

SECOND 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. I.

PARIS, ME., JANUARY, 1851.

No. 5.

JOSEPH BATES, S. W. RHODES, J. N. ANDREWS, and
JAMES WHITE, Publishing Committee.
G. L. MELLEN & CO., Printers.

TERMS—Gratis, except the reader desires to aid in its publication.
All communications, orders, and remittances, for the Review and Herald,
should be addressed to JAMES WHITE, Paris, Me., (Post paid.)

WELL OF BETHLEHEM.

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

In the Hold, long oppressed, by Earth's wearisome strife,
My soul is athirst, for the Waters of Life—
And longs for the Well-spring, at Bethlechem's gate,
Where its Fount gushes freely, this thirst to abate.

Oh! who will break through, in the Strength of the Lord,
And at once Overcome—by his Spirit and Word—
The uncircumcised Host, that opposeth His reign,
And bid the sweet waters of Life FLOW again?

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

Oh! who shall BETWEEN the bright Cherubims PASS,
And Restore the LOST garden of beauty at last;
Who shall give to its long desert bowers their bloom,
And say to the Saved, and the Ransomed, RETURN?

For ONE we have Waited, for ONE we have Sought—
While lords and gods many, great wonders have wrought;
But NONE has brought forth—the SALVATION the LOVE,
And we WAIT yet ANOTHER, to come from Above.

His Name must be Jesus! no other we know,
Who can BID the wide Stream of REDEMPTION to flow;
Who can BREAK through the Host, the Inheritance bless,
And RESTORE the lost Children of EDEN to REST.

C. S. M.

THE PERPETUITY OF THE LAW OF GOD.

BY J. N. ANDREWS.

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

Matt. v. The first testimony on this point was borne by the Lord Jesus in his sermon on the Mount. He says, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets." We believe therefore that he did not destroy them; consequently they are yet in force. He adds that not "one jot or tittle shall pass from the law till all be fulfilled." Hence no one of its precepts will cease before the rest. And that shall not be "till heaven and earth pass." Hence we say that the law of God extends down through the Gospel dispensation to the end. He testifies that he came not to destroy, but to fulfill; and that he might

stop the mouths of those who teach that his obedience to the law annulled it, he adds that "WHOSOEVER shall break one of these commandments," &c., "shall be called least in the kingdom of God," or, as Campbell renders it, "shall be of no esteem in the reign of heaven." And, that we might not mistake the commandments referred to, he proceeds to quote and comment on the law of the Decalogue, the ten commandments. This is a nail fastened by the Master of assemblies "in a sure place," and it is a clear proof that the mission of Jesus was not to destroy, but to "magnify the law and make it honorable."—Isa. xli, 21.

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

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

The second chapter of Romans [verses 11—16] shows that all men are amenable to the law of God, whether they possess that law written in his word, or only on their hearts. To this point Paul testifies again, when he says, "that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them *who are under the law*;" [to how many does the law speak?] "THAT EVERY MOUTH MAY BE STOPPED, AND ALL THE WORLD MAY BECOME GUILTY BEFORE GOD." Moses wrote the first books of the Bible; hence it appears, that previous to his time, the world was without a written revelation of God's will. But that the law of God written in the heart, as expressed in this text existed from the beginning, is evident from these considerations. 1. "Until the law, sin was in the world, but sin is not imputed where there is no law."—Rom. v, 13.—Now if the work of the law had not been written in the heart before the giving of the written word, how could God have counted men sinners? For they would have had no law to transgress. Again, "Sin is the transgression of the law."—1 John iii, 4.—"Where no law is, there is no transgression."—Rom. iv, 15.—As the transgression of the law has existed from the beginning, it follows that its requirements have also existed from the same point. To conclude the argument from this chapter, we say that if the doctrine that the law of God was abolished at Christ's death, be carried out, its advocates must also teach that sin has not existed in the world since that point; for it cannot be shown that he has ever re-enacted one of its precepts. If therefore the world has been "without law to God," since the death of Christ, it has also been without "transgression of the law," for "where no law is, there is no transgression."

Rom. iii, 9—31. The apostle in this chapter, has stated more fully the argument noticed in chapter second. "We have before proved," says he, "both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin." He did this by showing that those who had not the law written in the oracles of God, had at least the work of the law written in their hearts; and as all men have transgressed

sed the law, all are by the law convinced of sin as transgressors. He proceeds to sustain this doctrine by various quotations from the Old Testament, showing the fearful state of fallen man, viewed in the light of God's holy law. [Verses 10—18.] "What things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and ALL THE WORLD MAY BECOME GUILTY BEFORE GOD. Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight, for by the law is the knowledge of sin."—If man had not fallen, "a better covenant" would not have been needed, than,— "This do, and thou shalt live." But by the fall, man lost the only principle from which true and acceptable obedience can spring, viz., pure love to God. After the fall man was left with "the work of the law" written on his heart to show him what God required; and with the promise of a Savior, somewhat obscurely expressed, through whom he could hope for pardon. Salvation by faith in Jesus, was more clearly revealed to Abraham. After four hundred and thirty years, the written law was given to Israel, as the basis of a covenant, which should last "till the seed should come to whom the promise was made." Gal. iii, 19; Heb. x, 9, 10. Thus in the Providence of God, man has had a fair trial of his ability to live by a covenant of works, [see Gal. iii, 12, 21,] and of himself, to render acceptable obedience to God's holy law. It need not be added, that he has fallen under its fearful curse. "For it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them." Gal. iii, 10. Christ was "made under the law," and he, only, of all the sons of Adam, kept its requirements perfectly, then died to atone for our transgressions, and to redeem us from its curse. Our hope of salvation then is through faith in Jesus Christ, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation for our sins. Thus God is just and yet the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus. That we can be justified by Christ, and yet live in violation of God's law, no one can maintain; but to teach that our present obedience can justify, or atone for our past offences, would be an equal absurdity.—Hence we conclude that our justification in the sight of God, is solely on account of faith, and not on account of works. By faith in the atonement of the Savior our hearts are cleansed from sin, and we receive the "renewing of the Holy Ghost." Then with that perfect love to God, restored to us, which Adam lost at his fall, we are prepared to render acceptable obedience to God, and thus to fulfill "the righteousness of the law." Rom. viii, 3, 4, 7.

