

## **DEVELOPMENTS IN THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SEVENTH DAY BAPTISTS AND SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS, 1844–1884**

MICHAEL W. CAMPBELL

Adventist International Institute of Advanced Studies  
Silang, Cavite, Philippines

### *Abstract*

This paper reviews the complex relationship between two Sabbatarian denominations: Seventh Day Baptists and Seventh-day Adventists. The primary point of contact was through the Seventh Day Baptist, Rachel Oaks Preston, who shared her Sabbatarian views during the heyday of the Millerite revival. Later, after the Great Disappointment, one such post-disappointment group emerged with a distinctive emphasis upon the seventh-day Sabbath. These Sabbath-keeping Adventists, organized in 1863 as the Seventh-day Adventist Church, established formal relations with Seventh Day Baptists between 1868 and 1879 through the exchange of delegates who identified both commonalities as well as differences. Their shared interest in the seventh-day Sabbath was a strong bond that, during this time, helped each group to look beyond their differences.

*Keywords:* Seventh Day Baptists, Seventh-day Adventists, Adventists, interfaith dialogue

### *Introduction*<sup>1</sup>

Seventh Day Baptists and Seventh-day Adventists share a fundamental conviction that the seventh-day Sabbath is the true biblical Sabbath. Each tradition, although spawned two centuries apart, argues that, soon after the New Testament period, the Christian church began to worship on Sunday rather than continue to observe the Jewish Sabbath. Both groups teach that the original Sabbath was the seventh day, instituted at Creation and affirmed when God gave the Ten Commandments. Each tradition developed their view of the Sabbath during a time of chaos in which religious figures sought to return to what they believed was an earlier, purer form of Christianity. In this sense, both traditions were “outsiders” in comparison to the wider religious culture, to borrow the phraseology of Paul Tillich, but because of their deep-

<sup>1</sup>I am especially indebted to Nicholas P. Miller, Edward Allen, Jud Lake, and Douglas Morgan for input on an earlier version of this piece, although responsibility for its conclusions are mine alone. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the American Society of Church History in Minneapolis, MN, on 16 April 2015. I am grateful for assistance from the staff of the Center for Adventist Research, Andrews University, and the Seventh Day Baptist General Conference Archives for access to source material. Furthermore, I am grateful to the anonymous reviewers for their feedback.

rooted conviction of the seventh-day Sabbath they also shared a sense of being “insiders” together.<sup>2</sup>

At the same time, Seventh Day Baptists and Seventh-day Adventists are not afraid to be different. Each group evolved out of a larger tradition, which was incredibly diverse and complex. Baptists and Adventists each have distinctive markers. In the case of Baptists, this marker was baptism by immersion; for Adventists it was the Second Coming. Quite often these shared values overlapped. Each demonstrated similar approaches, for example, by their high regard for and interpretation of Scripture. Characteristic of this period, according to historian Mark A. Noll, is “the persistent Protestant dilemma of supreme trust in Scripture accompanied by divergent interpretations of Scripture.”<sup>3</sup> Since Baptists, after Methodists, were the second largest religious demographic in America during the antebellum period, it comes as no surprise that Baptists, in turn, made up a significant portion of the Millerite Adventism revival. After all, William Miller was himself a Free Will Baptist.

In the chaos after the Great Disappointment, when Christ did not return on 22 October 1844, many Millerite Adventists gave up their faith altogether. Of those who remained, the largest group gravitated around Miller’s lieutenant, Joshua V. Himes, at the May 1845 Albany Conference. These believers denounced as fanatics all those who believed in visions or who advocated the seventh-day Sabbath. Many of these Millerite Adventists faced significant persecution. Some former Baptist members were driven out of their churches. Thus, Millerite Adventism imbibed of the wider “come out” movements of the 1840s, when Charles Fitch declared that the popular churches of the day, by rejecting the Advent message, had become Babylon.<sup>4</sup> In the aftermath of the Great Disappointment, and especially at the Albany Conference, a small group of Sabbatarian Adventists found themselves isolated from the main body of those remaining Millerite Adventist believers who did not renounce their faith. This clearly placed the founders of Sabbatarian Adventism as “outsiders” to the main body of Millerite Adventists.

In the wake of all this, a small group of Sabbatarian Adventists formed the Seventh-day Adventist Church in 1863. During this process, they

<sup>2</sup>For a helpful overview of the use of terms in relationship to anthropology and religion, see N. Ross Treat, “Insiders and Outsiders in the Study of Religious Traditions,” *JAAR* 51.3 (1983): 459–476. Paul Tillich approached the issue from a Marxist perspective; the categories of “insiders” versus “outsiders” in terms of how these two denominations related with one another, is a helpful one. See Mary Ann Stenger and Ronald H. Stone, *Dialogues of Paul Tillich* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 2002), 175–177.

<sup>3</sup>Mark A. Noll, *In the Beginning Was the Word: The Bible in American Public Life, 1492–1783* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016), 322.

<sup>4</sup>The Pulitzer Prize-winning historian, David S. Reynolds, provides some helpful background on the “come out” movements of the 1840s in his *Walt Whitman’s America: A Cultural Biography* (New York: Vintage Books, 1995), 238. For Charles Fitch, see “Come Out of Her, My People,” *A Sermon, By C. Fitch* (Rochester, NY: J. V. Himes, 1843).

developed their own unique sense of identity and mission. Part of this identity included a combination of the restoration of the seventh-day Sabbath with their own unique apocalyptic framework. God’s “remnant church” at the very end of time would be distinguished by their observance of the seventh-day Sabbath. Gradually, Sabbatarian Adventists developed a growing awareness of mission, first to reach out to those who held similar values, which of course meant reaching out to similar groups. Since Seventh Day Baptists and Seventh-day Adventists both kept the seventh-day Sabbath, the question of their relationship to one another grew increasingly as a matter of concern from both traditions. Would they relate to them as “insiders” or “outsiders”? Surprisingly little work has been done to examine the relationship between these two denominations.<sup>5</sup> This paper helps to fill this lacuna, beginning with the earliest point of contact in 1844.

