

SECOND ADVENT REVIEW, AND SABBATH HERALD.

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

Vol. I.

PARIS, ME., JANUARY, 1851.

No. 4.

JOSEPH BATES, S. W. RHODES, J. N. ANDREWS, and
JAMES WHITE, Publishing Committee.
G. L. MCELLEN & CO., Printers.

TERMS—Gratis, except the reader desires to aid in its publication.
All communications, orders, and remittances, for the Review and Herald,
should be addressed to JAMES WHITE, Paris, Me., (Post paid.)

THE SABBATH.

Now dawns through heaven and earth the Sabbath day.

Auspicious season hail! with cheerful song
Thy glad return we celebrate below,
While, though in loftier yet symphonious strains,
Angelic choirs thy welcome chant above.

Yea, thou art welcome, for thy holy sway
Quells the wild tumult of the troubled soul,
And softly whispers peace. The sorrowing heart
Grows glad at thine approach, and spirits faint,
Fanned by thy hallow'd breath revive and smile.
From the rapt vision fades the world away,
And saints in union sweet, draw near to heaven.

Thou Prince of days expressly made for man!
O had we seraph harps, we'd sing thy praise
In numbers worthy the exalted theme.
We'd rise superior to the angelic throng,
And their impassioned minstrelsy outvie;
Because this sacred morn for us doth shine.
(Poor pilgrims wandering 'mid earth's gloom profound.)
To us by the creating hand was given
This dear memorial of creating love;
This beacon lighted at the burning Throne,
Piercing night's deepest shades, and scattering wide
Celestial radiance on the darksome way.

We will ascribe to God the glory due;
Will honor him who sitteth on the throne
And will rejoice before him; for his name
Is high exalted far above all gods.
Honor and might and majesty are his.
Creation bears his signature divine,
And loud attests the greatness of his power.

Ere ancient Time his measured course began,
When embryo earth appeared, formless and void,
When silence reigned, and universal night
Mantled the bosom of the mighty deep;
Then went the mandate forth, th' omnific word
Borne on the breath of Deity afar,
Traversed the echoing gloom;—nor void returned;
Nature awoke, responsive to the call,
And sprang to life in all her varied forms.
And in th' approval of the smiling God
Exulting, her majestic course began.

Six days the Almighty labored with his word.
But now his labors ceased; and heralded
By the clear anthem of the "morning stars,"
Crowned with excessive glory, shone on high
The first Sabatic morn. To greet its dawn,
All heaven joined in univocal song;
Mellifluous voices filled the balmy air,
Accompanied by harps of sweetest note,
Hymning the praises of creating love,
And the bright glories of the day of rest.

Momentous day! its first observer He;
The high and lofty One, whose fearful name
Gleams as a signet on its haly brow.
Alone ordained and sanctified by Him,
And with His blessing blest forevermore.

When from the sacred mount;
Whose cloudy top and trembling base proclaimed
The awful grandeur of its Guest sublime,
In thunder tones went forth the "Royal law,"
God's will to man, made known in ten commands;

On that dread morn, while to its centre shook
The steadfast earth, and Israel in dismay
Turned from the fearful sight, nor could endure
The voice of Him that spake; the great decree
Unchangeable was passed on all below.

"Six days may work be done, but on the seventh,
Which is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God,
Thou and all thine shalt rest; for in six days
The Lord made heaven and earth and all therein,
And rested on the seventh, and hallowed it."

Based on this grand foundation, stands secure
The Sabbath of the LORD. And who art thou,
That rashly dream'st to pluck this fabric down;
And on its ruins to erect thine own,
Thy Ulest, thy sanctified! Short-sighted man!
Canst thou command unnumbered worlds from naught?
Or canst thou thunder with a voice like Him?
Then mayest thou think to change the law divine.
Thy weakness know, and know that God is strong,
And jealous of his glory; and who dares
With impious hand to touch his high renown,
Shall his displeasure prove, and taste his ire.

Blest all-immortal day! Ah, it shall stand;
Unmoved amid the strife of mortal tongues—
Unmoved amid the ruin of the world;
And while Eternity his mighty years
Shall roll unnumbered o'er the earth made new,
Effulgent shine in glory's noontide ray,
By nations who are saved, observed for aye.

Paris, Me., Dec., 1850.

H. N. STEVENS.

HISTORY OF THE SABBATH.—CONTINUED.

THE SABBATH SINCE THE REFORMATION. —

With the commencement of the Reformation a new spirit of religious inquiry was awakened. Nearly every item of Christian practice was brought under consideration, and not dismissed until either approved or rejected. Among the subjects for discussion we find the Sabbath early introduced and thoroughly examined. There were three leading views then maintained by different classes of the Reformers, which deserve particular notice.

1. One class of Reformers there was, who, dwelling alone on the sufficiency of faith, and the freedom of the Gospel, trembled at the thought of imposing rules upon men, and seemed to fear the term *law*. These declared that the law of the Sabbath was abolished; that Sunday was no Sabbath, only a festival of the church, which had been appointed, and might be altered at her pleasure. That we may not be thought in error here, as well as to give a fuller understanding of the opinions of that time, we will present the assertions of some of these men.

Bishop Cranmer's Catechism, A. D. 1548, says:—"The Jews were commanded in the Old Testament to keep the Sabbath-day, and they observed it every seventh day, called the Sabbath, or Saturday; but we Christian men are not bound to such commandments in Moses' law, and therefore we now keep no more the Sabbath, or Saturday, as the Jews did, but we observe the Sunday and some other days, as the magistrates do judge convenient."

William Tindal says, in his answer to More, chap. 25:—"We be lords over the Sabbath, and may change it into Monday, or any other day, as we see need. Or may make every tenth day holy-day, only if we see cause why; we may make two every week, if it were expedient, and one not enough to teach the people. Neither was there any cause to change it from the Saturday than to put difference between us and the Jew, and lest we should become servants to the day after their superstition."

Bullinger, on Rev. i, 10, says:—"Christian churches entertained the Lord's day not upon any commandment from God, but according to their free choice."

Melancthon says:—"The Lord's day from the Apostles' age, hath been a solemn day: notwithstanding, we find not the same commanded by any Apostolic law; but it is collected from hence that the observation thereof was free, because *Epiphanius* and *St. Augustine* testify that on the fourth and the sixth days of the week church assemblies were held, as well as upon the Lord's day."

The Augustan Confession, drawn up by *Melancthon*, and approved by *Luther*, says:—"We teach that traditions are not to be condemned which have a religious end, namely, traditions concerning holy-days, the Lord's day, the feast of the nativity, Easter, &c."

These passages distinctly do away with the Sabbath, and place the observation of Lord's day on the ground of human authority. In the books of some early authors who adopted these views, may be found frequent references to a difficulty which drove them to deny the perpetuity of the Sabbath. *Bishop White*, in 1635, says:—"If the fourth commandment, concerning the keeping of the seventh day, is moral and perpetual, then it is not such in respect to the first and eighth day; for this precept requireth the observance of that one only day which it specieth in that commandment." In speaking of Lord's day, he says:—"Every day of the week and of the year is the Lord's; and the Sunday is no more the Lord's by the law of the fourth commandment, than the Friday; for the Lord's day of that fourth commandment is the Saturday."

In each of these quotations it seems to have been felt to be inconsistent to allow the perpetuity of the Sabbath, without keeping the seventh day. But to come back to this ancient day, and keep it in company with Jews, seemed too great a change.—Hence the abrogation of the institution was asserted, as the easiest way of escaping from the dilemma. *John Milton* speaking of this difficulty, says:—"If we under the Gospel are to regulate the time of our public worship by the prescriptions of the Decalogue, it will surely be far safer to observe *the seventh day*, according to the express command of God, than, on the authority of mere human conjecture, to adopt the *first*."