"The Law reveals and makes us know
What duties to our God we owe;
But 'tis the Gospel must reveal
Where lies our strength to do his will."

— Verse 31. "Do we then make void the law through faith? GOD FORBID: YEA WE ESTABLISH THE LAW."

Rom. vii. This chapter opens with the assertion that the law claims obedience through life. This fact is illustrated by the marriage covenant. As that cannot cease but with the death of one of the parties, no more could the first covenant with the people of God. Now as this covenant did end at Christ's death, yet could cease only with the death of one of the parties, the question arises, which of the parties died? The fourth verse answers, not the law, but ourselves. As Christ died to atone for our sins, we are, in the sense of this portion of the Scripture, represented as dying with him. [See Rom. vi, 6.] Then mark, THE LAW STILL LIVES. The dissolution of the first covenant, does not abolish the law of God, as we shall hereafter show. The sixth verse may be adduced as proof that the law is also dead. But the marginal reading shows that this text refers not to the law but to ourselves. The translations of Macknight and Whiting both render it thus. It is further evident from the fourth verse, which, as we have already seen, states the fact as it is given in the margin of this text. [See also Gal. ii, 19, 20.] And it is still more evident from the fact that the death of one party, only, is required in order to dissolve the covenant. In verses 4—6, the fruit of the two covenants is contrasted. By the first covenant we bring forth fruit unto death; by the second we bring forth "the fruit of the Spirit" unto God. The first points out our duty, but leaves us unable to perform it; the second points us to the same holy, just, and spiritual law, as the sum of our duty, and at the same time reveals the source of our strength to keep its requirements, viz., the grace of God, through

faith in Jesus. Thus we "serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter." In proof of this, contrast the remainder of this chapter from verse 7, with chapter viii. The manner in which the law convinces of sin is shown in verse 7. In proof that the term law, here refers particularly to the ten commandments, see the close of the verse where the tenth commandment is quoted. Paul has elsewhere said, that the law was "our school-master to bring us to Christ." The remainder of this chapter gives us his experience in that school. Verses 8—11, show Paul's efforts to live by the law, and also his utter failure to keep its precepts, and satisfy its demands. Verse 12. He acknowledges the holiness, justice, and goodness of the law. Verse 13. But through his inability to keep the law, sin works in him death by its means. Verses 14—25. He wills that which is good, and even delights in the law of God, but how to perform that which is good he finds not. The "schoolmaster" sets before him the righteous requirements of God's law, and with unrelenting severity, as he is not able to keep it, compels him to exclaim, "O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" He is now convinced that he cannot be justified by the deeds of the law, and in his despair, he flies to Jesus Christ. The next chapter shows him delivered from "the carnal mind" by the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, and having obtained power to obey, as well as forgiveness for past offences, he exclaims, "There is therefore, now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus; for what the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and by a sacrifice of sin, [margin,] condemned sin in the flesh; that THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF THE LAW MIGHT BE FULFILLED IN US." Rom. viii, 1—7.

II Cor. iii. The testimony of this chapter has an important bearing on the subject. As those who teach the abrogation of God's law regard it as their most important evidence, we will briefly state and examine their position. It is as follows:—"1. The law of God written on tables of stone constituted the first covenant.—2. This covenant is here called "the ministration of death" or "ministration of condemnation," and is abolished or done away in Christ. Verses 7, 13, 14.—3. The abrogation of this covenant annulled the law of God."

To the first point we answer, that a covenant is a mutual agreement between two parties; or, according to its second definition, it is a writing containing the terms of agreement.—[Noah Webster.] The first covenant, according to the first definition of the word, may be read in Ex. xix. The proposition on the part of God stands thus: "If ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then shall ye be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people." Verses 3—7. The answer of the people is as follows: "And all the people answered together, and said, 'All that the Lord hath spoken we will do.' And Moses returned the words of the people unto the Lord." Verse 8. This completed the mutual agreement. Its stipulation was obedience on the part of the people. Then follows what may, according to the second definition of the word, be called the covenant, viz., the ten commandments as the terms of the mutual agreement already entered into. The covenant or mutual agreement is one thing, the terms of that agreement, though closely connected with it, are quite another. We say then that the first covenant was strictly speaking the mutual agreement entered into by God and his people, the ten commandments being its terms of agreement. Mark this.

To the second point we answer that the word ministration signifies "the act of performing service," or "service" itself; consequently it is not the words "written and engraven in stones" to which the apostle refers, but to "the ministration" or service of those words. [Please note the use of the word where it occurs.] [Luke i, 23; Acts vi, 1; II Cor. ix, 13.] The careful reading of this chapter shows that its subject is a comparison of the ministrations of the two covenants. A full account of the ministrations of the first and second covenants may be read in Heb. vii, viii, ix, x. The Levitical priesthood with its ordinances of divine service, performed the ministration of the first covenant. The "more excellent ministry" of Christ, including all its branches, fulfills the ministration of the second. And it is a fact of much importance, that the ark of God's testament is found in the heavenly tabernacle, where Christ is ministering, [Rev. xi, 19,] as well as in the earthly tabernacle; that it is clear that the tables of the testament are still the foundation of

the divine government. Then the law of God given to Israel as the basis of the first covenant, is clearly shown to be distinct from its "ministration" as given in "the hand writing of ordinances." As the services of the first covenant meet their antitype in Christ's ministration, how natural the language, that the ministration of condemnation had no glory by reason of the glory that excelleth; the glory of the shadow being swallowed up in that of the substance. Then it is clear that the veil which is on the children of Israel, denotes the typical service or ministration of condemnation, which was abolished, or done away in Christ. If you say that it is God's law which was abolished or done away in Christ, then you teach that Christ destroyed the law. [Matt. v. 17—19.] Deny this, who can.

