



SABBATH AND ADVENT

MISCELLANY.

CONTENTS.

- 1 The Sabbath by Elihu. [the Lord.
- 2 The First day of the Week not the Sabbath of
- 3 An Appeal to men of reason and common sense.
- 4 The Sabbath by P. Miller, Jr.
- 5 Both Sides—The Sabbath Law in the New Testament—Letter by E. Miller Jr.—Reply by R. F. Cottrell.
- 6 Solemn Appeal, &c., relative to the speedy Coming of Christ,
- 7 True Picture of the state of the Churches.

PUBLISHED AT THE ADVENT REVIEW OFFICE.

ROCHESTER, N. Y.

1854.





LIBRARY OF PRINCETON

DEC 7 1992

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

THE SABBATH.

BY ELIHU.

IN reviewing the subject of "the Sabbath," I design not to follow any previous writer; but simply, plainly and briefly, to convince sinners of sin, let their profession be what it may. And this I hope and pray may be done without giving offence to those who love the truth more than error: for God has many servants on earth, who would gladly exchange error for truth, and many who do exchange their former traditions for the precious and everlasting truths of God as contained in his Word.

Now the New Testament witnesses to the law and the prophets: and that book is said to have been written thus: Matthew's gospel, six years after the resurrection of Christ. Mark's gospel, ten years after the church commenced. Luke's gospel, twenty-eight years after. John's gospel, sixty-three year after. The Acts of the apostles, thirty years after. The Epistle to the Romans, and two to the Corinthian and Galatians, twenty-four years after. Ephesians, Colossians and Hebrews, twenty-nine years. To Timothy, Titus and the second Epistle of Peter, thirty years. The Revelation of John, sixty-one years. His three epistles, about sixty-five years after the resurrection, and after the church had properly commenced. And it is easy for us to understand how these apostles understood and practiced,

with regard to the Sabbath; and they are the "foundation" next after Christ himself. Therefore if there was any such institution known and frequently spoken of in the church as "Sabbath," in those different ages of the church, we can easily know what then was meant by it.

Some say if we keep the seventh day of the week, we shall keep a "Jewish Sabbath!" Well, we have no Saviour to trust in but Jesus Christ, who was according to the flesh a Jew—no other apostles and prophets but Jewish—no other than Jewish Scriptures, and indeed, Jesus said himself, that "salvation is of the Jews." John iv, 22. And what did the writers of the New Testament mean by the words "Sabbath" and the Sabbath day? What did Matthew mean in the sixth year of the Christian church? He certainly did not mean the first day of the week, but he meant the day before the first day of the week. See Matt. xxviii, 1. He meant what all other Jewish writers ever meant: viz: "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." But neither Matthew nor any of the apostles ever told us a word about the Sabbath being changed from the seventh to the first day of the week.

Now if the Scriptures cannot be broken, but every where mean one and the same thing, viz: "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord," then if ministers contradict this, and say the seventh day is not the Sabbath of the Lord, but the first day of the week is the Sabbath, will they not in this bear witness clearly and positively against themselves, unless they bring forward the chapter and verse where God commanded the Sabbath to be changed? What did Mark mean by the word Sabbath? He meant,

also, that the Sabbath was the day before the first day of the week. Chap. xvi, 1, 2. Surely if the Sabbath had been changed at the resurrection of Christ, Mark would have known it within ten years afterwards. What did Luke mean who wrote twenty-eight years after the resurrection of Christ? He also meant that the Sabbath was the day before the first day of the week: for he says that the women who prepared the ointment, rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment. Chap. xxiii, 56. Thus Luke understood the words, the "Sabbath day" in the 58th year of the Christian era to mean the day immediately preceding the first day of the week. How did John understand this subject in the 63d year of the Christian church? He not only speaks of the Sabbath day as the others did, but he shows plainly that the first day of the week was considered a business day by the disciples after the resurrection. John xx, 1. See also Luke xxiv, 13.

But what did the writer of the Acts of the Apostles mean by the word Sabbath, and Sabbath day, thirty years after the Christian church was fully commenced? In writing he often mentions the Sabbath, and once mentions the first day of the week, as meaning quite another thing in plain distinction from the Sabbath. Acts xiii, 14, 42, 44. Chap. xx, 7. The practice of the Jews was then as it is now, to meet in the synagogue on the seventh day. And again the next Sabbath day came almost the whole city together to hear the word of God. He does not say this was the Jewish Sabbath, but the Sabbath day; this was the seventh day; and the first day of the week was not then known as a Sabbath by this writer; because he says the next Sabbath day the Jews

and Gentiles most all came together again. I say there would not have been any next Sabbath in the week till the next seventh day. Again, [Acts xvi, 13,] “ And on the Sabbath we went out of the city by a river side, where prayer was wont to be made.” He does not say on the Jewish, nor on one of the sabbaths, as though there were two sabbaths then, but on the Sabbath, i. e., the seventh day, as understood by all the Jewish writers, to this day. Again, [Chap. xvii, 2,] Paul, as his manner was, went in among the Jews, and three Sabbath days reasoned with them out of the scriptures.

Thus have I proved that the apostles of Christ, understood that one day in the week should be called the Sabbath day; and further, I have proved that this day was the day before the first day of the week, which is the seventh day; and you cannot deny it, nor by the Scriptures disprove it; consequently if the apostles of our Lord always called the seventh day the Sabbath day, six, ten, twenty-eight, thirty, and sixty-three years after the church was fully commenced, then it must be the Sabbath day now. And every one of the Lord's ministers who call any other day the Sabbath besides the one so called by the writers of the New Testament, gives it a title which is no where found in the Scriptures; for when they say the Sabbath day, they mean something very different from what the New Testament means. It is already proved that the apostles called the seventh day, or the day before the first day of the week, the Sabbath, and the Sabbath day, for many years after the church was fully commenced.

Now we are to show what sin is; and we are not left to guess at it, or to suppose it; but we have a

given rule to know with certainty what constitutes sin. "By the law" then "is the knowledge of sin;" by what law was the knowledge of sin twenty-four years after the resurrection of Christ? *Ans.* The very same law that was given when it was said, "Thou shalt not covet." The law, then, by which sin is known, is the ten commandments, and you cannot deny it! This law saith, the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it. Ex. xx, 10, 11. Now until this law is altered or abrogated (and Christ says he "came not to destroy the law!") by the same power that enacted it—a willful transgression of it is a willful sin! let your profession be what it may; for sin is the transgression of the law. He that offends in one point, or in one of these commandments, is guilty of all, i. e., is a transgressor of the law, a sinner in the sight of God.

Now a regenerated soul, a true-hearted Christian, says with Paul, "I delight in the law of God after the inward man. The law is holy, the commandment holy and just and good:" and any person who is not willing to keep the commandments of God, when plainly understood, has still a carnal mind, which is not "subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." Will you say this is judging too hard, or this is a hard saying, who can hear it? I wish to judge no man; but the word that the Lord hath spoken the same shall judge you in the last day. John xii, 48. "As

many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law; in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my gospel." Rom. ii, 12, 16. Then those who shall hold the truth in unrighteousness, those who pretend to keep the law differently from what God appointed it, those who, in fact, lay aside the commandments of God, (the seventh day or any other command,) and teach for doctrine the commandments of men, (the first day instead of the seventh,) such, the Word says, are vain worshipers. Mark vii, 7.

But you say it makes no difference which day is kept, or called the Sabbath day, provided we keep one seventh part of the time! This is not correct, because God never said so. God is not to be mocked in this way! He has been very good and kind to make a Sabbath for man—to appoint the day and the particular time of the day, when the Sabbath is to commence, and when it is to end; it is the seventh day in order from the creation—the seventh day in the creation: and he said, "From even till even shall ye celebrate your sabbaths;" as the evening and the morning were reckoned for the day. God did not leave this subject undecided, so that his people would appoint different days, and then for every one to call his own the Sabbath day! But God blessed and sanctified the seventh day, and proved that particular day to be designated by him, in the face and eyes of about six hundred thousand witnesses, by a miracle directly from heaven, in withholding the manna on that day, and in giving the food for that day on the day before; and you cannot deny it, or disprove it!

Again, you say, how shall we know which is the

seventh day? I answer, Do you wish to know? Then ask the Jews; for God has committed the lively oracles to them, and then scattered them among all nations. Do you know when the first day of the week comes? Well, the Sabbath day is always the day before the first day of the week. Matt. xxviii, 1. But you may say do not the majority of honest-hearted Christians keep the first day of the week? and have they not for centuries done common labor on the seventh day, and observed the first in obedience to the fourth command, and still been honest in their motives, and living Christians? I answer, What is that to us? so long as the true light of the Sabbath did not come to their minds? * * *

Now we certainly know what sin is; not by what popular writers say—not by the popular traditions of our fathers—not altogether by our feelings; but by the law of God is this knowledge; for sin is the transgression of the law; and all who have the law of God, have an infallible and an everlasting rule, to know what sin is. “To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word it is because there is no light in them.” And now if thou art a willful, weekly transgressor of the law of God, then by the law is the knowledge that thou art a willful sinner before God. But if thou art an ignorant transgressor of the law of God, then by the law is the knowledge that thou art an ignorant sinner before God. To say nothing of presumptuous sins, I say, if thou hast ignorantly sinned, then repent and reform, and God will heal you. Lev. iv, 2, 13.

By the law of God then is the clear knowledge of sin. I speak to you (Protestant) who keep the Sunday, a day formerly dedicated to the worship of the

Sun, by the Pagans, and afterwards brought into the church by Constantine and Roman Catholics, and called the Christian Sabbath, a name never known for the first day of the week by any of the writers of the New Testament. I speak to you, Protestants, and ask you if you have any given rule to know what sin is? Have you any certain rule to know whether Roman Catholics sin, or not, in bowing down to images? They say they do not sin! you say you know they do sin! but how do you know it is sin to bow down to images when they say it is not sin? *Ans.* By the law, you say, you know this is sin, and you know it by no other rule; for you "had not known sin but by the law." Well, by the same rule, I know what sin is. You say it is not sin to work and do common labor on the seventh day. But we know not by your assertion, but by the law, whether you sin or not. You say you know by the law that it is sin to bow down to images. I say, (by your own rule,) I know by the law, that it is sin to do common labor on the seventh day; and you cannot deny it! And if you know it is the duty of Roman Catholics to repent of their sins for transgressing the second command; then I know it is also your duty to repent of your sins for transgressing the fourth command. He that said thou shalt not kill—thou shalt not steal—thou shalt not bow down to images, neither serve them, &c., also said, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God."

I would that you could see the weakness of your argument; viz., that one seventh part of time was meant in the law, without regard to any particular day. In this you make the commandments of God of no effect through your tradition! Yea, you make void

that part of the command which says, "The *seventh day* is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." We read not that the Lord blessed the seventh part of the time, or the Sabbath institution, as you say, but the seventh day, in particular. Why do you wish to take out and make void this part of the fourth command? When Christ hath said, "Till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law." It was just as necessary that the particular day should be designated as it was that there should be a Sabbath made for man. It would not have been according to Divine Wisdom, to have said, thou shalt keep one seventh part of the time or one whole day in seven, because this would have left mankind in as much confusion as your theory could have made them! One might have kept one day and another the next, till seven sabbaths might have been kept in one family. Thus much for your seventh part of time.

Suppose a parent should command his child to do a certain piece of labor on a certain day, and the child should without any just cause neglect to perform the labor on the day specified, and should perform it on the next day. Would this show any respect for the authority of his parent, or would the parent approve such conduct in his child? You must say, No. Or if a governor should command all the military to do duty two days in the year, and for each one to select his own days, there would be as much wisdom in this, as in your seventh part of time, for the Sabbath of the Lord. God is not the author of confusion, but of order. While your theory of one seventh part of time, or one whole day in seven, instead of the seventh day, impeaches the Divine Wisdom, and makes

God the author of confusion. Thus your theory, not the law of God, leads to anarchy and confusion, and the observance of no Sabbath; and you cannot deny it. What reasonable objection have you to the law of God? What fault can you find with it, just as it stands? Have you wisdom enough to alter it for the better? "The law of the Lord is perfect converting the soul." Ps. xix, 7. Yea, it is so perfect that it has already converted the souls of many, even from the doctrines and commandments of men, to keep the Sabbath of the Lord, and I trust in God that it will convert many more. Because the statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart; the commandments of the Lord are pure, enlightening the eyes—more to be desired are they than gold, yea than much fine gold, sweeter than honey and the honey comb. Verses 8, 10. Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just and good. For I (Paul,) delight in the law of God after the inward man.

Reader, dost thou delight in the law of God after the inward man? If not, thy soul should be converted, by praying for the law of God to be put into thy heart, and written in thy mind. But if the law of God is already thy delight, then why not be reconciled to it? Why not be subject to it just as it stands? Why wish to make void one jot or tittle of it? I do not present the law for justification; but as a perfect rule of right, in this life; 1st, between man and his Creator: 2d, between man and his fellow man. Therefore, "whosoever shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven. But whosoever shall do and teach them shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven."

The Westminster Divines, found contradicting the writer of the Acts of the apostles. These Divines say, "From the beginning of the world to the resurrection of Christ, God appointed the seventh day of the week to be the weekly Sabbath, and the first day of the week ever since, to continue to the end of the world, which is the Christian Sabbath. 1. Luke (the writer of the Acts of the apostles,) says, [Acts xiii, 14,] Paul and his company went into a synagogue of the Jews on the Sabbath day. This was according to our account, A. D. 45, and twelve years after the resurrection of Christ. Luke says this was on the Sabbath day, then at that time. But the divines say, this was not on the Sabbath day at that time, but on Saturday, and that the seventh day was not then the Sabbath, neither had been for twelve years. (Thus they contradict Luke as plainly and pointedly as can be.)

2. Luke says, [Acts xiii, 42, 44,] "that when the Jews had gone out of the synagogue, the Gentiles besought that these words (of the Gospel) might be preached to them the next Sabbath." And the next Sabbath day came almost the whole city together to hear the word of God. This, Luke says, was on the Sabbath day at that time, twelve years after the resurrection. But the Divines say that it was not on the Sabbath at that time; for Sunday had been the Sabbath for twelve years!

3. Luke says, [Acts xvi, 13,] And on the Sabbath we went out of the city, by a river side, where prayer was wont to be made; A. D. 53, twenty years after the resurrection, and ten years before the Acts of the apostles were written. This, Luke says, was actually on the Sabbath day at that time—but the Divines

contradict him in saying, this was not on the Sabbath at that time, but on Saturday; for the seventh day, was not then the Sabbath, neither had been for twenty years—never since the resurrection of Christ! Thus they contradict Luke again, for all admit that Luke always called the seventh day, the day the Jews met in their synagogue, the Sabbath in the Acts of the apostles.

4. Luke says, [Acts xvii, 2-4,] Paul at Thessalonica, "as his manner was," went into a synagogue of the Jews, and so preached Christ and the resurrection three Sabbath days, that some Jews and a great multitude of Gentiles believed. This was twenty years after the resurrection of Christ. This, Luke says, was on three Sabbath days then at that time. But the Divines deny this also, because they say that the Sabbath had been changed from the seventh to the first day of the week, twenty years before. Thus they give Luke the lie! an awful mistake in them.

5. Luke says, [Acts xviii, 3, 4,] At Corinth Paul labored with his hands, as a tent-maker, (on the other days as we should understand,) but "reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks." This was A. D. 54, twenty-one years after the resurrection of Christ, and nine years before the Acts of the apostles were written. This, Luke said or wrote, A. D. 63, the thirtieth year after the resurrection, and the thirtieth year of the Christian church, that this preaching of Paul, was on every Sabbath;" that is, on every seventh day, (the same days that the Jews always met in their synagogue for worship.) This is a plain, pointed and positive proof, that the seventh day was the Sabbath, at least thirty years after the resurrection of Christ; for

Luke testified again and again that those meetings of the Jews and Gentiles were held on the Sabbath, and if Luke was a Christian, then the seventh day was the Christian Sabbath, thirty years after the resurrection! the Westminster Divines to the contrary notwithstanding. And if the seventh day was the Sabbath thirty years after the resurrection of Christ, as Luke says it was, then it is the Sabbath now. For you will admit, that no man or body of men, have had any lawful right to alter or change this command of God, since A. D. 63. But we find not one word in favor of the idea, nor even the least hint or allusion in all the New Testament, that the first day of the week was ever so much as thought of as a Christian Sabbath by any of the apostles while they lived! And you must give it up, yea, and you will give it up, if you search the Scriptures carefully and prayerfully on this subject, and if you have a spirit of discernment, and are willing to forsake error for truth, and if you are an honest-hearted Christian in the sight of God.

Now if the Scriptures are able to make one wise unto salvation, through faith in Jesus Christ, then why need I stop to examine all the various doctrines of popes, councils and fathers, when in searching I should find pope against pope, council against council and fathers against fathers! This would be like two companies fighting at great distance with small arms. But if we wish to come at close action, let us take the armor of truth, which will most assuredly prevail; and the closer the action, the sooner the victory will be won on the side of truth. Now my dear reader, if you will take the Scriptures and search them as above requested, then you will find the fol-

lowing valuable treasures of knowledge among the many therein contained.

1. You will find Christ himself saying, "The Sabbath was made for man," and that it was made when the first seven days were made, before man had sinned. The Sabbath was thus made not for the Jews in particular, but as a gift of God to man, i. e., mankind universally, of all nations and all ages of the world.

2. You will find that before the law was given at Mount Sinai, this was a law and a commandment, [Ex. xvi,] that it was also written by the finger of God, with the "lively oracles," which God committed to the Jews, to give unto us; that this law, by which is the clear knowledge of sin, is an infallible and everlasting rule to know by, what is sin and what is not sin; that sin is the transgression of the law; that to act against it, or to do things contrary to it is sin; but "where no law is, there is no transgression;" that this law Christ came not to destroy, abrogate, or make void; that the law is holy, and just, and good; and that Christians delight in it. And as Paul "had not known lust except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet," so we had not known which day of the week was the Sabbath except the law had said, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." Now we know by the law, that this is the Sabbath without the help of commentators!

3. You can find that the resurrection of our Saviour has nothing to do with changing the Sabbath, any more than his birth, his death, or his ascension. Whether he was risen near the end of the Sabbath, or some time before the common time of commencing the first day Sabbath, so called, has nothing to do

with altering one jot, or one tittle of the law of God.

4. You can find that the common reasonings of men, that Christ frequently met with his disciples on the first-day of the week, after his resurrection, any more than on other days, are false and without foundation; that he went with two of them to Emmaus, about seven and a half miles and returned to Jerusalem, which would plainly show that he did not regard that day as a Sabbath; that he met with his disciples in the evening, which must have been after the commencement of the second day of the week, (see Gen. i, 8,) when they were met, but not to celebrate the resurrection, as false reasoners pretend; that he met with them again "after eight days," i. e., near the middle of the next week, and again when they were together fishing, so that the fishing day would prove a Sabbath, just as much as either of the two first visits.

5. You can find that Luke had not forgotten the distinction between the "first day of the week" and "the Sabbath day," [Acts xx, 7,] in his recording the meeting of the disciples to break bread, on that day, and that this is the only time the first day of the week is mentioned in all the Acts of the Apostles; and that it is the only notice of Paul's preaching on that particular day, or rather evening, and that on a particular occasion, viz., in order to be "ready to depart on the morrow;" that this one instance of the first day being mentioned, proves that it was not on the Sabbath and that the many meetings of the Jews and Gentiles, believers and unbelievers, where Paul preached "every Sabbath," did not mean on the first day of the week.


6. You may find that Paul, in giving orders to some of the churches, to "lay by themselves in store something, according as God hath prospered them, on the first of the week" for the poor saints at Jerusalem, [1 Cor. xvi, 2,] does not prove that to be the Sabbath day, but that it was not the Sabbath day nor suitable to a Sabbath day's work; but rather as an offering to the Lord of "the first ripe fruits of their increase;" to be the first business attended to in the week, to reckon up their earnings or incomes and devote a part of the same, and lay it by itself so that it would be ready when Paul came. This indeed was a good calculation for the first business of the week.

