

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., FEBRUARY 3, 1852.

No. 11.

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.)

Remarks of O. R. L. Crozier on the Institution,
Design and Abolition of the Sabbath.

REVIEWED.

BY J. N. ANDREWS.

"TAKE HEED THAT NO MAN DECEIVE YOU," is the solemn injunction of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is a singular, as well as painful fact, that men have ever preferred human institutions in the place of divine. The tradition of the Elders must be sustained, even at the expense of the commandments of God. In things pertaining to this life, how carefully men shun a counterfeit! with what interest do they seek for that which is true. But in things pertaining to godliness, and to life eternal, how sadly is the case reversed! With eagerness men grasp the counterfeit, while at the same time they despise and trample under foot that which is sacred and true. Witness the Jews who rejected and crucified the TRUE Messiah, and who still continue to reject him. See how many FALSE Christs they have received! Witness the mass of mankind preferring Mohamedism, and open idolatry, to even a nominal profession of faith in Christ. Witness those who are nominally called Christians. See the Papist preferring the Pope for the head of the Church, in the place of the Lord Jesus Christ; and the fire of purgatory, in the stead of the blood of Christ, to cleanse his soul from sin. Witness the Protestant choosing sprinkling, in the place of burial with Christ as baptism; choosing death as "the gate to endless joy," in the place of the resurrection, the promised "path of life;" and choosing a kingdom "beyond the bounds of time and space," instead of "the kingdom and dominion, and greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven." Witness also the mass of adventists rejecting and trampling under foot the fourth commandment, that they may in its place observe a tradition of the Elders! Matt. xv, 3—9.

The reason of all this is plain. The worship of God, while the commandments of men are taught for doctrine, is vain. Satan therefore has no opposition to it. The institutions of men are congenial to the pride of our hearts, and we would fain persuade ourselves that they are quite as acceptable to God, as though they emanated from him. But the law of God cuts up the tradition of the Elders by the roots, makes manifest the carnal mind wherever it exists, [Rom. viii, 7; iii, 20,] and stirs every energy of that wicked principle in deadly opposition. Hence many are found in array against the fourth commandment, and not a few against the whole law of God. Some with the hope of sustaining their favorite tradition, others with no other object than to destroy the fourth commandment.

The subject of this review, is the report of a Bible class written out by C. in the "Harbinger" for Dec. 6; and in noticing it, we wish to trace out the effort made to show that "the Sabbath of the Lord" was a Jewish ordinance, instituted at, or near Sinai for the Jews, (the Jews,) and nailed to the cross at the death of the Lord Jesus; also to notice the effort to erect, as far as the thing is possible, a first-day apostolic institution, on the ruins of Jehovah's ancient Sabbath. He writes thus:

"1. When was the Sabbath instituted? Gen. ii, 1—3 was read as evidence that the Sabbath was instituted at the creation. But it was replied, that this passage only tells what God did at that time, and says nothing about men being required to imitate God in resting on the seventh day."

It is very true that this text only tells us what God did on the seventh day, and to the seventh day.—But that is the very thing we wish to learn. What did he do on the seventh day? "And he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made," verse 2. "This is the reason why the Bible calls the seventh day, 'the Sabbath (Rest-day) of the Lord.'" This fact inseparably connects the Sabbath of the Lord with the first seventh day of time.

What did he do to the seventh day? "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." Verse 3. This is the reason why the seventh day is claimed by Jehovah in the Scriptures as HIS HOLY SABBATH. If the word sanctify be used in its most obvious sense, then we may affirm that God blessed and hallowed the seventh day at Creation. If it be used in the sense of setting apart for sacred purposes, then no one can deny that God hallowed and set apart the seventh day in the beginning. The sense is the same either way. How, and when, then, did Jehovah make the Sabbath? Ans. By resting from his work of creation, upon the seventh day, and sanctifying and hallowing it. Those who are able to show any OTHER ACT OF MAKING THE SABBATH are requested to do it. The sixteenth of Exodus treats the Sabbath as an existing institution, as we will presently notice. The Decalogue, points us back to Creation for the origin of the Sabbath. Ex. xx, 8—11. For whom, then, did Jehovah make the Sabbath? For himself? No, verily. He made it "for man."—Mark ii, 27.

In the absence of direct testimony either way, it is by no means certain that "holy men of old" did not regard the Sabbath. We read of their reckoning time, by weeks and by sevens of days. Gen. xxix, 27, 28; viii, 10, 12. The reckoning of time by weeks is not derived from any thing in nature, and can be traced to but one source, viz: the six days work of creation, and the rest of the Sabbath. It is not very likely that the week of creation should be remembered and commemorated, and the rest and sanctification of the holy Sabbath should be forgotten.

But were it possible to show a violation of the Sabbatic institution in the Patriarchal age, it would no more destroy the sacred character of that institution, than a plain violation of the institution of marriage on the part of some of the Patriarchs, effects the sacredness of the marriage institution. Mal. ii, 14, 15. Gen. ii, 21—24; Matt. xix, 4—8; Mark x, 6—8, compared with Gen. xvi; xxv, 6; xxix; xxx.—Both of these institutions were made for man before the fall. Mark ii, 27; Gen. ii, 1—3; 1 Cor. xi, 1—12; Gen. ii, 18. Their sanctity is not derived from the Decalogue; but the fourth commandment guards the sacredness of one, the seventh, the other. Ex. xx, 8—11, 14. But he adds:

"As an explanation of this text, Heb. iv, 1—9 was read. All, I believe, conceded that this passage states the primary object of God's resting on the seventh day and sanctifying it; that it was to pre-figure the future "rest" that "remaineth to the people of God," into which they will enter when the Lord comes."

Those who read carefully the text referred to, will observe that it does not even mention God's act of sanctifying the seventh day! Much less does it state his "primary object" in sanctifying the day.—Paul asserts in verse 3, that the works of God "WERE FINISHED FROM THE FOUNDATION OF THE WORLD." He proves the point in verse 4 by quoting Gen. ii, 2. "God did rest the seventh day FROM ALL HIS WORKS." Whatever allusion this may be supposed to make to the future rest of God's people, it is certainly a mere inference to state from this text, that God's "primary object" in sanctifying the Sabbath, (before the fall of man,) was to typify the rest into which the redeemed should enter after the Second Advent!

With as much propriety at least, might it be said that God's primary object in the creation of Eve, and in the institution of marriage, was to typify the union between Christ and the church. For the same Apostle in Eph. v, 22—33 speaks much more in favor of such a view than he does in favor of the view of C. in Heb. iv. Particularly notice verses 30—33 where the language of Gen. ii, is QUOTED AND APPLIED, yet no one who reads Gen. ii, with care, can believe that God's PRIMARY design in the institution of marriage was to typify the union of Christ and the church. Neither should they on less evidence, in reading the same chapter, conclude that God's primary object in sanctifying the day of his rest was to "sanctify it as a type." A type of future redemption when man had not yet fallen!! How much more natural the reason assigned by the Lord Jesus for the sanctification of the Sabbath, then the reason inferred by C., which he declares is the only reason in the New Testament! "The Sabbath was made

for man," says the Lord, "not man for the Sabbath." Mark ii, 27. The same expression that is used by Paul respecting the creation of Eve. 1 Cor. xi, 9.—"The primary objects" of both institutions are stated in these two texts, whatever they may be elsewhere used to illustrate. The language in each case carries the mind back to the beginning; and there we find the creation of Adam, of Eve, and of the Sabbath. Gen. ii, 1—3, 7, 18—24.

Col. ii, 16, 17, was then adduced to prove still stronger that the Sabbath of the Lord is a shadow. Those who will take pains to read the two verses preceding the ones quoted, will notice the manifest impropriety of this application. "Blotting out," says Paul, "THE HAND-WRITING OF ORDINANCES THAT WAS AGAINST US, WHICH WAS CONTRARY TO US" &c.—"Let no man THEREFORE" (that is for the reason he has named) "judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days." ["sabbaths" says Macknight and Whiting; "sabbath days" says Wesley.] "The hand-writing of ordinances" which Paul affirms is abolished, is certainly distinct from "the royal law" which James teaches us, is yet in force. Chap. ii, 8—12. That this law includes the ten commandments, cannot be denied by those who will read James' testimony with care. (We shall notice the distinction again.) But some will object that "the hand-writing of ordinances" embraced "sabbaths," and therefore "the SABBATH OF THE LORD," embraced in the fourth commandment, was abolished by the death of Christ. But do you not in this "greatly err, not knowing (or at least not heeding) the Scriptures?" If you will turn to Lev. xxiii, 24, 32, 39, you will find connected with the feasts, and meats, and drinks, and new moons of the Jews, four distinct "sabbaths," "beside the Sabbath of the Lord." See verse 38.

"The Sabbath of the Lord" was not one of the "carnal ordinances," [Heb. ix, 10; Col. ii, 14,] but it is one of "the lively oracles" of God. Rom. iii, 1, 2; Acts vii, 3, 8; 1 Pet. iv, 11. Notice that the things abolished in Col. ii, are things "against us," "contrary to us" &c. But the Sabbath of the Lord "WAS MADE FOR MAN." So saith "the faithful and true Witness. Amen.—The use of Col. ii, noticed above, looks too much like the acts of those, who have, says God, "violated my law" and have "PUT NO DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE HOLY AND PROFANE," and HAVE HID THEIR EYES FROM MY SABBATHS. Eze. xxii, 26. "TAKE HEED that no man deceive you." Those who will reign in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem gloriously with the Lord are such as keep his commandments. Isa. xxiv, 23; Ps. cxxxii, 13, 14; Rev. xxii, 14, 15.

Ex. xvi, is next introduced by C.—In order (apparently) to darken as far as possible, the testimony of this chapter, that the Sabbath existed before the Israelites came to Sinai, he asserts "that the Testimony (the tables of stone) was spoken of, even more familiarly than the Sabbath. Verses 33, 34. And yet "the Testimony was not given till more than a month after this; [See Ex. xxv, 16, 21; xxxi, 18,] and it was not put into the ark, so that the pot of manna could be laid up before it till the first day of the next first month, nine months and a half afterwards. Ex. xl, 1—3, 17—21." This argument will probably deceive some; but I marvel how that C. as an honest man could use it.

Moses said on the sixth day, [verse 23,] "To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord." Hence there is no chance to deny that the Sabbath did then exist, and was distinctly rehearsed as such. But does he speak in that manner respecting the Testimony which did not then exist? C. asserts that it is "spoken of even more, familiarly than the Sabbath;" and the assertion will be received by many for "plain Bible testimony." Moses did indeed say to Aaron, "Take a pot and put an omer full of manna therein, and lay it up before the Lord, to be kept for your generations. As the Lord commanded Moses, so Aaron laid it up before the Testimony to be kept." Verses 33, 34. But the next verse accounts for the mention of the Testimony. It says: "And the children of Israel did eat manna FORTY YEARS, until they came to a land inhabited: they did eat manna, until they came unto the borders of the land of Canaan," Verse 35. Therefore the

record of events in Exodus xvi could not have been written until about forty years after the departure from Egypt. Now look at the record carefully. It does not say that the Testimony existed at the time of the fall of the manna. It does not say that Aaron THEN laid up the pot of manna before the Testimony. But it is said by Moses, "This is the thing which the Lord commandeth, Fill an omer of it to be kept for your generations." Verse 32. And the narrative being written forty years afterward, we have an account of what was done with it; it was placed in the ark of the Testimony. Verse 34; Heb. ix, 4.—If C. has not handled the Word *deceitfully* in this part of his subject, then an instance of the act does not often occur. 2 Cor. iv, 2.

