THE ADVENT REVIEW,

AND SABBATH HERALD.

"Here is the Patience of the Saints; Here are they that keep the Commandments of God and the Faith of Jesus."

VOL. III. ROCHESTER, N. Y., THURSDAY, MAY 27, 1852. No. 2.

JOSEPH BATES, J. N. ANDREWS and JOSEPH BAKER, } *Publishing Committee.*
JAMES WHITE, Editor.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY,
At No. 124 Mount Hope Avenue, Rochester.

Terms—GRATIS. It is expected that all the friends of the cause will aid in its publication, as the Lord hath prospered them.

☞All communications, orders, and remittances, should be addressed to JAMES WHITE, Editor of the Review and Herald, Rochester, N. Y. (*post-paid.*)

THE ARK.

BY R. F. COTTRELL.

When ancient Israel met the foe,
That aimed at them a deadly blow,
Though oft their prospect seemed most dark,
They triumphed when they had the Ark.

The Ark when borne to Jordan's tide,
Caused its deep waters to divide;
They need no boat in which t' embark;
They cross—because they have the Ark.

They march around old Jericho,
Its towering walls are laid full low—
Hear ye that mighty shouting? Hark!
They *triumph*, for they have the Ark.

Where was the strength by which it wrought,
And to its bearers victory brought?
It was a chest of wood—but mark!
THE LAW OF GOD was in the Ark.

When men oppose that law of love,
They lack the wisdom *from above*;
Deluded souls! they're in the dark,
Without the truth—without the Ark.

The remnant in these latter days
Will triumph sure; give God the praise!
They, of the beast, refuse the mark,
They keep God's law—they have the Ark.

THE SABBATH.

LETTERS TO O. R. L. CROZIER.—NO. II.

DEAR SIR:—Your second article commences in substance as follows: 1. The Sabbath was first made known and enjoined in the wilderness. 2. That consequently the Sabbath obligation did not commence in Eden, and continue thence forward. 3. That therefore the patriarchs had not the Sabbath, yet lived to a greater age than succeeding generations, and were the most holy of men, so that as a natural consequence the Sabbath is not an essential constituent in the health and happiness of men. 4. That Paul in Heb. iv developes in the plainest manner possible, the primary signification of the week, and especially of the sanctified seventh day, and shows that it was not sanctified as a weekly rest, but as an emblem of the rest of the saints after the resurrection. 5. That the obligation to keep the weekly Sabbath, began in the wilderness of Sin, and terminated at the crucifixion. Col. ii.

The specious character of your argument has already been exposed. But I will briefly notice the points a second time.

1. The first mention of the Sabbath in Ex. xvi, is not in the form of a command to keep it, but is a simple mention of something already in existence.—"To-morrow," said the Leader of Israel, "is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord." How long it had been the holy Rest-day of the Lord can be ascertained by reading Gen. ii, which tells us when it was that he rested on the seventh day and sanctified it, ("set it apart to a holy use.")

2. Your inference that the seventh day was made the holy Rest-day of Jehovah in the wilderness of Sin, being without foundation, your second statement, viz: that therefore the Sabbath obligation did not originate in Eden, being a deduction from that inference, falls of its own weight. But God has by his own voice given the origin of Sabbatic obligation. He gives the fourth commandment, and then, to shut the mouths of cavilers, gives the origin of the obligation to keep it. "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." If these words do not show the existence of the holy Sabbath at Creation, and that its sacred character there originated, then they do not mean what they say.

3. Your third position depends for a foundation on the inferences already refuted, viz: that the seventh day became the Sabbath of the Lord, after the Israelites entered the wilderness, and that the obligation to keep the Rest-day holy there commenced. That the sanctified Rest-day, or holy Sabbath of the Lord, has been in existence ever since the first week of time is an undeniable fact. To assume that the patriarchs were ignorant of the Sabbath of Jehovah, or that they had no regard for his hallowed Rest-day, (because in the brevity of the Mosaic record, after giving the account of its institution, we are not informed respecting its observance, or its violation,) is taking for granted a position, that must first be proved before any weight, whatever, can be attached to it.

