

**HERALD**  
**OF THE**  
**KINGDOM AND AGE TO COME.**

*“And in their days, even of those kings, the Eloah of the heavens shall set up a KINGDOM that shall not be abolished FOR AGES, and a DOMINION that shall not be left to another people. It shall grind to powder and bring to an end all these kingdoms, and itself shall stand FOR AGES.”—DANIEL.*

---

JOHN THOMAS, Editor. West Hoboken, Hudson Co., N.J., JUNE, 1861  
Volume 11—No. 6.

---

**The Sabbath Question.**

BY JAMES R. LITHGOW.

*Halifax, N.S.*

INTRODUCTION.

IN former years the shores of Nova Scotia abounded with fish, and the living of her now impoverished fishermen was less precarious than of late years, the sober and industrious among them could afford—notwithstanding the shortness of the fishing season—to make a sabbath or day of rest of every Sunday, without much apprehension of being unable to “provide things honest in the sight of all men,” and fulfil—at least once a year—that other good precept, — “Owe no man anything.” But for several years past the fisheries, especially on our shores, have so failed that for a fisherman to suffer any opportunity of taking a "school of fish" to pass by unimproved is a very serious matter, for in doing so he very probably loses his only chance of securing his year's living. It is seldom now that a fisherman on our shores has many opportunities in a single season of taking any considerable quantity of mackerel or herrings, on which, yet, he mainly depends for a living, or to pay for his living; and when a favorable opportunity of “making a stop” presents itself on Sunday, as often happens, — fishermen say, more frequently than on any other day—it is to the poor, conscientious and God-fearing man a great hardship—a "burden grievous to be borne"—hence not of Christ, whose "yoke is easy," and whose "burden is light"—to stand by and through fear of desecrating what is untruthfully called “the Sabbath day,”—or, of losing the respect of his unenlightened neighbors, —or worse than all perhaps, of incurring the displeasure of his minister and be cast out of the synagogue—suffer the means of subsistence which a kind Providence had placed within his reach, to pass away before his eyes.

Now I would ask the reader a question. If you *knew*—if you were fully persuaded from searching the Scriptures and carefully weighing and considering their testimony, that it is a violation of no Divine law or precept to work on Sunday—that Christ or his apostles never instituted a sabbath or holy day—would you not feel it your duty to make known this knowledge, and endeavour to relieve honest, upright fishermen of a great burden of mere human imposition? Again, —if you are not a fisherman imagine yourself one for a moment,

living on a rocky, sterile coast, with little to depend on but what your seine and nets may take, and that on some Sunday, after weeks of fruitless watching and tending nets you have at length an opportunity of securing a fine body of fish—would not the knowledge that what I maintain is the truth be gladly and gratefully received? especially if you were so conscientious as under no circumstances to fish on what you had been taught was the Sabbath day, on which, according to the fourth commandment, no work must be done.

Now if the reader be not a fisherman he may suppose, or be easily persuaded that such a thing rarely happens. But the fact is it often happens. I have for many years been in an establishment which supplies fishermen; and of late particularly, have heard much concerning the losses they oft sustain in consequence of their conscientious scruples in regard to working on Sunday. Last season especially, many well authenticated instances came to my knowledge of quantities of mackerel and herrings being lost to our fishermen in this way. And no wonder, seeing they have been taught from their childhood the fourth commandment, — "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy," etc., —and been impressed with the belief that the command is addressed to them, and that the sabbath day is Sunday! while the truth is, it was given only to the nation of Israel, and had reference only to the *seventh* day of the week; that is Saturday; or more strictly from 6 P. M., on Friday, to the same hour on Saturday evening; as observed by the Jews to this day in obedience to their law. Whoever, therefore, would keep the fourth commandment must "not do any work" from Friday evening till Saturday evening, "Any work"—not even *kindle a fire* in his habitation, or *gather sticks*, under pain of *death*! Such is the law of Moses, as see Exodus xxxv. 2, 3; Numbers xv. 32-36. And of this law it is written—"Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in *one* point, he is guilty of all." Alas! if the law of the sabbath day were binding on us! we must all inevitably perish! But as I have fully shown in the following pages, Moses is *not* the Christian's law-giver. The Christian is *not* under his law. (Rom. vi. 14.) He is a child *not* of the bondwoman but of the free! (Gal. iv. 21—31.) And only such Mosaic commandments as are found among the precepts of the NEW COVENANT are binding on the church, and that not because they are of Moses, but of Christ. "Go ye, therefore," said our Lord to his Apostles, "and teach all nations, baptizing them \* \* \* Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Matt, xxviii. 19, 20. The "all things" then, which Christ through his Apostles—not Moses in the law—commands, the baptized believer of the Gospel is to observe. Here then, I again repeat the offer—made through the *Acadian Recorder* in October last—of Five Pounds to any one who will point out among the "all things" inculcated by the apostles anything like a command to observe a sabbath day. And I further offer a like sum for such Scripture testimony as would justify an intelligent jury in finding a man who works on Sunday guilty of "sabbath-breaking," or of violating any divine precept: —provided the law of the land sanctions or winks at work on that day. The reasoning of Sabbatarians on this question is a piece of sophistry which it is high time was effectually exposed. The honor and supremacy of Christ and his Gospel, as well as a consideration of the fisherman's case, demand that this should be done.

But to return to the fishermen. In the *Acadian Recorder* the following paragraph appears:

"THE SABBATH CONTROVERSY. — We last evening had a conversation with a fisherman from St. Margaret's Bay—a most respectable and intelligent man on whose word we can rely—who, speaking of the Sabbath Question, assured us that he and his neighbors could have secured, on Sunday in July last, many hundred barrels of mackerel; but, thinking it unlawful to do so, they suffered the fish to pass by unmolested. He also stated that on another

occasion this season he stopped about two hundred barrels of mackerel on a Saturday evening, and could have landed them safely on Sunday, but leaving them until Monday the fish escaped. In view of facts like these our readers will agree with us, that if it be, as Mr. Lithgow maintains, no transgression of God's law for a fisherman to take fish on Sunday, it behoves them and all who are interested in the success of our fisheries (and which of us is not) to know it."

I was present when the above statement was made in the *Acadian Recorder* Office, and can vouch for the truth of it, knowing the person who made it to be a truthful, religious man, and a consistent member of the Baptist Church in Margaret's Bay.

*E pluribus unum.* —The above is but a sample—one out of many instances—of the grievous, intolerable losses our poor fishermen have annually to bear. Many similar cases might be adduced. Many such, of recent occurrence, are known to the fishermen of this Province. And I can safely affirm that had our Labrador and Shore fishermen known last season the liberty which Christ and his Gospel gives, in regard to the observance of days, thousands of pounds worth of fish would have been taken which were lost; and many a worthy man in Margaret's Bay and elsewhere, now deep in debt and oppressed with poverty, would have been to-day in comfortable circumstances, had he known last spring what the Bible teaches concerning "the Sabbath day" and "the first day of the week." Such is my conviction. And this conviction, with the Scripture testimony which produced it, I conceive it my duty to publish far and wide: and thus endeavor to save some of our good and honest-hearted fishermen from repeating in future seasons the uncalled-for sacrifices of the past.

But not only fishermen are interested in the truth of this Sabbath Question; every Christian who has a tender conscience and wishes to keep it void of offence, must desire to know how Sunday should be observed. It is the Lord's day and He only has the right, to say how it shall be observed. What, then, is the Lord's will concerning it? What has He said should or should not be done on His day? Has He called it a Sabbath or holy day, and forbidden His people to work thereon? How, in short, is it to be kept acceptably, —that is, agreeably to His will?

These questions are answered in the following pages: but since they were written I have been handed a little work published in 1824, by Dr. Cramp, now of Acadia College, entitled—"AN ESSAY ON THE OBLIGATION OF CHRISTIANS TO OBSERVE THE LORD'S SUPPER EVERY LORD'S DAY," wherein he shows conclusively what I contend for, viz.— that the Lord's day like the Lord's supper can only be scripturally observed by the Lord's people, and that only by their coming together on that day to BREAK BREAD. After showing the testimony of Scripture on the subject, he quotes in support of his position from Pliny, Justin Martyr, Chrysostom, Mosheim, Randal, Erskine, Cranmer, Calvin, Whitefield, Wesley, Baxter, Goodwin, Owen, Watts, Ames, Doddridge, Edwards, Mason, and others—Independents, Baptists, Church of England, Lutherans, &c. From page 26 of this work I quote the following: —

"Testimonies in abundance, might be adduced, were it needful, to prove that the Lord's Supper was regularly observed by the primitive Churches every Lord's day, and was considered the most important part of their services. For this reason Chrysostom styles the Lord's day the '*day of bread.*' Even in the fourth century, as Mosheim observes, 'the Christian worship consisted in hymns, prayers, reading of the Scriptures, a discourse addressed to the people, and concluded with the celebration of the Lord's supper,' which

institution was observed 'in some places two or three times a week, in others on Sunday only.'"

"Consider antiquity," says a modern divine, (Randal), "in what view you please, the elder or the later accounts; —consider it among enemies or friends; —view it in its truth or in its lies, in its simplicity or its superstitions; —consider all the accounts which all sorts of men have given; take the evidence from as distant corners of the world, and as opposite characters in it as you please, from those who have no bias but to the truth, or from such whose opinions and interests would lead them to give this fact a color if it would bear it—and all with one voice shall declare, that to come together on the first day of the week to break bread, was from the beginning, and for many ages, the custom, the uninterrupted, unquestioned, undisputed practice of all Christian Churches; —as much so, as it was their practice to sanctify the Lord's day, or to pray, praise and preach the Apostles' doctrine upon it; —that as this was the most distinguishing part of their worship, so was it what they and their worship was described by, and the action by which among themselves the Lord's day was known; what consequently they would least and last of all have omitted, while any degree of the purity of the Gospel remained among them."

On page 38 Dr. Cramp quotes CALVIN as follows, —"*Every week, at least, the Lord's table ought to have been spread before the assembly of Christians, and the promises declared which invite us to this spiritual feast.*" On page 30, BAXTER is quoted: —"*It is a part of the settled order of the Lord's day worship; and omitting it maimeth and altereth the worship of the day.*" . . . "Every Lord's day is no oftener than Christians need it." "The frequency will teach them to live prepared." On page 44 DR. WATTS says, —"If Jesus being dead, and being alive again, is so great and important an article of our religion, and, as it were, the foundation on which it stands, then how wisely hath He ordered in His Gospel, that we should have a *constant* memorial appointed us, both of His death and His resurrection! Of His death in the Lord's Supper, and of His resurrection in the Lord's day. On the first day of the week Christ appeared in His holy ordinances, and saith, 'Peace be unto you,' as He did to His apostles. The primitive Christians celebrated *both* those institutions on *every first day* of the week."

If now, these things be so, if Dr. Cramp and the eminent men he quotes be correct—and if Christians be under the obligation to observe the Lord's Supper *every* Lord's day, what must be the Lord's estimate of such as "break bread" once a month—once a quarter—yea, once in six months! Others, indeed, never! And, as if to compensate for their delinquency make a great "hue and cry" about a poor man working or taking a little recreation on Sunday, —call it a desecration of the Sabbath day, and so forth. Let such first cast the beams out of their own eyes, and then they may try their hand upon the fancied mote in their brother's eye. Let such as hold with Dr. Cramp practice what they preach, and profess to believe, let them follow their religious principles at whatever cost—let their own consciences acquit them of nearly every Lord's day neglecting the Lord's Ordinance, and then they will be in a fitter position to discuss the question of Sunday observance. If the Lord, now, as of old, require of his people *obedience* and not sacrifice, 1 Sam. xv., he will not accept a "rest from labor," which he hath not required in lieu of that Ordinance which he hath commanded to be observed until he come again. Let Sabbatarians see to it, lest some day they hear it is said to them—"Full well ye rejected my commandment, and kept your own tradition."

