

THE 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. II.

SARATOGA SPRINGS, N. Y., OCTOBER 21, 1851.

No. 6.

JOSEPH BATES, HIRAM EDSON, } Publishing Committee
and J. N. ANDREWS,
JAMES WHITE, Editor.

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, Saratoga Springs, N. Y. (post paid.)

"IT'S JEWISH."

BY ROSWELL F. COTTRELL.

When we present God's holy law,
And arguments from scripture draw;
Objectors say, to pick a flaw,
"It's Jewish."

Though at the first Jehovah blessed
And sanctified His day of rest;
The same belief is still expressed—
"It's Jewish."

Though with the world this rest began,
And thence through all the scriptures ran,
And Jesus said 'twas made for man—
"It's Jewish."

Though not with Jewish rites, which passed,
But with the moral law 'twas classed
Which must endure while time shall last—
"It's Jewish."

Though the disciples, Luke and Paul,
Continue still this rest to cull
The "Sabbath-day," this answers all—
"It's Jewish."

The gospel teacher's plain expression,
That "sin is of the law transgression,"
Seems not to make the least impression—
"It's Jewish."

They love the rest of man's invention,
But if Jehovah's day we mention,
This puts an end to all contention—
"It's Jewish."

The Seventh-day Sabbath Not Abolished.

The article by Joseph Marsh, editor of the "Harbinger and Advocate," entitled "Seventh-day Sabbath Abolished,"

REVIEWED.

We are happy to meet our opponents on Bible ground. By the light of the "sure word of prophecy" the Sabbath question should be candidly and carefully examined, and from the testimony of that word alone, the decision upon this question should be made. Protestants, especially Advent believers who profess to take the Bible alone in support of their religious sentiments, should be ready to take this position.

We are aware that the Sabbath of the Bible is unpopular, and generally despised. In all reforms, truth has been reproached and trodden down, until investigated by the sincere. We rejoice that the Sabbath is arresting the attention of many, and that both sides of the question may now be seen. Candid investigation is our only hope for the final triumph of the Sabbath of the Lord, yet we regard the institution as being too holy, and too unlike the spirit of the world, to become popular, even among professed Christians.

We are also aware that some resort to slander and ridiculous falsehoods in order to prevent the investigation of this subject. This has been a trick of the Devil in all past time, in his efforts to arrest the progress of divine truth. Never has there a pure people, a people separate from the world as the Bible requires, escaped reproach. The faults of the erring few among them have ever been seized upon to brand and reproach the whole body of the same faith, however holy their doctrines and lives. And for want of scripture argument, the enemies of truth have resorted to slander. But those who will stoop to such contemptible meanness, are not worthy the name of Christian, or the society of the sincere. When the writings of Dowling, Stewart, Chase, and others, failed to arrest the pro-

gress of the Advent cause, then the foolish stories of "ascension-ropes," "speculation," "getting rich," "insanity," and the "brick wall around Mr. Miller's farm," &c., were seized upon, and circulated in the place of argument. This had an effect; but those thus engaged, were doing Satan's meanest work.

To those who may be disposed to act over the same in opposing the Sabbath cause, and seek to draw us from our present work, we would say, as Nehemiah said to Sanballat, Tobiah and Geshem, we are "doing a great work," we "cannot come down to you." Neh. vi, 1—7. Such may have an influence over some for a short time; but we are sure the honest, who have minds capable of judging between a bible argument and slander, will not be influenced by them long. With such we intend to have as little to do as possible; but with pleasure we meet those who seek to show from the Bible that our position is incorrect.

"The Advent Harbinger and Bible Advocate" of September 27, 1851, is now before us, containing an article headed "Seventh-day Sabbath abolished," of which the editor says:

"The following article, in substance, was published in our sheet about six years since; then about four years ago; then again about two years since in its present form. It is unanswerable."

The principal reasons given in this article for the abolition of the weekly Sabbath have been, we think, fully and fairly answered in our publications, but as M. has published his article the fourth time, and still asserts that it is "unanswerable," we have concluded to give it a review. We shall not be able to copy the entire article; but that both sides of this question may be seen, and that the reader may see that we do not mis-state the position of M., we will quote largely from the article, and have it put in small type.

"What is the signification of Sabbath? Rest: and, when connected with day, it denotes a day of rest."

With this signification we fully agree. By substituting the word Rest, in the place of Sabbath, the truth is more clearly seen. We will here quote the fourth commandment, and use the word Rest.

"Remember the Rest-day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work: But the seventh day is the Rest of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates. For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and Rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Rest-day, and hallowed it." Ex. xx, 8—11. Is it any where historically recorded that God Rested on the seventh day? It is.

"And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made, and he Rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it; because that in it he had Rested from all his work which God created and made. Gen. ii, 2—3.

No one can fail to see that the Sabbath institution and the fourth commandment are inseparably connected with the Rest of the Creator on the last day of the first week of time. That day, and no other day of the week, is the Rest-day (Sabbath-day) of the Lord thy God. We may, therefore, appropriate the first, or any other of the six laboring days to the Lord, by resting from labor on that day, still it would not be the Rest, but a rest; for the Rest of the Lord thy God means the Rest that the Lord thy God observed.

God has given but one reason in his Word for the institution of the weekly Rest, which is as fol-

lows: "For, [or because] in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and Rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day, and hallowed it." It is said that the Sabbath was instituted to keep in memory the deliverance from Egypt. But it is not possible that the Sabbath should be designed to commemorate two events so widely different as the deliverance from Egypt on the fifteenth day of Abib, and the Creator's Rest, on the seventh day, after he had made all things in six. God has never sanctified, hallowed and blessed the Sabbath-day but once, and that was after he had Rested upon it at the close of the Creation. He did not bless the day in resting upon it, but first rested, then blessed and sanctified the day. Mark well that portion of the fourth commandment which gives the reason for the institution of the Sabbath. When speaking of the creation in six days, and the rest of the seventh, God says, "Wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day and hallowed it." Here the seventh day is called the "Sabbath-day" at the very period when God bestowed his blessing upon it, which was at the close of the seventh day of the first week of time.

For whom was the Sabbath instituted? The natural seed of Abraham, or Jews according to the flesh. Proof on this point is abundant. Those who wish to examine a part of it can read Ex. xvi. 2—25; xix. 24 on to xx. 11; xxxi. 12—17; and xxxv. 1—3; Lev. xiii. 1—3; and Deut. v. 1—15. This last we will copy in full.

We have shown the institution of the Sabbath, two thousand years before Abraham, or even a Jew lived. We have pointed the reader to the fact that God sanctified and blessed the seventh day, after he had rested upon it, at the close of creation, see Gen. ii, 3. And we have shown that God, in giving the reason for the Sabbath institution, calls the seventh day, the "Sabbath-day," at the time he blessed the day, at the close of the first week of time. See Ex. xx, 11. And there is not one text in the Bible to show that the Sabbath was instituted, sanctified and blessed at any other time or place but at creation, in Eden, after God had Rested on the seventh day. Hence the Sabbath is a memorial of the Creator's rest. And how wonderfully calculated to keep in memory the true and living God.

It is true that God, after he brought the children of Israel out of Egyptian bondage, reminded them of his Sabbath, (which they could not observe in Egypt,) and commanded them to observe it. To them he spake the ten commandments, and gave them the tables of stone. They were the only people to whom God could, at that time, deliver the precepts of his holy law. But that makes the Sabbath no more Jewish, than it does the other nine precepts of the decalogue. No, "the seventh day is the Sabbath [Rest] of the Lord thy God." The texts referred to by M. do not afford the least evidence that the seventh-day Sabbath was designed for the Jews alone. Let the reader turn and read them and be satisfied on this point.

Said Jesus, "The Sabbath was made for man." Mark ii, 27. The word man, when used as it is here by our Saviour, in its broadest sense, means all mankind. Not the Jews only, but MAN, the whole race of man, the same as in the following texts: "Man that is born of a woman is of few days and full of trouble." Job xiv, 1. "Man goeth forth unto his work and to his labor until evening." Ps. civ, 23. "There hath no temptation taken you but such as is common to man." Cor. x, 13. "Man lieth down and riseth not, till the heavens be no more." Job xiv, 12. No one will say that man in these texts means Jews or Christians, for the whole family of Adam is included. In this sense, "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath." Adam, Noah and

Abraham were men, and the Sabbath was made for them as well as for Abraham's natural seed. We are men, and the Sabbath was made for us. If Gentiles are not a portion of the race called "man" then what are they? The Lord of the Sabbath, standing down very near the close of the Jewish dispensation, just at the opening of the "ministration" of the law of God by the Spirit, in correcting the superstition of the Jew, and to guard against the idea that the Sabbath was for the Jews alone, says, "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath."

"And Moses called all Israel, and said unto them, Hear, O Israel, the statutes and judgments which I speak in your ears this day, that ye may learn them, and keep and do them."

"The Lord our God made a covenant with us in Horeb. The Lord made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day."

"Keeping the Sabbath was embraced in this covenant with the children of Israel at Horeb. It was 'NOT made with their fathers' [the Patriarchs], but 'with US, even us, who are all of US HERE ALIVE THIS DAY.' Verse 3. This testimony, first negative, 'He made it not with our fathers,' and then positive, 'But with us,' is conclusive. It plainly tells us for whom the Sabbath was not, and then for whom it was instituted."

