

The Sabbath Recorder

ALBANY, N. Y., FRIDAY, FEB. 27, 1873.

N. Y. HULL, - - - - - EDITOR.

FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald, in noticing our strictures on a certain feature of its arguments on future punishment, replies as follows:

That our arguments will not affect what is revealed on this question, is true; and this is not our object. But we do trust they may affect the views of some, leading them to believe what is revealed, instead of bowing as the majority do, to the voice of tradition, or the voice of the heathen mythology, in this matter. And this is the more needful, because this very doctrine of eternal misery tends to render the cross of Christ of none effect. The gospel itself loses its power with men who are compelled to view God through a mist of gloom, and with a distorted idea of his character, as really as the horrible images of paganism give us a distorted idea of his form.

But when the true doctrine of the destiny of the sinner is set forth, placing the character of God, clearing his way of difficulties, and showing the great stumbling block from the path of infidelity, then we can take our stand at the cross of Christ, and, with all confidence and earnestness, plead with the sinner to accept the blessings which the Saviour has to bestow.

The quotations we give in No. 6 from believers in the popular view were not designed to convey the idea that they gave utterance to those sentiments to disprove the idea of eternal misery; we gave them only to show the difficulties under which they labor, and to suggest the query whether they were correct, on our reason, unless held down by chain and staple, instantly revolting, had not better be very carefully examined in the light of the Scriptures, before we make them responsible for it. We do not urge the fearful nature of future punishment as any argument against it, but when it is carried to the extent above indicated, before we urge so extreme a view, it is best to be very well convinced that the Bible teaches it.

What the *Recorder's* ideas of the popular view are, we know. If they accord with the generally received view, it can not, with any very good grace, draw invidious comparisons between its own conceptions, and all the "brimstone" and "stench" which our view involves. We do not care what is characteristic of scriptural doctrine, as they can rest on the very phraseology which inspiration has seen fit to use. And so here we have no wish and no occasion to say more than the Bible says. It uses on this point the following explicit language:

2 Pet. 3: 7: "The heavens and earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men. Verse 10-12: "But the Lord will come as a thief in the night, in which the heavens shall pass with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up. Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be? In all things, wherein the heavens and earth are dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat?"

This is the perdition of ungodly men, and the hell in which we are to believe. And in this fiery doom, the wicked find themselves involved because they did not flee in time to the ark, Christ Jesus, as the antediluvian perished in the waters of the flood because they sought not safety in the ark of God. And in this fiery ordeal, which is to be the most lowest depth to which sin has struck its pollution or the curse its scar, the wicked will certainly be consumed, devoured, destroyed, and resolved into the original elements of their being; for out of it the earth is to come, and the new heaven and the everlasting abode of the righteous.

The question of the destiny of the wicked is one of the living, vital questions of the day. God who adapts his truths to the want of every age, has caused the light to shine forth gloriously here, at this time, to meet and expose the most terrible deception that Satan has ever sprung upon the world. Before this light, spiritualism with its foul brood flees away. Purgatory, saint worship, universalism, and a host of other errors all go down. If the *Recorder* thinks it can touch this question, the advancing light of truth and the quickened thought of this generation will surely ignore it. It may appeal with all eloquence from the cross, but if it disregards this question in which is involved the character of God, and the scope of the plan of salvation, its appeals will fall on callous hearts and deadened ears.

To this we answer: 1. On the nature and duration of future punishment, we rely wholly on the statements of the New Testament, availing ourselves for the definition of the terms employed in stating it of all the aids within our reach.

2. We do not bow to the "dicta of heathen mythology in this matter." We are a Christian, at least, we had supposed we were.

3. We have never undertaken to explain the doctrines of the Scriptures on this or any other point, so as to please men; but have always thought they were right, and therefore, best, as they are.

4. We do not believe the doctrine of eternal misery tends to render the cross of Christ of none effect, but rather this, the cross of Christ is made of none effect in just so far as men are influenced against it. There is never, we believe, a true saint who is at enmity against God, the Father is deceived, and God is glorified. This removing difficulties from the minds of sinners, by frolic explanations of Scripture, we regard of doubtful propriety, to say the least of it.

5. We believe that those who are intentions, and do not obey the law, will suffer indignation and wrath, tribulation and distress, thus suffering the righteous revelation of a judgment of God, who will reward every man according to his deeds.

