

JOSEPH BATES

A VINDICATION OF THE
SEVENTH-DAY SABBATH
AND THE
COMMANDMENTS OF
GOD

Joseph Bates

**A Vindication of the Seventh-
Day Sabbath and the
Commandments of God**

«Public Domain»

Bates J.

A Vindication of the Seventh-Day Sabbath and the Commandments of
God / J. Bates — «Public Domain»,

Содержание

Preface	5
The Sabbath Controversy	6
Barnabas Against The Sabbath	14
Конец ознакомительного фрагмента.	19

A Vindication of the Seventh-Day Sabbath and the Commandments of God / With a Further History of God's Peculiar People from 1847-1848

Preface

TO THE LITTLE FLOCK:

I dedicate to you the following pages, with my continued prayers to God, through our Great High Priest and coming King, that they may, in connection with God's Holy Word and guidance of the Divine Spirit, enable you more clearly to discover the deceptive arts of the Devil, and the agents he is employing in these last days, to betray and ensnare you in his (almost) innumerable and complicated variety of sins and snares; and see your true position *just here* under the High Lands of Immortality! Do not forget, while seeking to understand the Scriptures with a simple and honest desire to live *here* by every word of God, to read again and again the warning that God in his infinite mercy gave to Jesus more than fifty years after his glorious resurrection and triumphant ascension to his Father's seat in his Sanctuary in the heaven of heavens; and he sent it by his angel, who presented it before John in holy vision, recorded in his Rev. xii: 13 and 17, and in xvi. chapter, first part of the 13th, and 14th and 15th verses. You will see the opening development of these very things in the work before you. None will fully realize them but those who are keeping *all* of the Commandments of God, especially his Holy Seventh-day Sabbath. Without fear of contradiction here or hereafter before the great White Throne, I tell you there is not an Advent paper (that I have heard of) published in the land, that is leading to the kingdom. I do not say but what they publish many truths; but their heretical doctrines will, if followed, never, no never, lead you to God! And as you pass along through these peace and safety *valves* in your prophetic history, watching and anxiously waiting for God to give the fourth sign of the coming of Jesus by shaking the heavens and earth, the sea and all nations, and give you the *time* of Jesus' coming, you will more clearly discover the widening track these advocates are pursuing with almost to a *unit* every professed advent minister in their train. You will also see that the *Waymarks* and high heaps in your pathway, *past and present*, are the only sure earthly guides to the peaceful haven of eternal rest. From my watch-tower I have discovered and pointed out to you some of the devouring wolves in sheep's clothing. Let us avoid them, and live prayerful, humble and watchful, for more will yet be seen, and perhaps start right out of your midst!

As I am unable to pay the Printer, your means – as God has given you ability – will be needed. I trust that God's true children are ready.

Fairhaven, Mass. Jan. 1848.

J. B.

The Sabbath Controversy

Once more I feel constrained to speak in vindication of the Sabbath of the Lord our God. I have been privileged to read about all the articles which have appeared in the Bible Advocate, both for and against the Seventh-day Sabbath, for about four months past; and occasionally a thrust and a challenge from the Advent Harbinger, declaring that the law of God was abolished more than eighteen hundred years ago, and that we have since that time been under grace. The most that I have feared in this controversy was, that it would not be continued long enough to bring out the whole truth, to the utter confusion and dismay of these professed Second Advent Sabbath breakers. One trait in their characters is now pretty clearly developed, that is – they are Sabbath haters! The law of God is nicknamed by them, the “Jewish Ritual,” the “Jewish Sabbath,” the “Sabbath of the old Jews,” &c. &c., thus virtually showing up their characters in these perilous times, according to Paul, as covenant breakers, boasters, proud, blasphemers, denying the righteous law of God, and yet professing to believe the whole word of God. “As Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses” so do some of these leading men resist the truth. “A wonderful and horrible thing is committed in the land, the prophets prophecy falsely and the priests bear rule by their means, and my people love to have it so; and what will ye do in the end thereof?” Answer – “The soul that sinneth, it shall die.” I think it is becoming very evident that they are fulfilling Rev. xii: 17, and xvi: 13, first clause. None others so likely to deceive as these, because of their position in the near coming of the Saviour. It amounts to almost an impossibility to get *their* definition of the *Law and Commandments*. One class will tell you that the old and new testaments are the Word and Commandments of God. A second will tell you that the new testament contains all the commandments and teachings that are now required of us. I was informed of a company of professed advent believers, not thirty miles from this, having become so alarmed or tenacious, that they would not carry the old testament with them to meeting on the first day. There was nothing in it, however, that they feared but the commandment to keep the Seventh-day Sabbath. A third class will tell you that baptism, the Lord's Supper, washing one another's feet, holy greeting, and all the commands which are given, are commandments. Joseph Marsh, editor of the Advent Harbinger, says we are not under the law (of Moses) but under the law of grace, the new testament. Now the Apostle James has given us a test which will utterly confound all such unscriptural arguments, viz.: “Whosoever shall keep the whole law but shall fail with respect to one precept hath been guilty of all.” – [*Macknight's trans.*] Now to make it still plainer for us, he says, “For he who commanded do not commit adultery, hath commanded also, do not kill. Now if thou commit not adultery, *but killest*, thou hast become a transgressor of the law.” Now I ask in all candor which of these *five* are right? You answer, James, the inspired one. Well, does he justify either of the other four? You answer no, for he has directed us to the tables of stone, the ten commandments in the law, recorded in Exodus xx: 1-17. This is the true source. Is it doubted? Then here is the testimony of Jesus in Matt. v: 17-19. Now read the 21st and 27th verses – the very same ones James has quoted. See also the 33d verse, the third precept. There are several others if required, but surely these two are clear. Certainly no one will doubt from the above testimony but what the ten commandments in the decalogue are all and the only ones that man is required to keep, with the exception of the new one in John xiii: 34, given for the church of Christ. But J. Marsh says, it is clear that all the ten commandments in the decalogue were abolished at the crucifixion of Christ. So says every one that takes this stand, and they quote for proof 2d Col. 14-17. But it happens very unfortunately for them all that James saw his master crucified and his testimony is dated A.D. 60, about twenty-nine years beyond their point of time, and shows us that the commandments were as much enforced then and ever would be, as they were when his master was crucified twenty-nine years before. Now I say that this testimony pointedly and positively condemns them and will condemn them at the judgment. For proof of this I appeal to the teachings of our Lord Jesus Christ, what we must do to be saved, “If

thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments.” But some will say James called it the law, therefore you must so expound it. I will let God and Jesus do that: God says positively that the keeping of the Seventh-day Sabbath is my *commandment and my law*. Exod. xvi: 28, 29. So he has in other places taught us respecting the whole decalogue, and so in like manner does Jesus. Read the same question and answer recorded in Luke x: 25-28: “What shall I do to inherit eternal life?” Jesus asks him what is written in the LAW. He repeats the words of Jesus recorded in Matt. xxii: 36-40, or, in 37-39th verses. “*And (Jesus) said unto him, thou hast answered right this do and THOU SHALT LIVE.*” Now, if you want it still clearer, read Matt v: 17-19. Law and commandments are here too, synonymous: “Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least [*laws*] commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be in no esteem in the reign of heaven, but whosoever shall *practice* and teach them shall be highly esteemed in the reign of heaven.” – [*Campbell trans.*] That he is speaking of the law of commandments in the decalogue is positive and clear from the 21st, 27th and 33d verses. That he means the whole, is also clear from this and the above quotations in Matt. xxii. and Luke x. Now if the keeping of the commandments will secure us eternal life, and the violation of them render us of no esteem in the reign of heaven, how can those enter there who do not keep them, and especially such ones as Joseph Marsh and his adherents, who are teaching the world that there are no commandments, and are endeavoring to dissuade and discourage and reproach all of God's honest children, who are striving to be highly esteemed in the reign of heaven. Does not the Saviour's language as clearly apply to them now as it did when he was permanently establishing and confirming this covenant, the law and commandments of God, “putting them into our minds and writing them on our hearts.” viz.: “Why do ye also transgress the commandments of God by *your* tradition? Ye hypocrites, well did Esaias prophecy of you saying, this people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoreth me with their lips,” [They are advocating his speedy coming to judge the world.] “but their heart is far from me. But *in vain* they do worship me *teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.*” Oh, but say some, we believe that the commandments are as valid now as they ever were. Why do you then constantly and perseveringly reject, scoff at, and sneeringly deride, and denounce, those that are as honest as you are, while they are endeavoring to keep the fourth commandment just as God had directed them? When you have been so repeatedly shown by their writings, drawn from the clear word that the fourth commandment is not abolished and *never* has undergone any change more than the other nine, and that there is no other weekly sabbath recorded or intimated in the old and new testaments. If you will follow such downright infidelity as is taught in *all* the second advent papers respecting God's holy sabbath, and still continue to stigmatize the holy law of God, how can you expect to be treated otherwise than the rebellious house of Israel, and be made to feel in a very little while from this, all the horrors of a guilty conscience, urging you to do that which you now detest and abhor: even to come and bow at the feet of these very despised – as you are now disposed to term them – “*door shutters,*” “*mystery folks,*” “*Judaizers,*” “*feet washers,*” “*deluded fanatics,*” &c. &c. See Isa. xlix: 23, and lx: 14; Rev. iii: 9. Here your characters are delineated. You say no, these mean the nominal church. It is not so. *They* have rejected the message of the second advent. And *you* since that time (1814) have rejected the word of God. Our testimony will not be rejected when called for that you with us left them with all their creeds and confessions of faith and professed to take the whole word of God for our rule of faith and practice. This then is your clear position, even while opposing the commandments of God. If you ask why I speak in such positive terms about or concerning the commandments of God, allow me to cite you to our history, Rev. xiv: 12. Is not this positive proof?

Also in xii: 17. Do you not read your own characters as described above, on the remnant of the last end? and are not these individuals who enter the gates of the city the same remnant that are at last saved by keeping the commandments? xxii: 14. Does not the 15th verse describe those who are left out, “and whosoever loveth and maketh a *lie.*” How perfectly this compares with what I quoted above, Rev. iii: 9. See also 1st John ii: 4. “He that saith I know him and keep not his commandments is a LIAR and the *truth* is not in him.” You will possibly say the three texts which I have quoted in

Rev. xii., xiv. and xxii., have no reference to the Sabbath. When I come to treat on the xiv. of Rev. I will look at this point. But allow me to state here, that the first three commandments in the decalogue have never been a subject of dispute (*separately*) in Christendom, while the fourth *has* been for fifteen hundred years. We know positively that this is true in our second advent experience. Therefore it is plain that by keeping the fourth commandment or the seventh-day Sabbath as it stands recorded, and in the very time too in our history, we are clearly fulfilling the prophecy, viz.: “Here is the patience of the saints, here are they that keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus.” Allow me to state my conviction here with reference to the great mass of advent believers especially, that if they could quietly dispose of the seventh-day Sabbath and sink it with the Jewish rituals, then they would never raise their voice against the other nine commandments of God. This, then, is the evident reason why they are wielding their puny weapons to smite down the only foundation that upholds the old and new testament. It would be much easier work for them to stop the raging of the hurricane. God has them in derision, he will laugh them to scorn. But I must pass to the examination of this subject, as I intimated in the beginning.

IS THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK THE SEVENTH?

Before entering upon this subject, it will be proper for me to state, that some time last August the editor of the Bible Advocate, being pressed by his brethren to open his columns for the discussion of the Sabbath question, rather reluctantly complied, by first giving his views against it. He stated that he should first give C. Stowe's view, in the affirmative, covering the whole ground, and then the view of some other writer in the negative, before he published any thing more on the other side, and so on. Sister Stowe's piece, accompanied by the views of the editor, appeared in the B. A., Sept. 2d, 1847. C. Stowe sent the editor two articles, as she says. The editor saw proper to publish her second article and withhold the first, for purposes best known to himself. Perhaps it was considered objectionable, as the editor of the Advent Harbinger had refused to publish it for her. So for some reason or other, only part of the ground was covered, and not one candid objection or examination offered to her second, except by a certain character, who, apparently, was ashamed to have his real name known among honest seekers for the truth. So far as the subject has advanced, J. Croffut, of N. Y. city, J. B. Cook, of New Bedford, Mass. and A. Carpender, of Sutton, Vt. have spoken in the affirmative. The negative is advocated by the editor, Joseph Turner and Barnabas, and perhaps two others; besides what has been teeming from the Advent Harbinger, in the negative. Now, I do not re-examine Turner and Barnabas, because they have not been ably replied to by J. Croffut, J. B. Cook and C. Stowe of N. H., but because I see the necessity of taking up the subject in a different form, without being restricted, as all generally are, who write for papers. Another important point which governs me, is, that all the little flock may understand the true bearings of the subject, for there are undoubtedly a great many that do not see the Bible Advocate, and because I felt like taking a part in this great subject, in which I feel deeply interested, and I see from the commencement that I was excluded from that paper, by the statement that C. Stowe would cover the whole ground in the affirmative. I furthermore perceived there were additional objections to their unscriptural views, which continued to be presented to my mind.

