

THE ADVENT REVIEW, AND SABBATH HERALD.

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

VOL. II.

SARATOGA SPRINGS, N. Y., FEBRUARY 17, 1852.

No. 12.

JOSEPH BATES, HIRAM EDSON, } Publishing Committee.
and J. N. ANDREWS, }
JAMES WHITE, Editor.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY.

Terms—**GRATIS.** It is expected that all the friends of the cause will aid in its publication, as the Lord hath prospered them.

☞ All communications, orders, and remittances, for the Review and Herald, should be addressed to JAMES WHITE, Saratoga Springs, N. Y. (post paid.)

Remarks of O. R. L. Crozier on the Institution, Design and Abolition of the Sabbath.

REVIEWED.

BY J. N. ANDREWS.

[Concluded from our last.]

"2 Cor. iii was next examined. Those who believe in the Sabbath find it very difficult to make any use of this chapter. That which was "written and engraven on stones" was "done away," "abolished." What was written and engraven on stones? Ex. xxxii, 15, 16 will tell. It was the ten commandments. Those who contend for the perpetuity of the Sabbath have no evidence or arguments to present against these plain statements of God's word; yet they express great surprise that the ten commandments should be abolished, and admitting that they cannot see how men can be any longer under any moral restraint. But this consequence by no means follows, and they very well know that we do not believe that God ever has or ever will absolve men from the obligations of his law; yet he has seen fit to change the verbiage and appendages of his law to suit the unfoldings of his progressive plan. Now this chapter is easy to be understood, if we only allow ourselves to look at the subject impartially. The ten commandments were the constitution of God's religious system, from the departure from Egypt to Christ; but when he came he remodeled the religious system: to do which he set aside—"did away," "abolished"—the old constitution and established a new one, naming and enforcing in the new all the precepts of the old, except that of the Sabbath, which is not once named as belonging to the new system."

The above being the ONLY attempt to meet the real question at issue, viz: Is the royal law abolished? we present it entire. We have been taken down the steps gradually, thus: (1.) Christ relaxed the Sabbath; (2.) the disciples were not subject to it; (3.) the holy women kept it from fear of the Jews; (4.) Jesus and his disciples and those healed by him did more on the Sabbath than was lawful; (5.) The Father lightly esteemed it; (6.) Paul and Barnabas broke it, preferring in its place the first day of the week. There is another step, and the reader has reached the bottom of the stairs. We have been all the while descending, yet have remained in darkness respecting the fate of God's law and of his Sabbath. The seventh step fitly closes this fearful descent, and shows their fate. Prov. vi, 16, 19. God has "abolished," "done away" his "constitution," and thus, having abrogated the first principles of his own government, (that is what is meant by his "constitution,") we are at least set free from one of them, the fourth commandment—the holy Sabbath.

The first principles of his moral government embodied THE SABBATH, (how ridiculous, then, the idea that it was a Jewish shadow!) and God abolished those first principles, and then established a new constitution, with all of them in it except the Sabbath! As though the Infinite Jehovah had no settled principles in his moral government, but was like man, "given to change!" Prov. xxiv, 21; Ps. 1, 21. The great truth that the Sabbath was once one of the first principles of God's moral government, is thus distinctly confessed, but it is an astonishing doctrine that God has abolished all these first principles of his government, and then chosen a part in their stead. The standard of moral principles was defective, and another has been chosen in its stead!

We will state the points in the view presented by C. with which we agree, and also those from which we dissent.—We agree to his statement in the following particulars:

1. The ten commandments were engraven in the tables of stone. Ex. xxxii, 15, 16. (Note Job xix, 24.)
2. We do confess ourselves surprised that the law of God should be abolished, and do not see how men can, in that case, be under moral restraint. Luke xvi, 17; Rom. iv, 15.
3. God has changed the appendages of his law. Heb. x, 14, 17. (The ordinances of the Jewish church, appended to the "constitution," have given place to the ordinances of the Christian church. Heb. ix, 1; Eph. ii, 15; 1 Cor.

xi, 2, 23, 26. But this is a very different thing from abolishing his "constitution.")

4. That this chapter is easy to be understood, if examined impartially. Prov. viii, 8, 9; 1 Sam. iii, 10; Ps. cxix, 72, 126, 128.

5. That the ten commandments were once (at least) the constitution of God's religious system. Ex. xx, 3, 17; Deut. v, 22; Eccl. xii, 13, 14.

We dissent from the following assertions:

1. "Those who believe in the Sabbath find it very difficult to make any use of this chapter."
2. That which was written on stones was abolished.
3. They have no evidence or arguments to present against these plain statements (?) of God's word.
4. Men are under as much moral restraint, as before God's constitution was abolished. (?)
5. God, through his Son, abolished or did away his constitution in the days of the first Advent.
6. He has established a new one, embracing nine of the ten commandments.

We offer the following reasons for dissenting from each point:

1. We do not find it difficult to BELIEVE ALL that is written in 2 Cor. iii. But we have never thought of drawing an inference from it that would make Paul contradict his own direct and positive statements. We have left this for those to do, who having made "void the law through (pretended) faith," would justify themselves in breaking the commandments and teaching men so. The attempt to press it into that service, shows the absolute necessity of wresting and mangling it, before it can be made to say, "that which was engraven on stones was done away." As direct proof on this point, we present the following from another column of the same "Harbinger":

"But i, the ministration of death, WRITTEN and ENGRAVEN ON STONES * * * was to be DONE AWAY * * * is ABOLISHED * * * is DONE AWAY. What can be plainer than this?"

Had any observer of Jehovah's Sabbath been driven to thus wrest and mangle this, or any portion of the divine testimony, in order to sustain himself, I would hide my face and remain dumb with shame. There is no heresy, however "damnable," but what may thus be proved! (??) 2 Pet. ii, 1, 3. The plain reading of the chapter not being enough to the point, the words which explained what was abolished, (viz: the appendages of the law,) are left out. It is by quoting Scripture thus, that it is made to prove that "the royal law" is abolished. We have read in Peter's second epistle that some would wrest the words of PAUL to their own destruction. We had supposed that this remark of Peter belonged to some other period; we now think he rightly placed it in his account of the last days.

2. "That which was written and engraven on stones was done away, abolished." This extraordinary assertion is uttered with the utmost positiveness. But we think that the mangled verses in which Paul has spoken, should be written out in full and suffered to speak for themselves.—Look at them as they stand in the Book of God:

Verse 7. "But if the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away;"

Verse 11. "For if that which is done away was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious."

Verse 13. "And not as Moses, which put a vail over his face, that the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished;"

Verse 14. "But their minds were blinded; for until this day remaineth the same vail untaken away in the reading of the Old Testament: which vail is done away in Christ."

We ask then, is this direct testimony that Jehovah has abolished his "constitution," or is it only inferential? Not one of these verses can be presented as direct testimony, until that part of it which explains what was abolished, is left out. For the question in verse seven is this, Was it the temporary glory that enshrouded Moses in his minis-

tration, as he brought down the holy law of God from the hands of Jehovah, or is it that holy law itself, that has "been done away?" By leaving out the words between "written and engraven in stones," and "is done away" it makes direct and positive, "plain Bible testimony" that the law of God is all abolished. If, however, the words remain as Paul wrote them, the other idea is taught. We pass to the next verse:

Verse 11. "For if that which is done away was glorious, much more that which REMAINETH is glorious." Now as no one will deny that that which is done away in verse 11, is the same as that which is done away in verse 7, we ask, what is that which REMAINETH in distinction from "that which is done away?" For there is direct testimony here, that something REMAINS, and that everything was not done away, or abolished. Were we to answer in the words of inspiration, we would say "the royal law" "REMAINETH;" the hand-writing of ordinances is abolished. James ii; Col. ii.—Were we to answer in the terms used by C. we would say the "CONSTITUTION" REMAINETH; "the appendages of the law" (the Levitical ministration) are done away by the glory of Christ's more excellent ministry, before the ARK OF GOD in the heavenly tabernacle. Rev. xi, 19; Heb. viii, 1—5. The seventh verse, therefore, directly contradicts the view that every thing is abolished and that nothing REMAINS: But could we believe C. the ten commandments with all their appendages were abolished—nothing remains—and nine of the abolished precepts have been gathered up in their stead.

Verse 13 tells us that Moses "put a vail over his face, that the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished." This verse being explanatory of verse 7, we have here a good opportunity to determine what was abolished. WHEN the vail was upon the face of Moses, "the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished." What then did that veil hide? Were the tables of stone hidden by the vail? Nay verily. But the temporary glory of Moses' face, which in the estimation of the Jews still abides. The vail hid that which is abolished. That which he held in his hand was not hidden—it is that which REMAINS!

Verse 14. The vail with which Moses hid the glory of his face still remains upon literal Israel. They still connect in an inseparable manner, the great constitution with the glory that enshrouded Moses, and that attended the Levitical ministration, not seeing that Christ's "more excellent ministry" in the true tabernacle has taken its place. Israel can not see that the hidden glory is gone, but as they can still see the holy law, they believe that that glory must abide as well as that law. Others at the present day fall into the opposite extreme; they can see that that glory is gone, and hence conclude that that holy law has gone also. They do not see that in the heavenly tabernacle, where our Great High Priest is accomplishing his most glorious ministration, the ARK OF GOD abides as well as in the earthly tabernacle. They think highly indeed of the mercy seat, (Ex. xxv, 17—22,) but the law of God contained in the ark beneath that mercy seat, is despised and counted a thing of naught. Heb. ix, 4. The dream, that the blood of Christ blotted out the moral law (the very thing that caused it to be shed) will be found vain and delusive in the day of God!

The proof from this chapter, therefore, that God's law is abolished, being only inferential, we now inquire into the character of an inference on which rests the most remarkable doctrine that was ever taught. That it is not a necessary inference we have already seen. And we now inquire whether it agrees with the plain statements of this same Apostle. The doctrine is this: The Infinite Jehovah abolished the first principles of his own government, and then formed the most of them into a revised constitution! To believe this requires strong faith on the part of any one who has any just conception of the Infinite Jehovah. Isa. lv, 8, 9. Rathér, I should say, it requires strong testimony to establish such a view.

The apostle Paul has elsewhere stated in distinct terms what was abolished, and what is yet in force. He is consistent with himself, he is to be believed.

Eph. ii, 15. "Having abolished in his flesh the enmity.

even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace."

Col. ii, 14. "Blotting out the hand-writing of ordinances that was against us which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross."

Paul distinctly teaches that the "hand-writing of ordinances" was abolished. Now hear Paul speak of the "royal law."

He shows in Rom. iii, 19, that the law of God condemns the whole world, and thence onward through the chapter, shows how men are delivered from its fearful condemnation, and how they are justified in the sight of God; viz: by faith in the death of the Lord Jesus Christ, "the just for the unjust." He then informs us whether the salvation and pardon of the Gospel, offered to men though faith in him who has been slain, destroyed the law of Jehovah or not:

Rom. iii, 31. Do we then make void the law through faith? GOD FORBID: YEA, WE ESTABLISH THE LAW.

The Apostle was converted AFTER the ascension of the Lord, consequently after the time when it is said the law was abolished. His conversion is the most remarkable one upon record. But mark what it was that shew him that he was a sinner, and that he was lost without a Saviour.