7. The quotations in the *Review and Herald* from 2 Pet. 3: 7, 10-12 declare the miserable earthly end of the wicked, living at the time of the destruction of the world, by fire, but proves nothing concerning the nature of their future punishment. The form of reasoning followed by the *Review and Herald* entirely cuts off the idea of future punishment, as it also does a judgment after death. It also denies the resurrection of the wicked; for it would be most unreasonable to suppose that they would be raised and judged again after they had received their full doom. According then, to this reasoning, the world of human beings destroyed by the flood, the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah, and all who have suffered death by a direct judgment of God, are blotted out forever! Why not, then, all who die of drunkenness and debauchery, or even of cancer, small pox, or consumption? Let there, then, be no double-dealing here, but at once throw off the mask, and plainly say, that to the wicked, to all who die on account of their sins, there is no hereafter.

8. We believe that the bodies of all men, whether of the good or the bad, will be returned to their original elements. These bodies were made of dust of the ground, and to dust they must return. That in the resurrection, the just are to receive glorified spiritual bodies, but as to the character of the bodies of the wicked in the resurrection, the Bible is silent, and where it is silent it is wisdom for men to be.

9. The *Recorder* does not propose to ignore the question of the future condition of the wicked, because it is a matter of revelation; but when that question is made a hobby, and an attempt is made to sugar-coat it so as to please the taste of the wicked, it is only fraught with deception and mischief.

10. We sincerely believe the *Review and Herald* is doing an immense amount of mischief in the persistent advocacy of its peculiar theories, the tendency of which is not, as we think, upon godliness. That many most worthy things are said by it we are free to admit, but in so far as its literalism and its peculiar notions of the nature of the kingdom of heaven are concerned, no good can come of them.

THE BAPTIST UNION AND THE SABBATH.

The Sabbath Recorder replies at length to our article on the Sabbath. Our brother is courteous and fair, yet we are not convinced that the law which specified the seventh day as Sabbath is now binding upon the race. "We feel a profound respect for the Seventh-day brethren; they have convicted and made great sacrifices to vindicate them. Their example in this respect is worthy of imitation, though we regard their premises unsound, and regret to have them spend their energies in an unprofitable and needless warfare, and assert tests of fellowship which Christ and his apostles implicitly forbid. We do not see that our brother invalidates our arguments, and hence do not feel called upon either to repeat or vindicate them. He has our thanks for his fraternal courtesy, and our sincere respect for his candor, and evident desire to know and obey the truth.

And thus ends for the present, at least, the correspondence between the Baptist Union and the Sabbath Recorder, on the Sabbath question. We were, at the beginning, inclined to hold that the Baptist Union would, on account of its liberal sentiments and the very kind manner in which it referred to us, give its readers the benefit of our thoughts expressed in our own language, although we know that to be meager, but in this we were mistaken. We do not doubt, the *Recorder* feels there is wisdom in its course, and, if a certain kind of wisdom be meant, we agree with it, but we are confident the day desired by the Union will not come until the grounds of belief among the sects are more thoroughly understood by each other, and a thorough and candid weighing of them be given.

Take the present case for illustration, for notwithstanding the kind and generous manner in which the Union has invariably referred to Seventh-day Baptists, for which it has our thanks, still its readers do not know our line of defense nor the depth of our convictions on the Sabbath question. - The Union has given two or three extracts which, so far as they go fairly represent our views, but they by no means present our arguments. The result of this is that a large share of the readers of that paper still think the representations of the Union to be true in this; that we are *legislators*. An attempt has been made to convince its readers that we are under the old covenant, and children of Hagar. That we are wedded to Sinai and under the ministration of Moses, and if disciples of Jesus at all, we are unbound and Judaistic. Up to this hour, the Union has not acknowledged us cured of our blindness, but that at best we only "see men as trees walking."

Well, it has been our fate thus far to be misunderstood, and therefore misrepresented, but we abide in the faith that the day is fast coming when our own defenses will go before the world, and the unjust judgment now standing against us will be reversed, for there is no Christian sect holding the doctrine of salvation by Christ more clearly and firmly than do the Seventh-day Baptists. They not only glory in the freedom of the gospel, but also in its freedom, working power, but were never guilty of interpreting this freedom as a deliverance from duty, but as a deliverance from the guilt and power of sin, and the

gracious operations, so regenerating the heart as to make duty a pleasure, and sacrifice esteemed an honor. Something, however, has been gained, for the Union now concedes that the Sabbath law made binding the keeping of the seventh day; but says this law is now abolished. Well, if the law binding us to observe the seventh day is abolished, then we have no Sabbath, for the only Sabbath law enacted by Jehovah is the one which enjoined the keeping of the seventh day. Another thing is clear, and that is, the Union, provided the Sabbath law is still in force, justifies our course in organizing in its defense and support. This is the more important because the Union is an earnest advocate of open communion, and is laboring to show that there is no justification for the divisions existing among Christian sects. That to a certain extent, the Union is right in this we do not doubt, but we trust that in its zeal for its peculiar view, it will not be left to disregard the plain teachings of Scripture, nor to discredit those whose convictions will not allow them to trifle with its requirements. We long for the union of Christians, but believe that any union not founded in truth and the love of truth, unbound, and doomed to certain rupture. Let us pray and work and wait, and in God's good time, an imperishable union in the truth will be wrought. The blessed one hasten the day!