To the third point, we answer, that the first covenant ceased because its conditions were not kept. We have already shown that the law of God was given to Israel, as the conditions of the covenant between God and his people. The terms of agreement having been broken, the covenant based on them must of necessity cease. But to teach that the abrogation of the covenant, annulled the law of God also, would in reality be saying that God abolished his law because men would transgress it!—Our opponents teach that the law of God is abolished, and that those precepts which are not re-enacted in the New Testament, are not binding on us. The force of this blow is aimed at the Sabbath, but if carried out, its effect would be to overturn the whole law of God. "The law," say they, "was abolished at Christ's death." We know that the New Testament dates from the death of the testator, the precise point where the first covenant ceased. [Heb. ix, 16, 17; x, 9, 10.] Now if God abolished his law at Christ's death, how could he afterwards write it in the hearts and minds of his people according to the promise, as given in Heb. viii, 10? How could this be done unless he first re-enacted it? And we challenge you to show that God has ever abolished a law, and then re-enacted it. The word of God is not yea and nay after this manner. Nay, further. As the new covenant begins at the precise point where the first one ceased, your position requires you to believe that God abolished the ten commandments, and IN THE SAME MOMENT re-enacted nine of them to write on the hearts of his people. Deny this if you can. Do you say that it is the law of the New Testament, or law of grace, which God writes on the hearts of his people? We answer that you cannot show the existence of such a law, distinct from the precepts of the decalogue. Besides if the precepts of the Decalogue are abolished, even its principles cannot now exist without a re-enactment. If you could carry out this sentiment you would show that the ten commandments are all abolished; hence the law of God is destroyed: hence also the moral government of God is destroyed, and men are left without prohibition against any species of wickedness. Do you say that God abolished his law, and then re-enacted all of its precepts save the Sabbath commandment? We answer that such an unwillingness on your part to submit to the law of God, shows that you possess "the carnal mind," which is "enmity against God," which "IS NOT SUBJECT TO THE LAW OF GOD, neither indeed can be." Jesus has said that "NOT ONE JOT OR TITTLE SHALL PASS FROM THE LAW till all be fulfilled;" but you, to avoid the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, teach us that that commandment has been struck out of the law. Such then is your absurd and dangerous position. Will you still cling to it?

We invite the attention of the candid reader to "a more excellent way."—We have shown the existence of God's law from the beginning, and that its observance constituted the conditions, or terms of agreement, on which the first covenant was based. The first covenant ceased because its conditions were not kept. Heb. viii, 9. But the dissolution of this covenant could not abolish "the royal law" which had existed from the beginning: hence we believe that the law of God did not cease with the first covenant, but that it continued in full force, ready to be written by the Spirit in the hearts of God's people. See the promise, Jer. xxxi, 33; Heb. viii, 10. There is therefore no such absurdity in our faith, as in that of our opponents, who would have us believe that God abolished his law, and at the same moment re-enacted a part of its precepts. Our faith may be expressed in a single sentence: GOD'S LAW COVERS ALL TIME, and under all dispensations it stands out before men as the rule of their lives and the sum of their duty to God. The full of man left "the work of the law" written in his heart, though faintly indeed;

then at Mount Sinai, it was written in tables of stone by the finger of God: then, under the new covenant, it is written in the hearts of God's people even as it was before the fall. We appeal to men of candor and reason. Are not these things so?

Gal. iii. The great doctrine of justification by faith having been lost sight of by the Galatian church, the apostle argues the point with them, and with great clearness shows that it is our only hope of salvation. Hence, the different covenants which God has made with his people are here examined and contrasted. The covenant made with Abraham, which was based on the righteousness of faith, is first introduced. This covenant secured to himself, and to his seed, the inheritance of the earth. Rom. iv, 13. Four hundred and thirty years after this, that law, the principles of which have existed from creation, "was added" to the covenant which already existed. The question now arises, Why does the apostle say that the law could not disannul the promise made to Abraham? Is there any thing in the law, which is against the promise of God? No, verily. See verse 21. For the law of God which embodies his requirements, and man's duty, cannot be contrary to his own promise. Why then is it said, that if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise? We answer, that God made perfect obedience to his law, the condition on which he took Israel, the literal seed of Abraham, to be his people. Jer. xi, 3, 4; Ex. xix, 58; xx. This covenant made the works of the law the condition on which they should receive the inheritance, instead of the righteousness of faith, which was the condition of the promise made to Abraham. But it is plain, that if the deeds of the law be made the ground of justification, then is justification by faith made void. And as it is evident that fallen guilty man cannot be justified by a law which already condemns him, he could then have no hope of salvation. Is it asked, How then could Israel hope for salvation, whilst the law of God stood out before them? We answer, that beside "the royal law," [James ii, 8—12,] another law was given to Israel, viz. "the law of commandments contained in ordinances."—Eph. ii, 15; Col. ii, 14—17. In all his sacrifices and offerings, this law pointed them forward to the one offering of Jesus Christ, as the great atonement for their transgressions. Why then, it may be asked, did God give to Israel a covenant which recognized perfect obedience as its only condition? We reply, he did it that he might exclude all appearance of heirship from the natural seed, except such as should walk in the faith of their father Abraham. Hear the apostle: "For if there had been a law given, which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law. But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe." Such are the only heirs. But the literal seed of Jacob were the apparent heirs till the coming of the seed, to whom the promise was made, even as Ishmael was the apparent heir of Abraham till the birth of Isaac. God made promise to Abraham and to his seed, that they should inherit the world.—Rom. iv. He, who is thus designated as the seed of Abraham, is no less a personage than Jesus Christ. Verse 16. He was "made under the law," kept the covenant which requires perfect obedience, then died for our transgressions, and bequeathed to us his own inheritance.—Gal. iv, 4; 1 John iii, 4, 5; Heb. ix, 15—17; Luke xxii, 20. But as this chapter is considered an important proof that the law of God is abolished, we will state this view in its strength, and examine it.—1. The law had no existence prior to its being given from Mount Sinai.—2. It was only binding on literal Israel.—3. It was to last only till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; hence, it expired by limitation at that point.—We answer to the first position, that men, though destitute of the written law of God until the days of Moses, were counted sinners by God. And "sin is the transgression of the law."—1 John iii, 4. Again, if by the term the law was "added," we are to understand that it had no existence prior to that time, the inquiry arises, How are we to understand the next clause, which reads "because of transgressions?" The apostle has told us that where there is no law, there is no transgression.—Rom. iv, 15. This point may be fairly settled in Romans ii, where Paul shows that in the judgment, all will be left without excuse; for those who have not had the written law, have had at least the work of the law written in their hearts.