As, "example is better than precept," it may not be amiss to show that I do not advocate one thing and practice another, as some do who hold it to be the duty of Christians

to break bread every Lord's day, and yet do it not. Rule No. 3, of the Church of which I am a member, reads as follows:

“The body shall continue to assemble together on the first day of the week to read the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, offer spiritual sacrifices of prayer and thanksgiving to the God and Father of our Lord, to show our Lord's death by partaking of bread and wine with thanksgiving, in remembrance of his broken body and shed blood, and for mutual edification and exhortation, until he come again and receive us unto himself for ever.” Heb. x. 25; Acts xx. 7; 1 Tim. iv. 13; 1 Pet. 2, 5; Heb. xiii. 15; 1 Cor. xi. 23, 26, 1; 1 Thes. iv. 15—18; v. 11; John xiv. 3; Rev. xiv. 1-5; Jer. iii. 17; Ps. cxxxii. 13, 14; Heb. xiii. 14.

The practice of the Church with which I am connected has been in conformity with the above Rule ever since I have been a member of it; and Sabbatarians themselves being judges, must admit that we are, in the observing of the Lord's Supper every Lord's day, an example and standing reproof to them who omit it. And we may be pardoned if—while holding with the Reformers that “the Gospel *regardeth neither Sabbath nor Holidays*” and that it is a “*superstition and an apostasy from Christ to think that working on Sunday in itself considered is a sinful thing,*”—we assume to be the only church in Halifax which observes *scripturally* the Lord's day. Let the reader turn back and read again the statement of Randal—which cannot be gainsaid—and he may judge how much of “the purity of the Gospel” remains in *Churches* which break bread once in three months—or even, once a month. Can *they* be said to observe the Lord's day, when “the action by which that day was known among the primitive churches, and for many ages,” is omitted? I trust that some that love the Lord Jesus in sincerity, and desire to keep his commandments, will be stirred up to inquire into this matter; and ascertain how there happens to be in their respective churches such a departure from primitive and Apostolic practice. “Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices, as in *obeying the voice of the Lord*? Behold, to *obey* is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams.” In Acts xv. 7, we read: —“On the first day of the week when the disciples came together to”—what do you think reader? To pray? No. to sing? No. To hear a sermon? No. To read the scriptures? No. For none of these purposes does Luke say they came together: but to—“*break bread.*” That when they thus met they read the scriptures, etc., other passages show; but the main object of their assembling themselves together was to “eat the Lord's Supper.” Thus was Christ and the day on which he arose commemorated by his disciples in Apostolic times. For the most part poor and despised, like their master, and “everywhere spoken against,” it was not in their power to make a *sabbath* of Sunday, but they nevertheless managed to come together at sometime on that day, morning or evening, to “show the Lord's death.” 1 Cor. xi. 26.

All that is said about the blessings and benefits of Sunday, *to such as use it aright*, I fully admit. As a day of rest for the man who has worked from Monday morning till Saturday night, it is invaluable. As a day on which a mouthful of fresh air and some innocent recreation may be got by those who need it, it is a boon indeed; and would be much more so were it not for Sabbatarian notions. As a day on which those who love to search the Scriptures may do so without distraction, and become “wise unto salvation” without the aid of sermons, or other mere human teaching oft deceptive, it is welcome and precious; and for many other things it is to be highly prized. But as *the Lord's day*—as the day on which he was raised from the dead—it can be said is only *scripturally* observed by Christians who come together to break bread. They only observe it religiously and acceptably. Anything else than this is for some other reason than that the Lord enjoins it. A rest from labor the Lord does not require. His commandments are spiritual, not carnal; and there is nothing neither moral or spiritual in

simply doing no work, nor merely resting from labor. Neither is that man immoral who labors every day from a good motive. The fourth commandment, as a part of Israel's national law, was wise and good, for it was an effectual check upon the avarice and exactions of covetous masters; and gave servants and all who needed it a day of refreshment once a week. All nations have their national holidays; and it would have been strange indeed if God's nation should not have had theirs by law appointed. Men seem to forget or not to know that the law of Moses was Israel's civil law, as well as ecclesiastical, and was not designed for nor given to any other people.

But it is said the other nine commandments of the decalogue are moral. Well, suppose they are, does that prove the fourth to be moral, and of universal obligation? Upon the same principle I could prove other commandments, which theologians call ceremonial, to be moral. In Exodus xxii. 10-12, for example, the command to observe, *every seventh year as a Sabbath for the land*, is coupled, with the command to observe the seventh day as a Sabbath for man and beast. Now, is one of those commands ceremonial and the other moral? Is the one local and temporary, and the other of permanent and universal obligation? Surely, they are of precisely the same character, and if the latter be binding upon us, so is the former; and the farmers of Nova Scotia are morally bound to give their land a Sabbath every seventh year! If our fishermen must keep the Jewish Sabbath day, our farmers must, by the same law, keep the Jewish sabbatical year!

In reply to the argument, that because the other nine commandments are moral the fourth must be also moral, Dr. Paley answers, "that this argument will have little weight, when it is considered that the distinction between positive and natural duties, like other distinctions of modern science, was unknown to the simplicity of ancient language; and that there are various passages in Scripture in which duties of a political, or ceremonial, or positive nature, and confessedly of partial obligation, are enumerated, and without any mark of discrimination, along with others which are natural and universal. Of this the following is an incontestable example, —the Dr. here quotes Ezekiel xvii. 5-9, and continues, —“The same thing may be observed of the apostolic decree recorded in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts: —It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burdens than *these* necessary things, that ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication, from which, if ye keep yourselves ye shall do well.” On this apostolic decree Dr. Paley well remarks, “The *observation of the Sabbath* was not one of the articles enjoined by the Apostles upon them, ‘which from among the gentiles were turned unto God.’” Again, in another place he says, —“The distinction of the Sabbath is, in its nature, as much a positive ceremonial institution, as that of many other seasons which were appointed by the Levitical law to be kept holy, and to be observed by a strict rest; as the first and seventh days of unleavened bread, the feast of Pentecost, the feast of Tabernacles, and in the twenty-third chapter of Exodus, the Sabbath and these are recited together.” He further remarks,

"If the command by which the Sabbath was instituted, be binding upon Christians, it must bind us to the day, the duties, and the penalty in none of which it is received."

I hope the reader will carefully consider the arguments of Dr. Paley, for they afford an unanswerable reply to all that Sabbatarians say about the fourth commandment being a part of the Moral law, and not of the Ceremonial, and, hence, binding upon all mankind. If it be binding at all, "it must bind us to the *day*, the *duties*, and the *penalty*." It is not easy for us to realise the consequences of living under such a law. If we saw one of our brethren brought up

for merely "gathering sticks," tried, sentenced, and *stoned to death*, we would then have some idea of Israel's Sabbath law, which Sabbatarians profess to believe binding on all mankind!

If, then, the fourth commandment be ceremonial, not moral, why are the ten called "the moral law"? In the Scriptures, the ten commandments are not thus designated; neither did our Lord account them the *great* commandments of the law. See Matt. xxii. 37-40. He chose two from Deut. vi. 5, and Lev. xix. 18, and declared, "On these two hang all the law and the prophets." And Paul after him declares that the whole law is fulfilled in the keeping of one of them,—"Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Gal. v. 14.

If the ten commandments were called by their scriptural designation, and understood to be neither more nor less than the "first," or "old covenant," God made with Israel, which Paul shows, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, gave place to the new covenant, and was, when he wrote, "ready to vanish away," we would hear no more of the "moral law." Moses, addressing the Israelites, thus alludes to the ten commandments: "And he (Jehovah declares unto you his *covenant*, which he commanded you to perform, *even ten commandments*; and he wrote them upon two tables of stone." Deut. iv. 13. In the ninth chapter these tables are called "the tables of the covenant," and the ark or chest in which they were placed, is consequently called "the ark of the covenant." Deut. x. 5, Heb. ix. 4. Now the apostle, speaking of this "covenant," or "ten commandments,"—for they are synonymous terms—says, "For if that *first* covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the *second*. For finding fault with them, he saith, "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make "a *new covenant* with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah. . . . In that he saith, A *new covenant*, he hath made the *first old*. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away. Heb. viii. 7-15. Who will venture to say, in view of this testimony, that the "ten commandments" are still in force? And is not this doctrine of Paul's in harmony with Christ's teaching on the mount, where he alludes to the commandments as what was "said by *them of old time*?" See Matt. v. 21, 27. But the Christian is, nevertheless, not without a law and commandments to keep. "This commandment have we from him, That he who loveth God love his brother also." 1 John, iv. 21. And again, "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the LAW OF CHRIST. Gal. vi. 2.

The whole secret of the ten commandments being upheld as a standard of holiness for the Christian is, I am persuaded, that otherwise no semblance of divine authority could be produced for the observance of a Sabbath day. The precepts of Christ—ininitely superior, as they confessedly are, to the ten commandments—would be considered all-sufficient for Christians and their children, if only they contained a solitary *one* to observe a Sabbath! But, alas! where holy and Sabbath days are referred to by the apostles, their observance is censured, instead of being commanded! Col. ii. 16. No need to go to the old Jewish law to learn "how we ought to walk and please God," for we know what commandments are given us by the Lord Jesus; 1 Thess. iv. 1, 2; but we must go to Moses to learn how to observe the Sabbath day! How strange, that a Christian can learn his whole duty to God and his neighbor from the Epistles of Paul, the teacher of the Gentiles, save only in regard to Sabbath-keeping and Sabbath-breaking! Is not this a most remarkable circumstance? And should not every Christian who is jealous of the honor and supremacy of Christ, as his sole Law-giver, inquire into it?

The newspaper articles published herewith will assist the reader to do this. And if he carefully examine the numerous passages of Scripture to which reference is made, he may obtain a knowledge of many great truths hitherto, perhaps, undreamed of, or not understood;

for I have, while treating on the Sabbath question, incidentally introduced other matters of far greater importance.

In conclusion, I hope that my labor will not be in vain; but trust that some who read and understand what I have written may be edified and benefited, and their mind freed from superstitious notions of Sunday observance. Especially, I hope, that many of our fishermen may get their eyes open to the truth, and in future, when opportunities offer of taking fish on Sunday, be enabled to go to work with a good, enlightened conscience.

January 19, 1861.

JAS. R. LITHGOW.

P. S. The law of this province, it is said, forbids a fisherman pursuing his calling on a Sunday. If such be the case it is a grossly unjust law, and one that ought not to remain in the statute book of Nova Scotia. All such laws are the result of ignorance of the Sabbath question, and are made only to be broken every Sunday by their originators, directly or indirectly. Let the fishermen who arrive at a knowledge of the truth of this question, petition the legislature to amend the law concerning Sunday observance, so that they may, when occasion requires, follow their lawful calling without being interfered with by the magistrates, and their case will doubtless receive due consideration.

J. R. L.

---

**For the Acadian Recorder.**

MR. EDITOR, —Having heard this afternoon that the Rev. Mr. Brewster had announced through the *Wesleyan* his intention of replying to my articles on the Sabbath day, \* as soon as I had finished: and not wishing to prolong the time, I will sum up in four propositions, the pith of my arguments, and hope you will be able to insert them as a postscript to the article I sent for publication, to-morrow.

\* The two first articles are omitted here for want of space, and as being in substance reproduced in the subsequent communications.

1. I affirm that "the fourth commandment," and all other commandments to keep holy or observe the Sabbath day, are part and parcel of the Mosaic, or Jewish national law, binding only on Jews, and on Gentiles, or "strangers" living in the land of Israel when the Law was in force. These latter were, of course, obliged to respect Israel's laws, just as foreigners living in England, are obliged to respect her laws.

2. I affirm that "the first day of the week," or Sunday, as we call it, is *not* commanded by the Lord Jesus or his Apostles, to be observed as a holy day, on which, as on the Jewish Sabbath, no work should be done.

3. I affirm that the Scriptures show, simply, concerning "the first day of the week" that *sometime* on that day Christians were accustomed to come together to "break bread" and for mutual edification and comfort. The *hour* of meeting being, doubtless, one that would best suit their convenience and circumstances; and as we may gather from Acts xx. 7, and from the fact that it was chiefly the poor who embraced the gospel, was very commonly in the *evening*, when their day's toil was over, and they were at liberty to meet together.

