

The Sabbath Recorder.

New York, May 27, 1858.

EDITED BY A COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD.

Charity and Fidelity.

To be truly and fully charitable to men at large, or secretaries in religion, and at the same time faithful to the truth, may be, and probably is a nice point to attain. It is also a nice point for persons to reach, namely, to distinguish between just criticism and uncharitableness. The moment we begin to make allowance for the errors of men, we are liable to be looked upon as being latitudinarian and unfaithful to the truth. And when we attempt to vindicate the claims of truth against the errors of men, we are by many at once regarded as destitute of charity. No doubt there is much of both of these evils. Our weakness is such that whether we undertake to be just, or generous, we are liable to over-do the matter. But suppose we are so accurate as to be both just and generous, there is such a lack of discrimination among men that we shall be likely to be thought to be, neither the one or the other.

The discourse of Gerrit Smith lately published in the Recorder, if we are not mistaken, furnishes an illustration of this point. He evidently aimed in that address to be faithful to truth, and really charitable to all varieties of religionists. And we think he made an evident approximation to those points; indeed, we think he came much nearer to them than is common for men to, in these times. Yet we presume the great majority of professors of religion will regard that production as extraordinarily prejudicial to truth, and invidious towards the mass of those who call themselves Christians. We have seen and heard things which have impressed us that it is so regarded by many.

We do not deny that the discourse of Mr. Smith may be quite vulnerable in some particulars, though we apprehend it would be more difficult to disprove the positions he takes than many suppose. A number of his points seem to us to need more explanation and definition. For instance, the office of reason—the atonement—and some others; we might mention the seeming unimportance which he attaches to a man's having correct views, and the great uncertainty which he apparently admits to exist in regard to truth on various topics. But then, who can deny, or who wishes to deny that men may be good, yes, truly pious, and deeply in error at the same time? The amount of knowledge which is absolutely necessary to goodness and true religion, is, doubtless, very small. Therefore we may, and ought to give credit for goodness wherever we see reasonable indications of it, though those giving such indications may be in great error. But does it follow that there is no damage in error because goodness may exist in connection with it, and in spite of it? Is it unnecessary or uncharitable to contend for truth because goodness may exist without it? Or, is it unfaithfulness to truth to admit the goodness we find because truth is not attained. To so temper our advocacy of truth, with liberality to men, as to do justice to both, and injustice to neither, is a most important and desirable consummation, and not a little difficult. But the difficulty is augmented by the fact that a large proportion of men will have it (if we admit their goodness at all,) that they are good enough, and that we shall demand nothing more of them. Or if we insist upon their needing improvement, then they hold that we utterly condemn them, and therefore do not deserve to be heard, or heeded. Such difficulties attend this department of the Christian enterprise, namely Christian reform.

Again, many seem to think there is no object in searching for, or adopting truth, beyond what is absolutely necessary to their salvation. They appear not to know that, in order for men to understand, and receive the great redemption readily, they need to look upon complete specimens of its enlightening and perfecting power, and that all error and sin found upon its professed friends are regarded by the unconverted as proof that Christianity is a fiction, and leads them to turn away from it. They do not seem to understand that the fullness and perfectness of their own salvation is measured by their attainments in the knowledge, love, and practice of truth, but are inclined to treat all attempts to correct their errors as needless agitation, or uncharitable crimination.

Law and Light.

We are receiving lessons of instruction from time to time of most momentous importance, and on no subject more abundantly than that of the Sabbath. The Sabbath Committee have made the most wonderful discovery of the age, viz: that there is a clear distinction between the suppression of Sunday desecrations and the promotion of Sabbath observance and consequently that law is not the only means of reformation, but that light has something to do in the matter also. Law for Sunday desecration and light for Sabbath observance—this is a new distinction, but a very good one; for we suppose light will expose the real object of the law, and destroy the foundation of human legislation for religious observances. Light is what is most wanted to show the real condition of things, and when it is sought earnestly, will be found a revealer of many stumbling blocks of human origin in the path of religious duty. The Journal of Commerce expatiates largely upon this subject, and has evidently become quite taken with the new distinction of the New York Spingler Institute

Committee. We are glad that light is likely to have some opportunity of shining into the dark recesses of Sabbath legislation, and upon Sunday ordinances. We hope light will be victorious in the new race. Law in the days of the Puritanic Westminster Assembly of Divines, was as much resorted to as at present to suppress Sunday desecration, and law in those days had all to do with Sabbath observance, light was not then invoked to the aid of the Great Parliamentary Committee, all the cry was law, LAW, LAW. And the howling of newspaper boys on Sunday is to be stopped, even now that light begins to shine upon our modern Westminster Assembly at the Spingler.

We will for the sake of lighting the path of our modern Divines, quote a paragraph from Neal. "The Puritanic Parliament" under the influence and Counsel of the Westminster Assembly, then in Session, "Began with the Sabbath creed on March 22, 1643, sent to the Lord Mayor of London, to desire him to put in execution the statutes for the due observation of the Lord's day; his lordship accordingly issued his precept the very next day to the Aldermen requiring them to give strict charge to the Church Warden and Constables, within their several wards, that from henceforth, "They do not permit or suffer any person or persons in time of Divine service, or at any time on the Lord's day, to be tipling in any tavern, inn, tobacco-shop, ale house or other vitnaling-house whatsoever, nor suffer any fruiterers or herb-woman to stand with fruit, herbs, or other victuals, or wares in any streets, lanes, or alleys, or other ways to put things to sale at any time of the day or in the evening of it, or any milk-woman to cry milk, nor to suffer any person to unlade any vessel of fruit or other goods, and carry them on shore, or to use any unlawful pastimes or exercises, and to give express charge to all inn keepers, taverns, cook-shops, ale-houses, etc., within their wards, not to entertain any guests to tipple, eat, drink, or take tobacco in their houses on the Lord's day; except inn-keepers, who may receive their ordinary guests or travelers, who come for the despatch of their necessary business; and if any persons offend in the premises, they are to be brought before the Lord Mayor, or one of his majesties justices of the peace, to be punished according to law."