To the next position we answer, that such a view would make the apostle contradict himself. He testifies, [Gal. iii, 22.] But

the Scripture hath concluded all under sin. Again, Rom. iii, 19. Now we know that what things soever the law saith, *it saith to them who are under the law, that every mouth may be stopped, AND ALL THE WORLD MAY BECOME GUILTY BEFORE GOD.*

To the third point we reply, that God made his law the condition of the covenant into which he entered with the literal seed of Abraham. Thus was an addition made to the Abrahamic covenant, to continue till the seed should come, to whom God made promise. But to teach, that the law itself expired at that point, would be a plain contradiction of clear testimony. Matt. v, 17—19; Think not that I am come to destroy the law. Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled. Rom. iii, 31; Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law. Rom. vii, 7; I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet. We here inquire, how an abolished law could convict a man of transgression? And further, how the apostle could hold such a struggle with the law as he describes in Rom. vii, when that law had ceased to exist? Further, how can the royal law convince men of sin as transgressors, after God has abolished it? See James ii, 8—11. A law, embodying the moral perfections of the infinite Jehovah, must from its nature be unchangeable and immutable like its author.

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

But we leave the question, how God could take back a law which embodies his own attributes, and inquire further, Has the divine “Law-giver” abolished his own law? Our opponents affirm, we deny. Let us listen to their proof.—“1. God gave the law for a limited period, which expired at Christ’s death.—Gal. iii, 19. Hence, the law expired by limitation. 2. He has abolished the law at the crucifixion. II Cor. iii.” These two testimonies are the most important ones offered to sustain the position. To this view we reply, that if the law expired by limitation, then it could not be abolished. If it was abolished, then it did not expire by limitation. The language of Scripture being truth, and its statements not inconsistent with themselves, we say that that position is unscriptural, whose main proofs destroy each other. In an examination of the first of these proofs, we pointed out the distinction between a law, and the ministration of a law. With reference to the words engraven on stone, we say, that “condemnation” and “death” were there; for whilst they condemned and made guilty the whole world, they could not, without an atonement, give life to any. Rom. iii, 19, 24, 26; Gal. iii, 21. To conclude the point, we say, that if Gal. iii, 19, avails any thing for our opponents, it shows that the law was not repealed, but that it expired by limitation.

Setting aside these conflicting views, we come to a point where there is, perhaps, perfect agreement. On some ground or other, all admit that none of the precepts of the Decalogue are binding on us. The sentiment stands thus: When the law expired, the

Lawgiver transferred all of its precepts, save one, to the New Testament. In another place, we have pointed out the absurdity of the abolition and the re-enactment of the Law of God. To make use of Gal. iii, the first position is abandoned, and the view is now presented in its stead, that the law has expired through limitation. But the difficulty still remains. For leaving the question, Whether such a law could ever be limited to a period of time, we say, that it is still necessary to show that any part of the law has been re-enacted. It is idle to talk of the transfer of a law which does not exist. For that which is not in existence cannot be transferred. A law which has been repealed, or which has expired through limitation, does not exist. Hence, the idea of the transfer of a part of the law, after the whole has been abolished, is utter folly. If the law has been abolished, no part of it can now exist without re-enactment. This leads us to inquire, Has the law of God been re-enacted? If so, by whom? Certainly not by the Son of God, for it is not claimed that the law ceased until his death. Instead of coming to give another law, he came to “fulfill,” to “magnify,” and to make “honorable” the law, which already existed. Isa. xlii, 21.

Not by the great Lawgiver, for leaving out of the question the fact, that the abolition of the law, and its re-enactment in an amended form would be a virtual confession that his law was imperfect and needed correction, we ask, Where is the passage of Scripture which shows any such act of the Lawgiver?—Where?

Another question arises, Wherein has the law been improved by the alledged amendment? Was it not already “perfect,” “spiritual,” “holy,” “just, and good?” Wherein has it been made better? It is answered, that the Sabbath has been left out. The subject is brought to this point then: the Lord would strike the Sabbath commandment from his law. To accomplish this purpose, he abolishes his whole law, and then re-enacts all of its precepts, save the fourth commandment! If such a view does not make God altogether such an one as ourselves, we ask, What could? But we fail to discover wherein the law has been made better. If “the Sabbath was made for man,” we are by this alteration deprived of one of those blessings, which had been bestowed on the human family. That which has been made for man, is certainly inseparable from his well-being. But if the Sabbath has been abolished, it has failed to fulfill the original design of God, because a part only of the human family are permitted to share in its blessings. Nay, it would seem that the Great Lawgiver had already discovered that the Sabbath was not calculated to benefit man, though he made it for that purpose. Hence, he recalls his law, and having struck out the fourth commandment, gives the remainder to man as his amended will!