7. You can find that as there is no law of God against doing common labor on the first day of the week, so it is no sin, nor transgression of any law other than the laws and commandments of men.

8. You can find that the Saviour said to his disciples, "If ye love me, keep my commandments." Again, "He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me; and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father; and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him." Again, "Jesus answered and said unto him, If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him."

Now my dear readers, if you neglect, or refuse to obey this fourth command of the decalogue, you are left without excuse, and you can plead nothing in extenuation of your neglect. "For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil."

THE
FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK
NOT THE
SABBATH OF THE LORD.



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

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

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

To men thus situated, Jehovah thus speaks: “Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.” 1 Thess. v, 21. That is, bring every part of your faith and practice to the test of God’s sure word; ask the Holy

Spirit's aid, that your mind may be delivered from prejudice, and your understanding enlightened in the word of truth. Then what you find revealed in that word hold fast; it is of priceless value; but relinquish at once every precept or doctrine not therein recorded, lest you make the doctrines of men of equal weight with the commandments of God. What is the chaff to the wheat? saith the Lord.

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

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

That this commandment requires men to remember, and to keep holy the Rest-day of the Creator, which he hallowed at the close of the first week of time,

none can deny. We now ask for the authority for the change of this commandment.

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

Protestants deny the authority of the church of Rome, and attempt to vindicate the change of the Sabbath, by an appeal to the Bible. This is what we wish them to do. We ask them, therefore, to present a single text in which it is said that God has changed his Sabbath to the first day of the week. The advocates of the change have none to offer. If they cannot present such a text, will they give us one which testifies that God ever blessed and sanctified the first day of the week? Its observers admit that they have none to present. But will they not give us one text in which men are required to keep the first day holy, as a Sabbath unto the Lord? They acknowledge that they have none. How then do they dare to exalt the first day of the week above the Sabbath of the Lord, which the commandment requires us to remember, and keep holy?

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

But there are several reasons urged for the obser-

vance of the first day of the week, which we will here notice.

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

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

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

Nor can it be plead that the resurrection-day is the most remarkable day in the history of redemption.

It needs but a word to prove that in this respect it is far exceeded by the day of the crucifixion. Which is the most remarkable event, the act of Jehovah in giving his beloved and only Son to die for a race of rebels, or the act of that Father in raising that beloved Son from the dead? There is only one answer that can be given: it was not remarkable that God should raise his Son from the dead; but the act of the Father in giving his Son to die for sinners, was a spectacle of redeeming love on which the Universe might gaze and adore the wondrous love of God to all eternity. Who can wonder that the sun was veiled in darkness, and that all nature trembled at the sight! The crucifixion-day, therefore, has far greater claims than the day of the resurrection. God has not enjoined the observance of either; and is it not a fearful act to make void the commandments of God by that wisdom which is folly in his sight. 1 Cor. i, 19, 20.

But if we would commemorate redemption, there is no necessity of robbing the Lord's Rest-day of its holiness in order to do it. When truth takes from us our errors, it always has something better to take their place. So the false memorial of redemption being taken out of the way, the Word presents in its stead those which are true. God has provided us with memorials, bearing his own signature; and these we may observe with the blessing of Heaven. Would you commemorate the death of our Lord? You need not keep the day of his crucifixion. The Bible tells you how to do it.

“For I have received of the Lord, that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take eat;

this is my body, which is broken for you; this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death, till he come." 1 Cor. xi, 23-26.

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

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

“the inhabitants of the earth are burned, and few men left.” *Iša. xxiv, 5, 6.*

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

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

It is a fact, therefore, that the disciples were not commemorating the resurrection of the Saviour; it is equally evident that they had not the slightest idea of a change of the Sabbath. At the burial of the Saviour, the women who had followed him to the tomb, returned and prepared spices and ointments to embalm him; the Sabbath drew on;

they rested the Sabbath-day according to the commandment; and when the Sabbath was past, they came to the sepulchre upon the first day of the week to embalm their Lord. Luke xxiii, 55, 56; xxiv, 1. They kept the Sabbath according to the commandment, and resumed their labor on the first day of the week.

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

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

Was the act of Christ in appearing to his disciples sufficient to constitute the day on which it occurred

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

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

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

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

2. The disciples had been engaged in earnest prayer for the space of ten days; for the day of Pentecost was fifty days from the resurrection of Christ, and forty of those days he spent with his disciples. Acts i. Forty days from his resurrection would expire on Thursday, the day of his ascension. A period of ten days *after* his ascension on Thursday, would include two First-days, the last of which would be the day of Pentecost. If the design of God had been to honor the first day of the week, why did not the Holy Ghost descend on the first of those First-

days? Why must the day of Pentecost come before the Holy Ghost could descend? This answer is obvious. It was not the design of Heaven to honor the first day of the week, but to mark the antitype of the feast of Pentecost. Hence the first day of the week is passed in silence.

The slaying of the paschal lamb on the fourteenth day of the first month, had met its antitype in the death of the Lamb of God on that day. Ex. xii; John xix; 1 Cor. v, 7. The offering of the first fruits on the sixteenth day of the first month, had met its antitype in the resurrection of our Lord on that day, the first fruits of them that slept. Lev. xxiii; 1 Cor. xv, 20, 23. It remained that the day of Pentecost, fifty days later, should also meet its antitype. Lev. xxiii, 15-21. The fulfillment of that type is what the pen of inspiration has recorded in Acts ii, 1, 2. God has spoken nothing in this place respecting a change of his Sabbath. Yet grave men, calling themselves Doctors of Divinity, consider this text one of their strongest testimonies for their so-called Christian Sabbath. They might be profited by this advice of the wise man: "Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar." Prov. xxx, 6.

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

We answer, that at one period the apostolic church at Jerusalem broke bread every day. Acts ii, 42-46. If a *single* instance of breaking bread at Troas upon the first day of the week, was quite sufficient to constitute it the Sabbath, would not the continued practice of the apostolic church at Jerusalem

in breaking bread *every* day, be amply sufficient to make every day a Sabbath? Moreover, as the act of the Great Head of the church in breaking bread, must be quite as important as that of his servant Paul, must not the day of the crucifixion be pre-eminently the "Christian Sabbath," as Christ instituted, and performed this ordinance on the evening with which that day commenced? 1 Cor. xi, 23-26.

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

But if the Bible method of commencing the day, viz., from six o'clock P. M., was followed, it would appear that the disciples came together at the close of the Sabbath, for an evening meeting, as the Apostle was to depart in the morning. (If it was not an evening meeting, why did they have many lights there?) Paul preached to them until midnight, and then broke bread with the disciples early in the morning of the first day of the week. Did this act constitute that day the Sabbath? If so, then why did Paul, as soon as it was light, start on his long journey to Jerusalem? If Paul believed that Sunday was the Christian Sabbath, why did he thus openly violate it? If he did

not believe it had become the Sabbath, why should you? And why do you grasp, as evidence that the Sabbath had been changed, a single instance in which an evening meeting was held on Sunday, while you overlook the fact that it was the custom of this same Apostle to preach every Sabbath, not only to the Jews, but also to the Gentiles? Acts xiii, 14, 42, 44; xvi, 13; xvii, 2; xviii, 4.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This is the kind of reasoning which the advocates of Sunday are invariably obliged to adopt. But we ask, What right have they to assume the very point which they ought to prove? This text, it is true, furnishes direct proof that there is a day in the gos-

pel dispensation which the Lord claims as his; but is there one text in the Bible which testifies that the first day of the week is the Lord's day? There is not one. Has God ever claimed that day as his? Never. Has God ever claimed any day as his, and reserved it to himself? He has. "And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." Gen. ii, 3. "To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord." Ex. xvi, 23. "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." Ex. xx, 10. "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day," &c. Isa. lviii, 13. "Therefore, the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." Mark ii, 28.

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

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

THINGS TO BE CONSIDERED.

WE have now examined the main pillars on which the first-day Sabbath rests; and it is perfectly apparent that there is not a single particle of divine authority for the observance of that day. Hence, its advocates must observe the Sabbath of the Lord, or they must resort to the tradition of the "fathers" for proof of its change. The history of the change will be given in its place. But we now ask, what

right had the elders of the Christian church to change the fourth commandment, any more than the elders of the Jewish church had, to change the fifth?

The Pharisees pretended that they had a tradition handed down from Moses, which authorized them to change the fifth commandment. The Papist and Protestant Doctors of Divinity pretend that they have a tradition handed down from Christ and the apostles, authorizing them to change the fourth. But if Christ rebuked the Pharisees for holding a damnable heresy, what would he say to the like act on the part of his own professed followers? Matt. xv, 3-9.

The same fathers which changed the fourth commandment, have also corrupted all the ordinances of the New Testament, and have established purgatory, invocation of saints, the worship of the Virgin Mary and prayers for the dead.

The Protestant professes to receive the Bible *alone* as his standard of faith and practice. The Papist receives the Bible and the tradition of the fathers as his rule. The Protestant cannot prove the change of the Sabbath from his own standard, (the Bible,) therefore he is obliged to adopt that of the Papist, viz., the Bible as explained and corrupted by the fathers. The change of the Sabbath is proved by the Papist as follows:—

“Ques. What warrant have you for keeping the Sunday, preferably to the ancient Sabbath which was the Saturday?”

“Ans. We have for it the authority of the Catholic Church, and apostolic tradition.

“Q. Does the Scripture any where command the Sunday to be kept for the Sabbath?”

“A. The Scripture commands us to hear the Church, [Matt. xviii, 17; Luke x, 16,] and to hold fast the traditions of the apostles. 2 Thess. ii, 15. But the Scripture does not in particular mention this change of the Sabbath. John speaks of the Lord’s day; [Rev. i, 10;] but he does not tell us what day of the week this was, much less does he tell us that this day was to take the place of the Sabbath ordained in the commandments. Luke also speaks of the disciples meeting together to break bread on the first day of the week. Acts xx, 7. And Paul [1 Cor. xvi, 2] orders that on the first day of the week the Corinthians should lay by in store what they designed to bestow in charity on the faithful in Judea; but neither the one nor the other tells us that this first day of the week was to be henceforward the day of worship, and the Christian Sabbath; so that truly, the best authority we have for this, is the testimony and ordinance of the church. And therefore, those who pretend to be so religious of the Sunday, whilst they take no notice of other festivals ordained by the same church authority, show that they act by humor, and not by reason and religion; since Sundays and holy-days all stand upon the same foundation, viz., the ordinance of the church.

“Q. What was the reason why the weekly Sabbath was changed from the Saturday to the Sunday?

“A. Because our Lord fully accomplished the work of our redemption by rising from the dead on a Sunday, and by sending down the Holy Ghost on a Sunday; as therefore the work of our redemption was a greater work than that of our creation, the primitive church thought the day on which this work

was completely finished, was more worthy her religious observation than that in which God rested from the creation, and should be properly called the Lord's day."—*Catholic Christian Instructed*.

If further testimony is needed listen to the following:—

“Ques. What does God ordain by this commandment ?

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

“Q. What is this day of rest ?

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

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

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

“Q. Had the church power to make such a change ?

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

“Q. Why did the church make this change ?

“A. Because Christ rose from the dead upon Sunday, and rested from the great work of redemption; and because, on this day, the Holy Spirit descended

on the apostles and on the church.”—*Catechism of the Christian Religion*.

This testimony shows conclusively that the fourth commandment, which the New Testament has never changed, has been corrupted by the Romish church. It was from Rome, as we may here see, that Protestants learned to say that the Sabbath was changed because redemption was greater than creation. Here we will mention some things for special consideration.

1. Those who are now paying religious respect to the first day of the week, may possibly be led to examine the reasons for this course, by the following significant fact: The church of Rome undertakes to prove purgatory by the Bible, but acknowledges that Sunday-keeping cannot be proved by it, as she instituted that herself. Those, therefore, who despise the Lord's Sabbath, and in its stead honor the sabbath of the Romish church, virtually acknowledge that the authority of that church is above the authority of God, and sufficient to change his times and laws. Here is her statement respecting purgatory:—

“Question. But what grounds have you to believe that there is any such place as a purgatory, or middle state of souls?

“Answer. We have the strongest grounds imaginable from all kind of arguments, from scripture, from perpetual tradition, from the authority and declaration of the church of God, and from reason.”—*Catholic Christian Instructed*, page 146.

Hear the Catholic church once more, while she contrasts purgatory with Sunday-keeping:—

“The word of God commandeth the seventh day to be the Sabbath of our Lord, and to be kept holy: you [Protestants] without any precept of scripture,

change it to the first day of the week, only authorized by our traditions. Divers English Puritans oppose against this point, that the observation of the first day is proved out of scripture, where it is said the first day of the week. Acts xx, 7; 1 Cor. xvi, 2; Rev. i, 10. Have they not spun a fair thread in quoting these places? If we should produce no better for purgatory and prayers for the dead, invocation of the saints, and the like, they might have good cause indeed to laugh us to scorn; for where is it written that these were Sabbath-days in which those meetings were kept? Or where is it ordained they should be always observed? Or, which is the sum of all, where is it decreed that the observation of the first day should abrogate or abolish the sanctifying of the seventh day, which God commanded everlastingly to be kept holy? Not one of those is expressed in the written word of God.”—*An Antidote, or Treatise of Thirty Controversies.*

Reader, shall not such facts as the above open your eyes? Have you any better authority for Sunday-keeping than Romish tradition? What think you of that prophecy which foretells that the Pope should speak great words against God, and think to change times and laws? Dan. vii, 25. That church who styles her head, “Lord God the Pope,” has here openly testified, that without any authority from Scripture, she has changed the commandments of God. She also declares that of her two children, Purgatory and Sunday-keeping, the former is the most important personage. Cannot that mother judge impartially between two such darlings?

2. But perhaps the fathers, as they are called, may be regarded by the reader as the best of authority. We are aware that not a few, who profess to be Bi-

ble Christians, rest their Sunday-observance solely upon such evidence. We request the attention of such to the following from Storrs' *Six Sermons*. It was written in defense of the author's views of future punishment; but the remarks are of equal value with respect to the Sabbath question.

“It is said, ‘The *fathers* believed in the *endless* torments of the wicked.’ In reply, I remark, Our Lord and Master has prohibited my calling any man *father*. But, if the fathers, as they are called, did believe that doctrine, they learned it from the Bible, or they did not. If they learned it there, so can we. If they did not learn it from the Bible, then their testimony is of no weight. It may have been an error that early got into the church, like many others. Mosheim, in his Church History, tells us, as early as the third century, that the defenders of Christianity, in their controversies, ‘degenerated much from primitive simplicity,’ and that the maxim which asserted the innocence of defending truth by artifice and falsehood, ‘contributed’ to this degeneracy. And he adds:—

“This disingenuous and vicious method of surprising their adversaries by artifice, and striking them down, as it were, by lies and fictions, produced, among other disagreeable effects, a great number of books, which were falsely attributed to certain great men, in order to give these spurious productions more credit and weight; for as the greater part of mankind are *less governed by reason* than authority, and prefer in many cases, the decisions of fallible mortals, to the unerring dictates of the Divine Word, the disputants of whom we are speaking, thought they could not serve the truth more effectually than by opposing illustrious names, and respectable authorities, to the attacks of its adversaries.”

“This practice, spoken of by Mosheim, increased as the darker ages rolled on; and through these dark ages, what there are of the writings of the ‘fathers’ have come down to us. It is a truth, also, that the practice of corrupting the simplicity of the apostolic doctrine was commenced much earlier than the third century. Enfield, in his philosophy, says:—‘The first witness of Christianity had scarcely left the world when’ this work began. Some of the ‘fathers’ seemed intent upon uniting heathen philosophy with Christianity, and early commenced the practice of clothing the doctrines of religion in an allegorical dress.”—*Fourth Sermon.*

Those who make the “fathers” their rule, would do well to consider the above facts. Every damnable heresy of the Romish church, she proves by those same fathers. Tradition is the unfailing resort of Romanists, to prove their dogmas; indeed, they openly acknowledge that tradition is a part of their rule of faith. Protestants claim that they make the Bible their only rule of duty; but, whenever their unscriptural arguments for Sunday-keeping are exposed, they fly for refuge to the fathers. Thus Protestants defend their heresies with the same weapons that the Papists employ to defend theirs. The same fountain head of corruption feeds the several streams of error that flow through both these bodies.

3. But, says one, do you not think that it would be safe to believe what those have said who conversed with the apostles, or at least, conversed with some who had conversed with them? If such should tell us that the Sabbath of the Lord was changed, would it not be safe to receive their testimony? We answer, that the holy Scriptures come to us with the divine

guarantee that every word therein contained was divinely inspired. The tradition of the elders comes to us without a particle of such testimony. Wherefore it follows that the man who fears God will not reject that which he knows came from heaven, for the sake of following that which directly contradicts it, and which by that fact is proved to have come from the great enemy of divine truth.

But does the Bible contain the least intimation that what was written near the days of the apostles is any more sacred than what was written at a later period? Paul told the Thessalonian church that "the mystery of iniquity," or Romish apostasy, had already begun to work. 2 Thess, ii. If Paul was correct, it follows that it is far from being safe to adopt as sacred truth a doctrine which is not found in the New Testament, merely because it is said to have come from some who lived near the days of the apostles. Satan was then busily engaged in nursing in the bosom of the early church, the viper which should ere long infect with deadly poison a great portion of the professed people of God. Did not Paul warn those with whom he parted at Ephesus, that grievous wolves were to enter among them, and that of themselves men were to arise speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them? When any doctrine is brought to us from those who lived near the days of the apostles, it is then proper for us to inquire whether this comes from those who spoke the sentiments of the holy apostles, or whether it comes from those grievous wolves who were to follow after them, and speak perverse things.

Is there no way by which we can determine this question? Certainly there is an infallible test. The

New Testament contains the precise language of Jesus Christ and the apostles. Now if the fathers speak according to that word, they speak the precious truths of God. But if they speak that which makes void the word of truth, it is a very strong evidence that they belong to that class which Paul notified the church, should arise in their very midst, and speak perverse things, to draw away disciples after them. If the Holy Spirit has given us notice that false teachers were to arise in the very days of the apostles, should it not serve as a warning to us, that things which purport to come from the successors of the apostles, may, for all that, contain the most deadly poison?

4. If it were certain that the *early* fathers, in their zeal to improve upon the New Testament, changed the fourth commandment, it would only prove that they were of the number of grievous wolves that were to arise. But it by no means follows that the mystery of iniquity was able thus early to change times and laws. The testimony given from Storrs' Fourth Sermon, evinces clearly that even the fathers themselves do not now come to us with their own words. Their testimony has been corrupted, and many shameless forgeries are palmed off as their genuine testimony.

If the reader ever looked into a Romish controversial work, he will there find the very fathers, who are so much relied upon to prove the change of the Sabbath, quoted to prove all the heresies of that anti-christian church. It follows, therefore, that one of two things must be true: either the testimony of the early fathers has been shamefully corrupted, or those so-called early fathers were wolves in sheep's clothing.

5. If the Lord Jesus Christ and his apostles were now on earth, mingling with the men of this generation, as they once mingled with a former generation, we ask, Would it be safe for the men of the third or fourth generation from this to receive as sacred truth all that the fathers of the present generation might transmit to them? Is it not self-evident that unless human nature should undergo a radical change, the men of the following generations would have handed down to them as Christ's sayings, all the vain and foolish sentiments that different partizans might wish to maintain? In the case supposed, we ask, What would be the safety of the coming generations? There is but one answer, and in this all will agree. If this were the age in which the New Testament was written, the safety of the coming generation would be secured *only*, by faithfully testing, by that sure rule, whatever might be handed down to them as gospel truth from the fathers of the present age. Should they thus rigidly cleave to inspiration, they would be safe; but if they added to that sure word all the fables which satan would instigate the present fathers to attribute to Christ and the apostles, what would become of them?