4. I affirm that, unless restricted by the law of the land in which he dwells, a Christian may work on Sunday without violating any Divine law. And provided he neglect not the



apostolic exhortation to forsake not the assembling of himself with his brethren, to break bread, &c.

If Mr. Brewster can prove any one of these propositions to be false, no one will more readily acknowledge it than

Yours respectfully,

October 12, 1860.

J. R. L.

---

*For the Acadian Recorder.*

### **THE SABBATH DAY.**

MR. EDITOR, —When a clever, eloquent lawyer comes into court with a popular case in hand, which he yet knows cannot be sustained in law, his great aim must be so to work upon the feelings and prejudices of the jury, that their verdict may be—not according to the law and evidence, but—in accordance with what he may lead them to think is right and proper. The opposing counsel on the other hand, who knows the law and evidence are all in his favor, and that his only difficulty lies in the prejudices of the jury, —excited and increased as they will be by the eloquent and captivating speeches of the learned counsel on the other side, —with great calmness and much simplicity of speech, states his case to the court and jury—calls the witness who can substantiate it—reads over slowly and impressively the law to which all must bow—and turning to the jury, calls upon them as moral and responsible men, to remember their oath, and render their verdict in accordance with the law and the testimony.

Now the Rev. Mr. Brewster, in reply to my first proposition reminds me of the lawyer with the legally bad, though popular case in hand. For in his addresses to the jury—the readers of the *Wesleyan*, his aim plainly has been just what I have stated a clever lawyer's would be, under the same circumstances. He has evidently trusted to his excellency of speech and of wisdom—his flowery language and poetical imagery—at once to captivate and prejudice his hearer, and close his ears against the law and testimony; which, rightly expounded, are directly opposed to him. And herein lies my great difficulty, —I am, of course, the counsel on the unpopular, or at least, unorthodox side of the question—namely, to induce men to cast aside old prejudices—distinguish between the words of truth and soberness and poetical imaginations—receive with unbiased minds a plain statement of the question submitted for their consideration—hear in the same spirit the law and the testimony by which they should be governed, and decide according to the best of their judgment and without partiality.

In the hope then, that some who read our controversy may be of this stamp, I proceed to state the circumstances out of which arose the question about which I am at issue, not only with Mr. Brewster, but with the Protestant Clergy generally.

Some fishermen at Labrador this present season, pursuing their lawful calling on Sunday, enclosed or "stopped" a large quantity of Herring on that day. For so doing they were, on the following day, assaulted by ignorant men who imagine Sunday to be the "Sabbath day" referred to in "the fourth commandment;" they were denounced as "sabbath-breakers"—their seine was tripped, and what would have been a year's living to them was lost. Hearing of this circumstance, and having been for a long time fully persuaded from searching the Scriptures—both Old and New, for I equally prize both, Mr. Brewster's

suspicion to the contrary notwithstanding—that Sunday, or scripturally speaking, "the first day of the week" is not a divinely appointed Sabbath day, I resolved, if you Mr. Editor, would permit me, to publish in your independent paper what I believe to be the truth of the matter, and expose the ignorance or hypocrisy of Sabbatarians; some of whose forefathers enacted the Blue Laws of Connecticut, which, I am credibly informed, forbade a woman to kiss her child on Sunday? And whose brethren in the Legislature of the neighbouring Republic have recently passed similar absurd Sabbath laws. At whose instigation this is done, and whose ends are served by such laws, they only who are blind can fail to perceive. But to proceed, to this end I wrote the two articles which appeared in the *Recorder*, and intended writing a third; but learning that the Rev. Mr. Brewster had announced through the *Wesleyan* his intention of replying to my "most audacious attack upon the sanctity of the Christian Sabbath," I summed up my views of the Sabbath or *Seventh* day, and of Sunday, or "*the first* day of the week," in four propositions which you also published, in your paper of the 13<sup>th</sup> inst, and promised, if Mr. Brewster proved them to be false, I would readily acknowledge it.

Mr. B.'s first reply appeared in last week's *Wesleyan*. In this he says—"the whole question at issue between us, may be expressed in Mr. L.'s own words," my first proposition — "I affirm that the fourth commandment, and all other commandments to keep holy or observe the Sabbath day, are part and parcel of the Mosaic or Jewish national law; binding only on Jews, and on Gentiles, or strangers living in the land of Israel when the law was in force. These latter were, of course, obliged to observe Israel's laws, just as foreigners living in England, are obliged to respect her laws." This proposition is far from expressing the whole point at issue. It does not indeed affect the main question, which is expressed in my second proposition—"I affirm that the first day of the week, or Sunday, as we call it, is *not* commanded by the Lord Jesus or his apostles, to be observed, as a holy day, on which, as on the Jewish Sabbath, no work should be done." The fourth commandment refers to the *seventh* day, or Saturday—the day the Jews "under the law" still observe—and not to "*the first* day of the week," or Sunday. Thus the real question at issue would not be affected if I were to admit Mr. B.'s counter proposition, which runs thus — "I affirm that the Fourth Commandment is a part of the Moral Law, and not of the Ceremonial, and therefore is binding upon *Man*, —that is, upon all mankind, irrespective of Jew or Gentile." Let us admit for a moment this counter proposition, and what follows? Clearly this, that "all mankind," the Jews excepted, are weekly transgressors of the fourth commandment, seeing it forbids any work being done, by man or beast, on the *seventh* or Sabbath day. Let us look at the fourth commandment—"Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work: but the *seventh* day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God, in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor the stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it. — Ex. xx. 9-11. Waiving for a moment the fact that this was spoken to the people God had brought out of the land of Egypt, as the first verse clearly proves; and also, the axiom, that "what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law,"—Rom. iii. 29, — will any one pretend to say that "the first day of the week" is "the Sabbath" on which the Jews rested in obedience to this fourth commandment? Or, that it is called "the Sabbath" in the Scriptures? I affirm that it is never so called; and that the distinction between it and the Sabbath is maintained throughout the New Testament; — "the Sabbath" being always the seventh day; and "the first day of the week" being always the day after the Sabbath. In proof of this very important statement, I will quote all the texts where "the first day of the week" is spoken of. They are Matt. xxviii. 1; Mark xvi. 2, 9; Luke xxiv. 1; John xx. 1, 19; Acts. xx. 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 2. Here are five witnesses brought into Court — the four Evangelists and Paul, all

good men and true—whose testimony no Christian will dispute; I will now question the first:

—  
*Counsel.* "Matthew, when you wrote your Gospel, did you regard the first day of the week as the "Sabbath?"

*Matthew.* "Surely no one who has ever read the 1st verse of my 28th chapter could suppose that! Did I not clearly distinguish between them when I wrote, —'In the end of the *Sabbath*, as it began to *dawn towards the first day of the week*, came Mary Magdalene, &c.' Do I not here plainly state that the first day of the week, or Sunday, so you call it, only began to *dawn* when the Sabbath day was ended?"

*Counsel.* "I never thought otherwise since I was turned from darkness unto light; but there are some now-a-days who call the *first* day of the week the Sabbath, and doom to perdition all who do not say Amen to their foolishness. Matthew, you may retire, the learned counsel on the other side has, I fancy, nothing to ask you."

Mark is now called and comes forward.

*Counsel.* "Was the first day of the week the *Sabbath* day when you wrote your Gospel?"

*Mark.* "I am equally surprised with Matthew that men of intelligence should believe such an absurdity. Does not the 4th commandment expressly say —the *seventh* day is the Sabbath? How then, can *the first* day be the Sabbath? Has he of whom Daniel spake, chap. vii. 20, appeared, and thought to change times and laws? In regard to what I believed concerning the Sabbath day, no one need doubt who will read my 16th chap, verses 1, 2. — 'And when the Sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James and Salome, had brought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him. (Our Lord.) And very early in the morning the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun.'"

*Counsel.* "Your testimony, Mark, is so clear and explicit that I presume you may go. Luke will now please stand up. You wrote one of the four Gospels, and also the Acts of the apostles?"

*Luke.* "I did."

*Counsel.* "Therein you made frequent mention of the Sabbath day, and also of the first day of the week; did you regard the latter as the Sabbath?"

*Luke.* "Certainly not! Read in connection the last verse of the 23d chap, and the 1st verse of the 24th chap, of my Gospel; —and they returned (from the crucifixion which was on *Friday*,) and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the *Sabbath day* (Saturday) according to the commandment. (the 4th.) Now upon *the first day of the week*, (Sunday), very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulchre, bringing the spices which they had prepared.' "

*Counsel.* "So far, good. You confirm the testimony of the previous witnesses. Now, did, or did not, the Lord Jesus, to the best of your knowledge and belief, after his resurrection, command the *first* instead of the *seventh* day to be observed as the Sabbath?"

*Luke.* "Can you imagine that if He had given any such commandment I, or my old companion, Paul, would have omitted mentioning it? Can you not perceive that, in my second treatise—the Acts, I make the same distinction between 'the Sabbath' and the 'first day of the week' as in my Gospel? Refer to Acts xiii. 14, 27; xvii. 1, 2; xviii. 4. In all these places *the Sabbath* is mentioned as usual, without qualification; it is not distinguished as the *Jewish Sabbath*, as would have been the case had I known of any such day as the *Christian Sabbath*. I speak of it simply as *the Sabbath*; and if you read the portions referred to, you will see the Jewish Sabbath is meant. Paul took advantage of that day wherever he went, to gain the ear of the Jews and proselytes, when they met in their synagogues for worship; —for in those days there was liberty of speech in the synagogues on the Sabbath; (see Acts xiii. 15.) which is not the case in your day, I regret to learn. Now, in regard to the first day of the week, although we Christians did not observe it as the Sabbath, yet we always endeavored to come together sometime on that day—morning or evening, as circumstances permitted, *to break bread*, in remembrance of our Lord's body which was broken for us; and to exhort one another to continue steadfast in the faith, and so on. The only place where I allude to this is in Acts xx. 7, which reads thus; —'And upon the *first day of the week*, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them ready to depart on the morrow, and continued his speech until *midnight*.'" "

*Counsel.* On that occasion, I presume, the disciples met in the *evening* to eat the Lord's supper, seeing Paul spoke until midnight?

*Luke.* You may fairly gather that from my narrative.

*Counsel.* But did the disciples *work* on that day?

*Luke.* *Work* on that day? Why not? For several years after Christ's resurrection, the gospel, as you are aware, was preached only to the Jews; and of these it was chiefly "the poor" who embraced it. Now these poor Hebrew Christians who lived in their own land were obliged to submit to the law of Moses and do no work on the Sabbath; can you suppose that they could afford to be idle also on the first day of the week? Can you suppose that our Lord, who well knew beforehand how his poor little flock would for long centuries be placed in the world, —depending for employment on the unbelieving, —would have forbidden them to *work* on any day? Would He, think you, whose "yoke is easy and whose burden is light," have given his disciples any commandment, which in a majority of cases, they could not have kept? How were Christians—servants to unbelieving Jews and Gentiles—to observe any particular day as a Sabbath? Were they to be disobedient to their own masters, and refuse to work on the first day of the week? This they must have done, had God in Christ commanded them to do no work on that day. We would have suffered the loss of all things, yea of our lives even, before we would have disobeyed God. But I have never heard of any such commandment, nor will you find any such command within the lids of the Bible.

*Counsel.* You have clearly shown that even after Christ's resurrection, the *only* sabbath referred to is the Jewish. That there is not a shadow of evidence in the Scriptures of the first day of the week being a sabbath to Christians, I can also testify. Much obliged for your testimony. John will now please come forward.

You are believed to have written your Gospel long after the ascension of our Lord, — about A. D. 97, —and more especially for the instruction of the Gentiles; therein you make

mention of the Sabbath and the first day of the week, when telling of what Jesus said and did while teaching and ministering to the Jews; —what do you mean by *the* Sabbath?

*John.* Invariably, as you may see from my Gospel, v. 10, 16, 18; ix. 14, 16, etc., the *seventh* day, commanded in the law of Moses to be kept as the Sabbath. God having rested on the seventh day, blessed and sanctified it.