Rom. vii, 7. What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." (Tenth commandment.) Verse 12. "Wherefore the law is holy; and the commandment holy, and just, and good."—An abolished law never yet convicted a man of sin. And on his own testimony, he had not known sin had the law been abolished.

But hear him again. He wishes to enforce obedience to parents, and he takes the fifth commandment to do it: [Eph. vi, 2, 3:] "Honor thy father and mother, (which is the first commandment with promise,) that it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth." Mark, it is not Paul that establishes the commandment (as some would have us think) but the commandment that establishes what Paul has said. These statements of Paul show unequivocally that he did believe the hand-writing of ordinances to be abolished, and DID NOT BELIEVE that the ten commandments, God's great constitution of holy principles were. But in order to examine this same point still further, we will introduce C's next assertion:

3. "Those who believe in the perpetuity of the Sabbath have no evidence or argument to present against these plain statements (?) of God's word." Had C. refuted the plain testimonies of Holy Writ, bearing as he well knows directly against him, instead of passing them in silence, and then said that Sabbath-keepers have nothing to present against these inferences, he might have been somewhat entitled to confidence. Wholesale, sweeping assertions like the one just quoted may weigh with some as argument, but they are most frequent where argument is wanting. We offer the following direct testimony relative to the perpetuity of God's constitution, asking that C. will either refute it, or else withdraw his assertions.

1. THE TESTIMONY OF THE LORD JESUS: "Think not that I am come to subvert, the law or the prophets. I am come not to subvert, but to ratify. For verily I say unto you, heaven and earth shall sooner perish, than one iota, or one tittle of the law shall perish without attaining its end. Whosoever, therefore, shall violate, or teach others to violate were it the least of these commandments, shall be in no esteem in the reign of heaven; but whosoever shall practice and teach them, shall be highly esteemed in the reign of heaven." Matt. v, 17—19. [Campbell's Translation.] Luke xvi, 17. Matt. xxii, 35—40.

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

3. THE TESTIMONY OF JAMES. "If ye fulfill the royal law, according to the Scripture, thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself, ye do well: But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors. For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. For he that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law. So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty." James ii, 8—12.

4. THE TESTIMONY OF JOHN. "And every man that hath this hope in him, purifieth himself, even as he is pure. Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law. And ye know that he

was manifested to take away our sins and in him is no sin." 1. John iii, 3—5; Rev. xii, 17; xiv, 12; xxii, 14.

4. Men are as much under moral restraint, as before God's constitution was abolished. In explaining the point, he says that God "has seen fit" to change the verbiage and appendages of his law to suit the unfolding of his progressive plan." Had he said nothing more, we had altogether remained silent, for the constitution might be still supposed to abide, to hold men in check. But when we are told that the first principles of God's holy law are abolished, we inquire where the moral restraint is found. Had C. considered it worth his while to show any act of God in re-enacting his law, and thus establishing another constitution, he might then assert that men are under moral restraint, even as before the holy law was abolished. But when the law of God is cut up by the roots and scattered to the four winds, we cannot restrain a feeling of deep anxiety for the ark of God.

No man has yet explained how, or by what means the law of God was re-enacted. Most have taken it for granted, because the last six commandments are several times quoted in the New Testament, that they are certainly re-enacted. But notice these points: (1.) The first four are not quoted in the New Testament. Then they are not re-enacted. (2.) The last six are several times quoted. Then they are several times re-enacted. (3.) When Christ quoted from the law of God, it was not in the form of a re-enactment, but as a quotation from the law of Jehovah. (4.) But since Christ quoted a part of the law, the whole law has been abolished. (5.) When the apostles quoted the law of God, they quoted from the original law and not from a revised edition of Jehovah's constitution. And their quotations are proof, not of the re-enactment of God's law, but of its perpetuity. Rom. vii, 7, 12; Eph. vi, 2; James ii, 8—12.—(6.) There is no re-enactment of God's law recorded in the Bible. Hence, if the law of Jehovah has been abrogated, there is no moral law! We now request C. to explain how men are as much under moral restraint as before the royal law of the King Eternal was annulled.

5. God, through his Son, "abolished," "did away" his constitution in the days of the first Advent. No further proof is presented, than the inference already noticed. Why God did this, we are told but in part, and nothing of the kind being written in the Book of God, we shall be indebted to C. for all the light we have. Will he explain the subject further. We can however suggest one reason, and but one. It is this: Jehovah's Sabbath, a shadow, had entered into his constitution, and in order to get it out, God abolished his constitution, and then named nine of its precepts, (it is not shown when, nor where,) and made another. But as it may be possible that Jehovah places a higher estimate upon the Sabbath which he made for man, than its opponents do, and as the language of Job. xxiii, "he is of one mind, and who can turn him," may still be true, it is at least, possible that this is "a cunningly devised fable" that God has never sanctioned. Did the Infinite Law-giver in any instance that can be produced, ever enact a law, then abolish it, then re-enact it? Such variability and contradiction might perhaps be found in men, but should never be charged upon God. How well can the Old and New Testaments agree, when one was formed on one constitution, and the other was formed on another? Is God "altogether such an one as thyself?" Can God deny himself?

6. He has established a new constitution. For this idea also, we are indebted to C. as it is not contained in the Holy Scriptures. God has indeed promised that he would make a new covenant, but when he did this, he would put his law into the heart and write it in the mind. No abolition or re-enactment named, and none has ever existed except in the theories of men. We are also indebted to C. for a knowledge of what the new constitution contains. It was made by naming and enforcing nine of the ten commandments. The facts in the case are, that while the New Testament distinctly teaches the perpetuity of God's constitution, it has never repeated but six of the ten, those written on the second table. The constitution once consisted of the ten commandments. These God abolished at the death of his Son. He takes nine of these abolished precepts and makes a new constitution! A strange constitution truly, made up of precepts that God had abolished! Nine abolished precepts, are established without showing how! It is said that the creed of the sceptic involved the most unaccountable absurdities. But they can hardly excel such absurdities as these.

We invite attention again to 2 Cor. iii. The subject before the mind of the Apostle is the surpassing glory and excellency of the Gospel ministry. See verses 1—6. He then argues that "if the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not stead-

fastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away; how shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious?" The word ministration signifies "the act of performing service" or "service" itself. Mack night renders it *ministry*. It is thrice used in the New Testament. Luke i, 23. Zechariah accomplished the days of his ministration, (service.) Acts vi, 1. The Grecians "were neglected in the daily ministration" (service.) 2 Cor. ix, 13. Paul's *service* for the poor saints at Jerusalem is called a ministration. The face of Moses when he came down from the Mount shone with glory. Yet what he brought down was only condemnation, and death written and engraven by the finger of Jehovah. His ministry or service, was only the ministration of condemnation and of death. The holy law was written in those tables of stone, and it could only show them to be sinners and condemn them to death. Rom. iii, 19, 20; vii, 7—10; Gal. iii, 21. The Gospel of Jesus Christ recognizes all men thus condemned and sentenced to death, (2 Cor. v, 14, 15; Rom. iii,) and brings them the joyful tidings of pardon through the blood of the Son of God, in whom justice and mercy meet together. If the face of Moses shone with glory, though he only ministered condemnation and death, how much more glorious then is that ministry that offers life, pardon, and salvation!

Glorious as was that ministration it was not to abide. The glory was hidden, "the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished." But we all with open face, behold Jesus a merciful and faithful High Priest, standing before the ark containing God's holy law, and sprinkling his blood upon the top of that ark, the mercy seat. The ministration of condemnation has given place to the ministration of righteousness, not because the law that condemned the world has been done away, but because the blood that brings pardon has been offered for guilty man.

The remarks of C. occasion the following suggestions:

1. The ten commandments embodied the Holy Sabbath and formed the constitution of God's government; yet, according to C the same argument that would establish the Sabbath embodied in this constitution, would also establish the Jewish feasts, which were ONLY embodied in the hand-writing of ordinances!

2. Christ relaxed a part of the constitution of God's religious system, the disciples violated it, the holy women did not keep it, God the Father lightly esteemed it, and to get rid of it the whole constitution was abolished!

3. The whole foundation of God's religious system, his constitution, has been torn up and scattered to the winds, in order to get the Sabbath out of it. This, it is very true would be necessary in order to get rid of the Sabbath—but it cannot be done until a stronger than the Most High shall be found!

We have descended the flight of steps presented by C. and now stand upon the last one for a moment's reflection. This step we perceive is marked, "Law of God abolished." We have noticed the deception and dangerous character of each step as we have descended. We have also seen that there is nothing real in the step on which we stand. We look into the gulf before us; it is a pit, the depth of which has never yet been fathomed.

In strong contrast with this, let us mark the steps which lead to the "holy hill of Zion" (1.) "By the law is the knowledge of sin." Rom. iii, 20; vii, 7. (2.) "Repentance toward God." Acts xx, 21. (3.) "Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ." Acts xvi, 31. (4.) "Faith worketh by love." Gal. v, 6. (5.) "This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments" 1 John. v, 3; Rom. xiii, 10. (6.) "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." Rev. xxii, 14.

Reader I set before thee life and death, (Matt. xix, 17; Rom. vi, 23,) which doest thou choose? Prov. ix, 12.

"Finally, Rom. xiv was examined." The whole matter may be stated in a few words without doing injustice to C. This chapter proves that there is no difference in days—not merely feast days but between the first, third, seventh, or any other day; each is at liberty to esteem one day above another, or to esteem every day alike. And finally Col. ii, 16, was brought to prove that no one has a right to judge us in any such matter.

To expose the deceptive character of the broad field which C. thus endeavors to open at the foot of his flight of stairs, we call attention to the following admirable remarks of Dr. Justin Edwards in his (FIRST-DAY) Sabbath Manual:

"Some, after they embraced the Gospel, thought that the ceremonial as well as the moral laws were binding. Others, more enlightened, thought that they were not. This led to contention among them.

Paul, in the fourteenth chapter of Romans, presented such considerations as were adopted to lead them in this matter, to a right decision.

"One man," he says, esteemeth one day above another. Another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.—He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it." Both mean to honor God, and, he will accept them. But what day does he speak of? "The Sabbath" of the fourth commandment, associated by God inseparably with the *moral laws*! Read the connection. What is it? Is it, one man believeth he must worship Jehovah; another who is weak, worshippeth idols? One believeth that he must not commit murder, idolatry or theft, and another thinks he may? Were those the laws about which they were contending, and with which were connected the days that he speaks of? No: about those laws there was no dispute.

But, "one believeth that he may eat all things," (which are nourishing, whether allowed in the ceremonial law, which regulated such things, or not;) "another, who is weak, eateth herbs." Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not; and let not him that eateth not judge him that eateth, for God hath received him." Those were the laws about which they were contending, and with regard to which the Apostle was giving them instructions. It was not the *moral*, but the *ceremonial* laws; and the days spoken of were those which were connected, not with the former, but with the latter.

So, in the second chapter of Colossians, "Let no man judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbaths." The sabbaths spoken of are not "the Sabbath" associated with, Thou shalt not murder, or adultery, or theft; but the sabbaths associated with meats and drinks, and new moons, which were, indeed, shadows of things to come. But to take what he said about these sabbaths which were associated by God with ceremonial laws, and which the Apostle himself in this very discourse, associates with them, and apply it as some have done to "THE SABBATH" which God associated with moral laws, is *wrong*." Pages 134, 135, 136.