The writer next asserts that the Sabbath was "something entirely new to the people." His reasons for this assumption he offers in another place; they will be examined in their order. On the assumption just stated, he infers that they neither kept the Sabbath in Egypt, nor before their going thither. Of course this deduction amounts to nothing until the premise *assumed*, is made good. But we will notice the deduction in a brief manner. Please turn to Josh. v. It will there be seen that the ordinance of circumcision, though solemnly enforced by God, [Gen. xvii, 9—14; Lev. xii, 3; John vii, 22,] was neglected by the people while in the wilderness. See verses 5—7. Now if in a forty years sojourn in the wilderness, the ordinance of circumcision fell into total disuse, and was introduced the "SECOND TIME" by Joshua, it is possible that a CERVURY of "cruel bondage" in the iron furnace of Egyptian servitude, [Ex. i, 13, 14; Deut. iv, 20; 1 Kings viii, 51, Jer. xi, 4,] might render it necessary that the holy Sabbath, (which it is difficult, if not impossible, to observe in abject servitude,) should be solemnly set forth and enforced. But this is proceeding on the assertion of C., that the Israelites knew nothing of the Sabbath. We will now see if he be able to prove it.

In order to show the entire ignorance of the people relative to the Sabbath, it is necessary to explain away the fact, that, on the sixth day, they, without any direction from Moses, as he admits, "gathered twice as much bread" as the daily rate. Verse 22. To evade the Testimony that this act bears to their regard for the Sabbath, he introduces miraculous interposition. Notice the first miracle described by him:

"Then they gathered, the stout ones more and the weak ones (who were probably crowded away by the stouter ones) less, but when they came to measure it, God wrought a miracle, so that each one had just an omer full and no more."

Such is the view entertained by C. respecting Ex. xvi, 18. Now let us look at the view taken of it by the apostle Paul. See 2 Cor. viii, 14, 15. "But by an EQUALITY, that now at this time YOUR ABUNDANCE MAY BE A SUPPLY FOR THEIR WANT, THAT THEIR ABUNDANCE ALSO MAY BE A SUPPLY FOR YOUR WANT, THAT THERE MAY BE EQUALITY. AS IT IS WRITTEN, HE THAT HAD GATHERED MUCH HAD NOTHING OVER; AND HE THAT HAD GATHERED LITTLE HAD NO LACK."

C. declares that God wrought a miracle to diminish the portion of some, and to increase the portion of others. (As well might he claim that God would make the paschal lamb to increase or diminish according to the number of persons; but that was not so. Ex. xii, 3, 4.) But Paul shows us that there was an equality, the abundance of one supplying the lack of another. The first miracle, therefore, described by C. ceases to be a miracle.

Having introduced, as we have noticed, miraculous intervention to make the daily receipts of manna alike, C. is now prepared to account for the double quantity of manna obtained on the sixth day. Hear him again:

"The rulers did not know why, on measuring the manna the sixth day, each person should have twice as much as on other days; for Moses had not told them any thing about the Sabbath; therefore neither they nor the people knew any thing about it. But now he makes that known to them. Verses 23—26."

It will be noticed that C., (in order to reconcile this act of the people, with the idea of their entire ignorance of the Sabbath) proceeds on the assumption that there was still another miracle wrought by God; the miracle this time being to double the manna found in the vessels of the people!—We think however, that this miracle if examined, will turn out very much like the first; for neither instance presents any necessity for a miracle. It would seem that when God had provided food from heaven by a direct miracle, that the people who had "not one feeble person among their tribes," [Ps. cv, 37, 40,] might gather it without miraculous aid.—But we inquire, was it the act of the people, or a miracle from God, that a double quantity was obtained on the sixth day? "To the law and to the testimony." "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." Verse 22. There is no higher testimony than this; we believe it and rest upon it. *It was the act of the people in gathering, NOT the act of God in doubling what they had gathered*, that accounts for the double portion of manna on the sixth day. And this PLAIN TESTIMONY refutes the assertion of C. that "the rulers did not know why" the people had a double quantity on that day.

But it will be asked, "Why then did the rulers come and mention this matter to Moses? Verses 19, 20 present a reasonable answer, and one that involves no absurdity. They had been directed to leave none of the manna till another day, and how could their act of preparation for the morrow (the seventh day) be reconciled with that direction?—Moses in his answer to the rulers, sanctions the act of the people. "This" says he, "is that which the Lord hath said, To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord: bake that which 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." Verse 23. They laid it up, and it did not corrupt as on the preceding days, but was preserved. Take notice. The preparation on the sixth day named by God to Moses in verse 5, was not rehearsed by him to the people until AFTER they had gathered the manna on the sixth day. Verse 23.—This fact shows that the gathering of a double portion, was the voluntary act of the people, facilitated doubtless, by a more plentiful supply on that day.—Verse 29. This act of the people, therefore, directly refutes the assertion of C. that they were "perfectly ignorant" of the Sabbath. Whether the two miracles which he introduces to sustain the point, are entitled to any weight, others must judge.

C. having denied the institution of the holy Sabbath at the time when God rested upon, sanctified, and blessed, the seventh day, we look with no little interest for what he will show to be the act of instituting the Sabbath. After quoting verses 23—26, he remarks that "This is the first time the Sabbath is mentioned in the Bible, and Moses speaks of it as though he had just received it from God, and of which the people were perfectly ignorant." Had C. stated that this is the first place in the Bible where THE TERM SABBATH occurs, he would not have made a false statement. Those who will read the fourth commandment, will notice that the seventh day is called the Sabbath even before God blessed and sanctified it. It reads thus: "The Lord blessed the SABBATH-DAY, and hallowed it." And this act of blessing the Sabbath-day and sanctifying it, is recorded in Gen. ii, 2, 3. As well might he affirm that Jehovah was not spoken of before the days of Moses; for in making himself known to Moses, he says, Ex. vi, 3, "By my name Jehovah was I not known unto them," (the Patriarchs.) For the word Jehovah refers to a personage, not merely to a name; and the word Sabbath, refers to an institution, not merely to a term.

We have shown from the narrative that the people could not have been "perfectly ignorant" of the Sabbath, (how could any people be, that know as much of God as this, that he created heaven and earth in six days and rested on the seventh?) but as C. asserts that the holy Sabbath dates from Ex. xvi, and that the people were entirely ignorant of the institution, we feel no small interest to read an account of God's act of instituting the Sabbath, and also the institution and explanation of it given to the people.

What account, then, does the record contain of any act of instituting the Sabbath in the wilderness? The first sentence reads thus: "And he (Moses) said unto them, This is that which the Lord hath said, To-morrow, is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord;" then follows directions respecting the disposal of the manna. We ask then in candor, Did the statement given by Moses, constitute the seventh day "the holy Sabbath unto the Lord?" Was it not by that language confessed to be such already? If the latter question be answered in the negative, then we will look at the matter further. To constitute it his Sabbath (Rest-day) did God rest upon the seventh day in the wilderness of Sin? No. He did this at Creation. Did he sanctify and hallow the day in the wilderness? Nothing of the kind is claimed. He did that at Creation, even the enemies of the Sabbath "being judges." How then was it instituted? Was it by Moses giving express direction that it should be observed? The record is searched in vain for even that, until after at least one Sabbath had been in part observed in the wilderness. Perhaps it can be proved by what some would call "plain Bible testimony," that the Sabbath was instituted in the wilderness of sin, but we would be glad to have THE TESTIMONY PRESENTED. Or shall we conclude that the children of Israel observed the Sabbath without having it instituted? (!)

As the memorials of the Bible begin with the

events commemorated by them. (witness the Passover, Ex. xii, 11—14; the feast of Tabernacles, Lev. xxiii, 39—43; Baptism, Rom. vi, 3—5; the Lord's Supper, 1 Cor. xi, 25, 26; see also Ex. xvii, 8—14; Num. xvi, 39, 40; Josh. iv, 7—9; Matt. xxvi, 13,) it is not a little remarkable, that the Sabbath, commemorating as it does the events of Creation, (See Ex. xx, 8—11,) and not the events of the Exode from Egypt, should be instituted, not at Creation, but in the wilderness of Sin. (We greatly fear that those who teach this doctrine, are in that wilderness themselves, 1 John iii, 4.) But if it be true that "the Sabbath was made" in the wilderness of Sin, it is still more remarkable that NO ACCOUNT OF THE ACT should have been recorded!

The writer argues that because it is said "the Lord hath given you the Sabbath, therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days," that the Sabbath must then for the first time have been communicated to Israel. For surely he did not "give them what they already had!"—A text in the New Testament may help the mind of C. Please to read John vii, 22, and then answer me. How could Moses give them circumcision when they already had that ordinance, even from the days of Abraham? Gen. xvii, 9—14; Josh. v, 5. If you answer that the subject was still further set forth and impressed upon them, then we say, just so was it with the holy Sabbath.

He proceeds to quote Neh. ix, 13—15, which testifies that Thou (God) "madest known unto them thy holy Sabbath." "Certainly God did not make known to them what they already knew!"—We answer how could GOD MAKE HIMSELF KNOWN unto Israel in the land of Egypt, [Eze. xx, 5,] when he chose them, and lifted up his hand unto them, saying, "I am the Lord your God;" when they already knew the true God? (For they were the only church of God on the earth at that time.) Ex. ii, 23—25; iii, 7, iv, 31.

If you answer he revealed Himself to them more fully, and made known their duty to him more clearly, we add even so was it with his holy Sabbath. And we request the readers attention to the point a moment longer. The testimony of Nehemiah is directly against C. God did not make his Sabbath for the Jews. No! No! It was already in existence, as well as himself, and he made it known to them. Amen.

We have rested nothing upon "the use of the past tense in verses 23 and 29," and therefore do not stop to argue the point.

He next proceeds to explain the text. "How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws." Verses 18, 29. As the text now stands, it clearly indicates a *continuance* in the neglect of the Sabbath. He proceeds to enumerate what he terms, "several commandments and laws." Look at his list.

"1. That they should gather a certain quantity every day; 2. That they should leave none of it till the morning; 3. That they should gather twice as much on the sixth day as on any other; 4. That they should lay up that which remained on the sixth day to eat on the seventh, and 5. That they should not go out on the seventh day to get any."

This catalogue is worthy of attention. Whether it was made out for the purpose of "making out a case," or not, is not our province to decide, though it looks strongly that way.—The third "law" or "commandment" here enumerated had never, so far as we can read, been given to the people! But if it had been given, then it directly contradicts the view of C. that the double portion of manna on the sixth day, had been miraculously provided for them. It also contradicts the statement made by him, that the elders did not understand how the people came by a double portion of manna on the sixth day! For if any beside Moses and Aaron would know of the existence of such a precept, surely they *would*. What is quite as remarkable, the fifth "law" enumerated by C. was not given further than by implication until AFTER God had uttered the rebuke. See verses 28, 29. Of the three remaining laws not one was directly violated by the recorded trespass of the people on the Sabbath!

But it is manifest that it was the violation of the Sabbath of Jehovah, that called forth from him this cutting reproof, and led him to give in THE NEXT VERSE, what C. enumerates as the fifth law of his series!—By turning to verses 4 and 5, it will be seen that God's reason for giving the manna in the manner that he did, was that he might "prove them whether they will walk in my law or no." (Then he had something that he called his "law" before any of the precepts enumerated by C. existed.) Notice therefore, that every thing was so adjusted with reference to the Sabbath, in the giving of the manna, that it could be observed without being in the smallest degree burdensome. When, therefore, some of the people persisted in disobedience and in violation of God's Rest-day, he utters this solemn reproof, and by express statute forbids the repetition of the act.