*Counsel.* You outlived all the other apostles, and witnessed the dissolution of the Jewish Commonwealth, can you give us any information about the Christian Sabbath?

*John.* Not a particle—never heard of it—no word of such a thing in all the Scriptures—unless, indeed, you refer to that "glorious rest," or Sabbath, which remaineth for the people of God; of which our beloved brother Paul speaks in his Epistle to the Hebrews, 4th chapter, verse 9, —that great day of "a thousand years," in which it was revealed to me, Christ and his redeemed would "reign on the earth," Rev. v. 9, 10; xx. 6. That millennial day is, doubtless, the antitype of the Sabbath, and will be a sabbath worthy of Christ. If by the Christian Sabbath you mean *that* day in which "the Lord *alone* shall *be* exalted" and "idols be utterly abolished," I could tell you much about it; but you can read of it for yourself in the prophets everywhere. See Isaiah ii. 2, 4, 11, 21; xi. 10; Mich. iv. etc. But as for a command to observe the first day of the week as the Lord's Sabbath, I know nothing of it.

*Counsel.* I trust your evidence may have due weight with the jury. Paul will now take your place for a little. "My beloved teacher in faith and verity." "A friend in need is a friend indeed." You are last, but not least, in this matter of bearing witness to the truth. I have a client accused of "trespassing on the Sabbath," because he told some fishermen that they might, if they thought proper, and the law of the land permitted, follow their lawful calling on the first day of the week. His accuser—who, I regret to say, professes to be a Christian—bases his charge upon the 4<sup>th</sup> commandment, which he says is binding upon all mankind, whether Jew or Gentile. For this cause, therefore, have I called for you, to speak with you: and that all these here present may hear what thou thinkest: for we who contend against the 4th commandment as binding on Christians living in Gentile lands, are everywhere spoken against.

*Paul.* I think myself happy, brother, because I shall answer for thee this day touching the thing whereof thou art accused. Thine accuser doubtless errs, not knowing the Scriptures. Be it known unto him, therefore, that the law which was given by Moses, and of which the 4th commandment is a part, was the schoolmaster and instructor of us Hebrews, "unto Christ;" but since he came preaching "the gospel of the kingdom" for the obedience of faith, we are *no longer under a schoolmaster* (Gal. iii. 24, 25). We are not under the law, but under grace (Rom. vi. 14). We are delivered from the law, that being *dead* wherein we were held (Rom. vii. 6). Christ *blotted out* the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us and *took it out of the way*, nailing it to his cross. Let no man, therefore, judge you in respect of an holy day, or of the SABBATH *days*, which are a shadow of things to come (Col. ii. 14, 18).

*Counsel.* All you have said is very plain to my mind, and just what I contend for, but our accuser seeks to evade your teaching by affirming "that the 4th Commandment is a part of the MORAL law, and not of the CEREMONIAL, and therefore is binding upon all mankind." He says the law of God is expressed under two terms, the "Moral," and the "Ceremonial." The one he calls "that priceless gem," the other "the casket" containing it. The Moral law, he says,

is gold, and imperishable; the Ceremonial is quartz in which the gold is embedded. And he calls on me to admit a lofty distinction between the two; —that the one is binding on Christians, the other of no authority. Are these things so?

*Paul.* Ah, I am indeed reminded of my enemies with whom I had continual contentions and disputings in consequence of this very thing; but how any one who professes to receive my teaching can affirm what your accuser saith, is indeed surprising and shows the subtlety of man's wisdom. Why, even the first five chapters of my Epistle to the Churches of Galatia—which were in great danger from Judaizing teachers—should suffice to show my mind in regard to Christians who desire to be under the law. (chap. iv. 21.) But I am reminded of a lofty distinction your accuser lays great stress on—new to me, I must confess—and which affords another illustration of the old saying—'they have sought out many inventions.' Ecc. vii. 29). Where learned he to divide the law of Moses into two parts, and style one the Moral Law, the other the Ceremonial Law? If any man speak on divine things, let him speak as the Oracles of God; (1 Peter iv.11;) let him speak of the things of God, in the words of the Spirit, and not "in the words which man's wisdom teacheth," (1 Cor. ii. 11, 13,) and you will hear nothing more of the Moral and Ceremonial Laws. The law of Moses is one and indivisible; and must be regarded and kept or all is labor in vain: for it is written, 'Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.' (Gal. iii. 10.) Such was our forlorn condition when we were under the law. Once the word to Israel was, the law—the whole law—and nothing but the law, under the pain of death; but now God be thanked, Christ having fulfilled all the righteousness of the law, by his perfect obedience thereto, hath become to us the *end* of the law for righteousness, Rom. x. 4; and hath made us free from that yoke of bondage. 'Stand fast therefore in the *liberty* wherewith Christ hath made you free!' 'Brethren, ye have been called unto *liberty*; only use not your liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another. For *all the law is fulfilled in one word*, even in this, thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' Gal. v. 1, 13, 14. The doctrine of 'justification by faith without the deeds of the law,' Ro. iii. 28, and of our being no longer under the *law* but under *grace*, led some to conclude that they might sin *ad libitum* and grace would the more abound to them; hence my frequent warnings against such a conclusion. —'Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound? God forbid.' And again, 'Shall we sin because *we are not under the law*, but under grace? God forbid,' Ro. vi. 1, 2, 15. Hence, also, my continual exhortations to maintain good works, and to 'seek for glory, honor and immortality, by a patient continuance in well doing,' Ro. ii. 7.

*Counsel.* Seeing, then, Christians are not under Moses' law, and bearing in mind that what the law saith to them who are under the law, *we* are not spoken to therein, nor is it our teacher. To what then, or to whom are we to go for instruction in the way of righteousness? Whose commandments are we to keep—whose voice to hear?"

*Paul.* To whom shall we go but unto HIM who hath the words of eternal life? John vi. 68. Whose voice shall we hear but His who said, '*My sheep hear my voice*, and a *stranger* will they not follow? John x. 5, 27. Whose commandments shall we keep but Christ's? —'If ye love me keep my commandments.' 'God who at sundry times and divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days *spoken unto us by his Son*.' Heb. i. 1, 2. And in the holy mount when he was transfigured in the presence of Prophets and Apostles, —enabling them to see in miniature, his future kingdom and glory, —'there came a voice to him from the excellent glory,' 'This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased; HEAR YE HIM.'" —Matt. xvii. 1, 5; 2 Peter i. 16, 18.

*Counsel.* The church, then, is to be 'subject unto Christ' *only*, and to love and obey him as her head; just as a wife should be subject and obedient to her husband, who is in like manner her head?

*Paul.* That is exactly what I taught in my letter to the saints at Ephesus, v. 22, 24. And if the church recognize Moses or his law, and subject herself to him, she committeth adultery; as I have shown in my epistle to the saints at Rome, chap. vii. 1, 4. When Jews who had formerly the law for our husband, *could not have been married to Christ had the law survived*; for a woman is bound by the law of her husband *as long as he liveth*: but if *the husband be dead*, she is loosed from the law of her husband, and is no adulteress though she be married to *another man*. 'Wherefore' I continued, —addressing them who had been under the law as their husband—'my brethren, ye also become *dead to the law* by the body of Christ; that *ye should be married to another, even to him that is raised from the dead*, that we should bring forth fruit unto God. . . . Now we are delivered from *the law*, that being *dead* wherein we were held."

(To be continued.)

---

### **The Baptism of the Spirit.**

As we remarked in "*Bible Examinerism Reviewed*" we were under no obligation to our divine friend who fabricates it, for the appearance upon our table of the periodical which represents it. A friend of the undivine species, styled a "*layman*" by the Laodicean divinities of Babylonia, who paid us a visit when in these parts from Canada West, called our attention to the paper; and requested us to consider certain "*Questions on Baptism*" to be found on page 325 of the current volume; and to reply to them in an early number of the Herald. We promised so to do; and had accordingly prepared certain articles as answers to the following queries: —

1. What is the Baptism of the Spirit?
2. Are Christians of the present day baptized with the Spirit?
3. Can it be shown from the scriptures that the general belief that the Christian graces, faith, hope, charity, etc., are the work of the Spirit, is correct?
4. If they are, how does God reward *men* for work that He does himself?
5. Is not baptism taught in the New Testament as a Christian duty; and how does that agree with the idea that it is the Spirit?

To these we had written an answer, and had the first in type on the eve of being put to press for the January number, when the flames burst forth and baptized it in fire with an everlasting destruction; for the fire was unquenchable, and its organism destroyed beyond all typographical power of resurrection. The loss of this article, it being the first, put all the others in abeyance, until we could find time to resuscitate its ideas, or spirit, in a new form. The contemporary loss of a part of EUREKA which demanded immediate repair, caused its revival to be deferred. But now all obstacles being removed in the publication of Eureka, we can once more concentrate our attention upon the queries propounded to our divine friend by our Canadian correspondent.

We presume he is not satisfied with Mr. Storrs' "*response to the foregoing*," or his request would not have reached us to reply to them: and we suppose that his application to us is more a matter of curiosity than any thing else. He does not seem to apply to editors for teaching; but more to know what they think about this or that. He evidently did not think he

had yet found an editor that knew more than his readers when he sent his queries to our divine friend. "I consider a paper," says he, "from which every thing is excluded except the views of the editor, as being of very little use in the promulgation of truth." This is as much as to say to the divine Storrs, that if the *Examiner* contained no other views than his, it would be "of very little use!" Perhaps he did not mean to say this; but people often say what they do not mean. It is, however, an almost universal truth though spoken accidentally. Editors generally are only party echoes. They rarely have an idea in advance of the parties in whose service they write. It is the party creates the editor; rarely indeed that the editor creates the party. Hence the exclusion of all views but the views of the party's editor would be "of very little use" in the development of truth. You know all he knows, or dares avow, by knowing what the party believes to which he belongs and by which he is supported. Periodicals edited by such divine pens are mere party organs, and of no use to "the truth as it is in Jesus." They serve the interests of the sect, but they are of infinitesimal value to him who would understand the word.

Our divine friend is no exception to the rule. He is not an incarnation of originality. He knows nothing he has not hooked and pilfered from his neighbors. Intoxicated by Methodism, and demented by Millerism, he is hopelessly hallucinated by the imbecilities we anatomized in a previous number. He is an editorial incarnation of this medley; and as our Canadian friend intimates not obscurely, "of very little use in the promulgation of truth."

But while we admit the correctness of this in regard to our divine friend, and editors in general, we must differ from our correspondent in regard to all. Our *beau ideal* of an editor is, that he should be head and shoulders above all his contemporaries. We have no admiration for periodicals where every scribbler's opinions are a foil to the editorial views. A periodical to be useful in promulgating the truth should speak the sentiments of writers who are all agreed, and the most intelligent of these writers should be the editor; so that if there were no other writing in it than his, the paper would still be potent for the promulgation of the truth. We do not intend to say, that there should be no opposite views to the editor's apparent on its pages. Their appearance there is useful, provided they do not occupy too much space, and the editor is able to maintain the truth. He should know this demonstrably; and should edit, not to be taught, but to teach. An editor who conducts a periodical upon the principle of being taught, confesses himself incompetent for the work before him. Such a periodical may be profitable to him, but can be of little value to the generality of readers, who become lost in the chit chat and twaddle of penographers whose inspiration is the complacent satisfaction resulting from seeing themselves in print. The mind of an editor should stride in upon these with gigantic tread; and make the reader feel that he is the master spirit of the situation. And this editorial mind should be the reflex of the Spirit. Its giant power should be the truth which is "yea and amen," and not a mere "view," or "opinion," that any one could imagine as well as he." Editing after this type is so rare as to be phenomenal when found. It creates, but is not created by what exists. The truth, studied and digested in meditation upon the word, enters in and shines within the man. Its ideas distil as the dew, and he becomes fertile. When he speaks the truth, the spirit speaks; so that, if every thing else were excluded from a paper except such editorial speaking, it would be the most useful agent for the promulgating of the truth desirable at present. It might not be the most successful proselyting agency; but it would be the most useful for God, because the work it might accomplish would be most likely to endure unto the end.

