When was the Sabbath Instituted?

Sabbath was then instituted. God's resting on the day is given connection with the first seventh day in the order of time, and it is so mentioned as most forcibly to impress the reader that the Scriptures. There are frequent and, early notices of reckoning Sabbath was a festival not peculiar to any one people or country, but so common to all mankind, that it might be no reasonable doubt but that the day which in the time of Moses was known as the seventh day, was the same in its weekly succession with that which is called the seventh day in Gen. ii, 3. If the seventh day mentioned in the fourth commandment was not the same day of the week mentioned in Gen. ii, 3, as some profess to think, it must be perfectly inexplicable, that no one mentioned in the institution of the Sabbath, especially since the seventh day was intended in the fourth commandment than the one mentioned in the institution of the Sabbath, especially since both are recorded in the same appellation in a direct series of events. But what removes all obscurity from the subject is, that God has positively declared that the day which he commanded to be observed in Ex. xx, is the same on which he rested at the close of the creation. "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested on the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." This language is definite; and while it assures us that the day when commanded to be observed is the same in its weekly return with the day on which God rested, it assures us against any amendment of the week, or loss of time which might have been produced in the long lapse of time from the creation, by the general apostacy from the true worship of God. Had the Sabbath been lost, it was certainly restored; and the day then known as the seventh day received the divine sanction. The same remark is applicable to the subject during the succeeding history of the Jewish nation. Had the weekly Sabbath fallen into total neglect, and the day of its regular recurrence been forgotten, our Lord Jesus Christ, by giving his divine example in favor of the day known by the Jewish nation as the proper seventh day of the decalogue, has settled the question conclusively, down to that time; so that the day known in the New Testament as the Sabbath, was the seventh day in regular succession from the creation of the world. A perfect uniformity among all the nations in the known world, as to the days of the

What day of the week do the Scriptures designate as the Sabbath?

To this question, it might be supposed that every person who has any acquaintance with the subject would readily reply—The seventh. We are aware, however, that many are made to render this a difficult point to determine. We shall, therefore, make a few remarks upon it.

It is plainly recorded that the Creator, after laboring the first six days, in which he worked the work of creation, rested the following day, which was the seventh in the order of creation. This particular day God therefore sanctified and blessed. "And God blessed the seventh day." When the law was given at Mount Sinai, the observance of the seventh day was commanded; and the manner in which the fourth commandment is expressed, shows beyond a doubt, that one particular and definite day was known to Israel by this name. Consequently, they needed no instruction as to what day was intended. This is observable in Ex. xvii, 3, where the sixth and seventh days of the week are mentioned by their ordinal names, as a subject with which the people were familiarly acquainted. In this place, also, the seventh day is declared to be the Sabbath. There can be no reasonable doubt but that the day which in the time of Moses was known as the seventh day, was the same in its weekly succession with that which is called the seventh day in Gen. ii, 3. If the seventh day mentioned in the fourth commandment was not the same day of the week mentioned in Gen. ii, 3, as some profess to think, it must be perfectly inexplicable, that no one mentioned in the institution of the Sabbath, especially since both are recorded in the same appellation in a direct series of events. But what removes all obscurity from the subject is, that God has positively declared that the day which he commanded to be observed in Ex. xx, is the same on which he rested at the close of the creation. "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested on the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." This language is definite; and while it assures us that the day when commanded to be observed is the same in its weekly return with the day on which God rested, it assures us against any amendment of the week, or loss of time which might have been produced in the long lapse of time from the creation, by the general apostacy from the true worship of God. Had the Sabbath been lost, it was certainly restored; and the day then known as the seventh day received the divine sanction. The same remark is applicable to the subject during the succeeding history of the Jewish nation. Had the weekly Sabbath fallen into total neglect, and the day of its regular recurrence been forgotten, our Lord Jesus Christ, by giving his divine example in favor of the day known by the Jewish nation as the proper seventh day of the decalogue, has settled the question conclusively, down to that time; so that the day known in the New Testament as the Sabbath, was the seventh day in regular succession from the creation of the world. A perfect uniformity among all the nations in the known world, as to the days of the
A week, both before and since the advent of Christ, is a further testimony, that no derogation of the days of the week has ever been taken place. Indeed, it will not be pretended that the account of time has been lost since the introduction of Christianity. Since that period, the Jews as a people have maintained a perfect uniformity in the observance of the ancient Sabbath, though scattered through every nation of the globe; and the Christian church, in all its divisions, has been known to observe either the seventh day of the week, and for a considerable length of time, both of these days. So that we are as certain that the day now known as the seventh day of the week, is the same with that enjoined in the fourth commandment, as we are of any fact, for the knowledge of which we are dependent on the testimony of any erring mankind.