One fact that seems to have been generally overlooked, deserves, at least, a passing notice. God gave the manna to the people to prove them, *whether they would walk in his law or no.* Hence they were left without any direction to provide for the seventh day. But this they proceeded to do *voluntarily* on the sixth day. Thus their regard for his law was made manifest. But when some of them went out to gather the manna on the seventh day, the pointed rebuke of Jehovah was uttered, though they had not by express precept been forbidden so to do. Thus God, by placing them where they could act freely, *proved them*, and let each manifest what was in his heart.

The expressions of this chapter respecting the Sabbath should not be forgotten: "To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord: 'To-day is a Sabbath unto the Lord;'" "The seventh day which is the Sabbath." Verses 23-26. With a single question to the candid reader, we submit the chapter: Is there any ACT of instituting the Sabbath recorded in Ex. xvi, or does it treat the Sabbath as an INSTITUTION ALREADY IN EXISTENCE?

"We then passed to the Decalogue, Ex. xx, 8-11. Some thought this passage proved the Sabbath to be a primary institution, established at the creation. But it was replied, that it does not say any thing of the kind, hence that conclusion is only an *inference*, which is not sufficient to establish a truth or a religious duty. Because God commanded the Hebrews to rest on the seventh day, 'for' he had rested on that day in creation, does not prove that men began immediately after that to rest on that day, any more than the text in the New Testament which says, 'We love God because he first loved us,' proves that we began to love God just as soon as he loved us."

Those who will look at the fourth commandment FOR THEMSELVES can judge of the truth of C.'s assertion that the Sabbath is not a primary institution, or that the proof of it at least, rests upon mere inference. Were does this text place the origin of the holy Sabbath? For this is the grand question before us. At the giving of the manna in the wilderness of Sin? Silent about that wilderness. Did God say then, (at Sinai,) "I now institute the Sabbath?" Verily, he does not! And it is very evident that he could not thus say. For C. is obliged to admit that some how or other it was in existence at least thirty days before the Hebrews came to Sinai. What does God say then as to the origin of his Sabbath. [Rest-day.] He states the reasons on which the fourth commandment rests in these words: "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." Verse 11. Then the seventh day was the Sabbath of the Lord, prior to his act of sanctifying and hallowing it. And this act of blessing and sanctifying the day, immediately followed his act of resting upon it. [Gen. ii, 2, 3.] If these facts do not prove the origin of the Sabbath prior to man's fall, then they mean much less than they express. What act made it Jehovah's Rest-day?—His act of resting upon it—not at Sinai, not in the wilderness of Sin,—but at Creation. What made it "holy unto the Lord"—his "holy day" &c? His own act of blessing and hallowing it in Eden. Since then it has been the holy Sabbath unto the Lord. It does not derive its sanctity from Sinai, no, no. But because of the sanctity it had already passed, it was placed in Jehovah's royal law. Let the fourth commandment speak for itself.

We thank C. for his New Testament illustration. We could not have found so good a one in a long search, it is to the point. "We love him because he first loved us." 1 John iv, 19. Our love to him is BECAUSE he first loved us. This does not prove that we have loved God ever since he loved us; but it does prove that we ought to have so done. The fourth commandment requires the observance of the Sabbath BECAUSE of what God did at Creation: this does not prove that the Sabbath has been observed ever since that time; IT ONLY PROVES THAT IT OUGHT TO HAVE BEEN SO OBSERVED.—He continues:

"Special attention was called to the closing part of the passage quoted: God 'rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.' Why did God bless and hallow the seventh day? Not because he designed it to be a weekly rest for man, but because he himself had rested from the work of creation on that day: hence he sanctified it as a type. Heb. iv."

It is not a little remarkable that "special attention was called to the closing part of the passage," and yet they did not read the fact that the Sabbath existed at the beginning. God blessed the SABBATH DAY, (a thing in existence) and hallowed it at creation! Notice the care with which in the next sentence, he changes the expressions, *Sabbath day to seventh day.* It would prove the existence of the Sabbath too early! Was Matt. xiii, 15, true in this case? We now appeal to the reader. Is not the expression God "rested the seventh day, wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallow-

ed it," proof that he then constituted it a MEMORIAL of his rest from creation on that day? Especially when the fourth commandment reads, "REMEMBER the Sabbath day (REST-DAY) to keep it holy." Is it not sublime nonsense, to say that the Sabbath was made as a memorial of the departure of Israel from Egypt, or as a type of man's redemption and rest after the Second Advent, when as yet he had not fallen!—C. is willing to have the Sabbath instituted in Paradise as a type. But if it was "sanctified as a type" then, and never was any thing but a TYPE AFTERWARDS, why did it need to be instituted a second time in the wilderness of Sin, and (as we infer from C's words) a third time at mount Sinai! Surely if C. is correct in all this, there must be something very sacred about such a type as that! We are glad that he now (though inadvertently) confesses the truth that the Sabbath originated in Eden, before the fall. This is his position: God then "sanctified it as a type," and 2500 years afterward made it again as a type for the Jews! Does the reader—does C. himself "believe all this?" We suggest that obedience to the commandments of God is much more blessed, than, at least, a POOR EXCUSE for his breaking them! [Ps. xix, 7-11.]

We digress for a moment from the point before the mind of the reader, in order to answer an objection. "Sabbath breaking was not forbidden by express precept until after the Exode." Very good. Neither was *idolatry, blasphemy, disobedience to parents, adultery, theft, false witness, covetousness*. Yet it is certain they were heinous sins in the sight of Him who changeth not. [Mal. iii, 5, 6.] If we mistake not, no one of "the ten words" of Jehovah existed in the form of express precept in the Patriarchal age, save the sixth. [Gen. ix, 6.] But a moment's reflection upon the Decalogue will show that each of the principles therein embodied is as old as creation, and as broad as the family of man! "The Hebrews" indeed had the lively oracles committed to them, and thus had a great "advantage" over those nations not thus favored. Yet it is certain that the whole family of man were amenable to them. [Acts vii, 38; Rom. iii, 1, 2, 4-31.] God only embodied the moral precepts of his own government at Sinai; he did not create them there. The fourth commandment does not originate the duty contained therein, but gives the reasons for its observance, as old as creation, and alike applicable to all men. The "wholesome restraint contained in the law of God would never have been deemed 'a yoke of bondage,' were it not for the carnal mind which *dislikes the restraint.*"

"As a direct and positive answer to the question, When was the Sabbath instituted? Deut. v, 12-15 was read. [The reader will turn to it; he continues.] This is as plain as any thing can be. 'The Lord thy God brought thee out thence [from Egypt] through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm: THEREFORE the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day.' Now, as an effect does not precede its cause, so the Sabbath commandment did not exist before the departure from Egypt; because that event is distinctly stated as the cause of that commandment being given."

I can hardly suppress a smile when I witness the eagerness with which C. grasps this text, which says not one word about the origin of the Sabbath, to prove that it was instituted after Israel left Egypt. The Decalogue, as uttered by the voice of the King Eternal, gives us the reasons on which the Sabbath institution is based. Ex. xx, 8-11. These, as it has been already shown, are all against C.—Deut. v, does not give one of these reasons. And we submit this point to him, Can you tell from Deut. v, why the seventh day should have been preferred to the first, the second, or the fifth days as the Sabbath of the Lord? And further, can you tell from the same chapter how it happened that any day was called the Sabbath (Rest-day) of the Lord? And if you cannot answer, as most assuredly, you will not be able to do from Deut. v, then you must confess that we must look to Ex. xx, which explains the whole matter. For it is a rule (I think) to interpret that which is less particular, by that which is full and definite. Deut. v, is not the Decalogue as uttered by Jehovah. It is a rehearsal of it by Moses forty years afterward. Some things are added, and some things are omitted. Now look at its mention of the Sabbath. It begins [verse 12] as follows: "Keep the Sabbath day to sanctify it AS the Lord thy God commanded thee." Now where had he commanded this act? In Ex. xx, where "God commanded the Hebrews to rest on the seventh day, for he had rested on that day at Creation." Then Deuteronomy itself, cites us to Exodus for the Sabbath law, and Ex. xx, gives it, with reasons that base the institution on what was done at Creation. Nay it even calls the seventh day the Sabbath, as we have before shown, prior to the fall of man.

Does Deut. v contradict the testimony of Ex. xx, and tell us that the Sabbath was made after the de-

parture from Egypt? Not an intimation of the kind is given. Does it tell us that the Sabbath commemorated the departure from Egypt? Not a word of that. Let the *original* commandment speak. "Remember (the day of the Exode? No! but remember) the Sabbath day." What day is the Sabbath day? Some day connected with their flight from Egypt? No! No! It is the day on which Jehovah rested from his work of creation!

But does not Moses say "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." Truth. But is there a word in all this, that tells us how there came to be a Sabbath-day? Not one. It does not give one word respecting its origin. But it does give the reason why God enforced it upon the children of Israel.

He had brought them out of "the house of bondage" where they could not keep the Sabbath, [Proof Ex. i, 13, 14; iii, 7; v, 4-19; vi, 9,] and placed them in a situation where every thing was adjusted with reference to the Sabbath, that he might "prove them whether they would walk in his law or no."—But lest C. should say the fourth commandment originated the Sabbath, we find the Sabbath in existence BEFORE ANY express command to keep it had been given. [Ex. xvi, 23.] The reader will notice that it is not, When was the fourth commandment given? that has been the question before us, but, "When was the Sabbath *ITSELF* instituted?" As C. speaks of cause and effect, we will try to state them distinctly:

1. THE CAUSE: "God BLESSED THE SEVENTH DAY AND SANCTIFIED IT; because that in it he had rested from all his work."

2. THE EFFECT: "The Sabbath was MADE for man."

Deut. v, which says not one word about the ORIGIN OF THE SABBATH, is presented as a "direct and positive answer to the question," and in the estimation of C. makes IT AS PLAIN AS ANY THING CAN BE!

We sum up the question discussed as follows:

1. God sanctified the Sabbath at Creation. Ex. xx, 11.

2. He made it known to the Hebrews in the most solemn manner. Neh. ix, 13, 14.

3. The fourth commandment of the royal law, embodies the sacred institution, and renders it as immutable as that law. Rom. iii, 31; Luke xvi, 17.

The first question is now submitted.

"2. For whom was the Sabbath instituted? On this question Deut. v, 1-3 was read. The Sabbath was a part of that covenant which Moses said God made with the people in Horeb, and not with their fathers: hence it was made with, and for the Hebrews only, as also the commandment as it stands in the Decalogue clearly shows."

To show the wicked perversion of this text so often made, we say to C. "Come now let us reason together:"

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

2. "The Sabbath was a part of that covenant which Moses said God made with the people in Horeb, and not with their fathers."

3. Hence the duty enjoined in the fourth commandment was not binding on the Patriarchs.

Really, this disposes of the Sabbath in an admirable manner; but let us try it again:

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

2. The precepts "Thou shalt have no other gods before me, Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain, Honor thy father and thy mother, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet," were a "part of the covenant which Moses said, God made with the people in Horeb and not with their fathers."

3. Hence the duties enjoined in these nine commandments were not binding upon the Patriarchs!! Such a freedom as that, is really the freedom for which the carnal mind has ever plead. Rom. viii, 7; 2 Pet. ii, 18-22.—C's syllogism proves that the Sabbath was not binding on the Patriarchs; mine, (constructed on the same foundation,) proves that none of the duties enjoined in the Decalogue were! But "that which proves too much, proves nothing to the point." Hence there is a defect somewhere.