4. The Decalogue bases the weekly observance of God's Rest-day on the sanctification of the Sabbath at Creation. The fourth of Hebrews says nothing respecting the sanctification of the seventh day; therefore it does not contradict this idea of the Decalogue, nor does it even seem so to do. The rest of Jehovah from his work of creation, and the union of Adam and Eve may respectively illustrate the final rest of the redeemed, and the perfect union of Christ and his church; but can never be made to explain away "the primary object" of the Creator in instituting the Sabbath and marriage, as distinctly stated. Mark ii, 27; 1 Cor. xi. 9.

5. As the seventh day did not become the holy Rest-day of the Lord in the wilderness of Sin, but was such already, the first part of your statement rests upon nothing save your own assertion. And as it has been already shown that the CARNAL ordinances [Heb. ix, 10; Col. ii, 14—17] which Christ blotted out did not include the oracles of God, [Acts vii, 38; Rom. iii, 1,] the ten commandments, (which Paul calls holy, SPIRITUAL, just and good,) Col. ii does not even allude to the point which you wish to establish. Your next remark is as follows:

"The display made by the writer in the *Review* about there being no '*Act of instituting* the Sabbath recorded in Ex. xvi,' only shows that he wanted to say something, and was at a loss to know what."

It is a very easy thing for me to point to THE ACT by which Jehovah made the seventh day his sanctified Rest-day or holy Sabbath. But you deny this, and affirm that he made the seventh day his Rest-day or Sabbath in the wilderness of Sin, though no act of that kind can be produced by you. The following is what you are pleased to call my "display," which you say evinces a desire to say something, but a loss to know what. Which of us it is that is thus situated, I leave you to judge:

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

Your remark that the Sabbath came into existence as did light, the sun, moon, &c., by Jehovah's act of speaking, "and it was so," would be very opportune, were it not the case that Ex. xvi does not contain any such thing; the first mention of the Sabbath which it makes being the statement of Moses, "To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord."

After stating that the time *when* the Sabbath was instituted is a very plain matter, you remark:

"The *Review* attempts to invalidate the sentiments of the report on Ex. xx, 8—11, by showing that that text teaches the institution of the Sabbath at creation. I readily admit that such a conclusion might be drawn from that passage, considered by itself. Yet it makes no affirmation at all as to when the Sabbath obligation began: it simply enforces it, and assigns a reason for fixing upon the seventh for a rest-day in preference to any other, viz: because in six days God had created the heaven and the earth, &c., and rested on the seventh. To learn when men were required to rest on that day, we must have recourse to those portions of the Scriptures that speak on that point. Ex. xvi, is one such, which was considered last week; and others will be noticed."

To show the matter in the true light, I give the statement of your original report which you say I have tried to invalidate. It is this:

"We then passed to the Decalogue, Ex. xx, 8—11.—Some thought this passage proved the Sabbath to be a primary institution, established at the creation.—But it was replied, that it does not say any thing of the kind, hence that conclusion is only an *inference*, which is not sufficient to establish a truth or a religious duty."

The following is the manner in which, as you state, the *Review* attempted to invalidate your "report:"

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

The time when God gave an express precept for the observance of his Sabbath is not the point on which its institution turns. For the Sabbath is mentioned

in Ex. xvi, *before* any express precept for its observance is named. The fourth commandment itself points us back to the beginning for the origin of God's Rest-day; and we may add that although one only of the other nine commandments of the Decalogue existed in the form of direct precept, prior to the departure from Egypt, yet no person attempts to dispute that the moral duties contained therein have existed as such from Creation. The duty to keep the Rest-day holy grows out of the fact that God has hallowed and sanctified that day. And such will remain the duty of man until God's blessing and sanctification shall be removed from the day of his rest.—You continue:

"The *Review* had no occasion for saying that 'C. is obliged to admit that some how or other it [the Sabbath] was in existence at least thirty days before the Hebrews came to Sinai.' I have never shown any unwillingness to admit that."

Had you not attempted to make out that the Testimony (not then in existence) was mentioned *in the wilderness of Sin* even more familiarly than the Sabbath, I should not have had reason to conclude that you wished to darken as far as possible the fact that it then existed. If you can assign any other reason for that attempt, please do so.

