SECOND ADVENT REVIEW,
AND SABBATH HERALD.

"HERE IS THE PATIENCE OF THE SAINTS; HERE ARE THEY THAT KEEP THE COMMANDMENTS OF GOD AND THE FAITH OF JESUS."

VOL. I. PARIS, ME., MONDAY, MAY 5, 1851. No. 10.

JOSEPH BATES, S. W. RHODES, J. N. ANDREWS, and JAMES WHITE, Publishing Committee.

G. L. MELLEN & CO., Printers.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY.

TERMS—Gratis. It is expected that all the friends of the cause will aid in its publication, as the Lord hath prospered them.

☞ All communications, orders, and remittances, for the Review and Herald, should be addressed to JAMES WHITE, Paris, Me., (*Post paid.*)

OBJECTIONS TO THE SABBATH ANSWERED.

AN EXAMINATION OF THOSE TEXTS USUALLY QUOTED TO PROVE THE ABOLITION OF THE SEVENTH-DAY SABBATH.

[*Concluded.*]

Objection 2. "Blotting out the hand-writing of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross; And having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them in it.

Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new-moon, or of the sabbath-*days*: Which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ." Col. ii, 14—17.

The crucifixion was the dividing line between the two dispensations. "In the midst of the week [A. D. 31] he [Messiah] shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation [sacrifices and offerings of the law of Moses] to cease." Dan. ix, 27. They virtually ceased when Christ the great sacrifice was nailed to the cross. The "hand-writing of ordinances" was that very day blotted out. The first covenant, with its "ordinances of divine service and a worldly Sanctuary," was a shadow of the second and better covenant, with its "greater and more perfect Tabernacle," and the priesthood of Jesus Christ connected with it.—A shadow must have a body by which it is cast or produced, and must reach to its body and can reach no farther. The "hand-writing of ordinances" was the shadow in this case, and the "good things to come," connected with the priesthood of Christ, is the body which cast the shadow back into the Jewish age. Therefore when Christ, the only sacrifice for the gospel age, was nailed to the cross, the "sacrifice and oblation" of the Jewish law ceased forever. According to the testimony of St. Paul the hand-writing of ordinances was blotted out at the cross. This was not the work of years, but was accomplished the day of Christ's crucifixion. This is what the Apostle means by "nailing it to his cross."

By comparing Col. ii, 14—17, with Rom. xiv, 1—6, it will be seen that the Apostle is speaking of the same things in both places. He would not have his Colossian brethren JUDGED by Judaizing teachers, in respect to those things that had ceased according to the testimony of the Prophet:

"I will also cause all her mirth to cease, her feast-days. her new moons, and her sabbaths, and all her solemn feasts." Hosea ii, 11.

It is evident that both Paul and Hosea speak of those sabbaths or sabbath-days, which the Law-giver placed in the midst of the Jewish ordinances, and not of the Sabbath of the Lord, which he placed in the midst of the ten commandments. There are four sabbaths mentioned in Lev. xxiii, 24—39. One on the first day of the seventh month, one on the tenth, one on the fifteenth. and one on the twenty-second day.

"These are the feasts of the Lord, which ye shall proclaim to be holy convocations, to offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord, a burnt-offering, and a meat-offering, a sacrifice, and drink-offerings, every thing upon his day. BESIDES THE SABATHS OF THE LORD." Lev. xxiii, 37, 38.

The Sabbaths of the Lord our God, come every seventh day; but some of the Jewish convocation sabbaths were nine days apart, others had only four days between them. Here is a clear difference made between the two kind of sabbaths. The Sabbath of the Lord, so called by way of distinction, is not classed with the other sabbaths. The Jews were to observe their convocation sabbaths at their appointed time. "BESIDES THE SABBATHS OF THE LORD." The Sabbath of the Lord, so called by way of eminence, was instituted at Creation before the fall when the earth and man were holy. The convocation sabbaths were given at Mount Sinai twenty-five hundred years later, and we find them classed with the ordinances of Moses' law, such as "a meat-offering, a sacrifice, and drink-offerings." They were of the same nature of those offerings, and had their origin and end with them. But the Sabbath of the Lord, which was made for the entire human race to commemorate God's Rest after he had created the world in six days, was wisely placed in the midst of nine moral precepts which have been, and ever will be, binding on the whole race of mankind.

We do not hesitate to say that there is no good evidence that the Apostle refers to the weekly Sabbath in Col. ii, 14—17.—But there are many reasons which show that he has no reference to it, some of them we will give.

1. That which was blotted out and nailed to the cross was the hand-writing of ordinances given by the HAND of Moses; but the Sabbath commandment was written with the FINGER of God. Moses wrote his law in a BOOK; but God wrote his ten laws on TABLES OF STONE. It was the HAND-WRITING in the book of the covenant that was blotted out at the death of Christ, and not that which was written on the two tables of the covenant with the finger of God. One was a faulty covenant imposed on the Jews until the time of reformation, or first advent of Jesus; the other is God's perpetual, everlasting covenant. The "Royal Law" was engraven in stone to impress us with its perpetuity. The idea of "blotting out" what Moses wrote in the BOOK of the covenant is perfectly natural; but what idea can we have of blotting out what Jehovah had engraven with his finger in the TABLES of the covenant?

2. The Holy Sabbath never was "against us;" but it was "made for man." One reason for its institution is because man needs a day of rest. The law of Moses was imperfect, and could not make the "comers thereunto perfect," so Christ took it "out of the way, nailing it to his cross." The weekly Sabbath never was in man's way, only as God put it in his way for him to observe, and it is just what his natural and spiritual wants require. When we ask those who assert that there is no Sabbath for the gospel dispensaton, why they cease from labor on the first day of the week, the usual reply is, because we need one day in seven to rest, and to attend to the worship of God. This is universally admitted, and being true, what folly it is to assert that the Sabbath, which God made for this same purpose, is against us! Said Jesus, "The Sabbath was made for man." Amen.

3. The Apostle does not speak of "*the Sabbath*," which is associated with the other nine moral precepts of the Decalogue; but of the Jewish sabbath-*days* or sabbaths, which were associated with "meat," "drink," and "the new moon," &c.—Some object to this view, because the word "*days*," connected with "sabbath," is supplied by the translator. They think it should be left off, and that the word sabbath refers to the seventh day. Here we will give a few lines from the pen of J. B. Cook. In his excellent "Testimony," published in 1846, he says—"Col. ii, 16, does not speak of *the* Sabbath, but sabbaths—called in our version incorrectly sabbath-*days*, (days being supplied by the translator.)" Says J. Marsh—"*Days* is supplied by the translators, we therefore omit it." Macknight and Whiting both omit "*days*" in their translations of this text, but they do not leave the word "sabbath" in the singular, as J. Marsh has left it for his readers. They both translate it "sabbaths," in the plural, which makes the text perfectly clear. Here we will give four translations of this text, beginning with our common version.

"Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy-day, or of the new-moon, or of the sabbath-*days*."

"Let none therefore judge you in meat, or drink, or in respect of a feast-day, or of the new-moon, or of sabbath-days."—*Wesley.*

"Wherefore let no one judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a festival, or of a new-moon, or of sabbaths."—*Macknight.*

"Let no man therefore judge you in food, or in drink, or in respect to a holy-day, or the new-moon, or the sabbaths."—*Whiting.*

If the Apostle refers to the Sabbath of the Lord our God, then we might expect to find the words "the Sabbath" or "the Sabbath-day" in this text, as well as in the many other texts in the New Testament where the seventh-day Sabbath is spoken of. But it reads "sabbath-*days*" or "sabbaths" in all the translations of this text that we have ever seen. The only weekly Sabbath of the Bible is called, "THE SABBATH of the LORD thy GOD." It is also called, "MY HOLY DAY," [Isa. lviii, 13,] "The HOLY of the LORD." "THY HOLY SABBATH, [Neh. ix, 14,] and "THE SABBATH." But the Jewish sabbaths are spoken of in the following manner. "In the first day of the month ye shall have a sabbath." From even unto even, (on the tenth day of the seventh month,) shall ye celebrate YOUR sabbath. See Lev. xxiii, 24, 32. In Hosea, [ii, 11,] they are called HER sabbaths."