"This order had a very considerable influence upon the City, which began to wear a different face of religion to what it had formerly done. May 5th, the book tolerating sports upon the Lord's day was ordered to be burnt by the hands of the Common hangman in Cheapside, and other places; and all persons having any copies in their hands were required to deliver them to one of the Sheriffs of London to be burnt."

"Next to the Lord's day, they had a particular regard to their monthly fast, April 21st, all constables, or their deputies, were ordered to repair to every house within their respective liberties the day before every public fast, and charge all persons strictly to observe it according to the said ordinance."

"And upon the day of public fast, they were enjoined to walk through their said liberties to search for persons who, either by following the work of their callings, or sitting in taverns, victualing or ale-houses, or any other ways should not duly observe the same; and to return their names to the Committee for examination that they might be proceeded against for contempt. The fast was observed the last Wednesday in every month, the public devotions continued with little or no intermission from nine in the morning to four in the afternoon, and as has been already observed with uncommon strictness and rigor."

Sabbath Controversy.

THEOPHILUS BRABOURNE.

In the year 1837, Dr. Gilbert Ironsides, published a book on the Sabbath question in answer to Brabourne and the Puritanic writers. He professed to have listened for a long time to the Sabbath Controversy between the three contending parties and at last concluded to write himself in defense of the principles of the Church of England on this subject. Ironsides in common with most other writers on the no Sabbath side of the controversy, admitted the strong claims of the Fourth Commandment, but contended that if that law was still in force it was only for the original Sabbath—the Seventh-day, but as it would not do to admit of a necessity so Jewish in its character, the law must have a forced construction so as to justify in some way existing practice, and even to be abolished and concealed among the rubbish of Jewish ruins.

Although Ironsides wrote but a year or two subsequent to the publication of Bishop White and Peter Heylin, and in support of the same views, yet his work is a much better logical specimen than either of its predecessors, he states the argument of his opponents, the Puritans, and Sabbatarians, with great fairness, and proceeds according to his title which is as follows: "Seven questions of the Sabbath briefly disputed after the manner of the schools wherein such cases, and scruples, as are incident to this subject, are cleared and resolved, by Gilbert Ironsides, B. D., Oxford, 1637."

This work is a small quarto of 324 pages, dedicated to Arch-Bishop Laud, and beginning with the statement of the Sabbatarian argument as deduced from their writers. We will insert the first Chapter, for the purpose of showing how well our opponents had informed themselves of the question at that day. The rest of the book is devoted to the denial of the premises as stated in this Chapter:

"As in the maladies of the body the symptoms are removed, when the root of the disease is purged out: so our errors (the only sickness of our minds) are reformed, when the foundations of which they are built are overthrown.

Our first question therefore is, when the Sabbath had its origin, whether it were commanded by Adam, and the Patriarchs immediately from God himself in the beginning, or only to the Israelites in the wilderness, by the ministry of Moses. The former tenet seemeth to have many evidences, both from Scripture, from reason, and from the authority of many of the learned.

"First from the words of Moses, 'So God blessed the Seventh-day, and sanctified it; because in it he rested from all his works, an argument may be framed thus. The resting of God from all his works, and the blessing and sanctifying of the Sabbath were contemporaneous; for when Moses saith, so God blessed, he refers us both to the reason why, and the time when, and the manner how the Sabbath was first instituted; but God rested from all his works immediately from the Creation, while Adam was yet in Paradise, therefore, immediately from the Creation God blessed and sanctified the Sabbath day."

"Secondly, in the same Scripture, God said, let there be lights in the firmament for signs, and for seasons, for days, and for years; in which place the word in the original signifieth holy convocations. From whence thus: as soon as there was sun and moon, there were times appointed for holy convocations, for this was one main end of their Creation. But the sun and moon were from the beginning, therefore from the beginning there were times appointed for holy convocations, therefore the Sabbath."

"Thirdly from the words of the Apostle, who seemeth to comment upon the words of Moses. As I have sworn in my wrath, if they shall enter into my rest, although the works were finished from the foundation. When the works were finished, a rest was appointed for God's people: but the works of God creating the world were finished from the foundation, Sabbath appointed God's people."

"Fourthly, Moses could not have spoken of the Sabbath unto the Israelites in the wilderness, as of a thing well known and practised, unless the Sabbath had been observed by them, and their fore-fathers, before their coming thither; but Moses doth thus speak unto them of the Sabbath in the wilderness, before the Law was given in Sinai: To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord, and the Seventh-day, which is the Sabbath. Whence note that first he calls it the holy Sabbath. Secondly, he saith it is the Sabbath, but not that it had been already instituted, it could neither be holy, nor be at all; therefore, etc."

"Fifthly, that which was observed by Noah, at the time of the flood, was doubtless observed by him before the flood, and so from the beginning, but the Sabbath was religiously observed by Noah, in the time of the flood. For having sent out the dove, and she returning, finding no rest for the sole of her foot, he abode other seven days, and afterward other seven days there, etc."

"Sixthly, that which Job, and his children observed, was long in use before Israel came into the wilderness, for all agree, that Job was descended either from Shem or from Nahor, or from Ishmael, and Origen affirms that Moses wrote that story; but Job and his children kept holy the Sabbath day, for there was a day, (saith the text) wherein came the sons of God to present themselves before the Lord, these sons of God are Job and his children, and this day the Sabbath (saith Pineda the Jesuit), therefore, etc."