But let us try it again:

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

2. But the sixth commandment embodied in this covenant, was expressly given to Noah and to his posterity, Gen. ix, 6.

3. Therefore the moral duties embodied in the holy law of God (which was the condition, or terms of agreement of the covenant Ex. xix; xx) may have

been binding before they were given in this most solemn manner.

The covenant made (if you wish me so to speak) "for the Hebrews" in Horeb, either did, or did not, institute the duties of the moral law. 1. If it did institute them, then it enables C. to prove that the Sabbath, with all the rest of the moral precepts in the law of God, was made for "the Hebrews only." But this would prove that idolatry, blasphemy, murder, adultery, theft, false witness and covetousness, as well as Sabbath breaking, had not been wrong prior to this, and were not then wrong for "any other people than the Hebrews." This is every way as absurd as it would be to obey the fourth commandment. 2. But if the covenant made at Horeb ONLY EMBODIED those moral duties WITHOUT creating them, then C. has not in this text, ONE FRACTION of proof that the Sabbath was made in Horeb for the Jews. The reader will notice that the idea of C. is a mere inference drawn from the fact that God then made a covenant with Israel. But that covenant did not create the Sabbath, for it was in existence BEFORE the covenant was made. [See Ex. xvi.] And with the established fact before us, that the Sabbath was instituted at Creation, how absurd and ridiculous is the idea that it was made at Sinai "for the Hebrews!"

Because God saw fit to make a distinct revelation of his moral law to Israel, and to make a covenant with them, on condition that they would keep it, [Ex. xix; xx.] the law of God is in no wise affected by the question, whether they kept that covenant or not. Nor does the fact, that when the new covenant based on better promises is made, when God shall put his law in the heart of his people, prove, that it shall then be abolished. It proves that it shall then be in existence. Amen.

The question whether the fourth commandment pertained merely to the Jews, or alike to all men, really grows out of another, viz: Did the law of God pertain merely to the Jews, or did it actually pertain to all men? for the fourth commandment is as broad as the others.

If the law of God was confined to the Jews, then the Gentiles were not amenable to it. But "where there is no law, there is no transgression." And the Gentiles around them must be considered as moral beings, but not accountable to any higher authority than that of their kings! But what then should we make of that statement of Paul, that those who had not the written law had "the work of the law written in their hearts?" [Rom. ii.] Or of his testimony, that, though the Jews had the advantage in that "the oracles of God" were committed to them, yet by the law the whole world was condemned and shown to be guilty before God. [Rom. iii.] But if C. should admit that the Gentiles were amenable to the law of God, then we add, the fourth commandment is an important part of that law.

Having noticed the inferential testimony presented by C. we now proceed to examine that which is "direct and positive," "plain Bible testimony." It is of the same nature as that which the Sadducees presented to our Lord to disprove the resurrection, and which Prof. Bush has used to show the impossibility of such an event. The argument of the Sadducees is familiar to all. [Matt. xxii, 23-25.] Those who have read Bush's Anastasis, will recollect that he presents "unanswerable" objections to a literal resurrection of the body! He proceeds to demonstrate from a great number of ingeniously devised "considerations" that such an event is absolutely impossible! (For he knows not the Scriptures nor the power of God.) While obedient faith has ever said "Speak Lord thy servant heareth," and has ever regarded a divine requirement as quite too sacred to be trifled with, or to be explained away; but it has ever been the part of unbelief to cavil at, and by some means evade what God has said.

We will present a summary of the "considerations" by which he proves that the Sabbath of the Lord "was not adapted to all climates and latitudes, therefore it could not have been designed for universal man," but was instituted for the Hebrews in the land of Palestine. Fires were forbidden, without which it would be impossible to live in some climates; near the poles the sun rises and sets but once a year, so that the sun (the only guide in the Sabbath law) would give them but one Sabbath in seven years—day and night comprising a whole year there, and it would be impossible to regulate the time by clocks to correspond to Palestine—and finally a day may be gained or lost by circumnavigating the globe to the east, or to the west!

We cannot forbear to repeat the old adage that "Necessity is the mother of invention." What could not be found in the word of God to show that the Sabbath was made merely for the Jews, to be kept in Palestine only, is abundantly proved by "these considerations!"

1. "Fire was not to be kindled on the Sabbath."

Was that a part of Jehovah's "royal law," or was it a part of the "hand-writing of ordinances" containing directions "for a particular people" to observe in a "particular country?" It is given in connection with the penalty of temporal death for a violation of God's Sabbath, and also in connection with directions respecting the Tabernacle, and evidently pertains to none but the Hebrews. (The distinction between "the hand-writing of ordinances," and "the royal law," also the fact that the real penalty of the law was the second death, will be noticed in their place.) This direction was not burdensome to them in that land. As well might it be said, because they were directed to make extra offerings on that day, and as these offerings were not to be observed by other people, that the Sabbath was not designed for the Gentiles. But had C. "rightly divided the word of truth," he would have put some difference between the holy and the profane, and not have hid his eyes from God's Sabbath. One of the great ideas of the grand Sabbath Law, the fourth Commandment, is MERCY; and it is as much the act of mercy to kindle a fire in this climate as it was for the Pharisees to pull an ox from a pit, and it is less labor.

2. Relative to the people that have but "one Sabbath in seven years," we ask whether this statement made by C. was in sober earnest, or thrown in for effect. Look at the Sabbath law. We are to work six days because God made heaven and earth in six days—not in six thousand years—nor yet in six years; and we are to rest the seventh day—not a thousand years—nor yet one year, but one day, just as God did. That is the guide, "given in the Sabbath law." The first three days of the Creation week were reckoned without any sun. When the plagues were poured out on Egypt there were three days of total darkness. These according to the view of C. made but one long night! And there is yet to be in the fearful scene before us, a period when the vials of unmixed wrath from Jehovah's temple, shall be poured out on the worshippers of the Beast, and of his Image, and on those who have his Mark, when the kingdom of the Beast shall be full of darkness, and they shall gnaw their tongues for pain. But we ask, may not time be reckoned even then, by those to whom "the plagues shall not come near?"—could it not be reckoned in Egypt—was it not reckoned in the week of Creation? And finally, Cannot Sunday be reckoned in the polar regions, or do men who have spent a year there, reckon it but one day?

We notice two methods of reckoning time:

(1.) By the sun. This would lead us to keep the seventh day AS it comes to us. (2.) To regulate our time by Palestine. This would lead us to keep the Sabbath in part BEFORE the seventh day should come to us. The first is doubtless the scripture method; let either be correct, it can be followed.—(See articles in "Review and Herald" Vol. 1. Nos. 9, and 12, "The time of the Sabbath.")

3. Relative to circumnavigating the globe, we ask C. a question: Suppose that men were able to encompass the globe with the speed of a telegraphic despatch; suppose they could, for instance be able to encompass it twenty-four times in one day, and thus gain twenty-three days, we ask how much weight such a circumstance would have in deranging dates?—How much weight would it have in deranging his or your reckoning of Sunday? Verily none at all. It is doubtless very difficult to keep God's Sabbath in the polar regions, (it is here,) but it is not difficult to keep the day of apostolic "preference" either there or in circumnavigating the globe! When you are called to circumnavigate the globe or to visit the polar regions we will try to aid you further; till then we earnestly suggest the propriety of your obeying God.

We turn from the "oppositions of science, falsely so called," and listen to the "Scriptures of truth." The Holy One of Israel hath spoken on this point: "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. Then if the Holy One of Israel with whom a lie is impossible be credited, we may consider one point established. When the dominion of Christ is from sea to sea, and from the river to the end of the earth, and the kingdom, and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom UNDER THE WHOLE HEAVEN, shall have been given to the people of the saints of the Most High, ALL FLESH shall come to worship before Jehovah from Sabbath to Sabbath, and from new moon to new moon. Then it is possible for the human family to observe the Sabbath over the whole globe! We appeal to C. if it be not so! All flesh will have the Sabbath and the Tree of Life, as first designed, both of which were made before the fall. The Tree of Life shall yield

its fruit every month, and thus shall its fruit be ready for those who shall come up from one new moon to another. Greatly indeed, must that heart be changed that fights God's Sabbath now, before it can be admitted to enter where the whole family of the redeemed shall observe it, and have free access to the Tree of Life. Fully do we coincide with the words of Jesus, the "Alpha and Omega;" "Blessed are they that do his (the Father's) commandments, that they may have right to the Tree of Life, and may enter in through the gates into the City." Rev. xxii, 13-16.

C. having presented a groundless inference, and an amount of "philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ," we inquire, Does not the word of God contain some better answer than all this?—Yea verily. The beloved Son of God has told us for whom the Sabbath was made, and his testimony would not have been disregarded, and an inference from the words of Moses chosen in its stead, were it not for the vain hope of making the "Servant" contradict the Son! Jesus was with the Father at Creation, [John i. 1-3.] he is competent to testify. The Father says of him, "This is my beloved Son, HEAR him." We respond, Amen. He testifies in so many words; (his testimony is ultimate truth;) "The Sabbath was made for man." Mark ii, 27; 1 Cor. xi 9. Now look at one or two Bible instances of such expressions. "Man lieth down, and riseth not: till the heavens be no more." Job. xiv, 12. "There hath no temptation taken you but such as is common to man." 1 Cor. x, 13. "It is appointed unto men once to die." Heb. ix, 27. We offer the following grammatical rule from Barrett's Principles of English Grammar, p. 29. A noun without an adjective is invariably taken in its broadest extension, as: "Man is accountable." With the following points we submit the second question:

1. All flesh shall yet come to worship before Jehovah on the Sabbath.—God the Father.

2. The Sabbath was made for man.—Son of God.

3. Does the New Testament require us, as Christians, to keep the Sabbath day?

The artful manner in which this question is stated, is worthy the admiration of all Sophists. We have seen that the Sabbath was sanctified at Creation—made for man—embodied in Jehovah's royal law. The question before us therefore is not, Does the New Testament re-enact the fourth, or any other of the commandments? but it is this, Does the New Testament abolish the law of God, and give us another in its place? The burden of proof therefore belongs to the opponents of the fourth commandment. For God having enacted his holy law and proclaimed it in person, it is the part of its opponents to show that it is abolished; not the part of its friends to show its re-enactment. We believe in its perpetuity and immutability, not in the re-enactment of any part of it. For it is not like God to abolish a law and then re-enact it! This is something that he never yet did. The laboring oar is then in the hand of C.

Witness the effort which he makes to escape from the fourth commandment: He shows how lightly God the Father had ever regarded his Sabbath; he shows that the Lord Jesus Christ, the disciples, the holy women, who "rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment," and the apostles, Paul and Barnabas, all disregarded the Sabbath! And all of the above named, Paul and his company excepted, disregarded it before it was abolished! Apostolic preference for the first day of the week is then proved from Acts xx, 7; 1 Cor. xvi, 1, 2. He then proves from 2 Cor. iii that the ten commandments were all abolished, and then all but the Sabbath commandment are introduced into the new covenant! Then Rom. xiv is brought forward to prove that there is no difference in days, each being at liberty to keep, or to refrain from keeping, any day he pleases. The distinction between the royal law and the hand-writing of ordinances is next disproved! He sums up his argument and concludes with a chapter of Sabbath keepers' absurdities! It is not without a serious effort that he excuses himself from keeping the fourth commandment. The attention of the reader is called to his excuses, while we weigh them in the scales of truth. Will they screen him from wrath in the day when "the penalty of the law" shall be inflicted on "every soul of man that doeth evil." Please notice he passes over Matt. v, 17-19 where our Lord in his first sermon speaks out in distinct terms on the real point at issue, and begins with the accusations of Sabbath breaking, presented by the Pharisees, and refuted by Jesus Christ.