Now we add, that in the beginning, Jehovah sanctified and hallowed his Sabbath for man, and thence throughout the Bible, it is called the "Holy Sabbath unto the Lord," the "holy of the Lord honorable," "my holy day," "the Lord's day" &c. But you will say, I do not believe that the day is *now* sanctified and hallowed, on account of Jehovah's act at creation. Will you please listen a moment. Why do you see in every thing around you the most visible marks that mortality, decay and corruption, are stamped upon them? If you reply, because the earth is under the curse of God, we answer, Truth, but when did God put his curse there? All must answer, It was done at the fall of man. But why is it there now? Has he ever cursed it again? Never, Gen. viii, 21, 22. But the original curse abides, and will abide, until it shall have devoured the earth, (Isa. xxiv, 1-3,) when the curse shall be removed, and the family of the redeemed inherit the new earth forever. Rev. xxii, 1-3. We call attention again to God's hallowed day. His blessing was placed upon the Sabbath, prior to his curse being placed upon the earth;—he hallowed the day—he has never removed his blessing from it—it abides there still—it will abide there 'mid the glories of Paradise restored. Isa. lxvi, xvi, 23, 2. And in the language of Bolok to Balaam though in a far higher sense we say; I wot that what he blesset is blessed and what he cursest is cursed! Num. xxii, 6.

But did not Paul say "another esteemeth every day alike?" And does not the term "every day," include God's Sabbath? We answer if you will turn to Ex. xvi, 4, *again*, you will read, "The people shall go out and gather a certain rate EVERY DAY" and in the account of their acts we read "they gathered it every morning, Verse 21. But when they went out on the Sabbath to gather, the frown and the rebuke of Jehovah was upon them. Verses 27-29. It is manifest therefore, that when Jehovah saith "every day," that day is excepted which he hath reserved unto himself. Ex. xx, 8-11. See the point exactly illustrated by the language of 1 Cor. xv, 27. But we do not say on the authority of the Bible, that the first day of the week, for which C. puts forth all the plea that he is able, is one of "the six working days" (Eze. xlvi, 1.) and is one of the "every days" that are alike, an Apostle being judge. We should understand that God addresses us as reasonable beings, and "not as the horse, or as the mule, which have no understanding; whose mouth must be held in with bit and bridle, lest they come near unto thee." Ps. xxxii, 9; Prov. xxi, 16.

But as a direct and positive testimony that when he saith "every day alike" Jehovah's Rest-day is

excepted, we introduce Rev. i, 10, "I was in the Spirit on THE LORD'S DAY." This is a direct testimony to the fact that in the GOSPEL DISPENSATION, one day is still claimed by God. As we do not read in any place (except in the "FATHERS" who prepared the way for the great apostacy by adding tradition to the word of God) that Jehovah has "put away" his holy day and chosen another, we submit the following testimony as to what is the Lord's day. Gen. ii, 3. "God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it." Ex. xvi, 23. "The rest of the Holy Sabbath unto the Lord." Ex. xx, 8. "Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy." Is. lviii, 13. "My holy day" "the holy of the Lord, honorable" Mark ii, 28. "The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath" Rev. i, 10. "I was in the spirit on the Lord's day."

We will not say of Sunday-keeping, as C. affirms respecting God's Sabbath, that it is a type, unless perhaps it be ~~is~~ a type of the day that follows God's great week of time, WHEN THE WICKED SHALL BE RAISED AND PUNISHED; (Rev. xx, 5, 7-9;) ~~is~~ but we do say that it is a shadow—there is no substance to it—nothing real—nothing divine about it. Rom. xiv, 5-6.

We now examine his remarks relative to the two laws. He states the view to be this: The ten commandments constituted the law of God; and the last four books of Moses, the ten commandments excepted, constituted the ceremonial law, the abolition of which is taught in 2 Cor. iii. He then disposes of the whole question, by stating that the two great commandments named by Christ, (Matt. xxii, 35-40,) are not found in the decalogue, but in the ceremonial law. Deut. vi, 4, 5; Lev. xix, 18. He adds, their theory would abolish the two pronounced greatest by Jesus Christ, and would retain the ten which Paul says are abolished. "They ought to feel the force of this fact."

To this we answer, that we have already noticed the inference by which Paul is made to say that the divine constitution is abolished, and have shown that it is not only an unnecessary inference, but that it positively contradicts his own direct statements, also that of Jesus, of James and of John. We now respectfully represent that our "theory" does not teach that the two great commandments on which the others hang have been abolished. The force of his misrepresentation, we do feel. "The hand of Joab is in all this!"

That there may be no mistaking of the view, let me state it in distinct terms. We have believed and taught that "the ten words" written upon the tables of stone, were a *summing up* of ALL the principles of God's holy law, and that they were mixed with Jewish ordinances; and that those things which were against us, which were taken out of the way, were found in the book ONLY: NOT that every thing that was written in the book was abolished, (for the ten commandments after being given by themselves are interspersed through the ceremonial law,) and that NOTHING THAT WAS IN THE TABLES OF STONE WAS ABOLISHED.

Relative to the distinction mentioned may I not appeal even to C. Despite his hostility to the view, he confesses in distinct terms that the "Ten commandments were the CONSTITUTION of God's religious system;" while that connected with it seems to be entitled to no higher designation than "the verbiage and appendages of his Law!" Is there no distinction between a CONSTITUTION, and the laws that may be appended to it?

We do not believe that the two great principles out of which our duty to God and our fellow man springs, viz: Supreme love to him, and the love of our neighbor as ourselves, are abolished; nor do we believe that our "whole duty" (the commandments of God that grow out of these two principles) is abolished. Eccl. xii, 13, 14.

We now present two New Testament expositions respecting these two laws; the one from the pen of the apostle Paul, as an exposition of that law which "is abolished;" the other from the pen of James, as an exposition of that law which is "established." We trust that even C. will be satisfied respecting the distinction. We introduce, then, the apostle Paul to show the character of the law abolished, and to give an inspired commentary on it. Listen then to the words of the Apostle to the Gentiles:

"Blotting out the hand-writing of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross; and having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it. Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new-moon, or of the sabbath-days; which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ." Col. ii, 16, 17.

Every word of this we believe. No part of the moral duty of men is contained in the above—no one

of the ten precepts of Jehovah's "royal law" is abolished by it!

Now we call attention to the apostle James. He is rebuking his brethren for the sin of partiality to the rich, and (what a marvel!) he takes the law of God to do it with; not an amended copy, or revised edition, but the original which was perfect! Hear him:

"If ye fulfill the royal law, ACCORDING TO THE SCRIPTURE, *Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself*, do well: But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and ARE CONVINCED OF THE LAW AS TRANSGRESSORS. For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. For he that said, do not commit adultery, said also, do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law. So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty." James ii, 8-12.

We believe every word of this also. And it does show that there is a "royal law" that is *not abolished*, as well as a "hand-writing of ordinances" that is abolished. And that the two *great principles*, are inseparably connected with the ten great duties.—Matt. xxii, 35-40. We appeal to C.—we appeal to all who may read, "Are not these things so?"

James quotes but one of the two great principles, (as he was speaking of our duty to our neighbor only,) and consequently names precepts that grow out of that, found on the last table. But this no more proves that the first table (our duty to God) is abolished, than it proves that the first of the two great principles (supreme love to God) is abolished also!

Besides, the Apostle does distinctly say in speaking of the ten commandments, that "whosoever shall keep the whole law, but shall fail with respect, to one precept hath become *guilty of ALL*." [Macknight.] This also we believe. And in the last of the verses quoted above, he directs us to speak and to act as those "that shall be judged by the law of liberty."

Christ in Matt. v, 18, in speaking of this same law of liberty, cites us forward to the time when heaven and earth shall pass away, as the first point (at least) to look for the passing of the law of God. And it is a fact of surpassing interest, that at that point John says: And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face THE EARTH AND THE HEAVEN FLED AWAY; and there was found no place for them. And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works."—Rev. xx, 11, 12.

Mercy, which now offers pardon, obtained by the death of God's only Son, to guilty man condemned by the holy law, [Rom. iii,] shall have then stepped out, and stern justice will vindicate the broken law, and the insulted blood of the Lord Jesus Christ.—The commandment keepers will then enter into life, [Matt. xix, 16, 17; Rev. xxii, 14,] and those who have continued in sin ("sin is the transgression of the law") will receive the wages of sin—THE SECOND DEATH! Rom. vi, 23; Rev. xx, 15; xxii, 15.

"Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." Gal. vi, 7. I dare no more suppress these solemn and fearful truths, than I dare to deny the existence of the Most High God. And I would solemnly charge, nay I would entreat with tears, those who are determined to break the fourth commandment and to teach men so, that they do it on their own responsibility, and that they do not charge the sin of Antinomianism upon Christ and his chosen apostles!

The statement of C. respecting the two laws being false, the force of the matter is against him and ought to be felt by him! Let him show from the divine testimony that "the royal law" and "the hand-writing of ordinances" are the same, and we promise not to be "slow of heart to believe all that is written!"—We have taught the perpetuity both of the two and also of the ten commandments. Is such a theory any worse than the theory that (seems at least) to teach the abolition of both?

The ten commandments (duties) grow out of the two great commandments, (principles,) as materially as the fingers proceed from the two arms, and neither the two nor the ten, can be spared better than a man can part with his arms or his fingers. (We suggest that the directions given to Wisdom's Son, [Prov. vii, 3,] to bind the commandments about his fingers, could be obeyed much better, before one of the ten was abolished than since that time.) We believe in the perpetuity both of the two and of the ten—both of the arms and of the fingers; but C. teaches, (I ask pardon for the figure,) that the fingers have all been cut off, and then nine of them have been joined on again, though the manner in which this latter process was accomplished, is not very fully stated by him. If it took Jehovah in person to enact his law,

we ask whether it will not require quite as exalted a being to re-enact it, after it shall have been abolished by him?

The ten commandments hang on the two; they have ever hung there; they must continue to hang there until the principles of God's own holiness can change—until the love of God and of our neighbor, can consist of something else beside keeping those commandments that embody our whole duty to them!

The ten commandments grow out of the relation that man sustained before the fall, and embody those moral principles that are as immutable as God's character. Paul shows us that it is by the law (something just right itself) that the knowledge of sin exists. He shows that all men are condemned by it, and shown to be guilty in the sight of God, and that it is by the blood of Christ, and not by any typical sacrifice, that men are redeemed.

He shows that faith in that blood that was shed for our transgressions of the law, justifies us in the sight of him whose holy law has been broken. And that faith in him does not make void the law, but establishes it. He shows that faith works by love, and the love of God is manifested by keeping his commandments.

Then by the great work of redemption, supreme love to God and the love of our neighbor as ourselves (represented in the figure by the arms) is restored to us, and flows out through the ten commandments, (the fingers in the figure) in rendering not by mere outward act, but from a heart of pure love, those duties that we owe to our God and to our fellow men. The two are the principles; the ten are the principles carried out into acts.

The only way that these precepts can be kept, is by being filled with perfect love to God, which is the only fulfilling of the law that God will accept. As the work of salvation is all of grace through faith, there is no room left for Phariseism, (self righteous trustings in the law as though the obedience of a proud spirit would be acceptable to God. Luke xviii, 9—14.) nor yet for Antinomianism, (the making "void the law through faith," forgetting that it is necessary that faith should cause us to fulfill the righteousness of the law. "Rom. viii, 1—7.") The one is solemnly rebuked by Paul, the other in no less measured terms by James. Rom. x; James ii.