In answer to your inquiry why the *Review* contends for the institution of the Sabbath before the giving of the Decalogue, I reply, because of the facts already stated, which prove the institution of the Sabbath at Creation. And of this, as already seen, the Decalogue itself furnishes the most decided proof.—In connecting it with circumcision and the passover "you therefore do greatly err."

You next speak of the great propriety with which God could say to the people at Sinai, "*Remember* the Sabbath-day," inasmuch as he had made it known to, and enjoined it upon them, a month previous, and some of them had violated it, &c. You judge rightly, that without some knowledge of the Sabbath the children of Israel could not be called upon to "*Remember*" it. But let me ask, What day was it that he required them thus to keep in memory? The day of his rest from Creation, or some day on which he had rested in the wilderness of Sin? If the Sabbath did originate in that wilderness, is it not very remarkable that the Decalogue instead of citing us to the wilderness in question, should point us back to Creation?

You inquire why we find no reproof in Ex. xvi for neglect or forgetfulness respecting the Sabbath? In answer, you are requested to read verse 28, which contains the reproof of Jehovah given to certain of the people for violating his Sabbath. "HOW LONG refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws?"

The truth of your statement that "The plain, obvious teaching of Heb. iv is '*sublime nonsense*' to the *Review!*" may be judged from reading the language of the Review. It is as follows:

"Is it not sublime nonsense to say that the Sabbath was made as a memorial of the departure of Israel from Egypt, or as a type of man's future redemption and rest after the Second Advent, when as yet he had not fallen?"

Now I beg your attention while I inquire, Is it "the plain, obvious teaching of Heb. iv," that the Sabbath was made as a memorial of the departure of Israel from Egypt? Does it contain even an *intimation* of that kind? And as there is nothing of the kind therein recorded, I next inquire whether Heb. iv contains any "plain obvious teaching" that God sanctified the day of his rest as a type of the final rest of the saints? Failing to find such statements, I remark that I did not refer to "the plain obvious teaching" of the apostle Paul but to certain unwarrantable inferences of your own. You wish me to explain the third verse of the chapter. Its hidden meaning I shall leave to yourself, but will notice some of the plain obvious statements of that portion of Scripture, and its connection. The works of God were FINISHED from the foundation of the world. For he spake in a certain place of the seventh day on this wise, And God did rest the seventh day FROM ALL HIS WORKS. The Great Creator then entered his rest. After man had fallen, God held out to him the hope of restoration and final admission to that rest; but to a large class who had provoked him he sware that they should not enter it. Again through David he sets before man the hope of final admission to his rest. This shows that the rest of the saints is yet future, and remains to be realized by them.

The statement which you make respecting the zeal of Sabbath-keepers some time since in teaching that the Sabbath is a type, and now in denying that it is a type, is, so far as my knowledge extends, entirely uncalled for. Several who first embraced the Sabbath, as T. M. Preble, J. B. Cook, and others, who have since relinquished it, taught that it was a type. To some extent that idea was received, though I know of no instance in which it was presented by us as a point of importance. But never since the point has been examined have we seen any reason to believe that the Sabbath is a type. If we have here resorted to dishonorable expedients, you are requested to sustain the charge by facts; if we have not, then the use of a dishonorable expedient may rest *where it belongs*.

Before noticing my argument respecting Deut. v, 12—15, you refer to one of its concluding remarks which reads thus: "He had brought them out of 'the house of bondage' where they could not keep the Sabbath, [Proof Ex. i, 13, 14; iii, 7; v, 4—19; vi, 9,] and placed them in a situation where every thing was adjusted with reference to the Sabbath, that he might 'prove them whether they would walk in his law or no.'" Ex. xvi. After stating that these texts make no allusion to the Sabbath, you say:

"This is the kind of *proof* the *Review* relies on in this matter! To those who will admit *such proof*, it can prove anything it pleases to assert with its accustomed assurance. It dares enforce, as positive and plain divine revelation, its own groundless inferences. which contain not the first ray of evidence! O that it and its readers might see the fearfulness of such a course, and abandon it."