4. Those things that were blotted out and nailed to the cross, such as the Apostle mentions were a shadow, as he testifies in the following words. "Which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ." Col. ii, 17. But the seventh-day Sabbath is not a shadow: for it is to be observed as long as the New Heavens and the New Earth remain.

"For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I will make shall remain before me, saith the Lord, so shall your seed and your name remain.

"And it shall come to pass, that from one new-moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord." Isa. lxvi, 22, 23.

"All flesh" has never worshipped God on the Sabbath since Isaiah wrote this Prophecy, and there is no reason to suppose that it will be fulfilled until the righteous are all gathered into the New Earth. Then the Sabbath, in its Eden glory, will be observed as long as the immortal saints, and the New Heavens and Earth remain. Mark this: The Sabbath was instituted before the fall, when man was holy, and could talk face to face with God and angels. It is not an ordinance, and originally given to restore fallen man to the favor of God; for it was given when all was holy, and Eden bloomed on earth, and it will be in its proper place in the New Earth, after the restitution, as much so as it was before the fall.

All shadows cease when the bodies which produce them are reached. Follow the shadow of a tree to its body, and there the shadow ends. Though the autumnal types shadowed forth events connected with the cleansing of the Sanctuary at the end of the 2300 days, yet the ordinances of the law of Moses, as a whole, were a shadow of the gospel, which is the body. When the gospel dispensation was introduced at the crucifixion of Christ, that very day all the ordinances of the Jewish law ceased to be of any virtue. As the weekly Sabbath will never end, it cannot be a shadow, but is a body of itself, as well as the other nine commandments of the Decalogue; for they are all of the same character in this respect at least.

The idea is imprinted deeply in most minds that the seventh-day Sabbath is a type or shadow of the seventh millenium; but where is the Scripture to prove it? It cannot be produced.—This tradition is without foundation in the word of God. But if any choose to hold on to this tradition, let them remember that a shadow reaches to its body, and admitting that the seventh thousand years is the body, and the seventh-day Sabbath the shadow, then the conclusion seems irresistible that the Sabbath was to continue in full force until the seventh millenium. The view that the Sabbath is a type of the seventh thousand years, and that it ceased at the crucifixion, makes a blank space of more than eighteen hundred years between the shadow and the body, which entirely destroys the figure.

Finally, the fact that the early church was troubled with those who thought that the law of Moses must be kept in order to be saved, shows that Col. ii, 16, directly applied to the church in the Apostle's day. It is therefore wrong to apply this text to the case of those who now observe the seventh-day Sabbath; for none of us are judging others "in meat or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new-moon" with which the Apostle has associated the Jewish sabbaths.

Objection 3. "But if the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away: how shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious?

"For if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much *more* doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory. For even that which was made glorious had no glory in this respect, by reason of the glory that excelleth. For if that which is done away was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious." 2 Cor. iii, 7—11.

By a careful examination of this chapter, we think it will be seen that the Apostle's subject is the contrast of the "*ministration*" of the old covenant under Moses, with the ministration of the new covenant under Christ. There is certainly an essential difference between a law, and the ministration of that law.—One is the constitution necessary to govern the people, the other is the ministry, or the ordained powers to carry its laws into execution. With this distinction between a law and its ministration before us, we can better understand the language of the Apostle. That he refers to the ten commandments, when speaking of that which was "written and engraven in stones," is evident; but we fail to see the propriety of calling them a "ministration." There are many reasons why we think the Apostle did not design to be so understood. His language seems somewhat obscure, and, as the Apostle Peter has said of some things in the epistles of his "beloved brother Paul," "hard to be understood." But God forbid that we should "wrest" this portion of his writings to our "own destruction." We will give a few of the many reasons why St. Paul has not taught the abolition of the commandment of God in 2 Cor. Chap. iii.

1. The Apostle speaks of two ministrations, one he calls the "ministration of condemnation" and "of death," the other he calls the "ministration of the Spirit." Neither of these ministrations can properly be said to be the law of God. The law of God is one thing, and the "ministration" of it is entirely another thing. The ministration of death, or of condemnation, can refer to nothing but to the outward observances of the law of Moses, the design of which was to carry out and enforce the principles embraced in the ten commandments. That ministration of the law of God is properly called a "ministration of condemnation" and "of death;" because while it *condemned* the transgressor, and by it the penalty "*death*" was enforced, it could not "take away sins," nor give life and immortality. The blood of Christ alone was to take away sins, and through him alone life and immortality was to be obtained. That "ministration" was "done away in Christ," and was emblematically illustrated by the glory of Moses' countenance, which was temporary.

2. The Apostle does not say that that which was "written and engraven in stones" was done away. His language will not warrant such an inference. But that which was to be "done away" he declares to be, first, the glory of Moses' countenance, [verse 7,] and second that which it illustrated, which was the "ministration of condemnation," or Moses' law.

3. If the Apostle has taught the abrogation of the Decalogue, that the ten commandments are "DONE AWAY," then they do not exist, and God's law is null and void, and sin does not exist; for "sin is the transgression of the law." [John iii, 4.] And "where no law is, there is NO TRANSGRESSION." Rom. iv, 15. Is it said that nine of the commandments were re-enacted for the gospel dispensation? We say that this assertion should not be repeated without Scripture evidence to sustain it. This view charges the Omniscient Law-giver with abolishing and doing away all ten of the precepts of his holy law at the cross, and then at the same moment re-enacting and bringing back nine of them! All this had to be done to get rid of the Holy Sabbath!

Again, the Apostle, A. D. 60, says, "For if that which IS DONE AWAY," &c. This certainly shows that whatever was done away at the cross, A. D. 31, did not exist 29 years later. Now if he wished to teach his brethren at Corinth that the Decalogue was done away at the cross, and that nine tenths of it was then re-enacted, we might expect him to use the word, *was done away*, instead of "IS DONE AWAY," and then show them how nine of the commandments could be re-enacted and brought back by the very means that abolished and destroyed the whole of them. If the Apostle is speaking of the Decalogue when he uses the words "is done away," as many assert, then certainly it did not exist at that time; hence the folly, with

the supposition that he refers to the Decalogue, in asserting that nine tenths of it was re-enacted at the cross, 29 years before.

We are told that the crucifixion abolished the Decalogue, and that the gospel with nine re-enacted commandments was introduced by the same means. This is certainly a strange doctrine! Will some one explain this matter, and show us how nine of the commandments of God could be re-enacted and brought back by the same means by which they were all abolished and "done away?"

4. If the Apostle has taught the abolition of the law of God, then we think he has contradicted the plain testimony of Jesus. After stating that his advent was not to destroy the law, the Son of God declares that "one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass" from it "till heaven and earth pass" away.

Finally, to say that St. Paul has taught the abolition of the Decalogue is charging him with contradicting himself. In his letter to the Romans, written the same year that he wrote to the Corinthians, he says, "*The doers of the law shall be justified.*" He did not refer to the law of ordinances, for that had been dead 29 years. Therefore he is speaking of the Decalogue.—Now if the ten commandments had been done away, and had been dead 29 years, and, as has been said, "did not deserve a grave-stone," how could he say that the doers of such a law should be justified? Again, when speaking of the same law, but especially the tenth commandment that slew him, he says, "Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good."

He also says, "For I delight in the law of God." "I myself serve the law of God." "For we know that the law is spiritual."

The ten commandments are the "Royal Law," the great constitution of righteous principles for all to observe. This constitution was to remain as long as heaven and earth. In the time of the first covenant it was engraven in stone, but in the time of the second and new covenant it was to be put in the mind, and written in the heart by the Spirit of God. "I will put my law into their inward parts, and write it in their hearts." See Jer. xxxi, 33; Heb. viii, 10. While this law was only engraven in stone, and its righteous principles carried out by outward observances, and enforced by the penalties of Moses' law, its ministration was that of "*condemnation*" and "*death.*" But under the gospel, when the law of God is put into the inward parts, and written in the heart by the Holy Spirit, its ministration is that of the Spirit. "For if that which is *done away* [the ministration of Moses] was glorious, much more that which REMAINETH [the ministration of the commandments of God in righteousness by the Spirit] is glorious." 2 Cor. iii, 11.