In this connection, we would remark, that the sabbatical law does not appoint a seventh day, but the seventh day. It is but a flimsy subterfuge to pretend that the fourth commandment enjoins only a seventh part of our time to be kept holy. The people of Israel have so understood the law of the Sabbath; and their uniform conduct over so many ages shows that they understood it to mean the last day of the week, and that only. It will be admitted, that had the Jews, in the days of Moses, professed the rest of the seventh day, under the pretext that they had received this by revelation, they would have paid dearly for their presumption. If, then, their sense of this precept was correct, no person in any age has a right to understand it in a different sense; for a law cannot have a contrary or a double meaning. While the true genius of that precept remain the same, its meaning must continue the same. It is true that the law which enjoins the observance of the last day of every seven, does as a consequence enjoin the seventh part of our time; but it is still the seventh day in its proper order that it requires, and not merely a seventh part. And it should be remembered, that Christ said, “not one jot or tittle shall in any wise pass from the law;” and that the most awful penalty is denounced on him who dares to explain away its proper meaning. It is obvious, also, that if a seventh day, or any one day after six of labor, be all that the law of the Sabbath, the seventh part must be that day, from the fact, that to change it without divine authority would be to change the length of the week, and violate God’s established order. And as in the first instance it would be sin, there would never change the character of that act. A wrong act will become a right by our persisting in it. As it could not be changed without sin, so the sin must ever remain until repented of and retracted. It should be remembered, likewise, that by an admission that a seventh day or a seventh part of our time only is required, all arguments from a change of the days are effectually silenced; for if any good reason existed for one day more than another, the mere seventh part must be abandoned.

Has the Sabbath been changed from the Seventh to the First day of the Week?

This question involves matters of such importance that it should not be answered without a candid and thorough examination. If the Sabbath has been transferred from the seventh to the first day of the week, it must be great impiety to neglect that day or to appropriate any part of it to secular purposes. If, on the other hand, the law requiring the sanctification of the seventh day of the week remains in force, then to neglect that day is an act of equal impiety, and exposes the offender to the most awful consequences. The Scriptures should contain the account of it. If the law of the Sabbath has been changed by divine authority, and as the precept requiring the observance of the seventh day is plain and positive, nothing less than this should satisfy an inquirer in regard to the claims of the first day.

The method commonly pursued by the advocates for a change of the Sabbath, is to impress their readers, 1. That the Jewish people did predict such a change; 2. That there was a necessity for the change in order to commemorate the completion of the work of redemption, which was finished by the resurrection of Christ; 3. That on this day of the week Christ frequently met with his disciples after the resurrection; 4. That that from that time the Apostles and primitive Christians religiously observed the first day in memory of this event, and as a substitute for the Sabbath; 6. That the day of Pentecost, when the Holy Spirit descended, was the first day of the week; 7. That by “Lord’s day,” (Rev. i., 10), the first day of the week was intended.

Of course are the chief arguments advanced in support of the change, they should be fairly considered, and compared with the Word of God. “To the law and the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.” Let us examine these separately.

1. Did the prophets ever predict a change of the Sabbath? — The first and principal text cited in proof of this is Isaiah viii., 24— “The stone which the builders refused is become the headstone of the corner. This is the Lord’s doing; it is marvelous in our eyes.” Is this the day when the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it.” In order to make any use of this text, the main points in the argument are assumed. First, it is assumed, that Christ’s becoming the head of the corner refers to the day of his resurrection; whereas there is no conclusive evidence that it refers to this day rather than to the day of his birth, or of his first public ministry, or of his final ascension into heaven. Next, it is assumed, that the day spoken of is a natural day of twenty-four hours; whereas this word is often used to designate an indefinite period of time—particularly the gospel era (John viii., 56)—and is used, in this text, to show that it was to be changed by Christ. But whoever reads the following verses will see that the rest here spoken of is not the Sabbath, but that season when the Lord has set up an ensign for the nations, and assembled the outcasts of Israel, and gathered together all the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth.” Such a rest may well be called “glorious.”

There is one prophetic allusion, however, which some have, without any reason, referred to the change of the Sabbath. This is found in Daniel vii., 25, where in describing the papal anti-christ, the prophet says, “he shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws: and they shall be given into his hand, until a time and times and the dividing of time.” The “times and laws” here referred to cannot be those of the Mosaic ritual, since they were abolished at the death of Christ, and it could be no sin to suppress them. But if we allow that the dialogue, with its laws and time of rest, was to continue by divine authority, we are compelled to consider this as an allusion to the Sabbath and the moral code with which it is connected. And the historic character of the Sabbath, together with the idolatries and sins of the papal church, show how literally this prophecy has been fulfilled.