If the Advent body itself were to furnish the *fathers* and the *saints* for the future church, Heaven pity the people that should live hereafter! Reader we entreat you to prize your Bible. It contains *all* the will of God, and will make you wise unto salvation through faith in Christ Jesus.

Those who believe in a change of the Lord's Sabbath should look at these facts: The Sabbath of the Lord means the Rest-day of the Lord. Six days the Almighty wrought in the work of creation, and

the seventh day he rested from all his work. The Sabbath or Rest-day of the Lord, is, therefore, a definite day, which can no more be changed to one of the days upon which God wrought, than the resurrection-day can be changed to one of the days upon which Christ did not rise, or the crucifixion-day be changed to one of the six days of the week upon which Christ was not crucified. Hence it is as impossible to change the Rest-day of the Lord as it is to change the crucifixion-day or the day of the resurrection.

Men of God, to whom the Scriptures have been committed, can you longer pervert the commandments of Jehovah and not be guilty of willful transgression? Must it not be exceeding sinful in the sight of Heaven for you to change the Sabbath of the Lord for another day, and then to steal that commandment which guards the holy Sabbath, to enforce the observance of that new day? When the hailstones of Jehovah's wrath shall sweep away the refuge of lies, [Isa. xxviii, 17; Rev. xvi, 21,] how many of the arguments for Sunday-keeping will be left? The Bible thoroughly furnishes the man of God to all good works. Sunday-keeping is not, therefore, a good work; for the Scriptures furnish nothing in its favor. Why should you be ready of heart to believe what God has never spoken, and slow of heart to believe his plain testimony? Thus saith the Lord. "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God;" "Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy." J. N. A.

SEVENTH PART OF TIME THEORY

Shown to be False by the Following from J. W. Morton's Vindication of the True Sabbath.

THE only object, direct or indirect, of this [the fourth] commandment, is "*the day.*" What are we commanded to remember? "*The day.*" What are we required to keep holy? "*The day.*" What did the Lord bless and hallow? "*The day.*" In what are we forbidden to work? In "*the day.*" Now let us inquire:—

1. What day? *Not* the day of Adam's fall; nor the day Noah went into the ark; nor the day of the overthrow of Sodom; nor the day of the Exodus; nor the day of the Provocation; nor the day of the removal of the ark; nor the day of Christ's birth; nor the day of his crucifixion; nor the day of his resurrection; nor the day of his ascension; nor the day of judgment. It may be, and certainly is, proper, that we should remember all these; but we are not told to do so in this commandment. Neither is it some one day of the week, but no one in particular; for how could we remember "*the day,*" that is no day in particular?—how could we keep holy "*the day*" that has not been specified?—and how could we say that God had blessed and hallowed "*the day,*" that was no one day more than another? What day, then? God says, Remember *the Sabbath-day,* or *the day of the Sabbath;* Keep holy *the day of the Sabbath;* The Lord blessed and hallowed *the day*

of the Sabbath. He also says, *The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work.* This day, therefore, is "the seventh day," or "the day of the Sabbath."

2. What Sabbath? Not "*a* Sabbath," or any Sabbath that man may invent, or that God may hereafter keep; for that would be "some Sabbath," but no one in particular. Not some institution yet undetermined, that God may require man to observe weekly; for the command is not, "Remember the Sabbath institution," but, "Remember the *day* of the Sabbath;" not, "Keep holy the Sabbath institution," but, "Keep holy the *day* of the Sabbath." The Lord did not bless and hallow "the Sabbath institution," but "the *day* of the Sabbath." We are not forbidden to do work in "the Sabbath institution," but in "the *seventh day*." In fact, the phrase, "the Sabbath," in this commandment, means neither more nor less than "the rest." It is not *here* the name of any institution at all, though it is often thus used in other parts of the Bible. Hence, this Sabbath is "the Sabbath or rest of the Lord thy God."

3. Which day of the week is "the day of the Sabbath?" No other than that day on which the Lord rested; for the command refers to God's Sabbath. On which day of the week did he rest? "And he rested on the seventh day." Gen. ii, 2. Therefore, "the day of the Sabbath" is the same day of the week on which God rested from the work of creation; and as he rested on the seventh day of the first week, and on no other, the seventh and no other day of every week must be the only "day of the Sabbath."

Let it be particularly observed, that God does not

say, Remember the Sabbath, or, Remember the Sabbath institution, though this is necessarily implied in the command; but, Remember “the day of the Sabbath”—the day on which I have ordained that the Sabbath institution be observed. As if he had said, There is little danger, *comparatively*, that you will forget the fact of my having kept Sabbath; nor is it likely that you will altogether neglect to observe *some day* of rest from your arduous toils, for you will be driven to this by the ever returning demands of your exhausted bodies; but you are, and always will be, in especial danger of forgetting the proper day of the week for honoring me in my own institution. Satan, who takes infinite delight in all kinds of “will-worship,” while he hates with a perfect hatred every act of strict obedience to my law, will do all he can to persuade you that some other day will do just as well, or even better. Remember, therefore, the day of my Sabbath, and keep the same day holy in every week; for—mark the reason—I have myself rested on the seventh day, and on that account I have blessed and sanctified that and no other day of the week, that you may observe it, and keep it holy, not because it is in itself better than any other day, but because I have blessed and sanctified it.

There is only one day of American Independence; only one day of the Resurrection of Christ; only one day of the birth of any one man; and only one day of Judgment. And why? Because American Independence was declared on but one day; Christ rose on but one day; the same man cannot be born on two different days; and God hath appointed only one day in which he will judge the world. Now, on the same principle, there can be but one “day of the

Sabbath" of the Lord our God. If I should say that the day of Christ's Resurrection is not any particular day of the week, but only "one day in seven," you would not hesitate to call me a fool, while my ignorance would excite your deepest sympathy; but when *you* say that "the day of the Sabbath" does not mean that particular day on which the Lord's Sabbath occurred, but only "one day in seven," you expect me to receive your assertion as the infallible teaching of superior wisdom. I cannot, however, so receive it, for the following reasons:—

1. If God had meant "one day in seven," he would have said so. His first and great design, in writing his law on tables of stone, was to be understood by his creatures; but, for more than two thousand years after he gave the law, no human being ever suspected that "the day of the Sabbath" meant anything else than the seventh day of the week, because it was commonly known that that day alone was in reality "the day of the Sabbath." Indeed, this "one-day-in-seven" doctrine is known to have been invented within a few hundred years, with the pious design of accounting for a change of Sabbath, without the necessity of repealing a portion of the moral law. It is a matter of great surprise, that those pious theologians, who first substituted "one day in seven" for "the day of the Sabbath," did not shudder at the thought of presuming to mend the language of the Holy Ghost. "The words of the Lord are pure words; as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times." Ps. xii, 6. Brethren, are you prepared to enter into judgment, and answer for the liberties you have taken with God's word?

In substituting the vague and indefinite expression, "one day in seven," for the definite and unequivocal terms, "the Sabbath-day," and "the seventh day," you have as truly taken "away from the words of the prophecy of this book," as if you had blotted the fourth commandment from the Decalogue; while your leading object has been to make way for the introduction of a new command that, for aught the Scriptures teach, it never entered into the heart of the Almighty to put into his law.

2. God never blessed "one day in seven," without blessing a particular day. He either blessed some definite object, or nothing. You *may* say, indeed, without falsehood, that God blessed "one day in seven;" but if you mean that this act of blessing did not terminate on any particular day, you ought to know, that you are asserting what is naturally impossible. As well might you say of a band of robbers, that they had killed "one man in seven," while in reality they had killed no man in particular. No, brethren, yourselves know very well, that God had not blessed and sanctified any day but *the seventh of the seven*, prior to the giving of the written law. You know, that if God blessed any day of the week at all, it was a definite day, distinct from all the other days of the week. But this commandment says, that "the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day." Therefore the Sabbath-day must be a particular day of the week. Therefore "the Sabbath-day" is not "one day in seven," or an indefinite seventh part of time. Therefore it is not "one day in seven" that we are required to remember, and keep holy, and in which we are forbidden to do any work; but "the seventh day" of the week, which was then, is now, and will

be till the end of time, "the day of the Sabbath" of the Lord our God.

3. No day of the week but the seventh was ever called "the day of the Sabbath," either by God or man, till long since the death of the last inspired writer. Search both Testaments through and through, and you will find no other day called "*the Sabbath*," or even "*a Sabbath*," except the ceremonial Sabbaths, with which, of course, we have nothing to do in this controversy. And long after the close of the canon of inspiration, the seventh day, and no other, was still called "the Sabbath." If you can prove that any one man, among the millions of Adam's children, from the beginning of the world till the *rise of Antichrist*, ever called the first day of the week "*the Sabbath*," you will shed a light upon this controversy, for which a host of able writers have searched in vain.

But, farther; the first day of the week was not observed by any of the children of men, *as a Sabbath*, for three hundred years after the birth of Christ. Do you ask proof? I refer you to Theodore de Beza, who plainly says so. If you are not satisfied with the witness, will you have the goodness to prove the affirmative of the proposition?

I infer, therefore, that "the day of the Sabbath," or "the Sabbath-day," is the proper name of the seventh day of the week, as much so as "the day of Saturn;" and that to attach this proper name *now* to some other day of the week, and to affirm that God meant that other day, as much as he did the seventh, when he wrote the law on tables of stone, is as unreasonable as it is impious.

If you say, that when God speaks of "the Sabbath-

day," he means "one day in seven, but no day in particular," you are as far from the truth as if you said that, when he speaks of Moses, he does not mean any particular man, but "some one of the Israelites." Moses *was* one of the Israelites, just as the Sabbath-day *is* one day in seven. But when God says Moses, he means Moses the son of Amram; and when he says "the Sabbath-day," he means the seventh day of the week. You *may* give different names to the same object, without interfering with its identity; but to apply the same name to two different objects, and then to affirm that these two objects are identically the same, so that what is predicated of the one must be true of the other, is as though a navigator should discover an island in the Southern Ocean, and call it "England," and then affirm that the late work of Mr. Macaulay, entitled "The History of England," is a veritable and authentic history of his newly discovered empire. Which would you wonder at most, the stupidity or the effrontery of that navigator?

I cannot close this chapter without reminding you that, in attempting to refute the above reasoning, the main thing you will have to show is, that "the Sabbath-day," or "the day of the Sabbath," is an indefinite or general expression, applicable alike to, at least, two different days of the week, and that it is used indefinitely in this commandment. If it has been proved, that "the day of the Sabbath" refers, and can refer, *only* to the seventh day of the week, then it is true, and will remain for ever true, that the original Sabbath-law requires the sanctification of no other day.

AN APPEAL

TO MEN OF REASON AND COMMON SENSE.

FRIENDS :—If you lay claim to the above characteristics, then give attention to the following points :—

1. Is it reasonable to suppose that God created man an immortal being, and yet never once in his holy Word informed us of the fact ?

2. Is it reasonable to suppose, that if man naturally possessed immortality, God's word would recommend us to seek for it, as it does in Rom. ii, 7 !

3. Is it reasonable to suppose, that if men were naturally immortal, God's word would so plainly assure us that "God—ONLY hath immortality ?" 1 Tim. vi, 16.

4. Is it not far more reasonable to believe that immortality is the GIFT of God through Jesus Christ our Lord ? Rom. vi, 23.

5. Is it reasonable to suppose that words, when found in the Bible, *must* have a meaning attached to them, which no man in his senses would ever think of attaching to them in any other book? For instance, the words *Life* and *Death*, when found in the Bible, *must* (as Theologians tell us) mean *happiness* and *misery*; but, if found in any other book in the world, would simply mean, "Existence" and "cessation of Existence."

6. Is it reasonable to suppose that, in all the vast multitude of passages in which Christ promised *Life, Eternal Life*, to his followers, that he did not literally mean what he said? This he could not, if all men have immortal life by nature. In that case the wicked will live through eternity as well as the righteous.

7. Is it reasonable to suppose that in all the vast multitude of passages in which death is threatened as the punishment of the sinner, that *loss of happiness* is all that is meant? An unhappy man is as truly alive as the most happy being in existence; and if he be immortal by nature, will continue alive through all eternity. In no plain common sense, can any immortal being be said to suffer Death.

8. Is it reasonable to suppose that infinite wisdom would invariably use language which was only calculated to mislead his creatures? or which none but Doctors of Divinity could unravel? Would God speak in riddles to men, in the great matters which concern their salvation?

9. Is it not more reasonable and more in accordance with the wisdom and love of God, to suppose that he would give his creatures such a revelation, as plain, common-sense people could easily understand? He has done so:—if men would but use their reason in reading the Bible as they would do in reading any other book.

10. Is it reasonable to believe, that men go to Heaven or Hell immediately at death; and then hundreds or thousands of years afterwards are taken out to be judged, and to see which they deserve to be sent to? Should we deem it right to send a man to the State's Prison for ten years, and then bring him out for trial, to see if he deserved such a punishment? And "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?"

11. Is it reasonable that such prominence should be given in scripture to the doctrine of the Resurrection from the dead, if that event only means a

“re-union” of a lump of clay, with the conscious thinking and real man—*The Soul*: and which is said by Theologians, to be as capable of happiness or misery without the body as with it?

12. Is it reasonable to talk about a “Death that never dies,” when there is not a word in scripture to sanction such a contradictory phrase? Would it not be equally reasonable to speak of the reward of the righteous as a “Life that never lives?” Is there not as much common sense in the one as in the other?

13. Is it reasonable to be so constantly, both in sermons and prayers, talking about “Immortal souls,”—“Never dying souls”—“Deathless spirits,” and such like expressions, when there is not, from Genesis to Revelation, *one single passage* to warrant the use of such language?

14. Is it reasonable to say, that “Eternal Death,” and “Eternal Torment, are synonymous expressions,” (as Theologians tell us,)—for how then can it be said in Rev. xxi, 4, “there shall be *no more death?*”

15. Is it reasonable to believe that a hell of fiery torment, and ceaseless misery is to exist for ever, when God says, [Rev. xxi, 5,] Behold I make *all things new?*

16. Is it reasonable to believe in the Eternal Torment of the Wicked, when more than two hundred passages of scripture plainly affirm that they shall "*Die*"—be "*Consumed*"—" *Devoured*"—" *Destroyed*"—" *Burnt up*"—" *Be as though they had not been,*" &c., &c.

17. Is it reasonable to believe that the righteous, in their glorified state, can be indifferent to, and unaffected by, the endless sufferings of countless millions of their fellow-beings; among whom would probably be found parents, children, husbands, wives, &c.? Is it possible that they will be destitute or deprived of qualities which are considered most lovely and Godlike in this life; viz., piety, sympathy, compassion, commiseration for others' woes, &c.? Will insensibility to the woes of the wretched ever become a virtue? Will that which is a vice in this life become a grace in the glorious future life? Is the standard of virtue thus variable, that what is vicious here, is to be gracious hereafter?

18. Is it reasonable to believe that a God of Infinite Rectitude will punish with Eternal Torment, the Heathen who have never heard of Christ, and who therefore could not reject him? Is it possi-

ble that God can cast into one indiscriminate mass of fiery torment, the least wicked among the heathen, together with the most guilty in this Christian land? for such must be the case if their souls are immortal, and if their torment is to be eternal. There can be no degrees in that which is infinite. Is it not far more reasonable to believe the Apostle's words *literally*? "For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law." Rom. ii, 12.

19. Is it reasonable to believe that God is such a vindictive being, that his justice cannot be satisfied with the *death* of the offender? but that he must be constantly pouring floods of fiery wrath upon the wretched being, through the ever rolling cycles of Eternity?

I might multiply questions of this kind, but I forbear.

Men of reason and common sense, give your serious attention to these points. Read your Bibles again. Read carefully—read prayerfully. See if these things be true or not. Dare to think for yourselves. If other men should attempt to dictate a political creed for you, would you not indignantly spurn their interference? Do the same in religious matters. Dare to be independent. Do not trust to commentaries. Do not build your

faith on "Bodies of Divinity." Do not surrender your right of private judgment to any class of men. Go at once to the fountain head of truth. "The words of the Lord are tried words." "The law of the Lord is perfect." This cannot be said of the writings or opinions of any man, or number of men, however wise or holy they may be. To err is human. God and his truth, alone are infallible. Show yourselves *true* Protestants, and cast away the "traditions of men." You have the Bible. The wisest and holiest of the "Fathers" had no more. Your ministers have nothing else to guide them—at least they ought not. "The Bible, and the Bible alone, is the book for Protestants." Go then to your Bibles, and see if the God-dishonoring doctrines to which I have directed your attention are found there or not. Excuse me if I tell you, that, however full of these doctrines human books and human sermons may be, God's BIBLE does not contain them.

Rather believe that man is *mortal*, and condemned to *die*, but Christ is "Come that men may have *life*, and that they may have it more abundantly." John x, 10.

"The wages of sin is *death*, but the gift of God is *eternal life* through Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom. vi, 23.

“He that believeth on the Son hath *everlasting life*; and he that believeth not the Son shall *not see life*; but the wrath of God abideth on him.” John iii, 36.

“And I give unto them *eternal life*; and they shall never *perish*, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand.” John x, 28.

“He that hath the Son hath *life*; and he that hath not the Son of God hath *not life*.” 1 John v, 12.

“Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in their *graves* shall hear his voice and come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of *life*; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of *damnation*.” John v, 28, 29.

“And have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the *just* and *unjust*.” Acts xxiv, 15.

“The Lord knoweth how—to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished.” 1 Pet. ii, 9.

“And they were judged every man according to their work. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire—*this is the second death*.” Rev. ix. 13, 14.

THE SABBATH.

BY P. MILLER, JR.

It is said by some, and published to the world through the *Advent Watchman*, that after having searched the Scriptures for years, relative to the Sabbath, the *only* reason they have ever found why the Sabbath was given at all is, that the children of Israel might remember their bondage in Egypt, and their mighty deliverance therefrom.

Well, "come and let us reason together" according to the Scriptures; and if we find this position is according to the "law and to the testimony," then let us gladly receive it. But if we find it does not harmonize with these, it is like a house built on the *sand*, without foundation, and should therefore be rejected. If the Sabbath was given as a sign, or token of remembrance by which the children of Israel, should commemorate their bondage in Egypt, and their deliverance therefrom, then reason seems to say, they needed not another sign; or memorial of the same event. But Ex. xii, 3-11, records the institution of the Lord's Passover, not only to commemorate the passing over of the chil-

dren of Israel, when the Lord smote the first-born of the Egyptians, but to commemorate their deliverance from bondage. Verse 14. "And this day shall be unto you for a memorial; . . . ye shall keep it a feast by an ordinance for ever." Ex. xiii, 9, 10. "And it shall be for a *sign* unto thee upon thine hand, and for a *memorial* between thine eyes; that the Lord's law may be in thy mouth: *for* [because] with a strong hand hath the Lord brought thee out of Egypt. Thou shalt, *therefore*, keep this ordinance in its seasons, from year to year." Verse 14. "And it shall be, when thy son asketh thee in time to come, saying, What meaneth this? that thou shalt say unto him, By strength of hand, the Lord brought us out from Egypt, from the house of bondage." Verse 16. "And it shall be for a *token* upon thine hand, and for *frontlets* between thine eyes: *for* by strength of hand, the Lord brought us forth out of Egypt."

Thus we see, the children of Israel were to commemorate their bondage and deliverance therefrom, by keeping the *Passover*. And unless reason or Scripture can be brought to show that the deliverance of the children of Israel from bondage, was an event of such vast importance, that it needed *two* memorials lest it should be forgotten, then we may reasonably conclude that the Sabbath may have been given for some other purpose, than the "*only reason*," referred to.

Well, let us see. And let us inquire first, for whom the Sabbath was made. Shall we listen to Him who spake as never man spake? "And

he [the Master] said unto them, The Sabbath was made for man." Mark ii, 27. The primitive meaning of the term man, as it is used here, in its general sense is, the human family, which embraces every soul of man, from Adam, until probation closes, at the end of this age, or world. It being established then, that the Sabbath was made for the human family, and not the Jew only, let us inquire *secondly*, when it was made.

