

## THE SEVENTH-DAY SABBATH.

### THE WEEKLY SABBATH INSTITUTED AT CREATION AND NOT AT SINAI.

“Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy. 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, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates:

For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day, and hallowed it.” Ex. xx, 8—11.

These are the words of the fourth commandment, the great Sabbath law, which Jehovah spake from the smoking Mount, and with his finger wrote upon tables of stone. With the divine requirement is also given the reason why the Creator instituted the weekly Rest, which is as follows:—“For [or because] in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day, and hallowed it.” None can fail to see that the Sabbatic institution is inseparably connected with God’s resting on the seventh day of the first week of time, which day he then “blessed” and “sanctified.” Therefore, at the close of Creation, God instituted the weekly Rest, a memorial of himself, and gave it to “man,” to observe in commemoration of the very day on which the Creator rested.

We are told by those who advocate the no-Sabbath views that the Sabbath was given to commemorate the deliverance of Israel from Egyptian bondage. But this view is not only unscriptural but absurd in the extreme. The deliverance of Israel from Egypt was on the fifteenth day of the month Abib. It was commemorated by its two annual memorials, the pass-over and the feast of unleavened bread. These institutions were well calculated to call to mind God’s wonderful power manifested in bringing Israel from the house of bondage. But a moment’s reflection is sufficient to satisfy any reasonable mind that God never designed the weekly Sabbath to commemorate an event which took place on the fifteenth day of the

month Abib. God rested on the seventh day after six days of labor. That day of the week he "sanctified" and "blessed."

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

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

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

While the children of Israel were slaves in Egypt they could not keep the sabbath. But they had been from Egypt but thirty days when God reminded them of it, and, in giving the manna, guarded the Sabbath by three standing miracles. See Ex. xvi, 19—30. They were then free, and the only given reason why God at that time commanded them to keep his Sabbath was because he had brought them "out thence through a mighty hand, and by a stretched-out arm; [where they could keep it;] therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath-day." God does not here speak of the Sabbath, as of a new institution. He calls it "the Sabbath," as if speaking of an old institution perfectly understood by the people.

God has given but one reason for the institution of the Sabbath, and that reason shows that it was "made" for the first "man," Adam, and all his posterity.

"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."

That God instituted the weekly Rest for man to keep in commemoration of his Rest on the seventh day, after he had

created the world in six days, is as clear as the noon-day sun. It is one of the most simple and glorious truths of the Bible.

The passover was a memorial for Israel, that they might not forget their wonderful deliverance from Egyptian bondage.—The communion of the body and blood of Christ is a memorial instituted for the church to keep in memory the Lamb of God who suffered and died for us. So the seventh-day Sabbath is a weekly memorial to commemorate God's Rest-day, after he had created the world in six, that man might not forget the living God who made heaven and earth. If man had always observed this memorial, none would have forgotten God, and there never would have been an infidel in the world. How wonderful and wise the plan of Jehovah, laid out in the beginning!—Man was to labor six days, and on the seventh, rest from servile labor and care; and by viewing the heavens, the earth, the sea, and all things which were created in six days, he was to call to mind the living God who rested on the seventh.

The passover was to be observed from the time of the deliverance from Egypt, until "Christ our passover" was "sacrificed for us;" the communion was to be observed by the church from the crucifixion, until the Second Advent of Jesus; so the seventh-day Sabbath was designed to be kept from the Creation to, at least, the close of time.

God has "blessed the Sabbath-day and hallowed it" but once, and that was when there was but one man living.

"And God BLESSED the seventh day and SANCTIFIED it; BECAUSE that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." Gen. ii, 3.

Mark well the language of that portion of the decalogue which gives the reason for the institution of the Sabbath.—When speaking of the Creation in six days, and the Rest of the seventh, God says, "Wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day and hallowed it." Here the seventh day is called "the Sabbath-day" at the very period when he bestowed his blessing upon it, which was on the seventh day of the first week of time. As we have seen the institution of the Sabbath inseparably connected with God's Rest at the close of Creation, and as the Creator bestowed his blessing upon "the Sabbath-day" but once, and that at Creation, and as he designed the Sabbath for a memorial of himself, that the whole human family might call to mind the living God who made heaven and earth, by following his example and resting on the seventh day, we are now prepared to understand the words of our Saviour when he says, "The Sabbath was made for man."

The word "man" when used as it is here, in its broadest sense, means all mankind. Not the Jews only, but *man*, the whole race of man, the same as in the following texts: "Man

that is born of a woman is of few days and full of trouble." Job xiv, 1. "Man goeth forth unto his work and to his labor unto the evening." Ps. civ. 23. "There hath no temptation taken you but such as is common to man." Cor. x. 13. "Man lieth down and riseth not, till the heavens be no more." Job xiv, 12. No one will say that man in these texts means Jews or Christians, for the whole family of Adam is included. In this sense, "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath." Adam, Noah, Enoch and Abraham were men, therefore the Sabbath was made for them as well as for Abraham's natural seed. We are men, and the Sabbath was made for us.

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

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

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

The Sabbath was guarded by three standing miracles in giving the manna, and was kept by Israel, in the wilderness of Sin,

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

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

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

"And Moses said, Eat that to-day; for to-day is a Sabbath unto the Lord; to-day ye shall not find it in the field. Six days ye shall gather it; but on the seventh day, which is the Sabbath, in it there shall be none.

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

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

But some of the people went out on the seventh day to gather manna, and there was none in the field. This called forth the

rebuke from Him who hallowed the seventh day. "How long refuse ye to keep my COMMANDMENTS and my LAWS?—See, for that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath." Here we see that God's commandments and laws existed, and were observed by his people, before he spake them from Mount Sinai.

### THE TWO LAWS.

The Holy Scriptures show a clear distinction between the *law of God*, and the *law of Moses*. Those who confound these two laws in one, cannot see and feel the force of the law of God, which is shown to be perpetually binding, and is so strikingly enforced in the New Testament. Such are in great danger of resting down on the view that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment is abolished. But if it can be shown that the *law of God*, the ten commandments, and the *law of Moses*, or what the apostle Paul says is "abolished," which he calls the "enmity, even the law of commandments CONTAINED IN ORDINANCES, [Eph. ii, 15,] are two distinct covenants, then it will be clearly seen that the law of "ordinances" given to the Jewish Church could be abrogated, without affecting the Sabbath of the fourth commandment.

THE LAW OF MOSES, OR "THE LAW OF COMMANDMENTS CONTAINED IN ORDINANCES."

This law was written by the HAND of Moses, in a BOOK, which was called the BOOK of the COVENANT. To this the Apostle refers in the following words: "Blotting out the HAND-WRITING OF ORDINANCES," &c. Here we will give some texts of Scripture which speak of the book of the covenant.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The "ordinances" of the Jewish law, contained in "the book of the covenant," shadowed forth the "good things" of the gospel. Its "carnal rites," "burnt offerings and sacrifices," and "meats and drinks and divers washings," were all blotted out, and nailed to the cross when the Lamb of God shed his most precious blood.

### THE LAW OF GOD, OR TEN COMMANDMENTS.

The law of God was written with the FINGER of God on TWO TABLES OF STONE, which were called the TABLES of the COVENANT. Here we will give some texts which speak of the tables of the covenant.

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

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

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

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

"And he declared unto you HIS COVENANT, which he commanded you to perform. EVEN TEN COMMANDMENTS; and he wrote them upon two tables of stone." Deut. iv, 13.

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

By this class of texts we learn first, that "the tables were the work of God," second, that he wrote upon them with his own FINGER, third, that the matter written was the ten commandments, and fourth, that the ten commandments, alone, are God's covenant. They are not called a part of his covenant, but "HIS COVENANT." The Great Law-giver spake this covenant from "the Mount, out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness, with a GREAT VOICE; and he ADDED NO MORE;" and he wrote it "in two tables of stone." See Deut. v, 22.

The ten commandments that God wrote in the TABLES of the covenant, with his FINGER, are a law of substances, bodies and not shadows like the law of ordinances written in the BOOK of the covenant by the HAND of Moses. The law of God is founded on obligations growing out of the nature of men, and their relations to God and one another; obligations binding on man before this law was written by the finger of

God, and which continue to the close of time. The law of Moses, relating to outward observances which were not obligatory till they were commanded, was binding only on the Jews till the death of Christ, then it was abolished, and gave place to the "ministration of the Spirit."

### THE ARK OF THE COVENANT.

"And they shall make an ark of shittim-wood: two cubits and a half shall be the length thereof, and a cubit and a half the breadth thereof, and a cubit and a half the height thereof." Ex. xxv, 10.

The Ark was a small chest, a little more than four feet, six inches long, two feet, eight inches wide and high. It was made purposely to contain the tables of the covenant. See Ex. xxv. 16. Deut. x, 5; Kings viii, 9. Its place in the Tabernacle and in the Temple was the Most Holy, within the second veil. There, in the holiest place on earth, so sacred that no man entered it excepting the high priest, and he but once a year, God placed his covenant, his law, his testimony, even the ten commandments.

