask Protestants who this beast is, that should think to change times and laws, and they will tell you it is the Papacy. Why? Because it has fulfilled the specifications of the prophecy. Has the Papacy spoken great words against the Most High? Yes; it has claimed the titles and prerogatives of Jehovah. Has it worn out the saints of the Most High? Certainly; millions of the saints have fallen by that persecuting power. Has it thought to change the law of him who saith, "I

change not?" No, say they, Christ is the author of the change.

But what is the testimony of Christ on this point? What does he answer to this charge? Matt. v. 17. "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill." He did not then, as some affirm, abolish the law; but did he not change it a very little? Verse 18. "For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." The law then is unchangeable. Not a letter or a mark can pass from it, till the heavens pass away with a great noise and the elements melt with fervent heat. To substitute the first day for the seventh, and to observe it to commemorate some other event than the creation, is certainly changing the commandment more than a jot or tittle. Then if we receive the testimony of Christ himself, he is not the author of the change. Who is?

We will examine the testimony of the Roman Catholic church on this point; and if we find it in harmony with the prophecy which Protestants are agreed applies to that church, we shall receive it as the truth; since we have proved that Christ made no change whatever in the law of God. All that I am about to quote is from standard authors of the Roman church. The Catholic Catechism of the Christian Religion has the following questions and answers on the Sabbath commandment:

"Q. What does God ordain by this commandment?

"A. He ordains that we sanctify in a special manner this day on which he rested from the labor of creation.

"Q. What is this day of rest?

"A. The seventh day of the week, or Saturday; for he employed six days in creation, and rested on the seventh. Gen. ii. 2; Heb. iv. 1, &c.

"Q. Is it then Saturday we should sanctify, in order to obey the ordinance of God?

"A. During the old law, Saturday was the day sanctified; but the church, instructed by Jesus Christ and directed by the Spirit of God, has substituted Sunday for Saturday, so we now sanctify the first and not the seventh day. Sunday means, and now is, the day of the Lord.

"Q. Had the church power to make such change?

"A. Certainly, since the Spirit of God is her guide, the change is inspired by that Holy Spirit. The uniform, universal and perpetual tradition of all ages and nations attest the antiquity of, and consequently the Divine assent to, this change; even the bitterest enemies of God's church admit and adopt it."

From this testimony we see that the Papal church claims to have made the change in question, and that it had "power to make such change"—or thought itself "able to change times and laws." Milner's "End of Controversy," a Catholic work, has the following:

"The first precept in the Bible is that of sanctifying the seventh day; God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it. Gen. ii. 3. This precept was confirmed by God in the ten commandments: Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy; the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. Ex. xx. On the other hand Christ declares that he is not come to destroy the law, but to fulfill it. Matt. v. 17. He himself observed the Sabbath; and as his 'custom was, he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath-day.' Luke iv. 16. His disciples likewise observed it; they 'rested the Sabbath-day according to the commandment.' Luke xxiii. 56. Yet with all this weight of scripture authority for keeping the Sabbath, or seventh day holy, Protestants of all denominations make this a profane day, and transfer the obligation of it to the first day of the week, or the Sunday. Now what authority have they for doing this? None whatever, except the unwritten word, or tradition of the Catholic church, which declares that the apostles made the change in honor of Christ's resurrection, and the descent of the Holy Ghost upon that day of the week."

The following is from the "Catholic Christian Instructed," by Dr. Challoner:

"Q. What are the days which the church commands to be kept holy?

"A. First, the Sundays, or Lord's day, which we observe by apostolic tradition, instead of the Sabbath, &c.

"Q. What warrant have you for keeping the Sun-

day preferable to the ancient Sabbath which was the Saturday?

"A. We have for it the authority of the Catholic church and apostolic tradition."

The reader will bear in mind that the object of our present inquiry is the mark of the beast. We have identified the beast fully. We have found the power that has arisen in fulfillment of the prophecies, that has fulfilled every specification given. It has spoken great words against the Most High. It has worn out the saints of the Most High. And it boasts of having changed the law of the Most High; claiming the power and authority to do so, independently of the written word of God. We inquire, What is the mark or sign of that authority?—what is the mark of his name?