Another influence which led to the rejection of the Sabbath by these men, was the view of it which was held by the Roman Church. When the leaders of the Reformation separated from that church, it was claimed that all her festival days, including Sunday, were holier than other days, not only in relation to the use made of them, but to a natural and *inherent holiness* wherewith they thought them to be invested. In addition to this, many and hurtful restraints had been imposed upon the consciences of God's people, until these were days of *punishment*, rather than holy pleasure and profit. Seeing the days perverted from their real design, and made the means of strengthening papal power, it is not surprising that they were discarded together. Anxious to escape one error, they embraced another equally dangerous.

2. But another class of Reformers, (probably somewhat fearful of the consequences of those lax notions to which we have just referred,) considering that the Sabbath was given in Paradise, rehearsed at Sinai, and placed among the precepts of the Decalogue, declared that it must be moral in its nature, and perpetually binding. But having allowed its perpetuity, and having rested its claims upon the fourth commandment, the way of explaining and enforcing the change of the day, presented an obstacle to the spread of this view. How this was removed, let their own words answer. *Dr. Bound*, in 1595, says, "The fourth commandment is simply and perpetually moral, and not ceremonial, in whole or in part." *Richard Bifield*, 1630, says, "The fourth commandment is part of the law of nature, and thus part of the image of God, and is no more capable of a ceremony to be in it than God is." Afterwards he says, "The institution of the Lord's day is clearly in the work of Christ's resurrection; as the institution of the seventh day was in the work of finishing the creation." "The resurrection applieth and determineth the Sabbath of the fourth commandment to the Lord's day." Such was the course of reasoning adopted by this class of persons. Having established the morality and perpetuity of the Sabbath by means of Scripture, and brought the sanctions of the word of God to sustain them, they apply all this to the support of an institution, the existence and time of keeping which is inferred from Christ's resurrection. It is easy to see what must have been the consequence.

3. A third class may be found among the disputants about the Sabbath, who endeavored, by strict adherence to the Scriptures, to escape the difficulties and inconsistencies into which others had been led. They contended for the early institution of the Sabbath, for its morality and perpetuity as inferred from its being placed in the Decalogue, and for *the seventh day of the week*, as an essential and necessary part of the commandment. *Theophilus Bralourne*, in 1628, says:—"1. The fourth commandment of the Decalogue is a divine precept, simply and entirely moral, containing nothing legally ceremonial, in whole or in part, and therefore the weekly observation thereof ought to be perpetual, and to continue in full force and virtue to the world's end. 2. The Saturday, or seventh day of the week, ought to be an everlasting holy-day in the Christian Church, and the religious observation of this day obligeth Christians under the Gospel, as it did the Jews before the coming of Christ. 3. The Sunday, or Lord's day, is an ordinary working day; and it is superstition and will-worship to make the same the Sabbath of the fourth commandment." These opinions were vindicated by *Brabourne*, in two volumes, which appeared, one in 1628, and the other in 1632. They have never been answered to the satisfaction of many candid minds. It is true an answer has been attempted. But this answer, laboring as it did mainly to prove that such doctrine "is repugnant to the public sentence of the Church of England, and to the sentence of divines who lived at the beginning of the Reformation," could not satisfy one who believed the Scriptures to be a sufficient rule of faith and practice. To these volumes might be added others, which appeared soon after, and to the results of which, living witnesses have testified from that day to this. It was while the discussion just referred to was yet in progress, that *King James*, in 1618, published his Book of Sports for Sunday, in which is set forth, that "by the preciseness of some magistrates and ministers in several places in this kingdom, in hindering people from their recreations on the Sunday; the papists in this realm being thereby persuaded that no honest mirth or recreation was tolerable in our religion," wherefore, it pleased his majesty to set out his declaration, "that for his good people's lawful recreation, his pleasure was, that after the end of divine service, they should not be disturbed, letted, or discouraged from any lawful recreation, such as dancing, either men or women, archery for men, leaping, vaulting, or any other such harmless recreations; nor from having of May-games, Whitsun-Ales, or Morrice-dances, or setting up of May-poles, or other sports therewith used; so as the same be had in due and convenient time, without impediment or let of divine service." This was designed in part, probably, to counteract what was then called the puritan notion, and may be regarded as expressing the opinion of the English Church at that time in regard to the sacredness of the day. The same was re-published in 1636, by *Charles*, with how much real effect upon the practices of men it is not easy to determine.

It is evident that a reaction in favor of the institution had already commenced; and the earnestness of Puritanism on this subject, joined to the influence of Sabbatarianism, has affected almost the whole body of the English Church. Puritanism and Sabbatarianism deserve the credit of having preserved to that country a regard for the day of rest, which raises them infinitely above many other Protestant countries. Had they taken Scripture ground, the result can hardly be predicted.

By what has here been said in regard to the observation of the Sabbath, after the Reformation, it is not to be supposed that there are no traces of it since the Christian era until that time. It is believed that there have been Christians in every age who have kept holy the seventh day. During the first three centuries of the Christian Church, the Sabbath seems to have been almost universally kept. It was kept generally in the Eastern Church for six hundred years. And from that time onward to the present, frequent traces of Sabbath-keepers may be found, either in the history of individuals, or in the acts of Councils against those who kept it. These notices extend to the time of the Reformation; and as frequent as are the references to the first day of the week under the title of Lord's day.

When we enter upon that period of Reform, we find that Sabbath-keepers appear in Germany late in the fifteenth or early in the sixteenth century, according to *Ross's Picture of All Religions*. By this we are to understand that their numbers were such as to lead to organization, and attract attention. A

number of these formed a church, and emigrated to America in the early settlement of the country. There were Sabbath-keepers in Transylvania, among whom was *Francis Davidis*, first chaplain to the Court of Sigismund, the prince of that kingdom, and afterwards superintendent of all the Transylvanian churches. In France, also, there were Christians of this class, among whom was *M. de la Roque*, who wrote in defence of the Sabbath, against Bossuet, the Catholic Bishop of Meaux. But it is difficult to determine to what extent this day was observed in those countries.

In England we find Sabbath-keepers very early. *Dr. Chambers* says: "They arose in England in the sixteenth century," from which we understand that they then became a distinct denomination in that kingdom. They increased considerably in the seventeenth century; and we find that towards the close of that century there were eleven flourishing churches in different parts of the country. Among those who held this view are some names of distinction. *Theophilus Brabourne* was called before the Court of High Commission, in 1632, for having written and published books vindicating the claims of the seventh day. *One Traske* was about the same time examined in the Starr Chamber where a long discussion about the subject seems to have been held. Nearly thirty years after this, *John James*, preacher to a Sabbath-keeping congregation in the east of London, was executed in a barbarous manner, upon a variety of charges, among which was his keeping of the Sabbath. Twenty years later still, *Francis Bampfield* died in Newgate, a martyr to non-conformity—especially as one who could not conform in the matter of the Sabbath. It is needless to mention other names, or to speak particularly of *Edward, Joseph, Dr. Joseph and Dr. Samuel Stennott, John Maulden, Robert Cornthwaite*, and others, who have written and suffered in proof of their attachment to this truth.

But the Sabbath found great opposition in England, being assailed both from the pulpit and the press, by those who were attached to the established church. Many men of learning and talent engaged in the discussion on both sides of the question. It is evident that the opposers of reform felt unable to defend themselves against the strength of talent and Scripture brought against them. Therefore, as in similar cases, they excited the civil powers to check the progress of the Disseners by passing the famous *Conventicle Act*. By this law, passed in 1654, it was provided, that if any person, above sixteen years of age, was present at any meeting of worship different from the Church of England, where there were five persons more than the household, for the first offence he should be imprisoned three months, or pay five pounds; for the second, the penalty was doubled; and for the third he should be banished to America, or pay one hundred pounds sterling. This act was renewed in 1669, which, in addition to the former penalties, made the person preaching liable to pay a fine of twenty pounds; and the same penalty was imposed upon any person suffering a meeting to be held in his house. Justices of the Peace were empowered to enter such houses, and seize such persons; and they were fined one hundred pounds if they neglected doing so. These acts were exceedingly harassing to those who observed the Sabbath. Many of their distinguished ministers were taken from their flocks and confined in prison, some of whom sunk under their sufferings. These persecutions not only prevented those who kept the Sabbath from assembling, but deterred some who embraced their opinions from uniting with them, and discouraged others from investigating the subject. At present the Sabbath is not as extensively observed in England as formerly. But the extent of Sabbath-keeping cannot be determined by the number and magnitude of the churches, either there or in other countries. For many persons live in the observation of the seventh day and remain members of churches which assemble on the first day; and a still greater number acknowledge its correctness, who conform to the more popular custom of keeping the first day.