The vail, [verses 13—16,] that is "done away in Christ," and which was on the heart of the unbelieving Jews, was the ministration of Moses; for as long as they *read* and *continued* in the services of Moses' law, they could not see that Christ was the end of those typical services. But when they look to the blood of Jesus for the atonement, then they can see that the "vail [ministration of Moses] *is done away in Christ.*" "Now the Lord is that Spirit, and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty," [verse 17,] that is, under the better ministration of the law of God by the Spirit there is "liberty," being freed from the "yoke of bondage," Gal. v, 1, which was the "ministration of condemnation." Now we can clearly see the difference of the two ministrations of the immutable law of God. One was the "ministration of condemnation," while this law was only engraven on stone, the other is the "ministration of righteousness," or justification, by the Spirit of Christ, while this law is put into the mind, and written in the heart.

We have now examined the main pillars of the no-Sabbath system, and have found them weak, and utterly incapable of supporting the view that the commandments of God are abolished. May the Lord add his blessing, that these remarks may be the means of leading the sincere from error to the truth, that they may be sanctified through the Word. Amen.

THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK.

If the Sabbath has been transferred from the seventh to the first day of the week by divine authority, the Scriptures should contain the account of it. And as the precept requiring the observance of the seventh day is plain and positive, nothing less than as positive testimony should satisfy any person in regard to the claims of the first day. The texts usually quoted as divine authority for keeping the first day of the week are Cor. xvi, 2; Acts xx, 7; Rev. i, 10. These we will briefly examine.

"Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come." Cor. xvi, 2.

The Apostle's subject is a "collection for the saints" at Jerusalem. He does not make mention of a Sabbath, or of resting from labor, neither does he intimate that the brethren at Corinth should meet together for worship on the first day of the week. The evident design of this text was to teach a systematic manner of collecting money for charitable purposes. And the words, "Let every one of you *lay by him in store*," show, not a public meeting, but that each should attend to this duty at their homes. There, each was to have his bounty, laid "*by him in store*," ready for the Apostle when he should come.

"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." Acts xx, 7.

Luke here records the fact that St. Paul once preached all night of the first day of the week at Troas, and past midnight broke bread with the disciples. This is the only text in the New Testament in which the first day of the week is mentioned in connection with public worship. But there is no intimation given that the disciples regarded the first day of the week as a Sabbath, or that they rested from labor on that day. As that meeting at Troas was held in the night, and as there is no evidence that the disciples met regularly on that night of the week before or after that time, it is evident that it was an occasional meeting appointed to have a communion season, and for the Apostle to take leave of his brethren, for he was to "depart on the morrow."

It is said that apostolic example proves the first day of the week to be the Sabbath. To this we reply, that there is no record in the New Testament that the disciples ever met for worship in the day-time of the first day in the week. Therefore those who profess to follow the example of the disciples at Troas should, to be consistent with their own profession, hold their preaching meetings in the night, continue them "till break of day," and past midnight break bread. Says J. Marsh, "Harbinger," Dec. 29, 1849.

"*Then why keep the first day?* Because Christ rose on that day, and the Apostolic church have set the example, that we should assemble on that day to commemorate his resurrection, by breaking of bread, and other duties belonging to the worship of God." Acts xx, 7.

To this we reply, that the communion does not commemorate the resurrection, but the crucifixion. Says the Apostle, "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's DEATH till he come." Cor. xi, 26. The Lord's supper was instituted the night before the crucifixion, and the disciples at Troas broke bread the night following the Sabbath. And there is nothing in the New Testament that confines it to any day of the week; yet it seems most proper in the evening following the Sabbath. After enjoying the blessings of the Holy Sabbath, the true disciple is best prepared to receive the emblems of the body and blood of Christ. If the communion was designed to be strictly confined to one day of the week, the sixth day is the only proper one; for on that day, the crucifixion, the event which it commemorates occurred. And if attending to the communion on a day makes it a Sabbath, as is inferred from Acts xx, 7, then the sixth day of the week should be observed by all Christians.

Again, according to the first division of time [Gen. i,] the day closed at 6 o'clock, P. M., and if that meeting at Troas was held the night following the day time of the first day of the week, it was on the second day instead of the first. And according to the Roman division of time the day closed at midnight, therefore Paul broke bread and "talked a long while, even till break of day," on the second day of the week, if that meeting was in the night following the day time of the first day of the week. Accordingly, those who talk of apostolic example for observing the first day of the week, should keep the second day.

But that meeting was evidently in the night following the Sabbath of the Lord. The Apostle, "as his manner was," see Acts xvii, 2, preached to them on the Sabbath; then the disciples, the evening following, met together expressly "to break

bread." Such a meeting must have been very desirable to the disciples at Troas, especially as Paul was "ready to depart on the morrow." "Morrow" here should be understood as we use it, referring to the day light that followed, and not to the next twenty-four-hour day. For in that case Paul would have to tarry at Troas till the next evening, and then travel to Assos and Mitylene in the night. In the morning of the first day of the week, Paul left Troas, and walked to Assos, and from Assos he sailed with his brethren to Mitylene. See Acts xx, 7—14. A singular "apostolic example," truly, for Sunday-keepers!! With these facts before us it seems perfectly preposterous to talk of the "example" of the "apostolic church" for observing the first day of the week.

"I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day, and heard behind me a great voice, as of a trumpet." Rev. i, 10.

It is first assumed that "Lord's day" in this text refers to the first day of the week, and then because St. John was in the Spirit on that day, it is supposed to be what is called "the Christian Sabbath." We object to this view, because it is not sustained by the Word. In fact it is entirely destitute of support from the Holy Scriptures. Others may refer to the "Fathers;" but we appeal to the word of God. The Bible nowhere calls the first day of the week the "Lord's day," therefore we should not call it so. But one of the seven days of the week is called the Lord's day, and that is the seventh. God has never hallowed, sanctified and blessed but one day of the week, and that was the day on which he rested. That day he called after his own holy name. "*The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.*" Here we are not at a loss to determine which is the "Lord's day." But the testimony is full more to the point in Isa. lviii, 13, where God styles the Sabbath, "*My Holy Day*," and "*The Holy of the Lord.*" Jesus declared himself "Lord also of the Sabbath." Mark ii, 28. Here are three testimonies, two from the Old Testament, and one from the New, that prove the seventh day of the week to be the "Lord's day."—Two testimonies from the Eternal Father, and one from his Son Jesus Christ, are worth more to us than ten thousand from the so called "Christian Fathers," however near the apostolic age they might have lived.

Then, according to the word of God, and that shall decide this question, St. John recognized the "Lord's day," the Sabbath of the Lord our God, A. D. 96. This was 65 years after the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ. But, if it should be admitted that the "Lord's day" refers to the first day of the week, and that St. John was in the Spirit on that day, then what would be gained in favor of the first-day sabbath? Verily nothing; for the circumstance of the Apostle being in the Spirit on that day would not make it a Christian duty to keep the first day of the week as a Sabbath. Those who reject a plain and positive precept for observing the seventh day, and keep another day, with no divine authority for it, with only the weak and groundless inferences drawn from Cor. xvi, 2; Acts xxi, 7, and Rev. i, 10, in favor of the first day of the week, are to be pitied. May the Lord have mercy on his sincere followers, and may they be speedily turned from the tradition of men, to observe the commandments of God.