The great evangelical doctrine of the New Testament may be summed up in a few words which the Holy Ghost useth:

1. WE ARE SAVED BY GRACE THROUGH FAITH.
2. FAITH WORKS BY LOVE, WHICH IS THE FULFILLING OF THE LAW.

Those who are thus striving for salvation, have not fallen from grace!! They are not justified by the law nor do they sacrilegiously make it void through pretended faith. Those thus redeemed by the blood of Christ, constitute the church of the New Testament. The ordinances of Christ belong to these alone and in no sense to the world. It is *the law of God* that leads men to repent—it is the gospel that offers them pardon through Jesus Christ. Their relation to each other as members of the church of Christ, and to Christ as their Lord, is defined by that which Christ and his apostles have said. Their relation to God the Father and to their fellow men, as such, is defined by the law of God. We desire both "the Son and the Father,"—the commandments of God, AND the testimony of Jesus Christ. Amen.

As "the hand-writing of ordinances" or "law of commandments contained in ordinances" is abolished, some may be ready to assert that the ten commandments were ordinances of the Jewish Church. Let us test the matter. If the commandments were church ordinances, then those who were not members of that church were not amenable to them. For all church ordinances grow out of the relation that men sustain as members of the church.

But we ask whether the precept, "Thou shalt not steal," was in the days of the Hebrew Church, or is now in the days of the Christian, a church ordinance? Were there no people but the Hebrews amenable to it then? Is there none but Christians amenable to it now? Test the commandments "Thou shalt not kill," "Thou shalt not commit adultery," or indeed any of the ten in the same manner, and then answer me, Were they church ordinances, or were they moral laws? Do they grow out of the relation that men sustain as church members, or as moral beings accountable to the government of God? True it is that the Jews had this advantage, that unto them were committed the oracles of God; [Rom. iii, 1, 2; Acts vii, 38:] but the Apostle proceeds to show how "exceeding broad" they were, by stating in verse 19, that every mouth is stopped by them, and the whole world shown to be guilty before God! But says one, As you deny that THE SABBATH was Jewish, do you call it Christian? No, by no means. It is like the other precepts of the moral law, DIVINE! It was made by Jehovah for man, embodied in the royal law of God, and is as immutable as that law itself! Matt. v, 17—19.

"But it was a sign between God and the children of Israel, throughout their generations, and what do you do with that fact?" We do with that as with other portions of the divine testimony.—We BELIEVE it. It was a sign between God and the Hebrews for a certain period, for it designated them as worshipers of the TRUE God IN DISTINCTION from the nations around them, who worshipped "the gods that HAVE NOT MADE THE HEAVENS AND THE EARTH." Jer. x, 10—12; Eze. xx, 20. But this no more proves that it is now abolished, than the fact that Jesus is now a sign that is spoken against, (Luke ii, 34,) proves that he will be abolished, when he shall cease to be such a sign! We "delight" in the Sabbath, we adore the Lord of the Sabbath! He sums up the Bible class report thus:

"In reference to the position of the New Testament on the Sabbath question, two points were made: 1. Neither the Saviour nor any of his apostles ever enforced the Sabbath precept. 2. In all the catalogues of sins contained in the New Testament, Sabbath breaking is not once named.—In view of these facts, it was claimed that no christian could be required to keep the Sabbath day."

(1.) The above reflects much greater credit upon the shrewdness of the writer, than it does upon his candor in summing up so important a question. The fourth commandment is a part of the royal law, and it is his part to get it out, nor ours to insert it a second time. The idea that the moral law of God NEEDED to be enforced by the Son of God, or by any of his apostles, is a singular, and in the highest degree absurd, idea! Christ often took the law of God to enforce what he said himself, and so did the apostles!

But as marvels will never cease, we are given to understand that what Christ and his apostles did not enforce, is not binding on us as Christians. And the Sabbath precept having never been quoted directly by Christ or his apostles, we are not as Christians under obligation to keep it. Those who make this assertion seem not to have weighed it very well. The first four are not quoted; and we as Christians are not "required to keep them!" But to show how little weight it would have, had our Lord quoted the fourth commandment several times, we add that the last six, a part of which he quoted several times, are all abolished, together with the first four which he did not quote, all of which they attempt to prove from 2 Cor. iii. So that since that time we have a new law of God. That God who gave his holy law in person and himself wrote it, has abolished it, to re-enact it either through Christ or his apostles. Not approving the expression, we do not say that Christ and his apostles enforced the law, for how could the Son who says "My Father is greater than I," much more how could the apostles who were not so great as him who sent them, enforce the law of Jehovah? But on the strength of their testimony, we do declare that they most solemnly teach its perpetuity, and its immutability. Matt. v, 17—19; xxii, 35—40; Luke xvi, 17; Rom. iii, 31; vii, 7—25; viii, 1—7; 1 Cor. ix, 21; James ii, 8—12; 1 John iii, 4, 5.

(2.) The catalogue of sins named in the New Testament, contain nothing that the law of God does not show to be sinful. But they may be used to justify other sins as well as the sin of Sabbath breaking.—The sin of slave-holding is not named unless by implication, the sin of Polygamy is certainly not noticed distinctly, yet both these sins were very general in the apostles days, and certainly very heinous. The New Testament never yet offered its catalogue of sins as a complete list, for some omit to name many grievous sins, and all omit some that are very heinous. But mark! there is a standard somewhere by which these things are shown to be sins. We ask what is it? Now will you agree to believe the NEW TESTAMENT? If so we pledge ourselves to show that it is that much hated law of God.

Hear the beloved disciple: "Sin is the transgression of the law." 1 John iii, 4. Now hear Paul tell how sin is made manifest: "By the law is the knowledge of sin." Rom. iii, 20. Hear him again: "I HAD NOT KNOWN SIN BUT BY THE LAW." Rom. vii, 7, 13. This is the only standard by which sin is shown. It is the embodiment of God's own principles of holiness, and never can be improved even by Omnipotence. Ti. i, 2; Rom. vii, 12.

It is enough that the apostles have told us what the standard is by which sin is shown; we take the standard and tell any man who breaks the law of God, either the fourth, the seventh, or the eighth commandment, he is a sinner, and "the ways of sin is death!" We do not rebuke a man for an act of sin by turning to any of the catalogues of sin; we take the standard by which those acts are shown to be sinful and read to him "thus saith the Lord!"

Let me repeat the doctrine: The law of God is the only standard by which the acts of men as moral beings, are shown to be either righteous or wicked in the sight of God. Those who can present any other standard are requested to do it. (1) The New Testament distinctly teaches the doctrine.

Rom. iii, 20; vii, 7; 1 John iii, 4. (2) It pronounces this standard perfect. Rom. vii, 12; James ii, 8—12; i, 25. (3.) But for the benefit of those who claim that the New Testament furnishes us with another standard by which sin is shown, besides the law of God, we ask that this imaginary standard may be tested with this question: Does the New Testament show it to be wrong for a man to marry his sister, or his daughter? Shall I be answered as I was sometime since, "Such an act would not be sinful?" Those who wish to see this subject defined, can read it at length, in Lev. xviii. That the abominations there described are not mere Jewish pollutions, is evident from the fact that the land of Palestine was said to vomit out its first inhabitants on account of these things!

With the following points from the New Testament, we submit the question:

1. The perpetuity and immutability of the law of God is distinctly taught.

2. The Law of God is made the standard by which sin is shown.

3. Redemption from its fearful condemnation by the death of God's only Son, lays us under infinitely stronger obligations to keep it.

We cannot help noticing the assertion respecting prejudice. A few to be sure are shocked at the idea of calling God's holy law "the old Jewish law," "miserable rickety old law," and the like expressions, but the prejudices of the mass is all against the observer of Jehovah's Rest-day. Witness the expressions of contempt thrown upon the institution and its observers. "The old Jewish Sabbath," &c; "Judaizers" &c. &c. Nor can we forbear the remark, that the remainder of the article in question is one of the most shrewd efforts to create prejudice, and to throw dust, that we have ever seen. Else why should he refute things as arguments, that he knows we do not rest upon, and make assertions respecting us that are absolutely false! We notice the following points in the order presented by him:

1. "As the Sabbath is a type, some think it should be observed till its antitype—the day of the Lord—comes. But this is a mistake; for the same principle would bind us to keep all the other sabbaths of the Levitical law; and also all the other typical ceremonies that have not yet met their antitypes, such as the cleansing of the Sanctuary, feast of tabernacles, jubilee &c."—We do not believe that the Sabbath is a type, consequently have never used the argument which C. refutes. The evidences upon which C. rests, to prove that it is a type, have been reviewed already. But as C. calls it a type of the day of the Lord—the thousand years, we ask him to explain why the type should be observed after the antitype has come. Isa. lxxvi, 22, 23. Will not those who observe the Sabbath then, "walk in a shadow, or in the dark, instead of the light?" (See another column of the same paper.) When C. shall have refuted his own ARGUMENT OR "the cleansing of the Sanctuary," we will reconsider the subject.

2. C. next says that "Christ did not 'break the law' in abrogating the Sabbath observance, any more than in abrogating the other legal ceremonies: he will 'fulfill' it as well as the rest, in its time."—We ask C. if Christ did not break the law, in violating the fourth commandment before it was abolished? Does not C. believe that Col. ii, proves the abolition of the fourth commandment at Christ's death? Will he now say that he abolished it at the beginning of his ministry? If so, we think that the law must have been very hard to destroy, [Luke xvi, 17,] to have needed abolition twice! First before the ministry of Jesus, second at his death. If you say the law was abolished but once, and that this was done at the death of Christ, as we may infer from your use of Col. ii, we ask if Christ did not break the law in violating the fourth commandment before that time? The absurdity of two abolitions of the law is quite equal to the two or three times of instituting the Sabbath.

3. "Some who are preaching the Sabbath, think they are the 'angel' of Rev. vii, 2, sealing the servants of God in their foreheads, and the Sabbath is that seal of the 'living God.'" How wicked a thing it must be then to keep the fourth commandment! Rather, how wicked must it be to misrepresent those who are so doing! The idea conveyed by the above, that those who are trying to do and to teach the commandments [Matt. v, 17—19] believe themselves to be the angel of Rev. vii, with the seal of the 'living God' is false and is only thrown in for effect. Perhaps one or two individuals may have suggested the idea, but it has never been received by us as a body, nor do I know of one person that thus believes.—Read the following from the "Review and Herald" for February, 1851. "We learned that it had been reported in Bristol, (Vt.), that we profess to be the angel ascending from the east, having the seal of the living God. &c. Rev. vii, 2. But those who have read our writings, and have known our faith

know better." We do believe, however, that the four winds are about to be loosed, and that the time of trouble such as never was, will soon commence. Dan. xii, 1; Jer. xxv, 30—36; Isa. xvii, 12, 14; Rev. xiii, 14—17; xii, 17. We find no promise that those will be sealed, who break the commandments and teach men so. Can C. point it out? At another time we may notice this subject at length.