day. Far from it. My only hope is founded upon the glorious fact that "Christ died for the ungodly." "That he was delivered for our offenses, and was raised again for our justification." My heart's desire is to be in fellowship with him in his death, his burial, and in his resurrection. And I submit to you if true believers may not be brought into such fellowship with him in the Christian ordinances. When you partake of the sacred Supper, do you not show forth his death? When the baptismal water closed over your body, did you not impressively exhibit his burial? When your body was "raised from the liquid tomb, did you not, in a most beautiful figure, show forth his triumphant resurrection? And are not all these of his own appointment? If the ordinances of the gospel are not memorial of the three important events just referred to, then what do they signify? If the resurrection of Jesus is represented in baptism, and that by his own appointment and example, do we not lay ourselves liable to the charge both of disobedience and innovation, if we undertake to celebrate the same event in another way? It seems to me that the observance of the first day of the week in honor of the resurrection of our Lord, tends, first, to greatly detract from the interest which properly belongs to baptism, by setting up a rival memorial of the same event. Second, to destroy the only institution which Jehovah has given us as a memorial of the fact that in "six days he made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is." Third, it encourages human tradition, and prepares the way for endless innovations, inasmuch as it claims divine authority, when no such authority can be found in the holy Scriptures. Fourth, it gives strength and power to the church of Rome, while it places all First-day observers, who profess to be governed by the Bible alone, in an inconsistent and unenviable light, as the following quotation alone, is sufficient to show. I quote from a Roman Catholic writer entitled "Abridgment of Christian Doctrine":

Question—How prove you that the church hath power to command feasts and holy days? Answer—By the very fact of changing the Sabbath into Sunday, which Protestants acknowledge, and they therefore fondly commend to themselves by keeping Sunday strictly and breaking most other feasts commanded by the same church. Question—How prove you that? Answer—Because, by keeping Sunday, they acknowledge the church's power to ordain feasts, and to command them under sin; and by not keeping the rest, by her command, they again deny, in fact, the same power. And, finally, because it gives strength to infant baptism, inasmuch as the arguments for the latter, are almost the same as those for first day observance. In proof of this, I give the following extract from an article which I clipped from a leading Methodist paper:

"Some of the most solemn and oft-repeated ordinances of religion have been set aside, and new ones substituted in their room by an authoritative example in the absence of any command or enactment in the case. Take but one instance. No ordinance was ever solemnly and so repeatedly proclaimed as the fixing of the seventh day as a holy day. When God finished the work of creation He 'blessed the seventh day and sanctified it.' (Gen. 2: 3) and when the Decalogue, the basis of all moral law, was given at Sinai, it embodied the law of the Sabbath in that, and on through succeeding ages the blessings of heaven were poured upon the man who remembered the Sabbath day to keep it holy, and terrible curses fell upon him who scorned or despised that day. To enact a law to supersede the holy precept for the abrogation of that law of the Sabbath, and no command was ever given by Christ to substitute another day in its room. And yet the church for eighteen centuries has secularized the seventh day, and in the stead of the seventh day, it has remembered the first day to keep it holy. Now upon what authority does the Church do this? That there is no command for it all agree, that it sets aside the day which was given at Sinai, and beginning is perfectly plain, and in this thing in the absence of any command is done with a conscience void of offense toward God and man, by the holiest men the church has ever had, is equally true. We are then, the authority? We answer, it is only to be regarded as an example of the apostles and of the Church in its purest ages. Their example is esteemed by us as of sufficient authority to justify us in no longer remembering 'the Sabbath day to keep it holy,' and in keeping the first day of the week as a memorial of the Sabbath as possible—the first. Now, we shall apply this rule (an authoritative example) to the argument on infant baptism, thus: About one-third of the instances of baptism in the New Testament, a history embracing more than thirty years of apostolic labor, are instances of household, or family baptisms, and those family baptisms expressed by a word which narrows the signification of household down to the father, mother and children, which make up a family. Here is an authoritative example. We will also see that the Church, from the apostles on through the purest ages of its existence practiced infant baptism with an unanimity never exceeded in any item of faith and practice which the Church has held. If therefore the example of the apostles, and of the Church in the first three centuries can authorize the setting aside of the Sabbath day, and the institution thereof of the first day, their example can authorize infant baptism."—Rev. C. W. Miller, of Cincinnati, Ky., in St. Louis Christian Advocate, Nov. 29th, 1871.