We have seen that God gave to man an institution commemorative of his creative power and goodness, which naturally reminds us of his right to command and our duty to obey. This Sabbath institution he has declared to be a sign between him and his people forever. Has the beast—the Papal church—given us any institution as a sign of his power and authority, by the observance of which we acknowledge his right to make laws, "to ordain feasts, and to command men under sin?" We shall presently see.

We have found the seal of God connected with his law, and in the third angel's message the worship and mark of the beast are put in contrast with the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus; consequently they are in direct opposition;—the worship of the beast is in opposition to the commandments and the faith in general, and the mark of that power stands opposed to the sign of God in particular. It is well known that the Roman church has not only corrupted the commandments of God, so as to allow of bowing down to images, but that she has changed and corrupted the institutions of the gospel—baptism and the Lord's supper. To follow her in these corruptions is, at least to them that know the truth, a part of the worship of the beast. But the mark of the beast is not any one or all of these things, but a single, definite institution, opposed to the sign of God, which is a sign of his authority to make all these changes and corruptions of the word of God. It must therefore be a counterfeit sabbath, instituted as a rival to the Sabbath of the Lord our God. Has the self-styled Catholic church given us such sign of her power? She has. Read carefully the following from the "Abridgment of Christian Doctrine," a Catholic catechism of the first authority, from which I have already quoted:

"Q. How prove you that the church hath power to command feasts and holy days?

"A. By the very act of changing the Sabbath into Sunday, which Protestants allow of; and therefore they fondly contradict themselves, by keeping Sunday strictly, and breaking most other feasts commanded by the same church.

"Q. How prove you that?

"A. Because by keeping Sunday they acknowledge the church's power to ordain feasts, and to command them under sin; and by not keeping the rest by her commanded, they again deny, in fact, the same power."

The following is from the "Doctrinal Catechism," another Catholic work:

"Q. Have you any other way of proving that the church has power to institute festivals of precept?

"A. Had she not such power, she could not have done that in which all modern religionists agree with her;—she could not have substituted the observance of Sunday the first day of the week, for the observance of Saturday the seventh day, a change for which there is no scriptural authority."

Here we have the mark of the beast. The very act of changing the Sabbath into Sunday, without any Scriptural authority, is the proof of his power and authority, and the keeping of Sunday is an acknowledgement of the same.

Some have thought and reasoned like this: A day is a day—one is as good as another; and if I keep one day as I should, it makes no difference what day it is. Such reasoning is utterly fallacious. We ought to know that God requires obedience to his word. When God says, Keep the seventh day holy, it is for us to obey; and to keep no day at all would be better than to mock him with a substitute. If we are not willing to obey him, he would choose to have us make no pretensions of it. "I would thou wert either cold or hot." Now

when we see that the first-day sabbath is set up as a rival of the Sabbath of the Lord; that it was established by the man of sin, and is the mark of his name, or of his authority to change the law of God; none can fail to see that it makes a vast difference which day we keep. It is no wonder that the unmingled wrath of God is to be poured out upon those, who, knowing his will, choose in preference to obey the beast.

Reader, which will you choose? God is calling upon you to choose whether you will keep his commandments and receive his seal, or obey his rival, the beast, and receive his mark. He is warning you of the awful consequences of the latter. The great day of his wrath is just before us, and we need a shield in that day. The destroying angel is about to pass through; the men with the slaughter weapons are about to smite; the four winds are about to be loosed; and nothing but God's token, mark or seal, will cause the destroyer to pass over us. See Ex. xii. 13; Eze. ix; Rev. vii. 1-4. Already has the angel ascended from the east, having the seal of the living God. The sealing message—that of the third angel—is being proclaimed. The time has come for the fulfillment of the prophetic message of Isa. viii. 16. "Bind up the testimony, seal the law among my disciples." The beast, the changer of times and laws, has broken God's testimony, and it must be bound up; he has torn the seal (the Sabbath) from the law, and it must be restored; and while the angel with the seal of the living God passes through, the servants of God are sealed in their foreheads, while at the same time the seal is restored to the law among those servants or disciples.