God has placed great honor upon his law. The Ark containing it was the strength and glory of Israel. When the tribes of Israel were about to pass over the river Jordan, "the officers went through the host, and commanded the people saying, When ye see the Ark of the covenant of the Lord your God, and the priests the Levites bearing it, then ye shall remove from your place, and go after it." See Joshua iii, 3. The priests took up the Ark of the Lord and passed on, and the people followed after. And when the soles of the feet of the priests that bear the Ark rested in the brim of the water, Jordan parted before the Ark of the Lord of all the earth, and the waters that came down the river rolled up and stood upon an heap.—The priests passed down into the bed of the river, where their feet stood firm on dry ground. There they stood with the Ark of God until all Israel passed over on dry ground. Twelve men were then selected to take from the midst of Jordan, where the priests' feet stood firm, twelve stones for a sign or memorial. And when their children should ask their fathers, "What mean ye by these stones?" they were to answer, "The waters of Jordan were cut off before the Ark of the covenant of the Lord." And when the priests that bore the Ark came up out of Jordan, and stood upon the bank of the river, down came the waters of Jordan and rolled on as before. See Joshua iii—v.

The walls of Jericho fell down before the Ark of the covenant. Seven priests went before it blowing their simple trumpets of rams' horns. For six successive days the Ark of God, and the host of Israel went round the city, compassing it once

each day; but on the seventh day, seven times. And when the seventh time was completed, the priests made a long blast with their trumpets of rams' horns, and Joshua said to the people, Shout, and down came the walls of Jericho flat to the ground before the Ark of the covenant. See Joshua vi. When Israel obeyed the ten commandments they were victorious in battle; but when any of them violated any portion of that covenant they were smitten, and compelled to flee before their enemies. Hophni and Phinehas the sons of Eli, violated the seventh commandment, and caused the Lord's people to transgress; therefore, when Israel went out against the Philistines to battle, they were smitten before them, and there fell of them about four thousand men. The elders of Israel said, "Wherefore hath the Lord smitten us to-day before the Philistines? Let us fetch the Ark of the covenant out of Shiloh unto us." And when the Ark came into the camp, all Israel shouted, so that the earth rang again. When the Philistines learned that the Ark of the Lord had come into the camp of Israel they were terrified and said, "God has come into the camp." "Wo unto us!"

But the Ark was not the strength of Israel at that time, for one of the ten immutable precepts which it contained had been violated. The Philistines fought, and Israel was smitten, and thirty thousand footmen fell. Hophni and Phinehas were slain, and the Ark of God was taken. When the sad tidings was borne to Eli, that the Ark of God was taken, he fell from his seat backward, "and his neck brake, and he died." Eli was not so much affected in hearing of the slaughter of thirty thousand men, and of the death of his two sons; but when the messenger "MADE MENTION OF THE ARK OF GOD, he fell from his seat; for he knew that the GLORY HAD DEPARTED from Israel." See Samuel iv.

The Philistines put the Ark into the house of Dagon, their God, and in the morning, "behold Dagon was fallen upon his face to the earth before the Ark of the Lord." They set him in his place again, and the next morning they found Dagon on his face again, with his head and the palms of his hands cut off; "only the stump of Dagon was left to him." See Samuel v, 1—6.

The Ark was in the country of the Philistines seven months, and during that time "the hand of the Lord was against them with a very great destruction," and they were exceedingly anxious to get rid of it, and have it go back, to Israel where it belonged. They finally made a new cart and laid the Ark upon it, and took two milch-kine, that had never been yoked, and tied them to the cart, and shut up their calves at home. The Philistines then decided that if the cows went up to Beth-shemesh that they should know that the plagues that had come upon

them, while the Ark had been with them, were from the Lord, but if they did not, then they should know that "a chance had happened" to them. "And the kine took the straight way to the way of Beth-shemesh, and went along the highway, LOWING AS THEY WENT, and turned not aside to the right hand or to the left." The cart came into the field of Joshua, and the Levites set the Ark upon the great stone Abel. "And they clave the wood of the cart, and offered the kine a burnt-offering unto the Lord." The men of Beth-shemesh were curious to see what was in this wonderful chest, so they looked into the Ark, and God slew fifty thousand and seventy of them. "And the men of Beth-shemesh said, "Who is able to stand before this Holy Lord God!"

The Ark of the Lord was removed to the house of Abinadab, and Eleazer his son was sanctified to keep it. There it remained a long time until David with thirty thousand chosen men of Israel, went to remove it into the city of David. Uzzah and Ahio drove the new cart on which they placed the Ark, while King David and all the house of Israel followed, playing on psalteries, timbrels, cornets and cymbals. And when they came to Nachon's threshing-floor, the oxen stumbled, and Uzzah put forth his hand to steady the Ark, and God smote him for his error, [margin, rashness,] and he died by the Ark of God. This terrified the King, and he said, "How shall the Ark of the Lord come to me?" So he would not remove it to the city of David, but carried it aside into the house of Obed-edom, the Gittite. But when the King heard that Obed-edom and all his house were blessed because of the Ark of God, which had continued with him three months, he went and brought it into the city of David with gladness. And when they that bore the Ark went six paces, he sacrificed oxen and fatlings, "And David danced before the Lord with all his might." See ii Samuel vi.

We have given this brief sketch of the history of the Ark of the covenant, thus far, to show that it was the strength and glory of Israel, and also to show how the Great Law-giver has regarded and honored his holy law. Those who presumptuously speak of the law of God with contempt, and call it "the old law," "the old Jewish ritual," "a yoke of bondage," "an old thunder and lightning law, which always was a curse to man," and a "miserable rickety old law," are to be pitied. "Because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the heart of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil."—Ecc. viii, 11. But their day is coming.

Both Testaments make mention of the "ARK OF THE TESTIMONY"—a chest, or Ark, containing an important TESTIMONY delivered by Jehovah. See Ex. xxv, 22; Num. vii, 89; Josh. iv, 16; Rev. xi, 19; xv, 5. This testimony is nothing more nor less

than the ten commandments. It is often spoken of as "the testimony," and the "tables of the testimony." Why was it necessary that Moses should sanctify the congregation, and set bounds around the Mount as recorded in Ex. xx? Because the Great God was about to speak and bear a TESTIMONY to man, and in awful grandeur proclaim the "Royal Law." Lightnings flashed and thunders rolled upon the Mount, while God descended upon it in fire, and "the smoke thereof ascended as the smoke of a furnace, and the whole Mount quaked greatly." Israel, in dismay, tremblingly stood and listened, while Jehovah uttered the words of the ten commandments, "And he added no more." This testimony, contained in about sixty lines of our pocket Bibles, God has honored far more than any other portion of his Word. He would not trust it in the hands of man alone, as he has the other portions of the Scriptures; but with his voice proclaimed it, and with his finger wrote it in tables of stone, which, during the Jewish dispensation were placed within the second veil of the Sanctuary, the holiest place on earth.

But where shall we look for this TESTIMONY in the present dispensation? Answer. In its proper place, in God's Sanctuary in heaven. It was also to be put into the mind, and written in the hearts of the people of God by the Holy Spirit. There is no Sanctuary recognized under the gospel as the Lord's, but the "True Tabernacle" in heaven, of which Christ is a Minister or Priest. See Heb. viii—x.

The heavenly Sanctuary is perfect in all its parts. It is called "a greater and more perfect Tabernacle." See Heb. ix, 11. If we would be correctly instructed as to its apartments and furniture, we should study well the Scriptures which speak of the earthly Sanctuary, for when Moses was about to make it, God shewed to him in holy vision, the heavenly Sanctuary, and said to him, "See that thou make all things according to the pattern shewed to thee in the mount." This caution was repeated to Moses, even while receiving instruction how to make such small vessels of the Sanctuary as the golden lamps, tongs and snuffers. See Ex. xxv, 40.

From these facts, and many more of the same nature that might be presented, we conclude that the Temple of God in heaven contains the Ark of the testimony, the ten commandments; and this conclusion is backed up by a plain *thus saith the Lord*.

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

"And after that I looked, and behold, the temple of the tabernacle of the TESTIMONY [Holist of all, which contained the testimony] in heaven was opened." Chap. xv, 5.

The revelation of Jesus Christ to his servant John, while in

the Isle Patmos, was A. D. 96. This was twenty-six years after the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple. Therefore, the "Ark," and the "tabernacle of the testimony," of which St. John speaks, must belong to the heavenly Sanctuary. The "TABERNACLE OF THE TESTIMONY" can refer to nothing but to that apartment in the "True Tabernacle" containing the Ark of God's testimony, which is the "holiest of all." The "ARK OF HIS TESTAMENT" can refer to nothing but to the Ark now in that apartment which contains the TESTIMONY that Jehovah delivered when he descended upon Mount Sinai in fire.—Will those who differ with us on these points just give a more harmonious exposition of them. How cheering and glorious is the sublime thought, to all who love the holy law of God, that in the heaven of heavens, the High and Holy One has placed the ten commandments beside his own Holiness.