It is very true that the Sabbath is not spoken of in these texts, but the situation of the people, (the point before us) is "a great truth plainly stated." The texts referred to, show that the children of Israel were in the most *abject* bondage, under the control of a monarch who denied any knowledge of Jehovah, [Ex. v, 2,] and who forced them to toil to the utmost in "the iron furnace," so that their cry came up to heaven by reason of their bitter bondage. Such was the situation of the mass of the people. Ex. ii, 23, 24; Acts vii, 19, 34; Deut. iv, 20; 1 Kings viii, 51. You are requested to explain how the Rest-day of Jehovah could be observed by a people thus situated, "and after that," if you will, "mock on."

After saying that the "Review evidently feels the need of obscuring the clear light of Deut. v, 12—15," and that "to do this it resorts to a number of expedients, all of which will avail nothing with the candid," you remark:

"It says 'Deut. v, is not the Decalogue as uttered by Jehovah. It is a rehearsal of it by Moses forty years afterward. Some things are added and some thing are omitted.' What! does the *Review* charge Moses with *corrupting the Decalogue*? Hear his own testimony. [Here you introduce verses 2—4, which precede the rehearsal of the ten commandments by Moses, and verse 22 which follows, and continue:] This transcript of the Decalogue is attested more at length and with more precision than that in Ex. xx. 'These words the Lord spake' and 'wrote them in two tables of stone.' Yet the *Review* says this 'is not the Decalogue as uttered by Jehovah.' The reader may decide which to credit, Moses or the *Review*. If more is contained in the transcript of the Decalogue in Ex. xx or in Deut. v than was written on the two tables, that which contains this addition is a corruption, and Moses' testimony is untrue, that 'the Lord spoke these words' and 'wrote them'. But we believe Moses' testimony, and that he did not corrupt the Decalogue."

To expose the sophistry of the course of argument adopted by yourself, and to show your utter inability to answer the questions there addressed you, I append the words of the *Review*. The expedients which you charge me with resorting to, speak for themselves:

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

Does Deut. v contradict the testimony of Ex. xx, and tell us that the Sabbath was made after the departure from Egypt? Not an intimation of the kind is given. Does it tell us that the Sabbath commemorated the departure from Egypt? Not a word of that. Let the *original* commandment speak. 'Remember (the day of the Exodus? No! but remember) the Sabbath-day.' What day is the Sabbath day? Some day connected with their flight from Egypt? No! No! It is the day on which Jehovah rested from his work of creation!"

Your statement that in the above I charge Moses with corrupting the Decalogue, shall now be noticed. You take exceptions to three sentences, the first two of which read thus: "Deut. v is not the Decalogue as uttered by Jehovah. It is a rehearsal of it by Moses forty years afterward." Now this is a statement the truth or falsity of which can easily be tested. If you will turn to Ex. xix, you will there read that God came down on Mount Sinai in the third month after the departure from Egypt, and, continuing the narrative, you read in the first verse of the next chapter that God *then* spake the words recorded in verses 2—17 of that chapter. This is its time and place, and this the utterance of the Decalogue.

Now turn to Deut. i, 3, and you will find that the date of the book is the *fortieth year* after the departure from Egypt. Chapter v speaks for itself. It *purports* [verses 1—5] to be a REHEARSAL of the words spoken on the occasion described in Ex. xix; xx. This is direct proof that Deut. v is not the original version of the Decalogue, but is a rehearsal of it. As further proof on this point, notice the language of the fourth and fifth commandments as here given: "Keep the Sabbath-day to sanctify it, AS the Lord thy God HATH COMMANDED thee." "Honor thy father and thy mother AS the Lord thy God HATH COMMANDED thee." Thus both of these precepts contain direct evidence that they are not, the original commandments, as uttered by Jehovah, but plainly cite you to the original, already in existence. My first statement therefore is vindicated by *undeniable* facts.

Now I will examine the statement that causes you so much horror. It is this; "Some things are added and some things are omitted." This also is a point so simple that its truth or falsity may at once be tested. Turn to Ex. xx, 11, and you have a plain statement respecting the institution of the Sabbath at Creation, and the reasons out of which the institution grows. This verse Deut. v OMITS, and consequently says nothing respecting the origin of the Sabbath or Rest-day of the Lord. Now please to notice a moment longer. Deut. v, 15, which assigns as a reason why its observance was enjoined upon the people of

Israel, viz: that they had been delivered out of the cruel and bitter bondage of Egypt, is ADDED by Moses in this rehearsal of the Decalogue. (And even this verse cites us elsewhere for the original precept.)