#### *Beginnings*

The issue of the seventh-day Sabbath was brought up by a few Millerite Adventists, most notably by the Scot, James A. Begg (1800–1868), who urged Adventists in America to study the topic in 1841.<sup>6</sup> By and large, Millerite Adventism was a one-doctrine movement. Doctrinal differences were minimized. The heyday of the Millerite revival (1840–1844) corresponded with a series of resolutions by the Seventh Day Baptists during their General Conference sessions, in which delegates resolved that it was their “solemn duty” to share the Sabbath truth with others. By June 1844, the primary periodical published by the Seventh Day Baptists, the *Sabbath Recorder*, noted “that considerable numbers of those who are looking for the speedy appearance of Christ have embraced the seventh day, and commenced observing it as the Sabbath.” They suggested that keeping the seventh-day Sabbath was “the best preparation” for the Second Coming.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>5</sup>A helpful paper examining the role of Sabbath observance between these two traditions is Miguel Patino, “Continuity and Change in Sabbath Observance between Seventh Day Baptists and Seventh-day Adventists,” (Term paper, AIIAS, 2013). The most extensive overview of this relationship is Russell J. Thomsen, *Seventh Day Baptists—Their Legacy to Adventists* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1971), which mostly focuses on the historical precursors of Sabbath-keeping, the adoption of the Sabbath through Rachel Oaks Preston, and some highlights of the “growing pains” between the two denominations (see *ibid.*, 44–55) that brought about cooperation in matters related to religious liberty; but all cooperation came to an end in the early twentieth century (see *ibid.*, 54). The most recent contribution is Stefan Höschele, *Interchurch and Interfaith Relations: Seventh-day Adventist Statements and Documents* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2010), 14–19, which includes the key statements of exchange between the two denominations. Höschele notes that this is the first significant exchange by Seventh-day Adventists with another denomination.

<sup>6</sup>James A. Begg, “Letter from Scotland,” *The Signs of the Times* 2.2 (1 April 1841): 3.

<sup>7</sup>George R. Knight, *Joseph Bates: The Real Founder of Seventh-day Adventism* (Hagerstown, MD: Review & Herald, 2004), 78; Don A. Sanford, *A Choosing*

The earliest point of contact between Millerite Adventists and Seventh Day Baptists occurred when the Seventh Day Baptist, Rachel Oaks Preston, visited her daughter in Washington, New Hampshire. She, along with her daughter, a schoolteacher, since there were no other Sabbatharians, worshipped together with other Millerite Adventists on Sunday. According to one church member, they remembered that Frederick Wheeler preached a sermon in which he stated that all persons who confess communion with Christ should be “ready to follow Him, and obey God and keep His commandments in all things.” Afterward, Preston confronted Wheeler: “I came near getting up in the meeting at that point,’ she told him, ‘and saying something.’ ‘What was it you had in mind to say?’ he asked her. ‘I wanted to tell you that you would better set that communion table back and put the cloth over it, until you begin to keep the commandments of God.’” According to a memory statement, Wheeler stated that these words “cut him deeper than anything else ever spoken to him.” After studying the topic, he became a Sabbatharian.<sup>8</sup>

It is presumed that Wheeler, or someone from the small band of Sabbatharian Adventists who banded together soon afterward, most likely shared their Sabbatharian convictions with Thomas M. Preble, the pastor of the Free Will Baptist congregation in Nashua, only thirty-five miles from Washington. He, in turn, shared his views in the 28-February-1845 issue of *The Hope of Israel* (afterward distributed in tract form). Preble famously quipped that “All who keep the first day of the week for ‘*the Sabbath*’ are [the] *Pope’s Sunday Keepers!!* and *GOD’S SABBATH BREAKERS!!!*”<sup>9</sup>

It was Preble’s influence that, in April 1845, captured the attention of Joseph Bates, a local Millerite Adventist leader from Fairhaven, Massachusetts. He learned of the Sabbatharian Adventist group in Washington, New Hampshire, and traveled there to find answers to some of his lingering questions. Upon his return, he met his friend James Madison Monroe Hall, who asked: “What’s the news?” Bates replied, “The news is that the seventh-day is the Sabbath of the Lord our God.” He was so enraptured by the Sabbath truth that friends later reminisced that, even into old age, he would enthusiastically tell friends

---

People: *The History of Seventh Day Baptists [sic]*, rev. ed. (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 2012), 154.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid. See also Thomsen, *Seventh-Day Baptists*, 36–43. For background on Frederick Wheeler and Rachel Oaks Preston, see Michael W. Campbell, “Frederick Wheeler,” in *The Ellen G. White Encyclopedia*, 546; “Frederick Wheeler,” *Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia* 11:871; W. A. Spicer, “Our First Minister,” *The Review and Herald (RH)* 117.7 (15 February 1940): 8–9.

<sup>9</sup>T. M. Preble, *The Hope of Israel* (Portland, ME: Pearson & Clemons, 1845); idem., *A Tract Showing that the Seventh Day Should Be Observed as the Sabbath, Instead of the First Day; According to the Commandment.* (Nashua, NH: Murray & Kimball, 1845), repr. in George R. Knight, *1844 and the Rise of Sabbatharian Adventism: Reproductions of Original Historical Documents*, comp. and ed. George R. Knight (Hagerstown, MD: Review & Herald, 1994), 156–162.

“Oh, how I do love this Sabbath!”<sup>10</sup> Initially, Bates kept the Sabbath by himself, but in late 1850, Prudy, his wife, joined him. It appears that Preble’s tract was also influential in arresting the attention of fifteen-year-old John Nevins Andrews, who later became a stalwart Seventh-day Adventist minister and influential author of a book on the history of the Sabbath (1859). Although Bates, Andrews, and others joined forces into a Sabbatarian Adventist movement, Preble renounced his belief in the seventh-day Sabbath in 1849.

Thus, the initial point of contact for Sabbatarian Adventism came through a Seventh Day Baptist woman, Rachel Oaks Preston. Although individuals like Beggs had brought up the topic, she was the influential, yet inadvertent, catalyst that helped start a movement. Although the connection between Wheeler and Preble is unclear, it appears generally accepted by historians of both traditions that this was the birth of the Sabbatarian Adventist revival.<sup>11</sup>

Bates and Sabbatarian Adventism quickly absorbed and transformed the Seventh Day Baptist understanding of the seventh-day Sabbath. This can be seen in Joseph Bates’s tract, *The Seventh Day Sabbath, a Perpetual Sign*, originally published in August 1846. He argued that truth is progressive, and that the Sabbath (which he obtained from Preble) was new light. He worried about fanaticism, and that Preble’s emphasis about the Sabbath as connected to the original creation and the Ten Commandments was overlooked by most contemporary Christians. He shared his views in order to “save all honest souls seeking after truth.” Although this was new light for him, his arguments for the seventh-day Sabbath paralleled those used by Seventh Day Baptists.<sup>12</sup>

The transformation aspect for Bates can be seen in the second edition of his tract, published a year later, which shows that Bates had, in fact, moved beyond a Seventh Day Baptist view of the Sabbath. Bates now saw the Sabbath within an eschatological framework. “The *seventh* day Sabbath” is “to be restored before the second advent of Jesus Christ.” He tied the Sabbath to the Three Angels’ Messages of Revelation 14.<sup>13</sup> Seventh-day Adventist theologian Rolf Pöhler observes that Bates deserves the credit as the first individual to connect “the newly discovered Sabbath truth” with this notion of “present truth.”<sup>14</sup> He went even further by connecting the Sabbath to the newly developing concept that the events of 22 October 1844 actually occurred,

<sup>10</sup>For an overview, see Merlin D. Burt, *Adventist Pioneer Places: New York & New England* (Hagerstown, MD: Review & Herald, 2011), 68–69.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid.