"Seventhly, that which hath ever been the boundary of the week, was ever from the beginning: but the Sabbath hath ever been the boundary of the week, for time hath ever been divided by weeks, therefore the Sabbath hath ever been from the beginning."

"Eighthly, God left not Adam, and the Patriarchs without any necessary instructions, (for God never fails in necessities,) but the Sabbath contained matter of necessary instructions for Adam, and the Patriarchs, both in regard of their faith, in the article of the creation of the world in fixed days, and in respect of their hope, that there remained a rest for them in God's kingdom: Therefore God left them not without the ordinance of the Sabbath."

"Ninthly, to whom God appointed public worship, to them he appointed the time of worship, which is the Sabbath: but God appointed to Adam, and the Patriarchs public worship, for men called on the name of the Lord, neither was this any will-worship of their own. Therefore, etc."

"Lastly, the testimony of many of the learned. Philo, the Jew saith, that this feast did appertain to all nations from the beginning. Mr. Broughton affirms that the Fathers observed it before Moses. Calvin saith that the blessing of the Seventh-day was a solemn consecration, whereby God laid claim to the studies and employments of men for himself upon the Seventh-day. And again, God (saith he) did two things at the beginning, first he rested, then he blessed that rest, that it might be holy amongst all men throughout their generations. Unto this, Catharines, Alcuins and many of the Popish school subscribe. Zanchi us affirms as probable, that Adam kept the first Seventh-day in Paradise, and that the second person in the Trinity took upon him the shape of a man, and instructed him and his wife upon that day in the works of the creation."

We have before us the first number of "The Witness," a weekly journal, devoted to Religion, Temperance, Free-labor and the elevation of the masses. It is published at 201 Third Avenue, N. Y. J. B. Dunn and Thos. Fraser, editors.

This journal seems to be another outgrowth of the prevailing religious interest of the present times. Its tone is high in favor of religion and reform.

Among the things made prominent in its prospectus we find the following:

"Believing—that the sanctity of ONE DAY OF REST in every seven, is for granting toil, a heaven-ordained safeguard against potent imposition, and that the maintenance of this Sabbath Rest is for labor a guarantee that other times, in addition, must be granted, to afford opportunity for moral, healthful and intellectual recreation, such as by a weekly half-holiday on every Saturday, as has lately been instituted in Scotland: To this we shall bear witness."

"Believing—that all places of industry and business should be early closed, to allow due relaxation to the jaded energies, and permit reasonable seasons for Christian duty, family fellowship, mental culture, and physical refreshment: To these we shall bear witness."

So, instead of one seventh part of time being the measure of our Sabbath, we are to have three fourteenths. But this is no new thing in Scotland. It is an old one revived—

which had its origin in the lingering regard for the Seventh-day as the Sabbath that still remained when Christianity came to prevail in Scotland.—(See Carlow's Defense of the Sabbath, chap. vi.)

We are quite willing that the proposition to hallow a part of the Seventh-day should succeed: and when our friends get ready for it, we will strike hands with them in its entire sanctification.

The Witness has an editorial of considerable length on this half-holiday point; and as the paper appears to be ably edited, and has the aid of quite a list of influential contributors, among the clergy, and others, we hope they, and we, may more than realize their highest expectations respecting true Sabbath reform, and all the good things which they aim to promote.

SUNDAY LEGISLATION.—The memorial against crying newspapers in the streets on Sunday, came up recently before the Police Board and considerable discussion took place upon it, or rather, on Mr. Bowen's motion to direct the General Superintendent to enforce the law prohibiting the sale of wares and merchandise on Sunday.

Messrs. Ney and Stillman reminded the Board of the rights of those who observe the Seventh-day, and the propriety of their regarding them in their action on that subject. Finally, after several attempts to dispose of the matter without effect Mr. Bowen moved, that the General Superintendent be directed to enforce the laws and ordinances prohibiting the sale of wares and merchandise on Sunday, which was carried; Mr. Ney and Mr. Stillman voting in favor of a motion of the latter gentleman to lay it on the table.

Those who shall be bold enough to do any business of such sort on Sunday, about these days, may look out for vexation.

WINE FOR THE COMMUNION.—We do not know as it is a matter of sufficient interest to our churches to justify us in saying much more on the subject, but we will just say that we think the wine which Dr. J. Croft has on hand, manufactured by himself for that purpose from the grape, would give our people, or others, good satisfaction if they would try it. It would be found also an excellent article in sickness. They can address him at this office.

THE EASTERN ASSOCIATION.—We have not received any account of the late doings of that body as we hoped to in time for this number of the Recorder, but expect to give it to our readers next week.

Communications.

For the Sabbath Recorder.

W. H. ROGERS:

DEAR BROTHER,—Pardon my want of order in introducing in this article a passage from Neh. ix. 14, in further confirmation of my views of the existence of the Sabbath before the Mosaic dispensation, which reads thus: "And madest known unto them (the Jews) thy holy Sabbath." I think the form of expression is perfect as showing the Sabbath previously existed.

Your second question is as follows: "When the interchangeable expressions, 'law of God,' 'law of Moses,' 'the law,' are used in the Bible, what evidence is there that they do not embrace all God's requirements, of which Moses was the mediator without any such distinction as 'moral law' and 'ceremonial law.' For example, in such passages as Gal. iii. 19, 24, what evidence is there that Paul does not mean by 'the law,' all the commandments of which Moses was the mediator, just as by the 'law of liberty,' 'the law of the spirit,' in Jas. i. 25. Rom. viii. 2, the writers mean all the divine precepts of which Jesus Christ was the mediator?"