It is said that Christ often met with his disciples on the first day of the week, and that his example proves the first day to be the Sabbath. But this assertion, so often repeated, is untrue, and deceptive. There is no record that the disciples ever assembled for worship in the day time of the first day, either before or after the ascension. On the very day of the resurrection "Jesus himself drew near," and went with the two disciples who were traveling to the village of Emmaus, seven and a half miles from Jerusalem. Did Jesus rebuke them for traveling on that day, and tell them it was the "Christian Sabbath?" Far from it; he even went with them. And as "they drew nigh unto the village" they constrained him, saying, "Abide with us; for it is toward evening, and the day is far spent." Jesus went in and "sat at meat with them," and then the two disciples returned to Jerusalem that night, and "found the eleven gathered together." And while they were relating the interesting events of that day's journey, "Jesus himself stood in the midst of them, and said unto them, *peace be unto you.*"

If the first day had then become the "Christian Sabbath," that was a favorable opportunity for Jesus, the Head and Example of the church, to enforce it. But instead of this, he never hinted a word to them about a new Sabbath, and could say to those Sunday-breakers who had walked fifteen miles on that day, "PEACE BE UNTO YOU."

There is no intimation that the disciples had been together for worship during that day. On the contrary, the absence of Thomas, and the fact that most of them were not satisfied that Jesus had risen, shows the impropriety of representing this meeting as proof of a regard for the first day on account of the resurrection. The only other meeting of Christ with his disciples which is said to be on the first day of the week, is mentioned in John xx, 26—"And after eight days again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them." Now had this interview been on the following first day, it could afford no proof that they religiously regarded that day, since it is not noticed as a meeting designed for worship. But the expression "after eight days" by no means shows that it was just a week. Who can say that it was not on the ninth day after his first appearance? It was certainly full eight days after, which would bring it to Monday night.

THE FATHERS. With a consistent Christian, the testimony and practice of what are called the "Christian Fathers," have not sufficient authority to direct him either in devotion or duty, especially when their testimony has to be relied on in the absence of divine authority. Christians should follow Christ. Jehovah said of Jesus, "This is my beloved Son: hear him."—If Jesus has taught that a new Sabbath was designed for his followers, then Christians should observe it. But as he never intimated a change of the Sabbath, either before or after the resurrection, and as he has shown (by his own example in travelling to Emmaus on the first day, and, in pronouncing his blessing on those who walked fifteen miles on the first day of the week) that it was not a day of rest, those therefore who follow Christ in this respect will not observe it. Jesus declares himself Lord of the only Sabbath of the Bible, and says that it was made for *man.*

The apostles are also entirely silent upon the subject of a new Sabbath, and apostolic example is against the first day.—The Sabbath was Paul's regular preaching day, and he had no other. There is no record of his holding but one meeting on the first day of the week, and that was in the night, and the day time of that very day he spent in travelling. It really seems unfortunate for the advocates of the first day, that they cannot give us the first word of inspired testimony in favor of their Sabbath from the epistles of Paul, Peter, John, James and Jude. On the testimony of such "Fathers," (if we may be allowed to style them so,) Christians can rely with unshaken confidence. But as they cannot produce divine authority the uninspired, misinterpreted testimony of the so called "Christian Fathers" is made to answer. The testimony of those who lived in the time that Paul refers to in Acts xx, 29, 30, can be but sliding sand, while God's word is a solid rock. "For I know this," says Paul, "that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise SPEAKING PERVERSE THINGS to draw away disciples after them.

We notice in the "Advent Herald" for April 19, an article headed "THE LORD'S DAY—THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH" which is calculated to deceive some; we therefore give the following from "Sabbath Tract No. 4," which presents the subject in its true light.

OBSERVANCE OF THE SABBATH FROM THE TIME OF THE APOSTLES TO CONSTANTINE.

After the Acts of the Apostles, Christianity soon became widely spread in the Roman empire, which, at that time, extended over most of the civilized world. But as it receded from the time of the Apostles, and the number of its professors increased, the church became gradually less spiritual, and more disposed to deck the simple religion of Jesus with mystery and superstitious formalities; and the bishops or pastors became ambitious of their authority over the churches. These churches, even in Gentile cities, appear to have been composed, at first, principally of converted Jews, who not only observed the weekly Sabbath, but also the feast of the Passover, adapted particularly to Christian worship; respecting which, there was much contention. In the mean time, converts were greatly multiplied from among the Gentiles, and were united with those from the

Jews; who, not without some reason, considered themselves entitled to some distinction as the original founders of the gospel church, and as being better informed in the writings of Moses and the prophets, having been in the custom of reading them every Sabbath in the synagogues.

About three years after the martyrdom of Peter and Paul, according to the common account, Judea was invaded by the Roman armies, and Jerusalem was besieged and destroyed, as our Lord had predicted. By this awful calamity it is supposed that most of the churches in Judea were scattered; for they fled their country at the approach of their enemies, as they were taught by Jesus Christ to do. (Matt. xxiv, 16.) This war resulted not only in the breaking up of the nation, and the destruction of a great portion of the people, but also a general odium was brought upon the Jews wherever they were found; so that even the Christians of Judea suffered what our Saviour taught them to expect, Matt. xxiv, 9—"And ye shall be hated of all nations for my name's sake." These circumstances, added to the enmity which formerly existed between the Gentiles and the Jews, produced a prejudice which had its influence in the church, in bringing into disrepute, and in fixing a stigma upon, whatever was looked upon as Judaism. "The doctrines of our Saviour and the church flourishing from day to day, continued to receive constant accessions," says *Eusebius*, "but the calamities of the Jews also continued to grow with one accumulation of evil upon another." The insurrectionary disposition of the conqured Jews in the reign of *Trajan*, in the early part of the second century, and the calamities that followed them, seemed to confirm the opinion, that the Jews were given over by the Almighty to entire destruction. But the calamities of the Jews increased in the reign of *Adrian*, who succeeded *Trajan*, in whose reign the revolt of the Jews again proceeded to many and great excesses, "and *Rufus*, the lieutenant governor of Judea, using their madness as a pretext, destroyed myriads of men, women and children, in crowds; and by the laws of war, he reduced their country to a state of absolute subjection, and the degraded race to the condition of slaves." The transformation of the church in Jerusalem is thus described by *Eusebius*: "The city of the Jews being thus reduced to a state of abandonment for them, and totally stripped of its ancient inhabitants, and also inhabited by strangers; the Roman city which subsequently arose changing its name, was called *Ælia*, in honor of the emperor Ælias Adrian; and when the church was collected there of the Gentiles, the first bishop after those of the circumcision was *Marcus*." [Eccl. Hist. B. 4, ch. 6.]—Thus was extinguished the Hebrew church in Jerusalem, having had a succession of fifteen pastors; "all which," says *Eusebius*, "they say, were Hebrews from the first. At that time the whole church under them," he adds, "consisted of faithful Hebrews, who continued from the time of the Apostles to the siege that then took place." [B. 4, ch. 5.]

This church, which heretofore held the first rank in regard to its influence, being now a new church, composed entirely of Gentiles, and stripped of its apostolic character and influence, could no longer successfully oppose the growing ambition and influence of the bishops of the church in the metropolis of the empire.

Up to this time, and for some time after, there does not appear to have been any change in the sentiments or practice of the church, in any place, relative to the Sabbath; but from what is related by subsequent writers, which will be noticed in its place, it is certain that it was observed by the churches universally.

This fact is so generally acknowledged by those acquainted with the history of the matter, that we need refer to only a few passages in proof:—

The learned *Grotius* says, in his Explication of the Decalogue, "Therefore the Christians also, who believed Christ would restore all things to their primitive practice, as Tertullian teacheth in *Monogamia*, kept holy the Sabbath, and had their assemblies on that day, on which the law was read to them, as appears in Acts xv, 21, which custom remained till the time of the council of Laodicea, about A. D. 365, who then thought meet that the gospels also should be read on that day."

Edward Brerewood, Professor in Gresham College, London, in a treatise on the Sabbath, 1630, says: "It is commonly believed that the Jewish Sabbath was changed into the Lord's Day by Christian emperors, and they know little that do not know, *the ancient Sabbath did remain and was observed by the eastern churches three hundred years after our Saviour's passion.*"

At what time the first day of the week came into notice as a festival in the church, it is not easy to determine. The first intimation we have of this, in any ancient writer of acknowledged integrity, is from *Justin Martyr*, about A. D. 140. [Apology for the Christians.] He is cited as saying, "that the Christians in the city and in the country assembled on the day called Sunday; and after certain religious devotions, all returned home to their labors;" and assigns as reasons for this, that God made the world on the first day; and because Christ first showed himself to his disciples on that day, after his resurrection. These were the best, and probably all the reasons that could then be offered for the practice. He also speaks of Sunday only as a festival, on which they performed labor, when not engaged in devotions; and not, as a substitute for the Sabbath. And further, we can learn nothing from this as to the extent of this practice; for though he says this was done by those "in the city and in the country," he may have intended only the city of Rome and its suburbs. For, although *Justin* was a native of Palestine, in Syria, he is stated by *Eusebius* to have made his residence in Rome. Nor can we determine from this, that he intended anything more, than that they did thus on the Sunday in which the church of Rome, a short time after this, is known to have closed the paschal feast, which was observed annually.