<sup>12</sup>Bates argues first that the roots of the Sabbath stem from creation. See Joseph Bates, *The Seventh Day Sabbath, a Perpetual Sign* (New Bedford, MA: Benjamin Lindsey, 1846), 3–9. Second, he teaches that the Bible nowhere indicates that the Sabbath was abolished or transferred to Sunday (ibid., 9–16). Third, he examines purported texts that state the Sabbath was abolished (ibid., 16–27). Finally, he covers a smattering of topics, most important of which is the idea that the change of the Sabbath by the Pope fulfilled Daniel 7:25 as the one who changed times and laws (ibid., 27–47).

<sup>13</sup>See Knight, *Joseph Bates*, 110 (emphasis original).

<sup>14</sup>Rolf Pöhler, *Continuity and Change in Adventist Teaching: A Case Study in Doctrinal Development* (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2000), 181.

not on earth, but in the heavenly sanctuary. This concept was connected to the vision of the ark of the testament (Rev 11:19). Thus, the observance of the seventh-day Sabbath was a defining feature of God's end-time or "remnant" people. From this perspective, he noted that "the keeping of God's Sabbath . . . saves the soul."<sup>15</sup> Thus, by the late 1840s, early Sabbatarian Adventists now placed the observance of the seventh-day Sabbath in eschatological terms that had clearly moved well beyond the Seventh Day Baptists. As the church grew and matured, the question was how would these two denominations relate to one another? Would they treat each other as insiders or outsiders?

### *Defining Boundaries*

Although Sabbatarian Adventists quickly moved in new eschatological directions, they found that Seventh Day Baptists, with whom they shared a common commitment for the seventh-day Sabbath, were a logical place to share their views. Initially, Sabbatarian Adventists followed through on their "come out" inhibitions from the Millerite period that viewed other denominations as those who were a part of Babylon because they rejected the Second Advent message. In the midst of persecution, they applied the parable of Matt 25 about the Bridegroom and the Ten Virgins to keep their lamps full and trimmed. When the bridegroom returned, the door was shut. Yet, as time persisted, the "shut door" turned into a partially open door by 1852. This ideology was significant because it meant that as the Seventh-day Adventist Church was formed, it was not until two decades later (1874) that the denomination would send out its first official missionary and embrace a broad mission that extended around the world.<sup>16</sup>

During the 1850s, Sabbatarian Adventists and Seventh Day Baptists defined their boundaries in different ways. Joseph Bates noted with appreciation the influence Seventh Day Baptists had upon him, but expressed concern that Seventh Day Baptists do not believe in the "testimony of Jesus," a euphemism for the latter-day bestowal of the gift of prophecy, specifically as manifested through Ellen G. White.<sup>17</sup> Yet, in this particular sense it appears that Bates was using this as a euphemism for their collective eschatology that included how they viewed the Sabbath differently. Seventh Day Baptists looked backwards, seeking to restore what was lost, whereas the Seventh-day Adventists built on this legacy, but also went farther by looking forward eschatologically. In doing so, Sabbatarian Adventists saw a progressive development of

<sup>15</sup>Knight observes that Bates always had a tendency toward legalism. See his discussion in *ibid.*, 113–114, 144.

<sup>16</sup>For the best concise summary of the development of Seventh-day Adventist missions, see George R. Knight, "Historical Introduction," in *Historical Sketches of Foreign Missions*, Adventist Classic Library (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2005 [1886]), v–xxxv.

<sup>17</sup>Joseph Bates, "The Holy Sabbath," *RH* 1.5 (7 April 1851): 57–58 (quotation on 58).

truth about the seventh-day Sabbath that did build upon the Seventh Day Baptist understanding, but went beyond it. Thus, their understanding was complimentary rather than hostile for these early Sabbatarians.

As a result, Sabbatarian Adventists like James White, who edited the earliest Sabbatarian Adventist periodicals, felt comfortable reprinting Seventh Day Baptist articles and tracts, the earliest example being in 1852.<sup>18</sup> Another significant development, later that same year, was a note by James White about the significance of *The Sabbath Recorder*. After the initial and informal contact by Rachel Oaks Preston in 1844, it was this periodical exchange, which began in 1852, that appears to have started an active dialogue through print between these two traditions.<sup>19</sup>

Despite such exchanges, relationships during the 1850s and early 1860s appeared somewhat reserved between these two religious groups. A reason for this was no doubt the attempts of early ministers like Joseph Bates, who was especially fond of evangelizing Seventh Day Baptists. In one report, he noted that a Seventh Day Baptist came up to him after one of his sermons and told him that Seventh-day Adventists had a power in their ability to evangelize others about the Sabbath that Seventh Day Baptists lacked.<sup>20</sup> This was obviously a point of pride for Bates. Thus, outreach to Seventh Day Baptists was a natural starting point for Sabbatarian Adventist evangelism. In this way, they spoke as competitors. Reports from the Sabbatarian Adventist periodical, *The Review and Herald (RH)*, contain numerous such reports about similar points of contact. Initially, for church members who largely lived in rural locales, this created a common camaraderie as they worshipped together. In some localities, Seventh Day Baptists opened their meeting houses for worship services and even evangelistic meetings.<sup>21</sup>

Yet, tensions grew during the 1850s as continued reports circulated about church members, and even a few ministers, who converted to Sabbatarian Adventism. Research suggests that such conversions were never extensive—not more than five percent of the fledgling Sabbatarian Adventist movement came from the Seventh Day Baptists—but it was still a cause for concern.<sup>22</sup> At least one Seventh Day Baptist congregation disfellowshipped a church member in 1853 for agitating their convictions about the Second Coming.<sup>23</sup> Such interactions caused Seventh Day Baptists to clarify their relationship to Seventh-day Adventists. On 28 July 1853, the Seventh Day Baptist General Conference passed a resolution to enquire about the beliefs of the

<sup>18</sup>See James White, “The Lord’s Sabbath,” in *RH* 2.10 (13 January 1852): 77–79.