#### THE TWO LAWS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

This is a subject of great importance. By not understanding it many have honestly supposed that the commandments of God were all nailed to the cross and abrogated. It is our object to show that the word law, so often used in the New Testament, does not apply to one and the same law, but that it sometimes applies to the ceremonial law of Moses, and sometimes to the ten commandments. If the word "law," so often used in the epistles of St. Paul, refers to one law only, then the Apostle has often contradicted himself. Here we will give two texts from his epistles, which speak of the law, that the reader may clearly see the contradiction, if but one law is meant.

"Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace" Gal. v, 4.

"For not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified." Rom. ii, 13.

Has the Apostle contradicted what he wrote to the Galatians, A. D. 58, relative to the law, in his letter written to the Romans two years after? This he certainly has done, if he refers to one and the same law in both texts. But we are not ready to admit that there is a contradiction in his testimony. Much rather would we admit the clear distinction between the two laws, than to thus charge the Apostle. When we apply the word law correctly there is no contradiction. To do this, we should study well the context, which, with the text, will determine the true application.

When St. Paul speaks of the law in Rom. ii, 13, he refers to the ten commandments alone. See verses 12—22.—That we may not mistake what law is referred to, the Apostle

quotes three of the ten commandments, which proves it to be the law of God. "The DOERS of" this law, says he, "SHALL BE JUSTIFIED." But when the Apostle mentions the law in Gal. v, 4, none of the ten commandments are referred to. He speaks of circumcision, which judaizing teachers were pressing upon the gospel church, and testifies that if they were circumcised they were debtors to do the whole law of shadows, of which the gospel is the body or substance, and Christ its "end." Surely, those who turned from a living substance, the gospel, and sought justification by the deeds of a dead law of shadows, had "FALLEN FROM GRACE."

We are often referred to Rom. Chap. vii, for proof that the commandments of God are abolished, and we are told that verse 6, shows that the law is dead. But we think it proves no such thing. Read verse 6, with the marginal reading, and it will be seen that it is the Christian, who has been convinced of sin by the law, has submitted to obey it, and has been made free in Jesus Christ, that is dead to the law, and not the law that is dead. "But now we are delivered from the law, [condemnation of the law,] being dead to that wherein we were held." The law of God condemns, and leaves the sinner bound; but through faith in Jesus Christ he receives grace and freedom. "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, [transgression of the law,] that grace may abound?" Or, shall we who have been delivered from the condemnation of the law, and have found pardon through faith in the atoning blood of Christ violate any part of the "royal law," because we have found freedom? "God forbid." For the moment we do we are bound by its condemnation again. And further, it cannot be the law of God that is dead, for this law is the very living instrument to convict the sinner of sin, and slay him as it slew Paul.

"What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, [tenth commandment,] Thou shalt not covet." Verse 7.

"For I was alive without the law once; but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died." Verse 9.

"Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea we establish the law." Rom. iii, 31.

The epistle to the Romans was written A. D. 60. The crucifixion was A. D. 31, therefore the Apostle's letter to his Roman brethren was 29 years after the "hand-writing of ordinances" was nailed to the cross. If the Apostle wished to teach the Romans that the ten commandments had been abolished, and had been dead 29 years, that they were a "yoke of bondage," and if observed by them, they would fall from grace, as many teach at this day, we might expect him to write to them something as follows—Wherefore the law is *unholy*, and the com-

mandment *unholy*, and *unjust*, and *bad*; instead of saying, "Wherefore the LAW IS HOLY, and the commandment HOLY, and JUST, and GOOD." Verse 12. Paul also says, "For we know that the law is SPIRITUAL." See also 14. Who will venture to say that this was that law of ceremonies that had been dead 29 years? "For I DELIGHT in the law of God after the inward man." Verse 22. Who will say that he delighted in a yoke of bondage? "I thank God, through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then, with the mind I myself serve the law of God." Verse 25. Will any one say that Paul thanked God that he served a law that had been abolished 29 years, after teaching the Galatians two years before that if they sought to be justified by it they would fall from grace? Certainly no sane man will charge the great Apostle to the Gentiles with such contradictions and folly. Then we cannot avoid the conclusion that he, in his epistles, speaks of two distinct laws.

One was called a "yoke of bondage," Gal. v, 1, for when in force it could not "make the comers thereunto perfect;" but now it had been dead 27 years. The other is called "*holy*," "*just*," "*good*," and "*spiritual*," and was the Apostle's "*delight*." James calls it the "ROYAL LAW OF LIBERTY." Chap. i, 25; ii, 8. One was the "enmity, even the law of commandments CONTAINED IN ORDINANCES." The other is the law of God the ten commandments. One was abolished at the cross, while the other remains as firm as heaven. Here we will add the testimony of Jesus in his sermon on the Mount.

"Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily, I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." Matt. v, 17, 18.

To abolish a law is to destroy it. One of the great objects of the first Advent was to abolish or destroy the law of ordinances, to make place for the gospel. But there is a law which Jesus did not come to destroy, but to fulfill. The only way to fulfill this law is to keep it. See James ii, 8. This Jesus did; for he says, "I have kept my Father's commandments." John xv, 10. He who knew that men would make void the law of God, and think it abolished at the cross says, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law." He also, in an impressive manner, declares that while heaven and earth remain, this law in all its parts will remain the same. Not one jot or tittle was to pass from it. That none may mistake what law is spoken of here, Jesus adds, "Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least COMMANDMENTS, and shall teach men so, &c." This shows it to be God's law of commandments. But to make it

still more sure if possible, Jesus in verses 21, 27 and 33, refers to three of the commandments of the decalogue.

Men may teach for a few days that the law of God is abolished, that the fourth commandment is taken from it, that it is changed, or, as some say, "relaxed;" but their assertions and sophistry wither before the plain and positive testimony of the Son of God, who has said, "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in NO WISE pass from the law."

### OBJECTIONS TO THE SABBATH ANSWERED.

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

The principal passages of Scripture quoted to sustain the no-Sabbath system are from the epistles of the Apostle Paul. It is our object to show that these texts do not mean what they are said to mean, and also to show their true application. We fully believe that when their true application is seen, that they will not present the least objection to the perpetuity of the seventh-day Sabbath.

Objection 1. "Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations. For one believeth that he may eat all things; another who is weak, eateth herbs. Let not him that eateth, despise him that eateth not; and let not him which eateth not, judge him that eateth: for God hath received him. Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth; yea, he shall be holden up; for God is able to make him stand.

"One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it. He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks; and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks." Rom. xiv, 1-6.

If we would rightly understand the words of the Apostle we should first learn the subject of his discourse. And here we would say that he makes no reference to any of the commandments of God in Rom. xiv. His subject relates to eating, and those feast-days which some of the church then regarded, while others did not regard them. The word *eateth* is mentioned in this chapter eleven times, *eat* three, *meat* four, and *drink* twice; but the Sabbath, which many suppose is the subject of this chapter, is not once mentioned.

That we may better understand the application of this, and similar portions of Scripture, let us take a brief view of some of the trials of the early church with whom the Apostle labored and suffered. A portion of the Christian church were converts from the circumcision or Jews, and a portion from the un-



circumcision or Gentiles. The converts from the circumcision were inclined to still hold on to, and practice some of the customs and ceremonies of the Jewish religion, while the Gentile believers were free from those customs, having never been educated in them. Peter did not understand that the gospel was for the Gentiles also, until God gave him a vision upon the house-top, and sent him to preach to them at the house of Cornelius. He would not eat with the Gentiles or keep company with them until he was shown that God was "no respecter of persons." See Acts x, 1—45.

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

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

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

"But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?" Gal. ii, 14.

With these facts before us we may see that the subject of the fourteenth chapter of Romans applied directly to the trials of the church in the Apostle's day. We may also see that this subject does not directly apply to the church at this day; for divisions relative to feast-days and eating do not now exist, as they did in the apostolic church. The Apostle was giving the Romans a lesson of forbearance in relation to the Jewish views of eating and feast-days which some still retained. "Let not him that eateth, despise him that eateth not; and let not him which eateth not, judge him that eateth, for God hath received him."