4. "Akin to the above is the assertions of the same persons, that observing the first day of the week as a Sabbath, is having the Mark of the Beast and exposes to the wrath of God" denounced by the third angel in Rev. xiv, 9—11.—"It is not a thing impossible that the Mark of the Beast may have some connection with the very institution for which C. puts forth all the plea that he is able. It is well remarked by J. B. Cook that "Every enactment relative to the religious observance of the first day, originated with the Pope and Potentates of Rome, and those who in this matter sympathize with them."—It is true that the Papal power was to "think to change times and laws." Dan. vii, 25. It is true that the Mark of the Beast stands in opposition to, or in contrast with, the commandments of God. Rev. xiv, 9—12. It is also true that when the commandments of God are now presented, this Papal institution, now universally observed in the place of the fourth commandment, is arrayed against them with all the energy that can be imparted to it. It is evident also from Rev. xii, 17, that the Dragon shall yet make war on those who shall be found keeping the commandments of God. It is further evident that the Two-horned Beast is yet to require on pain of death, that men worship the Image of the first Beast, and also that they receive his Mark. But let the mark of the Beast refer to what it may, what has C. to say against keeping "the commandments of God," brought to view in the verse next to that which speaks of the Mark of the Beast? Rev. xiv, 9—12. And on which side would he stand, should the Dragon now make war on the commandment keepers?—This subject may be noticed at length hereafter. For a refutation of the view that the "Three Angels of" Rev. xiv, 1—13" refer to the future age, See "Review and Herald," Vol. II. No. 8.

5. C. next informs his readers that there is no evidence that man needs a day of rest. "Jesus did indeed say, The Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath, but Sabbatarian reverse this principle, by asserting that man was made expressly for the Sabbath—originally constituted for keeping it."—The Editor of the "Harbinger," who recommends C.'s article as "plain Bible testimony," directly contradicts the view of C. Hear him: "He [poor fellow man] has needed rest from his hard labors and God in his good pleasure, in giving his law, the law of Moses to his chosen people, provided a day of rest for them, and through them to all mankind who would submit to law."—Harbinger for Nov. 1, 1851.—In this obscure corner C. finds a space to use up the testimony of our Lord, relative to God's design in making the Sabbath. Why did he not present this divine answer, when he discussed the question "For whom was the Sabbath instituted?" And why should he misrepresent us, who believe that the Sabbath was designed for, and adapted to man's temporal and Eternal well being, by saying that we believe "that man was made expressly for the Sabbath?" Nay, why does he impeach the Highest Wisdom, by saying that *He made something for man, that he did not need!*

In order to present to the reader the commentary of C. we quote Matt. xxiv, 20, "But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter neither on the Sabbath-day." Hear him expound it:

"6. The reference to the Sabbath in Matt. xxiv, 20, only shows that the Jews who rejected Christ, would be keeping the Sabbath at the destruction of Jerusalem, and would, in consequence, add to the dangers of the disciples flight, by punishing them (perhaps with death) for fleeing on that day."

We are indebted to him, for a suitable commentary on his own remarks. Mark how appropriate it is:

"But how does he know this: there is nothing of the kind said. This is a bare inference, without a shadow of foundation in positive testimony: hence it is on his part an arrogant assumption!"

7. C. next asserts that the duty of keeping the fourth commandment is only *inferred* from the New Testament.—We have presented the direct testimony of the Lord Jesus Christ, also that of the apostles Paul, James and John, relative to the perpetuity and immutability of the law of God, and though he has nowhere attempted to refute these testimonies, they amount in his estimation to nothing but an inference. But his inference for Sunday which will not stand the test of a single moment's investigation, he brings forward with which to establish a kind of first-day institution out of apostolic preference!

"O reason, thou art fled to brutish beasts!"

8. God's act of resting upon the seventh day

and blessing and sanctifying it is an inference which is not sufficient to establish a truth or a religious duty," but an inference drawn from two instances in which the first day is mentioned, (both of which contain evidence the reverse of that desired,) is sufficient to establish apostolic preference for the first day instead of Jehovah's Sabbath!—"The days of visitation are come; the days of recompense are come; Israel shall know it: the prophet is a fool, the spiritual man is mad, for the multitude of thine iniquity, and the great hatred." Hos. ix, 7.

It is with feelings of deep sorrow, and painful regret, that we have witnessed this last attempt to make void the law of God, Ps. cxix, 126, 136; Rom. iii, 31. We weep, not merely that the MIGHTY HAVE FALLEN AND THE WEAPONS OF WAR BEEN PERISHED, (2 Sam. i, 27,) but rather that they have joined the Philistines, the enemies of the ark of God. Would to God that C., instead of counting "the great things" of God's law "a strange thing," had prayed "open thou mine eyes that I may see wondrous things out of thy law," then might he have been able to say with evangelical David, "O how love I thy law;" or with the great Apostle to the Gentiles, "I delight in the law of God." Alas that that other law of sin that is in the members, should lead C. to war in this desperate manner against the law of God. The report of that Bible Class evinces, as indeed every thing connected with the article plainly shows, that instead of canvassing the evidences on which Jehovah's law and Sabbath rest, every thing was said against them that could well be brought to bear. "Be not deceived, God is not mocked."

With a few suggestions, we submit the whole subject.

1. The blood of Jesus was shed for our transgressions of the moral law. Is it not very remarkable, then, that he himself was its transgressor? 1 John iii, 4, 5; Isa. liii, 5, 6, 11; Heb. ix, 28; 1 Pet. ii, 22-24.

2. The doctrine of the atonement establishes the moral law. The law of shadows that only, typified the death of the Lamb of God, came to its end—the substance at his death. Col. ii, 14-17. The royal law from the King Eternal, which condemned the whole world and shewed them to be guilty before God, was thus magnified and made honorable by the death of God's only Son. Through his blood pardon is offered to fallen guilty man. But when mercy shall have given place to justice, the claims of the holy law will be vindicated. Would it not be very remarkable, should it then be found that the blood of Christ had blotted out the moral law. Rom. iii.

3. The doctrine of the destruction of the wicked, rests upon the perpetuity of the law of God. The wages of sin is death. Rom. vi. Sin is the transgression of the law. 1 John iii; Rom. iv, 15. But the law is abolished! How unreasonable is this last idea, when we consider that the men who hold to it, talk much of the "penalty of the law" that will surely overtake the wicked. For a thorough elucidation of the last two points, viz: the fact that the doctrine of the atonement ESTABLISHES the moral law, and the fact that the doctrine of the destruction of the wicked RESTS upon the perpetuity of the law, the reader is cited to Mr. Dobney's great work on "Future Punishment" Part 1. We only echo the voice of the "Harbinger" respecting it, when we say it is unanswerable.

4. If the death of Christ destroys the moral law then the human family are delivered from its fearful sentence, whether they repent or not. This makes the atonement unconditional; hence it is the real foundation of Universalism, 1 Cor. xv, 3; Matt. xx, 28; John iii, 16.

5. The doctrine that temporal (instead of the second) death is the ultimate penalty of God's law, is the real foundation of the non-resurrection of the wicked. For after the penalty of the law has been inflicted, those who have suffered it, cannot be raised to suffer *something else*.

6. Is it not very remarkable that while the "Harbinger" is breaking the fourth commandment and teaching men so, it should be continually repeating the sentence "Death is the penalty of the law."—Would it not be better to unite with those who are trying to do and teach the commandments, and to talk of entering into life!

7. The Lord preserveth all them that love him; (this is the love of God that we keep his commandments;) but all the wicked (sin is the transgression of the law) will he destroy. Ps. cxlv, 20. And it is a fact of thrilling importance, that when the commandment keepers enter into life, the wicked shall be left without to be consumed of the second death. Rev. xxii, 14, 15; xx, 11-15.

8. The plain testimony of the New Testament, relative to the perpetuity of God's law was not noticed by C., neither is it often noticed by its opponents. They "find it very difficult to make any use" of it.

9. Many have noticed the fulfillment of the first

sign recorded by Peter, in his second epistle, chap. iii. But is there not one occurrence recorded in the concluding part of the chapter, that furnishes a striking sign of the times in which we live? I refer to the effort now made by many to WREST THE WORDS OF PAUL "to their own destruction."

Instead of saying to those "who are troubled" respecting their disobedience to the fourth commandment, "continue in sin ('sin is the transgression of the law') that grace may abound," we do say "to you who are troubled rest with us" upon God's Holy Sabbath, and you will find how "blessed" a thing it is to obey God. Amen.

"Momentous day! its first observer He,
The high and lofty One, whose fearful name
Gleams as a signet on its holy brow.
Alone ordained and sanctified by Him,
And with his blessing blest forever more.

When from the sacred mount,
Whose cloudy top and trembling base proclaimed
The awful grandeur of its Guest sublime.
In thunder tones went forth the "Royal law,"
God's will to man, made known in ten commands;
On that dread morn, while to its centre shook
The steadfast earth, and Israel in dismay
Turned from the fearful sight, nor could endure
The voice of Him that spake; the great decree
Unchangeable was passed on all below.
"Six days may work be done, but on the seventh,
Which is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God,
Thou and all thine shall rest; for in six days
The Lord made heaven and earth and all therein,
And rested on the seventh and hallowed it."

Based on this grand foundation, stands secure
The Sabbath of the Lord. And who art thou,
That rashly dream'st to pluck this fabric down;
And on its ruins to erect thine own,
Thy blest, thy sanctified! short sighted man!
Canst thou command unnumbered worlds from naught?
Or canst thou thunder with a voice like Him?
Then mayest thou think to change the law divine.
Thy weakness know, and know that God is strong,
And jealous of his glory; and who dares
With impious hand to touch his high renown,
Shall His displeasure prove, and taste his ire.

Blest all-immortal day! Ah it shall stand;
Unmoved amid the strife of mortal tongues—
Unmoved amid the ruins of the world;
And while Eternity his mighty years
Shall roll unnumbered o'er the earth made new,
Effulgent shine in glory's noontide ray,
By nations who are saved, observed for aye."

Jackson, (Mich.), Jan. 1st, 1852.

THE REVIEW AND HERALD.

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

SARATOGA SPRINGS, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1852.

OUR TOUR WEST.

In our last we gave a brief sketch of our recent tour up to January 23d. We were then at Bath, (N. Y.), Bro. Baker with us. Our meeting there which commenced the evening of the 23d, was well attended and interesting. Several who had very recently received the "present truth" were much strengthened and encouraged. Much interest was felt for the children. The two sons of Bro. and Sr. Raymond of Wheeler were under such deep conviction, on their way home First-day P. M., that they requested their parents to return with them to the meeting. So they returned, and we had a powerful season of prayer for them before the evening meeting commenced. We have since learned that a good work is going on with the children there.

We formed a happy acquaintance with Bro. and Sr. Platt who kindly entertained us much of the time we were in Bath. We were delighted with the order, and good behaviour of their dear children. We do not design to flatter; but as an orderly family, where children are trained as they should be, is so seldom found, we cannot refrain from mentioning this case. We hope to hear that the entire household is devoted to God, observing *all* his commandments.

We had a most interesting season at the house of Bro. Lebeus Drew of Putney. Much interest was felt for the unconverted children of our dear Bro. and Sr. Drew, and we trust that they will seek the Lord with all the heart.

Jan. 31st, and Feb. 1st we spent with the brethren in the vicinity of Pitcher, Bro. Baker went to Rochester. We were happily disappointed in finding so large a company of Sabbath-keepers in that vicinity. God has done much for his dear people there within a few months. We hope they will seek earnestly to be fully consecrated to God and his cause, and to be in possession of living, active faith.