Joseph Turner in attempting to prove that Sunday, the first day of the week is the seventh day of the week, and therefore the proper Sabbath, has failed to make out his case. His proposed foundation is from Matt. xii: 39, 40. “But he answered and said unto them, an evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign, and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas, for as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.” He says, “to rear the temple of this body in three days, or to remain in the heart of the earth three nights and to rise the *third* day was, according to the above scripture, to be a sign. I will now prove by Christ and his disciples that this sign was literally given, and that he arose, not the second, but *third* early in the morning.” This statement is not true. The above scripture states *three* days, and not as you say you will now prove *in* three days. If it proves

any thing, it proves three whole days, and then of course the Saviour would rise on the fourth day. This, according to your mode of calculating, would make the seventh day come on Monday. If you want the third day, or within three days, why not take as many as you need for your argument, from the eighteen other texts, and not take this isolated one, and then pervert it, as you have done. The only object that I can see, in your perversion of the text, is to prove, as you say, that Jesus was three nights in the heart of the earth, viz.: Friday night, one; Saturday night, two, and Sabbath night, three. You say, “that Christ was actually raised the *third* day and not the second, as tradition holds it.” I am not aware of any such tradition. That would be perverting the whole eighteen texts instead of the one you have done. But that he was raised the third day, and that third day was the first of the week, is the joint testimony of the four evangelists, Matt. xxviii: 1; Mark xvi: 2; Luke xxiv: 1; John xx: 1. But let us see how you have obtained these *three* nights as stated above, which, as you say, “proves triumphantly that ‘OUR SABBATH’ is the seventh day.” First read the second paragraph in your P. S., where you have attempted to pervert the plain and clear testimony of Luke, in chap. xxiii: 54, 56. Here you stated one scriptural fact: That the Sabbath always commenced at evening. “From evening to evening shall you celebrate your Sabbath.” Then, as a most natural consequence, the next day would begin where the Sabbath ended, and so of every other day thenceforward, or chaos and confusion would follow. This also perfectly agrees with God's manner of commencing time at the creation: “The evening (first,) and the morning is the first day,” &c. Now as you have shown that Friday was the first day of the crucifixion and that it was so far spent and passed away at the time our Lord was buried, that the women could not have got home and prepared spices, (which probably was not more than twenty minutes labor,) before the next day began. How, and by what authority do you claim Friday night? Does Friday night come after twenty-four hours of that day are spent? You see how difficult God makes the way of transgressors. You may reply that you made a mistake. Will you allow me to tell you where your mistake commenced on this subject. If I am not very much mistaken it was when you gave up keeping the true seventh day, the only historical, chronological or biblical day of the week ever given to man. Well, you may say, I have made some converts. True – but they are also deceived, and many very likely rejoicing in it like D. B. Wyatt, who seems to have swallowed the whole, and is endeavoring, with the assistance of the Advent Harbinger, (although they are at antipodes respecting the commandments of God,) to spread the glad tidings far and wide. This editor is in no wise particular about men and measures to accomplish his Jesuitical purpose, to annihilate the very foundation and superstructure of the Bible, “the commandments of God.” Matt. xxii: 40. This wonderful piece of Advent intelligence is recorded in the same paper with D. B. Wyatt's, Sept 9, 1847. See also April 28, page 38. Let it be well understood here also, that this man and J. V. Himes, editor of the Advent Herald, are the two, and only two, editors and papers in this country, which William Miller of Lowhampton, N. Y. recommends to give the light on the second Advent. The meat in due season.

Your erroneous doctrine is heartily welcomed by some here, and many I understand in New Bedford, and very likely many in other places. Yes, I have heard of it away on the Lakes. I was told by one the other day who had backslidden like yourself, that it was the best argument he had yet seen. Now if you undertake to rectify your mistake, it is possible you may destroy all their joy, until some one presents another error – for the truth, it seems, they are determined not to have. Again, you say, “let my brethren remember that the law of Moses, made the first day of the feast of the passover, a sabbath in which no work should be done; this was the Sabbath that drew on. Moreover, I will here prove that the next day following the crucifixion, was not the Sabbath of the Lord, which the Jews at that time kept. – See Luke xxiii: 54.” Now, I say if you will read the next two verses, 55 and 56, which are connected with 54, it will positively contradict your assertion, for it proves that they did keep the next day as the Sabbath, according to the commandment, and the seventh-day Sabbath was and is, the only Sabbath commandment in the whole bible. You pass this over and cite us to Matt xxvii: 62, 64, and base your whole proof on *inference*. It is this, that the Jews were so strict and pious in the

observance of the Sabbath that they would not have gone to Pilate on that day to have asked him to set a watch over the body of Jesus, if it had been the Sabbath, because it would be an important fact to record against them. “How easy to have said in this record that the Jews on the Sabbath,” &c. Yes sir, it would have been just as easy for *your* purpose, to have said in this record also, that “Our Sabbath *is the Seventh day.*” Then probably you would not have to answer for the sin which you have in these instances, knowingly committed. Besides this, you must have calculated largely on the credulity of your readers, to suppose that *all* of them would swallow such absurdities. As that men, who had just committed one of the most aggravating crimes ever recorded in the annals of history, in barbarously and cruelly murdering the son of the living God, should then for fear of having it recorded against them as touching the purity of their motives that they had violated the holy Sabbath of God by calling on the Governor, on the Sabbath of the Lord God, to set a watch over their victim, for fear that some of his disciples would come and steal him away, and thus openly expose them to the scorn of the world. This is your proof why the next day after the crucifixion could not be the Sabbath. How unfortunate and trying it must be to you, who, after being so highly extolled by your hearers in New Bedford, Fairhaven, &c., for your clear and plain Holy Ghost living and preaching, to have to flee to such mean subterfuges to establish a position to justify your backsliding from the plain and positive texts which stand right in your way.

Respecting your text in Matt. xii: 40. If you made use of it as it stands, it would positively prove the resurrection to be on the closing hours of Monday, between 3 and 6 P.M. and not in the morning, as every where recorded. So then, to fulfill your text to the very extent, and have the resurrection in the morning, it must be on Tuesday morning, for, Monday morning would bring you twelve hours too soon, only two and a half days instead of three. This would make *your* Sabbath, as you exultingly claim it for your adherents, come on Monday; that is, by your new mode of establishing the Sabbath. And then D. B. Wyatt, if he followed your strange view, would have to recall his address to his brethren and change the time of celebrating the Lord's Supper on Monday evening, and have it on Tuesday. I presume the editor of the Harbinger would have no objections to the alteration, provided Mr. W. was satisfied.