Reason says, (the Sabbath being made for man,) that it must have been instituted, or made, as early as in the days of Adam, unless it can be shown that he does not belong to the human family. And with this conclusion agree the Scriptures. Gen. ii, 2. "And on the *seventh day* God ended his work which he had made, and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made." Ex. xx, 11. "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day and hallowed it."

These texts of Scripture, with their corresponding ones, give the *only* account of the instituting, or making of the Sabbath, found between the lids of the Bible. Therefore, the *position*, or *platform* on which many stand, that the Sabbath was made for the old Jews only, at Mount Sinai, or in the wilderness of Sin, even, is without foundation; and when the storm, the great "time of trouble" comes, spoken of by the prophets, (those holy men of old who spake as they were moved by the *Holy Ghost*) and recorded, [Deut. xviii, 19; Ps. i, 5; xxxvii, 9,

10, 20, 38; Prov. ii, 21, 22; xiii, 13; xxix, 1; Isa. xxvi, 20, 21; Dan. xii, 1; Mal. iv, 1; Matt. iii, 12; xiii, 40, 42, 49, 50; Acts iii, 23; 2 Thess. i, 7, 9; 2 Pet. ii, 9; Rev. vi, 14-17,] the structure must certainly fall, and many doubtless will perish beneath its ruins.—“Because straight is the gate and narrow is the way which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it.” While “broad is the way that leads to destruction,” and many walk therein.

Let us view the subject from another point of observation. It is said by some, that the Sabbath is a yoke of bondage—designed only for that stiff-necked and rebellious race of people, the *old Jews*. What! does it reflect much wisdom and goodness on the character of God, to say that, by a mighty hand and a strong arm,—he delivered the children of Israel from Egyptian (a limited) bondage—and in order that his chosen people might commemorate and remember this momentous event, God gives them the Sabbath a yoke of perpetual bondage, to which, having placed it on their necks, they and their children must tamely submit, without a respite even for ever and ever? Well might the Jews remember their bondage in Egypt, having such a keepsake. Precious memorial indeed!

But, having shown when and for whom the Sabbath was made, let us inquire, thirdly, for what purpose the Sabbath was made? Gen. ii, 2. “And on the seventh day, God [having] ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made.” Ex. xx, 11. “For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth,

the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day ; wherefore [for which reason] the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it." After having rested on the Sabbath day, Gen, ii, 3, says, "And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it." Let us consider for a moment the terms "hallowed," and "sanctified." Hallowed is defined, "Appropriated to sacred uses ; dedicated inviolably to some particular purpose." Sanctified, "set apart to a holy or religious use."

Well, says the opposer of the Sabbath, "we admit that God rested on the seventh day, but he did not require man to keep it holy." Was it for his own use that God sanctified the Sabbath? or was it for the use of man, for whom the Sabbath was made? Are you not looking at the subject through a wrong medium—as though it were a "yoke of bondage," about to be fastened on man? Whereas the Sabbath was made *for*, and given to man as a blessing, a day of rest in which he, after having wearied himself by six days of labor, might rest from his toil, and engage in the service and worship of his Maker. Therefore "It came to pass at the end of days," [Gen. iv, 3, margin,] the six days of labor, that Cain and Abel brought their offerings unto the Lord ; and thus observed the seventh day, which was set apart for a holy and religious use. Thus we see the Sabbath was observed before the days of Moses. Another evidence that the law of God existed before the days of Moses, may be found in Gen. ix, 6. "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." Thus the command-

ment, "Thou shalt not kill," existed. The form of words is different, but the spirit of the law is the same.

With regard to the Sabbath being given as a day of rest, a blessing instead of a yoke of bondage. let us refer again to "the law and the testimony." Ex. xxiii, 12. "Six days thou shalt do thy work, and on the seventh day thou shalt rest; that thy beasts may rest, and the son of thy handmaid, and the stranger may be refreshed." Deut. v, 12-14. "Keep the Sabbath day, to sanctify it, as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee. Six days thou shalt labor, and do all thy work, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor any of thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates, that thy man-servant, and thy maid-servant may rest as well as thou."

Luke xxiii, 56. "And they [the disciples] returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment." "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." We learn from these Scriptures, that the Sabbath was designed, not only as a day of rest, but as a day of worship. And from closer examination, we find these are not the "*only* reasons why the Sabbath was given at all." Another important reason why the Sabbath was made *for*, and given to man, is, that he might keep it as a memorial of friendship, and evidence of remembrance—a sign, by which man might know and remember the

Lord his Maker, the Creator of the heavens, the earth, and all things that are therein.

Ex. xxxi, 12-14. "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak thou also unto the children of Israel, saying, verily my Sabbaths ye shall keep; for it is a sign between me and you, throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you. Ye shall keep the Sabbath therefore, for it is holy unto you." Verse 17. "It is a sign between me and the children of Israel for ever: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested and was refreshed."

Eze. xx, 12. "Moreover, also, I gave them my Sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them." This sign given by our only Law-giver, has been counterfeited by that power spoken of by the prophet Daniel, symbolized by the little horn, the Papacy, which should think to change times and laws. And this great counterfeiter has succeeded so well in circulating his base coin, that the true, has well nigh been lost among the traditions of men. He has attempted to destroy this sign or mark of our only Law-giver, and to put in its place a sign or mark of his own invention; thus sitting (or claiming to sit) in the temple of God, and showing that he is God, (or above God,) having assumed the power to abolish God's law, and seal, (the keeping of the Sabbath,) and to put in its place his own seal or mark, the keeping of Sunday, which constitutes the mark of the beast; which fact is clearly

brought to light by an examination of the Roman Catholic Catechism on the ten commandments, especially the disposal made of the fourth. This is one of Satan's deepest laid schemes to overthrow the government of the Most High God, the Creator, Preserver and Ruler of the universe.

As the decree of a king has no validity without his signature, seal, or sign, so the law of God without his signature, seal or sign (which is the fourth commandment) is made void. And thus by the device of Satan, man is led to believe that he is free from the law of God, as expressed in the Decalogue. But what saith the Scriptures? Ps. cxi. "All his commandments are sure. They stand fast [are established, margin,] for ever and ever." Matt. v, 17, 19. "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; [or prophecies;] I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot, or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." Please to remember that the prophecies are spoken of in connection with the law, and that heaven and earth have not yet passed, neither are the prophecies all fulfilled. "Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be of no esteem in the reign of heaven." [Campbell's Trans.] "For whosoever shall keep the whole law and yet offend in one point, [or precept,] he is guilty of all." James ii, 10. The law spoken of by James, is the ten commandments, as is clearly shown by the following verse which quotes from the Decalogue estab-

lishing this truth, "that whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one precept, he is guilty of all." He has set at nought the King's commandment, and unless he obtains a pardon from the King, he must suffer the penalty of the broken law.

Let us notice a few of the many groundless objections which are made against keeping the Sabbath of the Lord. It is said "that the hand-writing of ordinances was taken away, being nailed to the cross, and that Moses wrote the Decalogue on the second tables of stone with his own hand," therefore the law of God is placed among, and on a level with the hand-writing of ordinances. But let us see. Ex. xxxiv, 1. "And the Lord said unto Moses, Hew thee two tables of stone like unto the first, and I will write upon these tables the words that were in the first tables which thou breakest." Deut. x, 1-4. "At that time the Lord said unto me, Hew thee two tables of stone like unto the first, . . . and I will write on the tables the words that were in the first tables which thou breakest. . . . And he [the Lord] wrote on the tables, according to the first writing, the ten commandments."

Again, it is argued that the Sabbath could not have been binding before the giving of the manna, because, it is said, that seven days before, the Israelites were traveling, and were doing so by the command of the Lord. Well, if this argument is well founded we need not come down to the Christian Era, to find the abolition of the Sabbath. For

if this proves the non-existence of the Sabbath, before the giving of the manna, then we may prove from the book of Joshua, the abolition of the Sabbath in less than forty years after writing, and presenting the law (the Decalogue) on tables of stone. Josh. vi, 2-4, 15. "And the Lord said unto Joshua, See, I have given into thine hand Jericho. . . . And ye shall compass the city, all ye men of war, and go round the city once. Thus shalt thou do six days; . . . and the seventh day, ye shall compass the city seven times. And it came to pass on the seventh day, that they rose early; about the dawning of the day, and compassed the city in the same manner, seven times; only on that day they compassed the city seven times." Thus we find the children of Israel (by command of the Lord,) traveling about the city of Jericho on the seventh day. Therefore, according to the argument, the Sabbath must have been abolished at, or before this time.

Again, it is said, (but not truly as is clearly shown by the quotations already presented,) that neither the Master, whom we are to hear in all things, nor the apostles ever enforced, required or taught us to keep the Sabbath; therefore the Sabbath is not binding on us, still regarding it as a yoke of bondage. But it is true that the prophets, Malachi, Zechariah, Haggai, Zephaniah, Habakkuk, Nahum, Micah, Jonah, Obadiah, Amos, Joel Daniel and others, do not even mention the Sabbath in all their prophecies. Therefore according to the logic of all arguments against the Sabbath, it must

have been forgotten or abolished before their days, and of course it is vain that the old Jewish Sabbath is binding on us. Old Jewish Sabbath did you say? By what authority do you call the Sabbath of the Lord, a yoke of bondage, or the old Jewish Sabbath? It is not even once thus mentioned in the whole Book of inspiration.

But the sabbaths and holy days of which Paul speaks, may all be found enumerated and classified in one chapter. Lev. xxiii, 4. "These are the feasts of the Lord even holy convocations, which ye shall proclaim in their seasons." Lest I weary the patience of the reader too much, I will omit quoting the Scripture recorded in this chapter, only asking you to read the whole of it carefully, and you will find that there are no less than eight anniversary days called holy convocations (or holy days) four of which are called sabbaths, a sabbath, your sabbath &c., beside the Sabbaths of the Lord.

These are the holy days, and the sabbaths or sabbath-days connected with meat-offerings, drink-offerings, &c., of which Paul speaks. Col. ii, 16, May we remember, there are no less than eight annual festivals, or holy days, four of which are called sabbath days, and occur on the 1st, 10th, 15th and 22d days of the seventh month. Thus we see that Paul may well say to his Colossian brethren, "Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect to an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days," without either despising or treading under foot the Sabbath of the Lord. But if you must have a Jewish sabbath,

perhaps it may not be inadmissible to call these annual sabbaths referred to—Jewish sabbaths. But do not forget that one of these sabbaths occurs on the first day of the seventh month, another on the tenth day, and another on the fifteenth day of the same month. And that there are eight days between the first and tenth-day sabbaths; and only four between the tenth and fifteenth-day sabbaths, which facts show plainly enough to any mind that will see, that Colossians ii, 16, does not refer to the Sabbath of the Lord.

Think you that the law of God, embracing his Holy Day, the fourth commandment, may be trifled with? Beware!! What became of the men of Beth-shemeth, even for idly looking into the Ark of the Lord, which contained his Holy Law—the ten commandments, even the despised one which says, “Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.” “And he smote the men of Beth-shemeth, (what for?) because they had looked into the Ark of the Lord, even he smote of the people, fifty thousand and three score and ten men.” 1 Sam. vi, 19. Suppose ye that these men were sinners above those who fain would commit sacrilege by robbing the Ark of the Testament of God in Heaven, of its sacred trust, and destroy the seal of the holy law contained therein? “I tell you nay; but except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish.”

I might notice other objections, but forbear, only saying, that every position taken against the Sabbath, which I have seen or heard, (like those noticed,) is founded on error; and therefore can-

not stand before "the sword of the Spirit." For "the law of the Lord is perfect:" "the statutes of the Lord are right;" "All his commandments are sure: they stand fast [are established] forever and ever." Then "let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man." Therefore it is written, "A good understanding have all they that do his commandments." And "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." Let us remember, that this last quotation is one of the sayings of the Master, whom we are to hear in all things. Acts iii, 22, 23. "For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you, of your brethren like unto me: him shall ye hear in all things, whatsoever he shall say unto you. And it shall come to pass that every soul which will not hear that Prophet shall be destroyed from among the people."

"Him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you!" Then how important that we hear, and try to understand what this Prophet says unto us. For upon hearing and doing these sayings, depends the perpetuity of our future life. Did the Redeemer, when on his mission to a fallen world, say that he had come to take from man the memorial of friendship, the token of remembrance, which God had given him? No. Did he say to man that he had come to inform him that he no longer needed the Rest-day, which God had

made and sanctified for him? No. Did he say that he came to abolish God's law, and that man would no longer be subject to that yoke of bondage, and if man thought he should need a Rest-day any longer, he might choose one for himself—or leave it to Mahomet, or him who should think to change times and laws, to choose one for him? *Not at all.* Well, what does he say? Why, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be of no esteem in the reign of heaven." "Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man which built his house upon a rock." Here let us introduce one of the sayings of the Psalmist: "Those that be planted in the house of the Lord, shall flourish in the courts of our God. He is my Rock, and there is no unrighteousness in him." But again: "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." "He that loveth me not, keepeth not my sayings." And "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father's commandments and abide in his love."

Here it is plainly stated by the Son of God, that he kept his Father's commandments. Therefore let us not be found (as some are) taking sides with the scribes and Pharisees, in accusing the Redeemer,

Zion's King, of transgressing his Father's commandments—his holy law, and thus justify these wicked men in "denying the Holy One, and killing the Prince of life, whom God hath raised from the dead."

Should this meet the eye of any who have thus accused him, let me say, "Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord." Suffer me also to offer a word of admonition to those, who, to carry out their opposition to the law of God, resort to the low calling of speaking evil of those who are trying to manifest their love to their Maker by keeping all his commandments. (For this is the love of God that we keep his commandments.) And not only so, but attributing the success of their labors of love, to their skill in the art of mesmerism and every evil work.

But having digressed somewhat, let us return and consider the admonition, [Matt. xii, 32 ; Mark iii, 28, 30,] "Verily I say unto you, All sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and blasphemies. . . . But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him ; neither in this world, nor in the world to come." What called forth this admonition, from the Master, that Prophet whom we are to hear in all things? "Because they said he hath an unclean spirit." What do the opposers of the holy Sabbath say of those who keep it, "and teach men so" to do? Why, they are led by the spirit of mesmerism," [or Electro Psycholo-

gy,] or "he hath an unclean spirit." What is the difference, if any? We are able to see no difference. Therefore we say, *Beware*, lest you should be "weighed in the balance and be found wanting." For it is written, "If any man among you seem to be religious, and bridled not his tongue, . . . this man's religion is vain." It is also written "Howbeit, when he the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth; for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear that shall he speak, and he will show you things to come." John xvi, 13 Now therefore, may we have grace, wisdom, and the Spirit of truth, to direct us in trying the spirits by the rule which our only Law-giver has given us, which says, "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light (which is the Spirit of truth) in them.

Rev. xiv, 12. See also Rev. xii, 17. "Here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus:" hoping by adorning their profession which they have made, with a well ordered life, and by patient continuance in well doing, to have ministered unto them an abundant entrance into his everlasting kingdom.

BOTH SIDES.


THIS Tract contains a friendly *letter* by E. Miller Jr., and a candid *reply* by R. F. Cottrell. The former thinks that Christians should not observe the Sabbath; the latter teaches that the Sabbath was "made for man" to observe in all dispensations.

The *letter* and the *reply* were both published in the REVIEW, Vol. IV, No. 10. One reason why we give them in this form for much wider circulation, is this: The *Advent Harbinger* for Sept. 24th, 1853, copied from the REVIEW the *letter* without giving the *reply* with it, or even stating that it had been replied to. A singular course this, we think, for that paper which has made such high professions of *free investigation!*

The *Harbinger* states (see its rules of discussion) that "it is open for the free investigation of all Bible doctrines." Then why give one side and suppress the other, as in the case of the *letter* and the *reply*? If it be said that the Sabbath is not a "Bible question," then we ask, why give one side of it? Does not common honesty say, in a case like this, Give both sides or none? The REVIEW gave *both* the *letter* and the *reply*, that its readers might compare them, and decide for themselves. The *Harbinger* gives but one side, with the following note, calculated to deceive its readers relative to the Lord's Sabbath, and prejudice them against the REVIEW and its conductors. Let the candid judge whether acts of this kind are not more worthy a Catholic Priest, than a Protestant Editor, who has for years been talking of *free investigation!*

“We have repeatedly published that if the advocates of the Jewish Sabbath would present one plain declaration from the Bible that Christians are required to keep that day, we would believe. By the equivocating course the conductors of the *Review* have taken in the matter, by asking us to produce the same kind of evidence on other subjects, they have tacitly acknowledged that the *Bible* does not furnish *one* plain declaration that it is the duty of Christians, or any body under the Gospel dispensation to keep the Jewish or Seventh Day Sabbath. We have considered their evasive offset to our unanswerable request unworthy of notice. Bro. E. Miller, Jr., however, has given the following able article in reply to their quibbles. It may subserve the cause of truth, and we therefore copy it from the *Review* of September 13.”

In reply to this note we would say that the REVIEW teaches the weekly Sabbath mentioned in both Testaments, which is certainly binding on Christians, unless it has been abolished. The *Harbinger* affirms that the Sabbath has been abolished. *This* it should prove. The REVIEW has justly called for proof in the following request.

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

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

But the *Harbinger* says that if the advocates of the Sabbath would “present one plain declaration from the Bible that Christians are required to keep that day, we would believe.” The mocking priests said of Jesus, “Let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe him.” Jesus did not come down from the cross to remove their doubts; neither has the great God repeated the fourth commandment a second time in the New Testament, for fear the cavalier might have a chance to cavil. Why should a

second edition of the Sabbath law be given, unless the first were abolished? The request of the *Harbinger* is unjust. When it will prove by plain testimony the first edition of the fourth commandment abolished, then we will either show a second edition from the New Testament, or give up the Sabbath. We teach the Sabbath of the Bible. Let those who assert that it is abolished, produce one plain text to prove their assertion. This is a reasonable request. Will they produce the text?

We want none of their inferences from 2 Cor. iii; Rom. xiv; Col. ii. 14-17, which have been a hundred times repeated. They should not be allowed in a case like this. God gave the Sabbath law in the plainest language possible; and no man should be convinced that it has been abolished, unless he can find testimony as positive and plain, coming from as high authority.

Rom. xiv, does not mention the Sabbath. 2 Cor. iii, speaks of two ministrations of the law of God. That the ministration of death could be abolished, and give place to the ministration of the Spirit without affecting the law, is evident. Col. ii, 16, reads, "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." That these sabbath-days, or sabbaths, here associated with meat, drink, holy day and the new moon, are the annual sabbaths of the Jews, associated with the same ordinances in Lev. xxiii, is perfectly plain. The text has no reference to the Sabbath of the Lord our God. But admitting that the seventh-day Sabbath is meant, then what is gained? Verily nothing; for not a word is said about its being abolished. Men may infer that the Sabbath is included in the "hand-writing of ordinances," mentioned in verse 14, or that it is referred to in verse 16; but such inferences should not be considered of the least weight in such a case as this, in the absence of plain and direct testimony.

Behold the display of Divine Power at the giving of the ten commandments. The smoke ascended from Mount Sinai as the smoke of a great furnace ; the lightnings flashed, and the thunders of Jehovah rolled down its base. God had descended upon it in awful grandeur, to speak in the ears of all the people the ten precepts of his holy law. These precepts were of such a character, of such vast importance, that the great Law-giver did not leave them for man to write ; but with his finger engraved them in tables of stone. Behold them placed in the beautiful ark, overlaid and inlaid with the purest gold. Mark well the victories won by Israel, when with the ark of God they crossed Jordan, marched around Jericho, and went forth to battle. See the ark put in the Most Holy of the earthly Sanctuary. It was the center of their religious system, it was the glory of Israel. The fourth commandment was in that ark ; and for its violation the greatest curses are pronounced by the prophets ; and for the observance of the Sabbath, the greatest blessings are promised. And how preposterous the supposition that the Almighty, through his Son Jesus Christ, should abolish his Sabbath, without giving one plain testimony to the fact in the Book of Inspiration. And how awfully presumptuous for men to go on in violation of the fourth commandment, and risk their eternal salvation upon mere inferences !! May God help the reader to feel the force of the truth we are here stating.

