



The Sabbath Recorder. Alfred Centre, N. Y., Fifth-day, Sept. 19.

REV. N. V. HULL, D. D., - - EDITOR. All communications, whether on business or for publication, should be addressed to "THE SABBATH RECORDER, Alfred Centre, Allegany Co., N. Y."

TO THE YOUNG MEMBERS OF THE DENOMINATION. It is a happy thing that you have come to know Christ, your Saviour. The change you have made in turning from sin to holiness is radical indeed.

AN INCONSISTENCY. A large and increasing number of Christians hold that the Sabbath was a Jewish institution, and that therefore Christ abrogated it, so that under the present dispensation we have no Sabbath.

LIVING THEMES. A writer in the Church Union who signs himself "Layman," has, under the above heading, commenced a series of articles, the first one being headed "The Sabbath."

REVIEW. Of articles on the Sabbath, recently published in the Free Methodist, at Scammon, DeKalb Co., Ill.

LETTERS. Dear Brother, - I have read your articles on the Sabbath, as published in the Free Methodist, with very much interest.

OUR PARIS LETTER. (From a Regular Correspondent.) The Kingdom of Denmark—the participation at the French show—interesting exhibits of a sturdy people.

CHRISTIAN UNION.—No. 6. There is a body of people called the "Society of Friends," who reject baptism and the Lord's Supper.

AN ESSAY. Read the Seventh-day Baptist Manual, Association, and required reading by vote of that body.

sciences, and if anything can control them, it will. We charge the loose conduct of the world concerning Sabbath observance to the unscriptural position taken by religious teachers on that question.

It is a happy thing that you have come to know Christ, your Saviour. The change you have made in turning from sin to holiness is radical indeed. You have become new creatures, heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ.

A writer in the Church Union who signs himself "Layman," has, under the above heading, commenced a series of articles, the first one being headed "The Sabbath."

of beravement or distress of whatever kind, are those who love the Sabbath and remember to keep it holy, "not doing their own ways, nor speaking their own words, nor their own thoughts, nor their own desires, but the will of God which is the Father's will."

Of articles on the Sabbath, recently published in the Free Methodist, at Scammon, DeKalb Co., Ill. Levi Wood, Dear Brother, - I have read your articles on the Sabbath, as published in the Free Methodist, with very much interest.

The Kingdom of Denmark—the participation at the French show—interesting exhibits of a sturdy people. Among the nations who have responded to the appeal of France, the exhibition of her ancient art, Denmark is received with much sympathy.

There is a body of people called the "Society of Friends," who reject baptism and the Lord's Supper, and can not, therefore, unite in a church organization with those Christians who observe these ordinances.

Under these circumstances, do we not brethren see that the doctrine of no Sabbath tends to looseness on this subject? To argue that the Sabbath, which was made by God for men, was abolished by Christ is to set God and Christ against the Sabbath idea.

It is preposterous, then, to suppose that an infant, incapable of having any knowledge of the design of baptism, and of making a consecration of itself to Christ, should be a fit subject for Christian baptism.

Under these circumstances, do we not brethren see that the doctrine of no Sabbath tends to looseness on this subject? To argue that the Sabbath, which was made by God for men, was abolished by Christ is to set God and Christ against the Sabbath idea.

It is a happy thing that you have come to know Christ, your Saviour. The change you have made in turning from sin to holiness is radical indeed. You have become new creatures, heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ.

It is preposterous, then, to suppose that an infant, incapable of having any knowledge of the design of baptism, and of making a consecration of itself to Christ, should be a fit subject for Christian baptism.

Under these circumstances, do we not brethren see that the doctrine of no Sabbath tends to looseness on this subject? To argue that the Sabbath, which was made by God for men, was abolished by Christ is to set God and Christ against the Sabbath idea.

It is preposterous, then, to suppose that an infant, incapable of having any knowledge of the design of baptism, and of making a consecration of itself to Christ, should be a fit subject for Christian baptism.

Under these circumstances, do we not brethren see that the doctrine of no Sabbath tends to looseness on this subject? To argue that the Sabbath, which was made by God for men, was abolished by Christ is to set God and Christ against the Sabbath idea.

It is preposterous, then, to suppose that an infant, incapable of having any knowledge of the design of baptism, and of making a consecration of itself to Christ, should be a fit subject for Christian baptism.

Under these circumstances, do we not brethren see that the doctrine of no Sabbath tends to looseness on this subject? To argue that the Sabbath, which was made by God for men, was abolished by Christ is to set God and Christ against the Sabbath idea.

It is preposterous, then, to suppose that an infant, incapable of having any knowledge of the design of baptism, and of making a consecration of itself to Christ, should be a fit subject for Christian baptism.

Under these circumstances, do we not brethren see that the doctrine of no Sabbath tends to looseness on this subject? To argue that the Sabbath, which was made by God for men, was abolished by Christ is to set God and Christ against the Sabbath idea.

It is preposterous, then, to suppose that an infant, incapable of having any knowledge of the design of baptism, and of making a consecration of itself to Christ, should be a fit subject for Christian baptism.

Under these circumstances, do we not brethren see that the doctrine of no Sabbath tends to looseness on this subject? To argue that the Sabbath, which was made by God for men, was abolished by Christ is to set God and Christ against the Sabbath idea.

Under these circumstances, do we not brethren see that the doctrine of no Sabbath tends to looseness on this subject? To argue that the Sabbath, which was made by God for men, was abolished by Christ is to set God and Christ against the Sabbath idea.

Under these circumstances, do we not brethren see that the doctrine of no Sabbath tends to looseness on this subject? To argue that the Sabbath, which was made by God for men, was abolished by Christ is to set God and Christ against the Sabbath idea.

Under these circumstances, do we not brethren see that the doctrine of no Sabbath tends to looseness on this subject? To argue that the Sabbath, which was made by God for men, was abolished by Christ is to set God and Christ against the Sabbath idea.

Under these circumstances, do we not brethren see that the doctrine of no Sabbath tends to looseness on this subject? To argue that the Sabbath, which was made by God for men, was abolished by Christ is to set God and Christ against the Sabbath idea.

Under these circumstances, do we not brethren see that the doctrine of no Sabbath tends to looseness on this subject? To argue that the Sabbath, which was made by God for men, was abolished by Christ is to set God and Christ against the Sabbath idea.

Under these circumstances, do we not brethren see that the doctrine of no Sabbath tends to looseness on this subject? To argue that the Sabbath, which was made by God for men, was abolished by Christ is to set God and Christ against the Sabbath idea.

Under these circumstances, do we not brethren see that the doctrine of no Sabbath tends to looseness on this subject? To argue that the Sabbath, which was made by God for men, was abolished by Christ is to set God and Christ against the Sabbath idea.

Under these circumstances, do we not brethren see that the doctrine of no Sabbath tends to looseness on this subject? To argue that the Sabbath, which was made by God for men, was abolished by Christ is to set God and Christ against the Sabbath idea.

Under these circumstances, do we not brethren see that the doctrine of no Sabbath tends to looseness on this subject? To argue that the Sabbath, which was made by God for men, was abolished by Christ is to set God and Christ against the Sabbath idea.