I know it is stated that Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly. I know of no way to prove it but by the recorded time that our Lord was in the earth. You see that Matthew says *as he was* three days, &c. Now for the proof of how long *he was there*. First testimony – his disciples, Luke xxiv: 21-23. Second testimony – Angels, v: 7. Third testimony – Jesus himself, 46 v. “Thus it behoved Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead the *third day.*” This testimony, be it remembered, was given a few hours after the resurrection, on the same day. Here then is the proof of what Jesus had before asserted, recorded ten times by the evangelist, and once by Paul; 1st Cor. xv: 4; Matt. xvi: 21; xvii: 23; xx: 19; Mark ix: 31; x: 34 and viii: 31;¹ Luke ix: 22; xiii: 32; xviii: 33; John ii: 19. And five times by his accusers, Matt. xxvi: 61; xxviii: 40 and 63; Mark xiv: 58; xv: 29. Every one of these eighteen texts records the resurrection *in* three, some of them *within* three days; and not a syllable about *nights*. The one in Matt xii: 40, says three days and three nights, referring to Jonas, as above. Now I ask, shall we take this one isolated text, out of the harmony of the whole eighteen, *and then pervert it*, to prove that some how or other the world have lost one day, and therefore the first day of the week is the seventh. We all know that our judgment always rests on the majority or weight of evidence. Here then we have seven to one besides the testimony of Jesus himself after his resurrection, that he arose the *third day*, and clearly demonstrating that he did not lie there three days and three nights, and proving, to my judgment, that Jonas was also delivered the third day. See other scripture rules, Esther iv: 16, 17, and v: 1. Here the Jews were to fast three days, but Esther ended it the *third*. See also 1st Kings, xx: 29, the seven days ended on the seventh. Also, Gen. xvii: 12, eight days. Lev. xii: 3, shows the eighth the same. Thus we see that the testimony of Jesus is clear.

¹ Campbell translates this in three, and Matt. xxviii: 63, within three days.

It is clear to my mind that the Lord Jesus was not at furthest, more than thirty-eight hours in the tomb, and yet he was there, according to scripture proof, a part of Friday, the sixth day, *all* of the seventh day, Sabbath, and a part of Sunday, the first day, which last was the third day. Proof, Luke xxiii: 54-56. “And that day was the preparation and the Sabbath drew on.” Mark this, that the preparation had come, and they were drawing to the Sabbath. *See here*, the preparation was always on the day of the Passover, the fourteenth of the first month. The feast day was the fifteenth, the next day. Let Moses give the time: “And ye shall keep it up [the Lamb] until the fourteenth day of the same month, and the whole assembly of the congregation of Israel shall kill it in the evening.” Exo. xii: 6. The original – see margin – reads *between the two evenings*. See the same in Num. xxviii: 4, – practiced and carried out even to lighting the lamps in the tabernacle. Exo. xxx: 8.

Now our blessed Lord expired on the cross at the very time that this preparation always took place for 1670 years before, namely, the ninth hour, (Matt. xxvii, and Mark xv,) three o'clock in the afternoon. Then between the two evenings is just three hours, from 3 to 6 P. M. Keep this clear in mind and you will clearly understand how the disciples could have three hours from the death of their master to see him put in the tomb, to have gone and “bought sweet spices.” (Mark xvi: 1,) and be ready to keep the Sabbath according to the commandment, (please read it in Exo. xx: 8-11,) as stated in Luke xxiii: 54-56. You will understand Mark xv: 42, “Now when the even was come because it was the preparation, *that is the day before the Sabbath*,” that it was the ninth hour, or 3 P.M. Here the preparation goes on for three hours, until the Sabbath commenced. You see he says this was the day before the Sabbath, and when the Sabbath was passed, early in the morning of the first day, they found he had arisen. Mark xvi. Here then is the three days: The day before the Sabbath he was entombed, between the hours of 3 and 6 P.M., and the day after the Sabbath, the first day of the week, he arose. As J. B. Cook says, I can conceive of nothing more definite. Whitby and Scott say, “It is a received rule among the Jews that a part of a day is put for a whole day.” And so, let me add, it is with the commercial nations of the earth. Every bill, or note, or deed, counts the day of its date and the day of its extinguishment. For instance, the transaction of an interest note takes place at half past 11 o'clock in the evening of the first day of January, 1847, and the interest is cast to the first day of January, 1848, the demand for it would be valid if called for at 30 minutes A. M. after midnight. Both of these dates are counted days in this and all other kinds of business transactions, as we reckon time. And I say it is impossible for any rational being to understand it in any other way. When one day ends the next begins, and so I have amply shown is the bible rule. Then, according to the testimony adduced, if the Saviour was placed in the tomb any where between the hours of 3 and 6 o'clock P. M. on Friday, then I say that day was as much counted for one, as the day on which he arose; and no man, not even J. Turner, undertakes to say that it was more than a part of a day. That this work of preparation was all accomplished before the Sabbath came, is perfectly clear from the two passages already quoted in Luke and Mark. See also John xix: 31. Here then the antetype agrees perfectly with the type, all the preparation work accomplished between the hours of three and six in the evening, called between the two evenings. Much also has been said about the next day, the fifteenth being a Jewish festival Sabbath, and therefore God's seventh-day Sabbath could not possibly be until the day after. Just as well might it be asserted when our fourth of July happens to fall on Sunday, that it could not be Sunday, because it was the anniversary of our independence, but the next day would be Sunday. This explains all the difficulty. This feast day of theirs always following the Passover day, happened this year to come on God's holy Sabbath day, hence the peculiar expression of John, “for that Sabbath was an high day.” God's instruction to Moses respecting all the feast days is right to the point, “*Every thing upon his day*.” Lev. xxiii: 37. You see there is no provision to defer the Sabbath festivals whenever they happened on the Sabbath of the Lord our God.

Now I think the above Scriptures do clearly and incontrovertibly establish the resurrection to have been on Sunday morning, the first day of the week, and the day before, on which the Saviour rested in the tomb and his disciples in the city of Jerusalem, was the seventh day of the week, the

Sabbath of the Lord our God, according to the commandment; and the day before that, viz. on Friday, he was crucified and buried. This clearly overthrows your unscriptural arguments to establish the first day of the week for the seventh-day Sabbath.