Answer 1. I think the terms, "the law of God," "the law of Moses," "the law," etc., are not strictly interchangeable, i. e., you may not always, when one occurs, put in its place either of the others, e. g., Matt. v. 17: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets, I am not come to destroy but to fulfill." Insert for "the law" in this passage, "the law of Moses," and you have Christ asserting that he did not come to do what by universal consent he did come to do, namely, to do away or abrogate the law of Moses.

Answer 2. I am not aware that Moses was strictly the mediator of any "law," but of a covenant—a dispensation. It may indeed be allowable to use the term "law" in a large sense, such as makes it describe the idea of a "dispensation," or its equivalent, but I think not otherwise. In this sense it is used in Heb. x. 1, and in several other instances.

Answer 3. I think the passage you have quoted, (Rom. viii. 2,) primarily has no preceptive character, but has reference to the sinners of the Gospel to pardon and free the him on account of his sins, and for this reason is called the "spirit of life in Christ Jesus." That the "spirit of life" mentioned is the true source of obedience in the children of God, I make no doubt, and that this idea, as a consequence, is contained in the passage is unquestionably true. The passage in James i. 25, I take to be somewhat different in its construction, wherein the Gospel is spoken of as a rule of action, and is called a law of "liberty" not only because it frees from guilt, but also because it furnishes the disposition and power to live in conformity to the divine precepts according to Ps. cxix. 45: "I will walk at liberty, for I seek thy precepts." John viii. 32: "And ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

Answer 4. I readily grant that the terms, "moral" and "ceremonial" are not found in the Gospel, but that there is such a distinction made in the New Testament as justifies the use of these terms, I believe. Still I am by no means so partial to these terms as to be unwilling to exchange them for such as will better express the Scripture sense when such terms are furnished.

But I have said that the Scriptures indicate a distinction in the use of the terms, "law of God," "law of Moses," "the law," etc. In Eph. ii. 14, Paul says, "for he is our peace who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us, having abolished in his flesh the enmity even

the law of commandments contained in ordinances for to make in himself of twain one new out of the handwriting of ordinances that was it out of the way, nailing it to his cross." It will be seen that the Apostle particularly decried what law was "taken away" by Christ. It was the law of commandments contained in ordinances, which ordinances (rites or ceremonies, see margin,) Paul tells us (Heb. ix. 10) were imposed until the time of "reformation." Here then is a law which Paul calls a "law of commandments"—a handwriting of ordinances—which he says Christ "took away," but in Matt. v. 17, you have what Christ calls "the law," which he says he came not to abolish or destroy, but to "fulfill." Now if "the law" in both these passages mean precisely the same thing, then you have this contradiction between Christ and Paul, one saying he came to destroy or take away what the other says he did not come to destroy or take away. To avoid this contradiction is easy and natural, if we make a difference in the character of the laws spoken of, and happily Paul has furnished us with an idea of the nature of this difference by calling one of them "the law of commandments contained in ordinances." Again James says, ii. 8: "If ye fulfill the royal law according to the Scriptures, 'thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself,' ye do well," quoting the summary of the second table of the decalogue given by Moses, (Lev. xix. 18,) and tells us that those who would fare well when judged by the law of "liberty" should keep the precepts of this law. See James ii. 8—12, as follows: "If ye fulfill the royal law according to the Scriptures, (of the Old Testament, for the New was not written yet,) Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, ye do well, but if ye have respect to persons ye commit sin and are convicted of the law as transgressors. For whoever shall keep the whole law and yet offend in one point he is guilty of all. For he that said, do not commit adultery said also, do not kill. Now thou art become a transgressor of the law. So speak ye and so do as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty." A great number of texts might be quoted to show that the idea of a difference in the character of the terms, "the law of God," "the law of Moses," "the law," etc., is such as justifies the use of discriminating language such as "moral," "ceremonial," and the like, when the nature of the several passages is under consideration, but those quoted I think amply sufficient for this purpose.

I have now passed briefly over your second series of questions; but the real question of difficulty, namely, in what sense, if any, do the Scriptures teach the obligatoriness of the decalogue under the New Testament dispensation? is not fully reached. Let us then proceed to this question, and may God give us light.

But let us premise. Man is possessed of moral faculties, and therefore is a subject of moral government. Under whatever dispensation then he may live, he is a subject of moral law, and this moral law must always be the same, (in itself,) unless we may suppose that changes of relations may occasion modifications in the law. In the absence of a divine revelation this law is called the law of nature, i. e., whatever may be discovered by our natural or instinctive sense of right, and wrought out on our reason, is to us the moral law. But it is manifest that through the derangement of our natures, both physical and moral, our perceptions of right and wrong are quite limited. But our instincts are incapable of teaching us anything as to God's purposes of mercy toward us in our fallen state, and hence a necessity for a revelation. But that revelation whenever made, would be exceedingly deficient if it did not contain both the idea of moral law and God's purposes of mercy. But further, when the Jews were taken into favor, and God made a covenant with them, they sustained to him a double relation. 1. Creature relation. 2. Covenant relation. Now it was in their relation as creatures that they were subjects of moral government, i. e., their moral character did not grow out of the covenant that God incorporated into that covenant, was nevertheless antecedent to it, and must necessarily continue beyond it, provided man continues a moral being.