At what time the Sabbath became the subject of attention on this side of the Atlantic we cannot definitely say. The intolerance of the first settlers of New England was unfavorable to the Sabbath. The poor Christian that may have been banished to this country for its observance could find no refuge among the *Pilgrim Fathers*. The laws of Rhode Island were more tolerant, and observers of the Sabbath first made their appearance in Newport, in that State, in 1671. The cause of the Sabbath has

gradually gained strength in this country from that period; but it has found much to oppose its progress, even in Rhode Island. It was in opposition to the general practice of Christians, on which account an odium was put upon it, and those who have kept the Sabbath have been reproached with Judaizing, and classed with Jews. Besides this, they have been subjected to great inconvenience in their occupations, especially in cities and towns. In Connecticut the laws were intolerant and oppressive to the Sabbath cause.

At no time does there appear to have been in this country any general excitement on this subject. The friends of Sunday have avoided as far as possible its discussion; so that those who have observed the Sabbath have had but little encouragement, as they have supposed, to try to extend their sentiments. But the propagation of their opinions has not exclusively depended on their efforts. The common English version of the Bible has been found in many instances a sufficient means of converting men to the Sabbath. Churches observing and assembling on the Sabbath, have been founded in Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virginia, South Carolina, Georgia, and in most of the new States, embracing, as is supposed, a population of forty or fifty thousand.—*Sabbath Tract No. 4.*

THE REVIEW AND HERALD.

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

PARIS, JANUARY, 1851.

OUR PRESENT POSITION.—[Continued.]

THE SANCTUARY.—Daniel was told that the cleansing of the Sanctuary would be at the end of the 2300 days. "Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed."—Dan. viii, 14. There is no intimation of a space of time between the end of the days and the cleansing of the Sanctuary. Whatever it may be, the work of cleansing it immediately follows the end of the days. Now if the 2300 days commenced B. C. 457, as published to the world by Adventists up to 1844, and as clearly shown by the "Advent Herald" of 1850, then they terminated in 1844, and we, as consistent men and Christians, should look to that point of time for the work of cleansing the Sanctuary to commence.

If the days ended in 1844, and we believe that they did, then, certainly, the Sanctuary to be cleansed at their end is not the land of Canaan, for the simple reason that that land is not being cleansed. Therefore, it is inconsistent to hold on to the view that the land of Canaan is the Sanctuary, while successfully proving the commencement of the days B. C. 457, the crucifixion in the spring of A. D. 31, consequently the end of the seventy weeks in the autumn of A. D. 34, and the termination of the 2300 days in the autumn of 1844. We do not believe that there is a blank space of already more than six years between the end of the days and the cleansing of the Sanctuary.

By a careful investigation of this subject we have been led to believe that the Sanctuary, mentioned in Dan. viii, 14, is not the land of Canaan; but the New Jerusalem Sanctuary spoken of by the Apostle as follows: "Now of the things which we have spoken this is the sum: We have such an high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; A minister of the SANCTUARY, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man."—Heb. viii, 1, 2. In fact we do not know of one text of Scripture in all the Bible where the land of Canaan is called the Sanctuary.

The definition of the word Sanctuary is, "a sacred place." The land of Canaan is not such a place. No one will attempt to prove that it is. We are aware that many are ready to reject the view that the Sanctuary to be cleansed at the end of the days is in heaven, for want of information on the point, for, say they, "there can be nothing that needs cleansing in heaven." We will here give one text from Paul's clear commentary on the law, where he speaks of the earthly and heavenly Sanctuaries, and will notice the objection more fully in another place. This one text, however, fully answers the objection.

"It was before necessary that the patterns [worldly Sanctuary] of things in the heavens should be purified ["cleansed." Micknight's translation] with these; but the heavenly things themselves [heavenly Sanctuary] with better sacrifices than these."—Heb. ix, 23. Here we see

that the "heavenly things," which can refer to nothing but the Sanctuary in heaven, was to be "purified," "cleansed," by "better sacrifices" than that of beasts. They were to be cleansed by virtue of the atoning blood of the Son of God. Those, therefore, who are at war with the idea of the heavenly Sanctuary being cleansed, differ widely with the Apostle Paul, and are at war with his comment on the law.

The word Sanctuary occurs more than one hundred times in the Bible, and in most cases it applies to the tabernacle and temple of the Jews, sometimes to a part, and sometimes to the whole. It is mentioned four times in the New Testament, all in the epistle to the Hebrews. In chapter ix, 1, 2; xiii, 11, it refers to the Sanctuary of the first covenant, and in chapter viii, 2, it applies to the second covenant Sanctuary, which the "Lord pitched" in heaven. In three texts only [Ex. xv, 17; Ps. lxxviii, 54; Isa. lxiii, 18] it is supposed by some that the word Sanctuary applies to the land of Canaan. But by a close examination of these texts we may see that such a view rests upon a mere supposition. The "Advent Herald" for April 27, 1850, says:

"What are we to understand by the 'cleansing the sanctuary?' To 'understand' this correctly we must ascertain what is meant by 'the sanctuary.' The word sanctuary is used by the inspired writers in the following significations. 1. It is the name of a particular part of the temple.—Heb. ix, 2. 2. The different apartments of the temple.—Jer. li, 51. 3. The temple itself.—1 Chron. xxii, 19; xxviii, 10. 4. Places of worship generally, true or false.—Amos vii, 9; Eze. xxviii, 18; Dan. viii, 11. 5. Heaven is called the sanctuary.—Ps. cii, 19. 6. The promised land.—Ex. xv, 17; Ps. lxxviii, 54; Isa. lxiii, 18. 7. The tabernacle of God in the heavenly state.—Eze. xxxvii, 26, 28.—These are the principal significations of the word sanctuary, in the word of God. According to which of these significations is the word to be understood in the text before us? I think the most obvious sense is that which points out the promised land; for it must be evident to every one that the sanctuary here spoken of must be capable of being 'trodden under foot,' and of being 'cleansed,' and as I think we shall see, of being cleansed at the coming of Christ and the resurrection of the righteous dead. The text should also be understood in a sense that will harmonize with other cases in which the word is used by Daniel in particular, with the views of the other prophets, and the word of God generally."

With the first four, and the seventh and last, "significations" of the word Sanctuary, as given above, we agree. The texts are plain and afford positive testimony; but with the fifth and sixth we widely differ. There is no positive testimony that "heaven" is called the Sanctuary. That God's Sanctuary, the "true Tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man," the "greater and more perfect Tabernacle" of which Christ is a "minister," is IN HEAVEN, we have abundance of plain Scripture testimony. See Heb. viii, 1—4; ix, 11, 23, 24; Rev. i, 12, 13; xi, 19; xv, 5. The text referred to above, to prove that heaven is called the Sanctuary, is as follows: "For he hath looked down from the height of his sanctuary: from heaven did the Lord behold the earth." Ps. cii, 19.

The most natural, and the obvious meaning of this text is, that the Sanctuary, from the "height" of which the Lord "looked down" to "behold the earth," is the "Temple of God in heaven" in which "was seen" the "ARK OF HIS TESTAMENT." This view is sustained by a mass of plain Scripture testimony, while the other view has only an inference from Ps. cii, 19, to sustain it.