O, heed the warning voice which God in his great mercy is sending forth. Forsake the commandments of the beast, and keep the commandments of God. Receive the seal of God in your forehead. Keep all the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. And when the vials of wrath are poured out—when the earth is being desolated of its inhabitants, "because they have transgressed the laws, changed the ordinance, broken the everlasting covenant"—you will have a covering from the storm—a shelter beneath the wings of the Almighty—and finally, having got the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, you will stand with the Lamb upon the mount Zion, having his Father's name written in your forehead, and join in the song of deliverance that none can learn but those that have stood amid the perils of these last days, have heeded the last solemn warning to mankind, and are "redeemed from the earth"—"from among men"—being caught up to meet their descending Lord, to be forever with him. May God grant, dear reader, that this may be your happy lot and mine. And though we may never see each other's faces here, may we sing together the new song in the kingdom of God. R. F. C.

From Bro. Robbins.

BRO. SMITH: I am pleased with the suggestion in the *Review* to write from experience upon the subject of sanctification. It is a subject that for months past has deeply interested me, from the consideration that holiness is indispensable as a preparation for the coming of our blessed Master, holiness, without which "no man shall see the Lord."

I read the article from Bro. J. Clarke in the last *Review* upon this subject with much interest, and admire his spirit of sincerity, of confidence and trust in the promise of God; for truly "all the promises of God in him are yea and amen to the glory of God by us." 2 Cor. i. 20. But I think my brother is a little in the dark on this important subject, and comparing views may help us both; for with him I have longed desires to attain to holiness and perfect charity and purity of heart and life. And I think the provisions of the gospel are adapted to secure to us both, and to all believers, entire sanctification. "But of him are ye in Christ Jesus who of God is made unto us wisdom and righteousness, sanctification and redemption." 1 Cor. i. 30. Here is the provision to meet our wants and desires. "But my brother admits a failure to attain from a lack of entire consecration as an impediment in his way." As a matter of course a non-compliance with the terms of the covenant will hinder our reception of the blessing; so also if we had not complied with the terms of the gospel by repentance towards God and faith in Jesus, and the consecration implied

in a compliance with these terms, we could not have been justified.

But what are the terms of the covenant in order to our sanctification? 2 Cor. vi, 18. "Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing, and I will receive you, and will be a father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty." 2 Cor. vi, 18. "Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God." Chap. vii, 1. Again, Rom. xii, 1. "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service."

Here are the terms requiring on our part an entire consecration, a holy, acceptable sacrifice, as our reasonable service. Anything short of this is unreasonable and unacceptable. The sacrifice is specific—ourselves, our all, a living sacrifice. The sacrifice must be brought to the altar and laid upon it. And if brought by us according to the terms of the covenant, and laid upon the altar as our reasonable service, is it a holy, acceptable sacrifice unto God? Yes, most certainly. Why? Because the altar sanctifies the gift. But have we an altar most holy whereon to lay our sacrifice, that it shall be holy, acceptable to God? Yes, Christ is the Christian's altar, and our sacrifice laid upon him is sanctified, holy.

How obtained we justification? By faith in Jesus. "For we are justified by faith," and Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth. We made a personal application to Jesus, by faith in his willingness and ability to pardon and justify us from all things from which we could not be justified by the law. How may we obtain sanctification? By faith in the cleansing power of his blood, to cleanse from all sin. "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth from all sin." Do I believe this declaration of his word? Yes, most certainly. "For if the blood of bulls and of goats and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot unto God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God."

Now if I by faith make a personal application to Jesus for the application of his all-cleansing blood, may I not believe that his blood will cleanse, will sanctify me? Why not? Is Christ my wisdom and righteousness, and is he not also my sanctification? Away unbelief! I will believe God, and I will bear witness of his truth and faithfulness before angels and men. But my brother, are conflicts and trials and even temptations an evidence that we are not holy? No, the holy Jesus was tempted in all things as we are. The apostle Paul was tried and tempted, and can we expect advancement in faith and purity without the trial of our faith? Why, no. The trial of our faith is more precious than of gold that perisheth, &c.