But I said the Jews were taken into covenant with God, and have also said that in this covenant they were treated as moral beings. But there were other things contained in the covenant. 1. The Jews were God's people—nation—and he their king. 2. They were made the repositories of his purposes of mercy and grace in Christ Jesus, both toward them and the race, and these purposes of mercy were revealed both in gracious promises and a system of admulative sacrifices and offerings. But as these sacrifices and offerings were shadowy, it follows that when Christ the substance was sacrificed, they passed away. Also, whatever constituted the middle wall of partition between Jews and Gentiles was broken down. But, however, it might have been with other things, were the commandments of the decalogue typical in any such sense as that they referred to the passion of Christ? This will not be claimed. Again, were they in any just sense against us, or their observance burdensome? Indeed is not the welfare of society dependent upon their proper observance? Surely so. It is nevertheless admitted that in some sense the decalogue must partake of the nature of the dispensation with which it is connected, and in so much that it does partake of that nature must, on the abolition of the dispensation, undergo a change. If this reasoning is correct, then when the sentiments embodied in the decalogue were collected, and so embodied in the same ratio that the Mosaic dispensation excelled the preceding one, and I trust that it will be found in the sequel, that on being recognized by the Christian dispensation, they also arose to a dignity equal to their new relation.

But let us return to the Mosaic dispensation and inquire into its spirit and the relation of the decalogue to it. 1. As to the spirit and power of the dispensation, it is manifest that it did not contain in itself the power to save the sinner, but only pointed to one that could. But it did possess the power to condemn. Of this its entire system of sacrifices is in proof.

2. But the decalogue was the basis or foundation law of that system which is manifest by the form in which it was given as well by the whole tenor of both testaments. But this law could not give life to the one who violated it, nor could the dispensation of which it was at once the foundation and a member. All that were saved under that dispensation were saved by faith in him who was the mediator of a better covenant, and established upon better promises, and hence the necessity of the new covenant. Accordingly, in Jer. xxxi. 31—34, we have a promise as follows: "Behold the

days come saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt, (which my hand unto them, saith the Lord,) but this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts and they shall be my people. And they shall every man his neighbor saying, know the Lord for they shall all know me from the least unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord, for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sins no more." This is a most important passage touching the character of the new covenant. For instance, the old covenant was written upon tables of stone, (see Exod. xxxii. 12; Deut. ix. 10,) but in the new the law is to be written on the heart. Ezek. xl. 10, 11: "And I will give you one heart and I will put a new spirit within you, and I will take away the stony heart out of their flesh, and will give them an heart of flesh, that they may walk in my statutes, and keep mine ordinances and do them, and they shall be my people and I will be their God." 2 Cor. iii. 3: "Forasmuch as ye are manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ, ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God, not in tables of stone, but in fleshy tables of the heart." Here then is brought to light the great doctrine of the new birth so much insisted on by the Great Teacher. But I will not anticipate, but pass to the New Testament.

We now come to the words of the heavenly messenger, whose words are "spirit and life," (Jno. vi. 63,) and see how he introduces his new doctrine, wherein he goes beyond the letter of the law to its spirit, as in his sermon on the mount, (Matt. v. vi, vii.) But scarcely had he begun when he availed the people by saying: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets, I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill." As if he had said, "do not imagine that I am come to lower the standard of morals, but I go beyond mere action, I reach to the thoughts and purposes of the heart! Again, when Jesus was giving the sum of all true religion, (Matt. xxii. 37—40,) he said: "Thou shalt love the Lord with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind, this is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." And yet the Saviour was only enforcing here an epitome of the two tables of the decalogue, as Deut. vi. 5; x. 12, 13; Lev. xix. 18; Rom. xiii. 8, 9, 10.

Having heard Jesus so distinctly on this subject we might here rest, but being aware that difficulty is found with some minds in reconciling this view with some other portions of the New Testament especially certain passages in the epistles of Paul further attention may be required. We will commence with his letter to the Romans, in which the great question of justification by faith, and of salvation by grace are discussed. In the first and second chapters it is shown that both Gentiles and Jews were under condemnation, and therefore neither of them could be saved by the law, for by it they were condemned. He then introduces the doctrine of God's plan of justifying (or making righteous) sinners by faith. But the question here arises if men are justified by faith without the deeds of the law, then is not the law made void? to which the Apostles answers, "God forbid! by this the law is established." Perhaps I cannot better express my mind as to how the law is established by the doctrine of justification by faith, than by quoting a note on this text, (Rom. iii. 31,) by Mr. Barnes. He says, "Yea, we establish the law." By the doctrine of justification, by faith, by this scheme of treating men as righteous, the moral law is confirmed, its obligation is enforced, obedience to it secured. This is done in the following manner:

1. God showed respect to it, in being unwilling to pardon sinners without an atonement. He showed that it could not be violated with impunity, that he was resolved to fulfill its threatenings. 2. Jesus Christ came to magnify it, and to make it honorable. He showed respect to it in his life, and he died to show that God was determined to inflict its penalty. 3. The plan of justification by faith leads to an observance of the law. The sinner sees the evil of transgression. He sees the respect which God has shown to the law. He gives his heart to God, and yields himself to obey his law. All the sentiments that arise from the conviction of sin that flow from gratitude for mercies, that spring from love to God, all his views of the sacredness of the law, prompt him to yield obedience to it. The fact that Christ endured such sufferings to show the evil of violating the law is one of the strongest motives prompting to obedience. We do not readily repeat that which overweighs our best friends in calamity, and we are brought to hate that which inflicted such woes on the Saviour's soul. * * * And one of the chief glories of the plan of salvation is that while it justifies the sinner it brings a new set of influences from heaven, more tender and mighty than can be drawn from any other source to produce obedience to the law of God."