2. Is it necessary to change the Sabbath in order to commemorate the completion of the work of redemption? It is said the work of redemption is greater than that of creation; hence the necessity for a change of the day of the Sabbath. In reply to this we remark, the Scriptures are entirely silent respecting the comparative greatness of the two works; and while they give us no information on this point, we are not warranted in making our own suppositions the ground of praise or blame. As God has seen fit to make the seventh day a time to commemorate the completion of his creative work, why not gather together all his merciful works for us, and celebrate them on one and the same day? The greatness of redemption, therefore, instead of being a reason for a change, is a reason why the Sabbath as originally given should be doubly dear to us.

Again, supposing that a change of the day is required in order to celebrate the completion of the work of redemption, what day shall be chosen as most appropriate? Shall it be the day of the crucifixion, or of the resurrection, or of the ascension? If, then, the nature of Christ’s greatest labor for man was his greatest labor for them should be selected, then we should celebrate the day of his crucifixion. This is the day on which,
same day, making a distance of about fifteen miles. There is not the least intimation here that the disciples have evidence that this was not a meeting generally agreed upon. And if the preceding argument is well founded, it is reasonable to suppose that the keeping of the first day instead of the seventh is sanctioned by Apostolic usage. The proof of this position rests mainly on two passages. Let us examine them.

The first is Acts xx, 7—"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." But is there anything in this transaction, or the attendant circumstances, which clearly and undoubtedly proves an apostolic example in favor of a new Sabbath, or of keeping the first day of the week, in any manner, as a substitute for the former institution? Surely there is not. The passage does not so much as prove that the practice of meeting for worship on the first day of the week was then common and general. But if it did, it would not determine the change contended for. There is nothing said in the narrative which characterizes the day of this meeting as a Sabbath. Assembling for public worship is proper on any day of the week, and so is the breaking of bread. The supper was first administered on one of the six working days; and there is nothing in the Scriptures which restricts its subsequent administration to a particular day—not even the authorized Sabbath. Besides, in this case, the breaking of bread was deferred until after midnight. Of course, if there had been such a change, and this, with one more instance of meeting on the first day of the week, we should have known that it had taken the place of the seventh. But there is nothing of this. The record is perfectly silent in regard to either point. Besides, it is evident that the original Sabbath continued to be observed, according to the prevailing custom among observers of the first day of the week, after the coming of the Christian Sabbath; and hence it is entirely wanting as to the requisite evidence of a change in the observance of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, and without a word to prove it, the argument of the advocate of a new Sabbath from example gives the passage its widest possible scope, as implying something which gives to the meeting a religious character, or indicates regard for the day. But it is by no means certain that the expression upon the first day is of such an import as to prove that there was a new Sabbath.

4. Christ's meeting with the disciples after the resurrection.—It is common for the advocates of a change of the Sabbath to lay great stress upon Christ's meeting with his disciples, after his resurrection, on the first day of the week. We will examine these different appearances, and see if they afford any proof of the change they are brought to show.

On the day he was first seen after the resurrection, Christ appeared three times to different persons and at different places. His first appearance was to Mary, while she was alone at the sepulchre, John xx, 16. There is nothing, however, in the circumstances connected with this meeting which indicate that the least sacredness is to be attached to the time when it occurred. There is no indication that this journey was undertaken for religious purposes; and as our Lord did not subsequently direct the disciples, or cause them to do differently in future, it is reasonable to suppose that the day was regarded as a Sabbath.

His second appearance was to two of his disciples as they journeyed to Emmaus, Luke xxiv, 13-35. He accompanied them to that place, and both they and he returned to Jerusalem the same day, making a distance of about fifteen miles. There is no indication in the narrative which would justify all the agitation and extravagances of Popery.

5. Regard of the Apostles for the first day.—Another argument for the change of the Sabbath is the supposed apostolic practice of meeting on the first day of the week for public worship, and the breaking of bread. But this is often contested, on the ground that the keeping of the first day instead of the seventh is sanctioned by Apostolic usage. The proof of this position rests mainly on two passages. Let us examine them.