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

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

Those who read only the fifth and sixth verses of the fourteenth chapter of Romans, which speak of regarding and disregarding days, without an understanding of the Apostle's subject, may suppose that the seventh-day Sabbath is referred to. But an understanding of his subject, his trials, and his labors with his brethren at Rome, destroys all reasonable grounds for even an inference that he refers to the Sabbath of the Lord. It is urged by some that Rom. xiv, 5, 6, "refers to *every day*," therefore includes the seventh-day Sabbath. So it may be urged with equal propriety that some of the early christians lived without eating, from the expression, "Let not him that eateth, despise him that *EATETH NOT*; and let not him which *EATETH NOT*, judge him that eateth." It is evident that the words "eateth not" were spoken in reference to those things forbidden by the Jews. It is also evident that the words, "every day alike" had reference only to disregarding feast-days. "Consistency is a jewel," and should ever be seen in those who teach the Holy Scriptures.

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

We are told by many of those who advocate the no-Sabbath doctrine, that if we observe the Sabbath we shall fall from grace

and certainly be lost; and Gal. v, 4, is quoted as proof.—“Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law: ye are fallen from grace.” But this does not harmonize with their own view of what Paul has taught in Rom. xiv, 5, 6. They first tell us that we may esteem the seventh day above the other six, and keep the Sabbath; or we may esteem all alike and work on all seven days of the week. In either case we are safe, if the Sabbath is not made a test question. And then we are told that if we do esteem one day above another, that is, observe the Sabbath, we shall fall from grace, and call down on our own heads all the woes mentioned in the New Testament against those who rejected Christ, and went back to the observances of the Jewish law. Again, if the word law in Gal. v, 4, refers to the ten commandments, then certainly those who observe nine of them, all excepting the fourth, are also fallen from grace. If we have fallen from grace for observing the fourth commandment, we cannot be restored until we break it. And by the same rule those who observe nine of the commandments cannot be restored to grace, until they violate all ten of the commandments of God!! We leave the reader to decide as to the justness of this conclusion. Our object is to hold up the view that the commandments of God are abolished, in its true hideous form, that souls may take warning and not be devoured by it.

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

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

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

The crucifixion was the dividing line between the two dispensations. “In the midst of the week [A. D. 31] he [Messiah] shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation [sacrifices and offerings of the law of Moses] to cease.” Dan. ix, 27. They virtually ceased when Christ the great sacrifice was nailed to the

cross. The “hand-writing of ordinances” was that very day blotted out. The first covenant, with its “ordinances of divine service and a worldly Sanctuary,” was a shadow of the second and better covenant, with its “greater and more perfect Tabernacle,” and the priesthood of Jesus Christ connected with it.—A shadow must have a body, by which it is cast or produced, and must reach to its body, and can reach no farther. The “hand-writing of ordinances” was the shadow in this case, and the “good things to come,” connected with the priesthood of Christ, is the body which cast the shadow back into the Jewish age. Therefore when Christ, the only sacrifice for the gospel age, was nailed to the cross, the “sacrifice and oblation” of the Jewish law ceased forever. According to the testimony of St. Paul the hand-writing of ordinances was blotted out at the cross. This was not the work of years, but was accomplished the day of Christ’s crucifixion. This is what the Apostle means by “nailing it to his cross.”

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

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

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

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

The Sabbaths of the Lord our God, come every seventh day; but some of the Jewish convocation sabbaths were nine days apart, others had only four days between them. Here is a clear difference made between the two kind of sabbaths. The Sabbath of the Lord, so called by way of distinction, is not classed with the other sabbaths. The Jews were to observe their convocation sabbaths at their appointed time. “BESIDES THE SABBATHS OF THE LORD.” The Sabbath of the Lord, so called by way of eminence, was instituted at Creation before the fall when the earth and man were holy. The convocation

sabbaths were given at Mount Sinai twenty-five hundred years later, and we find them classed with the ordinances of Moses' law, such as "a meat-offering, a sacrifice, and drink-offerings." They were of the same nature of those offerings, and had their origin and end with them. But the Sabbath of the Lord, which was made for the entire human race to commemorate God's Rest after he had created the world in six days, was wisely placed in the midst of nine moral precepts, which have been, and ever will be, binding on the whole race of mankind.

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

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

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

3. The Apostle does not speak of "the Sabbath," which is associated with the other nine moral precepts of the Decalogue; but of the Jewish sabbath-days or sabbaths, which were associated with "meat," "drink," and "the new moon," &c.—

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

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

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

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

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

If the Apostle refers to the Sabbath of the Lord our God, then we might expect to find the words "the Sabbath" or "the Sabbath-day" in this text, as well as in the many other texts in the New Testament where the seventh-day Sabbath is spoken of. But it reads "sabbath-days" or "sabbaths" in all the translations of this text that we have ever seen. The only weekly Sabbath of the Bible is called, "THE SABBATH OF THE LORD thy GOD." It is also called, "MY HOLY DAY," [Isa. lviii, 13.]

"THE HOLY OF THE LORD." "THY HOLY SABBATH," [Neh. ix, 14.] and "THE SABBATH." But the Jewish sabbaths are spoken of in the following manner. "In the first day of the month ye shall have a sabbath." From even unto even, (on the tenth day of the seventh month,) shall ye celebrate YOUR sabbath. See Lev. xxiii, 24, 32. In Hosea, [ii, 11.] they are called HER sabbaths."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

spect of an holy day, or of the new-moon” with which the Apostle has associated the Jewish sabbaths.

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

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

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

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

istration<sup>1</sup> was "done away in Christ," and was emblematically illustrated by the glory of Moses' countenance, which was temporary.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

engraven on stone, the other is the "ministration of righteousness," or justification, by the Spirit of Christ, while this law is put into the mind, and written in the heart.

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

### THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK.

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

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

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

"And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, (ready to depart on the morrow,) and continued his speech until midnight." Acts xx, 7.

Luke here records the fact that St. Paul once preached all night of the first day of the week at Troas, and past midnight broke bread with the disciples. This is the only text in the New Testament in which the first day of the week is mentioned in connection with public worship. But there is no intimation given that the disciples regarded the first day of the week as a Sabbath, or that they rested from labor on that day. As that meeting at Troas was held in the night, and as there is no evidence that the disciples met regularly on that night of the week before

or after that time, it is evident that it was an occasional meeting appointed to have a communion season, and for the Apostle to take leave of his brethren, for he was to "depart on the morrow."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Then, according to the word of God, and that shall decide this question, St. John recognized the "Lord's day," the Sabbath of the Lord our God, A. D. 96. This was 65 years after the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ. But, if it should be admitted that the "Lord's day" refers to the first day of the week, and that St. John was in the Spirit on that day, then what would be gained in favor of the first-day sabbath? Verily noth-

ing; for the circumstance of the Apostle being in the Spirit on that day would not make it a Christian duty to keep the first day of the week as a Sabbath. Those who reject a plain and positive precept for observing the seventh day, and keep another day, with no divine authority for it, with only the weak and groundless inferences drawn from Cor. xvi, 2; Acts xxi, 7, and Rev. i, 10, in favor of the first day of the week, are to be pitied. May the Lord have mercy on his sincere followers, and may they be speedily turned from the tradition of men, to observe the commandments of God.

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

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

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

Who can say that it was not on the ninth day after his first appearance? It was certainly full eight days after, which would bring it to Monday night.

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

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

### THE SABBATH.

As the Sabbath was made for man, and as the whole human race have needed all its blessings ever since it was instituted in Paradise, it is reasonable to conclude that God designed that it should be as strictly observed in one dispensation as in another.

We do not see any good reasons why the Jews should keep it any more strictly than Christians. We design to show that there is perfect harmony in all the testimony of both Testaments relative to the observance of the Holy Sabbath. We are aware that every means has been, and will be tried to make it appear that we should not observe the Sabbath. Some assert that we cannot keep the letter of the Sabbath law. It is common for one class of our opponents to refer to certain restrictions laid upon the Jews in the wilderness, which are no part of the great Sabbath commandment, and which we will notice hereafter, to prove that we do not, and cannot observe the Sabbath. And then some even go so far as to try to make it appear that Christ and his apostles departed from the letter of the Sabbath law.—Their reasonings from false premises are well calculated to deceive, confuse the mind, and lead precious souls from the truth of the Bible on this subject.

The fourth commandment of the Decalogue is the great Sabbath law. It is the standard to which the testimony relative to the Sabbath, in both Testaments, should be brought and carefully compared. With the right view of this commandment, a harmony may be seen throughout the divine testimony on this subject.

"Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy. 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, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates." Ex. xx, 8—10.

The great God appointed six days for man to labor, and do the work necessary to obtain a livelihood. This labor is called "thy work." But on the seventh day he designed that man should rest from this world's toil and care, and engage in the service of his Creator. The Sabbath law does not require us to become stationary and inactive on the seventh day. When we speak of the Sabbath law, we refer only to the fourth commandment which God spake with an audible voice, and engraved in the tables of the covenant. The words, "let no man go out of his place on the seventh day," Ex. xvi, 29, were spoken in reference to the children of Israel not going out into the field to gather manna on that day, as they did the six preceding days. Afterward the Jews did go out of their places on the Sabbath, not to do servile labor, but to worship God. On the Sabbath they had "an holy convocation," a religious assembly. Lev. xxiii, 3; Acts xv. 21. And farther, the priests were required by God to offer on the Sabbath, even more offerings than on the other six days.