I have gone much further into this argument than I should, had I not have heard and seen the incalculable mischief that was being accomplished by the spread of such an argument; from one too, who is looked upon by those not personally acquainted with him as an ambassador, fully approved of God; a pillar in the church of these last days; one who is fully competent to preach and take the lead in camp-meetings, &c. &c. And still I feel there is a duty devolving upon me, which I ought not to shrink from, notwithstanding his high profession, and being fostered, and upheld as a brother beloved, by the Advent papers.

It is that since the winter of 1845, you have, by your deceptive arts, and false expositions of God's Word, taught and practiced ridiculous things in the churches, such as God never has, nor ever will approve. Your confession last spring in the Boston Conference seemed more like justifying and exalting yourself from your debased and fallen condition, than a bible confession, which says, "confess your faults one to another." But you perceived, I suppose with others, that it had become fashionable to confess the monstrous errors in our past experience in the advent doctrine to those who had drawn back and organized under the Laodocean state of the church. And also, that J. Marsh of Rochester, and others from different places, were distinguishing themselves by their wonderful confessions; therefore you also confessed how sorry you were for the mischief (or injury) that you had done the cause of God by writing and preaching the doctrine of *shut door* and *Bridegroom come*. Here you attempted to put down and destroy two of the most important and prominent truths according to the types and new testament teaching, with our history in the past, that is connected with the "twenty-three hundred days," and "cleansing of, or vindicating the sanctuary"; and use them as a scape goat to carry off and hide your unholy and iniquitous practices from their view. Why not confess that after you and A. Hale had published this clear scriptural view, that you had been so positive that you were right in your position, that at one of your meeting places in Portsmouth, N. H., you declared that you was ready to seal it with your own heart's blood, and that the appointment which you afterwards made to meet at Richard Walker's, if not, you would state the reason by writing, had been utterly disregarded, although you had passed through there several times. Why not confess with contrition your unscriptural teachings and practices? And lastly, why not inform your listening audience of the wonderful discovery and proficiency which you had made during that time, in the growing science of your predecessors, "Jannes and Jambres?" and what a loving drawing and wonderful effect this mesmeric influence produced on some of the dear sisters! You was aware that such kind of satanic practices would not go down with your hearers, therefore you withheld it probably for a more convenient season. The response from heaven to this confession (I think) is long since recorded by a servant of the Lord. Isa. i: 10-15. Since you began to preach in New Bedford, where it was said such a wonderful revival was following your preaching and practice, that some in Fairhaven were looked upon as sinners, because they would not believe that you were filled with the Holy Ghost. Here in New Bedford, I am told, that in reply to some of these charges: that you had studied or looked into the subject of mesmerism that you might ascertain the cause, or meaning, of the delusions practiced by the advent people. I think that by comparing dates, it may pretty clearly be known that this is one of the first and principal causes of the state of things now among many in Maine, especially where your influence was felt. In the course of this conversation you stated something else, which you will remember, and for fear, or something else, that it would not be believed, you said you could prove it by certain persons whom you named. I have since ascertained that these persons neither *know*, nor have ever *known*, or *have intimated any such thing*. Now, I ask, how much your confessions are worth in Boston or any where else. In the name of my Master, I here warn the little flock to beware of your ungodly teaching.

Since answering your argument on the first day for the seventh, I see by the Advocate of Dec. 16th, your exulting reply to J. B. Cook. Because he has not met every point of your twisted, sophistical argument, you now think it will stand forever. You say “The position *I* have taken will stand the onset of *all* while the eternal rock of inspiration stands secure; hence with confidence calm as heaven, I take my pen to reply,” &c. We read that “the Devils believe and tremble,” while this wonderful man is *calm* as *heaven*, because he thinks he has gained one day since the crucifixion, which would destroy the law of God, the fourth commandment, when in fact he has only stole six or eight hours. Perhaps he will try to borrow or take the balance in the forthcoming articles which he promises. And here he says again, “*the matter shall rest without a review on either side*”!! “Vanity of vanities, saith the preacher!” Will God's word forever remain unvindicated, because of your veto? Your one mistake that I have shown, proves your infallibility. Let me repeat it in connection: In your text, Matt. xii: 39, 40, it states three days and three nights. This itself overthrows the whole of your argument – for three days are just as long as three nights. See how it will work by *your* rule: Jesus entombed just about 6 P.M. on Friday. Now count – Friday evening, one night; Saturday evening, two nights; Sunday evening, three nights. Now for the days: Saturday, one; Sunday, two; and Monday three. But to make it three, the resurrection must be on Monday evening, at 6 o'clock, and the scripture says he arose in the morning! Then if you wait until Tuesday morning, you make it just three and a half days and four nights, and *your* Sabbath commences on Monday. But if you say it must be Monday morning, then you have but two days and twelve hours. You say this would be the third day, just as I say – true, but this text says “three days.” Besides, you say in your second article, “some have been so *vain* on this point as to count the day of the crucifixion, one; the next day, one; and then the morning while it was yet dark, one; and therefore the third day. *This is almost wicked.* Does not Jesus Christ in whose word we trust – say three *nights*?” Yes, sir, and does he not as expressly say three *days*, too? If we are almost wicked in counting, as *you* say, then all the evangelists were, Mark and Luke especially. I say there is no other rule but the one you call us *vain* for using. If it is almost wicked to count a part of the first day, for one day, by what authority do you count a part of the last day, for one day? The scripture no where says, *two* days, and *three* nights.

And then as I have shown where you borrowed a part of a night, by counting Friday night for one of your three nights, when you insisted upon it that it was past, because the disciples had no time left of Friday to even prepare their spices. Did you not see that if you claimed six hours of Friday, to break the scriptures, that the disciples would have just as much time to prepare for the Sabbath? How is it that you do not understand what the angel Gabriel said should be in the last days: “But the wicked shall do wickedly, and none of the wicked shall understand.” I really hope no one will be troubled with your forthcoming article. It would be far easier for you to shovel the Alleghany mountains into Lake Ontario than to attempt to gain one day, or prove that we have lost one.

Your threat about the fallacy of history, and what you will do about it, is also vain; yet, if you could do so, the bible is a sufficient rule in this case. You have therefore made but two and a half days and two nights, and work it which way you will, you will fail. You cannot destroy the validity of the other eighteen texts.

It is clear that the Jewish feasts always occurred when they fell on the Sabbath of the Lord. Lev. xxiii: 37, last cl.