We object to the sixth definition of the word Sanctuary, that it is "the promised land," because that view has no other foundation than weak and unwarrantable inferences from only three texts of Scripture. We have never seen but three texts quoted to sustain this view. These we will now examine.

The first is Ex. xv, 17, "Thou shalt bring them in, and plant them in the mountain of thine inheritance, in the place, O Lord, which thou hast made for thee to dwell in; in the sanctuary. O Lord, which thy hands have established." This is a part of the prophetic song of Moses sung by Israel upon the banks of the Red Sea, in praise to God for their deliverance, and in prospect of their settlement in Canaan. Its fulfillment is declared in Ps. lxxviii, 54, which is the second text claimed as proof that the promised land is the Sanctuary. "And he brought them to the border of his sanctuary, even to this mountain, which his right hand had purchased." Cruden says—"By Sanctuary here [Ex. xv, 17] may be understood the temple on Mount Moriah, which God would certainly cause to be built and established."

This view is shown to be correct from the context of Ps. lxxviii, 54. After declaring in verse 54, that God brought his people to the border

of his Sanctuary, the Psalmist in verses 68, 69, tells us what the Sanctuary was which his hands established, as follows. "But chose the tribe of Judah, the Mount Zion which he loved. And he BUILT his SANCTUARY like HIGH PALACES." The "border," or "place" of the Sanctuary, where God planted his people, was one thing, and the Sanctuary itself, which he caused to be built "like high palaces," was entirely another thing. The people were planted; and dwelt in the former, but God dwelt in the latter, among his people. "The Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel: . . . Let them make me a sanctuary, that I may dwell among them." That Sanctuary was "a sacred place." There the Lord placed his name, and manifested his glory. It is clear that no other Sanctuary is brought to view in Ex. xv, 17; Ps. lxxviii, 54, than the pattern of the "true Tabernacle" in heaven, which God caused to be built "like high palaces." Why should we confound the "border" or "place" of the Sanctuary, which was the promised land, with the typical Sanctuary itself? Certainly there is no necessity for so doing. And there is no more propriety in such a course, than there would be in asserting that a house, and the yard or farm around it were one and the same thing. And to say that Ex. xv, 17; Ps. lxxviii, 54, which speak of "the place," and "the border" of the Sanctuary, as well as the Sanctuary itself, prove that the promised land is the Sanctuary, is equal to asserting that a farm and a house are only a house. We use this simple figure to make the error, that the land of Canaan is the Sanctuary, appear in its true light. We see that these two texts, when examined by the light of truth and reason, are found to contain, in themselves, sufficient proof to condemn the view that the promised land is called the Sanctuary.

The other text that is quoted to sustain this position is Isa. lxiii, 18. "The people of thy holiness have possessed it [the promised land, or the "inheritance"] but a little while: our adversaries have trodden down thy sanctuary." The history of the Jews shows a perfect fulfillment of this text, therefore, the Sanctuary mentioned in the text refers to the typical Sanctuary.

There is no more necessity for, or propriety in, confounding the "inheritance," with the Sanctuary in this text, than in Ex. xv, 17, and Ps. lxxviii, 54. It is true that the "tribes" of Israel "possessed" the promised land "but a little while," and it is also true that their "adversaries" did tread down their Sanctuary, by desecrating and desolating their Temple.

Says the "Herald,"—"It must be evident to every one that the sanctuary here spoken of must be capable of being 'trodden under foot,' and of being 'cleansed.'"

No one believes that the words "trodden under foot," and "trodden down," mean that the entire land of Canaan has been literally trampled down by the feet of wicked men, any more than the text, "I will tread down the people in mine anger," Isa. lxiii, 6, means that the Almighty is to literally trample on men. Those that teach that "the promised land" is the Sanctuary must, therefore, admit that the words "trodden under foot," and "trodden down," are figurative expressions, and mean that the promised land has been overrun with "the wicked agents of its desolation." Then they should not object to our using the expressions figuratively, in applying the words "trodden down" [Isa. lxiii, 6] to the typical Sanctuary, and the words "trodden under foot" [Dan. viii, 13] to "the true Tabernacle" or "Sanctuary" in heaven.

It may be said that the heavenly Sanctuary is not "capable of being trodden under foot." But we ask, is it not as capable of being trodden under foot as "the Son of God," who is the "MINISTER" of the same Sanctuary? Says Paul:

"Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath TRODDEN UNDER FOOT THE SON OF GOD, and hath counted the Lord of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of Grace."—1 Cor. x, 29.

We say, then, that the Sanctuary in heaven has been trodden under foot in the same sense that the Son of God has been trodden under foot. In a similar manner has the "host," the true church, also, been trodden down. Those who have rejected the Son of God have trodden him under foot, and of course have trodden under foot his Sanctuary.

The Catholic Church have trodden under foot, not only the "Holy City," but the Sanctuary, and its Minister, or Priest, "the Son of God." Rome has been called "the Holy City," and the "Eternal City," which can only be said of the City of the living God; the New Jerusalem.

The Pope has professed to have "power on earth to forgive sins," which power belongs alone to Christ. The people have been taught to

look to "the man of sin," seated in his temple, or as Paul says—"so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God," &c.—instead of looking to Jesus, seated at the right hand of the Father, in the heavenly Sanctuary. In thus turning away from Jesus, who alone could forgive sins, and give eternal life, and in bestowing on the Pope such titles as MOST HOLY LORD, they have "trodden under foot the Son of God." And in calling Rome the "Eternal City," and the "Holy City," they have trodden down the City of the living God, and the heavenly Sanctuary. The "host," the true church that have looked to Jesus in the true Sanctuary for pardon of sins, and eternal life, has, as well as their Divine Lord and his Sanctuary, been trodden under foot. Yes, the true worshipers have been rejected and persecuted, and some of the brightest "stars," or gospel ministers, in the church have been "stamped upon" by the little horn.

The Protestant sects, with their spiritualizing views, in denying the existence of the person of God the Father, the personality of the "Son of God," the literal City and Sanctuary, have also acted their part in treading under foot the Sanctuary.

Adventists who reject the true Scripture light on this subject, and teach that the Sanctuary to be cleansed at the end of the 2300 days is the "promised land," notwithstanding they have not one text to prove it, are also, engaged in this work of treading under foot the Sanctuary.

It is supposed by some that the heavenly Sanctuary is not capable of being cleansed, for the reason that there can be nothing filthy in heaven. But we are aware that this objection is often urged for want of an understanding of this important subject. No sane person believes that the heavenly Sanctuary needs cleansing from physical uncleanness, as we would cleanse a room or a garment. The type will give light on this point. And here we will observe that we have the example of our Divine Master, and the Apostle Paul, for referring to the type. Said Jesus to his disciples,—

"These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the LAW OF MOSES, and in the prophets, and in the psalms concerning me."—Luke xxiv, 44.

When Paul was a prisoner at Rome, he "called the chief of the Jews together," "unto his lodging," "to whom he expounded and testified the kingdom of God, persuading them concerning Jesus, both out of the LAW OF MOSES, and out of the prophets."—Acts xxviii, 23. Here we see that Jesus and Paul both refer to Moses, evidently to the law of types. And we believe that if those who preach Christ would more closely follow the example of the Great Teacher, and the Apostle Paul, and trace each shadow to its glorious substance, the "good things to come," the true light would blaze all about them. And they and their hearers would be enlightened and comforted, as were the two lonely disciples traveling to Emmaus, who exclaimed, "Did not our heart burn within us while he talked with us by the way, and while he opened to us the Scriptures?" But some that profess to preach Christ at this day are, no doubt, much more blind and "slow of heart" to believe, and guilty than those that Jesus rebuked as follows:

"O fools and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken! Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory? And beginning at MOSES and all the prophets he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself."—Luke xxv, 25, 26, 27.