Such is the view which this Methodist divine takes of the relation existing between these twin relics of Popery. With a Seventh-day Baptist, such arguments do not amount to the weight of a feather, but how

will a First-day Baptist meet them? Are you quite sure that in any arguments which you may offer in favor of a change of the Sabbath, you are not giving aid and comfort, not only to pedo-baptism, but to all the errors of the Church of Rome? Are we justifiable in despising the "Sabbath of the Lord" simply because it was observed by the Jews? So far as the Jews observed it aright, were they not obeying the voice of Jehovah? I fear that many Protestants, even Baptists, in their anxiety to avoid the reproaches of Judaism, are drifting unconsciously into Romanism. Let us not be deceived. "Evil communications corrupt good manners." 1 Cor. 15: 33. There is evidently a growing sympathy, even among Baptists, for many of the customs of Rome. The prevailing custom of preaching funeral discourses long after the burial of the deceased, (which prevails extensively in the West and elsewhere,) gives strength to the custom of praying for the dead. I often notice in religious papers that are distributed among our children, what are regarded as "gems of poetry," set to most charming music, to be sung in Sunday-schools and families, which are simply prayers to departed friends. Were you to hear me praying to "angel bands" to "come and around me stand, and bear me on their smoky wings to my eternal home," would you not be shocked at my praying thus to mere creatures? And yet I have on several occasions heard this same prayer offered in song, in large Baptist congregations. At the same time, many of those very Baptists are much disturbed about my "going back to Judaism." I might allude to many other matters of a similar tendency. Such as the various "pious frands," and other means of a very questionable character, "to raise money for religious purposes." All this I regard as the result of this indirect fellowship with Rome. God is saying, "Come out of her my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues; for her sins have reached unto the heavens, and God hath remembered her iniquities." Rev. 18: 4, 5. My desire is that not one shred of the inventions of the "mother of harlots" may be found hanging to my skirts. But I protest against the present attempt being made by Christians to create a horrible prejudice against that system of religion which was made known to those "who were Israelites; to whom pertained the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever, Amen." Shall Christians show contempt for all those typical institutions which pointed to Christ, because they were committed to the Jews? Shall we despise the perfect "law of the Lord," by which every mouth must be stopped, and all the world become guilty before God, because it was committed to the keeping of the Jews? But yesterday I heard a Baptist minister deliver the contents of a manuscript of great length which he informed us had "cost him much hard study," in which his chief care seemed to be to excite a feeling of horror for the whole system of religion which was committed to the Jews, as though they were a kind of semi-heathenism. Why this prejudice against the only system of religion which was revealed from heaven previous to the advent of our Holy Redeemer? Were not all the institutions connected with that religion of divine appointment? And were they not all luminous with the glory of the coming Saviour? Shall we despise those types of which Jesus was the antetype, because they were committed to the Jews? Have Christians indeed no interest in contemplating the symbolism of the most holy place, containing the ark in which was deposited the autograph of Jehovah—his perfect law, written by himself on tables of stone, over which was the mercy seat, and the cherubim, upon which rested the symbol of the divine presence, because the whole was committed to the Jews? Our blessed Saviour gives us no intimation that his religion was antagonistic to that of Moses, but in perfect harmony with it. "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead." Luke 16: 31. "Do not think that I will accuse you unto the Father; there is one that accuseth you, even Moses, in whom ye trust. For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me, for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?" John 5: 46-47. The Pharisees regarded themselves as the only true followers of Moses, while they rejected the teachings of Christ, as antagonistic to those of the former. Jesus, however, proves that in rejecting him, they rejected Moses also. And it seems to me, that the counterpart of those Pharisees is to be found in those who, in their professed zeal for Christ, try just as hard as did the Pharisees to bring Christ and Moses into antagonism. I should suppose that such persons would feel but little interest in the song of the victors spoken of by John, when he says, (Rev. 16: 3). "And they sang the song of Moses the servant of the Lord, and the song of the Lamb, saying, great and marvelous are thy works, Lord God Almighty." Just and true are thy ways, thou King of saints." I think it not likely that the minister whom I heard yesterday will soon have occasion to use the hymn