We are aware, that it is contended that mention is made of keeping the first day, previous to *Justin*. The first of these it is believed, is from an apocryphal writing, styled the *Epistle of Barnabas*. It is an important objection to the whole of this epistle, that there is no evidence of its genuineness. *Eusebius*, who lived near the time when it was written, mentions it as a spurious writing, entitled to no credit. [B. 3, ch. 25.] *Dr. Milnor* says it is an injury to St. Barnabas, to ascribe this epistle to him. [Ab. Ch. Hist. p. 54.] And *Mosheim* says it is the work of some superstitious Jew of mean abilities. [V. 1, B. 1, p. 2, ch. 2.] And we think it has but little to recommend it besides its antiquity. His theory for observing the first day, rests upon the tradition, that the seventh day was typical of the seventh millennium of the age of the world, which would be purely a holy age; and that the Sabbath was not to be kept until that time arrived; and he says, "We keep the eighth day with gladness, in which Jesus arose from the dead."

The citations from *Ignatius*, [Ep. ad.] are as little to the purpose. In the passage of which most use has been made, he neither said that himself or any one else kept the Lord's day, as is often asserted. His own words are, that "the prophets who lived before Christ came to a newness of hope, not by keeping Sabbaths, but by living according to a lordly or most excellent life." In this passage, Ignatius was speaking of altogether a different thing from Sabbath-keeping. There is another quotation from him, however, in which he brings out more clearly his view of the relation existing between the Sabbath and Lord's day. It is as follows: "Let us not keep the Sabbath in a Jewish manner, in sloth and idleness. But let us keep it after a spiritual manner, not in bodily ease, but in the study of the law, and in the contemplation of the works of God." "And *after* we have kept the Sabbath, let every one that loveth Christ keep the Lord's day festival." From this it seems that he would have the Sabbath kept first, *as such*, and in a manner satisfactory to the strictest Sabbatarian, after which the Lord's day, not as a Sabbath, but as a festival. Indeed, with this distinction between the *Sabbath* and a *festival* before us, it is easy to explain all those passages from early historians which refer to the first day. We shall find them to be either immediately connected with instructions about such seasons as *Good Friday* and *Holy Thursday*, or in the writings of those who have recommended the observance of these festival days.

It is also said that *Pliny*, Governor of Bithynia, in A. D. 102, in a letter to *Trajan*, states that the Christians met on the first day of the week for worship; but by no fair interpretation of his words can he be so understood. He says, in writing about those of his own province, "that they were accustomed to assemble on a *stated day*." This might be referred to the first day, if there were credible testimony that this day was alone regarded by Christians at that time; but as there is no evidence of this, and as the Sabbath is known to be the stated day of re-

ligious assembling a long time after this, it seems altogether more proper to refer it to the Sabbath than to the first day.

We will mention but one more of these misinterpreted citations, and this is from *Dionysius*, bishop of Corinth, who lived a little after *Justin*. His letter to *Soter*, bishop of Rome, is cited as saying, "This day we celebrate the holy dominical day, in which we have read your epistle." As given by *Eusebius*, it is thus: "To-day we have *passed the Lord's holy day*," &c. The only ground upon which this phrase can be referred to the first day, is, that this day was at that time known by the same title that God has given to the Sabbath, (see Isaiah lviii, 13,) of which there is no evidence. Therefore it is not just to cite this passage as evidence of the observation of the first day at that time.

It is, indeed, a well known fact, that this day has come into very extensive use among the great body of Christians, as the only day of weekly celebration. The origin of this practice does not appear, however, to be as ancient as many suppose, by some centuries; nor was its adoption secured at once, but by slow and gradual advances it obtained general notice in Christian countries. This is frankly admitted by *Morer*, an English Episcopalian, in his *Dialogues on the Lord's Day*, p. 236. He says, "In *St. Jerome's* time, (that is, in the fifth century,) Christianity had got into the throne as well as into the empire. Yet for all this, the entire sanctification of the Lord's day proceeded slowly; and that it was the work of time to bring it to perfection, appears from the several steps the church made in her constitution, and from the decrees of emperors and other princes, wherein the prohibitions from servile and civil business advanced by degrees from one species to another, till the day got a considerable figure in the world." The same author says on the same page: "If the Christians in St. Jerome's time, after divine service on the Lord's day, followed their daily employments, it should be remembered, that this was not done till the worship was quite over, when they might with innocency enough resume them, because the length of time and the number of hours assigned for piety were not then so well explained as in after ages." * * * * *

Prejudice against the Jews was another influence against the Sabbath, and in favor of the first day. This was very strong, and directly calculated to lead the Gentile Christians to fix a stigma upon every religious custom of the Jews, and to brand with *Judaism* whatever they supposed had any connection with the Mosaic religion. Hence it was in those times, as it often occurs in our own, that to produce disaffection and disgust to the seventh day as the Sabbath, they spoke of it and reproached its observance as Judaizing. This general feeling in relation to Judaism led *Athanasius*, bishop of Alexandria, in Egypt, in the fourth century, who with his people then observed the Sabbath, to say, in his *Interpretation of the Psalms*, "We assemble on Saturday, not that we are affected with Judaism, but to worship Jesus the Lord of the Sabbath." In a community of Christians whose religion was formal, and whose celebrations were designed more to act upon the passions and senses than to improve their hearts or to conform them to divine requirements, a more powerful argument could not be used against the Sabbath day, which was kept by the Jews, or one that could more effectually promote the observance of the first day, which was raised up as its rival. *Dr, Neander* says distinctly, "Opposition to Judaism introduced the particular festival of Sunday very early."

The observance of the Passover, or Easter, by the early Christians, aided the introduction of the first day as a religious festival in the church, if it was not indeed the direct cause of it. This feast was held by the Asiatic Christians, who began it at the same time the Jews began their Passover, and ended it in like manner, without regard to the particular day of the week when it began or closed. The church of Rome does not appear to have observed it until the latter part of the second century, when in the time of *Victor*, bishop of Rome, it seems that it was observed by the Roman and Western churches. *Victor* insisted upon the fast being closed on the first day of the week, on whatever day it might commence; and he claimed the right, as *bishop of Rome*, to control all the churches in this matter.—"Hence," says *Eusebius*, "there were synods and convocations of the bishops on this question, and all (i. e. the western bishops) unanimously drew up an ecclesiastical decree, which they communicated to all the churches in all places, that the mystery of our Lord's resurrection should be celebrated on no other day than the Lord's day; and that on this day alone we should observe the close of the paschal feasts." The bishops of Asia, however, persevered in observing the custom handed down to them by apostolic tradition for a considerable time, until, either by the threats of excommunication which were made, or by a desire for union, they were induced partially to adopt the custom of the western churches. This change was made, as we are told, "partly in honor of the day, and partly to express some difference between Jews and Christians."

The question, however, does not appear to have been fully settled, for we find *Constantine*, in an epistle to the churches, urging them to a uniformity in the day of the celebration, wherein, after a strong invective against the practice of the Jews, he says, "For we have learned another way from our Saviour, which we may follow. It is indeed most absurd that they should have occasion of insolent boasting on account of our not being able to observe these things in any manner unless by the aid of their instruction." "Wherefore let us have nothing in common with that most odious brood of the Jews."

By this contest an important point was gained for the first day, although it was but an annual celebration. The Sabbath does not yet appear to have been laid aside in any place, but continued to be the principal day of religious worship throughout the whole Christian church.