Barnabas Against The Sabbath

Barnabas would fain have the world believe that God has made one law which man could never keep without leading him into bondage. He says, “Sister Stowe, nor any others of like faith pretends to keep the seventh-day according to the commandment, that reads, ‘thou shalt not do any work.’ Exo. xx: 10. ‘Let no man go out of his place on the seventh day.’ There stands the command with all its terrible sanctions of thunder and lightnings. If this command is now in force sister S. and all the rest must stand condemned at the dread tribunal of God, for they all break that commandment as much as we who do not pretend to keep it.” The speciousness of B.’s reasoning is a great deal more likely to lead saints into bondage, than what he has said of sister Stowe. He begins in the very onset to mislead the mind. He quotes “Let no man go out of his place on the seventh day,” and says, there stands the command with all its terrible sanctions of thunder and lightnings, and then says sister S. and Br. Bates and all the rest must stand condemned at the dread tribunal of God, for they all break that *commandment*. Now I say this is not a commandment, but a command given to the children of Israel twenty days before they heard that terrible thunder and lightning at mount Sinai, where the ten commandments was made known to them by the Almighty God’s speaking them all out in an audible voice, and then writing them with his own finger on tables of stone. These are all the commandments that God ever gave to man, and they were as equally binding on the stranger, (the Gentile) that was within their gates, as on the Jew. Every one can see how difficult it would be for a man well versed in scripture to remember every direction, or a “thus sayeth the Lord,” for a commandment, especially the millions who cannot read. They were of that character, of so few words, that God directed them to “bind them for a sign upon their hands, and they shall be as a frontlet between thine eyes,” (“that the Lord’s law may be in thy *mouth*.” Exo. xiii: 9,) “and thou shalt write them upon the posts of thy house, and on thy gates.” Num. xv: 38-40; Deut. vi: 8, 9. This, God’s code of Laws was put into the Ark. Deut. x: 5. And he says that “one law shall be to him that is home born and to the stranger that sojourneth with you.” Exo. xii: 49. Now Moses’ code of laws was written in a book and placed in the same ark. Deut. xxxi: 24-26. This law from the xiv. ch. and onwards, and in Lev. was to be read to the whole assembly once in seven years; see xxxi: 10-12, and Neh. viii: 1-6. Six hours, reading from morning to noon. But the ten commandments as in Exo. xx: 1-17, can be read in three minutes. If you want to understand God’s code of laws separately set forth and enforced, see from iv. to xiv. of Deut. His reasons for giving them to the Jews, vii: 6-8, and x: 22. He tells them they shall not add nor diminish from them. Deut. iv: 2. (Mind this.) “The man for gathering sticks (either to kindle a fire for his comfort, or cook some food, B. says,) was by the command stoned to death.” This is all supposition; nobody knows what he gathered sticks for, or what size they were; he was stoned to death for it, and so we might be now if the law of Moses was in force. Let it be distinctly understood, that God’s code of laws, which comprises the ten commandments, does not forbid us to kindle fires on his Sabbath; nor require us to stay in our houses, nor forbid us to assemble together to worship; neither does it forbid us to administer to the sick on his Sabbath, nor do any *work* of absolute necessity. These I propose to treat upon more at large, under the head *Scriptural Observance of the Sabbath*.

Barnabas says, “if the covenant is not altered, amended nor repealed, then it means just what it says. ‘Thou shalt not do any work,’ stands out in bold relief against those who talk so much about the command, but never yet pretend to keep it. If they say they have a right to alter the phrase,” &c. Now we answer, that we never have attempted to alter it. It is perfectly right, and your bare assertion, in the absence of any kind of proof, does not, nor ever will prove, that we do not refrain from work on the Sabbath, according to the commandment, as set forth in the Scriptures.

Two kinds of work are specified or inferred in the law of Moses. “In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread,” &c. The way this is done, “man goeth forth to his work and to his labor until evening.” This of course includes from the first day to the seventh. Then Sunday is the first working

day of the six. This is distinguished *servile* work, because in Lev. xxiii. chap. and xxviii. and xxix. ch. of Numbers, the Lord's Sabbath and the Jewish Sabbaths of holy convocations are all brought to view, so that from the 14th day of the first month to the 22d, is the feast of unleavened bread with offerings, and fifty days from the wave sheaf or resurrection is another. See Lev. xxiii: 16-18, and then from the first day of the 7th month until the 23d of the same, viz. 1st, 10th, 15th and 23d. The eight last days is a continual feast. Now the Sabbath of the Lord God must inevitably be included in this last eight day feast of Tabernacles; once every year, and very frequently on the first and tenth day Sabbaths, and so from the passover feast to the end of unleavened bread, always must include the weekly Sabbath every year; sometimes on a feast day, which John calls "an high day." Now the order of these Jewish Sabbaths and feasts. God says of them "*every thing upon his day, besides the Sabbaths of the Lord,*" &c. All the work was to be performed in these feasts, come on what day they did, besides the offerings on the Sabbath of the Lord. Lev. xxiii: 37, 38. Well, what was the work for every weekly Sabbath? See Num. xxviii: 9, and on Sabbath two lambs, besides the daily, which was two more; see 3d v. So we see here were always four lambs, with the meats, &c. offered every seventh day, and sometimes thirty bullocks, rams and lambs; and in all of the Jewish Sabbaths except that on the tenth of the seventh month, it is expressly said "ye shall do no *servile work* therein." Now all this was work and labor, but it was ceremonial worship and obedience to God, hence it was not *servile* work. It is explained in Exo. xii: 16, "No manner of work shall be done save that which every *soul* must eat. That only may be done." What will you do with all these commands, Barnabas. Did they not have to go out of their places after God gave them the law from mount Sinai? Did they not assemble for worship? Did they not prepare them food to eat, think ye, after the manna ceased? and did not the Saviour say of his disciples, when reproached for eating corn on the Sabbath day by the Pharisees, that they were guiltless? Was it wrong to take it without leave? See Deut. xxiii: 24, 22. Was not the work of circumcision always going on every weekly Sabbath? Now Jesus being the Lord of the Sabbath, shows us under the Gospel, where he transposes these ten commandments from the tables of stone, and gives them in our minds and writes them on our hearts; shows us that this work or labor on the Sabbath, were henceforth acts of necessity and mercy, instead of *servile work* because our mode of worshipping God was entirely changed. Hence Jesus said, "My Father worketh hitherto and I work." John v: 17. See what kind of work, xvii: 4. "Done the will of God, finished his work," after supper. See also iv: 34, and v: 36. See his good works, x: 25, 32. This then was the work that Jesus and his Father were doing, and for these he is called a notorious Sabbath breaker. Well he is now doing a marvellous work. Hab. i: 5, yet ye will not believe. "It is time for the Lord to work for men have made void thy law." Psl. cxix.