Here M. uses the word Sabbath instead of covenant, which he has no right to do. It is true that it helps his argument, but it perverts the word of God. The word Sabbath is not mentioned in Deut. v. 1—5, yet the readers of the "Harbinger" are told that the "testimony" is "conclusive," and "plainly tells us for whom the Sabbath was not, and then for whom it was instituted." If the text read, The Lord made not the Sabbath for our fathers, but for us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day, then M. would have some ground for his assertion; but the text would then prove too much for him, for it would prove that the Sabbath was instituted for those with whom "the Lord talked face to face in the mount out of the midst of the fire." Those only who were all "alive" that day. And after generations would have no right to the Sabbath, for it was made for those only who were all alive that day. By using the words "Sabbath," "instituted" and "for," which are not in the text, as M. has, the scripture is wrested from its true meaning, and those who do not carefully search the Scriptures for themselves will be led astray.

A covenant usually signifies the mutual consent of two or more. The covenant that was made in Horeb was a mutual agreement between God and his chosen people. We will first give the requirements and promises of God on the one hand, and then the consent of the people on the other.

"In the third month when the children of Israel" "were come to the desert of Sinai," "Moses went up unto God, and the Lord called unto him out of the mountain, saying, Thus shalt thou say to the house of Jacob, and tell the children of Israel,

"Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto myself."

"Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, [when he should speak the ten commandments,] and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people; for all the earth is mine."

"And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation. THESE ARE THE WORDS WHICH THOU SHALT SPEAK UNTO THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL."

The following is the agreement of the people.

"And Moses came and called for the elders of the people, and laid before their faces all these words which the Lord commanded him."

"And all the people answered together and said, ALL THAT THE LORD HATH SPOKEN WE WILL DO. And Moses returned the words of the people unto the Lord." Ex. xix, 1—8.

This is the covenant that the Lord made with his people in Horeb. The conditions on the part of the people were to obey the voice of God, and keep the covenant of commandments that he was about to speak to them with his own "voice." This the people promised to do. And God promised on his part, that if they would do this, he would make them a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation.—Truly could Moses say, "The Lord made not this

covenant with our fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day." Deut. v, 3.

But the position that the commandments and Sabbath were "made" in Horeb is contrary to the plain word of God, as will be clearly seen. Some object to the position that the Sabbath was made for man, immediately after God made the first man, Adam, because so little is said relative to it in the Bible until the giving of the law. But such should notice that the entire record of about twenty-five hundred years from the creation is contained in fifty-two chapters of our Bible, therefore we should not expect that much would be said relative to the weekly Rest during that period of time. But we find early and frequent notices of reckoning by sevens. The term *week* is used in the contract between Jacob and Laban. "Fulfill her week." Gen. xxix, 27. The word Sabbath not being used in the record of more than two thousand years is no evidence that there was none during that time. At a later period, even in that time when the transgressor of the law of God, was, by the law of Moses, put to death, the word Sabbath is not found in the divine record of about four hundred years.—None will say that there was no Sabbath during that space of time, because it is not mentioned in the record. The word Sabbath being left out of that portion of the Bible which only notices the most important events from the creation to the deliverance from Egypt, certainly, is not so remarkable as its being left out for hundreds of years when enforced by temporal death.

As there is no intimation given of the institution of the Sabbath only at the close of creation, and, as Jehovah has so forcibly shown, by the language of the fourth commandment, that the Sabbath of that commandment is inseparably connected with his Rest on the seventh day of the first week of time, we can now clearly see that when Jesus said, "The Sabbath was made for man," he meant for Adam, the first man, and for all his posterity.

We frequently hear it asserted, by those who oppose the Sabbath of the Lord our God, that "the word Sabbath is not mentioned in the Bible, till after the law was given from Mount Sinai; therefore," say they, "it is the Sabbath of the old Jews, and was abolished at the crucifixion, when the Jewish dispensation closed." But any one who has read Ex. xii—xx, ought to know better than to make this statement.

The Sabbath was guarded by three standing miracles in giving the manna, and was kept by the children of Israel, in the wilderness of Sin, thirty days before they came to Sinai. They departed from Egypt on the fifteenth day of the first month, and came to the wilderness of Sin on the fifteenth day of the second month. See Ex. xvi, 1. There, in the wilderness of Sin, God gave them bread from heaven, and through Moses reminded them of his Sabbath. They then journeyed to Rephidim, and from Rephidim they came to the desert of Sinai on the fifteenth day of the third month.

Moses was then commanded to sanctify the people, to set bounds around the Mount, and to be "ready against the third day." And on the third day, in the morning, "there were thunders and lightnings, and a thick cloud upon the Mount." And the Lord descended upon it in fire, and from the smoking Mount proclaimed in awful grandeur, the "Royal Law." But, thirty days before Israel saw Mount Sinai, and thirty-two days before they heard the voice of Jehovah repeating to them the ten commandments, both God and Moses speak of the Sabbath as of an old institution well understood by the people.

"And it came to pass, that on the sixth day they gathered twice as much bread, two omers for one man: and all the rulers of the congregation came and told Moses. And he said unto them, This is that which the Lord hath said, To-morrow is the rest of the Holy Sabbath unto the Lord: bake that ye will bake to-day, and seethe that ye will seethe; and that which remaineth over, lay up for you to be kept until the morning. And they laid it up till the morning, as Moses bade; and it did not stink, neither was there any worm therein."

"And Moses said, Eat that to-day; for to-day is a Sabbath unto the Lord; to-day ye shall not find it in the field; Six days ye shall gather it; but on

the seventh day, which is the Sabbath, in it there shall be none."

"And it came to pass, that there went out some of the people on the seventh day for to gather, and they found none. And the Lord said unto Moses, How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws? See, for that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath, therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days." Ex. xvi, 22—29.

There is something very interesting in the circumstance of the people gathering two omers of manna on the sixth day. This seems to have been done without the special direction of Moses or the rulers. And when "the rulers of the congregation came and told Moses," he said unto them, "This is that which the Lord hath said. To-morrow is the rest of the Holy Sabbath unto the Lord."—Where had the Lord thus said? At Sinai? Certainly not; for he did not speak the ten commandments till thirty-two days afterward. It is evident that Moses in his reply to the rulers of the congregation, referred to the time when God blessed and sanctified the seventh day of creation.

But some of the people went out on the seventh day to gather manna, and there was none in the field. This called forth the rebuke from Him who hallowed the seventh day. "How long refuse ye to keep my COMMANDMENTS and my LAWS? See, for that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath." Here we see that God's commandments and laws existed, and were observed by his people, before he spake them from Mount Sinai. Before he made a covenant with his people in Horeb. Then how preposterous is the position that the Lord made the Sabbath in Horeb, when he talked with the people "face to face."! See Deut. v, 4.

Abraham kept God's commandments, statutes and laws. "And I will make thy seed to multiply as the stars of heaven, and will give unto thy seed all these countries: and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed: Because that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes and my laws. Gen. xxvi, 4, 5. Compare this with Ex. xvi, 28, 29. "How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws? See, for that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath, therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days." Here commandments and laws are mentioned when direct reference is made to the Sabbath. It follows, then, that the Sabbath was one of God's commandments and laws observed by Abraham.

Mark this point well. The Sabbath, with the other nine commandments and laws of God, is not the covenant referred to, made in Horeb. If the "Sabbath is embraced in this covenant with the children of Israel at Horeb," as asserted by M., then it necessarily follows that the Sabbath was first instituted when God talked to the people face to face, and that it never had been previously known. But the fact that God said to Moses, thirty-two days previous to his speaking the ten precepts of his law, "How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws? See, for that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath," is proof positive that the covenant made in Horeb was not God's "commandments and laws," which include the Sabbath. It is evident then, that the covenant was the mutual agreement between God and his people, that they should obey his voice, and keep the covenant that he was about to speak with an audible voice to them, and that God should, on his part, make them a kingdom of priests, a holy nation, as we have before shown. With these facts before us, let us look again at the assertion of M. relative to Deut. v, 3, viz: "It plainly tells us for whom the Sabbath was not, and then for whom it was, instituted." Let the reader carefully examine this point, and it will be seen, that the text "tells" no such thing. We say again, that the words "Sabbath," "institution" and "for," used by M., are not found in Deut. v, 1—4. Search and see. We solemnly protest against such perversions of the word of God, and such "inferences" where there is positive and plain scripture testimony to the contrary.

What was the design of the Sabbath? It was made "for man, and not man for the sabbath." Mark ii, 27. When was it made for man? Not at the creation; for there is nothing said there about the sabbath on which man was to

est; but mention is made of the "seventh day" on which God rested. The only account we have of the sabbath being made for man, is the one given of its institution after the children of Israel crossed the Red Sea, and entered upon their journey to Canaan. Ex. xvi. 23-26; Deut. v. 2, 3.

It was then instituted as a day of rest, for the children of Israel. See Ex. xvi. 23-26; xx. 8-11; xxxi. 13-18, and xxxv. 1-3; Lev. xxiii. 1-3, and Deut. v. 12-15.