which I find in most of the Baptist Hymn books, beginning—"Awake, and sing the song of Moses and the Lamb." That every thing that was typical of Christ passed away at the time he ascended to heaven, I presume no one doubts. But I find nothing which authorizes me to regard the weekly Sabbath as a type of the coming Saviour, as it "was made for man," before the fall. All those typical institutions point forward to events that were yet to transpire. Among these were indeed Sabbaths, (Col. 2: 13-17) which were connected with "the hand writing of ordinances," which Paul says "was against us," and "contrary to us." That is, those annual or ceremonial, in which they are commanded to "afflict their souls," &c. (See Lev. 23: 27-32.) Christ tells us that the weekly Sabbath was made for man, not against him. It was made for the benefit of man, not, as I heard preached on yesterday, "as a yoke which neither we nor our fathers were able to bear." The weekly Sabbath points backward as a memorial of a great historic fact. History cannot be changed. We as Americans have our memorial days; that one which gave birth to our nationality being regarded with the greatest interest. So long as our present government exists, the fact will be regarded with great interest by every loyal American citizen, that on the 4th day of July, A. D. 1776, our nation took its stand among the independent nations of the earth, by the immortal Declaration of Independence. Our National Congress, and all our State Legislatures combined, not by any legislative enactments, transferred that interest to any other day. In like manner I regard the change of the day of the Sabbath, as a moral impossibility. Until the last trump shall sound, it will not cease to be a fact, that "in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested on the seventh day." Consequently, the seventh day cannot cease to be "the Sabbath of the Lord our God," that is, the day of the week on which He rested, and which He blessed and sanctified, and consequently could not be "the Sabbath of the Lord our God."

I remain ever, yours truly,
M. B. KELLY,
VILLA RIDGE, Ill., Feb. 10, 1873.

LETTERS ON THE SABBATH.—No. 7.

Ed. W. S. Post, Pastor of Bethel Baptist Church, Collinsville, Ill.
My Dear Brother,—I have examined, I believe, in these letters, every place in the New Testament where the first day of the week is mentioned. I believe I have done this with an earnest desire for the truth, whatever it may cost me. But, I have utterly failed to find one passage which invests it with more sacredness than any other one of the six unsanctified days of the week. If you have discovered any evidence which I have failed to notice, I shall be very grateful to you if you will be so kind as to call my attention to it. One of the most current arguments in the interest of the first day, is that the work of redemption is a greater work than that of creation, and it is therefore more important that it should be remembered. Inasmuch as the Holy Scriptures are silent on the subject, I am unprepared to decide as to the comparative magnitude of two works of infinite power. It is more becoming in me, in solemn awe, to reverence and adore the Almighty Author of those wonderful works, than to indulge in speculations as to their comparative greatness. A distinguished Baptist minister, with whom we are both acquainted, endeavored to illustrate the superior magnitude of the work of redemption over that of creation by stating that creation is the work of God's hands, while in the work of redemption he gave his Son. I would reverently bow myself down in the dust, in view of what my Lord Jesus Christ has done for the redemption of fallen man. But do we dishonor the Son, when we ascribe to him the creation of all things. "All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made that was made." "He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not." John 1: 3, 10. "But to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things and we in him, and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him." 1 Cor. 8: 6. "For by him (Christ) were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible, and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him and for him." Col. 1: 16. See also Heb. 1: 2. Thus, I have the unpeakable joy of recognizing the Creator of "heaven, and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, as my Redeemer. May I be careful, therefore, not to forget, or in the least degree disparage any of his works, whether in the old, or in the new creation. That was a great work in view of which "the morning stars sang together, and all the sons thereof; and they shouted for joy." And who can gainsay it, if I give it as my opinion that it was in the observance of the rest day of Jehovah, that the heart of David was inspired when he gave utterance to the sublime language of the nineteenth Psalm? The very language of the fourth commandment would lead his pious heart to meditate upon the immensity of God's works. And how natural it would be for him in the same connection, to contemplate the perfection of the law of the Lord. (See verse 6.) But is it necessary that Jehovah should take down the monument of his power in creation in order to make room for a memorial of his power in redemption? But again; if we must needs celebrate the finishing of the work of redemption in connection with a particular day, where do the Scriptures inform us how often this should be? Even admitting that it should be on the first day of every week? Do the Scriptures anywhere inform us that the whole of the work of redemption, as that of creation was accomplished in one week? If not, what authority have we for observing it every week, when such observance involves the subversion of a positive institution of Jehovah? I hope that my dear brother will not think for a moment that I undervalue the great work of our adorable Redeemer, in opposing its celebration in connection with a particular day. Far from it. My only hope is founded upon the glorious fact that "Christ died for the ungodly." "That he was delivered for our offenses, and was raised again for our justification." My heart's desire is to be in fellowship with him in his death, his burial, and in his resurrection. And I submit to you if true believers may not be brought into such fellowship with him in the Christian ordinances. When you partake of the sacred Supper, do you not show forth his death? When the baptismal water closed over your body, did you not impressively exhibit his burial? When your body was "raised from the liquid tomb, did you not, in a most beautiful figure, show forth his triumphant resurrection? And are not all these of his own appointment? If the ordinances of the gospel are not memorial of the three important events just referred to, then what do they signify? If the resurrection of Jesus is represented in baptism, and that by his own appointment and example, do we not lay ourselves liable to the charge both of disobedience and innovation, if we undertake to celebrate the same event in another way? It seems to me that the observance of the first day of the week in honor of the resurrection of our Lord, tends, first, to greatly detract from the interest which properly belongs to baptism, by setting up a rival memorial of the same event. Second, to destroy the only institution which Jehovah has given us as a memorial of the fact that in "six days he made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is." Third, it encourages human tradition, and prepares the way for endless innovations, inasmuch as it claims divine authority, when no such authority can be found in the holy Scriptures. Fourth, it gives strength and power to the church of Rome, while it places all First-day observers, who profess to be governed by the Bible alone, in an inconsistent and unenviable light, as the following quotation alone, is sufficient to show. I quote from a Roman Catholic writer entitled "Abridgment of Christian Doctrine":