It does not follow that men shall be put to death now for violating the Sabbath, any more than for violating the first, fifth, seventh, or all the commandments – for the penalty of death follows the violation of every one of the commandments.

1st commandment: "Thou shalt have no other Gods." See Deut. xiii: 6-10 and Exo. xxii: 20.

2d. "Thou shalt not make any image." Deut. xiii: 12, 16.

3d. "Thou shalt not profane my name." Lev. xxiv: 16, 22, 23.

4th. "Remember the Sabbath day." Num. xv: 32, 33, 36.

5th. "Honor thy father and thy mother." Lev. xx: 9.

6th. "Thou shalt not kill." Lev. xxiv: 21 and 17.

7th. "Thou shalt not commit adultery." Lev. xx: 10.

8th. "Thou shalt not steal." Joshua vii: 20, 21 and 25.

9th. "Thou shalt not witness falsely." Deut. xix: 16, 17, 19, 21.

10th. "Thou shalt not covet." Jos. vii: 20, 25.

All of the commandments together. Num. xv: 30, 31; see also Deut. xxviii: 15-67.

If these were all to be enforced now, there would be but a small remnant of the ten hundred millions now living, left upon the earth. If it is proper to enforce the fourth, it is the whole. How clear that all of these death penalties were annulled with the Jewish dispensation.

When Jesus begins to promulgate his Gospel, the stoning system is all broken up; see his admirable sermon on the mount. Matt v: 38-48. “Ye have heard that it hath been said an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, but I say unto you that ye resist not evil, but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also,” &c. &c. Here we see that all the followers of Jesus are to be peace men, or non-resistants, an entire change in administering the law. Says Barnabas, this is just what I have been trying to make you believe, that the law, *all* of the *law* that the Jews were subject to in their dispensation was abolished under the Gospel, for we are here under the new testament law, (grace). Not quite so fast: Jesus foreseeing such kind of teaching as this, placed the commandments of God, (on which hung all the law and the prophets,) on an immovable and fixed foundation and carried the teaching and keeping of them clear into the reign of heaven; and any honest man who is seeking for the truth though he be ever so ignorant in other things, will admit, when he reads the 17-19, 21, 27 and 33d verses in this chapter, the force of this truth. What an idea that Jesus should promise such invaluable blessings to his followers after they become immortal only to mislead and tantalize them. This is the tendency of your no commandment no law system. Why Jesus tells you that the teachings of the bible have no other foundations to stand upon. Well the multitude would not believe him then as you and others will not now. See what confusion and shame they suffered and bore in withering silence from his simple direction about enforcing the old law for the violation of the seventh commandment. Here *she* is master, “Now Moses in the law, (not God's code of laws,) commanded that such should be stoned. But what sayest thou?” “Let him that is without sin, cast the first stone at her.” The consequence was that the woman was left without an accuser. Thus for once the whole multitude were convinced that the stoning system for violating the commandments was abolished. See John vii: 3-11. Again, you ask, “What type or part of the law was fulfilled by Christ keeping the seventh day, or in our keeping it?” Answer – “Love is the fulfilling of the law.” “If ye keep my commandments ye shall abide in my love, even as I keep my Father's commandments and abide in his love.” John xv: 10. “This is *my commandment* that ye love one another as I have loved you.” 12 verse. Again, Jesus says in Matt. xxii: 37-40, where he includes all of the commandments that love to God and love to our neighbor, is the whole law and the prophets, i. e. that this is the substance of the whole ten commandments. The great one on the first table, the second on the second table of stone. Paul tells the Hebrews that the *law* having a shadow of good things to come cannot make the comers thereunto perfect. This is the *law* of Moses. The ten commandments, the *law* which God audibly gave from his own mouth, is the one that Jesus here refers to, and the only one that he kept abiding in his Father's love. Isaiah says, “He will magnify the law and make it honorable.” You know he dishonored the law of Moses by abolishing sacrifices and offerings altogether, and nailing it to his cross. It appears to me that any child, anxious for the truth, would see this distinction. But no, you seem determined on abolishing the whole. You see that Jesus' commandment, John xiii: 34; xv: 12, is the very essence of his Father's and is given exclusively for the church; but his Father's was, and is for the whole human family, and the fourth contains the Sabbath. Now do you see what Jesus means when he says he came not to destroy the law but to fulfill, and don't you understand him to, that this law will stand after the heavens and the earth are passed away. Here then is how and where he fulfilled the law, or as you ask to know, a part of the *law*, for in keeping the commandments he certainly kept the Sabbath; see Mark vi: 2, and Luke iv: 16, 31. This, then, is the way we fulfill the law, by keeping the very same seventh-day Sabbath. There is but two codes of laws brought to view here, viz. God's and Moses'. Don't you see here he has fulfilled the first and abolished the last. You take this rule with you to your favorite texts, viz. Col. ii: 14-17; 2d Cor. iii, and Gal. ii. and v., where you say the commandments, the law of God, and the Sabbath, are abolished; and you will find the same distinction. God never gave Paul, nor you, nor any one else, any more liberty to preach that *his law* was

abolished in this, or any other way, than he did to preach that there was no salvation for man. Don't you preach that man should obey the law of God, and when man obeys as Jesus did, don't he fulfill the *law*? Can you tell how man can fulfill it without obeying the *whole* law? You say that will bring us into circumcision. How can that be, when he has, as I have just stated, abolished all the ceremonial part of the law of Abraham and Moses. Again, you say, the only reason given in the bible why the Sabbath was ever kept was, that the Israelites might remember that God brought them out of Egypt. Deut. v: 15. Your objection to the answer that was given by C. Stowe, and reiterating the question, as you have the above answered one, and challenging all who desire to be under the law to prove the contrary, in B. A. Dec. 2d, only goes for proof of your ignorance, or wilfull misunderstanding of God's commandment. If the fourth commandment in Exo. xx: 11, as she quoted and you dissent from it, is not the reason given why we should keep the Sabbath on the seventh day, as directed in the ninth and tenth verses, then it would be impossible to understand the simple word of the Lord. Because God has used the words "command *thee*" to keep the Sabbath, in Deut. v: 15, every other word or form of speech where God requires the keeping of the Sabbath, is made void by you. What is the signification of commands? Is it not to appoint, enjoin, and require by authority? Does it not mean the same as to say "Remember the Sabbath day and keep it holy." – "*Thou shalt not* labor or do any work on the Sabbath day." Exo. xx: 8-10. Once more, God says, "Ye shall keep the Sabbath." Again, "Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath – for a perpetual covenant. *For* in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested and was refreshed." xxxi: 14, 16, 17. You see the word command is also used in the 16th verse, for the fifth commandment, and because it is omitted in Exo. xx: 12, according to your rule it is not valid. But it is not so – God speaks as positively and understandingly when he says "*ye shall*," as when he says "I command you." Again, you say – "If Christ did not virtually annul the fourth commandment when he began his public ministry, *then the Jews were* right in killing him as a NOTORIOUS SABBATH BREAKER. He travelled about and did much work on the Sabbath."