If the Sabbath was designed for man, and the Lord of the Sabbath has so taught, then let man, the entire race, have it. In this sacred institution we see the wisdom and goodness of God. No one will deny that man needs it. Man cannot do without it. Both his spiritual and physical wants require it. No sane man will say that this was true of the Jew only. It is true of man, the whole race of mankind. The only reason why God gave the Sabbath to man, was because the entire race needed it.

But the no-Sabbath view leaves "man" without it for about twenty-five hundred years, then gives it to the Jews alone for only about sixteen hundred years, and then leaves "man," through the entire gospel dispensation, without it. Please compare this view with the words of the Son of God, "The Sabbath was made for man."

As the Sabbatic institution was designed for man, it follows of necessity that it was made at the creation, when there was but one man living. The fact that there is no record of Adam's resting on the seventh day, is not proof that the Sabbath was not instituted at creation. The creation was in six days, then God rested the seventh day, and then, after he had rested upon it, he "blessed" and "sanctified" the day for the benefit of man. "And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it, because that in it he had rested from all his work." Gen. ii. 3. There was, therefore, no Sabbath for man to observe until God had blessed and set it apart for him, which was not till he had first rested upon it.

There is no account of the Sabbath being "instituted after the children of Israel crossed the Red Sea," as stated by M., and the texts he refers to, afford no proof that the Sabbath was then made for man. In Ex. xvi. 23-26, the Sabbath is spoken of as an old institution. The expressions are, "Tomorrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord," and "the Sabbath," without any reason being given for the Sabbatic institution. But why should M. refer us to Ex. xvi, when he has the Sabbath made at Horeb, when God talked with the people face to face, thirty-two days afterward!! The expression in Ex. xx. 8, is, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." How absurd to suppose that God required his people to remember what never had been.

But the fact that God has connected the Sabbath of the fourth commandment with his Rest on the seventh day, and has given no other reason for the institution in his Word than that given in the fourth commandment, is conclusive evidence that the Sabbath was instituted in Eden. Here is the reason for the Sabbatic institution. "FOR in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and Rested the seventh day; WHEREFORE the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day, and hallowed it." Ex. xx. 11. If there is any other reason, given in the Word, for the institution of the Sabbath, will some one point it out? If the Sabbath-day was blessed, sanctified and hallowed at any other place, but in Eden, will some one point to the place where it is recorded in the Bible?

"It was also designed as a sign or memorial to keep in memory the creation of the world in six days by God, and his resting on the seventh."

That the Sabbath was instituted to commemorate God's Rest on the seventh day after he created all things in six, is clear. It is one of the most simple and glorious truths of the Bible. Man needed this memorial of his Creator, to keep in memory the true and living God.

The passover was a memorial for Israel, that they might not forget their wonderful deliverance from Egyptian bondage. The communion of the body and blood of Christ is a memorial for the church to keep in memory the Lamb of God who suffered and died for us. So the seventh-day Sabbath is a weekly memorial instituted to commemorate God's Rest-day, after he had created the world in six. If man had always observed this memorial, none would have forgotten God, and there never would

have been an infidel in the world. How wonderful and wise the plan of Jehovah, laid out in the beginning! Man was to labor six days, and on the seventh rest from servile labor and care; and by viewing the heavens, the earth, the sea, and all things which were created in six days, he was to call to mind the living God who rested on the seventh.

The passover was to be observed from the time of the deliverance from Egypt, until "Christ our passover" was "sacrificed for us;" the communion was to be observed by the church from the crucifixion, until the Second Advent. So the seventh-day Sabbath was designed to be observed from creation, through all dispensations. The great necessity for this memorial may be clearly seen through the entire mortal state, where man is so prone to forget the living God.

But the no-Sabbath view teaches that man had no need of this memorial of his Creator for twenty-five hundred years after the event to be commemorated occurred, and then it was to be observed by the Jews only, for the space of only about sixteen hundred years, and that man, through the entire gospel dispensation, a period so marked with idolatry, has no need of this memorial to call to mind that God that made the heavens and the earth in six days. A singular memorial indeed, "to keep in memory the creation of the world in six days by God, and his resting on the seventh"! As though the Jews were the only people that needed "to keep in memory" God's creation, and holy Rest! The folly of such a position must be apparent to all.

It is also stated by M. that the Sabbath was designed to keep in memory the deliverance of the children of Israel from Egypt, and Deut. v. 14, 15, is quoted to sustain the position. But it is not possible for the weekly Sabbath to commemorate any event only that which occurred on the last day of the first week of time. What if we should assert that the feast of unleavened bread was designed to commemorate God's Holy Rest at the close of creation? Certainly none would believe us. Neither should our opponents be believed when they assert that the seventh-day Sabbath was designed to commemorate the deliverance from Egypt, which was to be commemorated only once a year! One is as absurd as the other. It is true that God, after he had brought the natural seed of Abraham out of the house of bondage, reminded them of his Sabbath, and commanded them to observe it; but there is not a word on record to show that it was then instituted. The reason is plain why God at that time specially enforced the observance of the Sabbath, which is as follows:

"And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched-out arm; therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath-day." Deut. v. 15.

While the children of Israel were slaves in Egypt they could not keep the Sabbath. But they had been from Egypt but thirty days when God reminded them of it, and, in giving the manna, guarded the Sabbath by a three-fold weekly miracle. See Ex. xvi. 19-30. They were then free, and the only given reason why God at that time commanded them to keep his Sabbath was because he had brought them "out thence through a mighty hand, and by a stretched-out arm; [where they could keep it:] therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath-day." The fact that God had brought them out of Egypt, where they were free to observe the Sabbath, was presented before them as a reason why they should then keep the institution, that they had so long been unable to observe. Let the candid reflect for a moment, and they will see the absurdity of the position, that the weekly Sabbath was designed for a memorial of the deliverance from Egypt on the fifteenth day of Abib, which had its two annual memorials, the passover and the feast of unleavened bread.

It was a feast or day of holy convocation. "Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, concerning the feasts of the Lord, which ye shall proclaim to be holy convocations, even these are my feasts. Six days shall work be done, but the seventh day is the sabbath of rest, an holy convocation; ye shall do no work therein: it is the Sabbath of the Lord in all your dwellings." Lev. xxiii. 2, 3.

It is true that the Jews were to have "an holy convocation," a general assembly on the "Sab-

bath of the Lord." This removes an objection frequently urged against the Sabbath, that the Jews were commanded to abide in their places, and not move out of their dwellings on the Sabbath, and that we cannot observe it as strictly as they were required to. It shows that the instruction relative to their abiding "every man in his place," [Ex. xvi. 29,] related exclusively to some going out into the field to gather manna on the seventh day. But there is no more evidence that the seventh-day was a feast day than that the other six were feast days. See Lev. xxiii. 3. If M. had quoted the next verse, and on to the 8th, he would have shown what the "feasts of the Lord" were.

"These are the feasts of the Lord, even holy convocations, which ye shall proclaim in their seasons. In the fourteenth day of the first month at even is the Lord's passover.

"And on the fifteenth day of the same month is the feast of unleavened bread unto the Lord; seven days ye must eat unleavened bread. In the first day ye shall have an holy convocation; ye shall do no servile work therein.

"But ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord seven days; in the seventh day is an holy convocation, ye shall do no servile work therein." Lev. xxiii. 4-8.

"Finally, it was a shadow of things to come. "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 is supplied by the translators, we therefore omit it] which are a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ. Col. ii. 16, 17.

If we would rightly understand the words of the Apostle, we should first learn the subject of his discourse. And here we would say that he makes no reference to any of the commandments of God in Col. ii. 16, 17. His subject relates to "meat," "drink," "the new moon," &c., which are associated with the sabbaths of the law of Moses, that were blotted out, and nailed to the cross. That we may better understand the application of this, and similar portions of scripture, let us take a brief view of some of the trials of the early church with whom the Apostle labored and suffered. A portion of the Christian church were converts from the circumcision or Jews, and a portion from the uncircumcision or Gentiles. The converts from the circumcision were inclined to still hold on to, and practice some of the customs and ceremonies of the Jewish religion, while the Gentile believers were free from those customs, having never been educated in them. Peter did not understand that the gospel was for the Gentiles also, until God gave him a vision upon the house-top, and sent him to preach to them at the house of Cornelius. He would not eat with the Gentiles or keep company with them until he was shown that God was "no respecter of persons." See Acts x. 1-45.

Certain men which came down from Judea taught the brethren that they must be circumcised in order to be saved. "Paul and Barnabas had no small dissension and disputation with them," and then went "up to Jerusalem unto the apostles and elders about this question." There they were met by "certain of the sect of the Pharisees which believed, saying, That it was needful to circumcise them, and to command them to keep the law of Moses." After they had discussed this question, they came to the following conclusions, which they wrote and sent by chosen men "unto the brethren which were of the Gentiles in Antioch, and Syria, and Cilicia."

"For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things; That ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication; from which if ye keep yourselves, ye shall do well. Fare ye well." Acts xv. 28, 29.