As the facts in the case sustain every point that you have assailed, you are at liberty either to withdraw your charges, or to stand in array against the plain statements of the Bible. However, if you wish to teach (in the face of plain, undeniable facts to the *contrary*) that Deut. v is the *original* version of the Decalogue, and that Ex. xx is a *rehearsal* of it by Moses, then let me show you that the charge of teaching that Moses corrupted the Decalogue applies with equal force to yourself. For if Ex. xx be a rehearsal of Deut. v, (a gross absurdity!) then it is plain that it ADDS the whole of its eleventh verse, (the account of the institution of the Sabbath,) and OMITS the whole of Deut. v, 15, (the reference to the Egyptian bondage.) Is it not so? As I expressly stated that Deut. v does not contradict Ex. xx, I can see no excuse whatever for the charges which you make. You next remark as follows:

"Now the COMMAND is plainly stated in both places, and in nearly the same phraseology: but in Ex. xx, the reason is assigned for enjoining the seventh day as a Sabbath in preference to any other, and in Deut. v, the reason is assigned for enjoining the Sabbath to be kept: this latter is what especially concerns us in this discussion.—For by the question, 'When was the Sabbath instituted? is, of course, meant, When were men *required* to keep it?'"

Your idea, that Ex. xx gives the reason why the seventh day was to be kept as the Sabbath, does very well as far as it goes; but the plain statement of that chapter, that it was the Sabbath at the time when God blessed and sanctified the day, you keep out of sight. Really, if you had no theory that would be upset by the admission, would you hesitate for a moment to acknowledge that the holy Rest-day of the Creator originated at the close of Creation, and not in the wilderness of Sin? The first mention of the seventh day states that God rested upon it, sanctified and blessed it. Gen. ii, 2, 3. The next time it is mentioned in the Bible it is called "the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord." Ex. xvi, 22, 23. What had been done to the seventh day between these two points? Nothing. The next chapter that speaks of of the seventh day (Ex. xx) proves plainly that by the acts named in the first mention of it, [Gen. ii, 2, 3,] the seventh day became the Sabbath.

The reason assigned for enforcing upon Israel the observance of that day which was hallowed at Creation is perfectly natural, and does not furnish the slightest proof that the seventh day became the Sabbath of the Lord after the departure from Egypt. The other precepts of the Decalogue might be observed even in abject bondage; but the observance of the Rest-day of the Lord was a question which, not themselves, but their masters would decide.

The question before us, is not, When was the first precept on record given, requiring the observance of the Sabbath? but, When did the seventh day become the holy Sabbath?

The fourth commandment did not create the moral duty of keeping the sacred Rest-day of the Lord, any more than the first, second, third, fifth, or tenth commandments create the moral duties which they were given to guard. For all these moral duties are as old as Creation, and neither of them is affected by the fact that the first direct precept on record respecting them was given after the departure from Egypt.—You shall be heard further:

"Now hear Jehovah's answer to this important question: '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.' A statement so plain as this ought to end all controversy on the question involved. God's people were servants in Egypt, he delivered them: THEREFORE he commanded them to keep the Sabbath day. Now as this is the only reason God gave for commanding that day to be kept, it settles the point, and proves in the most positive manner that that commandment did not exist with that people before the deliverance from Egypt, as its express design was, to keep them in mind of the heavy bondage of Egypt and their wonderful deliverance therefrom. No more need be said on this point: if such testimony will not avail, it is useless to adduce any other."

As you rest your argument in the most confident manner on this last position, I call your attention to its defects:

1. Deut. v does NOT furnish the ONLY reason for commanding the observance of the Sabbath. The grand reason, the blessing and sanctification of the Rest-day, is not even noticed. Now look at Ex. xx, the original version of the Decalogue. Verses 8—10 give the grand Sabbath commandment (of which, by the way, Deut. v, 12 *only* claims to be a *rehearsal*) and the next verse gives the *great primary* reason in words not easily explained away. Please read the reason as assigned by Jehovah in the sentence that follows the Sabbath commandment: "For [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."