This is the sort of agent we aim to make this paper—one that a really intelligent lover of the truth would feel uncomfortable in being without; uncomfortable because he would



know that truth was being developed in it, and he was not learning it. This conviction would make any honest heart uncomfortable. We do not invite communications for our own instruction; but to know the difficulties of others that we may remove them. "The religious world" cannot teach us. We read its questions, we hear its difficulties, and see in it only a mass of festering ignorance in which it is doomed to perish. Some of its questions are before us. They are questions which it is unable to solve; but the scriptural solution of which it will not accept. It doubts, and inquires, and shakes its head incredulously at the replies. It would teach us, but cannot; yet refuses to be taught. Under these convictions, we proceed to answer the questions. We expect very few to assent to our expositions; yet for the sake of that few, we encounter all consequences, knowing that we have the truth.

But, says one, this ground is too high for an uninspired man to take. It is. It is too high for a Laodicean. It is too high for a mere natural man. But it is not too high for one "renewed by knowledge after the image of his Creator;" for the new man in Christ Jesus; for the spiritual man who discerneth all things. Such a one is not an uninspired man. Every man who understandingly believes "the truth as it is in Jesus," has "Christ dwelling in his heart by faith," and that is inspiration; and the only religious inspiration worth any thing in these days. If one so inspired turn editor, he takes his stand with Jesus, Elijah, Moses, Peter, James, and John on the Mount of Transfiguration; and with Paul in the presence of kings and philosophers: he stands before assembled people, not to be judged of them, but to enlighten their ignorance, to teach them, to pull down their strongholds, and to cast down their high thoughts which all exalt themselves against the knowledge of the Deity. This is the relation between the spiritual and natural man. The spiritual man discerneth all the things of the Spirit of God, which the natural man is unable to know, yet is he critically and spiritually judged by none—1 Cor. ii. 14-16. The spiritual man does not write for the applause of natural men; or to know of them what is right and true. He judges for himself what is good for them, and says, "with me it is a very small thing that I should be judged of you, or of man's judgment; yea, I judge not mine own self. For I know nothing by myself; yet am I not hereby justified: but he that judgeth me is the Lord"—1 Cor. iv. 3. He is "a workman" not a botch, or mere apprentice. He walks not the court of the Gentiles, nor studies in their schools: but he is "taught of God," as all must be who would inherit his kingdom and glory—John vi. 45. Thus instructed, he is "a workman that needeth not to be ashamed," because he is not only skilled in the truth, but he "rightly divides" it. Compare the editorial production of such an one with that of the natural man! In the former it is a faithful, straightforward, and courageous contest for a well-defined certainty; in the latter, it is a mere wishy washy, shilly shally, yea and nay, mess of twaddle and speculation, which only "darkens counsel by words without knowledge." Illustrative of this, behold the following penographs of our divine friend in reply to the previous queries: —

"Baptism of the Holy Spirit is to *receive* the Holy Spirit communicated by Jesus Christ. It did not take place till Jesus ascended to heaven." Yet he quotes a text to prove that it is a reception of spirit which applies to the apostles before he ascended. So much for divine logic.

"It seems impossible," says he, "for a man to be a Christian, who has *not received* the Spirit." *Ergo*, the Apostles were not Christians till after the ascension! What constituted them such then? According to our divine's premises, the reception of the Spirit on Pentecost!

Having told the reader that faith is *founded* on the testimony of God, he says, "two agencies are concerned in it. God's first; man's second. The free Spirit of God is always first;

the free reception by man is secondary. Without the first, faith has no soil to take root in: that is, the free Spirit of God is the soil which receives the truth; so that God speaks, and is believed by himself! "Without the free reception by man, the grace or spirit of God is bestowed in vain." God, then, sometimes, bestows spirit in vain. That is, he bestows soil, but the spirit-soil is too poor for the enrooting of faith!

"The *tree* is first received and planted." This tree is the "free spirit of God which is always first." In our divine's scheme the tree and the soil are one and the same. The spirit-tree is received and planted in received spirit-soil, "before love, joy, peace, etc., grow;" and this he styles "a believing reception of Christ and the promised spirit."

"If baptism 'with water,'" says he, "is the '*essential* baptism," when, where, and by whom is it "taught as a Christian *duty*?" If taught as a Christian duty, it must be shown to be a *command* of Christ, who is the FOUNDER of the Christian dispensation. It will not meet the case, to say, Peter commanded it on the day of Pentecost, and at the house of Cornelius; for in both those instances the question may arise, whether he did not overstep his commission or misunderstand it, in that matter; for it is clear, he did not understand our Lord's commission, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature," etc. It is also evident, that he had not passed out of the *transition* state, entirely, when the transaction of baptizing with water was performed at the house of Cornelius. "The baptism of the Holy Spirit was, at the time of Christ's resurrection, future, and was the true *Christian* baptism. Of baptism with water, Jesus said nothing, except that John did it, in the transition state from Judaism to Christianity Proper." "Peter did not fully comprehend this fact till after the transactions at the house of Cornelius. There he was taken by surprise . . . supposing it necessary to be baptized with water, *in order* to receive the Holy Spirit; but his master corrected him in this matter by a direct act, at the house of Cornelius; thus showing that water baptism was superseded by the baptism which constituted the peculiarity of the Christian dispensation, at its full development."

"Peter's act, therefore, in 'commanding' water baptism *after* Cornelius and others had 'received the Holy Spirit,' was clearly without divine authority, and it seems likely that he never practised it again."

"It is undeniable that the baptism of the spirit is *a* baptism of the Christian dispensation; and as this dispensation has *but* "one baptism," water baptism cannot be that "one." "Nevertheless, if any think water baptism is *their* "duty," let them satisfy their own convictions, but see that they do not judge *others* in the matter. On no other ground can union be maintained. That is, union with "the Reverend Divine" of the Bible Examiner, which must be a very precious union in the estimation of all intelligent believers!

But, let us turn for the present from this Laodicean foolishness, to a sober consideration of the first question of the five—*What is the Baptism of the Spirit?* In answering this question, two things present themselves, a correct understanding of which is necessary before we can scripturally reply. The first question to be considered is, *What is the Spirit?* And next, what is the meaning of the word *baptism* in this connection? We shall answer these questions in the first place, and upon these answers as our premises, submit our reply to the question before us.

1. In this inquiry, we would know first, what is the meaning of the word *spirit*? To what language does the word belong? It is a latin word, as, *spiritus*, "as blowing," from *spiro*,

“to breathe, breathe out. exhale.” Hence, *spirit* is that also which is exhaled. In the Greek, the word which answers to *spirit* is *πνευμα*, from *πνεω*, which signifies the same as *spiro*. In the Hebrew it is *ruach*. But these words, while they tell us that they stand for something radiated or exhaled, do not tell us what the essence or substance of the exhalation, or radiation is. It may be air in motion, or wind, breath, electricity, or some other agent. What it is the word represents, depends upon something more than etymology can supply. The words *ruach*, *pneuma*, *spiritus*, and *spirit*, do not signify the same thing in all places where they occur; still, whatever the thing is, the radical idea is a motion outwards—from into.

The first place in the Bible where the word occurs is in Gen. i. 2. Here it is *ruach Elohim*—a principle going out of, or from, the Mighty Ones. What could this be? It may be known by its effects. “It brooded upon the face of the waters”—of the waters, which in the primeval state of the earth, covered its entire surface. This brooding principle covered the surface, and penetrated its substance in all its atoms; so that it was only necessary for the word of command to go forth from the Mighty, and whatever might be commanded would be done. Every thing was made by this brooding principle as the executive of the Divine Wisdom. “By his spirit he hath garnished the heavens;” “he sendeth forth his spirit; they are created,” even all the things detailed by Moses. Hence, Job says, “the *ruach* of Ail hath made me; and the *nishmah* of SHADDAI hath given me life.” The Spirit is, therefore, formative. It is creative power. It made the light; it divided the vapors from the waters by an expanse; gathered the waters together in the place of the seas; formed the vegetable world; established the astronomy of the heavens; developed the animal kingdom; and executed the whole so satisfactorily, that the work was pronounced “very good.”

When we contemplate *spirit* through these results, we behold an almighty power, which is predicated of AIL—the *Spirit of Ail*. But what is AIL? Etymologically, it is *strength, might, power*. Hence, the *Spirit of AIL* is a powerful emanation, or *breathing forth of power*. ALMIGHTY POWER is the fountain and origin of the universe—ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα, says Paul—“out of whom are all things;” 1 Cor. viii. 6. He also tells us, that the fountain of omnipotence is a glowing and torrid centre; a centre that cannot be approached by man; and the dwelling place of an Invisible Intelligent and Deathless Being—I Tim. vi. 16. This is AIL—all wise, all powerful, all seeing, and all knowing. There is only one such in the wide-extended universe. He is life and incorruptibility, and never was anything else. Here is a wonderful being; corporeal intelligence that hath always existed, and out of whom, as “THE FATHER,” all things have been produced. But of what does his substance consist? What his nature? What is he? “HE IS SPIRIT.” These are the words of Jesus, who knew what he affirmed. AIL is spirit; and there is spirit of AIL—the fountain and the stream are both spirit; and hold a like relation that radiant caloric does to iron glowing with a white heat. But what is the glowing substance of Deity? That which shall be manifested in the saints when they become spirit; for they shall be like him who is in the bosom of the Father. “Deity is spirit;” and to convey our conception to the reader of this substance, we would style it *corporeal electricity*. We behold the lightning's flash; we see its almighty effects upon rocks and trees; and we perceive its universality; still of its *essence* we are ignorant. Our words and definitions leave this untouched. But whatever the essence may be, that corporeal essence is God; and the same incorporeal and radiant essence, is the Spirit of God.

Electricity or lightning is a bible-symbol for spirit. Ezekiel, son of man, priest, and prophet, had “visions of Elohim” who are, when manifested, spirit, being all of them post-resurrectionally begotten and born out of spirit, ἐξ πνευματος; and consequently, consubstantial with the Father, who is spirit. In these visions of spirit, then, Ezekiel saw the

Living Ones, or Elohim, come forth out of the midst of fire and brightness. His description in ch. i. 4, is symbolical of 1 Tim. vi. 16. What we call electricity, for want of a better word, in glowing combustion, he terms "fire and brightness." In beholding these electrically generated beings, born of the Ezekiel-fire, he says, "whither the Spirit was to go, they went," because they will be spirit; so that wherever they may be, there necessarily, corporeal-spirit will be. And "as for the likeness of the living creatures," says he, "their appearance was like burning coals of fire, and like the appearance of lamps; it went up and down among the living creatures; and the fire was bright, and out of the fire went forth lightning," or flaming electricity. "And the living creatures ran and returned as the appearance of a flash of lightning."

In scriptural discourse, "electricity" is termed *spirit*, because it is radiated, or sent forth, from the substance of Almighty Power, after the tropical analogy of blowing, breathing, or exhaling. This idea is illustrated by the iron excited to white heat, or the magnet. These are solid substances, but within a certain radius, they are enveloped in an atmosphere of light and heat, or of magnetism. This atmosphere may represent the radiant power, or spirit, *of the Deity*; and the glowing iron and magnet, the radiating power, or substance, called DEITY. Here, then, is spirit free, radiant, or uncombined; and spirit in substance, corporeal, bodily existence. The latter is the original condition of spirit. It was not originally free or diffused through space, and at some particular epoch condensed, reduced to a bodily form, and individualized. To affirm this, would be to affirm the existence of abstract intelligent power antecedent to the *Hypostasis*, or substance, the exact representation of which Jesus Anointed is declared now to be. No, the Substantial Father has always been substance, and has had no incorporeal predecessor in wisdom and power. His nature is the substratum, or basis, of all conceivable existences, animate or inanimate, in all the universe; for they are all created out of his spirit, and that spirit radiates out of his substance. It is always subordinate to His will; and accomplishes that only whereunto it is sent. Hence, it does not act independently of the radiating power. Nothing, therefore, happens by chance in the operation of the spirit. The wisdom that ordains is in the Father; and the wisdom that executes is in the power radiating from him. This is illustrated by the fact (and we have verified the fact by experiment) that a man may simply will actions to be performed by another at a distance; and his will, though unexpressed in words or gesture, will be done. If any action result, it will not be contrary to the will, nor can it be. It is impossible, likewise, for the spirit of the Deity to execute contrary to the will of the Deity. Hence, "THE SON," or Spirit-Emanation from the Father-Spirit-Substance, "can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do," or will; "for whatsoever he doeth," or "wills," "these also doeth," or executeth, "the Son likewise"—John v. 19.