At Antioch, Paul withstood Peter to the face, and says that "he was to be blamed." His wrong consisted in eating with those who were converted from the Gentiles in the absence of those who were converted from the Jewish church, and then in presence of those from the circumcision, refusing to eat with those from the uncircumcision.

"But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel. I said unto

Peter before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?" Gal. ii, 14.

With these facts before us we may understand the subject of the Apostle in Col. ii, 16, 17. 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, everything upon his day. BESIDES THE SABBATHS OF THE LORD." Lev. xxiii, 37, 38.

The Sabbaths of the Lord our God, come every seventh day; but some of the Jewish 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 those that are called "her sabbaths," and "your sabbaths," at their appointed times, "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 Jewish 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.

No good reason can be produced that the Apostle refers to the weekly Sabbath in Col. ii, 16, 17. But there are many good reasons to show that he has no reference to it. Some of them we will here 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. Here we will quote two classes of scripture which show the distinction between

THE TWO LAWS.

1. The law of Moses, or "the law of commandments contained in ordinances."

"And it came to pass, when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a BOOK, until they were finished, that Moses commanded the Levites which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, saying, take this BOOK of the law, and put it in the SIDE of the ark of the covenant of the Lord your God." Deut. xxxi, 24—26. See verses 9—11.

"And when they brought out the money that was brought into the house of the Lord, Hilkiah the priest found a BOOK of the law of the Lord, given by the hand of Moses." (See marg.) 2 Chron. xxxiv, 14.

"And he read in their ears all the words of the BOOK of the COVENANT that was found in the house of the Lord." See 2 Chron. xxxiv, 30.

"And the king commanded all the people, saying, keep the passover unto the Lord your God, as it is written in the BOOK of this COVENANT." 2 Kings, xxiii, 21.

"And they spake unto Ezra the scribe, to bring the BOOK of the LAW OF MOSES, which the Lord had commanded to Israel." See Nelt. viii, 1—3.

"Then said I, lo, I come (in the volume of the BOOK it is written of me) to do thy will, O God." Heb. x, 7.

"Have ye not read in the BOOK of Moses." Mark xii, 26.

2. The Law of God, or ten commandments.

"And the Lord said unto Moses, come up to me into the mount, and be there: and I will give thee tables of stone, and a law, and commandments which I have written; that thou mayest teach them." Ex. xxiv, 12.

"And he gave unto Moses, when he had made an end of communing with him upon mount Sinai, two tables of testimony, tables of stone written with the FINGER OF GOD." Ex. xxxi, 18.

"And the tables were the work of God, and the writing was the writing of God, graven upon the tables. See Ex. xxxii, 15, 16.

"And he wrote upon the tables the words of the COVENANT, THE TEN COMMANDMENTS." See Ex. xxxiv, 28, 29.

"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.

"And it came to pass at the end of forty days and forty nights, that the Lord gave me the two tables of stone, EVEN THE TABLES OF THE COVENANT." See Deut. ix, 9—11; v, 22.

God has here made the distinction between the two laws very plain. One he spake to the people, and wrote himself; the other he gave to Moses as he communed with him forty days, and intrusted him to write. One was engraven in the tables of stone, which were called the tables of the covenant; the other was written in a book, called the book of the covenant. These were not portions of a covenant, or of the law; but they were two entire distinct covenants, or laws. Jehovah would not trust man to write his immutable covenant; therefore with his own finger he engraved the ten commandments in the tables of stone to make them sure, and to impress us with their perpetuity. The law of ordinances which was given to the Jews for a limited period, Moses wrote in a book; and when Paul speaks of "blotting out the hand-writing of ordinances," &c. he can refer only to those ordinances of the Jewish church written in the book of the covenant by the hand of Moses. That which is written in a book may be blotted out; but it is not possible to blot out engraving in stone. When Paul uses the figure "blotting out," he does not use unmeaning words. But to apply this figure to the law engraven in stone, makes his words without meaning. The law of God is founded on obligations growing out of the nature of men, and their relations to God and one another; obligations binding on man before this law was written by the finger of God, and which continue to the close of time. The law of Moses, relating to outward observances which were not obligatory till they were commanded, was binding only on the Jews till the death of Christ, then it was abolished, and gave place to the "ministration of the Spirit."

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. It is just what his natural and spiritual wants require. When we ask those who assert that there is no Sabbath for the gospel dispensation, 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 to assert that the Sabbath, which God made for this same purpose, is "against us!"

3. The Apostle does not speak of "the Sabbath," which is associated with the other nine moral precept of the Decalogue; but of the Jewish sabbath-days or sabbaths, which were associated with "meat," "drink," and "the new moon," &c. This view is objected to because the word "days," connected with "sabbath," is supplied by the translator. It is thought that 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,)"

"Days is supplied by the translators," says M., "we therefore omit it." Macknight, Whiting and Wakefield omit "days" in their translations of this

text, but they do not leave the word "sabbath" in the singular, as M. has left it for his readers. They translate it "sabbaths," in the plural, which makes the text perfectly clear. Here we will give five 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.

"Let no one therefore, call you to an account about meat and drink, or with respect to a festival, or a new-moon, or sabbaths; which are a shadow of what WAS TO COME." —Wakefield.

It is said by some that "holy-day" in this text must refer to the Holy Sabbath; but it is worthy of notice that Wesley translates the word "feast-day," and Wakefield and Macknight translate it "festival." The Jewish feast-days, or festivals, were "holy-days" or days of holy convocations.

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," "A 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. We can have no idea of an eternal shadow. The Sabbath was instituted in Eden, before the fall, when man was holy, and certainly fallen man needs it now more than then. And in the new heavens and new earth we see it observed to all eternity. Then it will be seen and kept in its Eden purity. All flesh will then reverence this institution of Jehovah, which has never been the case since Isaiah uttered this prophecy, and never will be, until the voice of the Son of God calls forth the righteous seed that sleep in Christ, and changes the righteous living. When that holy throng shall be led forth in immortal glory to view the work of God in its perfection, there will be no discord. No, "all flesh" will bow in sweet submission to the law of God, and keep his Holy Sabbath. We are aware that many cling to the tradition that the Sabbath is a type of the seventh thousand years; but we ask for bible proof. If it can be produced, then we will believe also. But admitting the Sabbath to be a shadow, and the seventh thousand years, the body, then certainly it would seem very natural to have the shadow or type reach to the body or antitype. But if there is no Sabbath, and if the shadow ceased at the cross, then there is a blank space of more than 1800 years between the shadow and the body. The law of Moses was a typical law, which reached to the gospel. Says Paul, "the law having a shadow of good things to come." The law of Moses, as a whole, was the shadow, and the gospel with all the good things of the better covenant connected, is the body. The shadow of a tree, or monument

holds good until the body is reached; therefore, if the Sabbath is a shadow of the seventh millennium, it did not break off at the cross; but was to extend with all its force and blessing to the Second Advent. But as the weekly Sabbath extends, and is to be observed, to all eternity in the new earth, it has no body in which it is to be lost, as in the case of shadows.

Finally, the fact that the early Church was troubled with those who taught 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.

"These are the only reasons we have been able to gather from the scriptures, for the observance of the Jewish Sabbath; and if Paul, or any of the New Testament writers, thought it binding on Christians, why have they been entirely silent on a question of this importance, with the exception of such expressions as these:

Let no man judge you in respect to the Sabbath. Col. ii, 16.
One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. Rom. xiv, 5."

Those who talk of the "Jewish Sabbath," and the "Christian Sabbath," do not use Bible language. The scripture terms are, "The Sabbath of the Lord thy God," "The Sabbath," "Thy Holy Sabbath," and "My Holy Day." But some, in order to bring God's Holy Sabbath into disrepute and contempt, choose the unscriptural terms, "Jewish Sabbath," and "Old Jewish Sabbath."

The following is given by M. as the language of the Apostle. "Let no man judge you in respect to the Sabbath." Why not quote the text as it reads? Why mangle the word of God thus, unless it is to make out one's theory? Christians ought to, and will, protest against such unfairness. This looks too much like handling the word of God deceitfully.

In regard to Rom. xiv, 5, we would say that Paul does not refer to the Sabbath in that chapter. His subject relates to eating, and those feast-days which some of the church then regarded, while others did not regard them. The word *eat* is mentioned in this chapter eleven times, *eat* three, *meat* four, and *drink* twice; but the Sabbath, which many suppose is the subject of this chapter, is not once mentioned. The Apostle was giving the Romans a lesson of forbearance in relation to the Jewish views of eating and feast-days which some still retained. "Let not him that eateth, despise him that eateth not; and let not him which eateth not, judge him that eateth, for God hath received him."

He did not take measures to rid the church at once of all those errors which the converts from the circumcision were inclined to cling to. The Apostle even had Timothy, his fellow laborer, "whose father was a Greek," circumcised, that they might better find access to the Jews. He was "all things to all men," that by "all means" he might "save some." But, says Paul, "Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but keeping the commandments of God is something." [Whiting's trans.] Cor. vii, 19.

The keeping of the commandments of God is nowhere in the New Testament spoken of as a thing of little importance, as circumcision and feast-days are, but it is always made a test of christian fellowship, and eternal salvation. The uniform testimony of the New Testament writers relative to keeping the commandments is as follows. "If thou wilt enter into life keep the commandments." Matt. xix, 17. "For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments." 1 John v, 3. He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him." Chap. ii, 4.