Passing on to the seventh chapter, the Apostle shows in the clearest manner why the sinner should not be held to the law as a ground of justification, because of the inability of the unrenewed heart to obey the law, on account of the carnality of the former and the spirituality of the latter; but does show in the eighth chapter that when the heart is made spiritual by Jesus Christ being freed from condemnation, the righteousness of this spiritual law is fulfilled by those who are renewed. It is the carnal mind that is not subject to the law of God while the spiritual mind is.

days come saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt, (which my hand unto them, saith the Lord,) but this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts and they shall be my people. And they shall every man his neighbor saying, know the Lord for they shall all know me from the least unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord, for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sins no more." This is a most important passage touching the character of the new covenant. For instance, the old covenant was written upon tables of stone, (see Exod. xxxii. 12; Deut. ix. 10,) but in the new the law is to be written on the heart. Ezek. xl. 10, 11: "And I will give you one heart and I will put a new spirit within you, and I will take away the stony heart out of their flesh, and will give them an heart of flesh, that they may walk in my statutes, and keep mine ordinances and do them, and they shall be my people and I will be their God." 2 Cor. iii. 3: "Forasmuch as ye are manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ, ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God, not in tables of stone, but in fleshy tables of the heart." Here then is brought to light the great doctrine of the new birth so much insisted on by the Great Teacher. But I will not anticipate, but pass to the New Testament.

We now come to the words of the heavenly messenger, whose words are "spirit and life," (Jno. vi. 63,) and see how he introduces his new doctrine, wherein he goes beyond the letter of the law to its spirit, as in his sermon on the mount, (Matt. v. vi, vii.) But scarcely had he begun when he availed the people by saying: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets, I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill." As if he had said, "do not imagine that I am come to lower the standard of morals, but I go beyond mere action, I reach to the thoughts and purposes of the heart! Again, when Jesus was giving the sum of all true religion, (Matt. xxii. 37—40,) he said: "Thou shalt love the Lord with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind, this is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." And yet the Saviour was only enforcing here an epitome of the two tables of the decalogue, as Deut. vi. 5; x. 12, 13; Lev. xix. 18; Rom. xiii. 8, 9, 10.

Having heard Jesus so distinctly on this subject we might here rest, but being aware that difficulty is found with some minds in reconciling this view with some other portions of the New Testament especially certain passages in the epistles of Paul further attention may be required. We will commence with his letter to the Romans, in which the great question of justification by faith, and of salvation by grace are discussed. In the first and second chapters it is shown that both Gentiles and Jews were under condemnation, and therefore neither of them could be saved by the law, for by it they were condemned. He then introduces the doctrine of God's plan of justifying (or making righteous) sinners by faith. But the question here arises if men are justified by faith without the deeds of the law, then is not the law made void? to which the Apostles answers, "God forbid! by this the law is established." Perhaps I cannot better express my mind as to how the law is established by the doctrine of justification by faith, than by quoting a note on this text, (Rom. iii. 31,) by Mr. Barnes. He says, "Yea, we establish the law." By the doctrine of justification, by faith, by this scheme of treating men as righteous, the moral law is confirmed, its obligation is enforced, obedience to it secured. This is done in the following manner:

1. God showed respect to it, in being unwilling to pardon sinners without an atonement. He showed that it could not be violated with impunity, that he was resolved to fulfill its threatenings. 2. Jesus Christ came to magnify it, and to make it honorable. He showed respect to it in his life, and he died to show that God was determined to inflict its penalty. 3. The plan of justification by faith leads to an observance of the law. The sinner sees the evil of transgression. He sees the respect which God has shown to the law. He gives his heart to God, and yields himself to obey his law. All the sentiments that arise from the conviction of sin that flow from gratitude for mercies, that spring from love to God, all his views of the sacredness of the law, prompt him to yield obedience to it. The fact that Christ endured such sufferings to show the evil of violating the law is one of the strongest motives prompting to obedience. We do not readily repeat that which overweighs our best friends in calamity, and we are brought to hate that which inflicted such woes on the Saviour's soul. * * * And one of the chief glories of the plan of salvation is that while it justifies the sinner it brings a new set of influences from heaven, more tender and mighty than can be drawn from any other source to produce obedience to the law of God."

Passing on to the seventh chapter, the Apostle shows in the clearest manner why the sinner should not be held to the law as a ground of justification, because of the inability of the unrenewed heart to obey the law, on account of the carnality of the former and the spirituality of the latter; but does show in the eighth chapter that when the heart is made spiritual by Jesus Christ being freed from condemnation, the righteousness of this spiritual law is fulfilled by those who are renewed. It is the carnal mind that is not subject to the law of God while the spiritual mind is.

I take it then that the law of God is to the unrenewed man a law of bondage, but to the renewed man a law of liberty. N. V. HULL. Alfred Center, May 28, 1858.

For the Sabbath Recorder.

Native Holiness.

"In those days they shall say no more: The fathers have eaten a sour grape, and the children's teeth are set on edge. But every on shall die for his own iniquity: every man that eateth the sour grape his teeth shall be set on edge."—Jere. xxxi. 29.

"Suffer little children to come unto me (said the Saviour) and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God."

Being some acquainted with the doctrine, and many of the ministers of the "Seventh-day Baptists" for the last sixty years, and in seeing some late articles in the Recorder, entitled "Native Depravity," I am almost ready to repeat the question, already asked,

Miscellaneous.

The Pastor of the Desert.