On this question Matt. xii, 1-8 was first read. The Pharisees accused the disciples of the Saviour of breaking the Sabbath day; and he excused them by referring to David's eating the shew-bread when he had need, and to the priests' customary profanation of the Sabbath by doing more labor on that day than on any other (Num. xxviii, 5, 10.) and tells the Pharisees that if they had understood

the great doctrine of 'mercy' which he came to establish, they would not have condemned the 'guiltless.'—He pronounced his disciples guiltless in doing what they did, and does not say but they would have been equally guiltless in doing any amount of labor."

In order to aid the mind of the reader, and also to make C. speak out plain, we offer him one of three positions:

1. Christ excused his disciples by referring to others who had done wrong. (A poor excuse truly.)

2. Or the law had always been relaxed, changed, superseded, or abolished. (Then it was not relaxed by Christ.)

3. Or the acts of the priests, the act of David, and the acts of the disciples, were not, *under the circumstances in which they were placed*, contrary to the law of God.

The first two positions being to absurd to need refutation, all must agree upon the third. Now look at the facts in the case. What said the law of God respecting the Sabbath? "Six days shalt thou labor, and do all **THY** work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: *in it thou shalt not do any work.*" Were the priests in their act of offering up sacrifices upon the Sabbath, at work for themselves, or for God? Not for themselves, but to obey God. Num. xxviii, 9, 10. They were not doing what could be called "*thy work*." But had they been engaged in slaughtering animals for their own use on that day, would they have been guiltless then? Verily not. Look at the case of David. 1 Sam. xxi. He was fleeing for his life from Saul, the king of Israel. "He had need" and as an act of mercy "*for there was no bread there but the shew-bread,*" the priest gave him of it to eat. This as an act of mercy was according to the law. "The **WEIGHTIER** matters of the law" were "judgment, **MERCY** and faith." Matt. xxiii, 23. Under other circumstances, though not expressly forbidden, it would have been wrong. Christ appealed to these circumstances to show that the disciples in satisfying their hunger from the heads of wheat, were guiltless. Was there any chance "to answer him again?" I trow not. But how "unreasonable" it is for C. to insinuate from this chapter that any amount of labor would have been "guiltless" on the part of the disciples. If David and the priests would under other circumstances have been blameless in acting as they did, then might C. offer this chapter as proof, not merely that the law was slackened up in the days of Jesus, but that it always had been! Is it not "hard for thee to kick against the pricks?" "Mercy and not sacrifice" was not a new doctrine. Hos. vi, 6. It was one of the *weightier matters of the law.* Matt. xxiii, 23.

"Instead of affirming, even by implication, the Sabbath law, all he says goes to relieve them from its obligations. He says he is greater than the temple, hence has a right to change or supersede its ceremonies; and that he is Lord even of the Sabbath-day, hence has a right to dispose of it as he pleases—even to abrogate it—he and his disciples are not subject to it. It is not recorded that either he or his disciples refrained from doing any thing on the seventh day because it was the Sabbath, except the women who delayed going to anoint his body till the Sabbath was over: but they probably did this more from fear of the Jews than for reverence for that day: for Jesus and his disciples often did more than that on that day. He healed on the Sabbath-day and commanded the healed to carry their beds, and justified his conduct by saying, "*my Father worketh hitherto and I work;*" as if he had said, my Father is not subject to the Sabbath law neither am I; and as he is so is his disciples."

We have already shown that there was no act of relaxing or destroying the "Sabbath of the Lord," on the part of Jesus. He justified the disciples on the same ground that he justified the priests in the temple, and David's act of eating the shew-bread; so that the law was no more relaxed or slackened up then, than it always had been!

Though Christ was greater than the temple, he was not greater than him who dwelt therein. John xiv, 28; Matt. xxiii, 21. He was not greater than the law contained in its ark, (Ps. cxxxviii, 2,) for he submitted to its penalty, and died "the just for the unjust." Gal. iii, 13; 1 Pet. iii, 18.

The fourth commandment was no more a temple ceremony than were the other nine! But even with the temple ceremonies Jesus did not meddle; he was not a priest upon earth; his priesthood which was to "supersede" the Levitical, did not commence till his ascension. Heb. viii.

The Son of man is the Lord of the Sabbath, even as the husband is the lord of his wife. See Mark ii, 27, 28; 1 Cor. xi, 9; 1 Pet. iii, 6; Gen. xviii, 12. Not to abrogate, abolish or put away, or destroy, but to cherish, protect, and defend. He is the Lord of his people—he is *our* Lord Jesus Christ. Not to abolish—not to abrogate—not to destroy us—but to lay down his own life for us, and to "come again," and take us to himself. Rom. xiv, 9; John xiv, 1-3. "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living."—Matt. xxii, 32. Jesus Christ is not the Lord of dead

types and shadows, but of "the lively oracles!" Amen.

In taking leave of Matt. xii, we ask, Whether an act shown by our Lord Jesus Christ to be in accordance with that **WEIGHTIER** matter of the law, **MERCY**, and therefore no violation of the law, will justify C. in *open willful* violation of the fourth commandment? If he be "weighed" in the balances of Matt. xii, his own chosen scales, will he not be "found wanting?"

"It is not recorded that either he, or his disciples, refrained from doing any thing on the seventh day because it was the Sabbath." (Witness the art used here; why did he not show where they ever violated the fourth commandment?) But we ask where is it recorded that they refrained from theft out of respect to the eighth commandment? Nay is it not written that one of the twelve was a thief? John xii, 6. How far would that fact go to show that he relaxed the eighth commandment? He repeated it indeed, as he did all the commandments on the second table, but we inquire respecting his *acts*. Why not prove from John viii, 11; Matt. xxi, 31, that Jesus relaxed the seventh commandment? Or from Luke xiv, 26, that he relaxed the fifth?

We regret that the Sabbath is so far from being a "delight" to C., [Isa. lviii, 13,] that he even calls in question the motives of those who observe it!—The holy women did not keep the commandment because they wished to obey God. O no.—It was "from fear of the Jews." We have read, indeed, that the disciples were once assembled on the *first day of the week* with closed doors "*for fear of the Jews,*" [John xx, 19,] but of the women who were *fearless enough* to follow their Lord at an hour when his disciples forsook him and fled, it is recorded that they "rested the Sabbath-day, according to the commandment." Whether an outward act "for fear of the Jews" would be "according to the commandment," may be judged from reading the commandment itself: "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." The holy women kept the fourth commandment—the Holy One and the Just had done no less. John viii, 29, 46.

Jesus "healed on the Sabbath-day." True he did. Was it not "lawful to heal on the Sabbath-day?" Luke xiv, 1-6. Nay was it not in an eminent degree *proper*, that the day which was hallowed for man, should be honored with the most of his merciful acts? We can hardly refrain from expressing the opinion, that, had the first day of the week been thus honored, C. would have urged that consideration in its behalf!

Jesus directed a man to carry his bed on the Sabbath. Very good. This, like the work of the priests on the Sabbath, was not an act of his own pleasure or profit. The carrying of the bed, considered as a burden, was a mere trifle. That it was not such a burden as God had forbidden may be seen by comparing Jer. xvii, 21-27; Neh. xiii, 15-20.

But God the Father lightly esteemed the Sabbath-day. "*My Father worketh hitherto and I work.*" How had God the Father worked hitherto? By his acts of Providence, and by the acts of his mercy continued to the human family, as well on the Sabbath as on other days. The earth continues its revolution on its axis, and in its orbit; the moon also, and the planets continue their usual course, impelled by the power of God; the rain falls, vegetation continues its growth as usual, and God watches over, and preserves the lives of men. These acts may in the estimation of C. show Jehovah's total disregard for his Sabbath, but we ask if so, did they not also on the first seventh day of time, albeit it is said he rested? Jehovah's own language, however, may be read in "the Scripture of the prophets." Isa. lvi; lviii; Jer. xvii.

Jesus, who upholdeth "all things by the word of his power," [Heb. i,] broke the Sabbath in the same manner that his Father had. For he performed many good works on the Sabbath, and declared (this is something that the Pharisees and our opponents have always denied) that "it is *lawful* to do well on the Sabbath day."

But he declares that he had kept his Father's commandments. John xv, 10. Shall it be said of him, as it may too often be said of men who make a like declaration, that his acts directly contradict his profession? Or will it be said that the fourth is not one of his Father's commandments? But it will be noticed in the text quoted, that we are required to keep his commandments, *even as he had kept his Father's commandments*. If he kept only a part of them, and abode in his Father's love, we may pursue a similar course with the commandments of Jesus, and abide in his love. But who does not know better than that? "This is the love of God, [the Father,] that we keep his commandments." 1 John v, 3. "If ye love me, [Jesus,] keep my commandments," John xiv, 15. And we add, those that retain that which they "have heard from the beginning" [John i, 1; Gen. i, 1; ii, 1-3] will "continue in the Son, and in the Father." 1 John

ii, 24. They will "keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ." Rev. xii, 17.

Christ was made subject to the fourth commandment, in the same sense that he was to the whole law. Hear the apostle Paul: "God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, *made under the law.*" Gal. iv, 4. The disciples were *not greater* than their Lord.

We take leave of the position of C. relative to the Gospels, with these remarks:

1. Christ came to "magnify the law, and make it honorable." [Isa. xlii, 21,] but he relaxed its obligation, even *before* God had abolished it! it!

2. He "came to fulfill" the law, yet justified the violation of its fourth precept!!

3. He did more against the law than its worst enemy could have done; for while it was yet in existence, (as all must admit) he justified its violation, and then relaxed its claims so that it could not take hold on its transgressor.

4. James says that whosoever "shall fail with respect to one precept hath become guilty of all." [Macknight.] Jesus himself failed with respect to the fourth commandment and became guilty of all!!!

5. "Sin is the transgression of the law." According to C., [note also John ix, 21,] Jesus was a sinner. But according to the beloved disciple "In him is no sin." 1 John iii, 4, 5.

But as it was a mistaken notion with the Pharisees in regarding the "mint, anise, and cummin" of the law, as above its "weightier matter," "**MERCY**," that led them to make these charges against him who had kept his "Father's commandments," and had ever done "those things that please him," we ask if C. may not be laboring under a similar mistake? Whether or not that which C. has presented from the Gospels, will cause Jehovah to "have him excused" from obeying the fourth commandment, is now submitted to the reader,

The patient attention of the candid is asked, while we now attempt to follow C. through the book of Acts. We will present as concise and definite a statement of his views as possible.

1. The meetings attended by the apostles on the Sabbath were generally under the control of the Jews. This accounts for them. 2. The historical mention of the Sabbath, proves no more for it than a similar mention of the Passover, Pentecost &c. proves for them. The same argument from the New Testament that would prove the perpetuity of the Sabbath, would prove the perpetuity of the Jewish feasts also. This proves too much, therefore proves nothing to the point. 3. Paul traveled on the Sabbath, (Acts xiii, 13, 14,) and "chose a time to start from Philippi to Troas (a sail of five days) that would cause them to sail on the Sabbath day!" Acts xx, 6, 7.—4. They then waited at Troas six days till the time for the disciples meeting came, which was the first day of the week. "No mention is made of their having a meeting there on the Sabbath. This shows that the apostles and disciples did not respect the Sabbath, as such, either as to traveling or as a day of worship, but chose to meet on the first day of the week in preference."