Monday night, Feb. 2d, we stopped with Bro. E. D. Cook, of Manlius. We found Bro. and Sr. Cook, whole-hearted in the present truth, and had a very interesting interview with them. They wish the brethren to call on them more frequently. Tuesday morning, after having a sweet,

weeping season of prayer with them and their children, we left for Oswego. There the brethren are rising, and the Lord is adding to their numbers. We trust they will dwell more on the glories of the kingdom for the future, and less on petty trials. Those who have recently embraced the Sabbath in that city are very decided. We became very much attached to them.

Feb. 7th and 8th we were with the brethren in the vicinity of Lorain. Here the Lord has raised up quite a large company of Sabbath-keepers within a few months, many of whom had but little or no experience in the advent movement. They seem decided, and were much comforted as we presented the reasons of our faith and hope. We hope to be able to visit them again in a few months, and tarry longer with them.

On our way home we called to see Sisters Cady and Briscoe of Stratford, formerly of New Bedford, (Mass.), who cherish the same blessed hope of soon seeing Jesus, and love the Sabbath of the Lord. Bro. Briscoe kindly entertained us. We hope that he will soon join his companion in observing the fourth commandment.

We reached home the 13th, and found our friends in good health and spirits. Sister Smith, who has had the care of the paper in our absence, seems happy with her charge.—Our health is improved by traveling. We are all very happy to see the cause of truth rapidly advancing. It must be cheering to all the friends of the third angel's message to learn that the cause is onward, and that numbers are daily entering the ranks of those who observe the Lord's Sabbath. This is so, praise the name of the Lord, and our poor heart is exceeding joyful to see the truth triumph.

WHO MAY HEAR THE TRUTH?

Answer. "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches," Rev. iii, 13. This verse immediately precedes the call to the Laodiceans to buy "gold tried in the fire," "white raiment" and "eye-salve," and the exhortation to them to be "zealous" and "repent." If, therefore, we are living in the period of the Laodicean church, then he that now hath an ear to hear may hear.

The Prophet speaks of those [Jer. vi, 10] whose "ears are uncircumcised, and they cannot hearken." "The word of the Lord is unto them a reproach: they have no delight in it." The condition of the Jewish Church, as a body, after they had rejected the first advent of Christ is described as follows by the prophet Isaiah: "Hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and not perceive. For the heart of this people is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes have they closed; lest they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them." Acts xxviii, 26, 27. The mass of the present generation, having rejected the doctrine of the Second Advent, are in a similar condition, having ears, but have no disposition to hear the truth. The condition of those who once rejoiced in the advent faith, and have since pronounced their past experience the work of some unclean spirit, is no better.

As the large mass of mankind have not an ear to hear the word of God, the Spirit of God, gives us no message for them. But, thank Heaven, there are those who have an ear to hear the truth, and we say of such, "let them hear." Those whose hearts are not hardened in sin, who have not wickedly trampled on offered mercy, who have not understandingly rejected the glad tidings of the coming kingdom, and who can feel the power of truth, "let them hear." We never felt greater liberty in pointing out the way of life to sinners in past years, than to such now.

Many of our brethren in this state, who are fully with us in our views of the message of the third angel, had no part in the messages of the first and second angels. And quite a number of young people are fully with us, who have recently found Jesus, and experienced his pardoning love. The Lord is at work converting the children of believing parents to Christ and the whole truth, in almost every family where the parents receive the present message.

"He that hath an ear to hear let him hear," the truth, and the whole truth. God forbid that we should lower the standard of truth to suit the unbelief of any one. We fully believe that the plain truth of the present message will draw out the real children of the Lord, and separate the precious from the vile.

Fallen from Grace.

It is common for the opposers of the Lord's Sabbath to represent those who observe the fourth commandment as fallen from grace and Gal. v, 4 is sometimes quoted as proof. "Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law, ye are fallen from grace." But does the Apostle refer to the commandments of God, or

either of them, in this text? We answer, he does not. The first three verses of this chapter clearly show what the Apostle's subject was. We will quote them.

"Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be CIRCUMCISED, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is CIRCUMCISED, that he is a debtor to do the whole law."

The subject introduced is *circumcision*." The "yoke of bondage" referred to, was the "law of commandments contained in ORDINANCES," and not the Royal Law. Circumcision was a part of the law of Moses which was abolished, and from which the Galatians had been made free by faith in Jesus. Judaizing teachers were urging circumcision and other ordinances of Moses' law, and the Galatians were in danger of being drawn away from faith in Christ, back to the ordinances of the Jewish religion, which virtually ceased at the cross. Those who would thus leave Christ, and go back to do the deeds of that law that had been dead 27 years, would certainly fall from grace. Circumcision of the "heart in the spirit" had taken the place of that which was "outward in the flesh," and the Great Sacrifice had taken the place of those offered by the Jews. Now any one may see that the Galatians would fall from grace through Christ, by observing the law of Moses.

But it is impossible for any one to show how the Galatians, or Christians at this day, would fall from grace in observing the fourth commandment in connection with their other Christian duties. It can be readily seen how the observance of the law of Moses would lead one from Christ, but will our opponents show us what there is in the Holy Sabbath of the Lord calculated to lead one from Christ.

They know better, or certainly should know better, than to apply Gal. v, 4 to Christian Sabbath-keepers. We do not believe that any sane person really believes that a Christian would fall from grace by keeping the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus." But the idea is given by our opponents that we are falling from grace to prejudice those we wish to benefit, and keep them from the truth.

Says the editor of the "Harbinger"—"And so far as any now seek, to be justified by that dead law [commandments of God we suppose Ed.] they are fallen from grace according to the declaration of Paul. Beware how you treat this important matter, lest you find yourself fallen from grace, when it is too late to be recovered from the fearful fall."

We agree with the "Harbinger" that if we seek justification by the deeds of the dead law of Moses we shall fall from grace, but we really feel safe in observing the law of God which Paul "served," "delighted" in, and called "holy just and good" 29 years after the hand-writing of ordinances died at the cross. See Rom. vii, and remember that his letter was written 29 years after the crucifixion.

The editor of the "Harbinger," Nov. 15th, represents us as standing upon the very brink of "irretrievable ruin," because we observe the fourth precept of the Royal Law, which was the delight of Paul, and of which he so highly speaks. In his remarks to Sr. E. A. M., Jan. 24th, his tone seems somewhat changed. He thinks that this Sister may observe the Sabbath and still be Christ's. He, however, represents the Sabbath as the "yoke of bondage," and the Sister liable of falling from grace.

Dear reader, study these points carefully, and be not deceived by those who make void the fourth precept of the immutable law of God. If men tell you that you will fall from grace in observing the Holy Sabbath, enjoin it upon them to show you how the observance of the commandments of God, will lead one to fall from grace through Jesus Christ. O, be not deceived by the modern heresy that the faith of Jesus abolishes the commandments, of God "Here are they that keep the commandments of God, [the Father,] and the faith of Jesus," [the Son.]

The Work of Grace.

The present work of grace that is now progressing among those who observe the Sabbath according to the commandment is no small evidence that we have the truth. We believe that it is the design of Heaven that the Sabbath should be especially proclaimed now, in the time of the patience of the saints; and God is setting his seal to this work.

Hundreds can testify that the message of the third angel has been the means of reclaiming them from a lukewarm backslidden state. In many families, where the family altar had been broken down, and no morning and evening prayers had been heard for some years, now the whole family join in the worship of God. Where the parents embrace the Sabbath, the children generally seek the Lord. Within the last two years we have baptized quite a number of the children of believing parents.

It is worthy of notice that the Ark of the Lord continued in the house of Obed-edom the Gittite three months, and he and all his house was blest of God. See 2 Samuel vi, 11.

When the parents observe the fourth commandment, with the other nine, it seems like taking the Ark of the Lord into their houses, and the blessing of God is sure to follow.

There are some with us who formerly run into the deceptive fog of spiritualism, and gave up the literal Jesus, and made his glorious appearing only spiritual. It is evident that they never would have been delivered from that snare of the devil, had they not heard our views of present truth. Nothing can be so well calculated to dispel the mischievous mists of spiritualism, as the clear, literal view of the Heavenly Sanctuary.

Many of the dear Advent brethren have felt much like the followers of Jesus who said, "they have taken away the Lord," "and we know not where they have laid him." But the present truth has found him, to the joy of their hearts. We have witnessed the flowing tears of some such, as the literal Sanctuary in heaven has been pointed out, and the literal Jesus shown to be standing before the mercy-seat (that is over the Ark of the ten commandments) still pleading his blood for the errors of his people. And we have heard them express great joy that they had found Jesus. In a number of such cases where prayer had been nearly or entirely dispensed with for four or five years, now the family altar is erected and the whole family join in vocal prayer. A man must have a heart hard like adamant, and as cold as the rocks in the bottom of the ocean, not to be affected by such a work of divine grace, or that can call it falling from grace.

This blessed cause is destined to triumph gloriously. All the opposition of those who oppose will only help in its advancement. If the people of God are humble and obedient, God will work for them mightily.

Call at the Harbinger Office.

We see by the "Harbinger" of Jan. 31st, that the editor has noticed our recent call at his office. Our object in going to the office was to obtain some of his books, also to obtain those names of his free list that he has recently dropped, and not for controversy. We fail to see anything of the noble spirit of the Christian that seeks fair investigation, in the remarks of M., but rather a disposition to oppose the truth and misrepresent those who advocate it. We are sorry to be compelled to thus speak; but we will let his remarks show the spirit of the man. He says:

"James White, a prominent leader among those of the Shut-Door [Note 1] and Seventh day Sabbath theory, and editor of their paper, recently called on us.—During our friendly conversation he stated, as near as we can recollect, that he knew that the seventh day was the Sabbath, binding on christians to keep. [Note 2.] We told him that we knew from the plain word of the Lord that he was in error in this respect. But we would yield the point, and become a convert to his views on the Sabbath if he would give one passage of scripture, without comment, inference or assumption, that plainly and unequivocally proves that it is the duty of christians to keep the seventh day as the Sabbath. He could give no such proof for none exists in the Bible. Hence the seventh day Sabbath is not binding on christians.

Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of the Lord; The word of the Lord furnishes no evidence that the seventh day Sabbath is binding on christians; hence no one can have real faith in it. If Mr. White had any Bible evidence to sustain his theory, why did he not present it? echo answers, Why?

Christians, beware how you listen to the vain, metaphysical and bewildering reasonings of these Shut-Door sabbatarians. No such ramblings as they present are needed to sustain a good cause.—The plain word of the Lord is always at hand to defend the truth. Remember this, and you will not be caught in any of the snares of these misguided ones. "Let no man deceive you."

Note 1. What does M. understand by the shut door theory? If he means what is ignorantly called the "door of mercy," we reply that we know of no such door. The Bible mentions no such door. The parable of the ten virgins [Matt. xxv] mentions a shut door, but that shut door was literal, in the eastern marriage. It however represents an important event with which the church is connected, that was to occur prior to our Lord's return from the wedding. That event shuts out none of the honest children of God, neither those who have not wickedly rejected the light of truth, and the influence of the Holy Spirit.