The typical Sanctuary [see Lev. xvi.] was cleansed, not from physical uncleanness, but from the sins of Israel.

"And he shall make an atonement for the holy [holiest, place, is supplied,] because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions in all their sins."—Verse 16.

The holiest of all was cleansed once a year, then no one entered it, not even the high priest, till a year had expired, when it needed cleansing again. This is sufficient to show every candid person that the cleansing of the typical, and also the antitypical, Sanctuary is the removal of the sins of God's people from it. This is done in the type and antitype, by the people first confessing their sins, second, the priest makes atonement for their sins and confesses them on the head of the scape-goat, and third, they are borne away into the land of separation. Then the Sanctuary is "cleansed." We have not space to examine this subject in a thorough manner, therefore, we refer the reader to the "Advent Review," a pamphlet of 48 pages. Pages 37-48, contain a clear and valuable exposition of the atonements, by O. R. L. Crosier. We would also refer the reader to a divine comment on the law. It is the Apostle Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews, from which we will here give a few extracts.

"Now of the things which we have spoken this is the sum: We have such an high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; a minister of the Sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched and not man. . . . For if he were on earth, he should not be a priest, [Here is positive proof that Christ's priesthood was not fulfilled on earth at the time of the first advent, but, that it was to be fulfilled in heaven, after his ascension,] seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law. Who serve unto the example and shadow of HEAVENLY THINGS, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle: for see (saith he) that thou make all things according to the pattern shewed to thee in the mount." Chapter viii, 1-5.

The "pattern" that was shewed to Moses was the "TRUE TABERNACLE," or Sanctuary in heaven, of which Christ is now a "Minister" or Priest. Did Moses obey God, and follow the "pattern?"—He certainly did. Then what overwhelming evidence we have before us that the type is a perfect guide to the substance, a guide to lead us to a correct view of the priesthood of Christ in the heavenly Sanctuary.—O, what a wide field of living truth this view spreads out before us.

"Then verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary. For there was a tabernacle made; the first wherein was the candlestick, and the table, and the shew-bread: which is called the sanctuary.—And after the second vail, the tabernacle which is called the holiest of all; which had the golden censer, and the ark of the covenant overlaid round about with gold, wherein was the golden pot that had manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of the covenant. And over it the cherubims of glory shadowing the mercy-seat; of which we cannot now speak particularly. Now when these things were thus ordained, the priests went always into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service of God: But into the second went the high priest alone once every year."—Chapter ix, 1-7.

These things mentioned by the Apostle were all made according to the pattern shewed to Moses while in the Mount. The place for the "candlestick" was in the Holy. John, therefore, had a view of Jesus while ministering in the Holy Place of the heavenly Sanctuary, a mediator for all the world.

"And I turned to see the voice that spake with me. And being turned, I saw seven golden candlesticks: [And thou shalt make the seven lamps thereof: and they shall light the lamps thereof, &c.—Ex. xxv, 37;] And in the midst of the seven candlesticks, one like unto the Son of man, &c."—Rev. i, 12, 13.

John also saw, while looking down the stream of time, in prophetic vision, to the sounding of the seventh angel, Jesus our Great High Priest move aside the second vail, and pass into the Most Holy, where "was seen the ark containing the ten commandments," or to use Paul's words, "the tables of the covenant."

"And the temple of God was opened in heaven, and there was seen in his temple the ark of his testament."—Rev. xi, 19.

Will any one try to spiritualize these things? and say that there is no literal Sanctuary, with its Holy, and Most Holy, the Ark containing the ten commandments, the candlestick, &c., in heaven? Such as do this can as well spiritualize the "Son of man," seen by John, and deny his personality. We have seen the sad fruits of the spiritualizing system, and have also seen that it is safest to take the word of God as it reads.

"But Christ being come a high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands." "It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these."—Chap. ix, 11, 23.

These extracts from the epistle of Paul to the Hebrews, (who understood the law,) make the subject clear. Moses made the Tabernacle, with its apartments and furniture, according to the pattern shewed him in the mount. That pattern was the "true Tabernacle" in heaven, with its apartments and furniture. Men of infirmity ministered in the worldly Sanctuary, but the Son of God in the heavenly. The worldly Sanctuary was cleansed yearly by the blood of beasts, but the heavenly, at the end of the 2300 days, by virtue of the blood of the Son of God.

The following is from "Advent Herald," Sept. 7, 1850:—

"R. R. YORK.—We have no new light respecting the connection between the 70 weeks and 2300 days. The only argument against their connection is, the passing of the time. Why that has passed is a mystery to us, which we wait to have revealed. Should we hear any sound reasons for explaining the disappointment, we shall be prompt to present them. In the meantime, we can substitute no guesses or suppositions, which may be wrong, and only mislead. We leave that to others."

As long as the "Herald" holds on to the unscriptural view that the promised land is the Sanctuary, "the passing of the time" will still remain a "mystery." But let the Herald take the plain scripture view of the cleansing of the Sanctuary, and the "mystery" is at once explained, and explained so as to perfectly harmonize with the Advent movement in the past. Certainly their present position is a "mystery," and must remain such, unless they change their views very much on some points. Well, what can the "Herald" do to explain this "mystery," so as to be able to give satisfactory light, to answer the inquiry that is now being awakened on this subject? Many are saying, "Watchman what of the night?" and they will not be satisfied, by being told that why the

time "has passed remains a mystery," &c. Will the "Herald" try to prove that the 2300 days will end at some future date? This we think it will not do; for it has already proved, beyond all controversy, that the days began B. C. 457, and terminated in 1844. And it has, for a few years, been opposed to this perpetual stretching out the 2300 days, from spring to fall, and from fall to spring. All must see that such a course must disgust the people, and destroy the faith of those who are thus flattered on, from one point of time to another, to find the end of the days, and are as often disappointed. We see no way to explain this "mystery" but by the light of present truth. The belief that the Sanctuary to be cleansed at the end of the 2300 days is the promised land, and that it is to be cleansed at the coming of Christ; and that the 70 weeks commenced B. C. 457, consequently, the 2300 days terminated in 1844, certainly must be a "mystery" to those who live in 1851!

Dear brethren and sisters, we will humbly thank our gracious Father that in the present truth there are no such mysteries, and contradictions, as are seen in the position of those who reject their past experience, and present light. Amen.

W.

Last September, at the Sutton Conference, we had the pleasure, for the first time, of meeting with our beloved brother Stephen Smith, of Lempster, N. H. He gave us the names of a number, and wished us to send the paper to them. Among the names was George W. Barns. We have sent the paper to him regularly, and it has been a pleasure to send it out free of charge. We have supposed that if any professed Christian received the paper, who did not want it, he would return one copy, which is sufficient to show that he desires it discontinued. But instead of this, G. W. B. sent us a very unchristian letter, not *Post paid*. Here is a part of it:—

"HILLSBOROUGH, N. H., Dec. 10, 1850.

Mr. James White—Sir: I have received three or four numbers of your papers, have read them some, and find nothing in them of any use to me, or any Gentile. And until you can show me that God has enjoined upon the Gentiles to keep any Sabbath, and that this side of the cross, I want no more of your papers, neither shall I take them from the office. I find in the book that the law is a shadow (or a type) of good things to come; but I do not find that the Gentiles are a typical people. But I find the law and prophets were until John, and then it was took out of the way, nailing it to his cross. So you see I am not living under the law, but under the gospel.

Please read the 3d of 2 Corinthians, and believe it and obey it, and you will find glory in the gospel that you do not find under the law.

GEORGE W. BARNES."

We pity those who mangle the word of God as G. W. B. has, and are troubled with such an unkind spirit as is manifested in his letter. We would help them. This is why we have introduced this extract.