But once more, my brother. "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit." What brings condemnation? Sin. If no condemnation, then what? Why, no sin. Now, dear brother, we will believe God, and venture all upon his faithfulness and truth. Amen. B. F. ROBBINS.

Friendship, N. Y., July 3d.

GET what you get, honestly, peaceably, and prayerfully; then you will enjoy it gratefully.

A HOLY soul never can be reconciled to unholy practices; herein appears the imperfection of our sanctification, that we make allowances for sin, and appear to excuse this deadly evil.

NEVER rejoice in an enemy's downfall, or in any evil that happens to him, but always pray for him—this is the gospel rule.

It is better sometimes to give up one's right, than to contend with a quarrelsome or covetous man.

A GOOD servant is concerned to ascertain his duty, and then to the utmost of his ability to perform it.

THE REVIEW AND HERALD.

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., JULY 28, 1859.

New England Conference.

THIS conference was held agreeably to appointment, at Fitchburgh, Mass., the 9th and 10th inst. The number present was not as large as we should have been glad to see. We doubt not many more of our brethren and sisters would gladly have been present, had the notice of the meeting been longer, and if it had not been such a hurrying season of the year with farmers.

The tent was pitched near the house of Bro. Luther Farnsworth. On the Sabbath the congregation was not large, though some came in to hear, who listened attentively to the word spoken. On first-day a goodly number came together, most of whom seemed interested in the truth spoken. They listened attentively to a discourse on the subject of the Sabbath in the afternoon, nearly two hours in length.

At the close of this meeting most of the brethren felt it duty to leave for home, but were anxious for one more prayer and conference meeting together. Our social meetings had all been more or less bound, by the indifference of some, and other influences.

We repaired again immediately to the tent, where we enjoyed a refreshing season. We think, with one or two exceptions, every brother and sister bore a testimony. From the commencement to the close, or near the close, of this meeting, the friends were gathering into and around the tent; so that if we had had strength we would gladly have preached another discourse to our congregation called together, not by the ringing of bells, nor by appointment, for public meeting.

In our last meeting, four stated their convictions that we have the truth on the Sabbath question. Three of the number, a man and his wife and his mother, were friends from some distance, who had attended the meeting from its beginning. The women decided to keep all of the commandments of God. The man said he should examine the subject still further, and should take a stand with us, if he became fully satisfied that we have the truth. The love which he has felt, in past years, for the glorious appearing of the Saviour, and his anxiety still to know the truth, entitle us to the opinion that he will take a stand in favor of the third angel's message.

It was quite a disappointment to the brethren and sisters that Brn. Stone and Sperry were not at this meeting. Never having seen Bro. Stone, they were especially desirous that he should be present. We learn however that a previous appointment called him in another direction. Bro. Sperry was engaged in N. Y. Had we been favored with more help, we should have held more meetings.

At the close of the meeting on first-day, it was thought best for us to hold meetings at the same place next Sabbath and first-day. Consequently our appointment stands for meetings on those days. We have held one evening meeting in the tent this week.

A. S. HUTCHINS.

L. BEAN.

Princeton, Mass., July 14th, 1859.

P. S. Our meetings in Fitchburgh have closed. Yesterday, (first-day,) our congregation was not large, but very attentive to the truths advanced. Three or four were present who have formerly preached the second advent faith. We believe that a very good impression was left on the mind of the friends in this section, who have heard the evidences of our position.

At the close of the meeting we repaired to the water, where five were buried with Christ in baptism. May the Spirit of the Lord help each of them to walk "in newness of life."

We believe our brethren and sisters were all satisfied that our meetings here will prove a blessing to the church. We hope and trust they may. Our prayer is that all may strive for the gathering, saving and sanctifying Spirit.

A. S. H.
L. B.

Business Proceedings of the N. E. Conference.

Evening following the Sabbath the brethren assembled for business conference. Organized by choosing moderator and secretary; and chose a committee to re-

port the business of the conference to an adjourned meeting.

At an adjourned meeting the committee made the following report:

1st. That we do pledge ourselves by our vote to sustain the tent enterprise when the way shall be opened for it to be suitably manned.