Those who read only the fifth and sixth verses of the fourteenth chapter of Romans, which speak of regarding and disregarding days, without an understanding of the Apostle's subject, may suppose that the seventh-day Sabbath is referred to. But an understanding of his subject, his trials, and his labors with his brethren at Rome, destroys all reasonable grounds for even an inference that he refers to the Sabbath of the Lord.

It is urged by some that Rom. xiv, 5, 6, "refers to every day," therefore includes the seventh-day Sabbath. So it may be urged with equal propriety that some of the early Christians lived without eating, from the expression, "Let not him that eateth, despise him that eateth not; and let not him which eateth not, judge him that eateth." It is evident that the words "eateth not" were spoken in reference to those things forbidden by the Jews. It is also evident that the words, "every day alike" had reference only to disregarding feast-days. "Consistency is a jewel," and should ever be seen in those who teach the Holy Scriptures.

Those who profess to believe that there is divine authority for observing the first day of the week as the Sabbath, should not refer us to Rom. xiv, 5, 6, for proof that the seventh-day Sabbath is abolished; for if they admit that St. Paul refers to a day of weekly rest, then their first-day Sabbath is at once overthrown. Therefore, those who observe the first-day are not wise in quoting this Scripture to prove us wrong in keeping the Sabbath.

We are told by many of those who advocate the no-Sabbath doctrine, that if we observe the Sabbath we shall fall from grace and certainly be lost; and Gal. v, 4, is quoted as proof. "Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law: ye are fallen from grace." But this does not harmonize with their own view of what Paul has taught in Rom. xiv, 5, 6. They first tell us that we may esteem the seventh day above the other six, and keep the Sabbath; or we may esteem all alike and work on all seven days of the week. In either case we are safe, if the Sabbath is not made a test question. And then we are told that if we do esteem one day above another, that is, observe the Sabbath, we shall fall from grace.

Again, if the word law, in Gal. v, 4, refers to the ten commandments, then, certainly, those who observe nine of them, all excepting the fourth, are also fallen from grace, as much as those who observe the fourth commandment. And if we have fallen from grace in observing the fourth commandment, we cannot be restored until we break it. And by the same rule those who observe nine of the commandments cannot be restored to grace, until they violate all ten of the commandments of God!! We leave the reader to decide as to the justness of this conclusion. Our object is to hold up the view that the commandments of God are abolished, in its true hideous form, that souls may take warning and not be devoured by it.

With the view that Gal. v, 4, and Rom. xiv, 5, apply to the case of those who keep the Sabbath, we will give the following. "One man esteemeth one day above another; [that is, he keeps the Sabbath and falls from grace:] another esteemeth all days alike. [He does not keep the Sabbath, therefore does not fall from grace.] Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." [That is, whether he should observe the Sabbath and fall from grace or not!!] Those who will search the Word for themselves, may not only see the error, but the utter folly in applying these and similar texts to those who observe the Sabbath of the Bible.

How was the Sabbath to be kept? "Remember the sabbath day to keep it holy. Thou shalt not do work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates." Ex. xx, 8-10; also, xxxi, 14-16; xxxv, 2, 3; Lev. xxiii, 3, and Deut. v, 13, 14. This in part constituted the 'yoke of bondage' from which the Galatians had been freed. Paul, however, was 'afraid of them, lest he had bestowed upon them labor in vain;' because they observe days, and months, and times, and years." Gal. iv, 10, 11; and v, 1.

The fourth commandment is the great Sabbath law. It is the standard to which all other testimony in both Testaments, relating to the observance of the Sabbath, should be compared. With the correct view of this commandment, a harmony may be seen throughout the divine testimony on this point. Here we will give the New Testament rule for observing the Sabbath, after the law of Moses was abolished. "And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments, and rested the Sabbath-day according to the commandment."

The great God appointed six days for man to labor, and do the work necessary to obtain a livelihood. This labor is called "thy work." But on the seventh day he designed that man should rest from this world's toil and care, and engage in the

service of his Creator. The Sabbath law does not require us to become stationary and inactive on the seventh day. When we speak of the Sabbath law, we refer only to the fourth commandment which God spake with an audible voice, and engraved in the tables of the covenant. The words, "let no man go out of his place on the seventh day," Ex. xvi, 29, were spoken in reference to the children of Israel not going out into the field to gather manna on that day, as they did the six preceding days. Afterward the Jews did go out of their places on the Sabbath, not to do servile labor, but to worship God. On the Sabbath they had "an holy convocation," a religious assembly. Lev. xxiii, 3; Acts xv, 21. And farther, the priests were required by God to offer on the Sabbath, even more offerings than on the other six days. See Num. xxviii, 9, 10.

The law that came by Moses, which he wrote in the book of the covenant, did not require the priests to violate that law uttered by the voice of Jehovah, and engraven in the tables of the covenant. Therefore the labor of the priests in presenting offerings before the Lord on the Sabbath, was not the labor prohibited by the fourth commandment, called "thy work." Again, male children born on the Sabbath were, according to the law of Moses, circumcised the following Sabbath, "the eighth day." See Lev. xii, 1-3; Luke i, 59. No reasonable person, with any knowledge of the Bible, will say that this was a violation of the Sabbath law. This view of the subject shows clearly the true import of the words "labor" and "thy work" in the fourth commandment. Six days are allotted to us to attend to that work necessary to this life; but the seventh is the Rest-day, in which we are required to rest from our own labor, and engage in the service of God.

It is said that the law of the Sabbath forbids kindling fires on the seventh day. To this we reply, that the great Sabbath law, the fourth commandment, says nothing concerning kindling fires. The children of Israel in the wilderness were not only forbidden to go out into the field to gather manna on the Sabbath, but, also, to pick up sticks to kindle a fire to cook it, and to wash their clothes on that day. "Bake that ye will bake to-day, [sixth day,] and seethe that ye will seethe." Ex. xvi, 23. They were a strong healthy people, free from disease, and were in a mild climate. It is said of them, [Ex. xv, 26,] "I am the Lord that healeth thee." Also, [Ps. cv, 37,] "And there was not one feeble person among their tribes." Their clothes were miraculously preserved, and their food was given them from heaven. As they were instructed to cook their manna on the sixth day, and therefore had no use for fires on the seventh, to kindle fires on the Sabbath for that purpose, would have been a plain violation of the fourth commandment.

We are differently situated. Our constitutions and climate require the heat of fire on the Sabbath a portion of the year. We kindle a fire on the seventh day as an act of mercy and necessity, the same as we would water an ox or a horse, or lift a sheep from a pit. Such acts, the "Lord of the Sabbath" pronounced "lawful." But it is evidently wrong, and a violation of the Sabbath, to neglect to make those necessary preparations for the rest of the Holy Sabbath, which can be consistently made on the sixth day. The Sabbath law forbids our doing on the seventh day that which can be done on the sixth, and also what is not really an act of mercy and necessity. But merciful acts, such as relieving the distress of man or beast, which cannot be done on the sixth day, are "lawful," on the seventh. A reasonable and Scriptural view of the Sabbath law does not require us to suffer cold or hunger; for the law is "holy," "just," and "good."

We deny that the commandments of God constituted any part of the "yoke of bondage," from which the Galatians had been freed. Says John, "This is the law of God, that we keep his commandments, and his commandments are not grievous." But if the ten commandments constituted the "yoke of bondage," then the "liberty," in which the Galatians were to stand fast, was the liberty which a removal of their restraint would give. "Glorious liberty indeed," says the idolator, blasphemous, Sabbath-breaker, murderer, adulterer, thief, false witness and the covetous! It is evident

that the yoke of bondage was the hand-writing of ordinances of Moses' law that had been nailed to the cross, in which the observance of "days, months, and years," was taught.

That the sabbath was embraced in that law which was nailed to the cross—slain—taken out of the way, and abolished, is clear from what Paul says in 2 Cor. iii, 7—16. He there tells us that the "ministration of death, *written and engraven in stones, was to be done away*," verse 7; and in verse 13, that it "IS ABOLISHED;" and, verse 14, "IS DONE AWAY in Christ."

By a careful examination of 2 Cor. iii, 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 commandments of God in this chapter.

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 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. It is 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 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 words, *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 in 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 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, 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 service 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.

What is the penalty for breaking the law of the Sabbath? "Ye shall keep the Sabbath, therefore, for it is holy unto you: every one that defileth it shall surely be put to death: for whosoever doeth any work therein, that soul shall be cut off from the people." Ex. xxxi, 14. "Whosoever doeth any work therein, shall be put to death." Ex. xxxv, 2. *Death*, was then the penalty for the violation of the law of the Sabbath; and death is now the penalty for the same offence—if the law is still in force. But some think the penalty was abolished, but the law not.