Says Paul, "For the law having a shadow of good things to come;" but what law? Certainly not the law of God, the ten commandments. If G. W. B., or any body else, believes that the commandments are shadows, or types, let them show us the bodies, substances, or "good things to come," of which the first, second, and third commandments are only shadows. Mark this: every shadow has a body. Tell us, what are the bodies, or "good things to come" of the law for swearing, killing, stealing, coveting, and "adultery." Ah! this confounding the law of God and the law of Moses in one, has led many poor souls in the road to ruin. The law of Moses was written in a book, and its "ordinances" were blotted out, and nailed to the cross; but God's law was engraven in stone. What idea can men have of blotting out what Jehovah, with his finger, engraven in stone!

We do not suppose that G. W. B. really means that the law and prophets were nailed to John's cross, though he has given this idea, for John was not crucified. He would be both to admit that the prophets were all blotted out also, and nailed even to the cross of Christ!! We have space only to hint at these points.

As it regards 2 Cor. chap. iii, we would ask if the "ministration" of a law, and the law itself, are one and the same thing? The answer must be that they are not. Then with the view that the "ministration" of the law is not the law itself, will G. W. B. and others read this chapter once more. We do not expect that the "Review and Herald" will be of any service to "Gentiles," but scores of letters received might testify that it is "meat in due season" to those who are "Jews" "inwardly," Israelites "indeed, in whom there is no guile."

God instituted a Sabbath; and that blessed and holy only weekly Sabbath of the Bible. Jesus says, it "was made"—all mankind. Unless it can be shown that the Sabbath law has been abrogated, we are bound to believe that the gospel church may share the blessings of the Sabbath of the Bible. Amen.

[Letter from Bro. Butler.]

Dear Brother and Sister White: Your kind and affectionate letters came duly to hand, and we were glad to hear that you were again coming into Vermont, and will hold some meetings. We wish you to hold a conference at our house.

Since I have been converted to the shut door, and seventh day Sabbath I have been out in this town, and some of the neighboring towns, and around Lake Champlain, to try to get off some of the prejudice from other minds, which I so deeply felt in my own. Some have been converted to the present truth, and some prejudice (I trust) removed. I have learned from conversation with others, as well as by past experience, that the *shut door* has been the *great shoal* on to which the Adventists have run their ship, and foundered. They have been running their small boats this way and that way, to see if they could get around it; but have not been able. So they undertake to cover up the "landmarks" behind them. Some say, we have had the message in Rev. xiv. 6, 7, the one following in verse 8, and the going forth of the virgins, &c., down to Matt. xxv. 5, "while the Bridegroom tarried, they all slumbered and slept;" but have not had the true Midnight Cry. When asked, *when, how, and where* they can have it, they answer, by Angels sent forth to give it; others don't know. Some think we have had the first and second Angel's messages; another thinks we have had the first; but don't believe any thing in the second; it has been a trial to them that any should call the Protestant Churches, Babylon. Still another believes, that if he acknowledges the first and second, he shall have to the third Angel's message, and he thinks he can be more consistent to say we have had none. You see how all these have shunned the door. And still there is another class that believe we have had all down to the true *Midnight Cry*, and that God's power accompanied all of these messages; but why the Lord has not yet come, they know not; but think probably the 2300 days have not yet run out. They have been looking for *light* from their papers, where they used to get it, but cannot find it. They are like sheep scattered on the mountains, without a shepherd. Some that had little experience previous to these movements have given up to disappointment, and have said but little upon the subject, and have gone, more or less, into the world. They suppose the shut door would exclude all the unconverted, having had *light*, or *no light*; *young*, or *old*, from every degree of the Spirit of God. I think if this class could have the true shut door set before them, and the third angel's message, some of them would see the true line of prophecy, and rejoice again in the light. I have been striving to look up those who have not given up their past experience in these messages, and trying to show them what the Sanctuary is, and what the shut door is, that the Sanctuary spoken of in Dan. viii. 14, is being cleansed. * * *

E. P. BUTLER.

From the Habinger and Advocate.

WHERE ARE WE?

BRO. MARSH: I have been looking very anxiously for something in some of the Advent papers, that would define our position; and as yet I see nothing satisfactory. I know it is said, Nigh, even at the doors; but what I am at is this, Where in the word of God are we? In '43 and '44, we knew where we were; say for instance, Rev. xiv. 6: "And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven." We very well knew then, the second angel's message—"Babylon is fallen." Both are in the past. Now I can draw no other conclusion than this: If we were correct in '43 and '44, as the Advent move did correspond with just such an effect as the first and second angel's messages would produce, the third angel in order follows with his message, and a loud one, too, as loud as the first: If any man worship the beast, and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, &c. 12 v.: Here is the patience of the saints; here are they that keep the commandments of God, (God the Father,) and the faith of Jesus (Jesus the Son.) Now I am left to inquire, What are the commandments of God? if they are the ten commandments, written with the finger of God on the tables of stone?—The next inquiry is, Are we keeping the commandments of God,—every one of them? and have we the faith of Jesus? If so, we shall have a right to the tree of life, and will enter in through the gates into the city. Now, Bro. Marsh, as a minister of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, expecting the Lord of the vineyard soon, will you give us the true time of

night? Tell us if you know what the worship of the beast and his image is; and what it is to receive his mark, in the forehead, or in the hand. I do not write this for dissension or any other motive.—but for light. For one, I believe the true saints, or the wise, will understand. My the Lord direct by his Spirit into his word, and sanctify us in the truth. Amen.

Bristol, Vt., Oct. 25, 1850.

The important inquiries of C. W. S. certainly deserve an answer from the editor of the "Harbinger," and we shall wait to see them fairly answered. If he does not answer them we shall. The spirit of inquiry that is now awaking all around us, relative to the third angel's message, will not be satisfied and silenced by such replies as the following note from C. [Crosier.]

* "The New Testament must be our guide in reference to the commandments." C.

We want no better guide. The New Testament scriptures are plain. We have space for three texts only.

"If thou wilt enter into life keep the commandments."—JESUS

"He that saith, I knew him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him."—JOHN.

"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."—Rev. xxii, 14.

☞ Providence permitting we will be at New Ipswich, N. H., Jan. 8th and 9th, at Washington, the 11th and 12th, and at Waterbury, Vt., the 13th and 19th.—At this season of the year General Conferences will not be convenient, therefore, we hope to be able to hold meetings in a number of places in N. H. and Vt., and hope that the brethren from towns near by such meetings will come together.

The "Review and Herald" will be published occasionally in our absence. All communications relating to the paper, should be directed to James White, Paris, Me. Letters requiring an immediate answer, may be directed to Waterbury, Vt., JAMES WHITE.

Brs. Rhodes and Andrews returned from Eastern Maine Dec. 31. They found a good number who have lived through the confused scenes of fanaticism on the one hand, and gross backsliding and giving up the truth on the other, who joyfully received the truth. They leave for Lancaster, N. H., and Sutton, Vt., the 5th.

THE CHART.—It is now ready. We think the brethren will be much pleased with it, and that it will be a great help in defining our present position. The cost for about 240 will be near \$250. Those whom God has called to give the message of the third angel can have it free. Brn. in Conn., have paid \$40; David Arnold, \$5; A. R. Morse, \$10; Harvey Childs, \$5; Reuben Loveland, \$5.—Those who wish can send in their donations, and if more is received than enough to pay for the Chart, it will be used in publishing the "Review and Herald."—The Chart can be had by addressing Otis Nichols, Dorchester, Mass. Price, \$1.50.

LETTERS RECEIVED SINCE DEC. 24.—Otis Nichols; Frederick Wheeler; Wm. Harris; F. M. Shimper; Mary Brown; Israel Camp; J. W. Heath; P. D. Lawrence; P. M. Bates; H. O. Nichols; J. C. Bowles; John Kemp; Harvey Morgan; Ira A'hey, \$2.50; S. T. Belden, \$2.50; Robert Gray, \$1; A. Belden, \$1, for others; D. R. Palmer, \$20.

FOR SISTER SHIMPER—Sister Smith, of Jackson, Mich., \$5.