And we should not expect that such a momentous event as the abrogation of God's law, or even the Sabbath precept, would take place without being foretold by the prophets. God by the prophets has not only revealed the great events connected with his people, or in which his people have a special interest, but has by them pointed out those events which are more minute.

Now, if the Lord's Sabbath has been abolished, where have the prophets foretold the event? "Surely the Lord God will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets." Amos iii, 7. As none of the prophets have foretold the abolition of the Sabbath, and as none of the apostles have recorded such an event, we are certain that no such event ever occurred.

To trample underfoot the fourth commandment because it is not given a second time in the New Testament, and to teach its abolition, with nothing but unwarrantable inferences from a few texts that do not mention the Sabbath of the Lord, is the height of presumption.

LETTER.

FRIEND WHITE:—Being casually thrown in contact with your paper, for June 23d, I noticed an article from R. F. Cottrell, under the caption of "The *Harbinger's* rule of Duty." He quotes the *Harbinger*, "Give us *one plain direct* passage from either the Old or New Testament that *reads* that either Jew or Gentile *christian* is required to keep the seventh day" &c., and says, "this is the rule by which the *Harbinger* decides that it is not duty to keep the Sabbath;" and to show the invalidity of the rule, says: "Give us *one plain direct* passage that *reads* that either Jew or Gentile *christian* should not kill, or steal, or bear false witness. *One* such passage cannot be found." I wish to test this assertion, and the validity of the "rule" spoken of. In order to do this, let me state two important facts, viz :

1. The law from Mt. Sinai—or the rule of life for the people of God, as given in the law, and in the prophets and in the Psalms, is given to Israel, and forms the rule of moral obligation for that dispensation.

2. The rule of life as given by the apostles is the rule of *christian* life.

The past dispensation is familiarly called the Jewish or law dispensation; and the present, the christian or gospel dispensation. If in the past dispensation, one not of the twelve tribes, would secure the favor of God, he must become a Jew

by being circumcised, and submit to obey the then rule of life. If one, whether Jew or Gentile, will now secure the favor of God, he must become a *Christian*, and submit to the rule of life given by the apostles.

Now let us see whether we have any direct prohibition of killing, stealing, &c. 1 Pet. iv. 15. "But let none of you suffer as a murderer, or as a thief." 1 John iii, 15. "And ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him." Rev. xxi, 8. "And murderers . . . shall have their part in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone." Gal. v, 21. "Murders" are reckoned among the "works of the flesh," and such shall not inherit the kingdom of God.

Eph. iv, 28. "Let him that stole steal no more." Ver. 25. "Wherefore putting away lying, speak every man truth with his neighbor." Col. iii, 9. "Lie not one to another." Here is the prohibition of the things specified in varied language; more examples of which might be brought, besides, some instances where the apostles have quoted the ancient commands, touching these things, in form, as in Rom. xiii, 9. Let not your correspondent try (as appears from his short article he will) to maintain his assertion by saying the word *christian* is not found in one of these passages. The apostles were each writing to *christians*, hence the passages do without note or comment, prohibit *christians* doing the things specified. If your correspondent thought that the *Harbinger* demanded that the passage enjoining the Sabbath should contain the word *christian*, his argument is excusable otherwise, it is an unworthy cavil. I will say, when you will produce the passage, addressed to the people of God since the establishment of the order of this dispensation, either enjoining the Sabbath in direct language, or reproving its violation, I will keep it. Doubtless this was the intention of the *Harbinger*.

Yourself, Friend Editor, quote in reply to the same passage from the *Harbinger*, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy," and "the Seventh day is the Sabbath," and refer us to the law for the passages. No one disputes that the people of God in that dispensation were required to keep the Sabbath; but it devolves upon you to show that it is required of them in this. Bring the requirement as addressed to *christians*.

Both you and Friend Cottrell, quote, "The Sabbath was made for man," and *infer* that it was made for all men's observance: but to give any force to this inference you have to assume that man cannot be profited by the Sabbath except by his individual observance of it. This you should prove. I

conceive that man as a race can be abundantly profited by it, while its observance was only enjoined upon one dispensation.

Please receive this as a friendly note from one who has not a shadow of a doubt but you are in error in your views of the Sabbath. Give it a place in your *Review* if you please, and if it is *reviewed* fairly, the writer will be happy to read and profit thereby.

Yours in hope of the Kingdom of God,

E. MILLER, JR.

Middlebury, Elkhart Co., Ind., July 29th, 1853.

REPLY.

FRIEND MILLER:—I feel a pleasure in replying to your kind epistle arising from the hope that my labor will not be in vain. Cheerfully would I devote my time to converse with one who has not “a shadow of a doubt” of my being in error on the Sabbath question. This perfect freedom from doubt is evidence, to my mind, that you have not carefully examined the evidences in favor of the Sabbath. Perhaps you might, in truth, adopt the language of Bro. A. J. Richmond as follows: “But from reading the *Harbinger*, and hearing but one side of the subject, and neglecting to examine it closely for myself, I had concluded that it was a ‘yoke of bondage’ and ‘done away.’” But if you have carefully read the article in the *Review* of Aug. 11th, to which your attention was invited, perhaps you are not so free from doubts as you were.

In stating what you call “two important facts,” you admit that the law from Sinai was the “rule of moral obligation for that dispensation.” Bear with me, for I *must* exclaim, Who hath bewitched you, that you should think that the rule of moral obligation can be changed, without a change in the relation existing between man and his Maker! Is God changeable?—Could he make a better moral rule at the commence-

ment of the gospel dispensation, than he could when he formed the first man? Can he improve his original law, which the inspired Psalmist pronounced "perfect," by abolishing one tenth part of it? And would he make known through the agency of man that he had changed that law which he spoke with his own mouth, in the hearing of all Israel; or that he had abolished it and given a new "rule of moral obligation" in its stead.

After stating your two "facts" you speak of the different ways by which men might "secure the favor of God" in different dispensations. To *live* in favor with God, and to *secure* his favor are two things. Why is not man in favor with God? Because he is a sinner. What has made him such? Transgression of God's law; for "sin is the transgression of the law." Man is a sinner. He has lost the favor of God, and is justly exposed to the penalty of the law, which is death. There is no salvation for him unless God should abolish his law, or make another law by which he may be forgiven, and thus restored to favor. This second law is the same, in one sense, in both dispensations. That is, it consists of faith, repentance and obedience to certain rites, which are outward acts expressive of faith and repentance. In another sense it differs much in the two dispensations. In the former dispensation the faith was in a promised Messiah, and was accompanied by obedience to typical rites; in the latter, the faith is in a Messiah already come and sacrificed for sin, (transgression of the first named law,) and shown forth by corresponding obedience to commemorative rites or institutions. For example: In the Jewish dispensation the sinner must offer an animal, the blood of which must be shed; in the Christian age, he must be buried by baptism. The language of the former was, God will provide a sacrifice for sin; the latter declares that Christ died for our sins, was buried and rose again for our justi-

fication. Repentance is the same in both dispensations. It consists not merely in sorrow, but in breaking off from sin (transgression of the first law) by righteousness. (Obedience to that law.) Sorrow is not repentance; but godly sorrow *worketh* repentance, or *reformation* not to be repented of.

“Repentance is to leave the sins I loved before,
And show that I do truly grieve, by doing so no more.”

Thus we see that, in order to save sinners, there must of necessity be a second law, or the first must be abolished. I have shown that this second law in the new dispensation, differs from the corresponding law in the old. Consequently they are distinguished from each other in the New Testament; the former being designated as “the works of the law,” the latter as the hearing, or obedience of faith. Did God abolish the first law, to save all mankind *in* their sins? or did he institute a second law, to save believers *from* their sins? Does forgiveness of sins entitle the forgiven to a right to commit the same thing again? Mark! Christ did not die to redeem man from the transgression of a law given by the apostles after his death, but to redeem him from sin against a law already in existence.

By moral law, or “rule of moral obligation,” I understand the first, or original law, the law man would have kept had he continued in favor with God, and which he must keep, if he is restored to his favor. By ceremonial or ritual law I understand the second,—the law which recognizes man as a sinner, and is a means of restoring him to favor. Viewing it thus, I am surprised when I hear any one speak of a change in moral obligation. To my mind, it seems equivalent to a change in God himself—that he has grown wiser since making his first attempt at a perfect rule of life.

The Sabbath is a part of the original law. It was made before man sinned. And *how* was it made?

God rested upon it, and then blessed and sanctified it, *because* he had rested upon it. If you can show any other time and manner of making the Sabbath, you are requested to do so. In regard to the expression of our Saviour, that the Sabbath was made for man, the learned have informed us that in the Greek, the word *man* is qualified by an "untranslated" article. That article, when translated, is the definite article *the*. So, in the original language, the passage reads, "the Sabbath was made for *the man*;" and as there was but one pair of human beings at the time when it was made, we cannot be at a loss in regard to the man for whom it was intended. This shows that the Sabbath was not a Jewish institution; and whether Adam could have been benefited by it, without observing it, you will, of course, enjoy your own opinion.

We have found a necessity for the two laws in the nature of things as they exist—man a sinner, and God willing to save him. Now if we can find the two laws in the Bible, the testimony, to me, will be sufficient. God spake ten commandments with his own voice, and wrote them with his own finger in tables of stone. Moses wrote the ordinances of the Jewish church in a book. The first is called "the law of God"—the commandments of God;" the second, "the law of Moses." and "the law of the Lord, given by the hand of Moses." The tables are called "the tables of the covenant;" the book is called "the book of the covenant" and "the book of Moses."—Ex. xxxi, 18. Deut. xxxi, 24–26; ix, 9–11. 2 Chron. xxxiv, 30. Mark xii, 26.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

by Christ, and consequently abolished, is false ; for that law does not pass away by little fragments.— One jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. So if fulfilling it does it away, it will all be fulfilled, and all go together.— But the context shows that all the *prophets*, must be fulfilled before one particle of the law can pass.— James informs *Christians* that, if they fulfill the royal law, they “do well.” He also tells them that “*whosoever* shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one, he is guilty of all.” And lest any should mistake the law of which he speaks, he immediately quotes two of the ten commandments. James ii, 8–12. The first law then is not changed : we must therefore look to the second. The ritual law, we have seen, is changed from a typical, to a commemorative character. It is now known as “the gospel” or “the faith.” Sin is still the transgression of the law, and the wages of sin is death. To escape this penalty, and “secure the favor of God” a person must be obedient to the faith.” “He must become a *Christian* and submit to the rule” *submitted to* and taught “by the apostles.” He must “delight in the law of God, after the inward man”—keep the whole law, and not offend in one precept lest he become guilty of all. “For there is ONE lawgiver, (not twelve) who is able to save and to destroy.” James iv, 12.— “Here are they that keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus.” The commandments are one thing, and the faith is another. The apostles taught them both. Says Paul, Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid : yea, we establish the law. Rom. iii, 31. In no way could the immutability of the law of God be more effectually established, than by the death of the Son of God to redeem man from its penalty. If the commandments could have been abolished, Jesus need not have died ; but he died for our sins—for our transgression of the

law! What gratitude is due to God for his exceeding love! and how can we demonstrate our gratitude better than by breaking off from our sins and keeping that holy law? Says David, The law of the Lord is *perfect* converting the soul. (Turning the soul from transgression to obedience, from sin to holiness.) Says James, But whoso looketh into the *perfect* law of liberty, and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed. O how love I thy law! says David; it is my meditation all the day. I delight in the law of God after the inward man, responds Paul. Says David, ALL his commandments are sure, they STAND FAST FOR EVER AND EVER. It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than for ONE TITTLE of the law to fail, says the Lord Jesus.

With all the testimony of Jesus and the apostles to the perpetuity and immutability of Jehovah's whole law of ten commandments, who can be so stubborn, as to refuse to keep the fourth, or any other commandment, because it is not given a second time, in the New Testament? The apostles frequently quote from the commandments, as a standard law; but they never re-enacted one of them, for the very good reason, that none of them were ever abolished. Do you still ask why there is not more testimony, for the Sabbath in the New Testament? I answer in the language of Bro. White. Speaking of the fulfillment of the signs in the sun, moon and stars, he says: "God has never revealed his truth to man in a manner to compel him to believe. Those who have wished to doubt his word, have ever found a wide field in which to doubt, and a broad road to perdition. While those who have wished to believe, have ever found everlasting rock on which to base their faith."

I feel perfectly satisfied with the evidence given for the Sabbath in the New Testament. I have no desire

for one word to be added to it. The Lord does all things well. He has suffered the Man of sin to exalt himself above God, and dictate laws to the world; but he will, ere long, vindicate his own truth. The Lord Jesus will be revealed from heaven, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. For *two* reasons the wicked are condemned. 1. They know not God. (The Father.) 2. They obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. (The Son.) How do we know that we know God? Let an Apostle answer. "And hereby do we know that we know him, if we keep his commandments. He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him." 1 John ii, 3, 4. The Sabbath, in particular, is a sign of the knowledge of the true God. "Hallow my sabbaths; and they shall be a sign between me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord your God." Eze. xx, 20. So we see, that while the "remnant" keep both the commandments and the faith, the wicked are condemned for rejecting both. Happy will he be who has a part with the remnant. "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."

You have pronounced my argument, respecting the *Harbinger's rule*, "excusable;" for I understood him to *mean* as he *said*. The demand was, that the passage should read that either Jew or Gentile Christian is required to keep the seventh day. And lest he should be misunderstood, emphasized the words, *reads* and *Christian*, giving them in italics. Besides this, after the *Review* had quoted some texts for the Sabbath, the *Harbinger* replied, "Not a word is *said* or intimated about *Christians* in the texts quoted." He did not say that these words were not *addressed* to Christians, but judges that the *Review* intended to

make the texts read, *Christians*, remember the Sabbath day, &c.

I admit that the apostles addressed themselves to Christians, and forbade, not only killing, stealing and lying, but the violation of every precept of that law which said, Thou shalt not kill. James ii, 10, 11, see margin. Jesus addressed himself to "his disciples" and said, Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven. *Who-soever* includes every body. *Therefore* signifies a conclusion drawn from what he had just affirmed of the perpetuity of the entire law, and shows that the law and the commandments are one and the same thing. *These* commandments refer to the commandments existing at the time, and not to *those* commandments "given by the apostles" some years afterwards. The fourth commandment of the law required the observance of the Sabbath. It was connected with "good statutes" by God himself, being written with his own finger in the midst of them. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder. Amen!

Be assured that all I have said proceeds from the kindest feelings; and if you, or any one else, can profit thereby, my object in writing will be attained.

Yours in hope of meeting all the saints in the kingdom.

R. F. COTTRELL.

Mill Grove, N. Y., Aug. 18th, 1853.

IT'S JEWISH.

WHEN we present God's holy law,
 And arguments from Scripture draw ;
 Objectors say, to pick a flaw,
 "It's Jewish."

Though at the first, Jehovah blessed,
 And sanctified his day of rest ;
 The same belief is still expressed—
 "It's Jewish."

Though with the world this rest began,
 And thence through all the Scriptures ran,
 And Jesus said 'twas *made for man*—
 "It's Jewish."

Though not with Jewish rites, which passed,
 But with the moral law 'twas classed,
 Which must endure while time shall last—
 "It's Jewish."

If from the Bible we present
 The Sabbath's meaning, and intent,
 This answers every argument—
 "It's Jewish."

Though the disciples, Luke and Paul,
 Continue still this rest to call
 The "Sabbath-day," this answers all—
 "It's Jewish."

The Gospel Teacher's plain expression,
 That "Sin is of the law transgression,"
 Seems not to make the least impression—
 "It's Jewish."

They love the Rest of man's invention,
 But if Jehovah's Day we mention,
 This puts an end to all contention—
 "It's Jewish."

R. F. C.

SOLEMN APPEAL.

[THE subject of this Tract is from a Pamphlet entitled, *A solemn Appeal to Ministers and Churches, especially to those of the Baptist Denomination, relative to the Speedy Coming of Christ; by J. B. Cook; published by J. V. Himes, Boston, in 1843.*

It is proper to state that we have omitted that portion of the *Appeal* that related to the prophetic periods. It is true that the writer has changed his views somewhat, relative to the Jews; but this does not change the truth of God, plainly brought out in the *Appeal*. We re-publish it for the instruction, comfort and strength of the people of God.]

“BEWARE therefore, lest that come upon you which is spoken of in the prophets. Behold, ye despisers, and wonder and perish; for I work a work in your days which ye shall in no wise believe, though a man declare it unto you.” Acts xiii, 40, 41.

This dreadful language was pressed from the heart of the Apostle by the solemn, awful impressions which the Holy Spirit made on his mind. His whole soul was moved to its depth, when viewing the state of his brethren, “his kindred according to the flesh.” God had written the truth of Christ’s Messiahship on his inmost soul; consequently, he *knew*, that however plausible their ob-

jections might be, however complaisant they might be to himself or the truth, they were in heart, rebelling against Heaven. Their arguments, he saw, were founded in prejudice and carnality of mind. "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?" "Search and look, for out of Galilee ariseth no prophet!" "Is not this the carpenter's son"!! "Have any of the *rulers* or *Pharisees* believed on him"!!! Surely we say that they were carnal—were destitute of living faith. They assumed that those who opposed *them*, *must be wrong*. Those to whom Paul addressed this dreadful appeal were not the impious or profane. They were the *rulers* of the synagogue,—“men of Israel, and those who feared God,”—the highest in reputation for piety and zeal. This is a point generally overlooked. Verses 15, 16. They adhered to their opinions with as much pertinacity as if the attributes of infallibility and immutability belonged exclusively to them. Their interpretation, which gratified the carnal mind must be true. The Messiah *must* come according to their notions—Jehovah must conform to their sectarian organizations in all he proposed to do for mankind. They would not, did not, yield either to prophecy or providence. When pressed with the evidence that the finger of God was seen in the miracles, and signs, and wonders, and gifts of the Holy Ghost that shone around them, they professed to want more evidence. When Jerusalem and all Judea were blazing with the light and evidence, they said, “*we would see a sign!*” They professed to desire sufficient light to see clearly, without questioning

their integrity to act according to their light. Thus they deceived others, if not themselves, with their acknowledged *willingness* to believe the truth when seen; but Jesus penetrating their hearts, said, "Ye are they which justify yourselves before men, but God knoweth your hearts; for that which is highly esteemed among men, is abomination in the sight of God." Luke xvi, 15. We know therefore, on the highest authority, that the Jewish rulers were not sincere, except in their love for themselves,—their stations of honor and profit. To these they clung. Hence Jesus said, "How can ye believe who receive honor one of another, and seek not the *honor that cometh from God only?*" John v, 44.

Paul saw the true character of these Jews in the light in which Jesus revealed it. He saw it in the light of prophecy which the Spirit then opened to his mind; therefore he could but feel for them deeply. The deep fountains of feeling in his soul were stirred. His brethren, his kindred according to the flesh, were in infinite peril of damnation. Crushed with their impending doom, his soul gushed out in this solemn language: "Beware therefore, lest that come upon you which is spoken of in the prophets. Behold, ye despisers, and wonder and perish; for I work a work in your days which ye shall not believe, though a man declare it unto you."