To this we reply, that temporal death never was the full and final penalty for Sabbath-breaking. The fourth commandment says nothing concerning it. Under the "ministration of condemnation" and "death," [2 Cor. iii,] by the services of Moses' law, the transgressor of the law of God was put to death. Why? Because, under that "faulty" ministration there was no atonement for such sinners. But under the "ministration of the Spirit," while Jesus is our Sacrifice and Priest, Mercy, the excellency and glory of the "ministration of the Spirit," pleads for the transgressor of the law of God, that he may be spared, and turn and live. This is why the stoning system was done away, with the other laws of Moses, at the cross. But if temporal death was the full penalty for violating the law of God, then he who broke the Sabbath, murdered, or committed adultery, only had to be stoned to death to fully satisfy the law. And in the judgment such sins cannot appear against him, for the law was fully satisfied when he suffered temporal death. When a man has suffered in states-prison the full penalty for violating the law, he is as free from it as the man who has kept the law. And if the full penalty for transgressing the law of God was temporal death, then in the judgment the transgressor will be as free from the law as those who strictly observed it. Therefore, the penalty for transgressing God's holy law was, and still is, Eternal Death. "Sin is the transgression of the law," and "the wages [penalty] of sin is death."

Sabbath-keepers are not the people that "think the penalty was abolished, but the law not." Who does not know that "when the penalty of a law is abolished, the law itself is also abrogated"? Those who teach that temporal death was the full penalty for violating the Sabbath should remember that there was the same penalty for idolatry, murder, adultery, &c. as for breaking the Sabbath. Is the penalty for these crimes abrogated? If so, then according to the argument of M., the commandments forbidding idolatry, adultery, &c. are also abolished. If the penalty for these crimes is not abolished, and if it is Eternal Death, as we have shown, then his argument that the Sabbath is abolished because the Sabbath-breaker is not now immediately put to death, falls to the ground. But says M.—

"To say that the penalty of the law of the Sabbath was abolished, and not the Sabbath, is as unreasonable as to say the penalty of every other command in the ten was done away."

This is so, certainly so. Here M. places all ten of the commandments on the same ground, just where they should be placed. And we will add, that it is as unreasonable for M. to say that the law of the Sabbath is abolished, because the Sabbath-breaker is not now immediately put to death, as to say that every other commandment in the ten is done away, because temporal death is not now inflicted on those guilty of breaking them. And therefore God has no law now for idolatry, blasphemy, theft, murder, adultery, &c. because the penalty of temporal death is abolished.

We think that none will fail to see that the position of M., that the penalty of the law of God is abolished, is unsound; for it makes his holy law null and void. "It is time for thee, Lord, to work; for they have made void thy law." Ps. cxix, 126. The penalty of the law of God ever was, Eternal Death, and could not be abolished, therefore every precept of that law is in full force.

The objections to the abolition of the Sabbath noticed by M., that "the Sabbath was given to the true Israel" and was "an everlasting covenant," and that the "type of our promised rest is destroyed," we do not urge. We go to the fourth commandment, Ex. xx, 8—11, where the Sabbath law is given in the midst of nine other moral precepts, as engraven in the tables of stone, and there we see the Sabbath law inseparably connected with God's Rest on the seventh day, showing clearly that the "Sabbath was made for man." Here is ground as firm, yea, firmer, than heaven and earth. See Luke xvi, 17.

Christ is asked, What is the great commandment of the law. He answers the question, but says nothing about the Sabbath; therefore it was not the great commandment in the law. The same is taught in Mark xii, 28—34. Also in Luke xviii, 18—22, a question is asked, "What shall I do to inherit eternal life?" Christ answers, "Thou knowest the

commandments: Do not commit adultery, Do not kill, Do not steal, Do not bear false witness, Honor thy father and mother." Not a word said about the sabbath.

It is true that Christ, in his answer to the lawyer, Matt. xxii, 35-44, does not mention the Sabbath; but this proves no more in relation to the fourth commandment, than it does in regard to the other nine, for not one of the ten are mentioned. Christ pointed out to the lawyer the two great principles out of which the ten precepts of the law naturally grew. Not because the law was abolished, and these two commandments had taken its place, as some in their blindness suppose. Mark this: No one has the commandments abolished earlier than at the cross, therefore, when Jesus answered the lawyer, the law was in full force, even if it could be shown to have been abolished afterward at the cross. Christ explained the true condition of the law of God at that time, that it hung on two great commandments or principles. It had always hung there, and it hangs there still. The first four precepts of the Decalogue hang on the principle of supreme love to God, and the last six on the principle of love to our neighbor, or brother, as ourself.

It is also true that "not a word is said about the Sabbath" in Christ's answer to the question of the ruler, Luke xviii, 18-22, "What shall I do to inherit eternal life?" But does this prove that the Sabbath was then abolished? Certainly not. No one places its abolition earlier than the cross. Does it prove that the Sabbath law was not to extend through the gospel dispensation? If it does, then it also proves that the gospel dispensation was to be favored with only the seventh, sixth, eighth, ninth and fifth commandments, only those quoted to the ruler, and men may have other gods before the Lord, worship graven images, blaspheme the name of God, break the Sabbath, and covet, for "not a word is said about these commandments in Luke xviii, 18-22! We thus carry out the position of M. in relation to the commandments quoted in the New Testament, only to show the weakness of his position. Not one of the first four commandments, containing our duty to God, are quoted in the New Testament. Search and see.

The commandments, that are quoted in the New Testament, are no where given in a new account; but as the law or commandments of God found in the Old. "I had not known lust," says Paul "except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." Rom. vii, 7. "For he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. For this, thou shalt not commit adultery, thou shalt not kill, thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not bear false witness, thou shalt not covet." Chap. xiii, 9. Says James, "If ye fulfill the royal law according to these rapture," &c. The word "scripture" here cannot refer to the New Testament scriptures, for when James, wrote they were not completed. It must then refer to the Old, to the Decalogue. May God help the Reader to see, and feel too, that this is the Christian's duty, to keep the ROYAL LAW according to the scripture. Ex. xx, 3-17.

Look at the conference held by the apostles at Jerusalem, named in Acts xv. The Gentile churches had been troubled with Judaizing teachers, and the apostles sent out their decree on the subject. In verse 24 they say: "Forasmuch as we have heard that certain which went out from us, have troubled you with words, subverting your souls, saying: Ye must be circumcised, AND KEEP THE LAW; to whom we gave NO SUCH COMMANDMENT." They then tell what they should do: "For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things; that ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication; from which if you keep yourselves, ye shall do well." They gave no commandment to keep the law; but moral principles were strictly enforced, and we "shall do well" not to depart from their instruction. For further evidence on this point, consult Rom. x, 1-14; Eph. v, 1-7; and 1 Tim. 1-11; in all of which places moral obligations are enforced, but the keeping of the sabbath is not named. This is unaccountable if it was binding on the Gentiles.

We should first ascertain what was the subject that called the assembly at Jerusalem. It was not to determine whether the commandments of God should be kept; but whether "it was needful to circumcise them, [the Gentiles,] and to command them to keep the law of Moses." There is no record in the Bible that teaching the commandments of God ever "troubled" any Christian, and we see no reason why it should. Paul delighted in them, and called them "spiritual," "holy, just and good." John says, "This is the love of God that we keep his commandments." And James has taught that they should be observed "according to the scripture," James ii, 8; Ex. xx, 3-17.

There can be no good reason given why the discussion of the Sabbath question at that conference was necessary, or a decision relative to it. Therefore we should not expect that mention would be made of the Sabbath in the letters which they wrote to the Gentiles. No sane man supposes that they

embraced the whole Christian duty. The inference so often employed that the Sabbath is abolished because no mention was made of it in these letters, is too weak for any man of candor, who has bestowed a thought on this subject, to use. They may as well infer that none of the ten commandments are embraced in the Christian's duty, excepting the seventh, because they were not mentioned in these letters. That is, the apostles and elders would "lay no greater burden" on the Gentiles, relative to the commandments of God, than that they should abstain from "fornication."

We cherish the best of feelings toward our friends who honestly suppose that the Sabbath is not binding on Christians, and we are not willing to injure their feelings unnecessarily; but we feel in duty bound to expose the no-Sabbath delusion into which they have fallen. We aim no blow at them, for we love them, but with their errors we are at war.

Then one day is no better than another. We admit it. Christ made no distinction, and the apostles enjoined none. Consult Luke vi, 1-5 and xiii, 11-16; John v, 1-17; Rom. xvi, 5, 6; and Col. ii, 16; and you will find Christ was accused of breaking the sabbath; and instead of enforcing its observance, he pleads his justification by saying, "The Son of Man is Lord of the sabbath." He had no right to, nor did he ever, break one of the commandments; but, he had a right to, and did, abolish the law; he did not, therefore break the sabbath. Otherwise, he did, and became a transgressor.

If we understand M's position it is as follows:

1. The Sabbath was abolished at the cross. He quotes Col. ii, 14-16, as proof. "Blotting out the hand-writing of ordinances," &c., "NAILING IT TO HIS CROSS."

2. That "Christ made no distinction" between the days of the week, therefore did not keep the Sabbath, and when accused of breaking it, by the Pharisees, justified himself by saying, "The Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath."

3. That "he had no right to, nor did he, break the Sabbath, because he, having a right to, abolished it before he began to heal the sick on the Sabbath."

4. That if Christ did not abolish the Sabbath about the time he commenced his public ministry, he "became a transgressor," for he made no "distinction" between the days of the week.