We have often heard it remarked that drowning men will catch at straws, but we are sorry to see it so clearly proved in the case before us. We have traced the windings of C. through the Gospels, and shown (as we trust) the falsity of the view that charges Christ and his apostles with the sin of breaking the fourth commandment. He now tries from the Acts of the apostles to show that *they* had no regard for the Sabbath, but preferred the first day of the week in its stead. He has not told us what had become of the fourth commandment; perhaps he is preparing the way to do so.

1. That many of the meetings attended by the apostles were under the control of the Jews is very true. But it is quite remarkable that while we read of Paul's sojourn at Corinth (the very place where C. will show hereafter, that they were "*accustomed to meet on the first day for worship*") we read that he *worked at his trade*, and preached in the synagogue **EVERY SABBATH**. And this he did for a year and six months, persuading both Jews and Greeks, thus spending 78 Sabbaths. Acts, xviii, 1-11; xvii, 1-3. As this was Paul's manner respecting the Sabbath, we ask what was his manner respecting Sunday? Not one word is uttered respecting stated, or indeed any worship on that day, and it is not improbable that it was one of the days on which he *worked at his trade*. This may not prove that the fourth commandment is binding on us, but it does indicate that Paul's preference for Sunday was not very strong. But let us look a little further. Paul tells the Ephesians that he had "*kept back nothing that was profitable*" unto them.—Acts xx, 20. But did he ever intimate to them that Sunday had taken the place of the Sabbath of Jehovah? But let us find a place where the apostles preached to the Gentiles.—We pass over the account in Acts xvi, 13, and notice the account given in Acts xiii, 42-44. We there learn that Paul after preaching on the Sabbath in the synagogue, was requested by the GENTILES to preach to them the next Sabbath, which he accordingly did. Is it not remarkable that he should not have said, You need not wait the space of

a week, TO-MORROW is the day of apostolic preference on that day therefore come and hear? What would C. have said had a like request been made to him by those who do not regard the Sabbath? Have we found any thing as yet to excuse C. in wilful disobedience to the fourth commandment?

2. The book of Acts, indeed, contains the record of institutions which are done away, as well as of those still in force. The institution of the Sabbath, made for MAN at Creation; the ordinance of circumcision, made in the days of Abraham, for his literal seed; the ordinances of the Jewish church, made for it at the Exode; the ordinances of the Christian Church made for it by our Lord, are all mentioned. Shall we conclude then that all are abolished, or that all are in force? We will do neither. The Apostle to the Gentiles speaks; hear him: "Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, the law of commandments contained in ordinances." Eph. ii, 14-16. The ordinances of the Jewish church were abolished; the ordinances of the Christian Church have taken their place. The Sabbath is not a church ordinance, but, like the rest of the moral law, pertains to men as men, not as members of any church, but as moral beings accountable to God's government. Hence it is not relaxed, amended or abolished, by any change of dispensation! The feasts of the Jews, the Passover and unleavened bread, the Pentecost &c. were embodied in the hand-writing of ORDINANCES. The Sabbath is embodied in the fourth commandment of the royal law. The hand-writing of ordinances is abolished. Col. ii. The royal law is in full force. James ii. It is submitted, therefore, whether the same argument that establishes the ancient Sabbath of Jehovah, establishes the Jewish feasts also. We have been looking for something against the fourth commandment. C. has discovered that Paul did not keep the Sabbath. We will now examine his proof.

3. As proof that Paul did not regard the fourth commandment C. presents Acts xiii, 13, 14, to show that Paul arrived at Antioch in Pisidia on the Sabbath, and thus broke the rest of the Lord's Sabbath. Is this inference sufficient to prove that Paul violated the law of God? Rom. vii, 25; viii, 1-7. Is it stronger than that by which infant baptism is proved? Acts xvi, 15, 33. Or the one by which purgatory is proved? Matt. xii, 32. Or the doctrine of probation for the dead? 1 Pet. iii, 19, 20. Or the doctrine of the transmigration of souls? John ix, 1-3.—Would the rulers of the synagogue have been very likely to extend to Paul a courteous invitation to speak if he had just broken the Sabbath?

The account of Paul's voyage from Philippi to Troas next claims attention. We inquire then, did Paul by this act break the fourth commandment and teach men so? That he journeyed on the Sabbath from choice, is all assertion! Before it can be proved that there was any act of breaking the fourth commandment on the part of Paul, it ought to be shown that the distance was such that he could not expect to reach the port of Troas before the Sabbath; (Acts xvi, 11, 12;) as it now stands they might have been driven of adverse winds, as he was on his voyage to Rome, so that a sail of two or three days might have been more than doubled.—And even then, there is no evidence that they might not have kept the fourth commandment on the water, by resting on the Lord's day, and by solemnly dedicating themselves to him.

The moral character of Paul ought not to be impeached without better testimony! Why did not C. discover that the children of Israel, while carrying the Ark of God around Jericho, were violating the fourth commandment contained in that Ark? For one of the seven consecutive days on which they carried it, must have been the Sabbath. Josh. vi. But as Paul, a long time after this, speaks directly on the point, he shall have liberty to defend himself. Hear him: "I have committed NOTHING against the people, or customs of our fathers." Acts xxviii, 17. And if even the Jews neither spake nor showed any harm of him, [verse 21,] we think the fact ought to "shut the mouths of gainsayers," and convince them that they have laid a "grievous complaint against Paul, which they cannot prove!" Acts xxv, 7. Perhaps however false witnesses might be set up, as in the case of Stephen, [Acts vi,] to testify that he had not ceased to speak blasphemous words against the law. Rom. vii, 12. Shall this kind of proof that Paul violated the Sabbath be called "plain Bible testimony?" We assure all that if it cannot stand NOW, assuredly it will not, when "the hail shall sweep away the refuge of lies, and the water shall overflow the hiding place." Isa. xxviii, 15-17; Rev. xvi, 17-21. Would it not be better to make the truth your refuge against that fearful scene? Ps. xci; cxix, 142, 151; cxi, 7, 8; Isa. xxiv, 5, 6. Having endeavored to vindicate the character of HIM who has ever "magnified his word above all his name," also that of the Messiah, the disciples, the holy women, and the apostles, Paul and Barnabas, from the serious aspersions

thrown upon them, we take leave of this part of the subject, requesting the candid reader to decide whether they are on the side of the fourth commandment, or on the side of those who trample it under foot? Ps. i, 21, 22.

4. We now inquire into the evidences on which it is asserted that Paul preferred the first day of the week, to the day that Jehovah hallowed for man. As C. has nowhere shown what has become of Jehovah's Sabbath, except that Christ relaxed it, and that his followers did not keep it "according to the commandment," we feel interested to see what he will make out for its apostolic rival, the first day of the week.

The silence of Scripture respecting the manner in which Paul spent the six days at Troas cannot be taken as evidence that they had no meetings during this time. For consider that Paul was on his journey, hasting if it might be possible "to be at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost." Verse 16. That that numerous company of brethren should be waiting there six days in order to have Sunday come, (a day which God had never set apart,) in order to get the disciples together, would indicate that the disciples were much more attentive to worldly business, than to the company of the great Apostle. But the same silence is preserved respecting his abode in Greece three months, his abode at Tyre seven days, his sojourn at Cesarea many days. Verse 3; xxi, 1-10; ix, 43.

As there is no precept for Sunday keeping, those who wish to observe it, have but one way to obtain directions. How did Paul in this the only instance that can be hunted up, keep the Sunday? For it is not to be presumed that Paul's example can be improved upon, otherwise it is an imperfect example, and should not be followed.

We inquire then respecting their coming together to break bread. As we are to follow this pattern, we ask, When did Paul break bread? If our method of reckoning time (from midnight) was followed, which is not very probable, then this act of breaking bread was upon the second day of the week, as it took place AFTER midnight. The question would then be fairly before the mind, Shall we be governed by apostolic preference for Monday, or by our preference for Sunday?

But if the Bible method of reckoning time (from six o'clock P. M.) was followed, which is much more probable, it would then appear that they came together at the close of the holy Sabbath, for an evening meeting, (Does it not read like one?) Paul preached to them, broke bread early Sunday morning, and then started off on his long journey to Jerusalem!! Then it would be clear that he waited till "the Sabbath was past," had a farewell meeting all night with the disciples, and started "early in the morning, the first day of the week," for the city of his fathers.

Suppose however that the example on which C. rests, could be well sustained. How much does it prove, when we consider that "the breaking of bread" was instituted on Thursday eve, [Matt. xxvi, 26-30,] and at one period celebrated daily, not merely by the church at Troas, but by the apostolic church at Jerusalem? Acts ii. 41-47.

We hope to be pardoned for the following quotation; it is the best summing up of the evidence from this text, that we have ever seen. It was not written by a Sabbath-keeper.

"You who infer, because St. Paul, and the disciples at Troas, spent the whole night of the first day of the week in praying, preaching, and heavenly conference, in regard he was to leave them and depart on the morrow; therefore, St. Paul and the disciples at Troas met that night to keep holy the day past; therefore, the disciples at Troas met every first day of the week, to keep that day holy; therefore the Church at Philippi, the Church in Cilicia, and all Christian Churches, did then keep holy the first day of the week; therefore all the apostles did constantly keep holy that day; therefore Christ and his apostles appointed the first day of the week to be forever celebrated, instead of the Sabbath. Is not this pitiful logic? Do you not beguile and mislead the people?"—Edward Fisher. 1653.

There would be a pyramid of evidence in the above, could we begin with the last conclusion, and reason back to the first statement. But as it now stands, the pyramid rests upon its apex, not upon its base, and those who stand upon it, are on slippery places, and in imminent danger of being cast "down into destruction." Ps. lxxiii, 18. Can it be said that C. has proved his point by "plain Bible testimony?"—If it be so, then, verily, (as a universalist once told me,) "It takes but little to prove the truth." Whether the straws that C. has gathered from the book of Acts will save him from the abyss of the Roman decretals, the reader must judge. But he has further testimony to offer for this apostolic institution. Hear him:

"Paul's instruction to the churches in Galatia and Corinth

is in keeping with this, 1 Cor. xvi, 1, 2. The collection for the saints was to be taken on the first day of the week.—This clearly implies that they were accustomed to meet on that day of the week, not to keep the Sabbath, but worship God and attend to the services and duties of the Christian Church."

The text quoted above does not, to be sure, prove that the people might not have gone to meeting after every one had laid by him in store, though it does not even intimate any thing of the kind, but it does prove that at the time when this injunction, "every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him," should be obeyed, each must be at his own home!! Having done this they could, when Paul should come, each take to him what they had gathered, as easily as we can take our Bibles with us to meeting. There would be nothing ostentatious about this manner of acting. Public contributions were forbidden by our Lord. Matt. vi, 3, 4. "But when thou doest alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth: that thine alms may be in secret: and thy Father, which seeth in secret, himself shall reward thee openly." Paul did not contradict this injunction of our Lord, nor does he even seem so to do. (We would commend the direction of Paul to the conscientious observer of the fourth commandment.) "Thus easily," as J. B. Cook remarks, "is ALL the wind taken from the sails of those who sail, perhaps unwittingly, under the Pope's Sabbatic flag."

This uses up all the inferences presented by C. with which to construct a first-day institution out of apostolic "preference." If C. be still bent on doing this, we now suggest that "the successor to the chief Apostle" can furnish any amount of evidence desired. ("The Catholic church commands all her children to keep the Sunday, and the festivals of the saints.") The Sabbath of the Elders rests(?) upon a rolling pebble: the Sabbath of Jehovah rests upon a solid rock. They are now submitted for choice. 1 Kings xviii, 21.