<sup>19</sup>James White, “The Sabbath Recorder,” *RH* 3.6 (22 July 1852): 48.

<sup>20</sup>Joseph Bates, “Letters: From Bro. Bates. Alden, Ill., Conference,” *RH* 3.9 (2 September 1852): 69.

<sup>21</sup>Apparently the Sabbatarian Adventist minister, J. N. Loughborough, was quite fond of reaching out to Seventh Day Baptists. See, for example, [J. N. Loughborough], “From Bro. Loughborough,” *RH* 3.22 (7 March 1853): 176.

<sup>22</sup>This estimate is based upon obituaries in *RH* from 1850 to 1884.

<sup>23</sup>John M. Mills, “From Bro. Mills,” *RH* 3.26 (12 May 1853): 207.

“Seventh day [*sic*] Advent people.” In response to this inquiry James White encouraged them to read Seventh-day Adventist publications:

It is now a little more than eight years since the Sabbath was first introduced among the Advent people; and as a people, they rejected it. A few stood firm amidst violent opposition. The Sabbath cause did not advance with us but very little up to 1849. At that time it began to rise and its progress has been steady and firm till the present. . . . As a people we are brought together from divisions of the Advent body, and from the various denominations, holding different views on some subjects; yet, thank Heaven, the Sabbath is a mighty platform on which we can all stand united. And while standing here, with the aid of no other creed than the Word of God, and bound together by the bonds of love—love for the truth, love for each other, and love for a perishing world . . . all party feelings are lost. We are united in these great subjects: Christ’s immediate, personal second Advent, and the observance of all of the commandments of God, and the faith of his Son Jesus Christ, as necessary to a readiness for his Advent.<sup>24</sup>

James White affirmed that the Seventh Day Baptists were pioneer Sabbath reformers, and that their writings “have been a great comfort and strength to us.”<sup>25</sup> In response to the Seventh Day Baptist resolution, Sabbatarian Adventists affirmed that they were grateful to learn that Seventh Day Baptists were inquiring about their beliefs.<sup>26</sup>

Thus, Sabbatarian Adventists and Seventh Day Baptists developed an initial posture of respect, despite conflict generated by competition, as they dialogued and defined their relationship to one another.<sup>27</sup> Most of this dialogue continued up through the 1870s as each tradition republished articles and tracts. Despite a few contentions, groups of church members continued to worship together in some areas.<sup>28</sup> It was a point of pride for a group of Seventh Day Baptists who lived in Milton, Wisconsin, that when a Seventh-day Adventist believer died in their community that they buried him in the Seventh Day Baptist graveyard. The author wryly noted that, although buried in a Seventh Day Baptist graveyard, he continued to await the return of Jesus to wake him from the grave.<sup>29</sup> The life of this believer was apparently enough to inspire some Seventh Day Baptists from that community to subscribe to the *Second Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*.<sup>30</sup> Thus, once again print would be the mechanism for dialogue and exchange between the two Sabbath-keeping traditions.

<sup>24</sup>James White, “Resolution of the Seventh-day [*sic*] Baptist Central Association,” *RH* 4.7 (11 August 1853): 52–53.

<sup>25</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>26</sup>S. R. C. Denison, “Proving Too Much,” *RH* 4.12 (27 September 1853): 96.

<sup>27</sup>See the unattributed note on the continuation of a journal exchange located on the back cover of *RH* 4.20 (22 November 1853): 160.

<sup>28</sup>See how R. J. Lawrence and Hiram Edson continued to hold religious meetings with Seventh Day Baptists who supported them in Hiram Edson and Horace W. Lawrence, “From Brn. Edson and Lawrence,” *RH* 4.18 (8 November 1853): 143.

<sup>29</sup>See “Obituary,” *RH* 4.21 (29 November 1853): 168.

<sup>30</sup>Cynthia Coon, “From Sr. Coon,” *RH* 4.22 (6 December 1853): 175.

The pattern of exchanging periodicals remained largely respectful, even if a bit cautious, as relations between the two movements continued through the 1850s up through the 1860s into the American Civil War. Each movement continued to uphold the seventh-day Sabbath, and Sabbatarian Adventists were especially careful to note the activist efforts by Seventh Day Baptists toward religious liberty. As early as 1854, Sabbatarian Adventists reprinted articles by Seventh Day Baptists about religious liberty issues.<sup>31</sup> James White observed that this piece was published “not because we approve of their purpose to resist by legal means the injustice and oppression, to which the observers of the Sabbath are subjected, but because it is an able exposure of the unjust character of those laws which enforce the observance of Sunday.”<sup>32</sup> It appears that the Seventh Day Baptist role in promulgating religious liberty, along with the common enemy of Sunday laws, helped to reinforce the idea that each tradition was part of a larger common cause. In doing so, Seventh-day Adventist leaders recognized that they were part of a common cause, and that they needed to put aside eschatological differences to focus on their common bond of the seventh-day Sabbath. Thus, they began to speak about each other more in terms as “insiders” in their exchange through print.

This does not mean, however, that competition ceased to exist. Some significant bumps included at least two instances where an entire congregation of Seventh Day Baptists converted to Seventh-day Adventism.<sup>33</sup> This sparked occasional protests by Seventh Day Baptist leaders. Thus, Seventh Day Baptists published an article on “The Kingdom of God.”<sup>34</sup> The article noted certain “disorganizers” who in some areas have disrupted Seventh Day Baptist congregations. Although the article does not mention Seventh-day Adventists, their leaders took it to be this way. Such individuals have “won their way to the hearts of our people,” the author opined.<sup>35</sup> Sabbatarian Adventists categorically denied the charge of disorganization. Even more sensitive was the fact that, in some instances, Seventh Day Baptists were reported to have been rebaptized. A former Seventh Day Baptist minister, D. P. Hall, who now addressed his former church members, defended himself from this charge. New believers accepted “present truth” and, in some instances, this meant that they were rebaptized. A clearer understanding of God’s law and its connection to baptism meant that “many Adventists have been re-baptized.” This was

<sup>31</sup>[Seventh Day Baptist General Conference], “Religious Liberty Endangered by Legislative Enactments,” *RH* 6.9 (10 October 1854): 65–67.

<sup>32</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>33</sup>The congregations were in Hayfield, Pennsylvania, and Brookfield, New York. See T. H. Dunn, “The Lectures of Eld. D. P. Hall in the Seventh-day [*sic*] Baptist Church at Hayfield, Crawford Co., Pa., and their Results,” *RH* 6.23 (20 February 1855): 178–180.