At what time the first day began to be observed weekly, we have no particular account; but from the favor it received from the bishops of Rome and some of the Christian fathers at the close of the third and beginning of the fourth century, we suppose it had become a practice in Rome and some of the western churches.

This brings us to near the close of the third century. And here it ought to be noted, that Lord's day, or Sunday, was not the only holyday of the Church, during these three centuries. *Origen* names the *Good Friday* as we call it now, the *Parasceve* as he calls it there; the feast of *Easter* and of *Pentecost*. And anciently, not only the day which is now called *Whitsunday*, or *Pentecost*, but all the fifty days from Easter forward, were accounted holy, and solemnized with no less observation than the Sundays were. Of the day of the *Ascension*, or *Holy Thursday*, it may likewise be said, that soon after, it came to be more highly reckoned of than all the rest. Such was the estimation in which the Lord's day was held. It was on a level with those other holy days which are now disregarded by the body of the Protestant Church. It is to be remembered, further, that the term Sabbath was applied exclusively to the seventh day of the week, or Saturday. Indeed, wherever, for a thousand years and upwards, we meet the word *Sabbatum* in any writer, of what name soever, it must be understood of no day but Saturday.

THE REVIEW AND HERALD.

"Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth."

PARIS, MONDAY, MAY 5, 1851.

THE SANCTUARY.—There is much importance attached to a correct and thorough understanding of the subject of the Sanctuary to be cleansed at the end of the 2300 days. The correct view of this subject shows clearly that the days have terminated, harmonizes our past Advent experience, and shows that the proclamation of the Advent which produced such happy and sanctifying effects up to 1844, was the work of God. Those who apply the word Sanctuary to the earth, or Palestine, and the cleansing of it to the burning of the world, cannot explain their own position. It is hoped that some, at least, of those who have advocated the end of the days this spring, and have again been disappointed, will now look at our views of this subject, before seeking a new date for their termination.

But it is a fact that many who profess to stand on the present truth, have neglected a prayerful and persevering study of the Scriptures, and are, therefore, unprepared to give the reasons of their faith. Such are not only unprepared to instruct, and lead others into the truth, but they are in danger of being overthrown by the reasonings of those who oppose it. We wish to urge upon all the importance of taking heed to the injunction of Christ, to "Search the Scriptures." To aid the brethren and sisters in studying the subject of the Sanctuary, we give the following from the pen of O. R. L. Crosier.

"The definition of the word Sanctuary is, "a sacred place," [Webster,]—"a holy or sanctified place, a dwelling place of the Most High," [Cruden.] It seems to us that the word Sanctuary cannot be applied to the earth upon any principle whatever. The primary meaning of the word forbids such a use of it, and it cannot be so applied in a figurative sense, because the thing to which it is figuratively applied must possess a quality agreeable to the meaning of the word—it must be holy. This cannot be said of the earth. Therefore the Sanctuary is not the earth.

We now notice the *Scriptural usage* of the term. The word Sanctuary occurs 104 times in the Bible—100 in the Old Testament, 6 in Daniel, and 4 times in the New Testament, all in the epistle to the Hebrews. It occurs 5 times in its plural form, Sanctuaries. It is applied 90 times to the tabernacle and temple, sometimes to a part and sometimes to the whole. It is so applied twice in Daniel, chap. ix, 17, 26, and three times in Hebrews, chap. ix, 1, 2; xiii, 11. In two texts it is by some supposed to be applied to the land of Canaan, Ex. xv, 17, and Ps. lxxviii, 54; in two to the Lord, Is. viii, 44 and Ezek. xi, 16; in one to Judah, Ps. cxiv, 2; in three to Heaven, Ps. cii, 19, Jer. xvii, 12; and Heb. viii, 2; in one to Moab's place of prayer, Is. xvi, 12; and in one to Jeroboam's chapel at Bethel, Am. vii, 13, (margin.) We have not counted Dan. viii, 11, 13, 14; xi, 31, because its meaning in these texts is disputed by some. We believe that any who will take the pains to examine will find the above to be a full and faithful statement of the different senses in which the word Sanctuary is used in the Bible. From these we can learn its primary meaning and legitimate usage. If the vast majority of evidence can determine our judgment in favor of any one among the several, as *the proper* application of the term, we should decide at once that its appropriate application was to the tabernacle and temple, while they stood; and after their day, to that of course which they, while standing, represented, while its application to other objects is unnatural and figurative. This we hope, if the Lord will, to make appear to the satisfaction of the sincere.

Let us, in the first place, examine those texts in which the term Sanctuary seems to be applied to other objects than the tabernacle and the temple; and, we doubt not, that we shall find "the testimony of Jesus" uniform. 1st. "Thou shalt bring them in, and plant them in the mountain of thine inheritance, in the place, O Lord, which thou hast made for thee to dwell in; in the Sanctuary, O Lord, which thy hands have established." Ex. xv, 17. This is a part of the prophetic song of Moses, sung upon the banks of the Red Sea, in praise to God for deliverance from Egypt, and in prospect of their settlement in Canaan.

It is quoted in Ps. lxxviii, 54, and its fulfillment declared, "And he brought them to the border of his Sanctuary, even to this mountain, which his right hand had purchased." Some have understood the word Sanctuary in these texts to mean the land of Canaan; and then, from the fact that that land was a type of the whole earth, they inferred that the Sanctuary in the vision of Dan. viii, was the earth. On Ex. xv, 17, Cruden says, "By Sanctuary here may be understood the temple on Mount Moriah, which God would certainly cause to be built and established." This opinion is conclusively shown to be correct from the context of Ps. lxxviii, 54. After declaring in v 54 that God brought his people to the *border* of his Sanctuary, the Psalmist in vs. 68 and 69 tells us what his Sanctuary was which his hands established, "But chose the tribe of Judah, the Mount Zion which he loved. *And he built his Sanctuary* like high palaces." This was the temple of Solomon, built on mount Moriah, near mount Zion in Jerusalem; and this mount Zion was the "mountain of his inheritance," "the border, (i. e. *the place*) of his Sanctuary." There the Lord dwelt upon the mercy seat among his people. This explanation of the Psalmist dissipates the only plausibility that exists for calling the Sanctuary the earth; and shows beyond all cavil that those very Scriptures which have been taken to support that opinion actually condemn it. Will our respected brethren, who have taught us this opinion, candidly look at this matter and honestly confess the truth. May the Lord help them to do it. 2nd. Isaiah, chap. viii, 13, 14, says, "Sanctify the Lord of hosts himself; and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread. *And he shall be for a Sanctuary:*" and the Lord says in Eze. xi, 16, "Although I have scattered them among the countries, yet will I be to them as a little Sanctuary in the countries where they shall come." The Sanctuary was a place of security from the avenger of blood and from their enemies, and when in foreign countries they prayed with their faces toward the temple at Jerusalem, hence God's providence towards his people, while scattered in their captivity was "for" or "as," i. e., instead of their Sanctuary. 3d. "Judah was his Sanctuary," Ps. cxiv, 3, "when Israel came out of Egypt," i. e. God was among them in a cloud and a pillar of fire; and, in the division of Canaan, Jeresalem, where the temple was afterwards built, fell in the lot of Judah, Josh. xv, 63; and when the ten tribes revolted, Judah remained loyal, and was the *kingly* tribe. 4th. When Moab "Shall come to his Sanctuary to pray, he shall not prevail," Isa. xvi, 12. This shows that the heathen Sanctuary was a place of religious gathering and worship. 5th. The chapel which the King of Israel built at Bethel, as a rival to the temple at Jerusalem, was called *his* Sanctuary. Am. vii, 13, (margin.)

The way is now prepared to notice the primary meaning of the word Sanctuary, *and its history*.

In Bible history the Mosaic Tabernacle was first the Sanctuary, then the temple which took its place, and from the time the Temple was "left desolate" the Sanctuary was in Heaven.