PUBLICATIONS.

The ADVENT REVIEW, containing thrilling testimonies written in the Holy Spirit, by many of the leaders in the Second Advent cause, showing its Divine origin and progress—48 pages. Also the five numbers of the "Review," and the "Extra," by Bro. Hiram Edson.

The Present Truth, No. 1. The WEEKLY SABBATH taught and enforced in the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments—28 pages.

The Seventh-day Sabbath NOT ABOLISHED. The article by Joseph Marsh, editor of the "Advent Harbinger and Bible Advocate," REVIEWED—36 pages. The Third Angel's Message—16 pages.

The Sanctuary, 2300 Days, and Shut Door—16 pages.

Bro. Miller's Dream, with notes—12 pages.

The above publications may be had by addressing Elias Goodwin, Oswego, N. Y., Otis Nichols, Dorchester, Mass., or James White, Paris, Me., (POST PAID.) Terms—Gratis. Those who would consider it a pleasure, are invited to help bear the expenses of publishing, as the Lord has prospered them. tf

NEW TESTAMENT SEVENTH DAY SABBATH.

Those who are keeping the seventh day Sabbath, in the third angel's message, are opposed by a certain class of believers that were recently their teachers and fellow laborers while passing through the first, and second angel's messages, as recorded in Rev. xiv, 6—8.

The main points of their objections are these.

1. That Jesus never taught, neither did he ever enforce the Sabbath. Many say that he "RELAXED" it.

2. That it was nailed to the cross, and never taught by the apostles: hence, we are not bound to keep it since the crucifixion of Jesus. It was all right, say they, for the Jews, to whom it was given under the Old Testament law; but not for the Gentiles under the New. We dissent from this, and will now attempt to show,

1. That Jesus did teach, and keep the seventh day Sabbath.

2. That it was not nailed to the cross, and that all four of the evangelists speak of it in the same light after, as they did before the crucifixion. That the disciples kept it after their Lord was nailed to the cross, hence it is as binding on the Gentiles, as on the Jews, and never was abolished by being nailed to the cross.

Our opponents say that Jesus never taught us in the New Testament that we should keep the Sabbath. I answer, neither did he ever show us that it ought not to be kept. The seventh day Sabbath is brought to view more than fifty times in the New Testament; seventeen times by Jesus himself, and twelve times, after his crucifixion by his disciples. The Sabbath is taught eleven times also, by and through the commandments, six times certainly after the crucifixion of the Saviour, and thrice in the Revelation: in all near seventy. A great portion of these our opponents say there is no Sabbath; yet they call the first day of the week the Sabbath, and profess to rest on that day. See their appointments for preaching on that day in the "Advent Herald," and the "Advent Harbinger."

Jesus taught that he was the Lord of the Sabbath. In the Old Testament! No, he taught it in the New. Did he keep it under the gospel, in the New Testament? Yes he did. See John xv, 10. "I have kept my Father's commandments." Is it possible for a living man to prove that he did in any way relax, or break the fourth commandment of the ten? the Sabbath that he was Lord of? Certainly not. He is no Saviour to those who doubt his plain simple words.

Mark says that "when the Sabbath day was come, he began to teach in the synagogue."—Chap. vi, 2. See also Luke iv, 21, and 16. It was his custom to read and teach on that day. All Christendom, as it were, do the same: but not on the Lord's Sabbath day. A part of his reply to his disciples respecting his coming and the end of the world was, "Pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath day." There was but two points of time for this flight referred to: first, the destruction of Jerusalem, the 39 years in the future, and second, "the great and terrible day of the Lord," the "time of trouble such as never was." I ask if the Sabbath, the one Jesus was the Lord of, was not clearly recognized 39, if not 1820 years beyond his crucifixion. Call it the Jewish Sabbath, or any other name that suits you best; and then prove why they were not to flee on the Sabbath, and then you have not disproved the perpetuity of THE SEVENTH DAY SABBATH, of which Jesus is Lord. It is clear also that this title, given him by his Father, was not nailed to the cross, nor can it be abolished while he has a follower to keep the Sabbath. For "the Sabbath was made for man."

By showing the commandments of God to be the foundation of all the law, and the prophets, and the keeping of them the road to eternal life, and being highly esteemed in the reign of heaven, [Matt. xxii, 35—40. Luke x, 25—28. Matt. v, 19.] he proves, that the Sabbath is perpetual, and was not nailed to the cross; because the whole ten were included in the above teaching. See article on "New Testament commandments." If the reader objects because the Sabbath is not separately quoted by Jesus, then by the same rule he may object to the first, second and tenth commandments; for Jesus has not quoted them, only as in the above, in the New Testament. Who for a moment supposes that we may with impunity, have other gods, or bow down to graven images, or covet our neighbor's wife, house, or lands, because he did not quote them separately?—No one. If these three commandments are binding here, it is clear that the Sabbath is also binding.

If the Sabbath was to be perpetuated, says one, why did not Jesus teach it clearly and distinctly. He has done it by enforcing all ten of the commandments. It was not necessary for him to re-enact a law that even his enemies were so tenacious in observing. They even threatened him with his life three several times for breaking the Sabbath law, as they said, when all that they could prove against him was that he had allowed some of his disciples to eat some raw wheat to satisfy hunger, and healed three men of their infirmities. He also said, The Sabbath was made for man." What sort of men? Paul will answer. "Is he the God of the Jews only? is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also."—Rom. iii, 29. "It is appointed unto men once to die, but after death the judgment." The Jews? yes, the Gentiles also.

It would be strange teaching indeed, for Jesus to say the Sabbath was made for man, and yet men were to live and multiply for more than 1800 years after that law was blotted out. If the Sabbath was made for the Jews only, then as Jesus has said, "for man," the Sabbath must be perpetuated while the Jews as men exist. There is proof enough that they are not dead yet.

THE SEVENTH DAY SABBATH NOT NAILED TO THE CROSS.

Our opponents say that the Sabbath was nailed to the cross, when Jesus was crucified. They quote Col. ii, 14, 16, for proof. "Blotting out the hand writing of ordinances, . . . nailing it to his cross." "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy-day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath-days." The version here is incorrect. It should be "sabbaths." Days are supplied. See Whiting and Macknight. Verse 17th shows that the new moon, meats, drinks, and sabbaths, as were required to be observed yearly, are shadows. But the weekly Sabbath, that never was given for a feast day as the above were, is not a shadow, neither can it be unless all of God's commandments are shadows. If they are shadows, then of course they are blotted out, and there can be no sin. "For sin is the transgression of the law." "Where no law is, there is no transgression." This

settles the question forever. For Col. iii, 16, 17, is the only scripture in the New Testament, that they can find to fix on the time for the abolition of the Sabbath. This fails them, for Paul says that they are shadows. But as they insist upon it that they are right, we will try the point by the testimony.

THE STARTING POINT THEN, IS A. D. 31, AT THE CRUCIFIXION.

The testimony of Jesus has already overthrown their whole argument: we will now present the testimony of his disciples.

All the Evangelists show the Sabbath, after the crucifixion. "In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn towards the first day of the week," the disciples came and found Jesus had arisen.—See Mat. xxviii, 1, 6. Mark gives the same testimony, chap. xvi, 1, 6. Also John xix, 31; xx, 1. Luke is more full. "And that day was the preparation, and the Sabbath drew on." The women that followed prepared spices, and saw the sepulchre, and how his body was laid. "And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments: and rested the Sabbath-day according to the commandment.—Chap. xxiii, 54—56. "Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came, . . . bringing the spices which they had prepared." Jesus had arisen. Chap. xxiv, 1, 6.

Now if evasion and perversion of the above scripture be allowed to, the greatest extent, the proof is still positive and clear that the disciples of Jesus did rest the Sabbath-day, [the seventh day] according to the commandment, after Jesus was nailed to the cross, taken down and laid in the sepulchre. And so tenaciously did they observe it, that they did not allow themselves to go with the spices they had prepared, and perform the sacred rites of anointing their beloved Master's body until the day was past.