Question—How prove you that the church hath power to command feasts and holy days? Answer—By the very fact of changing the Sabbath into Sunday, which Protestants acknowledge, and they therefore fondly commend to themselves by keeping Sunday strictly and breaking most other feasts commanded by the same church. Question—How prove you that? Answer—Because, by keeping Sunday, they acknowledge the church's power to ordain feasts, and to command them under sin; and by not keeping the rest, by her command, they again deny, in fact, the same power. And, finally, because it gives strength to infant baptism, inasmuch as the arguments for the latter, are almost the same as those for first day observance. In proof of this, I give the following extract from an article which I clipped from a leading Methodist paper:

"Some of the most solemn and oft-repeated ordinances of religion have been set aside, and new ones substituted in their room by an authoritative example in the absence of any command or enactment in the case. Take but one instance. No ordinance was ever solemnly and so repeatedly proclaimed as the fixing of the seventh day as a holy day. When God finished the work of creation He 'blessed the seventh day and sanctified it.' (Gen. 2: 3) and when the Decalogue, the basis of all moral law, was given at Sinai, it embodied the law of the Sabbath in that, and on through succeeding ages the blessings of heaven were poured upon the man who remembered the Sabbath day to keep it holy, and terrible curses fell upon him who scorned or despised that day. To enact a law to supersede the holy precept for the abrogation of that law of the Sabbath, and no command was ever given by Christ to substitute another day in its room. And yet the church for eighteen centuries has secularized the seventh day, and in the stead of the seventh day, it has remembered the first day to keep it holy. Now upon what authority does the Church do this? That there is no command for it all agree, that it sets aside the day which was given at Sinai, and beginning is perfectly plain, and in this thing in the absence of any command is done with a conscience void of offense toward God and man, by the holiest men the church has ever had, is equally true. We are then, the authority? We answer, it is only to be regarded as an example of the apostles and of the Church in its purest ages. Their example is esteemed by us as of sufficient authority to justify us in no longer remembering 'the Sabbath day to keep it holy,' and in keeping the first day of the week as a memorial of the Sabbath as possible—the first. Now, we shall apply this rule (an authoritative example) to the argument on infant baptism, thus: About one-third of the instances of baptism in the New Testament, a history embracing more than thirty years of apostolic labor, are instances of household, or family baptisms, and those family baptisms expressed by a word which narrows the signification of household down to the father, mother and children, which make up a family. Here is an authoritative example. We will also see that the Church, from the apostles on through the purest ages of its existence practiced infant baptism with an unanimity never exceeded in any item of faith and practice which the Church has held. If therefore the example of the apostles, and of the Church in the first three centuries can authorize the setting aside of the Sabbath day, and the institution thereof of the first day, their example can authorize infant baptism."—Rev. C. W. Miller, of Cincinnati, Ky., in St. Louis Christian Advocate, Nov. 29th, 1871.