The Jews, thus pitied, thus addressed and thus doomed, had probably a much more plausible ground for rejecting Jesus as then revealed, than we have the One to come, as he is now revealed. They said that if they had lived in the days of

their fathers they would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets. They were looking for the Messiah as much or more than any of their contemporaries. They based their expectation on the most plausible exposition of the prophets; of course, they *could not* reject him when he should come; this would be, they thought, *impossible*. The prophets spoke of him as a "King" on the "holy hill of Zion." They predicted, not only his humiliation and death, but his exaltation to the throne of David for ever; by consequence, they fastened on the latter, because more in harmony with their carnal notions of what would be for their good and the glory of God. If they had anything from the Messiah, it must come in their way. Shiloh must be honorable, powerful, able to relieve them from Roman bondage, ere they could receive him as the one to whom all the prophets gave witness. Above all, it is infinitely more easy for any mind to receive what is said relating to his glory than his suffering. I know that a heart filled with the Holy Spirit, will receive, with child-like confidence, just what God has revealed, and just as it is revealed; but we are by nature so constituted, so depraved, that we never reject a *glorified one* who comes in harmony with our views,—never receive a "*crucified one*," who has nothing to gratify us. Therefore, if we are allowed to judge by a human standard, we can more easily excuse *them* for rejecting their Messiah when despised and crucified, than we could now, when he is about to be glorified. This is not said to palliate unbelief in any age, or by any people; but only to show that

there are degrees of malignity in rebellion against Heaven. Some stripes in the picture of human life are broader and blacker than others. To reject revealed truth, when in direct opposition to all the known principles of human nature, does not *seem* so sinful, as when presented in a less repulsive form. Still, as the language was addressed to the unbelieving, but honorable and professedly pious, of a less favored age, concerning Jesus in his humiliation, it may, with more propriety, be now addressed to those who disbelieve, disregard, or trifle with the plainer evidence that Jesus is coming a second time to consummate his glory.

I feel awfully solemn in making an application of this passage. I would feel, if I do not already, all that compassion for my brethren, which characterized the language and labors of the Apostle. It is in view of the judgment you are addressed. Under His eye who searches all hearts is this solemn appeal made, to all in the *ministry* or *communion* of the *Baptist church*—to all within the circle of my acquaintance.

Dear brethren, God is working wonderfully—He is fulfilling prophecy—preparing for the consummation of “all things spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began.” The evidence of this is varied, comprehending types, signs, prophetic periods, and spiritual influences. It is overwhelming to my mind. My mind and heart are, perhaps, as well satisfied that God is in this movement relating to the second appearing of his Son, as were Paul’s that Jesus was the Messiah. As to the Apostle, the truth was stamped, by the

eternal Spirit, on his soul. He believed; therefore he spoke.—“The love of Christ *constrained*” him to give the reason of the hope that was in him. His heart seemed on fire to make known the truth on which the destiny of unnumbered thousands depended. To do this, he explored prophecy—stated its fulfillment and its harmony with God’s wonderful dealings with his own soul. He never became weary with telling his experience of the truth that Jesus was the Messiah. After exhausting every motive that is tender and subduing, he does not fail to employ those that are alarming. Follow Paul through life. The charity which is supposed by some to forbid the note of warning, compels him “to cry aloud and spare not.” “Beware therefore, lest that come upon you which is spoken of in the prophets. Behold, ye despisers, and wonder and perish; for I work a work in your days which ye shall not believe though a man declare it unto you.” The great truth that lies on the surface of the Bible relating to Christ’s second coming, (though overlooked by most, as the Jews overlooked the plainest prophecies relating to the first,) has been *experienced* by me. It has been wrought into my soul. Now you believe in the Apostle’s experience; in Luther’s experience of the doctrine of justification by faith; in Roger Williams’ experience of believers’ baptism, and doctrine of religious liberty. - If there be such a thing as the experience of a truth, as having a great truth engraven indelibly on the heart, then such is the fact with me. It is true I am infinitely unworthy of this. My soul melts within me when making this statement; for

unto me, "who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given that I should preach" the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. It is clearly perceived—as clearly as any truth of prophecy, that his second advent is just at hand. No truth of our holy religion has ever been more powerfully applied to my heart and conscience. Such is the impulse which the Spirit has given me to publish this truth, that it seems to me at the *peril of my soul* to forbear. * * * My message is the second appearing of Jesus. I expect this overwhelming event more than anything else. I look and long for it more than every thing else. I make no calculation to labor or live but a short time. Yet I never was more resigned to God's blessed will to live or not. O, the glorious expectation of the "glorious appearing" of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ!—how dare you disregard this fact, revealed with more frequency and more solemnity than any other event named in the Book of God! Even though for a time its occurrence was not mentioned, no one, it seems to me, can be regardless of this tremendous era in the Divine dispensations, without impiety. My reasons for believing thus, it is now my purpose to give, as briefly as possible.

My experience began in August last. A delightfully sweet and solemn influence was felt to be settling down upon my soul, and directing me to consider the predicted coming and kingdom of Jesus. This was believed to be from God,—as such it was cherished, and very imperfectly obeyed. Had I obeyed with all readiness of mind, more time would have been enjoyed to mature my views and prepare

others, instrumentally, for that day. No period of my life has been reviewed with less complacence than the last autumn and winter. My progress was too slow,—my investigations too cautious. Still my Bible was read with more interest and a somewhat better understanding. Some great truths, before unobserved, were perceived and felt. “Litch’s Address to the Clergy” appeared to me true, yet such was my attachment to former opinions that I sought something from his opponents. “He that is first in his cause seemeth just, but his neighbor cometh and searcheth him.” Beside personal conversation with one of the most learned in the ministry, Mr. Morris’ work was read. The two together exerted a powerful influence to counteract the truth of God on this subject, which had just begun, as I now believe, to dawn on my understanding. To show you that I have not been hasty, let me here say that about seven years ago, when in Cincinnati, my mind was called to contemplate with much interest what God had revealed as to the close of time; but it was not till after the lapse of two years, at the end of my ministry in that city, that sufficient light was perceived to enable me to preach on the subject. It was the theme of my farewell sermon. The prayerful reflection which I then gave to it has most of the time since been followed by a desire to learn more of what I knew was revealed. But it seemed beyond my grasp. In truth it *was* beyond my grasp, simply because of my reverence for the opinions of the learned. The Bible seemed now so plain, that I am sure I might have understood it had I given it just that place

among books which it should have had. My instruction in the theological seminary, as well as my habits there formed, prompted me to consult the learned *first*. "Father, forgive me," for surely I knew not what contempt I was casting on thee, and on that Spirit whose office it is to guide into all truth. It was like borrowing some wise one's brass lamps to see daylight. Of course this is not objecting to instruction—but to that kind of instruction which makes the Bible subordinate, and the promised teachings of the Holy Spirit almost nothing. Let me state a fact which made a deep impression on my mind two or three years since. "A graduate" of one of our popular theological institutions preached several times where I worship, without reading his text correctly. My conviction was that he quoted it from memory, when writing his sermon, and then, in preaching, read it from his manuscript. When "*the word*" is not consulted, "the Spirit" not sought, it is not strange if the people remain unspiritual. My appeal is to my Judge that this is stated with grief of heart. Could my conscience have been at ease and my skirts clear, all allusion to the subject of theological education would have been suppressed, especially out of regard to those for whom personal respect has ever been, and ever will be cherished. The fault lies in the system, which is obviously, to my mind, incorrigible.

After reading last autumn, what fell in my way on both sides, my mind was left in suspense. Still the strong desire awakened in my heart to know what was revealed, prompted strong cryings to God

for light. As an interesting field for ministerial labors was, in October, opened to me, six miles distant, where they had not had a sermon, save one funeral discourse, for about three years, my entire leisure was occupied in cultivating it. The exhaustion consequent on going so far daily, for a time prevented anything like progress in my investigations. When brother S—— was to come to our city to lecture on the second advent, my influence was so exerted, as to secure our meeting-house for that purpose. His first lecture seemed severe. Many were offended; my best friend, much so. I could not gainsay the substance of it. In reflecting on it, however, to sift the chaff from the wheat, my conviction was, that its severity was the severity of truth. It bore hard on respectable classes of character; *that was it*. Many, in company with myself, slept but little for days afterward. I felt intensely. My soul never was subject to a more terrible conflict; all the elements of my intellectual and moral nature were in commotion; a conviction of the truth began to fasten on my heart more deeply; while my family, the peace of the church, the value of a good name among friends and through the community, all seemed to be in the opposite scale. The settled, solemn purpose of my soul was, however, as soon as formed, to follow where the truth might lead; but darkness, more or less dense, shrouded my mind. I was not "light in the Lord." In truth, my mind was, as most seem to be, sceptical as to the fact of Christ's personal appearing. This scepticism was occasioned by reading a popular author in New York. So that at the outset, as well as in the entire

progress of conviction in my mind, there were antagonist principles, or rather a want of settled principles, for neither my mind nor heart was at rest, so far as this subject was concerned.

The *first* step towards peace of mind consisted in the dissipation of my remaining scepticism—the doubts excited by the conflicting opinions of the most learned and pious. Such was the influence of these doubts on my heart that portions of God's word appeared more like chaos, without form and void, than any other thing to which I may compare them. It saddens my heart to reflect that I was so long sceptical as to whether the Bible was to be understood in all ordinary cases, *as it reads*. I entertained no doubt that it was true, but it was a great point to decide, how much relating to "the end, was allegorical, and how much literal.*

From this state of uncertainty, my mind was relieved gradually by reflecting on the revealed character of Deity, on the improbability of his having given us a revelation which could not be understood by an honest, prayerful study. If the prophecies, which we are commanded to understand, [Matt. xxiv, 15] and pronounced "blessed" in reading, [Rev. i, 3,] are too obscure and enigmatical to

*That numbers are sceptical, that they have no settled faith, is evident from the oft-repeated saying, "I don't know about Christ's personal appearing!" "What do you mean by his personal appearing?" On this state of mind the plainest language of truth is lost, as it was when Paul preached to the Jewish rulers. Another minister says, "I know nothing more of these portions of Scripture than your chi d;" yet he opposes the doctrine strenuously. These are examples of the scepticism prevalent in the church.

be understood, then we need an *authorized* interpreter. The principle of the Papacy is then the only one which meets the pressing necessity of our souls, when hungering to know the Divine will.—To escape this alternative, I saw that God's word should be taken in its most natural import. The language of inspired men, relating to the coming and kingdom of Jesus, should be understood to mean what the same language would mean, if employed by an eminently wise and good man, who had a perfect acquaintance with the subject, to instruct us in it. Many of the terms are as simple, as intelligible and as much divested of figure as any that we find in the Bible. My soul was quickened, I am assured by the promised Spirit's aid, to read and understand the Bible according to the known laws of language, such as obtain in other books.—When, by faith, I was enabled to receive the testimony of God, with only a subordinate regard to human opinions, I was enabled to decide, at least to my own satisfaction, what is revealed.

2. As to our Lord's personal appearing. He solemnly averred to the high priest, "Hereafter ye shall see the Son of man—coming in the clouds of heaven." Matt. xxvi, 64. "And he led them out as far as to Bethany; and it came to pass, while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and carried up into heaven." Luke xxiv, 50. "He was taken up, and a cloud received him out of their sight." Acts i, 11. Two shining intelligences affirmed that this *same* Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall *so come* in *like manner* as ye have seen him go into heaven. Here we have a

threefold assurance that Jesus will come *personally*. The assurance is made doubly sure, by being connected with his personal, visible ascension.—“The Lord *himself* shall descend from heaven.”—“When he shall appear we shall be like him, for we shall *see* him as he is.” “Behold, he cometh with clouds, and every *eye shall see him*.” Here we have the most explicit, most solemn declarations that “the appearing” shall be personal and visible. This harmonizes with the ancient prophets. One exclaims exultingly, “I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand in the latter day upon the earth. In my flesh shall I see God, whom I shall *see* for myself, and *mine eyes shall behold*, and not another.” Certain it is, therefore, that the Bible teaches the visible, personal appearing of Jesus. If these plain, positive statements are not to be understood according to the most natural import of the terms, what doctrine of revelation can be understood? Observe that “the coming of the Son of man,” spoken of in the above quoted passages, is, by express revelation, known to be his second coming. He shall “appear the second time, without sin unto salvation.” The circumstances which are described as attending this dread event, can never occur except at the resurrection and judgment. Job cannot see him “with his eyes” till he comes up in the resurrection. The beloved disciple cannot “*see him as he is, and be like him*,” till he comes up in the resurrection. All the kindreds of the earth will not “*wail* because of him,” till the opening scenes of

“the day of God.” It is, then settled beyond all cavil, (but that of the infidel,) that Christ’s next appearing will be “the second time,” to consummate his work in reference to human probation.

It is plain that death, revivals, and providential judgments, are not the “coming” that is the subject of the leading prophecies on this subject—they are not “the appearing” on which the eye of faith rested with such heavenly rapture. Rom. viii, 23. 2 Tim. iv, 8. Heb. ix. 28. If the Redeemer’s coming, in the Scripture sense, be at these events, then the number of his comings will be the number of such events; consequently, a *second* coming would be impossible, because his next coming would not be his second, but possibly his ten thousand millionth. The apostles believed in *one* coming of the Lord, after the first—they call it his second appearing. It will be like the first, personal and visible. “*Even so, amen!*”

3. The next step was to ascertain what events are, in the Scriptures, identified with “the coming of the Son of man.” 1 Cor. xv. “In Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order—Christ the first fruits, afterward they that are Christ’s *at his coming.*” 1 Thess. iv, 14. “For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God *bring with him.* For the Lord *himself* shall descend.—Then we which are alive and remain, shall be (changed, 1 Cor. xv, 51,) caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air.” The resurrection of the righteous dead, the chang-

ing of the righteous living, and their ascent to join his holy retinue, are connected necessarily in these passages with the second advent.

The Man of Sin shall be destroyed; [2 Thess. ii, 8;] the body of the beast given to the burning flame; [Dan. vii, 11;] and the devil bound and shut up in the bottomless pit; [Rev. xx, 2;] and the wicked will be slain. Jer. xxv, 31-33.

4. The coming of Christ, to achieve these tremendous purposes, was seen to have been the event on which the apostles fixed their eye, whenever they looked into the future. It is said with truth, that "faith brings distant things near;" therefore, I was led to believe, that this fact, instead of proving that "*the day of the Lord*" is distant from us, as it was from the apostles, proves how destitute the Christian church is of faith.—This truth was fastened in my soul "as a nail in a sure place," that the "*glorious appearing*" of the Son of God had not that place either in my mind or ministry, that it had in Paul's. It is noticed in every chapter in 1 Thess. It is the theme of 2 Thess. To wait for the "Son from heaven" was as much a part of their Christian calling, as to "serve the living God."

This was, to me, a long step. It showed me that I was wrong—the ministry and the church wrong. Why, eighteen hundred years ago, when "*faith*" overcame "*the world*," they preached a coming Jesus and the judgment.

For hundreds of years this was the theme of the Christian ministry. The Coming One—the coming judgment, echoed down the shores of time, till

faith yielded to sense. When the abominations of earth were mingled with the purities of heaven—when the god of this world began to reign in the church in the place of Jesus, the ministry had neither courage nor strength to declare that God was reserving “this world unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men.”

It is not for want of evidence, but of a living faith that the ministry decline preaching the coming of Jesus. The faith of the first age brought the burning glories of the day of God *near*; surely the same faith in “*the last age*” will not put that day far distant. This is so evident that I should like to proclaim it with trumpet tongue. There is an alarming want of faith in the ministry and church, when they say, the “Lord delayeth his coming,” and have no pleasure in them that do. It is a dreadful token that the words of Jesus will soon be fulfilled, “When the Son of Man cometh shall he find faith on the earth!!!” My brethren, how dare you aid in producing this unbelief! How can you create the tokens of your own perdition!! You surely have read, “He that believeth not shall be *damned*.” You are bolder than I, if you rush on to such a doom. Faith—living faith, will exert the same power over us, that it did over primitive preachers and private members. It will bring Christ near. Beware, lest in your unbelief you only *behold to perish*.

5. The millennium, as held by many, was next demolished. It lay in my mind in such a form that it put off the second advent at least a thousand years—how much longer I did not know, because

no one seemed to know when it was to begin.—When this was taken from me, it brought the “mountain of the Lord’s house,” as it were, a thousand miles nearer—*right at hand!* I was roused as from a dream. The most stupendous scenes to occur in the history of the divine dispensations to man, were, in all probability, very near. The day of doom to myself, my family, the church and the world, might take us, it appeared to me, by surprise, very soon.

This conviction, without determining even the year for its fulfillment, was to me overwhelming. Who could, or, if they could, who would contemplate the terrible splendor of the day of God, possibly just opening upon us, without emotion! Under the deep and awful impressions which approaching judgment awakened, I looked around me to see whence I had expected a millennium in the present state. It is in the second Psalm, is it? Sure the Saviour is to ask “the heathen” for his “inheritance”—but what will he do with them? “He will dash them in pieces like a potter’s vessel.” Just so my poor earthly millennium was shivered. It may be in Isa. ii, 20—they shall cast their “idols—to the moles and the bats”—for what purpose? Surely, to come like the blessed Mary to Jesus’ feet; but let us read the next verse:—“To go into the clefts of the rocks—for fear of the Lord and the terror of his majesty, when he ariseth to shake terribly the earth.” Alas for my blindness—alas for the blindness of my instructors! Surely the annexed admonition, verse 22, speaks volumes: “*Cease ye from man, whose breath is in*

his nostrils, for wherein *is he to be accounted of?*" Yet the temporal millennium has some countenance. Does not the prophet say that "they shall not hurt or destroy in all my holy mountain, saith the Lord?" Yes, but this cannot be true of any state where death and the devil are. Where they are, they will both hurt and destroy. Of course, that cheering prediction is not to be fulfilled in the present state. It is in the new heavens and the new earth. Isa. lxxv, 17, 25. This, we learn from an inspired apostle, is after the burning of this world. 2 Pet. iii, 12, 13. Now do, dying reader, "search the Scriptures" sufficiently to put these two passages together. We have consulted the Book of God too much as lawyers consult a suspected witness. If we read the Bible in harmony, comparing spiritual things with spiritual, we can see the doctrine of the millennium, as held by many, to be as baseless as the wildest dream of the wildest sect in their wildest vagaries. It is utterly without foundation, except it be a perverted, spiritual interpretation of plain Scripture. Read those portions where we might most reasonably expect at least some notice of holy triumph to the church. Begin, if you please, at the Lord's prayer, Matt. vi, 9-14. Temptation is to be deprecated, forgiveness implored, and, at the same time, extended to our erring fellow-creatures. Is it not plainly implied, that the whole period, during which this model prayer shall be offered, will be a state of trial, instead of triumph?

In the 24th of Matthew, the disciples' inquiry relating to the end of the world, and the signs of

Christ's coming, is recorded. In reply, there is no millennium, nothing but temptation, tribulation and death, till the special signs of his coming should begin. This surely is the place for the happy condition of the church, (if there be any such place in the Bible,) but as there is no prosperous condition even alluded to, I conclude positively that there will be nothing of the kind prior to the second advent. If there is to be a millennium before this event, the Saviour does not deem it worthy of mention. Then his answer would not meet the disciples' inquiry. But his answer does meet their inquiry. There is no millennium to be enjoyed prior to his coming.

Read the Redeemer's last prayer. Does he pray that his people might become prosperous or popular, during some future period? Does he not pray that they might be kept "from the evil?"—that that they are "*not of the world,*" and that the world hated them on this account? During the same dreadful night of his agony, when he uttered his prayer, [John xvii,] he told his disciples that in the world they should have "tribulation." There is not a note of triumph relating to this world in its present state—nothing to cheer them, but the fact that "he had overcome the world," would give them peace in himself, and come again to receive them to himself. John xiv, 3, 27.