None will fail to see that M. has the Sabbath abolished twice! First, before he commenced to heal the sick on the Sabbath, ("otherwise" he "became a transgressor," says M.,) and then again at the cross! Reader, examine this position carefully, that you may see its absurdity.

A law abolished at the cross must of necessity be in force up to the time of the crucifixion, for it is not possible to abolish a law that is not in force. Christ was made under the law, [Gal. iv, 4,] and observed even the law of Moses up to the day of his crucifixion. He urged its observance upon his disciples. "The scribes and the Pharisees," said he, "sit in Moses' seat: All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do." Matt. xxiii, 2, 3. As Moses' law extended to the cross, this injunction was to be obeyed till that time. Those who teach that the Sabbath is merely a Jewish institution, and that it was abolished at the cross, should know that, in that case, it continued in full force until the crucifixion. And if "Christ made no distinction," as asserted by M., then it follows that Christ was a Sabbath-breaker.

But among the many positions of our opponents, which are perfectly destructive of each other, perhaps no one is more at variance with the Bible, and more wicked in the sight of heaven, than that which charges the Son of God with Sabbath-breaking. He says, "I have kept my Father's commandments." But this view contradicts Jesus, and charges him with violating the fourth. It also contradicts the testimony of the beloved disciple. "Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law; for sin is the transgression of the law. And ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin." 1 John iii, 4-5. This testimony proves that if Jesus did depart from the letter of the Sabbath law, then he was a sinner, for "sin is the transgression of the law." But as "in him is no sin," it follows that he did not transgress the law. He observed the Sabbath, as his followers did after his crucifixion, "according to the commandment." One thing is certain, Christ either kept the Sabbath law, or he broke it. If it is said that he observed it, then it is worse than idle to talk of his abolishing it when he entered on his public ministry. But if it is said that he did not observe it, but transgressed the Sabbath law, then Jesus is charged with being a sinner.

The wicked Pharisees charged the disciples with Sabbath-breaking, when they plucked the ears of corn, and ate to satisfy hunger, as they, with their Master, were on their way to the synagogue. But did Jesus teach that they had a right to break the Sabbath? Far from it. He referred them to what

David did when he was hungry, also to the work of the priests, on the Sabbath, who were "blameless;" and then declared his disciples "guiltless." David and the priests were "blameless" on no other ground than this; what they did was no violation of the law. The disciples were "guiltless" on the same ground. The Bible nowhere forbids eating on the Sabbath when hungry.

When Jesus was asked, "Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath-days," he replied, "What man shall there be among you, that shall have one sheep, and if it fall into a pit on the Sabbath-day, will he not lay hold on it, and lift it out? How much then is a man better than a sheep? Wherefore it is LAWFUL to do well on the Sabbath-days." Matt. xii, 11-12. The word lawful signifies "agreeable to law; conformable to law." [Webster.] When used by our Saviour in Matt. xii, and Luke xiv, it signifies conformable to the Sabbath law. Jesus did not give them a new Sabbath law, neither did he intimate that the fourth commandment was abolished. But he exposed the hypocrisy of those who falsely charged him with Sabbath-breaking, and declared that well-doing, that is, healing the sick, relieving dumb beasts in distress, or eating when hungry, was "lawful." The blind Pharisees, who rejected the first Advent to their own damnation, declared that those merciful acts which Christ performed on the Sabbath were "not lawful." Christ, on the other hand, pronounced such well-doing "LAWFUL." Those who teach that Jesus departed from the letter of the Sabbath law are on the side of the Pharisees, and their sin is worse, inasmuch as their blasphemous charge is against greater light. Christians should be on the side of Christ. Amen.

It is said that the "impotent man," to whom Christ said, "Rise, take up thy bed and walk," broke the Sabbath. This is but a repetition of the false charge made by the Jews, who were ever watching for a chance to accuse Christ. We reject their testimony, and choose to believe Christ. The healed impotent man walking with his bed was not for any selfish end, but for the glory of God. Such acts are not prohibited by the fourth commandment. Two of the prophets speak against bearing burdens on the Sabbath; but when their testimony is examined it will be seen that they refer to burdens of merchandise, such as "sheaves," "wine, grapes and figs." See Jer. xvii, 19-25; Neh. xiii, 15.

[Concluded in our next.]

LETTERS.

[From Bro. Camp.]

DEAR BRO. WHITE: Having called at the Post Office and not finding a paper for me, as I was in hopes, and thinking you had dropped my name from your list, I sit down here in the office to let you know that I want the paper continued. For in it I find the spirit of life to my soul. Though I am poor as to this world's goods, yet the Lord thinketh upon me, and I have been for years looking for, and loving that blessed hope of the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ.

The 17th day of last July, the truth of God's Holy Sabbath was proclaimed to me, which I had been trying to know for years. I received it, and it made me free, and I talked this truth to others around me; but they call me crazy, to cover up the truth.

The seventh day came, and I obeyed it as the Holy Sabbath. My companion and children opposed me; but my companion, after a few days, yielded to the force of eternal truth, and laid her good name, and all earthly honor upon the altar, and received the light of truth, and is now waiting with me, with patience for our Deliverance.

Yours in the patient waiting,

WILLIAM CAMP.

Williamstown, (Vt.) Oct. 10th, 1851.

BRO. S. W. RHODES writes from Shongo. (N. Y.), Oct. 7th, 1851: "I wish to say that a woman, by the name of Chapman has passed through this region where Bro. Andrews and Edson labored, and has raised an excitement, and drawn some after her; reporting that Bro. C. W. Holt has been a spiritualizer, and in the spiritual wife doctrine. In this way she has prejudiced the minds of all over whom she has any influence."

[Note on the above by Bro. S. T. Belden.]

In relation to the report referred to by Bro. Rhodes, I wish to say that I know it to be false. I have been personally acquainted with Bro. Holt since the summer of 1844. He lived in a house owned by my father, in Rocky Hill, Conn., a few rods only from us, from 1844 to 1848, and I have been acquainted with his faith and labor from that time to the present.

He has never favored, in the least degree, what is usually termed spiritualism, in any of its forms. And when Heath, Starkweather and Butler, noted spiritualizers, came into our meetings in 1845, and presented their views, Bro. Holt, as a faithful servant of God, strongly opposed them, and rebuked

them in the name of the Lord. He has ever been a faithful witness against the "damnable heresy" of what is called "spiritual union." And those who circulate such reports against him, and thus slander a servant of Jesus Christ in order to bring into disrepute the bible doctrine he teaches, will have to meet it in the Judgment. A sense of duty to those who may be injured by such false reports has alone prompted me to make this statement. It is painful to refer to such contemptible babblings.

S. T. BELDEN.

Saratoga Springs, Oct., 1851.

THE REVIEW AND HERALD.

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

SARATOGA SPRINGS, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 21, 1851.

The Paper.

The lengthy review of the article of M. in this number, prevents us from giving a desirable variety of matter. We could not well divide it, as it seemed connected. We also had a desire to give it connected, that our readers might give the whole subject a careful investigation at once.

Some of our readers, those who received the "Present Truth" in 1850, know that we wrote a brief review of M.'s article, and published it in that paper, also in pamphlet form. But as M. has published his article the fourth time, and as many of the readers of the "Review and Herald" have never seen our review, we thought it our duty to give his article a more lengthy notice. We invite all into whose hands this sheet may fall, to give it a careful reading. This is a subject of no small importance. Study it well, and decide this question in reference to Eternity.

Beside the regular number of copies, we shall have 2000 struck off for distribution. The extra copies will contain the entire review of M. That portion left out of this number will appear in the next. We did think of publishing the review in pamphlet form, but in paper form more than one half the expense is saved.

Will the brethren assist us in the circulation of the 2000 extra copies? Their expense will not exceed \$1.25 a hundred. If sent by mail we shall be obliged to pre-pay the postage. Large quantities should be sent by express. Let the extras be circulated, brethren, and judiciously circulated, and let them do what good they can.

We now expect to attend the conferences at West Medford, Washington, East Bethel and Johnson. These will be important meetings, and we have reasons to expect that they will prove a blessing to the people of God who may attend them. We hope that a special effort will be made to get our Advent brethren, those who have not heard the reasons of our position presented, out to these meetings. The next number will probably be delayed one or two weeks.

CONFERENCES.

There will be a Conference at West Medford, (Mass.), at the house of Paul Folsom, to commence Friday, Oct. 24th, at 6 o'clock P. M., and hold over the Sabbath and First-day. The Advent brethren in the vicinity, for whose benefit this meeting is appointed, are invited to meet with us. Brethren from abroad are invited to attend, as the Lord may direct them. Brn. G. W. Holt and J. Bates are expected to be present.

Those who come on the Cars will stop at West Medford Depot, on the Boston and Lowell Railroad. Fair from Boston, 17 cents. There will be a carriage at the Depot Friday to convey the friends to the meeting.

In behalf of the brethren. OTIS NICHOLS.
[The above notice came just as No. 5 was going to press. We abridged it for want of room. We now give it in full.]