[Concluded in our next.]

THE REVIEW AND HERALD.

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

SARATOGA SPRINGS, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1852.

Editorial Correspondence. OUR TOUR WEST.

A brief statement of our present tour, thus far, may be interesting to the readers of the "Review and Herald." The conference at Camden, which commenced Dec. 25th, was a profitable meeting to those present. By reason of a heavy snow-storm but few attended from a distance. We were happy to find Bro. Baker at the place of meeting when we arrived. The word preached found way to some hearts who have recently become interested in the present truth. May the Lord keep them.

By reason of stormy weather and ill health we were unable to attend the conferences at Pitcher and Bath. This was a great trial to us. But Bro. Baker attended both. These meetings have proved a great blessing to the brethren, and have been the means of bringing others to the knowledge of the truth. The Lord has blessed his truth, spoken by Bro. Baker, at Wheeler, and several have come out clear. Our meeting here at Bath commences this evening. Bro. Baker is with us. We expect the Lord will meet with us, and that much good will result from the meeting. We go from here to Pitcher, Oswego and Lorain.

At Oswego we found the brethren in trial, caused principally by the distracting influence of some who have put altogether too much confidence in dreams. We were exceedingly grieved that any professing to believe in the present truth should put such a stumbling-block in the way of those who are weak in the faith. We presented the Word as the only rule of faith and duty, and all seemed to come right again. The erring confessed, and the weak were much encouraged and blest. The Lord has done much for his dear people in Oswego. Bro. Wedrick, Benson, and Patch with their companions, who have recently embraced the Sabbath, are now strong in the truth.

We also visited the friends at Rochester and Greece, and had meetings of much interest with them. In the vicinity of Rochester many are becoming interested in the Sabbath, and we expect that the Lord will raise up a strong company in that region to stand in the battle in the day of the Lord.

We find that in many places our views of Bible truth are grossly misrepresented, therefore many honest seekers after truth have a large amount of prejudice that must be removed before they are prepared to listen profitably to the evidences of our position. All that is necessary is, that our real views should be understood, then the sincere will gladly embrace them.

We were never more confident that the truth would triumph gloriously than now. We never realized the importance of all the brethren moving in the counsel of God as we now realize it. Our opponents are active.—They have their eye on us, and are ready to do what they can to hinder the progress of the cause of truth. Dear Brethren, let us be active. We should know that there is a great amount of prejudice against us as a people. Let us, in the strength of the Lord, so live, and so present the truth of the Bible, as to break down this prejudice in the minds of the honest. There is mighty power in the simple truth of the word of the Lord, when spoken by one whose heart is subdued by the grace and filled with the Love of God.

Brethren, can you weep over the erring and deceived children of God? If not, get a little lower. O, get down into the valley where salvation's stream flows sweetly, and drink. May the Lord help us to speak the truth in love, and show to all around that God is with us.

Bath, (N. Y.), Jan. 23d, 1852

J. W.

OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

BY R. F. COTTRELL.

Obj. It requires both a command and a penalty to constitute a law. God's commandments were written on the tables of stone, and the penalty (death by the hand of man) in the law of Moses. When this was done away, the law was done away, for a law cannot exist without a penalty. Under the gospel the execution of the penalty is taken into the hands of God himself, who judges him a murderer who hates his brother, and condemns him to the second death.

Ans. A law must have a penalty. Read the tables, and see if there is nothing said about "visiting the iniquity" of those who disobey. In the fifth, the commandment with promise, *Life is held forth to the obedient, in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee.* What land is that? The land promised to Abraham. What was promised to Abraham? "That he should be heir of the world." Rom. iv, 13. "For he looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." Heb. xi, 10. The land of Canaan was only a faint shadow of "the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee." Life then in the promised land, (the land where the city is,) is the reward of obedience to the law of God. And this agrees with Rev. xxii, 14: "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city."

If life is the reward of obedience, death is the punishment of disobedience. God will judge the ancients as well as the moderns, according to the disposition of the heart. He that hated his brother in ancient time was a murderer as much as now. God never put it into the hands of men to inflict the penalty of his law. The infliction of temporal death under the law of Moses was, like the rest of that law, a *shadow*—a shadow of the penalty which God will inflict on those who die in their sins. The full penalty of sin was, and is, and will be, eternal death. I repeat it, man never executed the penalty of the law of God. None but He that knows the heart can do it. Alas! for human wisdom. It can make the real law of God a shadow, and the shadow of the penalty, a reality.

Obj. The Sabbath must have been confined to a particular locality on earth, from the fact that the day begins and ends at different times in different parts of the earth.

Ans. This argument, taken in connexion with scripture testimony, charges God with folly. "The Sabbath was made for man," and man was made to inherit the earth. Human wisdom says, in order to keep the Sabbath of the Lord, we must begin and end it, all over the earth at the same moment; but the Pope's sabbath is more accommodating—it can be kept in any part of the world. Satan does not care whether you honor the Pope or not, if he can persuade you to dishonor God. Do you believe that Jehovah was ignorant of the shape and motions of the earth, when he testified by Isaiah that the time should come when *all flesh* should come from one Sabbath to another, to worship before the Lord? Isa. lxvi, 23. Will the Sabbath then be confined to the particular locality of Judea?

I must quote from a poetic argument written by Wm. Stillman, some thirty or forty years ago.

"And now to trace you round this rolling world,
An eastern, and a western route you've twirled,
And made out nothing by the spacious travel,
But what I call a wretched, foolish cavil.
And now to make you clearly understand
That Sabbath day may be in every land,
At least those parts where mortal men reside,
(And nowhere else can precepts be applied.)
There was a place, where first the orb of light
Appeared to rise, and westward took its flight;
That moment, in that place the day began,
And as he in his circuit westward ran,
Or rather, as the earth did eastward spin,
To parts more westward daylight did begin.
And thus at different times, from place to place
The day began—this clearly was the case.
And I should think a man must be a dunce,
To think that day began all round at once,
So that in foreign lands it doth appear,
There was a first day there as well as here.
And if there was a first, the earth around,
As sure as rates the seventh can be found.
And thus you see it matters not a whit,
On which meridian of earth we get,
Since each distinctly had its dawn of light,
And ever since, successive day and night,
Thus while our antipodes in darkness sleep,
We here the true, primeval Sabbath keep."

A man's attention is called to a truth which he is not obeying. He seems convicted of his error, but having a choice to continue a popular practice, he goes at work to reason himself into the belief that it is right, and any flimsy inference answers his purpose. It matters not if it impeach the wisdom of God, and make him just such a being as ignorant, short-sighted, changeable man.

If the ten commandments were ever abolished, how long was it before the nine were re-enacted? If there was no intervening time, they never were abolished; and if there was, Jehovah's creatures were under no obligation to him during that time. Judged by human wisdom, what an oversight our Heavenly Father committed in making an institution for man, that could not be universally enjoyed! What an oversight, to place a Jewish rite with the eternal law of right on the tables of stone, so that afterwards, when the error was discovered, the nine must be annulled to get rid of the one! This wisdom is not from above.

LETTERS.

From Bro. Cottrell.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—Everything confirms me in the faith, that the third angel's message is now being given. It could not have been given while the people of God were ignorant of the meaning of its terms. But when the clear light shines upon the subject, so that we know what is meant by the beast, his image, his mark and the number of his name; also the commandments of God, in distinction from the faith of Jesus; then is the time for the message to go forth.

It comes also in the exact order of prophetic events; and we must acknowledge the hand of God in it, or think that our Heavenly Father has given the helm into the hands of satan—suffering him to give a false fulfillment of the divine word, and thus lead astray those who are looking for Jesus according to his promise, and willing to obey God in ALL his commandments.

Again, it is evident, from the present state of the world, that the angels of Rev. vii, 1 are now holding the winds. If there was no disposition for strife among men apparent, but a general time of peace, we could not see so clearly that the winds were held. But it is clear to my mind, that nothing but the power of God through the heavenly messengers has prevented general war throughout Europe for some years past. Now, while the winds are held, the servants of God are being sealed, for that is the purpose for which they are held.—The present being the time, who administers the seal but the third angel of Rev. xiv, who gives the last message before the Son of man is seen upon the white cloud with a sharp sickle, ready to reap the harvest of the earth? The seal imprints the Father's name in the forehead of those who have not the mark of the beast in that place. Has the third angel this seal? Yes, the commandments of God contain the Father's name, especially the fourth, which is the only one of the ten that distinguishes the Lord from every other god, as being the Maker of all things.

ROSSELL F. COTTRELL.

Mill Grove, (N. Y.), Jan. 18th, 1852.

From Bro. Philbrick.

DEAR BRO. WHITE: The keeping of the Sabbath in the third angel's message has endeared me to you, and all of like precious faith. How do we know that we love the children of God? John v. 2, 3 shall be the answer: "By this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God and keep his commandments." For this is the love of God that we keep his commandments; and his commandments are not grievous.

I am thankful, that, while I was starving for the true word of life, the Lord was pleased to send Bro. Rhodes and Baker with the present truth. It reached my heart, and its clear light dispelled the darkness that surrounded me, and I was enabled to break away from the unhallowed influence of denying our past experience. Glory be to God's holy name. I will praise him unworthy as I am.

I feel solemn in view of that time when there will no longer be a mediator between God and man. And unless I have a pure heart, and my garments unspotted from the world, I shall not be able to stand in the great day of his wrath. Never did I feel the importance of being *wholly consecrated*, as now. And as the way grows straiter, and the battle stronger, I feel to gird on the armor closer, and fight valiantly unto the end. If I am made a partaker of Christ's sufferings here, when his glory is revealed, I shall rejoice with exceeding great joy.

Yours in hope of eternal life at the appearing of Christ and his kingdom,

J. PHILBRICK.

Washington, (N. H.), Jan. 13th, 1852.

From Sister Griggs.

DEAR BRO. WHITE: We were disappointed in not seeing you at the conference in Bath, yet the Lord was with us, and we were encouraged and strengthened in meeting with the dear saints, by hearing their testimonies to the truth, and work of God, and the faithful labors of Bro. Baker in declaring the third angel's message, and the glorious truths connected with it. Light shone very clear on the shut door, and cleansing of the Sanctuary in heaven, where our great High Priest has entered to finish the work of atonement.

Ye servants of the living God, who are seeking out and feeding the lost sheep of the house of Israel with "meat in due season," be of good courage. "Fear not the reproach of men, neither be afraid of their revilings for great is your reward in Heaven."

My heart is joyful in anticipation of the time when our Father's children will all be gathered home: then the conflicts of this life will have passed away, and ye who have followed the example of Christ in his humiliation will be exalted to inherit the kingdom he has gone to prepare. O praise to God for the increase of faith and strength he gives me.

Though now we are scattered abroad, and are pilgrims in a strange land, we have the same spirit of adoption whereby we cry Abba Father, and angels as ministering spirits to guard us from evil, and comfort our hearts while toiling here amid trials and afflictions: yet nothing that we may be called to endure is worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed. Let us therefore gird on the whole armor of light that we may be able to resist the influence of dark spirits by which we are surrounded, and stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free, and take heed that we are not entangled with the cares of this life, and the spirit of worldly mindedness, which is one of the snares of these perilous times, by which the enemy will strive to divert our minds from the truth, and that preparation we must have in order to stand without an intercessor when Jesus comes out of the Sanctuary, having laid aside the garments of the priest's office, and taken the garments of vengeance, to render a just recompense to his adversaries.