The apostle Paul was doubtless misunderstood in speaking of the coming of Jesus; therefore he took up the subject in 2 Thess. ii, 1-8. Please read with care what precedes this great event. The taking away of that which hindered the rise

of Antichrist—the revelation of that “man of sin,” and his prevalence till his destruction by Christ at his coming. Surely there is no long period of prosperity to the church noticed in this chapter. It is in perfect harmony with the prophet. Dan. vii, 21, 22. This power “made war with the saints and prevailed against them, till the Ancient of days came, and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom.” If the Papacy and the Prince of evil “prevail” till the Judgment—the coming of Christ, then it follows, of course, that the church cannot “prevail” a thousand years, or one year, a thousand days, or one day prior to that event. No one can harmonize this and other Scripture passages with a millennium in this world. Well, this looks as if the millennium was indeed demolished; but what do you do, says one, with this? “They shall not teach every man his neighbor and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for all shall know me from the least even to the greatest.” It must be beyond this world, because all need to be taught here; in fact, with the best possible instruction, only a few can be said to know the Lord. Let no one therefore dream of a fulfillment of this prediction, till a new and heavenly state shall dawn; then alone shall all “know the Lord” without being taught. Teaching the knowledge of the Lord will not be necessary then; because all who are “counted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead” shall know him without being taught. * * * * *

6. After the millennium was seen to be subsequent to the Saviour's coming, the *restoration of*

the Jews, in my mind stood in the way. It was believed that they must be restored first. On this point, I had no very definite views, except that the natural seed of Abraham were to be returned, at some indefinite period, to Judea, and probably be made instrumental in the conversion of the world. This plausible idea was founded on the promise to Abraham, that in his seed "all nations" should be blessed; but had I read my Bible (as I intend to for the future) instead of Judaizing teachers, I might have learned who "the seed" is. Gal. iii, 16. Had the promise been understood, as it is plainly stated, [Rom. iv, 13, 17,] I need not have been in doubt, for "the promise that he should be heir of the world," was not to Abraham or his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith; for if they which are of the *law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise of none effect.*" You see the plain teaching of God was overlooked. The term "seed" was applied to the carnal Jews, instead of Christ. The carnal Jews restored, were to be made a blessing to the world—"they which are of the law" were by me esteemed "heirs," on principles, which, if true, broke up or subverted the whole gospel plan. If the carnal Jew be an heir, "faith is made void, and the promise of none effect."

My first object was to get a well defined idea of the new covenant. This comprehends all the promises. None are heirs of these promises except they come within its provisions—except they believe. The middle wall of partition between the Jew and Gentile is broken down, so that the gos-

pel knows no man "*after the flesh*. To give the promises to the carnal Jew would be to rebuild the partition wall which God has thrown down. In Gal. iv, 21-31, the Apostle names but "the *two covenants*," the two Jerusalems, and the two classes of people. One was after the flesh, in bondage, under sentence of being cast out—the other was by promise, free and heir to the Jerusalem above. Now we may take the curse from those who are under the law, and transfer it to the children of promise, with the same propriety that we may take the promise from believers and transfer it to those who are under the law; but we cannot do either. We must not mar "His work," which is perfect. We dare not "lay anything to the charge of God's elect," seeing it is he who justifieth them on the principle of the new covenant—"by grace through faith." We would not apply the promise, which is given only to "them who believe," to a carnal Jew, any sooner than a wicked, Gentile, lest we should be accessory to their deception and ruin.

But if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead? Rom. xi, 15. This I had supposed to be in harmony with the promise to Abraham that in his descendants all nations should be blessed. When the Jewish nation was cast off, the gospel was given to the Gentiles and made the means of bringing them to God; but when they should be restored, it would be a still greater blessing to the world, even as life from the dead. This is a prevailing notion; but still it is a notion not authorized by this or any other passage in the

Bible. Read it with care. "What shall the receiving of them be but of life from the dead?"—*as life from the dead?* No; there is no *as* in the text. It means what it says, that their restoration is nothing "*but life from the dead,*" nothing but a resurrection.

This is confirmed by what is said, [verse 25,] "that blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the *fulness of the Gentiles* be come in." Do see! The blindness is not said to be taken from them, and they made the instruments of bringing in the fulness of the Gentiles. If this had been said, we should have been authorized to entertain the prevalent expectation; but, instead of this, it is said that blindness is happened to Israel *till* the fulness of the Gentiles be come in—till all of the Gentiles are brought in who shall be. Their blindness will remain until the coming of Christ; then all Israel shall be saved—all God's Israel—all believers will have final, eternal salvation. They shall come out of their graves, [Eze. xxxvii, 12,] or be changed at the last trump. 1 Cor. xv, 51. This is the simple language of the Apostle; their reception is "*life from the dead,*" or resurrection. Their blindness remains till the fulness of the Gentiles shall come in; therefore all are deceived who rely on the Jews, devoted to *destruction*, as a means for converting the world. Deut. xxviii, 61; Isa. lxv, 9, 15.

The apostle defines the Jew, Rom. ii, 28 29: "He is a Jew who is one inwardly, and circumcision is of the heart." "They are not all Israel who are descended from Israel; the children of the

flesh, these are not the children of God, but the children of the promise are counted for the seed." Rom. ix, 6, 8. Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ; Christ is "*the seed*" to whom the promise is made. Gal. iii. He had no natural descendants, therefore the descent is not reckoned by natural generation, but by faith, as it is written—"if ye be Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise." Gal. iii, 29. Believers constitute the Israel of God, the "all Israel" who "shall be saved" when Christ the Deliverer shall come out of Zion. No argument is more direct. Those who believe are Christ's. They are to be "*his at his coming.*" Them "God will bring with him." 1 Thess. iv, 14. Now as these are the children of promise, who are counted for the seed—as this class alone are named in the provisions of the new covenant, it follows, of course, that they constitute the "all Israel who shall be saved."

The mass of the Jewish nation has ever been "under the law," consequently "under its *curse*," not under the promise of the new covenant.—"Wrath came upon them to the uttermost;" not the promise to national restoration. Deut. xxviii, 44; Rom. xi, 9, 10. Every Sabbath-school scholar knows that "the gospel" is to be preached to every class without distinction—to the Jew and Gentile. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," whether Jew or Gentile. "He who believeth not shall be damned," whether Jew or Gentile. We should rejoice that divine teaching is not yea and nay; it is all "*yea*," so that every honest inquirer, who will follow the word and Spirit of

God, may come directly out into light. No one need be in doubt as to who the *real* Israel of God are. To them all the promises belong. To the opposite class there is nothing but impending wrath. Lord, forgive thy professed people for sustaining the false and ruinous expectations of the poor carnal Jew. They have clung to their abolished system, and we have helped them to hold on to their perdition; but we should have cried aloud to them and spared not to tell them that they were under the curse. Alas for the church! it has been, for the most part, carnal; and by consequence in the same condemnation. Who can avoid this conclusion from Scripture premises? Who can wonder that professing Christians, who apply the promises of the new covenant to those who are under the curse of the old, should be in need of this solemn appeal: "Beware therefore, lest that come upon you which is spoken of in the prophets. Behold, ye despisers, and wonder, and perish; for I work a work in your days, a work which ye shall in no wise believe, though a man declare it unto you." Those who are in the fog as to the "first principles of the oracles of God," may be also with regard to both prophecy and providence, relating to the second advent and the final restoration of "all Israel." They should at least beware. * * *

We should have no will of our own, especially in religion. Such was my conviction; but my good name, my situation as pastor, or, what was more, the peace of the church—in truth, everything relating to this world seemed at stake. To admit the truth, was probably to forfeit the friend-

ship of those whom I had most highly esteemed. Everything of this kind was presented to my mind's eye in all its importance; and much of what was then seen, has been realized; so that I did not rush recklessly into my present position. O, no! the truth never was admitted with a more complete survey of consequences. I did not see anything with the second advent doctrine, in this world, but disgrace and the promised blessing of Jesus. On this condition my soul submitted. Soon, very soon, I was constrained to say, that whatever sufferings might be allotted me, I enjoyed enough to compensate for them all. My very soul and body were bathed and blessed,—my whole person was baptized with the Holy Spirit's influence; never did my heart love God so much. In fact, it seemed to me that I had been a comparative stranger to love. His word was verified: "No man forsaketh father or mother," &c., "for the kingdom of God's sake, but he shall receive an *hundred fold more*." My whole intellectual and moral nature was made to repose sweetly in the truth and its Divine Author. My Bible seemed nearer now than when I bought it, at my first conversion. If friends had been lost, I found those who were an hundred fold nearer and dearer. Heaven, for which my soul at times had panted, seemed as in open vision. Hell is an awful reality. Sinners seem to be in the condition of persons in a house on fire; their doom is seen to be so dreadful and so near, that I want to call after them continually. God never wrought in my soul with such power to rescue souls as brands from the burning. He gave me about all that my physical

strength could bear. Now my concern seems directed to my brethren in the ministry, and the state of the churches. *Beloved brethren*, suffer the word of exhortation. It is not possible for me to address you as if you had a long life of usefulness before you; it is not possible for me to feel that you or your people are safe. It is my settled, solemn conviction, that you are many of you in infinite peril. Many of you have been to me amiable; but it does seem that you, who put off the coming of Jesus, occupy a wrong position with reference to that amazing event. If you are in doubt as to the time, still there is no excuse why you should despise those who are not in doubt. Surely, the least you can do, with safety to your own souls, is to pray to be ready, and labor to get your people ready. "Take heed to yourselves—watch and pray always, that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all these things that shall come to pass, and to stand before the Son of man." Tell me—settle it in your mind before God,—how you can be safe, when **he** announcement of this tremendous event, on the authority of the Most High, produces little or no prayer. How can you forgive yourselves,—how can our common Judge forgive you, when you fulfill the character of the unfaithful servant, and turn to smite your fellow-servants? Do you not see that just so far as you oppose the speedy coming of our Lord, you please the ungodly? It is dangerous to stand in the way of sinners, for the next step will be to sit "in the seat of the scornful." Ministers have passions like other men, and are as easily excited, except they watch and pray. Ministers

have more at stake than other men—their salary, reputation, comfort and the respectability of their families, will all serve to tempt them to take just that stand against the unpopular doctrine of the second advent, that the rulers of the synagogue took against Paul. My brethren, you are exposed to temptation, and Jesus saw it, or he would not have charged you, as well as me, to watch. There are many, however, who seem not to suspect danger of being unprepared; these do not watch with reference to the coming of Christ. Some make light of “going up.” They may not have read with attention, that some who mocked at Elisha for saying that Elijah had “gone up,” were *cursed*, and made a monument to the impious in after ages.

God has given us one illustration, in each dispensation of the revealed truth, that his people shall be “caught up to meet the Lord in the air.” Enoch in the patriarchal, Elijah in the prophetic, and Jesus in the Christian; yet many make a mock of it. Though ministers may have read, they seem not to believe that even children were destroyed, who mocked at Elisha, for saying that Elijah had gone up. It was mocking God, who caused Elijah to go up. So now, it seems plain to me, that all who make light of second advent believers’ “going up,” *mock God*. One minister says that he had as lief be found fighting the doctrine of the second advent when Christ comes as not; but I forbear. “Father, forgive them, they know not what they do.” If my service be not accepted of the brethren, it will be, I trust, a relief to myself. I was constrained to write, and though I have writ-

ten amid the interruptions occasioned by the sale of furniture and "breaking up," yet here are some of my convictions stated—some of my feelings portrayed. * * * * *

As to spiritual influences, are they not what has been foretold? What cause can be assigned for Brother Brown's primitive experience? There are, I presume, thousands who have had an experience strongly resembling his. A ministering brother has just told me of a pious woman, who had essentially such an experience as Brother Brown's, and she was brought by nothing but the Word and Spirit to just those views I now entertain. She was deemed crazy, but the Spirit of God wrote this whole second advent doctrine on her soul; she has it all without human agency. If there are to be in the last days instances of remarkable outpourings of the Spirit, where are we to find them, if not among second advent believers? A child of six years old, when converted, told me the most interesting experience I ever heard; her whole soul was quickened, and *she* was a believer in her Lord's speedy coming. Now I should like to hear some of those who feel and act as if the Lord could not come yet, account for these spiritual influences, on any other principles than those by which "the rulers of the synagogue" accounted for Paul's experience—for the miracles of Jesus, &c. Account for them, my brethren, if possible, on any other principles than those by which Universalists and Infidels account for ordinary conversions. If insanity, mental imbecility, or the devil, be the cause of our experiences of truth, what is the cause of re-

vivals? My brethren, let those engaged in them be your judges. This is a solemn truth. I feel awfully, in view of the necessary conclusion to which these premises lead. You cannot justify opposition to that agency which cuts the soul loose from the world and fills it with the second advent, as well as "glory and God," except you virtually justify the Jewish rulers in opposing the apostles. Therefore, it is my solemn conviction, that you need beware, lest ye only behold, oppose and perish. It is true that there were miraculous powers attending Paul; but observe *that* is not the basis of my argument. The church has long regarded the argument derived from Paul's conversion, (it being sustained by the same kind of conversion in all parts of the world,) as a strong one. It has been urged as if irrefragable. If it be a good argument in any case, why not in the one before us? You observe that the argument is based only on spiritual influences. Every effect has an adequate cause; every direct spiritual effect has not only its adequate cause, but a cause of its own nature; as it is written, "Satan is not divided against Satan," nor can Jesus "deny himself." These eternal truths are not recognized by wicked men when they oppose the Holy Spirit's agency in the experience of the saints; nor do you, my brethren, when trifling with the same sort of agency in writing the second advent on the hearts of many. This Spirit is "not of the world; if it was of the world, the world would love its own; but seeing it is not of the world, "therefore the world hateth it." *All* ministers who believe in the Lord's coming at hand,

must be hated, or at least neglected. Those who believe, cannot, therefore, have the ordinary impulses to action, which worldly men have; they must have higher, holier impulses, derived from the Holy One, to separate from the spirit of this world, and wait, on scriptural principles, for the coming of Jesus to judgment. * * *

Jesus solemnly inquired, "When the Son of man *cometh*, shall he find faith on the earth?" Yet the masters in Israel are making the verification of this dreadful truth a reason for their continued unbelief. When unbelief is predicted to be a fearful token of his coming, many ministers, with an unbelieving world, co-operate to create that token. Surely I have not mistaken the application of my text. Beware, lest in unbelief ye only wonder to perish.

Even though a definite period had not been named for the coming of the day of God, such are the general admonitions to *be ready, to wait for, look for*, and love his appearing, that no one can disregard them without infinite peril. Beware, then, beware, lest that come upon you which is spoken in the prophets.

Did you ever learn the whole name of Jesus? Rev. i, 8. "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which *is to come*." The last clause, literally rendered, may read, *The coming One*. Faith respects him in his whole character. Many have spoken to me about preaching the gospel, not seeming to know that the gospel is the good news of the kingdom to come, when Jesus shall appear.

The gospel dispensation is not his kingdom, except in embryo in the hearts of his people, because, [Luke xix, 11-13,] "He spake a parable to them, because they *thought the kingdom* should immediately *appear*." The disciples were expecting the kingdom. Acts xvi. It shall be set up at his appearing; [2 Tim. iv, 1;] and we know, on the highest authority, that it cannot come till after the resurrection. 1 Cor. xv, 50. Now this I say, brethren, that *flesh and blood* cannot inherit the kingdom of God. No one will ever enter that glorious, everlasting kingdom, but by the resurrection, or a change equal to it.

Some want me to preach Jesus Christ and him crucified. Such, probably, do not know that he, who was the crucified One, is now *The coming One*. If we, my brethren, preach, and the people believe in Jesus as he is revealed, we shall both preach and have the people believe in the coming One. Beware how you omit to preach the coming of Jesus! By the terrible splendors of the Day of God, I charge you to preach the coming of Jesus. By your past remissness, I charge you to preach the coming of Jesus. By the doom of the unfaithful watchman and the unfaithful servant, I charge you to preach the coming of Jesus. To all, I say, in view of the opening judgment, repent, be baptized and believe in Jesus, *the coming One*. Amen!

A TRUE PICTURE;

OR

DESCRIPTION OF THE STATE OF THE CHURCHES.

BY ROBERT ATKINS.

THE following thrilling extract was published in 1844, and formed No. xxxix of the *Second Advent Library*. It is stated on the title page of that Tract that it is "extracted from a discourse recently preached in London."

EXTRACT OF A DISCOURSE.

"Let your loins be girded about, and your lights burning; and ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their Lord, when he will return from the wedding; that, when he cometh and knocketh, they may open unto him immediately." Luke xii, 35, 36.

PREACHING in ceiled houses, Sabbath after Sabbath, to the same congregation, appears to me little better than a mockery, when the awful state of Christendom arises before me, overshadowed, as it is, with the cloud of Almighty vengeance; and yet, were I to pursue the course that best accords with my present state of feeling—were I to cry aloud throughout the streets and lanes of this city, day and night, Wo, wo, wo to the inhabitants—wo to the corrupters of the pure gospel of the blessed Jesus, I should be regarded as a fanat-

ical maniac ; and, at the sacrifice of future usefulness, would only secure the lamentable satisfaction of having borne my testimony against a degenerate age, and an apostate church. My beloved hearers, I am well aware that the glance that I have taken, at this most alarming and exciting subject, is but ill calculated to prepare my mind, at least, for the deliberate investigation of the important doctrine which I have purposed to bring before you ; but depending for help, whence alone true help can come, I proceed to the consideration of my subject ; and, that your minds may not be confused by a variety of matter, I shall confine myself, in the present lecture, to the delusion that prevails respecting the state and prospects of the church and the world.

What is the opinion that the churches of the present day entertain of themselves, and of the world ?— My hearers, am I not stating a truth, when I say— Go where you will, either to the platforms of Bible Societies, or Missionary Societies, or to the pulpits of Churchmen or Dissenters, and you will hear one uniform tale of the increasing piety, and of the extending success of the gospel. You will almost be persuaded that the ministers and the churches are as holy and as zealous as they well can be—that the world is mending every day, through the influence of religious example, and that we may shortly expect the triumph of the gospel—the fulfillment of the promise that the whole earth shall be filled with the glory of the Lord. Now, without stopping to inquire what influence such statements as these, or such opinions, howsoever modified, of the church and of the world, are likely to produce upon either, let us see how they accord with Scripture and with fact. It is plainly stated by our Lord, that, until the end of the present dispensation, there should be the co-existence of Christianity and anti-Christianity—that the tares should grow together with the wheat until the end of the *age*

—not the end of the *world*, as it is rendered in our translation; and, if this be true, when shall every knee bow, and every tongue confess that Jesus is the Lord?—When shall righteousness cover the earth, and when shall the earth be filled with the glory of the Lord? Most certainly, if Christ's declaration is to be taken, not during the present dispensation.—The Apostle Paul informs us that iniquity, which, at the beginning of the dispensation, only worked by way of mysteries, in the latter days would assume the character of an actual manifestation. In his second epistle to Timothy, he also declares that, in the last days, perilous times shall come; or men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemous, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, truce-breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good—traitors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God, having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof—ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth; men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the truth; evil men and seducers, waxing worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived. And the apostle Peter gives this addition to the awful picture:—There shall come in the last days, scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of his coming? Here, you perceive, my hearers, you have two descriptions of the last days, that is, of the present time, as widely different as two descriptions can possibly be; the first is of man's drawing, and the second of God's. Which of the two will you believe? But, lest there should be any mistake, let us fairly and honestly inquire whether this description of God's giving, actually corresponds with the present state of the churches and of the world; and, in tracing the correspondency, may God carry conviction to every one of your minds, as he has done to

mine. And now, if we want a standard whereby to judge of the apostasy of the present churches, we must take the church of Christ when the apostatizing spirit was least manifested, that is to say, in the apostolic age. With this pattern in our eye, where, I ask, are the gifts of the Spirit? Where is the confidence and brotherly love that made all things common?—and where is the selling of all that we have, and becoming a disciple of the Lord Jesus? Where has the spirit of self-denial and of cross-bearing fled? Where is the taking joyfully the spoiling of our goods?—Where is the persecution that all who live godly in Christ Jesus shall endure, and where is the being hated of all men for Christ's sake? Alas! alas! my brethren, the gifts of the Spirit are gone, and, I fear, most of the graces have gone with them; and, as to suffering and reproach, to which the church is called, such things have long been mere matters of history. But this general mode of remark will do little, I fear, in bringing conviction to the mind; let us at once go to the churches and take their members individually, and compare the Christian of the present day, with Christ; and where, let me ask, O! where will you find almost one feature of resemblance? There are none of you ignorant of the fact that our Lord, while in the world, not only made an atonement for sin, but he also set us an example, that we might tread in his steps. He knew what was in man; he knew what would be his most dangerous besetment, that is, the love of the world, the love of creature comfort, the love of ease, and of a present resting-place. To guard against this besetment, he chalked out a course for his followers, and for his church; and, let me tell you, it is the only one that can be safely followed: and what is this course? He became a pilgrim and sojourner in a strange land, and would not have so much of this world as even a place whereon to lay his head; he took no thought for the mor-

row; he made no such inquiries as these: What shall I drink, or wherewithal shall I be clothed; and, in praying to his Father, he could honestly, and with a sincere heart, say, give me this day my daily bread. My hearers, whatever apostate churches may say to the contrary, every Christian is bound, by our Saviour's example, and, what is more, God's positive command is upon him to walk in these very steps, and to observe the very same rule.