Bro. William Farnsworth wishes us to say that there will be a Conference at Washington, (N. H.), at the house of Bro. John Stowell, to commence Friday, Oct. 31, at 1 o'clock P. M., and hold over the Sabbath and First-day. This meeting is appointed for the benefit of the Advent brethren in the region round about, who are invited to attend. Bro. G. W. Holt may be expected at that meeting.

There will be a Conference in the vicinity of East Bethel, (Vt.), where the friends there may appoint, to commence Nov. 4th, at 6 o'clock P. M., and hold about two days.

There will also be a Conference at Johnson, (Vt.), at the house of Bro. Reuben Loveland; to commence Nov. 7th, at 1 o'clock P. M., and hold over the Sabbath and First-day.

Plain Questions.

Reader! be pleased to give a plain answer to each of these plain questions, without equivocation or mental reservation.

1. Did God, after he had finished the work of creation, "bless and sanctify" *THE seventh day of the week*; or simply the *seventh part of time*, without reference to any particular day of the seven?

2. Did He not sanctify *THE very day in which he rested from his work*? Was not that the *last day of the seven*? Did He sanctify any other?

3. Why did He "bless and sanctify" *the seventh*

day? Was it not because he *rested* on that day? Will this reason apply to *any other day* of the seven? Did he not *work* on *EVERY* other day? (See Gen. ii, 2, 3.)

4. Is not God's example of resting on the seventh day enjoined upon us for imitation? (Ex. xx, 8—11.) Do we imitate him, when we rest upon some other day than the one in which He rested?

5. Is it the special *appointment of God* which renders a day holy, or is it *our own act*? Is the day holy because we *count* it so, or because God has made it so?

6. When God enjoins us to count the Sabbath, "the holy of the Lord," (Isa. lviii, 13,) is it not equivalent to telling us that He himself has *previously* constituted it a holy day by blessing and sanctifying it? Is it any thing more than requiring us to reckon the day to possess that dignity which He *has already* conferred upon it?

7. If God's blessing does not rest upon one particularly specified day, to the exclusion of others, and we are nevertheless required to keep a day holy, are we not required to do what is *impossible*? For how can we count a day to be holy, which God has not previously made so? (Compare Ques. 5.)

8. If God's blessing did not rest upon one particularly specified day, could he challenge to himself any propriety in one day more than in another? Yet in the Sabbath day he claims a special property; "My *holy day*." (Isa. lviii, 13.)

9. Are we not commanded to refrain from labor in *that very day* which God once "blessed and sanctified," and thereby made holy time? "In it thou shalt not do any work," &c. Do we obey this command when we work all of that day, and make it the busiest day of all the seven?

10. If it be downright disobedience to set about our work on the seventh day, when God says, "in it thou shalt not do any work," can we think to make amends for this act of disobedience by ceasing from work on another day? Even the performance of a required duty will not make amends for another one neglected. How much less, then, the performance of something which is not required! "Who hath required this at your hand?"

11. Has God ever *taken away* the blessing which he once put upon the seventh day, and made that day a common or secular day?

12. Does not the *reason* of the blessing (See Ques. 3,) possess all the cogency now that it ever did? Has it lost force by the lapse of time? And while the reason of an institution remains, does not the institution itself remain?

13. Was the reason of the blessing which God originally put upon the seventh day, founded upon any need that men then had of a Redeemer? Was it therefore to receive its accomplishment and fulfillment by the actual coming of the Redeemer? In what possible sense can it be said, that Jesus Christ fulfilled and made an end of this reason?

14. Has God ever said of the first day of the week, "In it thou shalt not do any work"? Has Christ ever said so? Have the apostles?

15. Is there any scriptural proof that Christ, or his apostles, or the Christian churches in the days of the apostles, *refrained from labor* on the first day of the week?

16. As there is no transgression where there is no law, (Rom. iv, 15; 1 John iii, 4,) what sin is committed by working on the first day of the week?

17. Does not the Sabbath Institution *RESULT* from the blessing and sanctifying of a particular day? Is not this *the very thing in which it consists*? How then is the institution *separable* from the day thus "blessed and sanctified"? How can it be separated from that upon which its very existence depends?

18. If the very life and soul of the institution consist in the blessing which was once put upon a particular day, is it not idle to talk of the *transfer* of the institution to another day? If another day has been sanctified and blessed, then it is an *entirely new* institution, and not a transfer of the old.

19. Does not the law of the Sabbath require the weekly commemoration of *that rest* which God entered into after he had finished the work of creation? By what principle of law or logic, then, can that law be made to *require* the commemoration of the work of redemption?

20. If it be necessary that the work of redemption be commemorated weekly by a positive institution, must not the obligation so to commemorate it arise from some law which directly and specifically requires it? But when, instead of this, the attempt is made to derive the obligation from the Sabbath law, is it not a tacit acknowledgment that there is no law requiring the weekly commemoration of the work of redemption?

21. Does the Scripture ever apply the name, *Sabbath*, to the first day of the week? Even in the *New Testament*, where the term is used, is not the reference always to the *seventh day*?

22. If Luke, who wrote the acts of the Apostles

full thirty years after the death of Christ, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, still calls the seventh day of the week the Sabbath, can it be wrong in us to do so? (See Acts xiii, 14, 42, 44; xvi, 1, 3; xvii, 1, 2; xviii, 4.) If this be the *inspired* application of the term so many years after all the ceremonial institutions were nailed to the cross, is it not our duty to make the same use of the term now?

23. Is it not a manifest perversion of the scriptural use of terms, to take away the sacred name from the seventh day of the week, and give it to the first day?

24. When the first day of the week is so generally called the Sabbath, are not the common people thereby led to suppose that the Bible calls it so? Are they not thus grossly deceived?

25. If the name *Sabbath* were no longer applied to this day, and it should simply be called first day of the week, as in the Bible, is it not probable that it would soon lose its sacredness in the eyes of the people?

26. Is it possible, then, that God has not given the day a name sufficiently sacred to secure for it a religious regard, nor even guarded it with a law sufficient to prevent its desecration?

27. *What then? HAS GOD LEFT HIS WORK FOR MAN TO MEND! IS IT NOT SAFE TO LEAVE THE DAY AS GOD HAS LEFT IT!* "Who hath directed the Spirit of the Lord, or being his counselor hath taught him?" (Isa. xi, 13.)

28. Are you very sure that by the Lord's day, (Rev. i, 10,) is meant the first day of the week? Have you any *Scripture* proof of it? Have you any other proof of it than the testimony of those who are called the early Fathers?

29. If the testimony of the early Fathers is to be relied on, that the Lord's day means the first day of the week, ought not their testimony to be just as much relied on, as to the manner in which the primitive Christians observed the day?

30. If it were even certain that by the Lord's day the writer of the book of Revelations meant to designate the first day of the week, would it thence follow that it is a day *sacred by divine appointment*, any more than that the "*Sabbath-day's journey*," (Acts i, 12,) was a distance limited and prescribed by *divine* authority? If Luke could select the latter expression from the vocabulary of *human tradition*, without intending to sanction it as being of divine origin, could not John do the same with regard to the former expression?

31. Do the Fathers, or any one of them, inform us that the Lord's day was observed by *abstinence from labor*?—that it was observed as the Sabbath? Mark the question. It is not, was the day *observed*, simply; but was it observed *as the Sabbath*?

32. Is there not an important distinction between the *Sabbath* and a *religious festival*? Does not the word Sabbath mean *rest*? Can any day, therefore, be called a Sabbath day, which is not a day of rest from ordinary labor?

33. Does a religious *festival* require any thing more than the commemoration of some important event, allowing the time not occupied in the public celebration of it to be spent in labor or amusement? Is not this precisely the manner in which the first day of the week was observed, according to the testimony of the ancient Fathers?

34. Though the observance of the first day of the week as a religious festival be in itself innocent, (Rom. xiv, 5,) so long as it is not made a pretext for dispensing with an express law of God, (Matt. xv, 6,) yet do you find it any where in the word of God *commanded as a duty*?

35. Do you believe that a Sabbath, in the true and proper sense of the term; namely, a day of rest from all ordinary labor, is necessary and indispensable to the well-being of mankind? If so, do you honestly suppose that God would set it aside, and have its place supplied by nothing more than a religious festival?

36. Is it not wicked to uphold a course which makes the commandment of God of none effect? (Matt. xv, 1—9; Mark vii, 1—13.)

Reader! carefully ponder the foregoing questions, together with the Scripture references. Answer them as you would if you stood at the gates of death. Do not trifle with the Holy Spirit of God, by forcibly wresting his word from its obvious meaning. Let conscience be unfettered; and act, as fully realizing that "*thou, God, seest me*."—[Sabb. Tract, No. 7.]

Letters received since October 9th.

Albert Belden, H. S. Gurney, Wm. Farnsworth, Lester Lockwood, S. W. Rhodes, John Kemp, Wm. Camp, Wm. Hyatt.

Receipts.

Jasper Stone, \$3; H. P. Wakefield, \$2; Wm. M. Smith, A. A. Dodge, Daniel Harvey, \$1 each.

For the Pamphlet entitled 'Experience and Views.'

Otis Nichols, A. A. Dodge, D. R. Palmer, \$5 each; A. A. Marks, \$2; Preston Dickerson, Harriet Jones, \$1 each.