<sup>34</sup>See the Seventh-day Adventist response, D. P. Hall, “Review of T. B. B., in his Article Headed, ‘The Kingdom of God,’ Published in the ‘Sabbath Recorder,’ February 8th, 1855,” *RH* 6.26 (3 April 1855): 204–205.

<sup>35</sup>*Ibid.*

not to discount the validity of the baptism of Seventh Day Baptists, but was instead a recognition of spiritual growth.<sup>36</sup>

Perhaps the most defining doctrinal differences between these two traditions centered upon what happens to human beings after death. Seventh-day Adventists followed the Millerite Adventist George Storrs, who adopted the view of the non-immortality of the soul. This doctrine was never unanimous and divided other Adventist groups after the Great Disappointment, even if Sabbatarian Adventists uniformly embraced this belief. This doctrine was resisted by Seventh Day Baptists, who emphasized it as a point of departure for the two traditions.<sup>37</sup> From the point of the American Civil War forward (at least until 1884 within the confines of this study), this remained the main area of concern.<sup>38</sup> Eschatological concerns faded to the background. This can be seen in the extensive debate between the Seventh-day Adventist evangelist R. F. Cottrell and the Seventh Day Baptist minister N. V. Hull that continued over several years during and soon after the Civil War.<sup>39</sup>

The period from 1852 up through the Civil War was a time in which Seventh Day Baptists and Seventh-day Adventists defined their boundaries. Dialogue occurred primarily through print, although church members occasionally worshipped together. The commonality of the seventh-day Sabbath was a natural bridge that caused them to increasingly speak to one another as “insiders,” even if they were still competitors. The occasional member of a congregation that converted did cause some tension. This tension found noticeable expression when the Seventh Day Baptist General Conference expressed serious concerns in 1855. Yet, this was not enough to stop dialogue. They had a common commitment to the seventh-day Sabbath. They also had a common enemy with the threat of the loss of religious liberty. Altogether, neither group felt compelled to follow the other. At times, this resulted in a further definition of boundaries, which was most dramatically seen in debates over the state of the dead.

#### *Postwar Dialogue*

Many of the patterns from the 1850s up through the American Civil War continued after the conflict. During this time, the editors from both traditions exchanged periodicals. They also republished articles. Perhaps the best example is when Seventh-day Adventists republished the Seventh Day Baptist tract, *Thoughts Suggested by the Perusal of Gilfillan, and Other Authors on the Sabbath*, by T. B. Brown. Ten thousand copies were made by the Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association.<sup>40</sup> Seventh-day Adventist

<sup>36</sup>Ibid.

<sup>37</sup>E. Lanpheart, “The Immortality Question,” *RH* 16.5 (19 June 1860): 34–35.

<sup>38</sup>J. F. Hammon, “State of the Dead,” *RH* 27.24 (15 May 1866): 186.

<sup>39</sup>N. V. Hull, “Nature and Destiny of Man,” *RH* 30.15 (24 September 1867): 227.

<sup>40</sup>See “New Work on the Sabbath,” *RH* 33.20 (11 May 1869): 160. See also Thomas B. Brown, “Gilfillan on the Sabbath,” *RH* 33.21 (18 May 1869): 165–168; [J. N. Andrews], “Brown’s Reply to Gilfillan,” *RH* 33.26 (22 June 1869): 204.

Church leaders were similarly impressed by the publication by A. H. Lewis of his *History of the Sabbath*. Seventh-day Adventists snatched up copies. It was seen as a companion volume to an earlier volume by the same title written by J. N. Andrews.<sup>41</sup> Even Adventist prophetess Ellen G. White kept a copy in her library.<sup>42</sup>

Another pattern that continued was sharing worship services. One noticeable example of this was when, in 1867, a group of Seventh Day Baptist leaders attended the Wisconsin camp meeting. Southern Wisconsin was a center for the Seventh Day Baptists. Thus, the location of the Seventh-day Adventist camp meeting only seven miles away was a cause of concern for them.<sup>43</sup> Another similar pattern was the exchange of print. In 1868, Seventh Day Baptist leaders sent a copy of the actions from their then recent General Conference session. This triggered a positive response that in turn sparked increased dialogue between the two groups.<sup>44</sup> And finally, Seventh-day Adventists especially admired the Seventh Day Baptist work for religious liberty. The fact that Seventh-day Adventists were forced to apply for non-combatancy status during the war meant that they could not avoid politics altogether. Efforts for “Sabbath reform” were indeed a cause for concern, and only amplified by the eschatological views of Seventh-day Adventists, who believed that this was another sign of the end. Thus, religious liberty appears to have heightened other points of exchange and contact as a point of admiration.<sup>45</sup>

The patterns of print, attendance at meetings, and a mutual interest in religious liberty (along with a mutual antipathy for Sunday legislation) created the backdrop for a group of Seventh-day Adventist leaders who issued an “Address to the Seventh-day [*sic*] Baptists” in May 1868. The semiofficial resolution was drafted by James White, J. H. Waggoner, J. N. Andrews, and R. F. Cottrell. They noted their admiration for the Seventh Day Baptist Sabbath observance. “In all this our hearts are as yours,” they stated. “We have, as a people, been called to the observance of the Bible Sabbath, while deeply interested in the doctrine of the speedy advent of the Son of God. We may even add, that our connection with the Advent movement has lead us directly, and almost inevitably, to the observance of the Sabbath of the Lord.” They invited their counterparts to study the soon return of Christ and increase their zeal to keep the seventh day. Previous differences related to the nature of humans in death were not mentioned. In commenting

<sup>41</sup>[Uriah Smith], “Sabbath Agitation,” *RH* 30.20 (29 October 1867): 304. It appears that J. N. Andrews, who in 1859 had written a booklet by the same title, was especially encouraged by this parallel work.

<sup>42</sup>Warren H. Johns, Tim Poirier, and Ron Graybill, *A Bibliography of Ellen G. White’s Private and Office Libraries*, 3rd rev. ed. (Silver Spring, MD: Ellen G. White Estate, 1993).

<sup>43</sup>[Uriah Smith], “Editorial Correspondence, No. 2,” *RH* 30.16 (1 October 1867): 248.

<sup>44</sup>Idem, “Book Notices,” *RH* 31.20 (28 April 1868): 320.