The first is Acts xx, 7—"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." But is there anything in this transaction, or the attendant circumstances, which clearly and undoubtedly proves an apostolic example in favor of a new Sabbath, or of keeping the first day of the week, in any manner, as a substitute for the former institution? Surely there is not. The passage does not so much as prove that the practice of meeting for worship on the first day of the week was then common and general. But if it did, it would not determine the change contended for. There is nothing said in the narrative which characterizes the day of this meeting as a Sabbath. Assembling for public worship is proper on any day of the week, and so is the breaking of bread. The supper was first administered on one of the six working days; and there is nothing in the Scriptures which restricts its subsequent administration to a particular day—not even the authorized Sabbath. Besides, in this case, the breaking of bread was deferred until after midnight. Of course, if there had been such a change, and this, with one more instance of meeting on the first day of the week, we should have known that it had taken the place of the seventh. But there is nothing of this. The record is perfectly silent in regard to either point. Besides, it is evident that the original Sabbath continued to be observed, according to the prevailing custom among observers of the first day of the week, after the coming of the Christian Sabbath; and hence it is entirely wanting as to the requisite evidence of a change in the observance of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, and without a word to prove it, the argument of the advocate of a new Sabbath from example gives the passage its widest possible scope, as implying something which gives to the meeting a religious character, or indicates regard for the day.
The clay on which that remarkable event occurred, is known. It is clear that the original appointment remains obligatory and unchangeable.

Another passage quoted in an apostolic example of keeping the first day of the week, and, consequently, in support of the opinion that the Sabbath is changed, is 1 Cor. xvi. 2.

"Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him that which he intends to give; that there be no gatherings when I come." This passage, like the others, does not imply that the first day was then commonly and generally regarded as a day for public worship, nor does it necessarily imply a public meeting of any kind. The direction for "every one to lay by him that which he intends to give," for the benefit of the poor residing at Jerusalem, "on the first day of the week," necessarily amounts to no more than an appointment of this day to make up their bounty at home, so that it might be sure to be ready when the Apostle should come. It does not imply any new thing, but it is simply that they should bring their donations together publicly on the first day of the week, so as to be prepared in the fullest manner for the Apostle's visit. Therefore, according to this view of the case, it proves no more than an occasional meeting on the first day of the week for the purpose of a benevolent or charitable object.

But even if it could be so construed as clearly to imply that it was a common and general practice to meet for public worship and instruction on this day, it would not thereby be pointed out to us as the Christian Sabbath, and substituted for the seventh day, seeing that there contains no information to that effect, and that no divine warrant appears on part of the New Testament records for the supposed change.

Meetings for public worship, taking up of collections, and even breaking of bread, do not constitute a Sabbath. To sabbatize is to render a day of the week peculiarly sacred because it is the day appointed for a public meeting for any object, however high and holy. These proofs for a change of the Sabbath, therefore, which are unquestionably the best that can be produced, are utterly deficient, and the argument therefrom, as generally presented, is deceptive, and unworthy of confidence.

6. Doctrine of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost.—Much has been said respecting the descent of the Holy Spirit, on the day of Pentecost. It is urged that this was the first day, and that this circumstance was an indication that God designed to give the day in its own special honor. This opinion, however, is supported only by reasoning. The day on which that remarkable event occurred, is known only as the day of Pentecost, an annual feast of the Jews, fifty days from the feast of the Passover, which was held on the fourth day of the first month. It might, therefore, occur on the first, or any other day of the week. This year it probably occurred on the fifth or seventh day. But the fallacy of the argument we have opposed, is apparent from the fact, that it is founded in the presumption that they began to count the fifty days from the day after the weekly Sabbath, whereas they counted from the annual passover Sabbath. See Lev. xxiii. 39. The descent of the Holy Spirit at this time could not be considered as rendering any other day than the Jews' feast of Pentecost. Pennant.

But we have no evidence that God intended by the event to bestow a special honor upon any day, nor was it implied in the promise that the disciples should be baptized with the Holy Ghost. The perpetual obligation of the Decalogue implies, of course, the perpetual obligation of the Sabbath as enjoined in the fourth commandment.

We will therefore first examine the proofs adduced in favor of the abolition of the weekly Sabbath and the introduction of a new institution.

To sustain this position, the broad ground is taken by some, that the Decalogue itself, in which the law of the Sabbath is contained, was abrogated; and that, under the new dispensation, no part of it was binding, but what is newly enjoined or expressly recognized, either by Christ or his Apostles.

The perpetual obligation of the Decalogue is, of course, the perpetual obligation of the Sabbath as enjoined in the fourth commandment. But if that was abrogated, the Sabbath which it enjoined was also abrogated; and, consequently, it ceases to be binding. The case removes under the new economy. What, then, is the proof here relied upon? One of the principal passages in which this supposed proof is supposed to be contained is 2 Cor. iii. 13. But if the ministration of death, written and engraven on stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished, the ministration of the Spirit shall be rather glorious. And not as Moses, which put a veil over his face, that the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished, "for the glory of the Lord was to be done away," and "to the end of the which is abolished," refer to the whole law, moral as well as ritual,
or, strictly rendered "sith billion," it is in ordinances, It was this, and this only, which was that eateth; for God hath received him. This quotation clearly teaches that the Sabbath is the fourth commandment. There were, besides, 'also by the law of Christ, that ye are become dead to the law by the holy of Christ, that ye might chiefly of the ceremonial law—net the Mosaic ritual. This is particularly distinguished from the Decalogue, but not as abolished. It was merely the abolition of it, or the then instituted manner of teaching, illustrating, and enforcing it, which was abolished, to be succeeded by a new ministration of the same law by the Spirit. For it is written, 'I will write my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people.'