Such is the view which this Methodist divine takes of the relation existing between these twin relics of Popery. With a Seventh-day Baptist, such arguments do not amount to the weight of a feather, but how

will a First-day Baptist meet them? Are you quite sure that in any arguments which you may offer in favor of a change of the Sabbath, you are not giving aid and comfort, not only to pedo-baptism, but to all the errors of the Church of Rome? Are we justifiable in despising the "Sabbath of the Lord" simply because it was observed by the Jews? So far as the Jews observed it aright, were they not obeying the voice of Jehovah? I fear that many Protestants, even Baptists, in their anxiety to avoid the reproaches of Judaism, are drifting unconsciously into Romanism. Let us not be deceived. "Evil communications corrupt good manners." 1 Cor. 15: 33. There is evidently a growing sympathy, even among Baptists, for many of the customs of Rome. The prevailing custom of preaching funeral discourses long after the burial of the deceased, (which prevails extensively in the West and elsewhere,) gives strength to the custom of praying for the dead. I often notice in religious papers that are distributed among our children, what are regarded as "gems of poetry," set to most charming music, to be sung in Sunday-schools and families, which are simply prayers to departed friends. Were you to hear me praying to "angel bands" to "come and around me stand, and bear me on their smoky wings to my eternal home," would you not be shocked at my praying thus to mere creatures? And yet I have on several occasions heard this same prayer offered in song, in large Baptist congregations. At the same time, many of those very Baptists are much disturbed about my "going back to Judaism." I might allude to many other matters of a similar tendency. Such as the various "pious frands," and other means of a very questionable character, "to raise money for religious purposes." All this I regard as the result of this indirect fellowship with Rome. God is saying, "Come out of her my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues; for her sins have reached unto the heavens, and God hath remembered her iniquities." Rev. 18: 4, 5. My desire is that not one shred of the inventions of the "mother of harlots" may be found hanging to my skirts. But I protest against the present attempt being made by Christians to create a horrible prejudice against that system of religion which was made known to those "who were Israelites; to whom pertained the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever, Amen." Shall Christians show contempt for all those typical institutions which pointed to Christ, because they were committed to the Jews? Shall we despise the perfect "law of the Lord," by which every mouth must be stopped, and all the world become guilty before God, because it was committed to the keeping of the Jews? But yesterday I heard a Baptist minister deliver the contents of a manuscript of great length which he informed us had "cost him much hard study," in which his chief care seemed to be to excite a feeling of horror for the whole system of religion which was committed to the Jews, as though they were a kind of semi-heathenism. Why this prejudice against the only system of religion which was revealed from heaven previous to the advent of our Holy Redeemer? Were not all the institutions connected with that religion of divine appointment? And were they not all luminous with the glory of the coming Saviour? Shall we despise those types of which Jesus was the antetype, because they were committed to the Jews? Have Christians indeed no interest in contemplating the symbolism of the most holy place, containing the ark in which was deposited the autograph of Jehovah—his perfect law, written by himself on tables of stone, over which was the mercy seat, and the cherubim, upon which rested the symbol of the divine presence, because the whole was committed to the Jews? Our blessed Saviour gives us no intimation that his religion was antagonistic to that of Moses, but in perfect harmony with it. "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead." Luke 16: 31. "Do not think that I will accuse you unto the Father; there is one that accuseth you, even Moses, in whom ye trust. For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me, for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?" John 5: 46-47. The Pharisees regarded themselves as the only true followers of Moses, while they rejected the teachings of Christ, as antagonistic to those of the former. Jesus, however, proves that in rejecting him, they rejected Moses also. And it seems to me, that the counterpart of those Pharisees is to be found in those who, in their professed zeal for Christ, try just as hard as did the Pharisees to bring Christ and Moses into antagonism. I should suppose that such persons would feel but little interest in the song of the victors spoken of by John, when he says, (Rev. 16: 3). "And they sang the song of Moses the servant of the Lord, and the song of the Lamb, saying, great and marvelous are thy works, Lord God Almighty." Just and true are thy ways, thou King of saints." I think it not likely that the minister whom I heard yesterday will soon have occasion to use the hymn