The first name given to those things of which the Tabernacle formed a part, was, *Sanctuary*. While Moses was in the mount with God he received the institutions which Israel were to observe in the land to which they journeyed. He was commanded to receive from the people their voluntary offerings of the necessary materials, and the Lord said, "*Let them make me a Sanctuary; that I may dwell among them.* According to all that I shew thee, after the pattern of the tabernacle, and the pattern of all the instruments thereof, *even so shall ye make it.*" Ex. xxv, 1—9. From this we learn, that the Sanctuary embraced the tabernacle and all the instruments thereof, which are described in this and the following chapters of Exodus,—the principal parts of which are, the Ark with its Mercy-Seat and Cherubims, the two Altars, one of Incense, the other of Burnt-Offerings, the Table of Shew-bread, the Candlestick and the Laver. These were all enclosed in a Court 100 cubits long and 50 broad, made of curtains hung upon brazen pillars. The tabernacle itself seems to have been only an *adjunct* to the Sanctuary to hide its most sacred parts and services from the common gaze. This is evident from the book of Numbers. After the tabernacle had been set up at Sinai, the Lord chose the tribe of Levi to be dedicated to its service. They were divided into three families, descended from the three sons of Levi, Gershon, Kohath and Merari. The sons of Gershon had charge of "the tabernacle, and the tent, the covering thereof, and the hanging for the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, and the hangings of the court, and the curtain for the door of the court, which is by the tabernacle, and by the altar round about, and the cords of it for all the service thereof." Num. iii, 25, 26. The sons of Kohath were to "keep the charge of the Sanctuary," defined to be, "the ark, table, candlestick, altars, and the vessels of the Sanctuary, wherewith they minister, and the hanging, ("between the holy and the most holy," Ex. xxvi, 31—33,) and all the service thereof," vs. 27—32. The "charge of the sons of Merari was, the boards of the tabernacle, and the bars thereof, and all the vessels thereof, and all that serveth thereto, and the pillars of the court round about, and their sockets, and their pins, and their cords," vs. 36, 37. When the camp was to set forward, Aaron and his sons covered the Sanctuary, composed of the things mentioned in Kohath's charge, and all its vessels, which were the furniture of the altars, table and candlestick, such as spoons, bowls, tongs, snuff-dishes, oil-vessels, censers, flesh-hooks, shovels, basons, &c., and the sons of Kohath came "*to* bear it," ch. iv, 4—15. It is distinctly said that when the camp set forward, the sons of Kohath should bear the Sanctuary upon their shoulders, ch. vii, 9; x, 21. In the charges of these three families of Levi we find a *particular definition of the Sanctuary*. The sons of Kohath had charge of all that properly constituted the Sanctuary, the things embraced in the charges of Gershon and Merari being only the *appurtenances* of the Sanctuary. In strict definition, therefore, the Sanctuary was composed of those things only which were necessary to, and *actually used* in, the work of making atonement for the people. The reader, perhaps, cannot now see the importance of defining so particularly what the Sanctuary was; but the reason for it will appear in the sequel, if the Lord permit us to pursue the subject.

This Sanctuary was called "the house of God," Josh. ix, 23; xviii, 1; Judges xviii, 31; xix, 18; xx, 18. 26, 31; xxi, 2; 1. Sam. i, 3, 7. It was his prepared dwelling place among his people,—the place of his special presence was in the most Holy place of the tabernacle, on the mercy-seat, between the cherubims, (Ex. xxv, 22; Lev. xvi, 2; 1. Sam. iv, 4; 2. Sam. vi. 2,) though at the morning and evening sacrifices he met them at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, Ex. xxix, 38—44. This continued to be the Sanctuary and house of God, till Solomon built him an house for the Sanctuary, 2. Sam. vii. 4—13; 1. Chr. xxii; xxviii, 1—10. David received the patterns for it, "by the Spirit," and gave them to his son, vs. 11—13. When Solomon had built the temple, the ark and the holy vessels were brought into it, 1. Chr. xxii, 19; 1. Kings viii, 6. While in battle or in their enemies land, they were to pray with their faces toward this house, 1. Kings viii, 44—49, which was called the temple of the Lord's holiness," Ps. v, 7, (margin.) This Daniel did at Babylon, Dan. vi, 10. The Sanctuary being the place whence they looked for help, Ps. xx, 2, and the place of their sacrifices, it was, among the gifts of God, the centre object of their affections—a thing indispensible to the perpetuity of their peculiar polity. When the Assyrian desolated their Sanctuary, their religion was prostrated—their nationality gone. Hence Daniel's fervent interest in prayer to God, to cause his face to shine upon his Sanctuary that was desolate, Dan. ix, 17.

We feel confident that we have now presented, though briefly and doubtless imperfectly, the true view of the Sanctuary for the period of time spoken of, that is, from Moses to Daniel. No other view can be supported from Scripture. We apprehend none will be attempted, unless it be that which applies the term to Palestine; but that theory is refuted by the context of the only two texts that can be adduced to sustain it. Within three months from the time that the song was sung, of which Ex. xv, 17 is a part, the children of Israel were commanded to *make the Lord a Sanctuary* at Sinai, Ex. xxv, 8. There is not the least hint that any thing else was the Sanctuary besides that which they then made, until the Lord appointed his people a place and "*planted* them," 2. Sam. vi, 10—13, according to Ex. xv, 17, by the building of the temple and the establishment of the kingdom under Solomon. Its fulfilment is again recorded in Ps. lxxviii, 54, and explained in verse 69:—"And he built his Sanctuary like high palaces." Though that song may have contemplated a more remote and glorious fulfilment, yet these scriptures declare, at least, its temporary fulfilment, and they leave not a shred of plausibility for the theory that the land of Palestine was the Sanctuary—*not a foothold for even an inference.*

We come in the next place to inquire what the Sanctuary of Dan. viii, 14 is. The chronology of that prophecy makes it certain that it was not the Jewish Sanctuary, because our Saviour declared it "LEFT *desolate*," Matt. xxiii, 38, the Romans "destroyed the city and the Sanctuary," about A. D. 70, and "the *end* thereof shall be with a flood," Dan. ix, 26—irrecoverably destroyed. Yet, though the Jewish Sanctuary ceased to be *the* Sanctuary 1800 years ago, something else existed to the end of the 2300 days which was called *the Sanctuary*, and was at the end of that period, to undergo a change which is expressed by the word "cleansed," "justified," "vindicated," or "declared just." Do the Scriptures teach us to what the name Sanctuary was transferred from that which had been the Sanctuary under the Mosaic dispensation? We think they do. Paul, after stating the prominent parts and uses of that Sanctuary, tells us that it "was *a figure* for the time then present," Heb. ix, 1—9.

Of what was it a *figure*? On this question two positions have been taken: 1st. That it was a figure of the Gospel church; 2d. That it was a figure of heaven or something in heaven. In the epistle to the Hebrews one thing is made very clear, which if kept in view will greatly aid us in the solution of this question, viz: That Christ at his ascension entered the place of which the Jewish Sanctuary was a figure, pattern or type, and that it is the place of his ministry during the Gospel dispension. This fact Paul places beyond all controversy. Now, if the Gospel Church be the antitype of the Mosaic tabernacle and the temple of Solomon, as many believe, then Jesus never ascended to heaven as his disciples thought he did, and the angels said he did, Acts i, 9—11; but he vanished into his disciples that "stood gazing up into heaven," and the two angels only completed the deception—he never "went away" and will never "come again," and our hope is vain; for, if there be no second coming, there will be no resurrection, no reward. "The sum" of Paul's argument to the Hebrews is: "We have such an Hight Priest, *who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty*

IN THE HEAVENS; A MINISTER OF THE SANCTUARY, and of the true tabernacle; which the Lord pitched, and not man." This is the only text in the New Testament in which the word Sanctuary is found, except the three that speak of the Jewish Sanctuary. And now we feel safe in stating, that there is no Scripture authority for calling any thing else the Sanctuary under the Gospel dispensation, but the place of Christ's ministry in the heavens, from the time of his ascension to the Father till his second coming. If there be, let it be produced.

May grace, mercy and peace be with you.—Amen.—*Day-Dawn.*

THE HOLY COVENANT.