But the foundation, the reality, and the perpetuity of the Sabbath, may be learned from a few simple facts. It was instituted in Paradise. Gen. ii. It was guarded from profanation by the fourth commandment of “the royal law,” even as marriage was by the seventh. Ex. xx. Christ testifies, that “the Sabbath was made for man;” and that “till heaven and earth pass, one jot or tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled.”—We look forward to Paradise restored, and there stands the holy Sabbath. Isa. lxvi, 22, 23. Think you, that the Gospel so far exceeds in spirituality Paradise when first created, or Paradise after its restoration, that the Sabbath is not congenial to its character, and must needs be abolished? Nay, we ask our friends who would thus destroy “the holy of the Lord,” [Isa. lviii, 13,] how they can reconcile the idea, that the Sabbath has been struck out of existence, with the fact that it existed in Paradise lost, and that it will exist amid the glories of Paradise restored? The Sabbath was made for man; it began with the first man, and continues notwithstanding the man of sin, inseparably connected with the history of the human family forever. Gen. ii, 2, 3; Ex. xvi, 23—28; xx, 8—11; Isa. lvi; lviii, 13, 14; Dan. vii, 25; Matt. v, 17—19; Luke xxii, 55, 56; Matt. xxiv, 20; Mark ii, 28; Rev. i, 10; Isa. lxvi, 22, 23.

The Sabbath is to be in the new earth; but it has long been trodden down by the little horn of Dan. vii; the saints are about to return to Paradise from whence they have so long wandered. Is it not in place then, that the holy Sabbath should here be brought out and vindicated, that the church of the living God may carry back to Paradise the very institution which was brought from thence? We say further, that the closing strug-

gle between the dragon and remnant of the church, is with reference to the COMMANDMENTS OF GOD, and the testimony of Jesus Christ. Rev. xii, 17; xiv, 12.

Paris, Maine, January 3, 1851.

A CHRISTIAN CAVEAT
TO THE
OLD AND NEW SABBATARIANS.

BY EDWARD FISHER, ESQ.

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

"The third opinion is, of the new Sabbatarians, who dream of a middle way betwixt a Jew and a Christian; and this they usually lay down in two propositions. The first is, *That the Lord's Day, or first day of the week, namely Sunday, may be called the Sabbath*: the next is, *That the observation of the Lord's Day is a moral duty, enjoined by God himself, and declared both by the doctrine and practice of Christ and his apostles*. The first appearance of this kind of teachers was in the year of our Lord 1595, near the end of the reign of Queen Elizabeth: and because they are neither able to produce direct Scripture, nor solid reason for what they say, they labor to support their conceits by fallacies, falsities, and wrestings of God's holy word, as upon scanning their proofs will be manifest to the meanest capacity.

"For their first proposition, they alledge two reasons why the *Lord's Day* may be called the *Sabbath*. One is, because the Sabbath signifies a rest; and therefore the Lord's Day being a rest, may be called the Sabbath. But to this we answer, it is false that the *Sabbath* signifies a rest; for when by custom of speech a common name is restrained to a particular place, thing, or person, it then becomes a proper name, and so losing its community, does signify that only particular, unto which by custom of speech it is applied; as for instance, the *temple* is a common name, signifying the Church; yet in London, where by custom of speech this name, *The Temple*, is restrained to an Inns of Court, it is false and absurd to say you were at the *Temple* and mean the *Church of St. Giles*. In like manner the *Sabbath* is a common name, signifying the rest; yet in the Christian Church, where by custom of speech, according to God's holy phrase throughout the Old and New Testament, this name, the *Sabbath*, is restrained to the Jewish weekly festival, it is false and absurd to speak of the *Sabbath*, and mean the *Lord's Day*. Their other reason why the *Lord's Day* may be called the *Sabbath*, is, because the *Lord's Day* succeeded in the room of the Sabbath. But if this argument be good, then may baptism be called *circumcision*, the *Lord's Supper* the *Passover*, and King James Queen Elizabeth.

"As for the second proposition, wherein they assert the *moral* and *divine institution of the Lord's Day*, we shall here notice only three of their reasons. The first is, because Adam, according to God's command, kept the Sabbath in the state of innocency. . . . But what is the sanctification of the Sabbath spoken of by Moses in the second chapter of Genesis, to our observing the *Lord's Day*? That was appointed to be kept on the *seventh* and *last* day of the week; this is kept on the *first* day of the week: that was the day in which God rested from his work of creation; this is the day in which God began to create the heavens and the earth: that was our *Saturday*; this is our *Sunday*. Their second proof for the morality of the *Lord's Day*, is from the fourth commandment, where they seek to corrupt the very text, and would persuade us that for the seventh day, we must read a seventh day; as if God did not there set apart a certain day of the week, but left it to man to keep which of the

seven he pleased. Unto which we answer, that this conceit is not only against the letter of all our translations, but even repugnant to the sense of the commandment; for the words are express that God blessed and hallowed the Sabbath day; that Sabbath day was the seventh day; that seventh day was the day in which God rested from his six days' work of creation. Nay, grant it were true (as these men would have) that this special precept does exactly oblige us, and that no particular day of the seven was by God appointed to be kept holy, then we may set apart Monday, or Tuesday, or any other day to God's service, as well as Sunday; and so, by their own argument, the Lord's Day is no more moral than any other day of the week. Their third proof is from the title or name, *Lord's Day*, which (say they) cannot be for any other reason, but because it is of the Lord's institution. We answer, this is false; for the Lord's Day was not so called because it was instituted by the Lord, but because it was dedicated to the Lord; as we commonly say, Saint Mary's Church, or Saint Peter's Church; which no man did ever imagine were built or founded by Saint Mary or Saint Peter."

Near the close of his book, after having examined each of the positions here referred to, he comes directly to his design, and says:—

"In vain, therefore, it is, and most absurd, for you our opponents to charge us with *befooing and misleading the people*. Your own practice, your own doctrines, shall bear witness betwixt us.