<sup>45</sup>Idem, “Sabbath Reform,” *RH* 29.21 (30 April 1867): 252.

on this development, W. C. Gage, who served as foreman of the Seventh-day Adventist Publishing House, noted the need to cultivate “fraternal feelings between . . . these two denominations being the only Christian people on this broad continent who are honoring God by defending his law and Sabbath.”<sup>46</sup>

In response, the Seventh Day Baptists noted with appreciation the Seventh-day Adventist resolution. They found this as a “matter of rejoicing to us, that through God’s good providence he has, in you, so largely increased the number of those who observed his holy Sabbath.” While the doctrine of the Second Advent did not “seem to us of such pressing importance as it does to you,” they reciprocated by sending Jonathan Allen to attend their next General Conference session. Seventh-day Adventists noted with approval “the spirit of Christian courtesy that breathes through this document.”<sup>47</sup> This move was a significant development that began a formal relationship between the two denominations that lasted a decade. It represented the first significant attempt by Seventh-day Adventists to formally exchange a delegate and, while Seventh Day Baptists had delegates from other Baptist groups, this was a unique phenomenon for them as well, at least for the period under consideration. Whereas they had a common bond, up until now a spirit of competition had threatened their status as fellow believers. Now they changed their stance to avoid competition. The formal exchange of delegates marked a new and special development between them.

#### *Exchange of Delegates*

The period of 1869 to 1879 marked a “high point” in terms of contact and exchange between the two traditions. The exchange of delegates reflected both a sense of curiosity as well as a gesture of goodwill. After the initial 1868 resolution, the Seventh-day Adventists reciprocated by forming a committee (consisting of R. F. Cottrell, J. N. Andrews, and Nathan Fuller) “to address the Seventh-day [*sic*] Baptists, and open such correspondence with them as they may deem fit.”<sup>48</sup> The resolution gave a mechanism for communication. In the meantime, an early itinerant ministerial couple, John and Sarah Lindsay, attended the 1870 Seventh Day Baptist General Conference session. They provided a warm report and encouraged others to participate.

This cooperation continued when Professor Jonathan Allen attended the 1870 Seventh-day Adventist General Conference session. Seventh-day Adventists welcomed him with the “hope” that “as far as [*is*] consistent with the difference of our views of truth, to establish fraternal relations with the only people beside ourselves who hallow the day of the Creator’s rest.”<sup>49</sup> This initial exchange of a delegate was also followed up when, for the first time,

<sup>46</sup>W. C. G[age], “The Seventh-Day [*sic*] Baptists,” *RH* 34.2 (6 July 1869): 16.

<sup>47</sup>[J. N. Andrews], “Response from the Seventh-Day [*sic*] Baptists,” *RH* 34.22 (23 November 1869): 176.

<sup>48</sup>“Business Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Session of the General Conference of S. D. Adventists,” *RH* 33.22 (25 May 1869): 173.

<sup>49</sup>[J. N. Andrews], “Our Annual Meetings,” *RH* 35.10 (22 February 1870): 80.

the Seventh Day Baptist H. P. Burdick occupied the pulpit of the Battle Creek Seventh-day Adventist Church, at the denomination's headquarters.<sup>50</sup> This was an unprecedented gesture of goodwill on the part of Seventh-day Adventist Church leaders and clearly indicated that they considered them to be fellow Christian believers. While this occasionally happened in rural areas (i.e., worshipping together), the invitation to preach at church headquarters was a clear evidence that their relationship was, in fact, now different.

**Table 1.** Seventh-day Adventist and Seventh Day Baptist Delegates

Year	Seventh-day Adventist Delegates	Seventh Day Baptist Delegates
1869	“Address to the Seventh-day [sic] Baptists” <sup>a</sup>	
1870	James White (unable to attend due to sickness), R. F. Cottrell, John and Sarah A. H. Lindsay attend unofficially <sup>b</sup>	Jonathan Allen <sup>c</sup>
1871	J. N. Andrews <sup>d</sup>	H. P. Burdick <sup>e</sup>
1872	Uriah Smith <sup>f</sup>	N. Wardner <sup>g</sup>
1873	J. N. Andrews <sup>h</sup>	Stephen Burdick <sup>i</sup> ; No delegate at the second Seventh-day Adventist General Conference session <sup>j</sup>
1874	J. N. Andrews <sup>k</sup>	L. C. Rogers <sup>l</sup>
1875	Uriah Smith <sup>m</sup> and D. M. Canright <sup>n</sup>	N. V. Hull <sup>o</sup>
1876	James White <sup>p</sup>	C. W. Whitford (president of Seventh Day Baptist College in Milton, Wisconsin)
1877		
1878	J. H. Waggoner	N. Wardner <sup>q</sup>
1879	James White <sup>r</sup>	

<sup>a</sup>See James White, J. H. Waggoner, J. N. Andrews, and R. F. Cottrell, “The Address to the Seventh-Day [sic] Baptists,” *RH* 34.7 (10 August 1869): 52–53.

<sup>b</sup>James White was supposed to attend as a delegate, but was unable to do so on account of sickness. Several Seventh-day Adventists were present, including John Lindsay, S[arah] A. H. Lindsay (John Lindsay and S[arah] A. H. Lindsay, “Report of Meetings,” *RH* 36.25 [6 December 1870]: 198), and R. F. Cottrell (R. F. Cottrell, “Seventh-day [sic] Baptists,” *RH* 36.14 [20 September 1870]: 109). Although the Lindsays and Cottrell were not official delegates, it does help to demonstrate a desire for close cooperation with the Seventh Day Baptists.

<sup>c</sup>“Business Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Session of the General Conference of S. D. Adventists,” *RH* 35.14 (22 March 1870): 109.

<sup>d</sup>J. N. Andrews, “Visit to the S. D. Baptist General Conference,” *RH* 38.14 (19 September 1871): 108–109.

<sup>50</sup>See editorial note on back page that indicates the sickness of editor, along with initials of the interim editor (W[illiam] C. G[age], *RH* 36.18 [18 October 1870]: 144).

<sup>e</sup>“Business Proceedings of the Ninth Annual Session of the General Conference of S. D. Adventists,” *RH* 37.9 (14 February 1871): 68.

<sup>f</sup>See editorial note on back page of *RH* 40.13 (10 September 1872): 104. The full report was published as [Uriah Smith], “The S. D. Baptist Anniversaries,” *RH* 40.15 (24 September 1872): 116.

<sup>g</sup>“Business Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Session of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists,” *RH* 39.3 (2 January 1872): 20. Although this conference was in late 1871, it appears that the Seventh Day Baptist church considered this as a counterpoint to Uriah Smith’s earlier 1872 visit.