It is said of the Roman power, that "his heart shall be *against* the *holy covenant*," and that he shall "have indignation *against* the *holy covenant*;" . . . and "have intelligence with them that forsake the holy covenant." "And it cast down the truth (of the holy covenant) to the ground; and it practiced and prospered," (in this work.) "And thought to CHANGE times and LAWS," (of the holy covenant.) Dan. xi, 28, 30—35; viii, 12; vii, 25.

It is sometimes asked, what covenant is referred to in the above texts, called "THE HOLY *Covenant*." See Luke i, 72, 73. To perform the mercy promised to our fathers, and to *remember* his *Holy Covenant*. What is it? Answer, The oath which he made to our father Abraham. Verses 54, 55. He hath holpen his servant Israel, in *remembrance* of his mercy; As he spake to our fathers, to Abraham, and to his seed forever. From these texts we see clearly that the covenant made with Abraham is the *Holy Covenant*, and identical with the Gospel. The covenant made with Abraham was the Gospel Covenant. See Gal. iii, 7, 8, 16, 17. "Know ye therefore, that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. And the scripture *foreseeing* that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached BEFORE the GOSPEL unto Abraham, saying, in thee shall all nations be blessed. Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds as of many: but as of one, and to thy seed which is Christ.—And this I say the covenant which was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law which was four hundred and thirty years after cannot disannul that it should make the promise of none effect.

The covenant made with Abraham is the *everlasting covenant*. See 1. Chron. xvi, 13—17; Ps. cv, 6—10. And the blood of Christ is the blood of the everlasting covenant. See Heb. xiii, 20, 21. Now the God of peace that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus that great shepherd of the sheep, through the *blood* of the *everlasting covenant*, make you perfect to do his will, &c. It is a settled point in Scripture, that Christ and his followers, viz. they which be of faith, are counted for the SEED of Abraham. Such are the children of Abraham, to whom the promise was made. Gal. iii, 7, 8, 9, 14, 16, 17, 19, 29. The Jews claimed that Abraham was their father; but Jesus told them, if they were *Abraham's* children, they would do the *works* of *Abraham*." "Ye do the deeds of your father." "Ye are of your father the devil." John viii, 39, 41, 44. They are not all Israel, which are of Israel, but in Isaac (that is, Christ) shall thy seed be called. That is, they which be of faith are the CHOSEN ones, and are counted for the *seed*. With all the foregoing truths fixed in our minds, let us read a few texts addressed to the seed of Abraham. Ps. cv, 6—10. O ye seed of Abraham his servant, ye children of Jacob his chosen. He is the Lord our God; his judgments are in all the earth. He hath remembered his covenant FOREVER, the word which he commanded to a thousand generations.—Which covenant he made with Abraham, and his oath with Isaac; and confirmed THE SAME unto Jacob for a LAW, and to Israel for an EVERLASTING COVENANT." 1. Chron. xvi, 15—17. O ye SEED of Israel his servant, ye children of Jacob his CHOSEN ones. He is the Lord our God his judgments are in all the earth. Be ye mindful *always* of his *covenant*; the word which he commanded to a *thousand generations*; EVEN of the covenant which he made with Abraham and of his oath unto Isaac; and hath confirmed the same to Jacob for a law, and to Israel for an EVERLASTING covenant. Thus we see that the covenant made with Abraham was commanded to a thousand generations, which being multiplied by 70, the number of years allotted to man, Ps. xc, 10, would make seventy thousand years, and is truly denominated the everlasting covenant, extending through all time. Mark it; the same covenant made with Abraham was confirmed to Jacob for a LAW. And he declared 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. Thus we have positive testimony that the law of God, the ten commandments, was the basis of the Abrahamic covenant, and though the promise was not to Abraham through the law, (of Moses,) yet it was not without, or aside from strict obedience to the law of God. And thus it is written, Gen. xxvi, 4, 5, and in thy SEED (Christ) shall all the nations of the earth be blessed: BECAUSE Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my COMMANDMENTS, my *statutes*, and my LAWS. The evidence is also positive that the Abrahamic covenant is the Gospel covenant, as above shown and is based on the law of God. This testimony is further sustained by reading Heb. x, 16; 2. Cor. iii, 3; Matt. v, 17, 18; Rom. ii, 13; James ii, 8, 10—12. God speaking of Christ and his followers, the true children and seed of Abraham, says, Ps. lxxxix, 27—34, "Also I will make him my first born higher than the kings of the earth. My mercy will I keep for him *forevermore*, and my covenant shall stand fast with him. His SEED also will I make to endure forever, and his throne as the days of heaven. If his children FORSAKE MY LAW, and walk not in my judgment; if they break my statutes, and keep not my COMMANDMENTS; then will I visit their transgressions with a rod, and their iniquities with stripes. Nevertheless my loving kindness will I not utterly take from HIM, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail. My *covenant* will I not break, NOR ALTER the thing that has gone out of my lips." Also Ps. cxi, 7—10. "The works of his hands are verity and judgment; ALL his *commandments* are sure.—They STAND FAST FOREVER AND EVER." O how manifest that the heart of those who teach that the law of God was abolished, relaxed, amended, ALTERED, revised and improved, is against the holy covenant, and that they have indignation against the holy covenant, and their intelligence is with them that forsake the holy covenant.

HIRAM EDSON.

LETTERS.

[From Bro. Drew.]

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—Since I have received the third angel's message there has been quite a spirit of inquiry among my brethren in this region of country, and I have had an opportunity to distribute more papers than I have had on hand to spare. Please send me a few of the back numbers of the Review and Herald. I was at Bath last Sunday, met with the church there. I think the church in that place will nearly all receive the third angel's message. We had a good season with the brethren. I felt some of the love and Spirit that we had before '43.—To God be all the glory.

I would say to my brethren who are proclaiming the third angel's message, I believe with all my soul that God is with those who are sounding this message to his tried people. It comes in the right time, the test is of the right kind, his church on earth are receiving it, and they will receive this last warning message. Amen. Your Bro., hoping to get the victory over the beast &c. and to meet you in the kingdom.

LEBBEUS DREW.

Pultney, N. Y., April 18, 1851.

[From Bro. Mead.]

BRO. WHITE:—Having had the privilege of reading a few numbers of the Review and Herald, and feeling that it is "meat," I wish you to send it to me, also the small Hymn Book.

Peterboro', N. H., April 22, 1851. HOSEA A. MEAD.

Bro. H. S. Case writes from Cleveland, (Ohio,) April 17, 1851:—"I have been in this place long enough to give eight lectures. Some see the truth very clearly, but many are ready to give the most solemn and glorious truths to the Enemy. Many have gone into spiritualism; some of them have, as they say, got on to Mount Zion. But their "harps" do not cord well, and their song of deliverance does not answer the description given by John. Nothing short of a literal Jesus, coming in the clouds of heaven, and beholding him with my eyes will answer my expectation of the glorious event of the coming of the Son of man."

We feel deeply interested in Bro. Case's mission to Ohio, and we hope that some one will see duty clear to go and assist him in that wide field of labor, and take along a quantity of publications.

The brethren should be prompt in sending the names and address of such as will read the paper with candor. W.

☞Bro. Hiram Edson's Post Office address is Port Byron, N. Y.—Bro. H. S. Gurney's address at present is West Wareham, Mass.

LETTERS RECEIVED SINCE APRIL 21.—Joseph Bates 2; Ira Abbey; Geo. W. Holt; R. R. Chapin; H. Cushman; Elias Goodwin; H. S. Case; H. S. Gurney; F. H. Howland; S. T. Belden; G. W. Holt.

RECEIPTS.—Lebbeus Drew, John Stowell, Azmon Woodruff, Robert Barns, S. W. Rhodes, $5 each; S. Gilbert, O. Cushman, H. Cushman Jr., Sister Ingalls, S. R. Burgess, R. Smith, L. Tarbell, $1 each; E. Everts, $10, (five sent to Bro. Nichols for books;) M. Thompson, $2; L. O. Stowell, $3; Hiram Bingham, $2; H. A. Mead, $3; E. L. H. Chamberlain, $2; C. H. Farnsworth, $2; L. W. Flanders, $2; H. Ricker, 50 cents; W. Phelps, $2, for Hymn Book.