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

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

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

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

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

"Take ye heed; these are not small matters; consider well with yourselves what it is to stand guilty before God of belying Christ and his apostles, and willfully wresting the Holy Scriptures. Be advised; take time while time is to repent of those notorious slanders wherewith you have aspersed the ancient approved ways of God's worship; and let the sincerity of your repentance appear by the speedy abandoning of your unchristian

tian practises and principles; lest the heavy judgment of seducers, to *wax worse and worse*, fall upon you, and God in the end deliver you up to such *strong delusions* that you *should believe your own lies*."—*Sabbath Tract No. 5.*

THE REVIEW AND HERALD.

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

PARIS, JANUARY, 1851.

THE CHART.—We stated in our last that "about 240" would cost "near \$250." But we have since seen Bro. Nichols, and have ascertained that 300, (the number to be published,) will cost not less than \$400. Of this sum, Bro. Nichols pays \$75. As the Chart costs much more than we anticipated, it is necessary that the price should be more than was stated in No. 4. The price, therefore, will be \$2,00 each, a small sum for such a treasure. Bro. Nichols has spared no pains to have the work done correctly and well. We are much pleased with the arrangement of the Chart, and the execution of the work; and we are satisfied that it will be a great help to those who teach the present truth, and prove a blessing to the scattered flock. Those whom God has called to give the message of the third angel, can have it free. Those who wish, can send in their donations, and if more is received than enough to pay for the Chart, it will be used in publishing the "Review and Herald." All letters relative to the Chart should be addressed to Otis Nichols, Dorchester, Mass., (*Post Paid.*)

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

J. N. ANDREWS.

DEAR BRO. WHITE—I would be glad to say a few words to the dear brethren and sisters, who have not, as yet, embraced present truth. In my intercourse with them, I am often met with the following objections. "If I have Christ formed within, it is enough." "It is Christ that saves, not the Sabbath. Outward observances avail not; it must be an inward work. The Spirit guides into all truth, and you Sabbath folks require an assent to your faith and practices, making the commandments a test of salvation." I wish to inquire of these dear brethren, if they did not meet with the very same in 1843 and '44? When you felt the truth of God like fire shut up in your bones, and you *must* speak, were not your hearts pained by such reasonings? As though to love and obey the truth, was making the merits of Christ of none effect. Getting up another Saviour; lessening the importance of vital piety; giving heed to strange guidances, and necessarily begetting a dogmatical, proselyting spirit. O how far from the reality. How different from the true effect of God's word upon the heart. But to make the subject clear, and shew the importance of *searching* for truth, I would mention a personal acquaintance who "walked with God," and had long enjoyed close communion with Him. When the "Advent near" was proclaimed, she loved it, but rested, having the witness that "Christ is mine now," and looking for the "Spirit to guide into all truth," without the act of "hearing" and examination on her part. She neglected to search diligently to see whether these things were so, and consequently suffered not the deep disappointment and reproach of God's people. But, she lost, and knew not why or how, as she afterwards expressed, the power she formerly had with God. Alas! she had not embraced what was then "present truth," had failed of its sanctifying influences, and was not prepared for that which followed. O my dear brethren and sisters, next to the "Gift of His dear Son," I praise God that he has led me along step by step in his trying, saving truths of these last days, until I am now found under the third angel's cry, striving with my whole heart to keep the commandments of God, and the faith, or teachings of Jesus Christ. Not till the Midnight Cry did I so fully realize the importance of

the preceding messages. But O, then I felt how improbable it was, that those who rejected them would receive this. I saw that one only prepared the way for another, and thus it appears to me quite through the perfect chain. But I do rejoice that some have been enabled to embrace these truths as a *great whole*. May the Lord enable them, with those who have known this way, to stand, and enter into his rest. We hail with gladness the "Advent Review and Sabbath Herald," believing it just adapted to the wants of the household; and most sincerely hope each will contribute a "mite" by writing, that it may be known whether the commandments are to them "grievous" or not. Praise the Lord, my soul witnesseth, they are a delight. And here may I ask, does not holy writ (not we) make the keeping of them a condition of life? Yea, even the love of God itself? See John's Epistles. And are not those that *do* them (all of them) blessed, "that they may enter in through the gates into the city," &c.? But it is argued, you thus make the righteous dead enter without having kept them. We answer, they lived up to the best light they had. Now the temple of God has been opened in heaven, and the clear light shineth. O let us come to the light, that our deeds may be reprov'd, and we henceforth walk as children of the light. In hope. F. M. SHIMPER.

[From the Harbinger and Advocate.]

FROM BRO. E. P. BUTLER.

DEAR BRO. MARSH :—I have almost from the commencement of your publishing the Voice of Truth, been a subscriber for your paper, but after much reflection, have concluded to stop it.

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

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

"At the passing of this time, I believed the door was shut, nor was I alone in this belief. Yourself, and almost every other Advent believer, for months after the passing of the time, believed their work for the world was done. And as Bro. Miller expressed it, in his letter to Bro. Himes, Adv. Her., Dec. 11, 1844: 'We have done our work in warning sinners, and trying to awake a formal church. God in his Providence has SHUT THE DOOR.' You say, in the Voice of Truth, Nov. 7, 1844, in describing our position: 'We cheerfully admit, that we have been mistaken in the nature of the event we expected would occur on the tenth day of the seventh month; but we cannot admit, that the Great High Priest did not on that very day accomplish all that the type would justify us to expect. We now believe he did.' George Needham, in Voice of Truth, March 19, 1845, says: 'I am and have been convinced, since the 10th day of the 7th month, that our work with the world and the foolish virgins, is done. I must deny that glorious movement as the work of God, or can come to no other conclusion.'