It is declared by some that Jesus is still on the mercy seat. And this expression is often used in preaching, praying and singing. But because we teach that Jesus now stands before the mercy seat in the most holy place of the Heavenly Sanctuary, we are represented as being one of the leaders of the shut door theory. We say that Jesus is not on the mercy seat. He never was there, and never will be there. The place for the mercy seat is over the Ark of the covenant, within the second vail, in the holiest of all. Over the mercy seat is the cherubim of glory. They overshadow, or cover

the mercy seat. No place for the priest on the mercy seat.

We teach that Jesus our Great High Priest in the Heavenly Sanctuary, has fulfilled the following texts:

"And the key of the house of David will I lay upon his shoulder; so he shall open, and none shall shut; and he shall shut, and none shall open." Isa. xxii, 22. "And to the angel of the church in Philadelphia write: these things saith he that is holy, he that is true, he that hath the key of David, he that openeth, and no man shutteth; and shutteth and no man openeth. I know thy works; behold I have set before thee an open door, and no man can shut it." Rev. iii, 7, 8.

This OPEN DOOR we teach, and invite those who have an ear to hear, to come to it and find salvation through Jesus Christ. There is an exceeding glory in the view that Jesus has OPENED THE DOOR into the holiest of all, or has passed within the second veil, and now stands before the Ark containing the ten commandments. "And the temple of God was opened in heaven, and there was seen in his temple the ark of his testament." Rev. xi, 19. If it be said that we are of the OPEN DOOR and seventh day Sabbath theory, we shall not object; for this is our faith.

Will those who are forward to speak evil of those things that they understand not, give an exposition of Isa. xxii, 22; Rev. iii, 7, 8?

Note 2, We are here represented as first introducing the Sabbath question, and asserting that we "knew" that our views were right. This was not so. We asked M. if he would let us have those names of his free list that he had dropped, and stated that we had offered to send the "Review and Herald," to those poor persons free, and if they were not able to pay the postage we would pay it for them. This he was not willing to do. He asked us if we would let him have our list. We stated that we should first wish to know his object in obtaining our list. We also stated that if we were in his place we could not object.

Mark this: We did not ask M. for the list that he uses, but merely those names he had dropped. The names of the poor of the flock, that he withheld the "Harbinger" from. He then stated that he knew that we were wrong relative to the Sabbath. We replied that there was then no room for controversy, as the matter was settled on his part; and that we might say that we knew that we were right.—This we had better not have said, as it gave a chance for misrepresentation; but our object was to show that assertions were not proof.

We were then requested to open the Bible and read one text where the Christian church was commanded to keep the seventh day. We then asked M. if he did not remember when he taught the coming of the Lord in 1843 that scoffers of every grade required him to read from the Bible that the Lord was coming in 1843. To this M. replied, "AND THEY REQUIRED IT JUSTLY TOO."

At this admission of M. we were astonished. If scoffers justly required M. to read from the Bible that the Lord was coming in 1843, before they would believe, then he unjustly urged them to believe on the evidence then presented. Therefore, according to this admission, they were the just, the wise that understood, while M. was with the unjust, or those that did not understand, but were doing wickedly!! See Dan. xii. This admission not only destroys the advent movement, and places its proclaimers in a sad position, but if this principle were carried out, it would render every prophetic period in God's word entirely useless. Would it not also charge God with injustice and folly in giving the prophetic periods in the manner that he has?

We then stated that our position on the Sabbath did not require that we should read from the New Testament the commandment to observe the Sabbath. That the Bible mentioned but one weekly Sabbath and that Christians were certainly bound to observe it unless it could be shown that it was abolished.

Here let it be distinctly understood that God has given but one weekly Sabbath, and has enforced it by dreadful penalties. Both Testaments recognize the seventh day as the Sabbath. Therefore our position does not require that the fourth commandment should be repeated in the New Testament. It is enough for Christians to know that the commandment is given in God's word.

Brethren, let the "laboring oar" be placed where it belongs, in the hand of those who reject the Sabbath. The commandment to keep the seventh day is given in the most plain and positive terms, and when our opponents will produce as plain and positive testimony for its abolition as is employed in the fourth commandment, then, and not till then, will we yield our position.

The fact that the commandments of God are taught and enforced in the New Testament is sufficient evidence for the honest Christian, that wishes to believe the whole truth that it is a Christian duty to observe the fourth. Unbe-

lief can always find a handle to take hold of when it wishes one. Those who wish to doubt, may find a wide field to doubt, and a broad road to death; while those who wish to believe the truth, as plainly revealed, can find abundant reason to believe.

LETTERS.

From Bro. Bates and Edson.

DEAR BRO. WHITE: Since our last from Toronto, (C. W.) as published in the "Review and Herald" No. 10, we have accomplished the circuit around Lake Ontario.

From the various places we visited, from Kingston (C. W.) to this place, we left more than one hundred interested in the present truth, many of which confessed that the Sabbath of the Lord our God was clear, and began to keep it in connection with those that had embraced it at an earlier period. More than fifty, as you will see by the list of names, are anxious to receive the paper. Many also confessed that they see no light coming from the various positions now occupied and presented by the professed leading Adventists, while the third angel's message looked clear and unobjectionable.

We now expect to leave here in the morning for Ulyses, Alleghany County, Penn., embracing in our way Batavia, Mill Grove, Buffalo, Fredonia, Busti, and other places in this state as the way opens, and if the Lord will, reach Ulyses in time to spend the last Sabbath and first day in Feb. in conference with the brethren in that place, and the next week following in Bath, N. Y.

While we were in Canada West one of the brethren showed us an ancient translation of the New Testament, that was so mutilated that we could not learn when it was published or who translated it. We thought that 2 Cor. iii, 3, 4, 6—18, was much to the point. The following is a copy.

2 Cor. Chap. III, 3, 4, 6--18.

Verse 3. "For it is apparent to the world that you are Christ's epistle written by our ministration, not with ink, but with the spirit of the living God—inscribed not on tables of stone, but on the tablets of the human heart.

4. "Such is the firm confidence we repose thro' Christ in the supreme being,

6. "Who hath empowered and qualified us to be ministers of the new covenant, not the Mosaic, but the Christian covenant—for the Mosaic pronounced an irreversible sentence of death upon its transgressors; but the Christian covenant holds forth the palm of immortality.

7. "But if the dispensation which annexed death to the violation of it, and whose laws were engraven on stones, was ushered in with such magnificence and splendor (a splendor that was only designed to be transient and temporary) that the eyes of the Israelites could not support the dazzling beams that darted from the countenance of Moses,

8. "How much more glorious and effulgent must be the lustre of the Christian dispensation.

9. "For if that rigid and implacable dispensation which condemned the offender to death by an irreversible sentence, was introduced with such striking pomp and glory, how infinitely superior must be the strong and ineffable radiance of that dispensation which is replete with benignity and mercy.

10. "But in this respect the glory that was reflected on the former dispensation vanishes into nothing when compared with the superior splendor of the latter.

11. "For if that economy which was destined to be superceded and annulled, was delivered with such an ostentatious display of grandeur—how much more glorious must be that economy which is designed to be forever durable and permanent.

12. "Animated therefore with these hopes, we use great freedom and liberty in our addresses.

13. "We are not like Moses who covered himself with a veil—so that the children of Israel could not clearly see the end and design of a dispensation which was intended to be abrogated:

14. "But their rational faculties were involved in the mists of darkness—for to the present day that very veil which Christ hath removed and forever abolished continues to enwrap their minds when they read the old testament; and still shrouds their understandings in the baleful shades of obscurity and gloom.

15. "To this very day when the law of Moses is read by them, the veil remains upon their hearts.

16. "But when the Jews shall be converted to the Lord, the veil that new involves and obscures their minds, shall be forever removed

17. "By being converted to the Lord I mean being converted to the spiritual institution of the gospel—and where this spiritual dispensation of God is, there is the truest liberty.

18. "But we all, with unveiled face, beholding

the glory of the Lord reflected as from the brightest mirror are metamorphosed into the same moral resemblance; receiving continual accessions of glory and splendor, emitted from the great indefectible source of spiritual light.

JOSEPH BATES.
HIRAM EDSON.

Centerport, (N. Y.) Feb., 1, 1852.

From Bro. Ingraham,

DEAR BRO. WHITE: I am in a waste howling wilderness, in the northern part of New York, in search of my heavenly Father's sheep. One of the Lord's shepherds passed through this vicinity but a few days since, (S. W. Rhodes,) and was successful in taking some of our Father's family from the jaws of the lion. Others of late have embraced the Sabbath of the Lord our God. I have visited Canton, Lisbon, Norfolk, Bangor, and am now in Chateaugay. In the first mentioned place Bro. Rhodes held a few meetings, and many of the brethren were convinced that we were right in our views of the present truth; but since his departure greivous preachers have entered in not sparing the flock. I found them distracted and discouraged. I preached the Word to them as well as I could. I had the privilege of preaching to one of those professed shepherds that had been trying to hedge up the way of truth. In his prayer he made mention of the devil's imps, that were going through the land to divide the flock of God. And in his exhortation he said he could show the falsity of our position. I gave him the opportunity of so doing, but found him destitute of argument or courage. He did not undertake to do away our position by a thus saith the Lord, but manifested a disposition to haggle and oppose the truth. O God! save the little ones from such preachers, is my prayer.

In Lisbon the Lord has a few jewels that have embraced the third angel's message. And in Norfolk I found some honest souls that wanted the truth. Some have embraced the Sabbath and others are enquiring. In Bangor the Lord was with us, and a good result immediately followed the preaching of the truth. Bro. Lawrence, a young preacher, confessed his faith in the Sabbath, and is living accordingly. The Lord enable him to be as valiant for the third angel's message as he has been for the first and second. As it regards myself, my faith is fixed, and my determination is to enter the New Jerusalem with the 144,000, to enjoy the society of angels and saints 1000 years, and then, with all the meek, inherit the kingdom under the whole heaven for ever and ever.

WM. S. INGRAHAM.

Chateaugay, N. Y., Feb. 4th, 1852.

From Bro. Holt.

DEAR BRO. WHITE: The conference at Bro. Howland's, Topsham, (Me.) commenced Jan. 30th, and continued three days. This meeting was one of deep interest and I trust of great blessing to the scattered brethren that came together from Paris, Portland, Canaan, and other places, to worship the True God, and keep his commandments. The number of believers present were about fifty. The solemn presence of God rested down upon us through the entire meeting, and no spirit but the pure Spirit of God was permitted to remain among us. We had great freedom in speaking on the different subjects of Bible truth relative to our present position. The word of God had free course in our midst, and was glorified. Every one present engaged in taking a part in the meeting, and humble heart-felt confessions of past errors were made. The importance of an entire consecration to God and his cause was deeply realized. I can say of a truth, it was one of the best meetings of the kind that I ever attended. Perfect order in the meeting, and at intervals was observed. I need not tell you there was perfect order in Bro. Howland's house.

I expect to be at the Leverett Conference the 21st.

G. W. HOLT.

Paris, Me., Feb. 5th, 1852.

From Bro. Seaman.

DEAR BRO. WHITE: I am very thankful that God in his mercy has counted me worthy to suffer with those who are everywhere spoken against. Even that paper, where once the light emanated, is now loud in its denunciations against those who are striving to give meat in due season. Last Sabbath and First-day Bro. Baker spoke to a few at Bro. Patten's. Sabbath after-noon the Lord poured out his Spirit in a special manner, and our cups were filled to overflowing. It was the first time I had kept the Sabbath, and when I spoke, I received the witness of the Spirit that God was there. Although there are some objections which I am not competent to answer, yet I am determined to hold on to the arm of God, for he will make it plain.