The distinction made by "philosophers" between "matter" and "spirit" is artificial, and does not obtain in scripture. The Father is matter, or substance, but he is spirit also; for that matter of which he consists, and which constitutes his nature, is spirit. This being the fact, matter is eternal. But this by no means implies that *the forms of matter* are eternal likewise; for that would be to affirm that the Creator was not antecedent to his works. The dispute, then, upon the question whether spirit existed before matter, or matter before spirit, is a vain controversy; and indicative of the ignorance of the "philosophers" on both sides. The one had no precedence of the other, being essentially the same.

Hence matter is not essentially evil, or corrupt and mortal; nor is it incapable of thought. The Divine Power is matter, but, though he creates evil, he is not evil, nor corruptible and mortal. There is, therefore, no force nor reason in the argument that a thing is immortal

because it is immaterial, or not matter. Whatever exists is matter. Electricity is as much matter as a block of marble, the only difference is, that it is matter in a different form. Hence the immaterial is the non-existent, or nothing. To say, then, that a thing is immortal because it is immaterial, is to affirm that it is immortal because it is nothing, or does not exist; which is the demonstration of the wisest thinking of the flesh—"the wisdom of the world" condemned as folly, working death in all that are deceived by it.

There is no part of the boundless universe where the spirit of the Divine Power is not. It pervades the atoms of all bodies and is everywhere. Hence the inquiry of Christ in prophecy, "Whither shall I go from thy spirit? Or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend into heaven thou art there; if I make my bed in the grave, behold thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; even there shall thine hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me. If I shall say surely the darkness shall cover me, even the night shall be light about me. Yea, the darkness hideth not from thee; but the night shineth as the day; the darkness and the light are both alike to thee."—Ps. cxxxix. 7-14. This proves what we have said, and teaches that, in a general sense, all creatures are in the presence of the Creator; that they are so in being contiguous to his spirit: for, as fish live, and move, and have their being in the waters, so all animals and men "live, and move, and have their being" in spirit of God. Upon this natural principle it is that Paul declared to the heathen philosophers that God is "not far from every one of us"; and that Jesus said, "a sparrow shall not fall on the ground without the Father." Hence, in the natural or physical sense, all creatures have the spirit, and cannot live without it; so that as Job says, "If He gather to himself his spirit and his breath, all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again unto dust"—xxxiv. 14. Spirit develops the organism of all creatures, and preserves it from disorganization. It is what pathologists term the *vis medicatrix naturae*; and physiologists, "the vital principle." When the spirit and breath of the Creator are withdrawn from a man or a sparrow, there remain no healing power and vitality in their several bodies; and the immediate tendency in them is to corruption and dust. Hence, all creatures in the air, earth, and seas, are *spirit-forms*. The types or patterns, after which they were created were all in the mind of Deity before they were created; and when they were formed, the formation was out of spirit-matter and by spirit according to pattern. Every creature is therefore a spirit in this sense; but not necessarily immortal because a spirit. The immortality of a spirit depends upon the constitution of the matter or substance of the peculiar form. A spirit form of a flesh and blood organization is essentially mortal and corruptible; for death and corruption are peculiar to that material constitution. The "spirits in prison" Peter speaks of, were flesh and blood organizations turned again into dust, consequent upon the Deity gathering to himself his spirit and breath. His free spirit withdrawn, and the cohesive affinity of their substance departed, and its gaseous elements entered into new combinations, destructive of the forms, termed man, cattle, fowl, and so forth. Hence the Deity is styled by Moses in Numb, xxvii. 16, "YAHWEH, *Elohim* of the spirits of all flesh": that is, the spirit self-styled HE SHALL BE, is the *powers* of all flesh-emanations of his power. The spirit-power of the lion is the power of Jehovah; and so of all other creatures. Hence the facility with which he can open and shut their fierce and voracious mouths, as in the case of Daniel and his persecutors. This universal diffusion of spirit places all created things in telegraphic communication with the will of the Deity. What he wills needs not batteries and wires for transmission. He has but to will and it is instantaneously responded to according to his purpose, though the locality where obedience is required be distant from his throne a hundred millions of miles. Take these two points, the throne of the Universe, and the earth we inhabit, as the two extremities of the line—the Deity at the one end, and we at the other. The intermediate space is filled with his "free spirit," radiant from his substance, and incarnately organic in all his creatures. What we call "time" is

unnecessary for the transmission of ideas. The Deity is not a being of time. He has not to move from where he is to be where he would be; for he is everywhere by spirit, and fills all. Hence his will at the throne is his will at the same instant on earth; for his intelligence and wisdom are as universal as his power and only require his will to be exercised for their manifestation in every part of his wide domain.

Now, in studying the subject of spirit we must consider it severally in its relations to things physical and natural; and to things intellectual and moral, or spiritual in a special sense. As we have seen, all mankind and animals generally are the subject of the operation of the spirit; but it is only a certain class of mankind that is operated upon in the special sense by which individuals are brought into harmony with the moral attributes of Deity.

The ideas and thoughts of the Deity are as much spirit as this physical power. His thoughts are moral power *breathed forth* in his words, and that is spirit, even as the lightning *breathed forth*, or radiant, from his substance is spirit. His thoughts breathed forth or revealed in any way he may determine constitute "the truth," and therefore the truth is spirit. Hence, the Lord Jesus said, "My words are spirit"; and the apostle John says, "The spirit is the truth." To produce physical results, such as raising the dead, curing the sick, speaking with tongues, speaking by inspiration, and so forth, material power or spirit is required; but when purely moral results are the things desired, the truth is the spirit that operates upon the heart.

(To be continued.)

---

## **Analecta Epistolaria.**

### **Whom shall we obey?**

NORFOLK, *April 17, 1861.*

*Brother Thomas:* — Will you please give me your views on the course that we should pursue in the discharge of the duty enjoined upon us by the laws of both God and man. The State law exempts no one under a certain age from military service. We are a unit in regard to a war of invasion; of course we believe it to be unscriptural to take up arms for the purpose of invading an enemy's country; the point we want to arrive at is, which of the two alternatives shall we accept, —take up arms in defence of our homes and firesides, or allow ourselves to be imprisoned by the State authorities during the contest. Please let me hear from you by return mail, as the exigency of the case is great. The State will certainly secede: to-day the authorities are enrolling men for the fray: exciting times are on us: the brethren are all well, and in good spirits. They join with me in love to you. Please answer this without delay as the mails may be stopped at any moment. Great excitement prevails here.

Your brother in hope of the speedy manifestation of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

E. H. BEAZLEY.

---

### **Shall we fight for the Devil?**

HADLEY, *April 30, 1861.*

*Brother Thomas:* —Brother Wright, Brother Chart, and myself have received each one copy of "Eureka," also April number of Herald, and we are endeavouring to gain the

instruction and to be the fit recipients of that "charity" which the author of "Eureka" has shown himself to be possessed of, by sending forth to his brethren a work so full of the "charity" of the "Word" if your former expositions have failed to show those who are such sticklers for man's charity, that you are not a "sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal." I should think if they are not wholly blinded by the world's charity, "Eureka" will open their eyes to see what true charity is. There has been a great deal said of late about "charity," which shows to me that it is not properly understood. I am but a babe as yet in the knowledge of the truth. I find many foes to contend with, not only those who oppose the truth but also my own natural failings. We are all very anxious that you or some other strong brother in the truth should come and lecture to the people here. Many have expressed a desire to hear you expound the Scriptures. If you can come let us know: we have but a short time to work and we need your help *personally*.

These are troublous times and it may be they will endeavor to draft us into the devil's service. But we say with Brother Lemmon "we will not fight;" but at the same time, I am undecided what should be the proper course to take in the matter, whether to leave and get away from the chance of being drafted or stay and take the "evil" as it comes. If we are drafted and refuse to go and suffer for it, would it be persecution for the truth sake, or would it not be suffering the evil which is being brought upon this nation? Jesus prayed to the Father that his disciples might be kept from the evil. I understand that to be the evil to be brought upon the Jewish nation, and in conformity with that prayer, he instructed them to flee unto the mountains: was not that for them to be preserved from the evil or judgment upon Jerusalem? As it is reported that the Governor of this State is about calling for ten Regiments, it is probable there will be some drafting going on to make up the required amount. Is it our duty to stay and run the risk of being drafted, or should we put ourselves out of reach? For my part I should like to be satisfied just what course to take. If Brother Lemmon is in Baltimore he is in a trying spot, as also the believers in Washington and the seceded States. Will you give me instruction concerning our duty in this matter and oblige

Your Brother in Christ,

C. PACKHAM.

P. S. —I believe I have another "Eureka" my due; there are some here who are not able to buy, and it is to lend to those that I sent for two.

The two copies were mailed together, though they did not leave the Post Office in company. They have no doubt both arrived ere this.

EDITOR.

May 10, 1861.

---

### **Let Satan Fight their own Battles.**

Our citizenship which begins in the heavens, as Paul expresses it, is above any citizenship that begins in flesh. The citizenship of the faithful in Christ Jesus over rides every thing else in its claims and obligations. "Jehovah has called us to His kingdom and glory" to which our allegiance is due primarily and absolutely. All that is not of this kingdom belongs to "the old Serpent, the Devil and Satan." God and Satan are the rival potentates claiming the allegiance of mankind. They are the "Two Masters" who cannot be served acceptably in concert. God will not divide His authority with Satan; nor will Satan consent to the supremacy of God. Satan is the god or power of this world, and gives its glory to whom he will; and demands that every man shall honor his flag, bray out his praise, and esteem it sweet and

pleasant to fight and die for him. To lavish money, and to do battle for the things the flesh delights in, he glorifies as "patriotism;" and is ready to denounce all as "traitors" worthy of death and ignominy, who prefer to "obey God rather than man." His reasoning in support of his policy is specious. Should a man not fight for the power that protects him? Should he not defend the national altars and his fireside? If all were to refuse to fight what would become of the country? All this is well enough for those under the power of Satan. By all means let Satan fight for Satan if he would perpetuate his authority. But then we are not of Satan. We have been "turned from the power of Satan unto God" by the truth understood and believed. Our case is exceptional. Satan does not protect the Saints. He has prevailed against them, and only lets us alone because he does not know that we are of their class. We pray for Satan in authority, not that he may prosper in his wars and ambitions, but that he may let us alone, and allow us to "lead quiet and peaceable lives in all godliness and honesty." If he will only do this, the alternative of fight or imprisonment and death, will not be presented to us in the North or South, in the Old World or the New. True believers are neither traitors, rebels, nor tyrants; but law abiding submissionists under all governments, be they abolitionist or secessionist, republican or monarchical, imperial or papal, so far as their laws do not contravene the laws and principles of the gospel.

By what rule then are the saints to judge of these laws and principles as opposed to the laws and principles of the Devil and Satan; that is, of the flesh in its governmental organizations? In answer to this we affirm, that *Christ Jesus is the rule*. He is "the truth" that was incarnated or "made flesh" to show how all flesh is required to walk that would attain to consubstantiality with him and the Father; that is, "ascend to the Father," whom Jesus styled in his conversation with Mary, in reference to his brethren in general, "my Father and your Father; and my God and your God."—John xx. 17.