What law but the Decalogue is here referred to? Evidently none. For surely we are not under the Mosaic ritual. Again, 'Do we make void the law through faith? . . . Yea, we establish the law, that by the commandment we may understand the circumcision, but that by faith we might be justified from the law.' Hence, the Apostle James says, 'If ye fulfill the law according to the Scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, ye shall do well.' Here the title 'the royal law,' is given by way of eminence to the Decalogue; and its permanent obligation is distinctly recognized, as is truly the case, by giving it as a summary of the last six commandments of this code, and the allusion is so made as to imply the continued obligation of the first four, which are summed up in supreme love to God. Again, the Apostle John testifies, 'Hereby do we know that we know God, if he keep his commandments.' And again, 'Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter through the gates into the city.' In both these passages, reference is evidently had to the precepts of the Decalogue, as the essential and permanent rule of obedience to the Christians. The doing away of abomination, therefore, spoken of in the above passage, cannot refer to the Decalogue or the moral law itself, but to the Mosaic dispensation. Another of the proofs alluding to the abrogation of the Decalogue, is Colossians ii. 14-15.

"Blotting out the hand-writing of ordinances that were against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to the cross; and having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them in it." As we have no reference to the Decalogue, or anything that is there comprised, it is manifest, that if "the law," that is, the Decalogue, is put away by the cross, it is the ceremonial law, and the whole Bible, There is no proof in any of these passages, that the law of the ten commandments was abolished, or that the Sabbath enjoined therein was done away.

Nor is there such proof in Romans xiv. 5, 6. "One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. For he that regardeth the day, regardeth it to 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." In these passages is evidently referred to that time when the Mosaic ritual was replaced by the new dispensation, and it will be easily perceived, that if this argument has any weight in reference to the seventh day as the Sabbath, it operates equally against the Sabbath at all—so much so as to be an argument against the observance of that day, as well as the observance of the first day of the week for any purpose. The distinction referred to as to days, are a seal of things to come; but the Sabbath is of Christ. By the hand-writing of ordinances, is not evidently meant the ceremonial law—not the Decalogue, or the moral law—"This is never characterized as 'the hand-writing of ordinances,'" and therefore, the "blotting out," "taking away," and "nailing to the cross," spoken of, have no reference to this law, but to the Mosaic ritual. This is particularly distinguished from the Decalogue, and fully described as "the law of commandments contained in ordinances." It was this, and this only, which was abolished, and not as abolished, included in this law, or among these "ordinances," and do not include the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. There were, besides, the weekly Sabbath, various other sabbaths appointed by the Israelitish nation, and not to the Mosaic ritual. Accordingly, these were expressly included in "the hand-writing of ordinances," and like the rest were "a shadow of things to come," and ceased to be obligatory at the death of Christ. There is evidently no authority in this passage for including any sabbath but what was properly belonged to the Mosaic ritual. This view of the matter is corroborated by a more literal rendering of the 17th verse, viz: "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in the observation of a festival, or of a new moon, or of an old sabbath." The sabbaths alluded to are obviously those which were kept in the same place with meats and drinks, festivals and new moons, and which were of the same general character—"the Sabbath of the Lord." Mr. Smith, therefore, is not affected at all by their abrogation, but remains in full force, as does every other precept of the Decalogue.

We find the same distinction as to the law which was abolished, in Ephesians iv. 13, 15. "For he is one, who hath both the circumcision and the uncircumcision, and the barbicans and the walls of partition between us, having abolished in his flesh the enmity, that is of the law of commandments contained in ordinances, for to make himself in vain one new man, so making peace. Here the middle wall of partition between Jews and Gentiles, called 'the enmity,' is expressly defined, as before, to be the 'law of commandments contained in ordinances.' This, and this only, therefore, was abolished, leaving the Decalogue, or moral law, in its original character and obligation. This is the language of the whole Bible. There is no proof in any of these passages, that the law of the ten commandments was abolished, or that the Sabbath enjoined therein was done away.

One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. For he that regardeth the day, regardeth it to 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. For surely we are not under the Mosaic ritual. Again, 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.