Here we must contend with spiritual wickedness in high places, and also with those that have turned

their ears from the truth, and are turned unto fables. May God open their eyes before it is too late.

There is much to be done here, and only a few weak worms to do it. The field is large but the laborers are few. We should pray the Lord to send more laborers into the harvest. I can but anticipate the time when quite a large band will be established here. God will do his work in his own time and way. I pray God that he will speed the day when the 144,000 will all be sealed, and Jesus will come out of his place to punish the inhabitants of the earth.

The whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain to be delivered.

May God bless the scattered flock. Amen.

E. R. SEAMAN.

Rochester, N. Y., Feb. 9th, 1852.

From Bro. Bates.

DEAR BRO. WHITE: We are passing through Rochester on our way west. The work is gaining ground here.

We found a company in Marion, 23 miles east of this place, that listened with attention. Several of them are examining the truth. One confessed the Sabbath. We send the names of such as would like the paper.

Yours in haste,
J. BATES.

Rochester, N. Y., Feb. 5th, 1852.

From Sister Harrington.

DEAR BRO. WHITE: I receive your paper and am glad to say that it is a welcome messenger. I rejoice for the truth that it brings relative to our present position and duty. I thank the Lord that he has permitted me to hear upon this glorious subject, the third angel's message, and the Sabbath of the Lord. I feel thankful that Bro. Wheeler sent me some of your publications, and papers. Previous to reading them I enquired of some brethren and sisters what they thought of the subject. They said it was error. I therefore was prejudiced against it. But still I resolved to read them. As I read I was astonished at the amount of evidence in its favor.

The Spirit of the Lord sent the word home to my heart in such a manner that I could not resist it. These words spoke in thunder tones to my soul, "They have changed the ordinance and broken the everlasting covenant." Then I saw, as never before, that the covenant was the ten commandments, the fourth of which was desecrated every week. I also saw that the observance of Sunday was an institution of the Pope, and a mark of the beast. I wonder so few embrace the last message, when so many were strong in the first message. I feel the necessity of being wholly consecrated to God, and having all upon the altar, that God may dwell in my heart by faith, that I might stand when Jesus leaves the Sanctuary, and having done all to stand.

Yours, in hope of obtaining a right to the tree of life, and admittance through the gates into the city.

LEMIRA HARRINGTON.

Claremont, N. H., Feb. 7th, 1852.

From Sister Elmer.

DEAR BRO. WHITE: I have great reason to praise the Lord for all his tender mercies to us. It is with much satisfaction we read your paper. It is a great comfort to us, as I have cut loose from the world and it is just such a paper as I need. O, how vain do all earthly things appear to me. I thirst for the righteousness that is from God alone.

I attended a meeting at Bro. Flower's a few weeks since. Bro. and Sr. Lothrop were present. We had a very interesting season. The Spirit of the Lord was manifest. It was a time long to be remembered. My soul feels to praise the Lord for his mercy endureth forever.

How sweet is holy communion with God's people, now, while his holy law is shining into our hearts. My heart has been made greatly to rejoice in the present truth. It is good to keep the whole law of God. O, how plain the Holy Sabbath appears to me. I want to be found with the humble few who are striving to keep the commandments. It is the law of God that will judge us at the last day, and how careful we should be to obey the truth, for that shall make us free. The word of God plainly teaches that the seventh day is the Sabbath. I feel willing to abide by the sure word of God. I would not follow the multitude to do evil, for I fear God more than man.

My husband wishes me to say that he has searched the Bible, and is convinced that the seventh day is the Sabbath.

I should rejoice to have some of the brethren come this way again. We have been greatly blessed with the labors of Bro. Wheeler and Holt. How cheering is the testimony to the truth.

Yours waiting for redemption

SUSAN ELMER.

Buckland, Mass., Feb. 4th, 1852.

From Sister Pitts.

Dear Bro. White: I thank you and all the dear children of God, who are doing all they can to spread the light of truth, for sending me the "Review and Herald." I thank the Lord for overruling the means so that the light of present truth has reached me, a poor, unworthy creature.

I believe if I was cast out to the ends of the earth his mercy would follow me, his hand would lead me, his 'right hand would guide me, and his Word would be a lamp to my feet and a light to my path. By the Bible I try everything that I receive. O, how sweet and refreshing has the influence of the Holy Spirit been to me, while it has opened my understanding and showed me glorious things out of God's holy law, and took of the things of Jesus and showed them unto me. How plain it was to me that the holy Sabbath, the sanctified Rest-day, the seventh day, had never been abolished, no, no. God's commandments stand fast. I wish I could tell my brethren how glorious and bright they look to me.

The Dear Redeemer has said, whosoever shall do and teach them shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven. May the Lord help us all to do and teach them, and have the faith of Jesus.

I believe Jesus will have a tried people, and while they are in the furnace they will be purified and made white, and he will never try them too long.

I did not confer with flesh and blood, but kept the Sabbath of the Lord our God as soon as I had light on the subject.

Yours waiting for Jesus,
POLLY G. PITTS.

Union, Rock Co., Wis. Feb. 2d, 1852.

We wish to call special attention to the article of Bro. Andrews in this number and in our last. Brethren read it again and again, until you understand the arguments presented.

We think the article should be put in a pamphlet, and widely and judiciously circulated. Will the friends of the cause express their opinion?

The Paper—We have made arrangements to publish two more numbers only of the "Review and Herald." We have no doubt but that it is the will of the Lord that the brethren should have a paper, and that weekly, but we cannot conduct it in its present condition longer than two numbers more.

We think the time has come when a press should be owned by Sabbath-keepers. Now our work is being done on the Sabbath, which is very unpleasant and inconvenient. It also costs much more than it would if we had an office of our own. Will the Committee take this matter in hand? Will the friends of the cause express their opinion and state what they can do. We hope to be freed from the paper. Our health is such that we must travel.

It is thought best to have a Conference in this vicinity, to commence March 12th. The principal object of the meeting is that those who teach the present truth may assemble to examine more fully their present position, and be better prepared to go forth into the wide harvest with union and strength, all speaking the same things, that a healthy influence may be exerted everywhere they may go preaching the Word. It is hoped that all those brethren who can attend will be present. A more particular notice will be given in our next.

S. W. RHODES.
JAMES WHITE.

Saratoga Springs, Feb. 17th, 1852.

The brethren should remember that we are not in the scattering, but the gathering time. Spiritualism has done its work of death in scattering the flock, and it is almost impossible to establish gospel order among those who have, in time past, run into spiritualizing notions. Some such think they have a great amount of spiritual discernment, while in fact they are not at all capable of judging in spiritual matters. They, while thus deceived as to their true state, are in great danger of satan's deceptive power, while following their impressions. A self-righteous denunciatory spirit is generally seen in such cases, and the precious flock is often scattered in consequence. Some letters from the west, stating a decrease of numbers, have suggested these remarks.

Brethren, "He that hath an ear to hear, let him hear." "Now we exhort you, brethren, warn them that are unruly, comfort the feeble minded, support the weak, be patient toward all men." "Follow that which is good, both among yourselves, and to all men." See 1 Thess. v, 14, 15.

Those who send names for the paper will please state whether the back numbers are wanted or not. We have a large quantity of them left. Will those who have recently received the paper write if they wish them.

"Bear Ye One Another's Burdens."

HENRY O. NICHOLS.

Give me to feel my brother's woe,
I have not much to bear;
My soul can take a part I know,
Can of his trials share.
For oft his spirit's bowed with grief,
'Tis then perchance I may
Administer some kind relief,
While others are away.

Give me to feel my brother's woe,
He is quite near my side;
And onward up the stream we'll row,
Against the wind and tide.
Long he has toiled, while many a one
Laid down the heavy oar:—
Oh! I'll keep with him till he's done,
Until his task is o'er.

Give me to feel my brother's woe,
And lightly him condemn,
If from the channel he should go,
As we the current stem.
I'll kindly whisper that he must,
The shoals and breakers flee;
And when I need it, I would trust
He'll do the same to me.

Give me to feel my brother's woe,
Nor never once repine;
But every selfish thought forego,
And have his heart near mine.
The Golden Rule, perhaps I could
Observe in part, 'tis true—
"Do unto others as ye would
That they should do to you."

Give me to feel my brother's woe,
And cheer his lonely hours,
When sickness doth his frame lay low
To enervate his powers.
At such a time the prayer of faith,
His restlessness might still:
Ask what ye may, our Master saith,
If ye but do my will.

Then let me feel my brother's woe,
And lighten up his brow:
He has been with me years ago,
I will not leave him now.
The burden that is on him cast—
The persecution given,
I'll bear, and fondly hope at last,
To share with him in heaven.

Dorchester, Mass.

We hope that all the traveling brethren will be interested to obtain the names of those who wish the paper, inform us if we send to those who do not want it, and collect means for the paper.

We send the "Review and Herald" to a large number that we have not heard from. We know not that it is received by them. Brethren, will it not be a pleasure for you to inform us whether it is a welcome messenger or not. As a gentle hint to such they will find their names on this number in Red Ink. We think it duty to drop the names of a number unless we hear from them soon.

Several papers have been returned with no name upon them, and it is not possible to tell who has returned them. Please write your name on the paper you return.

QUESTION—Should those who have no calling travel extensively, while those who are called to teach the truth are obliged to remain at home for want of means?

There will be a Conference at Fair-haven, (Mass.), at the house of Bro. William Gifford, to commence Friday Feb. 27th, to continue over the Sabbath and First-day, and longer if thought best. A general invitation is extended. It is earnestly hoped that Bro. White, Rhodes, or some other of the ministering brethren will be present. And we pray that it may be a time of refreshing from the presence of the Lord, and the means of much good.

In behalf of the brethren,

O. DAVIS.

Bro. S. W. Rhodes thinks that he shall not attend the Fair-haven Conference. Neither shall we be able to attend it. Bro. Baker, or Bro. Wheeler, may be expected.

Letters received since February 3d.

D. D. Chapin, S. Elmer, C. Tolman, C. M. Lockwood, J. Bates, J. N. Andrews, G. W. Holt, W. Ingraham, R. R. Chapin, A. H. Robinson, H. Platt, J. Kellogg, A. Woodruff, C. Brown, E. P. Butler, S. Howland, H. S. Gurney, A. E. Randall, J. C. Bowles, H. O. Nichols, P. G. Pitts, C. J. Stowell.

Receipts.

A. H. Robinson, J. G. Hook, A. L. Burwell, M. Wiles, A. Rogers, J. S. Peckham, S. A. Steadman, J. W. Birdleough, P. M. Reed, S. P. Swan, E. A. Poole, E. D. Cook, each \$1.
A. R. Mott, C. Brown, J. Vaughn, E. R. Seaman, B. Stillman, J. B. Sweet, David Robbins, J. Barrows, A. Tuttle, each \$2.
L. Lowry, A. Ross, each \$3; B. Loveland, \$4; D. Ford, \$5.
H. Page, J. H. Harrington, G. Sanders, J. Sanders, S. Bunnel, L. Harrington, W. C. Brigham, each 50 cents, T. Bailey, \$1.25.