"And on the Sabbath-day two lambs of the first year without spot, and two tenth-deals of flour for a meat-offering, mingled with oil, and



the drink-offering thereof. This is the burnt-offering of every Sabbath, BESIDE the continual burnt-offering, and his drink-offering." Num. xxviii, 9, 10.

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

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

We are differently situated. Our constitutions and climate require the heat of fire on the Sabbath a portion of the year.—We kindle a fire on the seventh day as an act of mercy and necessity, the same as we would water an ox or a horse, or lift a sheep from a pit. Such acts, the "Lord of the Sabbath" pronounced "*lawful*." But it is evidently wrong, and a violation of the Sabbath, to neglect to make those necessary preparations for the rest of the Holy Sabbath, which can be consistently made on the sixth day. The Sabbath law forbids our doing on the seventh day that which can be done on the sixth, and also what is not really an act of mercy and necessity. But merci-

ful acts, such as relieving the distress of man or beast, which cannot be done on the sixth day, are "*lawful*," on the seventh. A reasonable and Scriptural view of the Sabbath law does not require us to suffer cold or hunger; for the law is "*holy*," "*just*," and "*good*."

But among the many positions of our opponents, which are perfectly destructive of each other, perhaps no one is more at variance with the Bible, and more wicked in the sight of heaven, than that which charges the Son of God with Sabbath-breaking. He says, "I have kept my Father's commandments."—But this view contradicts Jesus, and charges him with violating the fourth. It also contradicts the testimony of the beloved disciple.

"Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law; for sin is the transgression of the law. And ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin." i John iii, 4, 5.

This testimony proves that if Jesus did depart from the letter of the Sabbath law, then he was a sinner, for "sin is the transgression of the law." But as "in him is no sin," it follows that he did not transgress the law, as he declares; "I have kept my Father's commandments."

It is said that Jesus departed from the letter of the law in healing the sick on the Sabbath, and that he taught by example, as well as precept, that it was "*relaxed*." One thing is certain, he either kept the Sabbath law, or he broke it. If it is said that he observed it, then it is worse than idle to talk of his departing from its letter, and relaxing it. But if it is said that he did not observe it, but transgressed the Sabbath law, then Jesus is charged with being a sinner; for "sin is the transgression of the law." Christ was made under the law, [Gal. iv, 4,] and observed even the law of Moses up to the day of his crucifixion. He urged its observance upon his disciples. "The scribes and the Pharisees," said he, "sit in Moses' seat: All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do." Matt. xxiii, 2, 3. As Moses' law extended to the cross, this injunction was to be obeyed till that time. Those who teach that the Sabbath is merely a Jewish institution, and that it was abolished at the cross, should know that, in that case, it continued in full force until the crucifixion; for Christ and his apostles were to observe the law of Moses, until the hand-writing of ordinances was nailed to the cross. Again, those who hold that the Sabbath law was abolished at the cross, virtually admit that it was in force up to that point of time. But if Jesus had the power and the right to relax it, and if he exercised that power in doing it away, and taught that it was done away, by healing the sick on the Sabbath, then it is unwise to talk of its being abolished afterward, at the cross. For a law that is not in force cannot be abolished.

The wicked Pharisees charged the disciples with Sabbath-breaking, when they plucked the ears of corn, and ate to satisfy hunger, as they, with their Master, were on their way to the synagogue. But did Jesus teach that they had a right to break the Sabbath? Far from it. He referred them to what David did when he was hungry, also to the work of the priests, on the Sabbath, who were "*blameless*;" and then declared his disciples "*guiltless*." David and the priests were "*blameless*" on no other ground than this; what they did was no violation of the law. The disciples were "*guiltless*" on the same ground. The Bible nowhere forbids eating on the Sabbath when hungry. When Jesus was asked, "Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath-days," he replied:—

"What man shall there be among you, that shall have one sheep, and if it fall into a pit on the Sabbath-day, will he not lay hold on it, and lift it out? How much then is a man better than a sheep? Wherefore it is **LAWFUL** to do well on the Sabbath-days." Matt. xii, 11, 12.

The word lawful signifies "agreeable to law; conformable to law." [Webster.] When used by our Saviour in Matt. xii, and Luke xiv, it signifies conformable to the Sabbath law. Jesus did not give them a new Sabbath law, neither did he intimate that the fourth commandment was "*relaxed*." But he exposed the hypocrisy of those who falsely charged him with Sabbath-breaking, and declared that well-doing, that is, healing the sick, relieving dumb beasts in distress, or eating when hungry, was "*lawful*." The blind Pharisees, who rejected the first Advent to their own damnation, declared that those merciful acts which Christ performed on the Sabbath were "not lawful." Christ, on the other hand, pronounced such well-doing "**LAWFUL**." Those who teach that Jesus departed from the letter of the Sabbath law are on the side of the Pharisees, and their sin is worse, inasmuch as their blasphemous charge is against greater light. Christians should be on the side of Christ. Amen.

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

Finally, it is said that the penalty for violating the Sabbath is done away, therefore the Sabbath law does not exist. To this

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

#### THE SABBATH AND TEN COMMANDMENTS TAUGHT AND ENFORCED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The New Testament makes mention of no other weekly Sabbath than the seventh day. Christians should not, therefore, observe another day, in the absence of any divine precept for so doing, and reject the Sabbath of both Testaments. "The seventh day," said Jehovah, "is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God."

It will be admitted that the "Sabbath of the Lord" should not be rejected, and another observed, without as positive testimony from the Bible requiring it, as there is for the seventh day. But when we search the New Testament through for a precept for the observance of the first day, we do not find it. It is not there. But the New Testament writers speak of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, as of an institution that then existed in all its importance. None of them call it the "old Sabbath," or the "old Jewish Sabbath," as is common in our day; but they speak of it with all that reverence that the prophets have before them.

"And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments, and rested the Sabbath-day, according to the commandment." Luke xxiii, 56.

The Apostle Paul testifies that the "hand-writing of ordinances" was blotted out at the cross, see Col. ii, 14, therefore, whatever was abolished expired with Christ. Jesus was nailed to the cross the third hour of the day, or at nine o'clock, A. M. Mark xv. 25. From the sixth to the ninth hour, or three o'clock

P. M., darkness was over all the earth, and at this hour Jesus gave up the Ghost. The holy women had three hours to see the body of their Lord laid in the sepulchre, and to return, and prepare the spices and ointments, before the Sabbath commenced. It is not possible to conceive how that St. Luke could record the fact of their "resting the Sabbath-day, according to the commandment," if, as some teach, the fourth commandment, requiring rest from labor on the Sabbath, had previously expired at the cross. The record of their resting on the Sabbath-day, according to the commandment, shows conclusively that the "commandment," and the institution guarded by it, both existed the day following the crucifixion. The modern view that Jesus "relaxed" the Sabbath, and taught his disciples, by precept and example, that they might violate it, charges the intimate followers of Christ, with ignorance and folly, in being so strict about the commandment. They could not conscientiously even apply the spices and ointments to the body of their Master on the Sabbath. All was still during the seventh-day. But "very early in the morning" of the first day of the week, all were active again. The angel came down and rolled the stone from the door of the sepulchre, and the disciples were running to and fro. We confess that it looks much more safe to follow the sure Word, and the example of the holy, who personally learned of Jesus, than uninspired men of this day who have been continually sliding from one position to another.

"But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath-day." Matt. xxiv, 20.

It is supposed by many that this text was spoken in reference to the destruction of Jerusalem. Some say it refers to the days of Papal persecution. But J. Litch, in the "Advent Herald" for Dec. 7, 1850, applies it to the "end of human probation." If the first view, which applies these words of our Saviour to the destruction of Jerusalem, is correct, then it follows that Christ recognizes the perpetuity of the Sabbath, as really as the seasons of the year, about forty years after the Jewish feasts were abolished. If Matt. xxiv, 20, applies to the Papal persecution, then it follows of necessity that the Sabbath existed more than five hundred years after the crucifixion. But if J. Litch is correct, in applying this text to the "time of trouble such as never was," after "human probation" closes, and just prior to the Second Advent, then Jesus clearly recognizes the perpetuity of the Sabbath through the entire gospel dispensation at least.

The great Apostle to the GENTILES preached on the Sabbath, and had no other regular preaching day. We have no record of his meeting with the disciples on the first day of the week but once, [Acts xx, 7,] and that was in the evening, or first part

of the day, [Gen. i, 5,] to break bread. Mark this: Paul pursued his journey on foot to Assos, and sailed with his brethren to Mitylene, the same day that he broke bread at Troas. Let those who talk of apostolic example for Sunday-keeping, look at these facts. We say apostolic example is in favor of the seventh day.