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

Such has been the interest I have felt on this great subject, I have designed to neglect no means, nor refuse any necessary expenses, to learn

our true position and whereabouts. While the light was shining from our publications, I took all the Advent papers I had knowledge of; and there has been much good matter in them, but I have been *constrained* to believe that most (if not *all* of them) lost their light on our present position, soon after the 10th day of the 7th month. Is this the 'way of the just, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day?' Where is the love that existed among us, previous to the Albany Conference?—Where is the church of Brotherly Love, of which the Lord said: 'Thou hast a little strength, and has kept my word, and hast not denied my name?' Rev. iii, 8. And to whom will the 9th verse apply?

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

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

Yours, in the bonds of love,

E. P. BUTLER.

Waterbury, Vt., Nov. 23, 1850.

SANCTIFY THEM THROUGH THY TRUTH: THY WORD IS TRUTH.

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

DEAR BRO. WHITE—Although a stranger to you, yet I take the liberty of writing you a few lines. I should have written you before now, but I am a man that follows the water for the support of my family; therefore, I am absent from home the greater part of the sailing season. I have now just returned home (having been absent about four months) to stop through the winter. Since my return, I have been reading a small book, the "Advent Review," and also the "Present Truth." I think your views in regard to certain prophecies being fulfilled in '43 and

'44, are correct. I do not hesitate to receive your views in regard to the judgment hour cry, the tarrying time, and the Midnight Cry. I believe that many of the Adventists have been, and still are in an indifferent state; and I think the most of them might with propriety claim the Laodicean state for their position. For myself and family, I can only ask the Lord to grant us repentance unto life. I feel very thankful that you have been so kind as to forward me your paper. I think it is meet in due season, and feel to praise the Lord for it.

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

Yours,

J. B. SWEET.

Oxford, Ohio, Dec. 24th, 1850.

Bro. Lewis Martin, of Bennington, N. H., writes, Jan. 1st, 1851:—"Bro. White—We receive your paper, and we are highly pleased with it; for it is just what we believe, and what we have experienced. I thank and praise God that I have not forgotten the Cry that was made in 1844, "Behold the Bridegroom cometh, go ye out to meet him."—That was the true Midnight Cry. I thank God that he gave me a disposition to heed that Cry. I have just read Bro. Bates' article in the last "Review and Herald." It is good. There are a few of us here, strong in the faith that the parable in Matt. xxv, was fulfilled in the fall of '44. That is, it ended there, down as far as the shut door. We are endeavoring to keep the Sabbath of the Lord our God "according to the commandment."

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

Your books are doing much; do send more."

DUTY TO OUR CHILDREN.

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

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

The children, that are taught, and that keep the commandments of God, as they come to the years of accountability, are believers just as fully as adult persons, that are now embracing *all* of the commandments, in addition to what they believed before.

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

We are rejoiced to know that many are doing their duty. Bro. White has spoken out on this subject, in the "Present Truth." Also Sister Whitcomb; yet there are some, that are not doing all they can, in the way of instructing their children at home, and in taking them with them to the Sabbath and other meetings. God wants to save the children, as well as their parents.

Moses was especially instructed about this thing. "Specially the day that thou stoodest before the Lord thy God in Horeb, when the Lord said unto me, Gather me the people together, and I will make them hear my words, that they may learn to fear me all the days that they shall live upon the earth, *and that they may TEACH THEIR CHILDREN.*" Deut. iv, 10. "Thou shalt keep, therefore, his statutes and his commandments which I command thee this day, that it may go well with thee, and with *THY CHILDREN* after thee;" &c. Verse 40.

See also Deut. xi, 19—21. And ye shall teach them your *CHILDREN*, [my commandments which I command you this day. See verse 13.] speaking of them when thou *sittest in thine house*, and when thou *walkest by the way*, when thou *liest down*, and when thou *risest up*.—And thou shalt write them upon the *door posts* of thine house, and upon thy gates," &c.

When the whole people promised to keep this covenant, God said, "O that there were such an heart in them, that they would fear me, and keep all my commandments always, that it might be well with them, and with *their CHILDREN FOREVER!*" Chap. v, 29.

Isaiah also, when teaching of things that would come to pass in the last days, says, "For I will contend with him that contendeth with thee, and I will save *THY CHILDREN.*" Chap. xlix, 25. "And all thy *CHILDREN shall be taught of the Lord; and great shall be the peace of thy CHILDREN.*" Chap. liv, 13.

At the day of Pentecost, Peter points to the same day that Malachi does. "And it shall come to pass in the last days, (saith God,) I will *pour out of my Spirit* upon all flesh; and your *sons* and your *daughters* shall prophecy, and your young men shall see visions," &c. Acts, ii, 17. "For the promise is unto you and your children," &c. Verse 39.

When God, by his outstretched arm, recovered ancient Israel from the power of the king of Egypt, their *children* were included, and went out with them, and finally entered the promised Canaan. God in setting his hand the second time to recover the remnant of Israel, has shown by his prophets, that the *children* will come with their parents. See Jer. xxx, 20; Eze. xxxvii, 25; Zec. x, 7, 9. Praise our God, we have the evidence that he is now doing this very work among the remnant. Let us look at it also in the example or type according to Paul. 1. Cor. x, 6, 11. The Lord said unto Moses, "Behold, I will rain bread from heaven for you; and the people shall go out and gather a certain rate every day, that I may *prove* them, whether they will *walk* in my LAW, or no." Ex. xvi, 4. This LAW was the *keeping*, or *restoring the seventh-day Sabbath*. Proof, verses 27—30. Here the *children* were included with their parents; so also in the other passages quoted above. So now, in the second and last time, when God is recovering the true Israel, that are keeping and restoring the same seventh day Sabbath, with the keeping of all the commandments of God, they will have their children, that are in like manner obedient, to go with them into the heavenly Canaan.

With what energy and zeal should the parents who keep the commandments, grasp these precious promises for their dear children; and beseech God for help and strength from the Holy Sanctuary, to bring their children to him, before "the great and terrible day of the Lord shall come." At which time their wicked children will be cut down before their eyes, if they have neglected to lead them to God.