which I find in most of the Baptist Hymn books, beginning—"Awake, and sing the song of Moses and the Lamb." That every thing that was typical of Christ passed away at the time he ascended to heaven, I presume no one doubts. But I find nothing which authorizes me to regard the weekly Sabbath as a type of the coming Saviour, as it "was made for man," before the fall. All those typical institutions point forward to events that were yet to transpire. Among these were indeed Sabbaths, (Col. 2: 13-17) which were connected with "the hand writing of ordinances," which Paul says "was against us," and "contrary to us." That is, those annual or ceremonial, in which they are commanded to "afflict their souls," &c. (See Lev. 23: 27-32.) Christ tells us that the weekly Sabbath was made for man, not against him. It was made for the benefit of man, not, as I heard preached on yesterday, "as a yoke which neither we nor our fathers were able to bear." The weekly Sabbath points backward as a memorial of a great historic fact. History cannot be changed. We as Americans have our memorial days; that one which gave birth to our nationality being regarded with the greatest interest. So long as our present government exists, the fact will be regarded with great interest by every loyal American citizen, that on the 4th day of July, A. D. 1776, our nation took its stand among the independent nations of the earth, by the immortal Declaration of Independence. Our National Congress, and all our State Legislatures combined, not by any legislative enactments, transferred that interest to any other day. In like manner I regard the change of the day of the Sabbath, as a moral impossibility. Until the last trump shall sound, it will not cease to be a fact, that "in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested on the seventh day." Consequently, the seventh day cannot cease to be "the Sabbath of the Lord our God," that is, the day of the week on which He rested, and which He blessed and sanctified, and consequently could not be "the Sabbath of the Lord our God."

I remain ever, yours truly,
M. B. KELLY,
VILLA RIDGE, Ill., Feb. 10, 1873.

REPLY TO ELD. SAWYER.—No. 1.

I most heartily approve the sentiment that we should "go in for the truth." But where shall we go to find it? Evidently to the Word of God. "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." No speculative theories or traditions of men must be set over against the plain "truth saith the Lord," as authority in matters of religious faith. I wish also to say in passing, that I am glad Bro. Sawyer has discovered, "that a man cannot prove what he pleases from the Bible by taking detached passages here and there," but that "a detached passage proves only what it did in connection with the context." Judging from his previous arguments, it is evidently a new discovery to him. It certainly is a valuable one.

Mr. Sawyer asks: "Is the Sabbath one named in that history? (the first 2500 years of the world's history.) Are any instructions given in regard to its observance? Is there the most remote allusion to its observance or violation?" Suppose we ask: Are the laws against idolatry and against blasphemy named in all that history? Are any instructions given in regard to their observance? Mr. Sawyer cannot name the chapter and verse where any such laws are found. Will he therefore claim that these laws did not exist, that idolatry and blasphemy were innocent during all that period? He should if his position above amounts to anything. But the truth is, it is not the name but the thing itself that is wanted. And in this respect the record is sufficiently clear concerning the Sabbath. Not only are there "remote allusion" to sabbath observance, but there is direct proof of the existence of the Sabbath during this time. The direct proof is in Gen. 2: 2, 3, "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. And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because that in it he had rested from his work which God created and made."

is not then designed simply to reveal to us divine rest, but more especially what *rested* the divine rest: the setting apart of the seventh day to be henceforth a sacred day. 2. We do not disagree upon the point that God's rest was not from fatigue. It was rest of satisfaction and delight. So he would have us regard the Sabbath a delight, a day of holy joy and communion with him. 3. Whether the literal week actually covered the time of the creative periods, or merely represented those periods, does not affect this question. For it was the literal day that God blessed and sanctified. This is certain from the reference to this day in the fourth commandment. No one will deny that the day there commanded to be observed is a literal day, yet it is the same day mentioned in the beginning. The reason given in the fourth commandment why the Sabbath should be observed is: "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. 20: 11. The days blessed in the two passages are identical. If one is literal the other is.

During this Sabbath was observed during this period is evident from the existence of the week, and from the practice of reckoning time by periods of seven days. The week's mentioned in Gen. 2: 2, 3, and is proved to be a period of seven days from Judges, 14: 12—both passages referring to the time of the marriage feast. This practice cannot be consistently explained upon any other theory than that of the existence and observance of the Sabbath. A. E. PRENTICE.

ELD. SAWYER'S REPLY TO ELD. PRENTICE.

[Continued from last week.]
4th. Does Gen. 2: 2, 3, teach the institution of a Sabbath at creation? Answer. The passage appears to have had a later nativity. Its nearest and only relations are found to have lived in Egypt, 2500 years later. We are then told that God blessed and sanctified the Sabbath, and we are here told he blessed and sanctified the seventh day. The facts it contains appear to be facts that came to light at the giving of the law from Mount Sinai, the reason there assigned, and explicitly set forth in the Sabbath command, for selecting the seventh day as a day of rest, the observance of which was a sign between God and that people.

My reviewer calls it "an anachronism" in Moses to place a truth then revealed in connection with the history of creation. But I should call it common sense under the guidance of the divine Spirit. In making up that history, after the giving of the law, Moses evidently arranged the truths, new