What law but the Decalogue is here referred to? Evidently none. For surely we are not under the Mosaic ritual. Again, 'Do we make void the law through faith? . . . Yea, we establish the law, that by the commandment we may understand the circumcision, but that by faith we might be justified from the law.' Hence, the Apostle James says, 'If ye fulfill the law according to the Scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, ye shall do well.' Here the title 'the royal law,' is given by way of eminence to the Decalogue; and its permanent obligation is distinctly recognized, as is truly the case, by giving it as a summary of the last six commandments of this code, and the allusion is so made as to imply the continued obligation of the first four, which are summed up in supreme love to God. Again, the Apostle John testifies, 'Hereby do we know that we know God, if he keep his commandments.' And again, 'Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter through the gates into the city.' In both these passages, reference is evidently had to the precepts of the Decalogue, as the essential and permanent rule of obedience to the Christians. The doing away of abomination, therefore, spoken of in the above passage, cannot refer to the Decalogue or the moral law itself, but to the Mosaic dispensation or ritual. Another of the proofs alluding to the abrogation of the Decalogue, is Colossians ii. 14-15. "Blotting out the hand-writing of ordinances that were against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to the cross; and having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them in it."

But what properly belonged to the Mosaic ritual. This view of the matter is corroborated by a more literal rendering of the 17th verse, viz: "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in the observation of a festival, or of a new moon, or of an old sabbath." The sabbaths alluded to are obviously those which were kept in the same place with meats and drinks, festivals and new moons, and which were of the same general character—"the Sabbath of the Lord." Mr. Smith, therefore, is not affected at all by their abrogation, but remains in full force, as does every other precept of the Decalogue.
are not said to be delivered from it, considered in any other light than as a covenant of works. Certainly they are not delivered as a rule of obedience. To suppose this is inconsistent with Christ's sermon on the mount, before alluded to, and many other decisive proofs of the perpetual obligation of the Decalogue. It is probably the Apostle had special reference to the obedience of believers from the curse of the moral law. This is reasonably inferred from the clause, "that being dead wherein we were held." If any thing more pertinent to this law be intended, it must be its original character when given to Adam as a covenant of works or of life. For surely we are not and cannot be delivered from it as a rule of obedience, so long as God is what he is, and we are what we are. Seeing that as long as the relation constituted by his character as Supreme Ruler, and by ours as moral subjects, exists, we shall be bound to keep him supremely, and our neighbor or ourselves, which is the fulfilling of this law. And to suppose that this law, as a rule of obedience, was actually annulled, and that those precepts only are now to be considered obligatory, which are enacted or published anew under the Gospel, is to suppose that God, at a certain time, actually rescinded the rule requiring supreme love to him, and to our neighbor as ourselves, which is palpably inconsistent, and contrary both to the current of Scripture and the nature of things. It would be maintaining that to be changed which is manifestly unchangeable. It would imply, that for the time being, the Sabbath, as recognized by the law by which God and moral beings are united, was sundered, not by rebellion on the part of his subjects, but by his own act of desertion. It is manifestly unchangeable. It would imply that, for the time being, the Sabbath, as recognized by the law by which God and moral beings are united, was sundered, not by rebellion on the part of his subjects, but by his own act of desertion.

The kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them, the least shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." If any thing more pertinent to this law be intended, it must be its original character when given to Adam as a covenant of works or of life. For surely we are not and cannot be delivered from it as a rule of obedience, so long as God is what he is, and we are what we are. Seeing that as long as the relation constituted by his character as Supreme Ruler, and by ours as moral subjects, exists, we shall be bound to keep him supremely, and our neighbor or ourselves, which is the fulfilling of this law. And to suppose that this law, as a rule of obedience, was actually annulled, and that those precepts only are now to be considered obligatory, which are enacted or published anew under the Gospel, is to suppose that God, at a certain time, actually rescinded the rule requiring supreme love to him, and to our neighbor as ourselves, which is palpably inconsistent, and contrary both to the current of Scripture and the nature of things. It would be maintaining that to be changed which is manifestly unchangeable. It would imply, that for the time being, the Sabbath, as recognized by the law by which God and moral beings are united, was sundered, not by rebellion on the part of his subjects, but by his own act of desertion. It is manifestly unchangeable. It would imply that, for the time being, the Sabbath, as recognized by the law by which God and moral beings are united, was sundered, not by rebellion on the part of his subjects, but by his own act of desertion.

Thus we have the continued obligation of the Sabbath sanctioned by the Decalogue itself as first promulgated, any more than they belong to any law subsequently added. But if it were admissible, and if no part of this law is binding on Christians but what is newly enacted or particularly recognized under the Gospel dispensation, the Sabbath of the fourth commandment could not in this way be set aside; because its continued obligation is plainly taught in the New Testament. It is a doctrine, that he "came not to destroy the law, but to fulfill;" that "one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled"; and that "he did it; because he came to render perfect and universal obedience. Hence he affirmed that one jot or one tittle should be called the least in the kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them, the least shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven."
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The Review and Herald.