Here then, the only text of scripture, which our opponents can find in the Bible, for proof that the Sabbath was nailed to the cross, fails them; because the Sabbath was kept after the crucifixion. Therefore they are left without a starting point: equally as much so, as the far-astern, ship-wrecked mariner, with neither masts, rudder, or compass to guide to a place of safety.

Permit me to digress for a moment, to ask the Sunday keeper a few questions. First, did God establish the (so called) "christian sabbath," the next day after the disciples of Jesus had ceased to keep the Sabbath, that Jesus was the Lord of? You know that it is not even intimated in this connection, where so much proof is given of the true Sabbath, the day before. Second, did God pervert the order of the week at the resurrection of Jesus, so as to require a rest for his people, the first day, and seventh day also? two days in one week, viz. the beginning and the end of it? Every man of common sense knows that it is not so. You see that the disciples did not regard this day, as they did the day before. The story proceeds in Luke xxiv, 9—12. They were running about the city. See verse 13 and onward. Two of the disciples were traveling seven and a half miles to Emmaus, and Jesus went with them. Did he chide them for breaking the (so called) "christian sabbath"? Would he allow himself, or them, to violate it by permitting them to go back again that afternoon, if this was the changed day? Did the disciples at Jerusalem fasten themselves up in an upper chamber to keep it? No, they kept the day before.

Again: the first day of the week is brought to view seven times in the New Testament, and not one word, or hint, of any change, or of its being a Sabbath, or a holy day, then, nor in the future. Paul mentions the first day in two places.

1. "Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him" [himself] &c. What? why, money for charitable purposes. A meeting, or a Sabbath, is not required for individuals to lay money by themselves.

2. Paul held a meeting all night, at Troas and broke bread after midnight. At day light, of this first day of the week, he desisted the meeting to attend to business, and traveled and sailed all that day.—See Acts xx, 7—15. This is the only meeting ever recorded in the New Testament to have been on the first day for religious purposes. This, remember, was a night meeting only, and probably has never been practiced by any worshiping assembly to christendom. Do, I beseech you, lay aside your prejudices, and follow the plain, simple scripture as it reads.

But to the Sabbath again. The great Apostle to the Gentiles, followed the example of his Master, and kept the Sabbath; yes, the very man that our opponents say has proved in Col. ii, 14, that it was nailed to the cross. If we adduce scripture argument to prove that Paul kept the Sabbath, then surely you must yield; for by their own arguments, Paul was the commissioned Apostle to teach the Gentiles that the Sabbath of the Lord was abolished. See his commission. Acts xiii, 2—4. At Antioch, Paul enters their synagogue on the Sabbath day, and he was called upon to teach. Verses 14, 15. And when the Jews were gone out of the synagogue, the GENTILES besought that these words might be preached to them the next Sabbath." "And the next Sabbath day came almost the whole city together to hear the word of God." Verses 42, 44. Here Paul preached two Sabbath days. The last one was crowded with Gentiles. Says an objector, he preached in the Jewish synagogues. What of that? Did he not preach on the Sabbath?

Well, he came to Philippi, the chief city, but on the Sabbath they went by the "river side," and taught, and prayed. Chap. xvi, 13. Then he travelled as far as Thessalonica; "and Paul as his MANNER WAS, went in unto them, and three sabbath-days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures."—Acts xvii, 2. Paul was keeping the Sabbath,

just as Jesus had kept it. His custom (or manner) was to teach on the Sabbath.—See Luke iv, 16, 31. After a while Paul was at Corinth; and there he reasoned with them every Sabbath, and was with them one year and a half.—Acts xviii, 4, 11. This must be seventy-eight Sabbaths in succession. Many Gentiles believed, and were baptized. God told him that he had much people in that city.

Here is an account of eighty-four Sabbaths in all, in which, Paul taught in different places, as Jesus did. The last date is, A. D. 51, 23 years after the time where we are told that it was nailed to the cross. Six years after this, he declared to the Romans, that "the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good;" and that it was established, and that he delighted in the law of God, and thanked God through Jesus, that he himself served the law of God. How? Answer: by keeping the whole of God's commandments, which of course includes the seventh day Sabbath. James shows that if we "offend in one point," we are "guilty of all." John says, "For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments." How many? Ah, all of them! In chap. ii, 7, he shows the old one from the beginning, which we believe is the Sabbath.

Let us now see how this important subject stands. We have shown,

1. That the seventh day Sabbath is brought to view more than fifty times in the New Testament.
2. That Jesus kept all his Father's commandments
3. That he has taught the perpetuity of the Sabbath, through the ten commandments of God.
4. That Jesus recognized the Sabbath 29, if not 1220 years beyond his crucifixion.
5. That he is still, the Lord of the Sabbath.
6. That the Sabbath was made for man—all men.
7. That it was his custom to teach on the Sabbath.
8. That the four evangelists show the Sabbath since the crucifixion.
9. That the commandments of God, also, are taught six times since.
10. That Luke positively proves the keeping of the Sabbath by the disciples, since the crucifixion.

11. That Paul's manner, or custom was, and that he did teach from place to place, on the Sabbath of the Lord our God; that he delighted in, and kept the law of God, which includes the Sabbath.

12. That James, and John also, teach the Sabbath by enforcing all of the commandments of God, which makes the Sabbath as binding now as it ever was.

13. That there is not a passage in the New Testament that shows a change of the day, or keeping of the first day of the week for the Sabbath.

14. That both Luke, and Paul, utterly and forever destroy, and take from our opponents, the main and only point which they ever had to show where the Sabbath was abolished, by proving incontestably that the Sabbath of the Lord our God was kept after they say it was nailed to the cross; viz: one day, 12, 23, and 29 years after.

But says an objector, is there no other scripture, or point of time, by which it can be shown that the Sabbath was abolished? None that I have found. Something may come up after this; but thank the Lord, there is testimony enough in the above fourteen points, to scatter it to the four winds. This is the New Testament testimony. O Lord, let thy blessing accompany it to the scattered remnant, Amen.

About sixty-five years after Jesus was nailed to the cross, God gave him a revelation. He sent his angel and signified it to his servant John, for the churches. In this message, the subject of the commandments of God was renewed. John saw that the last end of the church, the remnant, would be made war with for keeping them, and for having the testimony of Jesus. Chap. xii, 17. This is true now, and is developing more and more: but it is impossible for any one to show this war made on any one for strictly keeping the 1st, 2d, 3d, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, and 10th, commandments. But keeping the fourth commandment right, makes the war. The experience of five years has taught me this.

In Revelation xiv, John saw, and heard the third angel giving the last message of mercy for God's people. He was describing a patient waiting company of saints, who were keeping the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus. This is the same class as described in chap. xii. Thank the Lord our God, we know this to be strictly true; for we are acquainted with a goodly number of them, and they understand their message. They are keeping the Sabbath of the Lord our God, right; restoring it as Peter has shown, in the blotting out time. It is the last crowning sealing truth for the Church, to pass them through the time of trouble such as never was, right before them. We are not obliged to labor for an argument for this; for we are actually keeping the Sabbath, as it is taught in the commandment.

We ask then, if this is not 1819 years this side of the crucifixion. This proof that it was not nailed to the cross, is independent of the New Testament teaching. It is this side of it, and is actually knowledge to us.

Now pass to chap. 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." Does the keeping of nine of the commandments right, and the fourth wrong, give an entrance there? No, never. What then? Answer, the keeping, or doing all of them right. How shall we do it? Answer, keep the fourth, as God has taught, viz: the seventh day Sabbath, and the other nine according to your profession, and claim the blessed promise. Fail in this, and the promise is not yours.

JOSEPH BATES.

Fairhaven, Mass., Nov. 18, 1850.