The term "desert," as is well known to all students of French Protestant history, was formerly applied to those wild and secluded spots in the southern districts of France, to which the children of the Reformation were driven by the persecuting edicts of successive monarchs subsequent to the never-to-be-forgotten massacre of St. Bartholomew. Here, like the Scottish Covenanters in the seventeenth century, in lonely caverns, in dark ravines, in mountain gorges, and in dense woods, the faithful met in secrecy and fear, and generally at midnight hours, to worship God, and to comfort and strengthen each other in the faith that cost them so dear. Generation after generation were born, lived, and died here, under the ban of the Romish church and the proscription of the State. They were treated as social outlaws and religious recusants. Many a child could count an ancestry of martyrs. Their baptism was one of blood; their nursery that of fear and danger; their remotest earthly prospect was the dungeon, the galleys, the stake, or the assassinating sword of the dragon.

preferred losing my life by quitting it, to saving myself and running the chance of rendering my person and my ministry ridiculous. God had pity upon me; I escaped." "Have you never been taken?" asked Helvetius. "Should I be here?" "And you never will be?" "O! let us leave the future; and yet, nevertheless, I have often said the same thing to myself. Danger makes us fatalists. One would say that by respecting you often it seems bound to respect you again. At this rate no soldier escaped from twenty battles would be more sure than myself of dying peacefully in his bed. But, once more, let us leave the future; the future will be—what God chooses." He paused for a moment. They looked at him in silence. "And why?" resumed he, "should God be bound to let me finish my course in peace? If he has called me to daily sacrifices, these sacrifices have had their daily reward. Has not God remunerated me largely, bountifully, by the very good that he has given me the means and the courage to do? The blessings of those that I have consoled and strengthened, the tears of joy that I have seen flow at sight of me—these are inestimable treasures in my past life that are worth, far more than worth, the little that I have done to earn them.

cent together two months, six months beforehand; all must be informed, and yet nothing must transpire. If we have wind of any hostile project, all must be warned in time, lest some, as has often been the case, should find soldiers where they expected to meet their brethren. Hence an organization, which might be considered as cleverly wroten together, but which has influence of danger alone. If we sometimes require months to combine the plan of an assembly, sometimes also, in a few hours, it is convoked and concluded. Often arriving unexpectedly in some one of our villages, I have had but a word to say, in order to gather around me, in some retired valley, one or two thousand hearers. These convocations are made and ramified with perfect order; the choice of the place of meeting, the posts of the sentinels, all is regulated with admirable art, or rather instinct.

spreading contagion far and wide, which the most weary traveler cannot avoid. It is the heart searching dagger of the assassin. It is the poisoned arrow whose wound is incurable. It is as fatal as the sting of the most deadly asprey; and its employment, innocence its prey, and ruin its sport.

spreading contagion far and wide, which the most weary traveler cannot avoid. It is the heart searching dagger of the assassin. It is the poisoned arrow whose wound is incurable. It is as fatal as the sting of the most deadly asprey; and its employment, innocence its prey, and ruin its sport.

spreading contagion far and wide, which the most weary traveler cannot avoid. It is the heart searching dagger of the assassin. It is the poisoned arrow whose wound is incurable. It is as fatal as the sting of the most deadly asprey; and its employment, innocence its prey, and ruin its sport.

But I should really neither know where to begin nor where to end," said Rabant. After a brief pause, he remarked: "For twenty years past, I have hardly ever sat down to table without making sure how and by what issue I could make my escape. It is well, I did so; for several times the house has been surrounded; several times I have been obliged to disappear before the meal was over. Very rarely could I tell where and with whom I should dine on the morrow. To be brief, the list of the places where I have dined would give you the geography of all the south of the kingdom—towns, villages and hamlets. In the first I took the name of Paul, Dennis, Pastourel, Theophilus, Theo, Tuabar; it is under this name, the anagram of Rabant, that I have come to Paris. Thus, gentlemen, if ever you should happen to name me, be so good as not to forget that it is Mr. Tuabar who has had the honor of supping with you this evening. Many times I have had that of dining with the officers of the horse patrol, with priests and clerks of the administration. I have heard them speaking of me, of my never-ending journeys, of my assurance in braving them, and of my good fortune in eluding them.

But our real, our great festivals, are our meetings in the Desert. On this head our history is well enough known; I could tell you nothing that you are not acquainted with. What I can assure you, however, is, that all that is related of them is rather within than beyond the truth. One must have lived amongst us, to have an idea what a meeting is to our people, where we are to have a pastor, to pray, to sing, to be edified together. Never was a fete at Versailles the object of more ambition, impatience, or arrangement, than is one of these humble assemblies, which may, perhaps, lead the pastor to the scaffold, the men to the galleys, the women to prison, or into convents for life. Sometimes we begin to con-

ten in Austria, fourteen in Africa, twenty-four in Spain, twenty-six in Portugal, thirty in Asia, sixty-five in Belgium, fifty in Russia and Poland, eighty-five in Denmark, three hundred and fifty in the Germanic States, five hundred in Great Britain and Ireland, and two thousand in the United States. Total, 3,154. From the foregoing it will be seen that in the United States are issued nearly twice as many as in all other nations combined.

Slender.—Against slender there is no defense. Hell cannot boast so foul a fiend, nor man deplora so foul a foe. It stabs with a smile. It is a pestilence walking in darkness, soon as a horse comes in.

Slender.—Against slender there is no defense. Hell cannot boast so foul a fiend, nor man deplora so foul a foe. It stabs with a smile. It is a pestilence walking in darkness, soon as a horse comes in.

Slender.—Against slender there is no defense. Hell cannot boast so foul a fiend, nor man deplora so foul a foe. It stabs with a smile. It is a pestilence walking in darkness, soon as a horse comes in.

Slender.—Against slender there is no defense. Hell cannot boast so foul a fiend, nor man deplora so foul a foe. It stabs with a smile. It is a pestilence walking in darkness, soon as a horse comes in.