Paris, November, 1850.

To our readers.—The Review and Herald is designed to be strictly confined to those important truths that belong to the present and sanctifying truths embraced in the message of the third angel, viz: the highest profession standard, containing thrilling testimonies, written in the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. 28 pages.

We also desire to get out a large pamphlet, containing the same matter from their publications, that we publish in the paper. Such a work judiciously circulated, will certainly do a great amount of good.

How shall we circulate publications?—As our list of names is small, we can send them to few; and it is impossible for us to give a wide and faithful distribution, unless the brethren situated in different places help in the work. The last number being sent to those who have expressed no wish for the paper. It is a pleasure to send in special charges, especially to the "poor of the flock." We fully realize the importance of having those who would read with profit, and obtain suitable publications for them. There is a great amount of the "Advent Review" and "Brother Miller's Dream," with notes, 12 pages.

For the Review and Herald.

The Laodicean Church.

We believe this state of the church exists, and that it is composed of evil stomachs and people, who are "bald headed and become " lukewarm." What and where did this state of the church commence? We believe that it commenced in 1843, at the commencement in the city of Albany, N. Y., with the two leading teachers in the advent cause, as chairman and secretary pro tem., viz: William Miller and J. V. Rines, and sixty-six of their well engaged ministers and delegates. See Advent Herald, May 11, 1844, page 195.

This organization proceeded by a series of conferences in the cities of Philadelphia, Baltimore and Boston. Page 118, Col. 3.

The result was most encouraging to their hearts, particularly to J. V. Rines and S. Bliss. See Col. 2 of the same page; also the Herald for May 21. We then that this organization was completed April 3, 1844, in Rochester, N. Y. See Voice of Truth, April 22, page 25; also page 29, Col. 1, "Conference Address": "Our brethren, east, west, north and south, are harmoniously, (with a few exceptions,) united in the faith and hope of the gospel, and well engaged in extending their influence and blessings to others. They are making preparations for going forth upon the work of the third angel's message in their schools and homes, and all over the land."

We publish since in the Advent Review Extra. This shows the decided change and departure from the Philadelphia state of the church, where they all professed to be, at the tenth day of the month of November, 1848. See the "Advent Review," of 49 pages, published at Auburn, N. Y.

Unquestionably they were then in the right state of the Church, and holding fast to that which they had attained, viz: the change from Babylon, or the Sardis state of the church, to the Philadelphia state.

When they changed from the Philadelphia to the Laodicean state, we believe they influenced hundreds of honest souls to go with them.—These are the ones we are trying to seek out, by this article, and every other possible way, and show them their present danger and utter destruction, if they do not forsake them and turn back immediately to the open door in the Philadelphia church; for there is no more settlement, or hope for them, than there is for them. See page 288, Advent Review.

Let us just take a general retrospect of the downward progress of the Laodiceans. For six successive years, viz: from the fall of 1844 to the spring of 1850, the most of those who espoused these mischievous and assisting each other in changing the chronology, i. e. the world's history; to prove that they were on the true position. What have they gained? Answer, nothing but disappointment and confusion. This, too, in direct opposition to their standard work. (Advent Shield.) It has not proved to be their shield, that is clear. Six times, did we say: Six times, did we say: once we have to send more. Some have moved the time for the termination of the 2300 days, from fall to spring, for six years in succession, and thus they have almost finished a circle, (if seven years would make one,) instead of gaining one inch the right way.

The Advent Herald for March 2, 1850, last came out and proved to a demonstration that the position of the tenth day of the seventh month, relating to the end of the 2300 days was right. But, said one of them to me; nothing was accomplished. Daniel was told that the sanctuary should be cleansed; but nobody knew anything about it, no, nor even himself! In 1844, it moved the whole church to change their position into the open door, in the Philadelphia state of the church, and to sacrifice their houses, lands, and personal characters to the God of Israel, because they believed it, and that the Lord Jesus also was coming. In the Laodicean state now, the opposite is the case. According to the standard work, the Advent Herald, the highest profession standard published in the world, to exalt and prepare the church of God for the great and pleasant day of the Lord, right upon us.

What is the matter! Answer—personal character is at stake. Who is in the wrong! The greatest difficulty is to meet, among those who are so right. Just call out the name of one of these leaders of these leading men, and all the Laodiceans trembled under their thrilling appeals, to be ready for the coming of Jesus. What now? The reverse. Slandering and devouring one another with their Exegetes, Vindicators, &c. &c. Is this the true church? God forbid! Why, methinks the very angels in heaven would shudder to see them appear there in their present state. Will they grow any better? If the past is a criterion by which to judge, we answer, never, no, never. Then you that hope for salvation, flee quickly, flee, I say, for your lives! You have not one moment to spare. Utter destruction awaits every soul that is found in this Laodicean state.