"And Paul, AS HIS MANNER WAS, went in unto them, and three Sabbath-days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures." Acts xvii, 2.

The Apostle preached to the "Greeks" as well as the Jews at Corinth, "every Sabbath," for the space of one year and six months. See Acts xviii, 4—11. It is said that the only reason why Paul preached on the Sabbath, was because the Jews were assembled in their synagogues on that day. But this is not true; for we find the Apostle and his companions preaching elsewhere, besides in the synagogues, on the Sabbath.

"And on the Sabbath we went out of the city by a RIVER SIDE, WHERE PRAYER WAS WONT TO BE MADE; and we sat down, and spake unto the women which resorted thither." Acts xvi, 13.

If that meeting by the "river side" had been on the first day of the week, then the advocates of the first day might, with some degree of propriety, talk of Apostolic example for observing that day. But, as we have shown, there is no record of a public meeting of the apostles, in the day-time, on the first day of the week, in the New Testament; therefore it is folly to talk of apostolic example for Sunday-keeping. At Antioch, Paul preached on the Sabbath, at the request of the GENTILES.

"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." Acts xiii, 42, 44.

Here are some things worthy of special notice. It was the Gentiles, not the Jews, that invited Paul to preach to them the next Sabbath. If Paul taught the people that the Sabbath was a mere Jewish institution, as many teach at this day, it seems really unaccountable how these Gentiles, who were entirely disconnected with the Jewish religion, should request him to preach to them on the Sabbath. It is evident that the reason why the Gentiles invited Paul to preach to them on the Sabbath, was because he regarded the seventh day as the Sabbath of the Lord, and the proper day for religious worship. If that request of the Gentiles had been made to a modern preacher, he would have replied, you need not wait till another Jewish Sabbath; to-morrow is Lord's day, we will preach to you to-morrow. That was certainly a good opportunity for the great Apostle to the Gentiles to show the Gentile portion of that community that the Sabbath was abolished, if it had been, as our opponents assert.—And if, as some teach, it was the design of Heaven that the ob-

servance of the first day of the week should rest upon "apostolic example," how convenient it would have been for the Apostle to have set the example in the city of Antioch, when the people were anxious to hear, and were in a good state of mind to receive right impressions. But instead of setting an example favoring the first day of the week, the Apostle entirely overlooked it, and the poor Gentiles, so anxious to hear the word of God, had to wait until, what is falsely called, the Jewish Sabbath arrived!

The Jews never accused Paul with violating the Sabbath law. And it is evident that his most bitter enemies, the Jews, would have charged him with Sabbath-breaking if he had disregarded the fourth commandment, and taught its abolition, and sought to introduce another day instead of the Sabbath. "Men and brethren," says he, "though I have committed nothing against the people, or CUSTOMS OF OUR FATHERS, yet was I delivered prisoner from Jerusalem into the hands of the Romans." Acts xxviii, 17. This testimony would have been denied by those Jews who heard it, and the Apostle would have been silenced at once, if he had ever taught the abolition of the seventh-day Sabbath. But instead of this, he "dwelt two whole years in his own hired house," "preaching the kingdom of God," "with all confidence, no man forbidding him." See Acts xxviii, 30, 31.

Now, we ask, who can for a moment believe that Paul taught the Romans, Galatians, Corinthians and Colossians that the seventh-day Sabbath had been abolished at the cross, and at the same time was preaching every Sabbath, not only to the Jews, but at the request of the Gentiles, and by "a river side," and had no other regular preaching day? Those who can, make him one of the most inconsistent men that ever undertook to preach the gospel. But God forbid that we should thus charge the holy Apostle. We have the best of evidence that his teaching was in accordance with his example, and that he both taught and observed the Sabbath of the Bible.

Wherever the commandments of God are taught and enforced in the New Testament, the Sabbath of necessity is taught and enforced, for the simple reason that the fourth commandment is one of the ten.

"Children, obey your parents in the Lord; for this is right. Honor thy father and mother, (which is the first commandment with promise,) that it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth." Eph. vi, 1-3.

It will not be denied that Paul here refers to the ten commandments as engraven in the tables of stone. He quotes the fifth commandment, which is the *first* on the second table, and which has a "promise" annexed to it. It is "the first com-

mandment with promise;" the first of the six containing our duty to each other. If the commandments of God, mentioned in the New Testament, refer to all the precepts given to govern the church of Christ, as some teach, then we fail to see the propriety of calling the commandment showing the duty of children to their parents, the *first with promise*. It is evident that the Apostle refers to the order of the commandments of the Decalogue. See Rom. vii, 7-14; Luke xxiii, 56; Matt. xix, 17-19; xv, 3, 4; v, 17-19.

"Here is the patience of the saints; here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." Rev. xiv, 12.

"And the dragon was wroth with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ." Rev. xii, 17.

Here are some things in these texts of peculiar interest to us. First, it is the remnant of the seed of the woman, with whom the dragon makes war. A remnant is a small part, and the last end. The remnant of the seed of the woman, therefore, must be the last portion of the church, the "little flock," who are waiting for Jesus to come the second time. In their patient waiting time, they keep the commandments of God.

Second, they possess, and keep the "testimony," or "faith" of Jesus Christ, [the Son,] as well as the commandments of God, [the Father.] It will be admitted that the testimony, or faith of Jesus, includes every New Testament requirement peculiar only to the gospel, such as repentance, faith, baptism, Lord's supper, &c. Then we inquire, What are the commandments of God to be kept in connection with the testimony of Jesus Christ? It will not do to say that they are "all the precepts that God has given to govern man's conduct, not the ten commandments," as asserted by "C," of the "Advent Harbinger." This assertion virtually charges the True Witness with making a useless distinction between the commandments of God, and the testimony of Jesus Christ. We say, therefore, that the commandments of God, mean nothing more nor less than the COMMANDMENTS OF GOD, the ten which he spake to the people, and wrote with his finger in the table of the covenant. We are satisfied that this natural position never would have been questioned by Adventists, had it not been for a desire to get rid of the fourth commandment.

Third, no one has a right to say that the "commandments of God" mean only nine of them; all save one. Let those who are tempted to do so, first read Rev. xxii, 19.

"And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the Holy City, and from the things which are written in this book."

It is evident that the dragon is wroth, and makes war with the remnant, because they observe the fourth commandment, as well as the other nine. Nine of them are universally admitted to be binding, and are professedly kept, and the very dragon himself says, this is as it should be. But the war is coming for keeping the commandments of God. Remember this. Well, will any make war with us for not having "other gods before" the Living God, or for not making a "graven image" to bow down to? Certainly not. If we should do so, we should at once be called heathen. Neither will war be made with the remnant for not profaning the Name of God, for honoring their parents, and for refraining from murder, adultery and theft, for not bearing "false witness," and for not coveting their neighbor's house, or wife, &c. Nine of the commandments may be strictly regarded, and the dragon will be as mild as a lamb. But let the "remnant" reject, and totally disregard the day which the papacy has put in the place of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, which is now observed by the daughters of Babylon, and keep the Sabbath of the Lord our God, and the dragon's ire will be stirred. Then, and not till then, can it be said that they keep the commandments of God. Then the war will come from the two-horned beast, that is yet to speak "as a dragon," and the "remnant" who keep the commandments under the message of the third angel, [Rev. xiv, 9—12,] will feel his wrath. But the commandment-keepers are not left here.—The True Witness [Jesus] presents them triumphantly marching through the golden gates of the City of God, where they have a right to the Tree of Life. "Blessed are they," says the Son of God, "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, 14.

"A Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you, of your brethren, him shall ye hear in all things." Acts iii, 22.

This Prophet was no other than the Son of God. Moses was the teacher of the Jewish dispensation, Christ of the Gospel.—We must "hear" Jesus relative to the commandments, law, Sabbath, and all else. The desire of every Christian should be, "Speak Lord, for thy servant heareth." Says the Mediator of the New Covenant, "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." If it is said that commandments here mean all the requirements of the gospel, then we answer, Jesus quotes five of the precepts of the Decalogue, which shows what he meant by "commandments." But it is asserted that Jesus answered the young man as a Jew, and that his instructions were only to last till the crucifixion, and then the commandments would no longer be binding on him? To this we reply, that

the young man was not inquiring of Moses his duty as a Jew; but of the Son of God, the way to Life. He taught the young man the duty of all Christians, down to the resurrection of the just, when "Life" and Immortality will be given. Praise His Name.