In your second article you offer as proof Luke iv: 18-20. There certainly is no proof of the law's being annulled here. You then quote xvi: 16. "The law and the prophets were until John," &c. This in your whole argument for annulling the fourth commandment. Read the next verse, "And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than for one tittle of the law to fail." Now don't a law fail when it passes away? Yes. How then can this law fail till heaven and earth passes? This was virtually showing how impossible it would be for one tittle of the law of God to fail. Here Jesus reverts to the seventh commandment, 18th verse, and shows that the law of the decalogue was what he meant. But he does not say that any law was annulled here. If you say that any part of the law of Moses was abolished here, you upset all the foundation that infidelity raises to overthrow the whole law of God. I wonder that all the second advent editors are not out against you, for if this be true they have no more foundation for their no-law and no-commandments of God system to stand upon than many who are hung on the gallows for venturing to practice after such teaching, by violating the eighth and sixth commandment. I am aware that their Judge Advocate, Joseph Marsh of Rochester, N. Y. has filed in his plea, (see Advent Harbinger, Nov. 9th,) that *we* are under the law of grace, the new testament, and not the law of Moses, which he asserts embraced the ten commandments. Why does not the law of grace save thieves and murderers and liars from the gallows here, and eternal death hereafter. (Rev. xxi: 8.) Answer – because there is no *precept* by which it can be done out of the law of commandments, which was made for *all men*, Jew and Gentile. How would murderers and robbers understand their sentence, viz. You are to be hung until you are dead for violating the law of the new testament, and may the Lord have mercy on you for violating his law of grace. Stop, says the American, you are bound to show me the precept. I ask where it is to be found if the commandments are abolished? Oh, sir, but you have violated the spirit of them. Well, but do tell me, sir, how I have violated the spirit of a law that you say was abolished and forever done away more than eighteen hundred years

ago. I am ignorant, I never professed religion, I do not understand the meaning of grace in the new testament – I pray you, sir, don't hang an innocent man.

I have already shown what they tell us that their foundation is for the abolition of God's law; it is in Gal. ii.; Cor. iii, and Col. ii: 14-17. The very day that our Lord was nailed to the cross – (every writer that I remember to have read before on this subject begins at the cross, where Paul directs us to look for the abolition of offerings and oblation, Moses' ceremonial mode of worship) – but you have attempted, without proof, to show that this was done three years before, and that without a shadow of proof that the fourth commandment, or any of them, was done away.

In this second article, you cite us for the same proof to Col. ii: 8-17. How unfortunate for your argument; first that Christ annulled the *law*, and of course the Sabbath, when he began to preach, according to Luke iv: 18-20, and xvi: 16. And then in another place quote Col. ii: 8-17, for the same point of time. How could Christ annul any law twice. First, at his preaching and second at his death, three and a half years apart. Your argument is groundless and futile; therefore the uncalled for blasphemous language of yours, that the Jews were right in killing him (the Son of God) as a notorious Sabbath breaker, will fall on your guilty head. Hear the proof: “They that forsake the law praise the wicked. – He that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his *prayer* shall be *abomination*.” See also James ii: 10. Once more, the law that Jesus says shall not pass away, &c. Luke xvi: 17, is proved to be the same as in ch. x: 25-28. Jesus says, how readest thou? what is written in the law? He answers by quoting the two great commandments in the law, in Matt. xxii: 36-40 – the same as given in ch. v: 17-19, the keeping of which *then* and *thenceforward* would make them of great esteem in the reign of heaven. Compare also xix: 16-19 with Luke xviii: 18-20. If Jesus' promise of eternal life by our keeping the law of – or, and commandments fails us here, then all his new testament teaching, the “law of grace,” so termed, will fail with it.

In conclusion, you call us foolish adventists, and wish to know who has bewitched us? Answer – not the strictly keeping the holy Sabbath and other commandments, but by listening to, or following such unrighteous and deceptive teachings as you set forth. No marvel that you would like to preach it in all the sectarian synagogues in the land, if they would hear you. Fallen Babylon is a more suitable place for such teaching than you will ever find any where else. John describes their condition, Rev. xviii: 2. But I pass. There is but one more remark of yours that I deem worthy of a reply, and I should not most probably have reviewed your articles, only for the defence of God's law and the suffering little flock, my brethren, who are endeavoring to stand where John, in his vision, saw them at this present hour, viz. In their patient waiting time, “keeping the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus.”

You say, “If a tree may be known by its fruits, we have a woeful tree here. First, *shut door*; next, *seventh-day Sabbath*, or the bondage of the law; next, Oh, it would be a shame to speak of those things which are done of them in secret. God grant them repentance which is unto life.” That we believe in the shut door, and seventh-day Sabbath, is true; that we wash one another's feet, as Jesus taught, and greet one another as Paul has taught, is true of a great portion of those who keep the Sabbath and believe in the past and present truth. If you mean these, that it be a shame to speak of, we answer that we do it openly and avowedly, and teach and practice the same wherever we go, and prove it clearly by the scriptures. If there is any thing secretly practiced by us, it is as much unknown to the church as it is to you. The days of J. Turner and some other leaders of fanaticism in Maine, I trust, have about all subsided, since they have crawled into the Laodocean state of the church. If you know of any thing that we secretly practice in our worship or service of God, that which is a shame to us, we are not unwilling for you to make it as public as you please. We have no faith nor fellowship for any such thing, neither have we any claim on them.

Конец ознакомительного фрагмента.

Текст предоставлен ООО «ЛитРес».

Прочитайте эту книгу целиком, [купив полную легальную версию](#) на ЛитРес.

Безопасно оплатить книгу можно банковской картой Visa, MasterCard, Maestro, со счета мобильного телефона, с платежного терминала, в салоне МТС или Связной, через PayPal, WebMoney, Яндекс.Деньги, QIWI Кошелек, бонусными картами или другим удобным Вам способом.