Now, that Christ is the rule, or practical example, set before the saints of God, is proved by the following testimonies. In 1 John ii. 6, the apostle saith, "He that saith he abideth in Christ ought himself also *so to walk, even as he walked.*" John's authority for saying this was that of Jesus himself. "I am," said he, "the light of the world so long as I am in it." (chap. ix. 5.) "He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life."—John viii. 12. In these words, he commands us to follow him. This we can only do during his absence from this planet, by adopting his example as the rule of our conduct in the several relations of our social and political existence. John's fellow-disciple, Peter, reiterates the same principle of action in 1 Epist. ii. 21; "If when ye do well and suffer, ye take it patiently this is acceptable with God. For even hereunto were ye called: because Christ also suffered for us, *leaving us an example that ye should follow his steps.*" "Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth: who, when he was reviled, reviled not again: when he suffered he threatened not; but committed his cause to him that judgeth righteously." Paul also, "the teacher of the Gentiles in faith and truth," points to Christ as the rule, and to his own conduct as far as it conformed thereto. "I beseech you," said he, "be ye followers of me even as I also am of Christ"—1 Cor. iv. 16; xi. 1. Jesus is the head of the Body of Christ; the body therefore follows the will and action of the head. What a phenomenon it would be in the animal kingdom to see heads walking in one direction and bodies in another! Ezekiel did not see this in his "visions of the Elohim," or Mighty Ones of the Age to Come. "To the place whither the head looked they followed it."—Chap. x. 11. This is the principle Jesus taught by precept and example. He "looked" in this direction; and all the true believers in this probationary state, which is a state of tribulation in which the saints are "prevailed against" by Satan "in church and state," they follow whither he taught, that when he appears in power, they may *personally* "follow him whithersoever he goes"—Rev. xiv. 4.



The walk and conduct of Jesus, then, we regard as the rule for all true believers. If these desire to know what they should do in certain trying situations, let them seek to realize what he would do if so placed, and the answer found according to the word, is the course for them to pursue without regard to consequences. If there had been civil war in Judea in his day would Jesus and his apostles have enrolled themselves under the flag of either party? The teaching in James "to the Twelve Tribes," some thirty years after, is proof that they would not. "The fruit of righteousness is sown in peace of them that make peace." This shows that our civil war is not a fruit of righteousness, and therefore the righteous are interdicted from meddling with it. It is of the lusts of sinful men as were the wars and fightings in Judea that preceded the dissolution of the Commonwealth of Judah. "From whence come wars and fightings among you?" said James to the "patriots" of the day. "Come they not hence even of your lusts, that war in your members?" "Ye lust, and have not: ye kill, and desire to have, and cannot obtain; ye fight and war, yet ye have not, because ye ask not. Ye ask and receive not, because ye ask amiss, that ye may consume it upon your lusts. Ye adulterers and adulteresses, know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God? Whosoever, therefore, will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God." Would James and his brethren have mingled in these wars and fightings? Assuredly not; for he condemned them as lustful contentions for the acquisition of the means of gratifying the lusts of the flesh. Satan would be very friendly to us if we would approve his policy. He would commend us for our "patriotism," and promote some of us to be his corporals, captains, and colonels, if we would only fall down and worship him, in unresistingly acquiescing in his invitation to enrol. Thus he would be our friend, and we should be his, and all things would go smooth for a time; and when peace came, if ever, and we escaped the slaughter of battle *pro aris et focis*, for Satan's altars and fires, we should receive the thanks of the victors, and be puffed in the lying columns of his newspapers, as heroes transcending in prowess and feats of arms, all the Alexanders and Caesars of ancient and modern times! Thus our vanity would reach to heaven, where we should collapse into vexation of spirit, being scouted from the Divine Presence as the enemies of God.

No, dear reader, on both sides of Mason and Dixon's line, we have no real concern or interest in the questions that agitate the intoxicated peoples of these States. The scriptures say, that they are all drunk and strongly deluded, believing a lie to their confusion and condemnation. See Rev. xvii. 2; xviii. 3; 2 Thess. ii. 10-12; Isaiah xxv. 7. They are now suffering a paroxysm of political delirium tremens; and those who join in with them on either side, must share in the divine displeasure against both factions. We belong to the land promised to Abraham and his Seed, and to the kingdom to be established upon it. Our fathers Abraham, Isaac and Israel, were Syrians; and so are all who are their seed according to the promise. "The flesh profits nothing." According to this we are Gentiles of this or that country. What are their questions and ambitions to us? Their "patriotism" is the selfishness and superstition of the flesh, and all resolves itself into love of goods, chattels, and effects, vested interests, and cerebral magnetism. They are zealous for what they feel. If an object makes them "*feel good*" in the contemplation of it, they have great and noisy zeal for it; but if they "*feel bad*" in view thereof, though ever so heavenly, they fight and war against it, and ask its destruction. This is the "patriotism" of North and South, and of all countries of the Gentiles, a brawling glorification of themselves, and the instincts and interests of their flesh, irrespective of the "righteousness of God."

There was none of what Satan terms "patriotism" in Jesus and his apostles, who are our example. When he foretold the dissolution of the divinely constituted government of Judea, he did not instruct his disciples to enrol themselves for the defence of the State against

the Romans. But he told them to fly from the country. The reason was, his kingdom did not belong to that order of things, constitution, *κοσμος*, or world; and therefore his servants were not to fight. They were to hold off after his example, till the time arrived for the kingdom to be set up. This time is not quite come. This is our time. Till then, if need be, we are to "take the spoiling of our goods with joy" in view of the recompense to follow. There is nothing in "the present evil world" that is worth a true believer's fighting for. Such an one would not fight to free the negroes, nor to keep them enslaved; but he would be quiescent, and contented to accept whatever might come as the result of the strife between "the potsherd of the earth;" and accept it too, as just that "ordained of God." Neither would he fight for "the free school system," nor for any other system approved or reprobated by Wide Awakeism, or its opposites. His principle is passivity, and to accept results so far as according to the word. Such a course as this, though, is condemned in toto by the flesh. But what of that? "The flesh lusts against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh: and are contrary the one to the other." The very fact that the flesh condemns the course is presumptive evidence in the light of the word, that it is correct, "Walk in the spirit," says Paul, "and ye will not fulfil the lust of the flesh." To walk in the spirit is to walk as Jesus walked, who did not work the works of the flesh, among which are wars and fightings for mere human institutions and aspirations.

In view of the whole, then, we say to Brother Packham, be not drafted into the devil's service. It is, however, no use fleeing to any other State of the Union, as the same liability exists in all. He might go to Canada. We should accept this alternative if disturbed. We replied by return mail to Brother Beazeley. Norfolk has since been blockaded. Our advice to the brethren there was, be not enrolled; go to prison rather. The authorities will perhaps soon get tired of feeding men in prison at the public expense while money is so depreciated. Fear not their threats. Unionist and Secessionist can go only so far in their violence as God permits, who will doubtless overrule the times for the good, of his people, and his own glory.

May 10, 1861.

EDITOR.

---

### **Of the Brethren in the War Region.**

*Dear Sister E* — : —Being anxious to hear from you, and the brethren with you in these troublous times, I venture to write, not knowing whether you will receive this, or no. Times are gloomy here. The brethren are nearly all out of work. The disgraceful affair of last Friday week (the attack on the troops by the mob) has prostrated our once prosperous city. I fear it will be long ere it rises again. We did not know but we might have to fly for our lives. Truly we live in a grand and awful time; glorious to those who are discerning scripturally the signs of the times. Prussia, France, Austria, Poland, and so forth, just ready for the war whoop. America shaking with internal commotion, and her once boasted republic ready to fall bathed in the blood of its sons. Is it not an awful time? But to the wise it bears the welcome sound, "Lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh."

We may be asked, why we call these glorious times? The believer can turn to that word which has gone forth, and will not return void, but will accomplish that whereunto it is sent, for his answer; showing that the time is near at hand when the kingdoms of this world will become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign for the ages of the ages;"—when "the nations shall be given to him for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession; and he shall rule them with a rod of iron, and dash them in pieces as a potter's vessel: —when he shall have dominion from sea to sea; and from the river to the ends of the earth." "His name shall endure forever; his name shall continue as long as the sun; and men shall be blessed in him; all nations shall serve him." Then "the meek shall inherit the

earth, and delight themselves in abundance of peace so long as the sun and moon shall endure; and when the Lord shall reign on Mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, before his ancients gloriously."

Our brethren here as yet, though out of work, are able to get along very well for some time. Mr. Packie visited Washington a short time since. The brethren are getting along very well. He spoke for them, and spent quite a pleasant time with them. They like ourselves feel very insecure, as we do not know but we may have to leave the city, not being willing to live under any other untried government. We are patiently waiting the issue.

We had a visit this winter from a Brother Morgan of Western Virginia. He came to hunt up some of the same faith, hearing there were some in Baltimore. He was convinced by reading ELPIS ISRAEL and some HERALDS lent him by a Campbellite. There are several little bodies formed in the several counties round where he lives believing the gospel of the kingdom, and have yielded obedience to it. You would be much interested to hear of the ordeal he was subjected to by Mr. P. in ascertaining his belief. He stood it well. After leaving us he visited Washington, where he told the brethren he could stand the test any where after being in Baltimore. He is very anxious your father should visit them. They appear earnestly engaged in searching the scripture, and are desirous to know more of the truth.

Mr. Benedict has left the Campbellite sanctuary in Paca Street, the congregation not being able to pay the stipulated sum of fifteen hundred dollars a year. Truly the gospel of these hirelings is not for the poor, but for those who are able to pay! How thankful should we be that we can buy without money and without price the glorious truths of the Bible.

The brethren are much pleased at the receipt of EUREKA. Those who are reading it are delighted with it, and think it one of your father's best productions. For my part, I am sorry there are so few who can appreciate it as it deserves. I was anxious it should be placed in some of the book stores in hope that some of the general public might be induced to read it; but hardly any one cares now for aught else but the question of North or South? It is hopeless. Darkness covers the earth, and gross darkness the people; we may therefore as well let them alone, for they are wedded to their idols; but their time is nearly out. We are anxious to hear from you.

Your Sister in the one faith.

*Balt., April 29, 1861.*

MARY B. P

---

**A word for the Truth.**

*Bro. Thomas:* —Allow me to write a few lines in favor of the truth. I had tried all the Protestant harlots for peace of mind; but it was for a moment only that it endured, and then came an aching void the world could not fill; but when Bro. H. M. Chase revealed to me what Moses and the Prophets say, it was like water to a thirsty soul; and when I was immersed into Christ, I became a new creature, and I was released from sin. I love the truths as they come from you, and they satisfy me. I have read different authors on prophecy, but your exposition comes nearer to the point than any others; therefore I thank God that you have been raised up for the truth. That you and yours may be blessed abundantly is the prayer of

Your Brother in hope of the Kingdom,

M. R. NASH.

---

### **A Desire to Read the Book.**

*Dear Brother:* —Send me five more copies of EUREKA. More wish to read it than I expected. I shall have none to read unless I can get some more. I have no ELPIS ISRAEL of all the copies I got. God bless your labors, and you for your labors. Your Brother in the Hope.  
*Louisiana, Ap. 28, 1861.* P. TANNER.

---

### **The War-Spirit.**

*Dear Brother Thomas:* —I have received EUREKA, and have read it through once. As the result I am satisfied that if I had been possessed of the book at an early time I should have been greatly advanced in Bible knowledge, and hope to be now in its use. We are in great excitement here on account of the course being pursued by the old administration. There are great war preparations and a great war spirit. I do not know really what those opposed to the South want, but it does seem that they are endeavoring to make slaves of white men, and to make free men of blacks. I fear we are to have a serious time. I feel like Abraham said he felt when there was war about him, greatly troubled in mind. If those opposed to the South have as great feeling of hostility to the South as the South has to them, there never went into battle foes more hostile.

As it respects the prospects religiously there are none favorable. The people seem not disposed to be instructed. The last time I was at Looxohama, Mississippi, I could not get a hearing. I should be pleased to have you often with us if you could have an opportunity of being useful, but there seems but little chance of that. There were "revivals" among the various sects in the fall for the saving of the souls of the people from the liability of going into hell. This is all they can reach. Wishing you health, happiness, and usefulness, I remain,

Yours in hope of the coming Savior,

M. W. WEBBER.

*Fayette Co., Tennessee, April 27, 1861.*

---

### **The Storm in the Political Air an Embarrassment.**

*Dear Bro. Thomas:* —We received the package of EUREKAS safe and uninjured, and it was a very great treat *indeed*. The brethren are all delighted with it; but owing to the financial difficulties of the people growing out of the political, we have not sold any more copies. We hope to help to sell the balance of the edition.