Well, says the objector, "I will observe those commandments that the Great Teacher has quoted in the New Testament, and no more. As he has never quoted the fourth, I am not bound to keep the Sabbath." Stop Sir, did you know that Jesus never quoted the first four commandments? Search and see for yourself. Now if you reject those commandments not quoted by Christ, then you strike from your duty, as a Christian, the four commandments on the first table of stone, showing your duty to God. And you have, therefore, the same liberty to profane the Name of God, as you have to desecrate the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. It may be said that the third commandment is referred to in Matt. v, 33. But it will be seen, by a closer examination, that Jesus refers to the ninth, instead of the third. Whiting translates it thus: "Thou shalt not swear falsely, but shalt perform to the Lord thine oaths." This is in substance the ninth commandment. "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor." The "ambassadors for Christ," who stand "in Christ's stead," should teach the same way to "Life" pointed out by the Master. "If thou wilt enter into life keep the commandments."

But it is said that Christ, in his answer to the lawyer, resolved the ten commandments into two, requiring love to God, and love to our neighbor. Therefore it is "not a Christian duty to keep the Sabbath." Those who do not search for themselves, but receive as truth what is told them by their preacher, or what they read in their favorite paper, may be satisfied with this position. But let it be compared with Scripture and reason and it will be seen to be unsound and deceptive. It is admitted by our opponents, that whatever change has taken place in the commandments and Sabbath, occurred at the crucifixion, and resurrection of Christ. Therefore, if the precepts of the Decalogue have been abolished and set aside, and if the two great commandments take their place, it was not done until the crucifixion. Before this portion of Scripture can help the no-Sabbath position it will have to be altered, and the question of the lawyer will have to read, Master, which will be the great commandment in the law, after the ten commandments are abolished, instead of, "which IS the great commandment in the law?" And the reply of Christ should also read like this, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This will be the first and great commandment in the gospel dispensation, instead of, "This IS the

first and great commandment." And the second shall be like unto it, instead of "And the second IS like unto it. On these two commandments will then, in the gospel dispensation, hang all the law and the prophets, instead of, "On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." But it is much more safe to abandon a false position, than to wrest the Scriptures.

It is evident that Christ was teaching the lawyer the two great principles, on which the ten commandments ever hung, and ever were to hang as long as God was to require man to love his neighbor as himself, and his Maker supremely. When it can be shown that these two great principles, supreme love to God, and love to our neighbor, are abolished, then, and not till then, will it be seen that the commandments that have ever hung on them are fallen. The first four commandments, on the first table of stone, show us our duty to God. They owe their existence to, and hang on the principle of, supreme love to God. He who loves God supremely will not violate them. The last six, on the second table, show our duty to each other. These hang on the righteous principle, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." He who does, will not violate one of them. Thus, "love is the fulfilling of the law." Rom. xiii, 10. It is said that nine of the commandments are "embodied in the law of Christ, and enforced," but the Sabbath law is left out. The "law of Christ" is the new commandment given to the church. "A new commandment I give unto you," says Jesus, "that ye love one another." John xii, 34. "This is my commandment, that ye love one another, as I have loved you." Chap. xv, 12. Paul explains this commandment or law more fully. "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfill the LAW OF CHRIST." Gal. vi, 2. The assertion that nine of the commandments are embodied in this one law, or new commandment of Christ, is groundless. This is one of the smooth fables of the last days, suited to itching ears. Were it possible for any of the precepts of the Decalogue to be embodied in this one law of Christ, none but the last six showing our duty to each other, could be. This position also leads to the conclusion that the crucifixion abolished all ten of the precepts of the Decalogue, and that the same act re-enacted, brought back, and embodied nine of them in the principle of love to our brethren! Therefore, supreme love to God, "the first and great commandment," is left out of the question after all!

Jesus observed, and taught, his Father's commandments, so did his apostles; but they never called them the law of Christ, or any part of the new commandment given by Christ. When Christ and the apostles speak of the commandments, or law of God, they certainly mean all ten of the precepts of the Decalogue. This is plain enough for Christians. But unbelief can

always find a handle to take hold of, and calls in question the plainest revealed truths. God has not revealed himself to man in such a manner that he cannot doubt. If he had, there never would have been an Infidel. The Second Advent of Jesus is one of the simplest truths of the Bible, yet few lay hold of the "blessed hope," while thousands doubt. Just so with the Sabbath. Those who wish to believe the whole truth, may, relying on the word of God alone, believe without a doubt, while those who fear the cross catch at straws, and sink in unbelief.

As there is no record that the Sabbath law was violated in the days of Christ and his apostles, we see no reason why the letter of the fourth commandment should have been separately enforced by them. The only natural reason why the apostles did not rebuke the sin of Sabbath-breaking, is because the sin did not exist in the early church. The Sabbath was their regular preaching day, and they had no other. And Paul, John and James taught the keeping of the commandments of God, as a test of Christian fellowship, and eternal salvation. Those who read the Bible know that the commandments of God are taught and enforced as a whole in the New Testament, and this is sufficient to condemn them in the judgment, if they violate the fourth. Because the fourth is not separately enforced, those who wish to violate it for some worldly object, through pride, or the fear of man, will not be guiltless before God. He will not be trifled with. His word will not return unto him void. If the Sabbath-breaker should be asked in the judgment, what excuse he had for violating the Sabbath law, he would not dare, while standing before the great white throne, to say that he broke it because the fourth commandment was not separately enforced in the New Testament. Such an excuse may look quite plausible to some, and may ease the conscience now; but the day is not far distant when those who teach that the fourth commandment may be violated, will feel, with deep anguish of spirit, this simple, yet tremendous truth, that Christ and his apostles, when enforcing the commandments of God, and making the observance of them a test of Christian fellowship, and eternal salvation, mean THE COMMANDMENTS OF GOD, instead of *nine* of them.

Says Jesus, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law." Master, what law? "Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least COMMANDMENTS," &c. "For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law." If the Sabbath passed from the law at the time of the first Advent, heaven and earth then passed away. Such a view would suit Spiritualists, but not those who are looking for Christ to come and make all things new.

Says James, "Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet

offend in one, [*point* is here a supplied word. Macknight translates it, "fail with respect to one precept,"] he is guilty of all. For he that said, Do not commit adultery; said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou are become a transgressor of the law. So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty." Chap. ii, 10—12. Here are some things which should be carefully noticed. First, the Apostle quotes the sixth and seventh commandments in verse 11, which shows that the "law" of which he speaks is the Decalogue. Second, if we observe nine of its precepts, but fail in one, we become transgressors of the law, and therefore are guilty of all. "For he that said, [Jehovah, when he spake the ten commandments,] Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill." Under the same circumstances, and at the same time, the same Holy Being said also, "Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy." "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." If we "offend in one," or "fail with respect to one precept," we become "guilty of all." Third, this law is called by the Apostle the "law of liberty," the "perfect law," and the "royal law." Moses' law was imperfect and faulty. It is called [Gal. v, 1] "the yoke of bondage." Fourth, if we fulfill the "royal law" according to the SCRIPTURE, [the Decalogue Ex. xx,] we shall "*do well*." And fifth, we are to "so speak," and "so do," as "they that shall be judged" by this law. How very natural and irresistible the conclusion that man will be judged by the same law given him as the rule of his duty to God, and to his neighbor.

Dear Reader: are you living in violation of the fourth commandment? Let me exhort you to prepare to meet your God. He, who uttered in thunder tones the "Royal Law," is soon to call you to an account how you have regarded it. If you pass on till the judgment as you are, you will appear before God a transgressor of his holy law, and guilty of all, having *failed in one precept*. The true light upon the commandments is now shining. Oh, be entreated to lay hold of it before it is too late. Let the light of the commandments shine into your mind. Resolve, by the grace of God, that you will not fail in one precept, then fly to Jesus for pardon of past neglect. He will plead your cause before his Father. Pardon will be given, and a full salvation through the atoning blood of Christ. But be resolved to go forward now. Delay no longer. Let not the death-like slumber that has come over the world hold you any longer.

#### REPAIRING THE BREACH.

"And they that shall be of thee shall build the old waste places; thou shalt raise up the foundations of many generations; and thou shalt be called, The repairer of the breach, The restorer of paths to dwell in.

If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day, and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable, &c." Isa. lviii, 12, 13.

That the seventh-day Sabbath is the subject of this prophecy, will not be denied. That it has been trodden down by the professed church of Christ for "many generations," the history of the church plainly shows. The Sabbath law being one of the immutable precepts of the Decalogue, its being trodden down has caused a "breach" in the law of God. This breach is to be repaired by the true church, before it can "stand in the battle in the day of the Lord." Ezekiel speaks of the same breach.

"Ye have not gone up into the gaps, [margin breaches,] neither made up the hedge for the house of Israel to stand in the battle in the day of the Lord." Chap. xiii, 5.