Oh! my hearers, find me a follower of Christ, find me a true pilgrim, a genuine sojourner, a man that is truly a stranger in this evil world, find me the man whose conduct tells the world he is living for eternity; find me the church who lay it down as a rule, that, for the sake of thoughtless, world-loving, comfort-loving, and pleasure-loving sinners, their ministers and members shall uniformly preach the following truths, by their lives and by their conduct: Men are probationers for eternity; the world is man's worst enemy; the world has damned millions of souls, and is damning millions more at this very moment.—Renounce the world, come out from the world, beware of the world, overcome the world. I hesitate not to say, such a man, such a church is not to be found; the truly righteous are diminished from the earth, and no man layeth it to heart. The professors of religion of the present day, in every church, are lovers of the world, conformers to the world, lovers of creature-comfort, and aspirers after respectability. They are called to suffer with Christ, but they shrink from even reproach, not to speak of suffering in the flesh, as an evil that they are justified in using every means to evade: they are called to endure hardness as good soldiers of Christ, but, to a man, they love softness and ease; they are called to bear a testimony for Christ, to endure persecution, and to rejoice in tribulation, but they take good care to keep out of the way of both when they can. They are called to weep

and to mourn, and are promised a Comforter; but they prefer to be without the Comforter, rather than have the mourning. Apostasy, apostasy, apostasy, is engraven on the very front of every church; and did they know it, and did they feel it, there might be hope; but, alas! they cry, We are rich, and increased in goods, and stand in need of nothing; and thus, blasphemy is added to apostasy. My beloved hearers, do I speak too strongly, have I overdrawn the picture? Come with me to Lambeth Palace, tell the number of its turrets, count its splendid halls and its painted chambers, give a tongue to these appendages of state, these contributors to luxury, and say, oh! say, What are all these calculated to teach a pleasure-loving and a world-loving sinner? Go to the salaried dissenting preacher, who has found a resting place in his five hundred, or his one hundred a year, and see whether his stipulated income, or the round of duty for which it is paid, will give you any just idea of the leader and the exemplar of Bible pilgrims. Go to the opulent professing churchman, or the wealthy deacon, go to the *Christian* merchant, or the *Christian* shop-keeper, and learn the church's comment on the two notable commandments of our Saviour, "Lay not up treasures on the earth." and "Labor not for the meat that perisheth." Where, oh! where is the world-hater, the money-despiser, the cross-lover to be found? Where is the Bible sojourner, the Bible probationer for eternity, the Bible sufferer for Christ's sake—Christ's living epistles, which sinners may read? Where have they their hiding-place? My brethren, my brethren, the whole gospel system, and the very gospel object is perverted, and yet am I censured as a reviler for calling the churches apostate. The churches do not know that iniquity is working in the way of mystery—the churches do not know that Satan's method of damning souls is by giving them much that has the ap-

pearance of good—that he will go the length of making a three-parts Christian to keep the inquirer in peace, that he may thus not only make his damnation more sure, but also bring deeper reproach upon Christ and his cause. Is the witness of the Spirit a thing inquired after? The sinner shall have it, but it will be counterfeit. Is peace, is joy, is a praying or preaching gift wanted? They shall be given, but remember, they are blessings and gifts too frequently of Satan's giving. Holiness of heart, and Christ's example, are the only things that Satan fears; and all partial piety, and half-hearted Christianity, are Satan's glory, and the church's shame. My hearers, I have given you a short sketch of what are called the Christian churches of the day, who are going to convert the world by their preaching and their example. Do I revile them? Nay, but, according to the light which God has imparted to me, I feel myself called upon, fearless of all consequences, to bear my testimony against them, for the honor of Christ and his cause, as a warning to the deluders, and for the benefit of the deluded; and it is my constant prayer, that they may awaken to a sense of their real condition, and humble themselves before God, from whom they have awfully apostatized, ere the vials of Almighty wrath give indisputable evidence that the measure of the iniquity of the Gentile church is full.

My brethren, were I to attempt to draw the character of the churches of the day in full, of the churches who, according to their own account, are to be the honored instrumentality of evangelizing the heathen, and filling the whole earth with the glory of the Lord, the sun would go down upon us before one hundredth part of their corruptions and abuses could be brought before you in detail; even mere natural men and avowed infidels have but to direct their eye towards them, and the feeling of disgust is created, and the cry of shame is extorted, because of their party bickerings

and their unchristian animosities; but, with the record of their unhallowed contentions, or with the abuse of the powers they possess, and their aspirings after more, I have, at present, nothing to do; it is enough for my purpose simply to point at their apostasy from primitive purity and primitive simplicity, and their total want of primitive power. Alas! alas! the gospel-perverting nature of their conduct and operations, their worldly-mindedness, their spiritual darkness, their self-conceit, their party-spirit, their secularizing policy and utter selfishness, their having the form of godliness without the power, and their ever hearing and never coming to the knowledge of the truth, all, all about them, and of them, and in them, but too strongly mark them out as the prepared and the preparing objects of Almighty vengeance. Startling though the language be, I dare not hesitate to use it; God has forgotten to punish, if his arm be not lifted up against them, and mock piety is no longer offensive to a holy God, if the hour of their destruction be not nigh at hand. I fear much that the unconverted and backsliding portions of every Gentile church, I mean of the churches of the day, will laugh at this testimony, which I consider it my duty to bear against them; for they have closed their eyes, they have shut their ears, they have hardened their hearts, and God has given them over to their strong delusion; they are believing a lie, and they will assuredly be damned, because they have obeyed not the gospel, because they have held the truth in unrighteousness; but, blessed be God, there are some in every church, a small remnant, a little flock, whose eyes are still open, who weep and mourn over the general defection, who know the voice of the Spirit: and to them I address the admonitory language of my text, "Let your loins be girded about, and your lights burning; and ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their Lord, when he will return from the wedding; that when he com-

eth and knocketh, they may open unto him immediately.”

But, my dear hearers, I must take my leave for the present of the rich churches, the churches that are possessed of goods, the churches that can reign without Christ, the churches that love not his appearing, the churches that scoffingly cry out, Where is the promise of his coming; the anti-Christian, apostate Gentile churches, who are fitting themselves for the fire with which God will shortly plead with them; and I shall now direct your attention for a few moments to the awful state of the world, which the divines of the day would have you believe is improving in manners, and in spirit, through its intercourse with the churches which I have just been characterizing as apostate. But where, oh! where shall I begin? The heart sickens the moment that the eye falls upon the mass of iniquitous abomination that lies before it.—Take the Christian country in which we live, or, it may be better for our purpose, the Christian city in which we dwell, (London,) I ask, is it an improvement upon heathenism, to see a court at the opera on Saturday night, and at the sacramental altar on the Sunday morning? Are balls, and concerts, and theatres, and race-courses, places of preparation for the judgment-seat, and places of training for the mansions of the blessed, and for the eternal companionship of a holy God? Were there not a Bible in our land, could the iniquities of the heathen be more gloried in than they are? And yet, this is the capital of the world, which is so wondrously improved by the influence of Christian example. Take your Bible in your hand, and place your finger upon that portion of it which says, “Remember the Sabbath day and keep it holy,” and go throughout the streets and markets of this city; and if your heart does not sink within you, and if your spirit does not fail you, you have neither the heart nor the spirit of a Christian. On

any Sabbath throughout the year, take your stand in Hyde Park, and see how daring and impiously the bulk of our nobility can insult the God of heaven.— In front of every equipage, I can see in my mind's eye an angel of the Lord crying aloud, for God's sake, and for our own sake, "Remember the Sabbath day and keep it holy;" and I can hear the infatuated worms reply, "Onward, onward, who is the Lord that I should obey his voice?" Shall I speak to you of whoredoms? There are eighty thousand public prostitutes within the precincts of this wicked city, and who can count the number of the secret ones! drunkenness, dishonesty, swearing, and lying, and every kind and manner of abomination, have uncontrolled license; and there is not a street, lane, or neighborhood, that has not a polluted moral atmosphere.— This, my hearers, is but a slight etching of our Christian city, of our improving world, of the wicked harlot with which the Gentile churches have been shaking hands, nay, committing open whoredom, for fifteen hundred years. Tell me not, by way of palliation, that the persecuting spirit of the world is gone; the truth is, Christ is gone; there is no Christ in the churches to persecute. And as to the individual Christian, there is too little of the image of Christ, and of the power of Christ there, to excite either the jealousy of Satan, or the malice of the world. Be assured, my dear hearers, whatever Christians of Satan's making may say to the contrary, a God-despising, Christ-rejecting Spirit-resisting world, doth not lack malice towards Christ and his followers.— Let any minister of Christ fully take his Master's ground; let him begin at the palace, and, coming down through the members of the administration, the houses of parliament, the bishop's stalls, and the chairs of justice; let him tell every man, plainly and honestly, what he is, what he is doing, and where he is going—and you will soon see the arm of the law

stretched out against him ; and let the efforts of this faithful minister be zealously backed by a few equally bold and resolute denouncers of iniquity, let one fair stand be made for Christ and for God, and you will quickly behold the fires of Smithfield re-kindled, or some other more civilized invention in active operation, to rid the land from troublesome, soul-alarming, and Satan-disturbing disciples of Christ. But why should I keep my eye, and yours, so long fixed upon the world ? did not the first glance satisfy you all, that it was ripe for destruction ? It is true, God is a long-suffering and a merciful God ; but what can he do, that he has not already done ? And, after having done everything that was consistent with his own nature, and with man's position, as a probationer for eternity, for the church's reformation, and the world's salvation, it were directly libelling God to say he has not done so ; and after having done all this in vain, as far as either the reformation of the one or the salvation of the other is concerned, a lengthening out of the day of mercy would, in my estimation, be most unmerciful. I see it to be just a crowding of hell with daily increasing victims, and a seven-fold heating of its flames, by hourly despised privileges. Because I love mercy, and pity the sinner, my continual cry, is, Lord, come speedily to judgment ! Because I feel for God's insulted honor, I cry, Lord come to judgment ! and, because I know the penalty of continuing to resist the Spirit, and to trample upon the blood of the Lamb, I must cry, Lord, come quickly to judgment ; and I am as sure as that there is a merciful God in the heavens, that he is hastening on the day of the wicked's destruction ; and as soon as this, his purpose, can be accomplished, it will be accomplished. Wo, wo, wo to the Bible-despising, gospel-hardened inhabitants of this land ; for assuredly the fearful day of retribution, the terrible day of God's reckoning, with this worse than heathenish people, is

nigh at hand. Sinners of Great Britain, depend upon it, the last offer of mercy and salvation is being made to you—your last day of grace is hastening to its close. I look upon it that you are placed as a nation in precisely the same situation as the Jews were, when Jesus Christ, weeping over Jerusalem, cried aloud, in the anguish of his soul, Oh! that thou, at least, that thou hadst known the things that belong unto thy peace; but now—and the sentence is irrevocable—now they are forever hid from thine eyes.—Notwithstanding the awful sentence, Jesus Christ commanded his disciples to begin the preaching of the gospel at Jerusalem—and why? Simply because, though the national doom was fixed, individuals might, even at the last hour, be induced to accept of a Saviour. A postate churches of Christendom, the measure of your iniquity is full. Godless, Christless world, your destiny is fixed; your destruction is inevitable, but shall I not begin at Jerusalem? Oh! that in these last days God would give me energy of body and of mind, and the mighty power of his Spirit, to warn the individual sinner with effect; that some might yet escape for their lives, and take refuge from the coming calamity, in the hitherto despised, but still outstretched arms of their Saviour.

ADDRESS TO THE MINISTERS OF CHRIST.

Ministers of Christ, and ye men of God, who are scattered throughout the churches, suffer the word of exhortation; what have you to do with the doctrinal squabbles, the secularizing policy, and the party interests of existing churches? If you be, indeed, men of God, spiritual men, you must long ago have been tired of their mud, and their filth, and their shallows. I entreat you, in God's name, and for Christ's sake, put away your apathy, and awake from your slumbers; come out from among them, lest ye become partakers of their plagues. The cry is raised,

Behold, the Bridegroom cometh ! as you value your souls, disobey not the command : but “ Go ye forth to meet him.” ’Tis vain to imagine that, by remaining where you are, you may still be a leaven for good. The churchman will remain a churchman, the independant, an independant, and the methodist a mere methodist, in spite of you ; mother’s children are they all. They do not bear the image of the heavenly, and I am satisfied, as regards the great bulk of them, the Father never begat them. The little zeal that they have hath self for its spring, and party aggrandizement for its object ; and either self-interest or self-exaltation constitutes the bond of this union. If ever they knew anything of God individually, I am afraid the most of them died in the weaning, when the sensible comfort, the milk that God hath provided for the babe in Christ, was withdrawn, because they had been long enough babes—they would not learn to feed upon the word—they would not take to the flesh and to the blood of Christ : and, consequently, that which was given them hath been taken away from them. The preaching gift and the praying gift—yea, and part of the decently-living gift, may remain ; and because they must have peace, and joy, Satan will take care that they are furnished with both ; but as to the life of God and the image of Christ, they are scarcely anywhere to be found. Men of God, can you make the members of your several churches sensible of their state ? Can you convince them of their delusion by remaining amongst them ? Never. Will such men unite with you in hastening on the coming of your Lord ? Will they mourn with you over the apostasy of the churches ? Will they weep with you, will they cry with you for all the abominations that are existing in the world ? O, no. You will uniformly find them on the side of the scoffer, and they will tell you, We are doing well—we are increasing in goods, we are triumphing, we are reigning, and

what care we for the promise of his coming? Men and brethren, from this moment come out from among them, and be ye like unto them who are waiting for the return of their Lord. Bear your testimony boldly and openly against them, and thus you may succeed in alarming some of them. You are injuring them, you are hindering the work of Christ, you are weakening one another's hands, by continuing in your present position. Oh! may the spirit of Elijah, who must come, and of John the Baptist, be given unto you. Let your loins, like theirs, be girded about; let your lights burn where they may be seen, and let your united cry awaken both the slumberer and the sleeper. "Prepare to meet thy God." I have a conviction on my mind, that it is God's purpose that yet once more the note of alarm shall be sounded throughout these realms, and that this last trumpet will, under God, either have the effect of hardening or saving the sinner. I clearly see that both processes have already commenced under my own ministry, and if you, my fellow-laborers, will only be faithful, and in your several spheres and stations stand out boldly for God, the harvest of this land will soon be ripe. I feel as if death or life was in every word; and every time I make the inquiry, Watchman, what of the night? the answer cometh with increasing thrill to my soul, The morning cometh, and also the night. And, Oh! may every soul now before me tremble at the voice of the Spirit, and take the prophetic warning in time, make haste—return—come! Ministers of Christ! men of God! to your knees for oil, to your Bibles for light; away with every trapping of worldly policy; strip your party-colored robes of Satan's weaving; take to you locusts and wild honey; have done with the poisonous dishes of man's providing: strengthen your loins as with a girdle, with the promise of his coming, with the blessed hope of the glorious appearing of the great God and your

Saviour, and let your voice be a united voice—the voice of one crying in the midst of this wilderness of apostasy, blasphemy, ignorance, pollution, and sin—“Prepare the way of the Lord.” Thus will you be “like unto the men who are waiting for their Lord;” and take the promise for your comfort, “When he cometh, and shall find you thus watching; verily, I say unto you, that he shall gird himself, and make you sit down to meat, and will come forth and serve you.”—Amen.

“Spiritual apathy,” said Prof. Finney, in 1844, “is almost all-pervading, and is fearfully deep; so the religious press of the whole land testifies. It comes to our ears and to our eyes, also through the religious prints, that very extensively church members are becoming devotees of fashion—join hands with the ungodly in parties of pleasure, in dancing, in festivities, &c. But we need not expand this painful subject. Suffice it that the evidence thickens and rolls heavily upon us, to show that the *churches are becoming sadly degenerate*. They have gone very far from the Lord and he has withdrawn himself from them.”

Luther, just before his death, speaking of the state of things near the end, while writing on the prophetic periods of Daniel, in his German Bible, says: “About the consummation of these periods, *this gospel* will be shut out of all the churches and confined to private houses.”

Says Charles Beecher: “Oh, woful day! Oh unhappy church of Christ! Fast rushing round and round the fatal circle of absorbing ruin! Thou sayest, I am rich, and increased in goods, and have need of nothing; and *knowest not* that thou art poor, and miserable, and *blind*, and naked!”

REMEMBER LOT'S WIFE.

How prone are professors to rest on their lees,
To study their pleasure, their profit and ease ;
Though God says arise, and escape for thy life,
And look not behind you ; " Remember Lot's wife."

Awake from thy slumbers, the warning believe,
'Tis Jesus that calls you, the message receive ;
While dangers are pending, escape for thy life,
And look not behind you ; " Remember Lot's wife."

The first bold apostate will tempt you to stay,
An'tell you that lions are found in the way ;
He means to deceive you—escape for thy life,
And look not behind you ; " Remember Lot's wife."

How many poor souls has the tempter beguiled !
With specious temptations how many defiled ;
O, be not deluded, escape for thy life,
And look not behind you ; " Remember Lot's wife !"

The ways of religion true pleasure afford,
No pleasures can equal the joys of the Lord ;
Forsake then the world and escape for thy life,
And look not behind you ; " Remember Lot's wife !"

But if you determinè the call to refuse,
And venture the way of destruction to choose,
For hell, you will part with the blessings of life,
And then, if not now, you'll " Remember Lot's wife !"

PUBLICATIONS.

THE ADVENT REVIEW AND SABBATH HERALD;
Published Weekly, at C^t. Dollar a year, in Advance.

THE YOUTH'S INSTRUCTOR; Published Monthly,
at 25 cts. a year.

The Four Universal Monarchies of the Prophecy of
Daniel, and the Kingdom of God.—8 cts.

Sabbath Tracts, Volume I, Nos. 1, 2, 3 & 4—152
pp.—12½ cts.—postage 1 ct.

The Atonement—196 pp.—15 cts.

The Law of God—Testimony of Both Testaments—
132 pp.—10 cts.—postage 1 ct.

The Sanctuary and 2300 days by J. I. A.—10 cts.

Perpetuity of the Royal Law “ “ —5 cts.

Review of O R L Crozier—Sabbath “ “

Signs of the Times.—Spirit Manifestations—10 cts.

Time and Prophecy (Poem) 25 cts.—paper cov 15 cts.

A Word for the Sabbath (Poem)—5 cts.

The 2300 days and the Sanctuary—5 cts.

The History of the Sabbath—5 cts.

Why Don't you keep the Sabbath-day? Extracts
from Catholic Works—5 cts.

Solemn Appeal—Coming of Christ—3 cts.

True Picture—state of the Churches—16 pp.

The Sabbath by Elihu—16 pp.

Both Sides—on the Sabbath—16 pp.

The Sabbath by P. Miller Jr.—16 pp.

First day of the week not the Sabbath—16 pp.

Review of Objections to the Sabbath—16 pp.

Tracts of 16 pp. sent by Mail, and postage paid, at
\$1 per 100, in packages of not less than 50.

Sabbath and Advent Miscellany—seven of the above
Tracts bound in paper covers—10 cts.

Address James White, Rochester, N. Y. 109 Monroe
Street.

189

4621 TA

11-9-95 32188



Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries



1 1012 01210 8447