Slender.—Against slender there is no defense. Hell cannot boast so foul a fiend, nor man deplora so foul a foe. It stabs with a smile. It is a pestilence walking in darkness, soon as a horse comes in.

Slender.—Against slender there is no defense. Hell cannot boast so foul a fiend, nor man deplora so foul a foe. It stabs with a smile. It is a pestilence walking in darkness, soon as a horse comes in.

Slender.—Against slender there is no defense. Hell cannot boast so foul a fiend, nor man deplora so foul a foe. It stabs with a smile. It is a pestilence walking in darkness, soon as a horse comes in.

Slender.—Against slender there is no defense. Hell cannot boast so foul a fiend, nor man deplora so foul a foe. It stabs with a smile. It is a pestilence walking in darkness, soon as a horse comes in.

Slender.—Against slender there is no defense. Hell cannot boast so foul a fiend, nor man deplora so foul a foe. It stabs with a smile. It is a pestilence walking in darkness, soon as a horse comes in.

Slender.—Against slender there is no defense. Hell cannot boast so foul a fiend, nor man deplora so foul a foe. It stabs with a smile. It is a pestilence walking in darkness, soon as a horse comes in.

Slender.—Against slender there is no defense. Hell cannot boast so foul a fiend, nor man deplora so foul a foe. It stabs with a smile. It is a pestilence walking in darkness, soon as a horse comes in.

Slender.—Against slender there is no defense. Hell cannot boast so foul a fiend, nor man deplora so foul a foe. It stabs with a smile. It is a pestilence walking in darkness, soon as a horse comes in.

Slender.—Against slender there is no defense. Hell cannot boast so foul a fiend, nor man deplora so foul a foe. It stabs with a smile. It is a pestilence walking in darkness, soon as a horse comes in.

Slender.—Against slender there is no defense. Hell cannot boast so foul a fiend, nor man deplora so foul a foe. It stabs with a smile. It is a pestilence walking in darkness, soon as a horse comes in.

Slender.—Against slender there is no defense. Hell cannot boast so foul a fiend, nor man deplora so foul a foe. It stabs with a smile. It is a pestilence walking in darkness, soon as a horse comes in.

Slender.—Against slender there is no defense. Hell cannot boast so foul a fiend, nor man deplora so foul a foe. It stabs with a smile. It is a pestilence walking in darkness, soon as a horse comes in.

Slender.—Against slender there is no defense. Hell cannot boast so foul a fiend, nor man deplora so foul a foe. It stabs with a smile. It is a pestilence walking in darkness, soon as a horse comes in.

Slender.—Against slender there is no defense. Hell cannot boast so foul a fiend, nor man deplora so foul a foe. It stabs with a smile. It is a pestilence walking in darkness, soon as a horse comes in.

Slender.—Against slender there is no defense. Hell cannot boast so foul a fiend, nor man deplora so foul a foe. It stabs with a smile. It is a pestilence walking in darkness, soon as a horse comes in.

Slender.—Against slender there is no defense. Hell cannot boast so foul a fiend, nor man deplora so foul a foe. It stabs with a smile. It is a pestilence walking in darkness, soon as a horse comes in.

Slender.—Against slender there is no defense. Hell cannot boast so foul a fiend, nor man deplora so foul a foe. It stabs with a smile. It is a pestilence walking in darkness, soon as a horse comes in.

Slender.—Against slender there is no defense. Hell cannot boast so foul a fiend, nor man deplora so foul a foe. It stabs with a smile. It is a pestilence walking in darkness, soon as a horse comes in.

Slender.—Against slender there is no defense. Hell cannot boast so foul a fiend, nor man deplora so foul a foe. It stabs with a smile. It is a pestilence walking in darkness, soon as a horse comes in.

Slender.—Against slender there is no defense. Hell cannot boast so foul a fiend, nor man deplora so foul a foe. It stabs with a smile. It is a pestilence walking in darkness, soon as a horse comes in.

Slender.—Against slender there is no defense. Hell cannot boast so foul a fiend, nor man deplora so foul a foe. It stabs with a smile. It is a pestilence walking in darkness, soon as a horse comes in.

Slender.—Against slender there is no defense. Hell cannot boast so foul a fiend, nor man deplora so foul a foe. It stabs with a smile. It is a pestilence walking in darkness, soon as a horse comes in.

Slender.—Against slender there is no defense. Hell cannot boast so foul a fiend, nor man deplora so foul a foe. It stabs with a smile. It is a pestilence walking in darkness, soon as a horse comes in.

Slender.—Against slender there is no defense. Hell cannot boast so foul a fiend, nor man deplora so foul a foe. It stabs with a smile. It is a pestilence walking in darkness, soon as a horse comes in.

Slender.—Against slender there is no defense. Hell cannot boast so foul a fiend, nor man deplora so foul a foe. It stabs with a smile. It is a pestilence walking in darkness, soon as a horse comes in.

Slender.—Against slender there is no defense. Hell cannot boast so foul a fiend, nor man deplora so foul a foe. It stabs with a smile. It is a pestilence walking in darkness, soon as a horse comes in.

Slender.—Against slender there is no defense. Hell cannot boast so foul a fiend, nor man deplora so foul a foe. It stabs with a smile. It is a pestilence walking in darkness, soon as a horse comes in.

Slender.—Against slender there is no defense. Hell cannot boast so foul a fiend, nor man deplora so foul a foe. It stabs with a smile. It is a pestilence walking in darkness, soon as a horse comes in.

Slender.—Against slender there is no defense. Hell cannot boast so foul a fiend, nor man deplora so foul a foe. It stabs with a smile. It is a pestilence walking in darkness, soon as a horse comes in.