This prophecy cannot apply to past time, because the "day of the Lord," the burden of the prophecy, is future. But how are we to become repairers of the breach? Let Isaiah answer. "Thou shalt be called, The repairer of the breach, The restorer of paths to dwell in, If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my Holy Day, and call the Sabbath a DELIGHT, the HOLY of the Lord, HONORABLE." Then there is but one way to repair this breach, and that is by keeping and teaching the Sabbath of the Lord — But what does the Lord say of those who refuse to help make up this breach, and choose to call the Sabbath a yoke of bondage, instead of a "*delight*," dishonorable, instead of "*honorable*." And who tread down that day which Jehovah styles, "*The Holy of the Lord*," and "*My Holy Day*." Let the Prophet answer.

"Thus saith the Lord God; Wo unto the foolish prophets, that follow their own spirit, and have seen nothing! O Israel, thy prophets are like the foxes in the deserts. Ye have not gone up into the gaps, neither made up the hedge for the house of Israel to stand in the battle in the day of the Lord. They have seen vanity and lying divination, saying, The Lord saith; and the Lord hath not sent them; and they have made others to hope that they would confirm the word."—Eze. xiii, 3—6.

Herod was called a "fox" by Christ, because he was cunning and artful. When the word is used by the prophet, it is designed to represent the artful positions taken, and crafty course pursued by those who refuse to engage in the work of repairing the breach in the law of God, necessary for the house of Israel to stand in the battle in the day of the Lord. When the Sabbath question came up among Adventists, an attempt was made to prove that the first day of the week was the Sabbath. Reference was made to a few texts in the New Testament, and the testimony of what are called the "Christian Fathers," was quoted largely to supply the lack of Scripture testimony. But as the Advent people professed to take the Bible alone for their rule of faith and duty, and as the

New Testament did not afford the least evidence that the first day was holy time, it was necessary that a new position should be taken to dispose of the Sabbath, so as to still those who were becoming interested in it. Those who searched the New Testament, supposing they could find proof for the first day, were surprised that there was none, and many were ready to embrace the Sabbath of the Bible. But at this period, J. Marsh, S. S. Snow, and others, came out with the position that the ten commandments were abolished. This was a very short way to dispose of the Sabbath question. No distinction was made between the law of God, and what Paul calls "the *enmity*, even the law of commandments CONTAINED IN ORDINANCES;" but the word "law," in the New Testament, was considered to mean both, notwithstanding this view virtually charges St. Paul with teaching the greatest absurdities and contradictions. This view has led some to speak of the law of God with contempt and ridicule. The "Holy of the Lord" has been called the "old Jewish Sabbath," and "a yoke of bondage," and those who have considered it a "delight," and "honorable," have been called "Judaizers," "fanatics," &c.

But this view did not put the Sabbath question to rest. Many could not take the broad ground that the commandments of God were abolished. It was therefore necessary that a position, more artful and crafty than those already mentioned, should be taken. Such a position was taken by J. Turner, in the Bible Advocate for Sept. 23, 1847. We give his own words as follows:

"I must keep that day of the week that can be proved to be the 7th, for I then believed and do now believe that the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord our God."

He then labored to show from Matt. xii, 39, 40, that the first day of the week was the true seventh day, therefore the leading classes of mankind had, even to a man, made a mistake of one day in numbering the days of the week! This position, (though the idea of such a mistake seems absurd in the extreme,) had a wonderful power to deceive and ensnare some. A few gave up the Sabbath. But it will be seen that T. held the same position relative to the perpetuity of the Sabbath that we do. Therefore he could be charged with "Judaism," "falling from grace" and being "under the bondage of the law," with as much propriety as we, who do not believe that Jews, Christians, and Mahometans have all been put into a deep sleep, or something equivalent, so as to all agree in a mistake of one day in numbering the days of the week.

But in less than eight months T. took the ground that the ten commandments were abolished, and charged those who taught what he professed to believe a few months before, (that "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord our God,") with leading "the unwary under the bondage of the law of Moses." See his article headed "Judaism." "Bible

Advocate" for May 4, 1848. None will fail to see that these two positions are perfectly destructive of each other. For if "the seventh day is the Sabbath," and is our first day as taught by T., then the Sabbath is not abolished. But if the Sabbath is abolished, then it is worse than folly to talk of keeping our first day as the Sabbath of the Lord our God. But as the great object was to throw obstacles and doubts in the way of those who were inclined to observe the seventh day according to the commandment, either position could be employed, as would best accomplish the design.

Soon, J. B. Cook came out with a series of articles in the "Advent Harbinger," in which he labored to show that the Sabbath law was "relaxed." That we might or might not observe it. But to make it a matter of importance sufficient to be urged as a Christian duty, was unlike the spirit of the gospel. Reference was made to the miracles of Christ which he wrought on the Sabbath, and to the disciples eating the ears of corn on that day when hungry. But no fact is better established than that the law was in full force till the crucifixion, therefore Jesus and his followers strictly observed its letter up to that time. When Jesus says "It is lawful to do well on the Sabbath-days," Matt. xii, 12, he means that acts of mercy and necessity, such as he and his disciples did on the Sabbath, were in accordance with the letter of the fourth commandment. The wicked Pharisees said that those acts were "not lawful." They charged Christ and his disciples with departing from the letter of the Sabbath law—with Sabbath-breaking. Has not J. B. C. taken his stand with them? Judge ye. Who would not rather be on the side with Christ? These different positions, most of them destructive of each other, have all had an effect, and have led some from the truth of the Bible. We noticed the following, which we copy from the letter of C. I. Percival, "Advent Herald," April 5, 1851.

"I should like very much to see a short editorial upon the evidences of the divine authority in changing the day of rest from the seventh to the first day of the week; although I am perfectly satisfied in my own mind, I might obtain some new ideas that would be valuable."

Says the Editor of the "Herald," "We shall publish an article on the Sabbath soon." We therefore expected that an attempt would be made to show from the New Testament, that the "day of rest" had been changed "from the seventh to the first day." But instead of this, the next number of the "Herald" contained an article from "Jennings' Jewish Antiquities," in which the writer labors to make it appear that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment is not the original Sabbath—the day on which God rested, but that our first day is the original seventh day. Mr. Jennings shows the institution of the Sabbath at Creation, but utterly fails to show that the Jews kept the sixth day. No point can be better established than that the fourth commandment enforces the observance of the very day on which God rested—the seventh



day. The only reason given in the Bible why God instituted the Sabbath of the fourth commandment is, "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." As the Sabbath was given for a memorial to commemorate God's Rest-day, after he created the world in six, to remove it from the very day of the week on which God rested, destroys the institution itself. As well might the passover have been observed on any day of either of the months in the year, or the fourth of July be celebrated on the twenty-fifth day of December. It utterly destroys a memorial to move it from the day on which the event occurred, which it celebrates.

The "Herald" for April 19, also contains an article from "D. T. T. JR.," headed "THE LORD'S DAY—THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH." It gives what is commonly called the testimony of the "Christian Fathers," gathered from the "Sabbath Manual," as proof that the Sabbath has been changed "from the seventh to the first day of the week." But in all this, the "divine authority" desired to appear in the "Herald," by C. I. Percival, is missing. How unfortunate for that first-day theory that the inspired testimony of Paul, John, Jude, or James cannot be produced in its favor! The "Herald" for May 3, contains a note from P. M. Morgan, addressed to "Bro. Bliss," recommending the article of Mr. Jennings, and asking the brethren to "read that article again." But Mr. Bliss says, "We are not prepared to say that the argument of Mr. Jennings is perfectly conclusive," &c. "The article of Bro. Taylor in the *Herald* of April 19th is conclusive to our mind."

We have briefly reviewed some of the many positions taken on the Sabbath question by our opponents, to show that perfect confusion exists among them on this question. One comes forward to overthrow the Sabbath; but as he does not accomplish the work, another takes another position to overthrow it. But his position entirely overthrows that of his brother who first wrote against the Sabbath. This forcibly reminds us of the course pursued by those who wrote against the Second Advent. One came forward to overthrow what was called "*Millerism*" and said that Mr. Miller was wrong; the 2300 days were not prophetic, but only 1150 literal days. Another in overthrowing Mr. Miller's views, first showed that the position that the 2300 days were only 1150 literal days was incorrect, and then labors to prove that they were 2300 literal days. But Mr. Bush came forward and took the ground that Mr. Miller was right as to time, that the days were prophetic, but that he mistook the event to occur at the end of the 2300 days. In overthrowing the views of Mr. Miller, Mr. Bush also overthrew Dowling, Stewart, and many others. Those who are opposing the Sabbath of the Bible, are doing as those did who opposed the Second Advent.—But truth was a unit then, it is a unit now; while error ever has a multitude of heads and horns. Truth ever flows in an even channel, and its advocates are united; but erroneous views are fated to devour each other. Those who had the one true position on the Second Advent, triumphed, for the God of truth was with them. Those who have the one true position on the Sabbath question, though few in number, will have Him on their side, who is more than all that is against them.—The breach in the law of God will be repaired, that "the house of Israel may stand in the battle in the day of the Lord." J. WHITE.