<sup>h</sup>J. N. A[ndrews], “Visit to the Seventh-Day [*sic*] Baptist General Conference,” *RH* 42.16 (30 September 1873): 124.

<sup>i</sup>See Stephen Burdick, “Report of Eld. S. Burdick,” *RH* 42.17 (7 October 1873): 133.

<sup>j</sup>J. N. Andrews noted his disappointment. See J. N. A[ndrews], “Visit to the Seventh-Day [*sic*] Baptist General Conference,” *RH* 42.16 (30 September 1873): 124.

<sup>k</sup>“The Seventh-Day Baptists [*sic*],” *RH* 44.18 (27 October 1874): 141.

<sup>l</sup>“Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual Meeting of the Gen. Conf. of S. D. Adventists,” *RH* 44.10 (25 August 1874): 74–75. This report notes that this was L. C. Roger’s last Seventh-day Adventist General Conference session.

<sup>m</sup>See untitled news note by G. M. A[madon] on back page of *RH* 46.12 (23 September 1875): 96.

<sup>n</sup>Uriah Smith preached a sermon before the Seventh Day Baptist delegates. See D. M. Canright, “Faith and Works,” *RH* 47.1 (6 January 1876): 1–3.

<sup>o</sup>“Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual Session of the S. D. Adventist General Conference,” *RH* 46.8 (26 August 1875): 59; see also N. V. Hull, “Seventh-day Adventist General Conference,” *RH* 46.10 (9 September 1875): 77.

<sup>p</sup>James White, “Seventh-Day [*sic*] Baptists,” *RH* 48.14 (5 October 1876): 108.

<sup>q</sup>[Uriah Smith], “The Conference,” *RH* 52.16 (17 October 1878): 124.

<sup>r</sup>See untitled news notice on back page of *RH* 54.14 (25 September 1879): 112.

In **table 1**, I have traced the exchange of delegates. What follows is essentially a summary of some of the key points made by delegates during this decade. Future delegates highlighted the polity and procedures that occurred during their respective General Conference sessions. The structure of each denomination was different, and delegates found this to be quite interesting. Seventh-day Adventists, for example, had delegates who arrived from each state conference. Seventh Day Baptists, in contrast, had only one delegate from each church, although multiple representatives could caucus together to decide about how to vote. Another significant difference in terms of polity was that the Seventh-day Adventist General Conference voted resolutions that had to be implemented at the local church level, yet Seventh Day Baptists resolutions could only be recommended and lacked any mechanism for enforcement.<sup>51</sup> The Seventh Day Baptist reports suggest that

<sup>51</sup>A helpful description from a Seventh-day Adventist perspective is J. N. A[ndrews], “Visit to the Seventh-day [*sic*] General Conference,” *RH* 42.16 (30 September 1873): 124.

what stood out from their perspective was the Adventists' cohesive, centralized system of organization.<sup>52</sup>

Perhaps the most interesting discussions, from the perspective of the Seventh-day Adventist delegates, concerned the internal debates by Seventh Day Baptists over "closed" versus "open" communion. This was a widely debated topic among Baptists, with the majority of American Baptists during the nineteenth century in favor of "closed" communion.<sup>53</sup> Seventh Day Baptists joined others, although there were some protests toward this stance. Such discussions predated internal discussions by Seventh-day Adventist leaders, who did not begin a serious discussion on the topic until the 1880s, after the exchange of delegates came to an end.<sup>54</sup> One wonders if perhaps such discussions may have prompted reflection by Seventh-day Adventists upon the topic, who similarly were not uniform in their approach about how to celebrate this church ordinance.

Another area of mutual interest concerned missions. This was discussed by delegates from both sides who earnestly noted their areas of growth, as well as their mutual desire to not compete with one another. J. N. Andrews, the year before he left as the Seventh-day Adventist denomination's first official missionary, noted with interest at a Seventh Day Baptist general conference session about the Seventh Day Baptist missionary presence in China.<sup>55</sup> Similarly, the energy exerted by Seventh-day Adventists to print tracts in new languages, expand their missionary reach to California, and eventually to develop a missionary presence in Europe, was keenly observed by Seventh Day Baptists. It appears that their missionary efforts were synergistic and mutually beneficial to each denomination. Furthermore, the Seventh Day Baptist, William M. Jones, who lived and operated in the vicinity of London, provided a useful point of contact for J. N. Andrews. Jones hosted Andrews on his way to Switzerland, shared with Andrews about their history, and personally gave him a tour of historic sites.<sup>56</sup>

The exchange of delegates marked a new and increased communication, as well as a "brotherly" fraternity between the two denominations. Competition was put aside so they could focus on being fellow believers, even though not

<sup>52</sup>Cf. Stephen Burdick, "Report of Eld. S. Burdick: Delegate from the S. D. Baptists to the Last Gen. Conf. of S. D. Adventists," *RH* 42.17 (7 October 1873): 133.

<sup>53</sup>David W. Bebbington, *Baptists through the Centuries* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2010), 92.

<sup>54</sup>For an overview of the development of the Lord's Supper among Seventh-day Adventists, see Michael W. Campbell, "A Holy Spell: The Development of the Communion Service among Seventh-day Adventists" (term paper, Andrews University, 2004).

<sup>55</sup>J. N. Andrews, "Visit to the Seventh-day Baptist General Conference," *RH* 42.16 (30 September 1873): 124.

<sup>56</sup>William M. Jones, "Interesting Letter from London," *RH* 44.26 (22 December 1874): 206; idem, "Seventh-Day [*sic*] Baptists and Seventh-day Adventists," *RH* 43.26 (9 June 1874): 205.

all theological tensions were resolved. This was at least enough to facilitate a sense of continuity. Tragically, this continuity unraveled during the latter part of the 1870s.

### *Tensions*

The exchange of delegates and increased interaction between the two denominations brought up new questions about their future relationship. Any questions about a possible merger were stifled. In 1876, the Seventh Day Baptists voted a resolution that they should continue to exchange delegates, but that there should be no “consolidation of two bodies holding such opposite views concerning important doctrines.”<sup>57</sup> The feelings of good will would only go so far.