To get a right understanding of the Laodicean state of the church, let us examine a few things concerning the seven states of the church. The first, second and third chapters of Revelation present to our view seven distinct and different states of the church under the gospel. Some have supposed that these churches described in the second and third chapters of Revelation were literal, because there were seven literal churches in Asia Minor, bearing the same name.

But we think the literal definitions of these names describe the spirit and qualities of the seven states of the church. They cannot be literal, for several reasons. First, this is a repeat, or restatement of the future. "The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to show unto his servants, things that must shortly come to pass," Rev. x. 1. If John had his vision from the 11th to the 22nd of June, 1843, which was the time he was in the city of Philadelphia, he must have been mistaken as to the time. For if it was in 1843, it must have been before the close of the year 1844, and then his decided change in Nov. 11, 1846. Here we see the Laodicean church by the editor of V. T. Aug. 12, 1846, published since in the Advent Review Extra. This shows the decided change and departure from the Philadelphia state of the church, where they all professed to be, at the tenth day of the month of November, 1848. See the "Advent Review," of 49 pages, published at Auburn, N. Y., containing their shocking testimonial.

We call the special attention of the brethren to the articles, in this number, from the publications of the Seventh-day Baptists. They are clear, comprehensive, and irrefutable. We intend to enrich the columns of the Review and Herald, with extracts from their excellent works on the Sabbath.

The Review and Herald.

The Laodicean Church.

We believe this state of the church exists, and that it is composed of evil stomachs and people, who are "bald headed and become " lukewarm." What and where did this state of the church commence? We believe that it commenced in 1843, at the commencement in the city of Albany, N. Y., with the two leading teachers in the advent cause, as chairman and secretary pro tem., viz: William Miller and J. V. Rines, and sixty-six of their well engaged ministers and delegates. See Advent Herald, May 11, 1844, page 195.

This organization proceeded by a series of conferences in the cities of Philadelphia, Baltimore and Boston. Page 118, Col. 3.
Those that came out of Babylon under the cry, in obedience to the word where the ten commandments are seen, where else. Here was the perfect harmony of shadow and substance. I was led again by my one position and yet another, How unlike the path of the just, that shined more and more unto the perfect day. They that were left were not the elect, but the unprofitable servants. This, we understand to be the present nominal church, the Babylon, or Sardis; for it is the unprofitable servant who is cast out from the Lord's presence. See Rev. iii. 19. The nominal church is back of 1814, in the Sardis state, through the prophet Joel. Jesus would have them either believe their true position or stop, and not be lukewarm; for as long as they were back of Sardis, they caused their own and others faith to wane; and thus have been continually sinking into a false state of things, neither one thing nor yet another. This state it is impossible to prove to their entire satisfaction, for they are divided. Jesus says that he will spit them out of his mouth, or destroy them. Then Jesus is to come quickly, and the true church is exhorted to prepare and get ready before he comes upon them. Jesus is cleansing the Sanctuary, or is blotting out the errors of the house of Israel. When this work is finished, he will take his place on the white horse. Jesus would have them either believe their true position or stop, and not be lukewarm; for as long as they were back of Sardis, they caused their own and others faith to wane; and thus have been continually sinking into a false state of things, neither one thing nor yet another. This state it is impossible to prove to their entire satisfaction, for they are divided. Jesus says that he will spit them out of his mouth, or destroy them. Then Jesus is to come quickly, and the true church is exhorted to prepare and get ready before he comes upon them. Jesus is cleansing the Sanctuary, or is blotting out the errors of the house of Israel. When this work is finished, he will take his place on the white horse. Jesus would have them either believe their true position or stop, and not be lukewarm; for as long as they were back of Sardis, they caused their own and others faith to wane; and thus have been continually sinking into a false state of things, neither one thing nor yet another. This state it is impossible to prove to their entire satisfaction, for they are divided. Jesus says that he will spit them out of his mouth, or destroy them. Then Jesus is to come quickly, and the true church is exhorted to prepare and get ready before he comes upon them. Jesus is cleansing the Sanctuary, or is blotting out the errors of the house of Israel. When this work is finished, he will take his place on the white horse. It is in vain for them to apply the Laodicean state of the church, now existing, (and must exist before Jesus comes,) to any other class of believers on earth. The shut door believers are in the Philadelphia state. The nominal church, are back of 1814, in the Sardis state, spiritually dead. I counsel of thee to buy of me gold tried in the fire, [present truth, that has stood the trial of six years opposition, and now is shining brighter and brighter,] that thou mayst be rich; and white raiment, that thou mayst be clothed. Their continued idolatry and wickedness, is a banner burned with fire: for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her.