With us, we have set apart a portion of the Sabbath to pray with and instruct all the children that come to our meetings, and have already felt the blessing of God attending it. Sensible we are, that our time in doing any more for our children is short. It must be done quickly, or it will be too late.

JOSEPH BATES.

Fairhaven, Mass., Nov. 24, 1850.

ATTITUDE IN PRAYER.

"I will therefore that men pray every where, *lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting.*" 1. Tim. ii, 8. There is much Scripture testimony for this position in prayer. When Moses was to look to God to stay the mighty thunders and hail from Egypt, he went out "and *spread abroad his hands unto the Lord*; and the thunders and hail ceased."—

Ex. ix, 33. And in the war with Israel against Amalek, when Moses held up his hand; Israel prevailed, and when he let down his hand, Amalek prevailed. Ex. xvii, 11. "But Moses' hands were heavy; and they took a stone and put it under him, and he sat thereon; and Aaron and Hur stayed up his *hands*, the one on the one side, and the other on the other side; and his hands were steady until the going down of the sun. And Joshua discomfited Amalek and his people with the edge of the sword." Verses 12, 13.

When Job would be comforted in his deep trouble, he was directed to "stretch out his hands toward God." Job xi, 13. Again, "Lift up your hands in the sanctuary, and bless the Lord." Ps. cxxxiv, 2.

David in deep affliction, said, "I muse on the work of thy hands. I stretch forth my hands unto thee; my soul thirsteth after thee, as a thirsty land." Ps. cxliii, 56. When Nehemiah and Ezra gathered all the people together on their holy feast day, and read the law unto them, "Ezra blessed the Lord, the great God; and all the people answered, Amen, Amen, with *lifting up their hands*: and they bowed their heads, and worshipped the Lord with their faces to the ground." Neh. viii, 6.

The Lord directed Aaron how to bless his people, thus: "The Lord bless thee, and keep thee; The Lord make his face shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee; The Lord lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace." Num. vi, 24—26. "And Aaron lifted up his hand towards the people, and blessed them." Lev. ix, 22. When Ezra in deep trial would prevail with God, he says, "I fell upon my knees, and spread out my hands unto the Lord my God." See Ezra ix, 5.

At the dedication of the Temple, Solomon "kneeled down upon his knees before all the congregation of Israel, and spread forth his hands towards heaven." II. Chron. vi, 13. On that night in which our blessed Lord was betrayed, he retired a little from his disciples, and *kneeled down*, and prayed. See Luke xxii, 41. "And he led them out as far as to Bethany; and he *lifted up his hands*, and blessed them," and passed into heaven. Chap. xxiv, 50. Much more might be adduced from the Old and New Testament, to prove the attitude of God's humble praying people, when in prayer before him. But this may suffice; for every real Christian knows when he kneels before the Great and Mighty God, who is ever ready to answer every sincere petition, how instinctively the *hands* will rise with the voice, as though reaching for the very answer that the soul is crying for. Some may think it makes no difference, if they only get down from a standing position, how they present themselves in prayer before God. Let such practice the above plain Scripture rule, both in private and social seasons of prayer, and they will soon learn (if their hearts are right before him) that the apostle Paul, both saw, and felt the difference between the wrong and right position. Hence his earnest exhortation, "I will therefore that men pray every where, *lifting up holy hands*, without wrath and doubting." In the great and dreadful day of the Lord, when destruction upon destruction is cried, and the whole land shall be desolate, as Jeremiah has prophesied in his fourth chapter, especially verses 19—31, the *spreading forth of hands* by the daughter of Zion, (the remnant in the time of Jacob's trouble,) will be as universal as the day and night prayer; for "their souls will be wearied because of murderers."

JOSEPH BATES.

Fairhaven, Mass., Nov. 24, 1850.

LETTERS RECEIVED SINCE JAN. 2.—P. M. Bates; H. S. Gurney; Lewis Martin; H. S. Case; F. M. Shimper; W. Morse; Robert Harmon; Frederick Wright; P. D. Lawrence; Rosella Lovjoy; S. T. Belden; Eliza Foster; Ira Fancher; Hiram Edson; R. R. Chapin; L. C. Young; Israel Camp; Wm. Lassell; O. Hewett; J. S. Wager; Emily Dav; D. Shaw, P. M.; Philip Collins, \$1; J. Smith, A. Huntly, N. S. Mead, each \$1, by Joseph Bates. G. W. Holt, \$1, for Lebbeus Drew; E. W. Waters, \$2; C. B. Preston, \$1; A. A. Marks, \$15; J. C. Bowles, D. R. Palmer, each \$10; (for the Chart;) J. M. Lowrey, 50 cts.; Sister Bailey, 50 cts.

FOR SISTER SHIMPER.—Hiram Edson, \$1; Rachel Cushin, \$1; Annis and George Waters, \$1.

PUBLICATIONS.

The ADVENT REVIEW, containing thrilling testimonies written in the Holy Spirit, by many of the leaders in the Second Advent cause, showing its Divine origin and progress—48 pages. Also the five numbers of the "Review," and the "Extra," by Bro. Hiram Edson.

The Present Truth, No. 1. The WEEKLY SABBATH taught and enforced in the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments—28 pages.

The Seventh-day Sabbath NOT ABOLISHED. The article by Joseph Marsh, editor of the "Advent Harbinger and Bible Advocate," REVIEWED—36 pages.

The Third Angel's Message—16 pages.

The Sanctuary, 2300 Days, and Shut Door—16 pages.

Bro. Miller's Dream, with notes—12 pages.

The above publications may be had by addressing Elias Goodwin, Oswego, N. Y., Otis Nichols, Dorchester, Mass., or James White, Paris, Me., (POST PAID.) Terms—Gratis. Those who would consider it a pleasure, are invited to help bear the expenses of publishing, as the Lord has prospered them.