2d. That a committee be chosen to whom this matter shall be referred, and that it is the duty of this committee to correspond with Bro. White on the subject, and secure the labors of Brn. White and Loughborough, or others, to travel with the tent, as the Lord shall open the way.

3d. That the address to the Battle Creek conference be read at this conference; and that an expression by vote of the sense of this conference on the subject of systematic benevolence be taken, which was accepted.

Art. 1st was sustained by a unanimous vote.

Art. 2d. A committee of three, viz., Brn. L. Hastings, P. Folsom, and O. Davis, were chosen for the purposes referred to.

Art. 3d. The address was read before the conference, when it was unanimously voted that we endorse the sentiment of systematic benevolence as referred to in the address.

It was then voted that this conference recommend to the churches of New England the adoption of the plan of systematic benevolence.

We were sorry that sickness deprived Bro. White from finishing his address to this conference. We looked for it with anxiety until his note informed us of his inability to finish it.

But we were favored with a letter from Bro. E. L. Barr, just in time to read before the business meeting, filled with comforting words, and stirring exhortations to the church.

O. DAVIS.

APPOINTMENTS.

PROVIDENCE permitting I will meet with the church in Bowne, Aug. 4th, 5 o'clock, Wright, 6th and 7th, Caledonia 13th and 14th, Otsego 16th, 5 o'clock.

J. B. FRISBIE.

Providence favoring, there will be a meeting in the Ohio Tent at Wauseon, Fulton Co., Ohio, commencing on Thursday evening, July 28th, 1859.

Wauseon is on the Air Line R. R.

J. H. WAGGONER.

T. J. BUTLER.

Business Department.

Business Notes.

Sarah Philo: You will find the \$1,00 receipted in No. 5.

M. C. M. Andrews: \$1,00 for books. What kind? The \$2,00 from C. B. pays her paper to next volume. She owes nothing. Chart sent the 12th inst.

Letters.

UNDER this head will be found a full list of those from whom letters are received from week to week. If any do not find their letters thus acknowledged, they may know they have not come to hand.

E. Elmer, F. Wheeler, E. Hale, N. N. Lunt, J. H. Waggoner, A. Hoff, S. Philo, L. Taber, J. H. W., W. Russell, W. D. Sharpe, Wm. W. Lockwood, Geo. Busk, R. J. Lawrence, C. K. Farnsworth, J. Philbrick, T. P. Burdick, T. E. Thorp, A. Gleason, J. Newton, L. W. Carr, E. Miller, L. W. Sims, M. C. M. Andrews, F. C. Castle.

Receipts.

ANNEXED to each receipt in the following list, is the Volume and Number of the "Review and Herald" to which the money receipted pays. If money for the paper is not in due time acknowledged, immediate notice of the omission should then be given.

FOR REVIEW AND HERALD.

E. Hale, 1,00, xv, 10. Wm. W. Lockwood 1,00, xv, 14. Geo. Busk (for A. Parmerton) 0,25, xv, 1. Geo. Busk 0,50, xv, 1. C. K. Farnsworth 0,50, each for J. Chase and J. Oaks 1,00, each to xv, 10. J. Philbrick 2,00, xvi, 1. E. Elmer 1,00, xv, 1. N. M. Gray 1,00, xv, 1. C. Brown 2,00, xv, 1. C. Andrews 2,00, xvi, 1. L. W. Carr, 1,00, xiii, 1. Wm. Moore 2,00, xvi, 10. A. Hoff (for C. Hoff) 0,50, xv, 10. T. E. Thorp 0,85, xi, 20. H. Patch 1,00, xv, 1. J. B. Benson 1,00, xiv, 14. L. W. Sims 1,50, xiii, 14. A. Ross 1,00, xvi, 1. J. R. Lewis 2,00, xv, 1. J. R. Lewis (for A. G. Bogardus) 0,75, xiii, 14. Jas. Stiles 3,00, xv, 1.

FOR REVIEW TO POOR.—Wm. W. Lockwood (S. B.) \$1,00.

FOR ILLS. AND WIS. TENT.—A friend \$0,50. A. Hoff \$1,00. O. Hoff \$1,00.

FOR MICH. TENT.—Church in Byron, Mich., \$5,00.