These warm feelings generated by the exchange of delegates quickly dissipated over the next year. During 1877, significant tensions developed between them. Church leaders from both traditions indicated that some “rash efforts” were made by some Seventh-day Adventists in Minnesota, western New York, and Pennsylvania—areas with high concentrations of Seventh Day Baptists. Most notorious of all was Nathan Fuller, who apparently aggressively tried to convert Seventh Day Baptists. He apostatized after news of an affair and financial problems came to light.<sup>58</sup> Similar other “rash efforts” were made, according to James White, by individuals in Minnesota.<sup>59</sup>

In response, Seventh Day Baptist church leaders published a resolution condemning such actions. This appears to have troubled James White, who affirmed the earlier 1876 resolution that the two bodies not compete with one another. They declared that no evangelism should be done in a community with an already existing congregation, and Seventh Day Baptist church leaders should have contacted Seventh-day Adventist General Conference leaders when there was a problem instead of publishing an article about it. Such an article was written to “excite prejudice” against Adventists. Over the previous twenty years, James White observed, Seventh-day Adventists maintained a respectful posture toward Seventh Day Baptists. The best timber for new church members, suggested White, was “hewn right from the forest.”<sup>60</sup>

A gap in delegates exists for the year of 1877, during which no delegates were exchanged by either denomination. The Seventh-day Adventist minister, J. H. Waggoner, did, however, attend the 1878 Seventh Day Baptist General Conference session. At that meeting, Varnum Hull read an essay highlighting the differences between the two denominations. Reflecting on

<sup>57</sup>Albert N. Rogers, *Seventh Day Baptists in Europe and America: A Series of Historical Papers Written in Commemoration of the One Hundredth Anniversary of the Organization of the Seventh Day Baptist General Conference: Celebrated at Ashaway, Rhode Island, August 20-25, 1902*, 2 vols. (Plainfield, NJ: American Sabbath Tract Society, 1910), 1:206.

<sup>58</sup>D. M. Canright, “Pennsylvania and New York,” *RH* 49.17 (26 April 1877): 134.

<sup>59</sup>J[ames] W[hite], “The Two Bodies,” *RH* 50.8 (16 August 1877): 60.

<sup>60</sup>*Ibid.*

this meeting, J. N. Andrews wished that there should be no “strife between these two denominations that are alike loyal to the law of God.”<sup>61</sup> Despite some doctrinal differences, “[i]n practice they are substantially one.” Such efforts by Andrews and others appear to have fallen on deaf ears.<sup>62</sup> The next year the Seventh Day Baptists sent N. Wardner as their final delegate to a Seventh-day Adventist General Conference session. Finally, the last delegate was James White, who attended the 1879 Seventh Day Baptist General Conference session. In this final point of contact (he died two years later), he reviewed their mutual relationship that had developed over the previous decade. Both denominations stood in “general agreement” on the “divine law” and other great Christian truths, but their principal difference remained “the immortality question.” He urged that there be “no controversy between the two bodies” and that the exchange of delegates continue. Unfortunately, this was the last official exchange of delegates between the two denominations until 1979 when the practice was resumed.<sup>63</sup>

Subsequent reports in church publications indicate that, among local church communities in some areas, Seventh-day Adventists and Seventh Day Baptists occasionally continued to worship together. Ministers from either denomination also conducted funerals. Debates continued between ministers, especially on the state of the dead.<sup>64</sup> In one instance, a Seventh Day Baptist employed a Seventh-day Adventist who lost his job due to Sabbath observance.<sup>65</sup> While there was no longer a formal relationship, with some exceptions, relations returned to earlier competitive patterns.

Despite the distance, Seventh-day Adventist church leaders continued to admire the Seventh Day Baptist stance on religious liberty. In a way, it was Seventh Day Baptists who served as a role model for the religious liberty work. Adventist church leaders regularly reported on the work of Seventh Day Baptists.<sup>66</sup> Although Adventists were reticent to get involved in such cases, during the 1880s and 1890s they did follow the Baptists’ example by actively combatting Sunday legislation and advocating for religious liberty.<sup>67</sup>

<sup>61</sup>J. N. Andrews, “Seventh-Day [*sic*] Baptists and Seventh-day Adventists,” *RH* 52.17 (24 October 1878): 132.

<sup>62</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>63</sup>James White, “Seventh-Day [*sic*] Baptists and Seventh-day Adventists,” *RH* 54.23 (4 December 1879): 180–181.

<sup>64</sup>Cf. the debate between N. Wardner and Uriah Smith that occurred during 1880 (N. Wardner, “Death—No. 2. Reply to U. Smith,” *RH* 56.21 [18 November 1880]: 322–324).

<sup>65</sup>Geo. E. Loomis, “How We Found the Truth,” *RH* 55.20 (13 May 1880): 316–317.

<sup>66</sup>The Daniel C. Waldo case was closely followed by Adventists from 1879–1880.

<sup>67</sup>See note by editor with reprinted letter by Horatio Gates Jones ([Uriah Smith], “Religious Liberty in Pennsylvania,” *RH* 55.5 [29 January 1880]: 75).

*Summary and Conclusions*

The relationship between Seventh Day Baptists and Seventh-day Adventists from 1844 to 1884 was indeed complex as each denomination defined its relationship to the other. Each group credits Rachel Oaks Preston as the initial contact point which led to the emergence of Sabbatarian Adventism. This relationship was nurtured through print. Yet, the two denominations were too closely related to one another for this warm relationship to last very long: very early on competition between these two Sabbatarian churches soon created tension. In some instances, early Seventh-day Adventist converts came from the Seventh Day Baptist tradition; and conversely, an occasional defector resorted to the Seventh Day Baptists as a place of refuge. While this friction extends beyond the scope of this article, what is significant is that each group sought to delineate boundaries. Although they had strong ties through an important doctrine, the Sabbath, they saw other biblical teachings in a very different way. During these earliest years, particularly during the 1850s, the primary point of departure related to eschatology, but later shifted to differences over views concerning the state of the dead.

The fact that such differences existed between these two denominations should not diminish points of continuity. The observance of the seventh-day Sabbath, including the nurtured memory of the initial point of contact through Rachel Oaks Preston, continued to nurture the seventh-day Sabbath as a significant commonality. This created a strong bond. Early believers used language that they were still spiritual brothers and sisters, or fellow “insiders,” as opposed to non-Sabbatarian “outsiders.” Continued exchanges, often through print, encouraged natural curiosity. A significant turning point came in 1868, when Seventh-day Adventist Church leaders made a resolution at their General Conference session that ultimately led to the formal exchange of delegates between 1868 and 1879. Such an exchange marked a high point during this time, as they recognized their common Sabbatarian cause. They resolved not to compete with one another, and worked toward common interests, such as missions and religious liberty. In turn, the two Sabbatarian denominations exchanged ideas (and at times church members) in a complex and unique relationship. When they emphasized “commonalities” (particularly during the 1870s), they were “insiders.” However, renewed tensions eventually overshadowed such commonalities, and each denomination distanced itself from one another as “outsiders.”