We are all well. Our meetings are still kept up, and had a very interesting meeting yesterday. Application was made by one for the obedience of faith. After conversation had, and consultation with the brethren, we met at the pond in the lawn before my house, and he was baptized by brother Norment. There was a good audience morning and afternoon. So you see the troublous times are stirring up the people to more interest in our teaching.

Truly yours,

J. M. STONE.

*Henderson Co., Ky., April 29 1861.*

---

### Well Pleased.

*Dear Bro. Thomas:* —We have received the fifty copies of EUREKA, and are, as far as we have examined it, delighted with it. I received a letter from brother Luxford, in which is the following: —“EUREKA! What a gigantic creation to those who *can* bear its light. There never yet, surely, was book written, outside of the Scriptures, containing such wonderful things.” After saying many other things in commendation, he concludes—“I want to say more about the book, but time and paper fail me, and the means of saying a tenth of the thoughts that burn, and emotions kindled in my soul.” So you see he is perfectly charmed, and I trust many more may read it with like gratification.

But, I seated myself only to write a few business lines, and must conclude with my best wishes for your present and future welfare, and our Christian love to yourself and family. No news of interest. War and commotion seem to be the order of the day. Every thing will work good, however, to those who are recognized as the Lord's people. As ever,

LEMUEL EDWARDS.

*King Wm. Co., Va., April 15, 1861.*

---

### The Lord's Day and the Devil.

*My Dear and Respected Brother:* —I have much pleasure in acknowledging the receipt of the EUREKAS, all safe and sound. At the contents I have been taking a peep, and have noticed something I have for some time been doubtful of; that is, whether or not, "*the Lord's-day*" referred to Sunday? I wish you had given us your new light on that point some few months ago; it would have helped me in my controversy with the Sabbatarians, whose most telling argument is the assumption that Sunday is the Lord's-day, and hence should be consecrated to his service. I have felt there was something inconsistent in the Lord claiming a day as his in these the times of the gentiles, after speaking through Paul as he did in Rom. xiv. and Col. ii. If Sunday be the Lord's-day, it should be esteemed above other days; and hence, he who esteems every day alike, does not respect as he ought the Lord's-day. Until recently I was under the impression that the early writers called it "*the Lord's-day*," but now find it was not so called for some two hundred years after the Apocalypse was written. I do wish, before "*the Sabbath Question*" appeared, I had known your views of the matter.

I may mention that Polycarp, quoted by my friend Judge Marshall, as saying, “In the Lord's-day let every man keep Sabbath,” never said a word about the Lord's-day; and Iraeneus, or Ignatius, I forget which, often quoted, is quite unreliable, owing to numerous interpolations. But I must quit this subject. Two or three brethren have just been in for their EUREKAS. Its appearance pleases; much more we cannot say yet.

Last "Good Friday" I was in the country, and had the pleasure of baptizing three believers of the gospel, and of forming a little ecclesia of them, and a fourth I had previously immersed. I also spoke twice in public on the nature of the kingdom promised to Christ and his joint-heirs. I was opposed by two local methodist preachers, who warned the audience that Satan had appeared as an angel of light. As a general thing, the gospel of the kingdom was laughed at, and deemed foolishness. By some, however, it was heard with interest; and if the brethren up there continue to declare the glad tidings, as I doubt not they will, some of honest and good hearts may receive the good seed.

I agree with you that human nature is the devil. The beasts are not, at any rate, so diabolical. For example, some of the deaf and dumb pupils in an institution in this city conspired recently, it is said, to murder their teacher at midnight. She had a narrow escape. If this does not prove human nature to be the devil, it goes pretty near it. Why, a cage full of tigers will have some affection or regard for their keeper; but man! what will he not do? so deceitful and desperately wicked!

I remain yours affectionately, in the gospel,

JAMES R. LITHGOW.

*Halifax, N.S. ; April 5, 1861.*

[Yes; and our experience is, that the most wicked and *deceitful* are those who intrigue in the garb of truth.]—ED.

---

## **Theiopolitical.**

### **Is "the South" one of Gomer's Bands?**

*Brother Thomas*, —You are aware of the present troubles among us. The people are angry; and they little expect that the wrath of the Lord will soon come, although they are fearful of something, and their money is their strong-hold in time of trouble. I am alone here; and as to the things of the kingdom of God, they are not talked of; and to tell you the truth about it, I don't talk much about it myself, except in my own family, as sowing seed among thorns is a dull business. Yet I cannot remain silent at all times; believing that what God has promised, he will surely perform. There are all kinds of speculations about the New Confederacy; and I say, success to it, if it will produce any good thing to mankind. I tell them, that I think the states will be allied with France, and become one of the bands of Gomer mentioned in Ezekiel xxxviii. 6, which you say, includes France; and as this government gained its independence by the assistance of that power, I think the fate of one may be the fate of the other. France is said to be offering assistance here; and the South will ere long come (or go) at the bidding of the unclean frog-like spirit; and be gathered with the rest, as one of Gomer's bands, to where all their bands will be broken. Am I right? You have answered many questions; please answer mine. At present I conclude, and subscribe myself, Yours in the hope,

C. M. R.

*Green Co., Ala., April 26, 1861.*

---

### **The Frog Power and the Union.**

There is no special revelation concerning the United States, North or South; we can, therefore, only conjecture concerning the details of its immediate future, There are general principles affirmed in the Bible, which leave no doubt upon the mind of the believer, of the destiny of the republic, and of all its constituent states. Thus, we affirmed last fourth of July, in our address at the Wild Woods Spring, in Franklin County, Mississippi, that it was extremely probable that there would be but one more president of the United States after Mr. Buchanan. Not that the Bible says anything about the Union and its presidents; but it says much about the advent of Christ, the character of the times preceding that advent, the signs of its approach, and about the time appointed. The best evidence accessible to the inquirer proclaims that it is near, and that it may transpire in the epoch composed of the years from

1864 to 1868. On the basis of this conviction, we supposed that the presidential election of 1860, would be the last; for the four years of the new term would expire in 1864, when "the time of trouble" to be somehow inaugurated, would give men of these states something else to do, and to think of, than to concern themselves with the election of a president for the four years ensuing, upon the expiration of the current term. We think that Mr. Lincoln is the last president constitutionally elected for the whole Union. We can see no moral reason why it should escape utter and final dissolution. The demoralization of north, south, east, and west, is perfectly antediluvian. "The earth is corrupt before God, and filled with violence; for all flesh have corrupted His WAY upon the earth."—Gen. vi. 11-13. The clergy befool the people with their drivelling nonsense, and are themselves befooled by their own traditions; so that there is no health in any of them. The Legislature of the Union has repudiated Jesus Christ, in setting up one of his bitterest enemies, Rabbi Raphael, as its chaplain. The way of Jehovah they have all utterly corrupted, and there is no light for the illumination of the blind in any of them. The days of Noah, and the days in which we live, are a perfect parallel. Now, if God spared not the world before the flood, but brought the deluge upon it, because of violence, and the corruption of his way of salvation, can you conceive, dear reader, any valid reason why he should spare our generation, which is guilty in precisely the same particulars? Verily, we believe that he will not spare it; and that the existing troubles are but the beginning of woes that will increase more and more to the bitter end, and for all sections of the land.

As to "the South" being one of the bands of Gomer in the gathering of the hosts of the nations, under the imperial protectorate of Gog, we can only conjecture. That Canada, the United States, and South America, from Mexico to Cape Horn, are sections of "*the whole habitable*" (Rev. xvi. 14) is very probable. They are an extension of the ten kingdoms of the Fourth Beast—not of all, but of some of them, though peopled from all. This "New World" is an emigration from the Old World, the peoples, laws, and superstitions of the two, being essentially the same. If then the phrase βασιλείς της οικουμένης ὅλης, kings, or *sovereign powers, of the whole habitable*, refer also to the sovereignties of this New World, we may certainly expect the FROG POWER, or French Diplomacy, to exercise some important influence in the troubles occurrent between the North and South; and that that influence will not be of a peaceful and tranquillizing character. Much will probably depend upon the continuance of the *entente cordiale* between England and France. If the Eastern Question antagonize these powers, their rivalry may influence affairs in this region. France might aid Lincoln to blockade the South, or with her steel plated frigates, to capture the forts, and to hold them against all comers. The cotton would then be withheld from England, and by consequence, throw all the naval power of Britain on the side of the South. The fall of Louis Napoleon would transfer the conflict to the East, and lead to an alliance of all commercial and maritime peoples with Britain, offensive and defensive against Russia and Europe. This would swell the armies and navies of the Modern Tyre with the wild barbarians of this New World; and the policy of all rulers would find an arena of strife upon the mountains of Israel, where Jehovah's King will smite them, and trample them in his fury, because their wickedness is great. This, we suppose, may be the working of things. But of a certainty we know not. We doubt not, however, but all parties in North and South will be deceived. The Union is, doubtless, a gone case. It is in its death throes, and its entire dissolution is only a question of time. —EDITOR.

May 7, 1861.

---

**Caution.**

The Believers and Friends of "the Gospel of the Kingdom" wherever this Periodical circulates are hereby cautioned against receiving or encouraging a Lecturer known until recently in Toronto and other parts of Western Canada by the name of John Williams, but whose real name is Shillibeer. This man by his antecedents in England, as well as his procedure in this country has proved himself to be a Wolf in Sheep's Clothing. He stands convicted of having two wives, both living, and by his various misdemeanors both in England and in Canada has shown himself unworthy of the confidence of the friends of the truth.

His apparent age is about 40 or 45 years, height about 5 feet 6 or 7 inches, round headed, thin hair, particularly on the top head, bushy whiskers slightly grey, pale face, speaks the South of England (Devonshire) dialect, not educated, but with considerable fluency of speech, and a great amount of assurance and self reliance—remarkable memory of "chapter and verse."

Since his departure from Toronto in March last, he *may* have assumed another name, and is known at this date (April 10) to be in the neighborhood of Cleveland, Ohio, lecturing wherever openings present themselves.

Signed in behalf and by order of the Church.

JAMES SKINNER,  
JOHN COOMBE,  
Elders.

*Toronto, C. W., April 15, 1861.*

Since receiving the above, which came too late for insertion in our last, Brother Coombe writes—"Do you not wish to insert it? The fellow actually came back here last evening from Ohio with his wife number two, deposited her at her father's, and drove off in the same cab again for town. His wife's father, Hastings, at once came up to ask me what he should do? He was for arresting him. I could not advise in the premises. I rather expect it will be found that he has taken his final departure for parts unknown, as he had previously written to Hastings, that the news from Toronto had quite balked him in Ohio."

We had the honor of being scurrilously insulted by this man Shillibeer *alias* Williams, and some of his supporters in Owen Sound, C. W., who gloried in him as their "Spiritual Father," not very long before his exposure. He sent us a letter full of slanderous untruth originating from certain of his own class in these parts and those of the Sound, one also which proved them to be worthy of such a parentage! This man and his sympathizers show how people may have, and often do, *a smattering of the truth picked up by the wayside*, —mere spermologists—and a zeal for it to some degree, but are at the same time utterly destitute of all scriptural appreciation of it, strangers to its spirit, and the worst enemies it has to deal with. We rejoice when such "false brethren" are revealed, for by their apocalypse they place themselves in a position in which they have no longer an opportunity of deceiving "the very elect." Those who really love the truth will be as tender of it and its interests as of the apple of the eye. They will not be against its faithful advocates, nor be satisfied to be starved on twaddle while in reach of the instruction without which they have said they and their generation would have groped in heathen darkness to this day. We judge of the sincerity of such by their actions, not by the incense of their words. They are like the man before us, "earthly, sensual, and demoniac," hastening to an expected end.

---

EDITOR.