Let us be clothed with humility and grieve not the Holy Spirit whereby we are sealed unto the day of redemption, nor rest short of the hourly witness in our hearts that we please our Father in Heaven, and are covered with the covering of his Spirit, that we may be hid in the pavilion of the Almighty in the time of trouble. Enoch before he was translated had this testimony that he pleased God, and this abiding testimony must we have to obtain final de-

liverance. O, my Saviour, grant us that preparation we must have to live in this mortal state and be accepted of God without a mediator. I want the preparation now and dare not put it off, expecting to receive it at the descent of the latter rain. I know that my Redeemer is mine and I am his, and am willing to do or suffer anything for his sake.

Yours in hope of Eternal life, SARAH GRIGGS.
Avoca. (N. Y.), Jan. 14th, 1852.

Extracts of Letters.

Bro. E. S. Eastman writes from Hatley, (C. E.), Jan. 12th, 1852:—I feel it my duty to acknowledge my gratitude for the paper, which comes as a messenger of mercy to enlighten my dark understanding in the truths of the Bible.

I thank the Lord that I ever heard the third angel's message. It has supplied a void since '44 that nothing else could fill.

I feel like a pilgrim and stranger in this vale of tears. But I seek a city that has foundations, whose builder and maker is God.

No foot of land do I possess,
No cottage in this wilderness—
A poor wayfaring man.
I stop awhile in tents below,
And gladly wander to and fro,
Till I enjoy my rest.

I feel willing to do all I can in the cause of the Lord and his truth. O, that we may all be looking and loving his appearing, and confess our errors, and have them blotted out, when the refreshing from the presence of the Lord shall come.

Bro. J. Alden writes from Bath, (N. Y.), Jan. 15th, 1852:—We were disappointed in not seeing you at the conference here, yet the Lord was with us, and the dear brethren and sisters returned home rejoicing in the blessed hope of soon meeting in the kingdom. Some came on foot seventy and ninety miles to attend.

Bro. Baker faithfully set before us the promises and threatenings connected with the present truth, in the clearest light, and good has been done in the name of Jesus.

The truth seems to carry conviction to the minds of almost all who have heard.

I do believe the Lord will here gather some precious jewels for the "second casket."

Bro. G. W. Holt writes from Dorchester, (Mass.), Jan. 21st, 1862:—The interest in the present truth is increasing. We have no reason to be discouraged, for the Lord is with us in power. Although we meet with trials, disappointments, and seeming difficulties, yet the Lord is at work, and his truth is advancing, and is surely destined to triumph.

I feel like pressing forward with all my might, and doing what I can in this glorious cause, that I may do the will of God in all things,

A Sister writes from Montpelier, (Vt.), Jan. 22nd, 1852:—That precious promise, that I may have right to the tree of life, and enter in through the gates into the city, is very dear to me, while striving to do his commandments. I am thankful for the light that now shines upon his holy word. The jewels are shining brighter and brighter, and some are coming up, that have until recently been buried beneath the rubbish, O, magnify the Lord, and let us exalt his name together.

I want to make thorough work for eternity, for I believe that time is near, when Jesus will have finished his work, and the servants of God will all be sealed; then he that is filthy must be filthy still.

O, let us pray earnestly to God, and trust in him, and he will direct our path. Yes, praise his name he will never leave us to our own understanding, as long as we are willing to be taught of him.

O, my heart is enraptured with the vision, and I long to share with all the saints and holy angels the joys of paradise.

THE PAPER.

We have the advice of the Committee, with several other brethren, in favor of using the nice paper for publishing the "Review and Herald," as the expense is so trifling. We think that none of the real friends of the cause would object to a few cents in a volume of good paper. As far as interest is concerned, some have even remarked, "They would to God it was engraved in marble."

THE SABBATH.

BY H. O. NICHOLS.

The evening shades steal gently on,
I fain would rest:
Let earthly care this day be gone—
Divinely blest.
Brightest and best of all the seven
Is this, the day my God has given;
'Tis as it were a type of heaven—
The Sabbath.

Welcome, thou peaceful sacred day,
Welcome to thee!
My thoughts I'd lift to God, and pray
Unceasingly.
That it may be my chief delight,
Ever with all my mind and might
To improve the hours, and keep aright
The Sabbath.

Thou blissful period of repose,
To travelers worn.
A balm to heal the many woes,
Of those that mourn.
New strength it gives us while we may,
Journey along o'er life's rough way,
We'll reverence while on earth we stay,
The Sabbath.

Thou art a time of smiling peace,
To hearts now sad:
Pointing unto the great release,
When all are glad.
Hope like a bright star cheers the soul,
While hastening onward to the goal—
Then find when time shall cease to roll,
The Sabbath.

This truth like holy fire it burns—
'Twill ne'er decline:
It came from heaven—to heaven returns,
God's hallow'd time!
And though for ages it has lain
Buried beneath traditions vain,
Its light is shining bright again,
The Sabbath.

Gem of the week, the best of all
Created days.
'Twas made for man before the fall—
Give God the praise!
And upward lift your longing eyes
To greet his coming from the skies:
When all will keep in Paradise,
The Sabbath.

Then lift your hearts the time is near,
Ye pilgrims lone;
When Jesus will for you appear—
Then think of Home!
Think of the hours that ne'er will end;
And fervent let each prayer ascend,
That we may all in glory spend,
The Sabbath.

There shall we all each other meet.
In peace together!
There brother will his brother greet,
And naught will sever.
Sorrow will never dim the eye,
No clouds e'er pass the heavenly sky;
Sweet then will be the rest on high,
The Sabbath.

Dorchester, Mass.

"LET NO MAN DECEIVE YOU."

To those who have recently embraced the Sabbath, Dear Brethren: "Take heed that no man deceive you," is the warning of the Son of God. The followers of Christ have ever been in danger of being deceived; but you are aware that the "perils" of the "last days" are upon us, and that our dangers are fast increasing. This is an age of deception, and if possible the very elect will be deceived.

But, perhaps, there is no class of men by whom you are so much in danger of being deceived and led from the truth as those who teach that the commandments of God are abolished. Many of them have for a number of years taught that there is no Sabbath for the gospel dispensation; therefore they are prepared to bring objections against the Sabbath that those who have just commenced to study the arguments cannot readily remove. Here they will take advantage of your lack of a thorough knowledge of the subject, and if possible ensnare you.

"The Bible class on the Sabbath question" is a snare for the feet of those precious souls who have recently commenced to "run the way of the commandments." We approve of investigation when conducted with fairness. And if those who teach that the commandments of God are abolished really wish to investigate the Sabbath question, why do they not meet our arguments with candor and fairness? If the Editor of the "Advent Harbinger" has the truth why does he not produce his strong reasons, instead of coming out on the "Review" and the "reviewer" as he has done? See his articles in the "Harbinger." The spirit of those articles is sufficient to convince any candid individual that the writer is unable to present Bible argument; therefore,

assertions and over-bearing denunciations are called in to make up the deficiency.

If candid investigation is really desired, on the Sabbath question we are ready, and happy to meet our opponents on Bible ground. But let those brethren who have not a knowledge of the arguments, for and against the Sabbath, be careful and not be deceived by the plea of "investigate." If those who profess a wish to investigate this question are really sincere, you will see them seeking investigation with those who understand the arguments, instead of going to those who have not had time and opportunity to learn them. "Take heed that no man deceive you."

To Correspondents.

We are under the necessity of reminding those who send in names for the paper, that much care should be taken to give the name and address distinctly. By complying with this, we shall not only be saved much time and perplexity, but the subscribers will not be disappointed in receiving their paper.

PUBLICATIONS.

THE ADVENT REVIEW, a pamphlet of 48 pages, containing thrilling testimonies by many of the leaders of the Advent cause.

THE BIBLE SABBATH, or a careful selection from the publications of the American Sabbath Tract Society, including the history of the Sabbath—64 pages.

THOUGHTS ON THE SABBATH, AND THE PERPETUITY OF THE LAW OF GOD, by J. N. Andrews—32 pages.

SEVENTH DAY SABBATH—48 pages.

THE PARABLE, MATTHEW XXV, 1—12—24 pages.

A brief exposition of the Angels of Rev. xiv.—32 pages.

The above publications can be had of us at Saratoga Springs, of Elias Goodwin, Oswego, (N. Y.), and all excepting the last named of Otis Nichols, Dorchester, (Mass.)

VOLUME I OF THE REVIEW AND HERALD.—We have a quantity bound in paper covers, which should be circulated. Brethren, this is a valuable work for you to obtain to lend or give to those who wish to learn the reasons of our faith.

NUMBERS 6 AND 8.—We have extra copies of these two numbers for distribution. No. 6 contains our entire review of the article, "Seventh-day Sabbath Abolished," and No. 8 contains the lengthy article on Babylon, from the Voice of Truth of 1844, the "Review of O. R. L. Crozier on Rev. xiv, 1—13," by J. N. Andrews, and our remarks on the Sabbath in reply to the Editor of the Harbinger." We hope they will be called for and judiciously circulated.

CONFERENCES.

A general Meeting is appointed to commence Sabbath Feb. 21st, at the house of Bro. Everett, Leverett (Mass.), and hold as long as thought best. Bro. G. W. Holt is expected to be present. Bro. Baker is requested to attend if consistent with duty.

There will be a Conference at Fair-haven, (Mass.), at the house of Bro. William Gifford, to commence Friday Feb. 27th, to continue over the Sabbath and First-day, and longer if thought best. A general invitation is extended. It is earnestly hoped that Brn. White, Rhodes, or some other of the ministering brethren will be present. And we pray that it may be a time of refreshing from the presence of the Lord, and the means of much good.

In behalf of the brethren, O, DAVIS.

Brn. Bates and Edson have returned from their tour to Canada West.

Bro. H. S. Case writes from Jackson, (Mich.), encouragingly of the state of the cause.

The brethren in Milan, (O.), are desirous that some of the messengers should visit that way.

There is a wide field open in the West. "The harvest truly is great, but the laborers are few."

Letters received since January 13th.

J. N. Andrews 3, S. W. Rhodes 3, R. F. Cottrell 2, S. Howland 2, H. S. Case 2, H. O. Nichols 2, F. M. Shimper 2, R. G. Whitcomb, A. Chapman, J. K. Bellows, C. B. Spalding, J. Lindsey, N. Rublee, E. L. Eastman, J. Alden S. Griggs, J. Philbrick, F. Wheeler, E. L. H. Chamberlain, L. Hastings, E. A. Poole, H. A. Hastings, A. S. Stevens, O. Davis, M. S. Prior, J. S. Wright, M. D. Elger, A. P. Marsley, H. S. Gurney, P. D. Lawrence, J. Hebrner, G. W. Holt, E. Cray, J. Martin, J. B. Sweet, G. Smith.

Receipts.

C. Stevens, \$3; J. R. Gaveth, L. Kellogg, W. H. Graham, J. Crandal, H. P. Wakefield, M. Orr, \$2 each; J. Chapman, C. P. Russell, J. Whitmore, E. Mugford, P. Gibson, D. Barnes, R. Coggeshall, T. Raymond, E. L. Platt, O. Raymond, C. Gould, S. Macomber, L. Leach, B. Madill, \$1 each; C. Davis 65 cts; P. C. Champlin, H. M. Reed, B. Ball, John Post, 50 cts. each.

For the Pamphlet entitled "Experience and Views," F. G. Stevens, \$1.

The cost of the Pamphlet was about \$100, of which about \$78 has been received.