2. You have exactly reversed the statement of Deut. v, 15. Instead of making the deliverance from Egypt a reason for remembering the Sabbath, you make the observance of the Sabbath something expressly designed to *commemorate* their deliverance from Egyptian bondage. This idea flatly contradicts the language of Jehovah: "*Remember* the Sabbath-day;" that is, the day on which he rested at Creation, and not the day of their flight from Egypt.

3. But as you rest the whole weight of your argument upon the language, "THEREFORE the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath-day," and think that if this testimony does not prove that the Sabbath was instituted after the departure from Egypt, that it will be useless to adduce any other, it shall be noticed in particular. Turn to Deut. xxiv, 17, 18, and you will read thus:

"Thou shalt not pervert the judgment of the stranger, nor of the fatherless, nor take a widow's raiment to pledge; but thou shalt remember that thou wast a bond-man in Egypt, and the Lord thy God redeemed thee thence; THEREFORE I command thee to do this thing." (The same *form* of expression occurs in verse 22, and in Deut. xv, 15; xvi, 12.) If the expression in Deut. v, 15 proves that before the departure from Egypt, men had not been under obligation to keep the Sabbath which God sanctified and hallowed at Creation, Does not the SAME EXPRESSION in Deut. xxiv, 17, 18 prove that men had not been under obligation, prior to the departure from Egypt, to treat with justice and mercy the stranger, the fatherless and the widow? And if you confess that such a position is a monstrous absurdity, then I would ask further, Is it not a legitimate conclusion drawn from premises laid down by yourself? Will you not be candid enough to acknowledge that this your concluding argument to prove that the Sabbath was instituted after the departure from Egypt, is nothing but a baseless inference?—I now append the language of the *Review* to which the remarks noticed above is your reply:

"But does not Moses say, 'The Lord thy God brought thee out thence, through a mighty hand and by a stretched-out arm: THEREFORE the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath-day?' Truth. But is there a word in all this that tells us how there came to be a Sabbath-day? Not one. It does not give one word respecting its origin. But it does give the reason why God enforced it upon the children of Israel.

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

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

2. THE EFFECT: 'The Sabbath WAS MADE for man.'

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

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

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

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

2. "*For whom was the Sabbath instituted?* The *Review* calls the use made of Deut. v, a wicked perversion; yet it says, C.'s syllogism proves that the Sabbath was not binding on the Patriarchs.' Well let that remain then—a nail in a sure place. But the *Review* constructs another syllogism, the conclusion of which is, virtually that God did *not* make a covenant with his people in Horeb which he had not made with their fathers; for it insists that nothing new was enjoined by the covenant in Horeb. Here again the *Review* is in direct array against Moses; he affirms, and it denies!"

Perhaps nothing can show in a plainer manner your *disposition* to wrest my words, and to hide my arguments (rather I should say, the *necessity* that compels you thus to act) than to present the words of the Review to which you refer. They are these:

"To show the wicked perversion of this text, [Deut. v, 1—3,] so often made, we say to C. 'Come now let us reason together:'

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

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

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

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

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

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

3. Hence the duties enjoined in these nine commandments were not binding upon the patriarchs!!

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

Had there been any chance to show wherein the second syllogism was not as fair as the first, you would, doubtless, have pointed it out. If your syllogism is good for any thing it may be turned against either of the commandments with the same propriety that it can be against the fourth. And with the same propriety (I submit to yourself) it can be turned against them all. The necessity of your case must indeed be great, or you would not catch at a straw and call it "a nail in a sure place." The sentence reads thus: "C.'s syllogism proves that the Sabbath was not binding on the patriarchs: mine, (constructed on the same foundation) proves that none of the duties enjoined in the Decalogue were!" The conclusion of the first syllogism you rest upon as a sure foundation, when the second exposes the sophistry and perversion of the first. Your "nail in a sure place" is fastened in a perversion; but it is on nails of this kind that your argument hangs.

You then quote Deut. v, 2, 3; Jer. xxxi, 32; Heb. viii, 9, to prove that God made a covenant with his people in Horeb, and to prove that this covenant was the Decalogue, you quote Deut. v; Ex. xxxiv, 28; Deut. iv, 12, 13; ix, 9, 11, 15. You then draw the conclusion that "the Decalogue *contains something* that God had not given to the fathers of those with whom he covenanted in Horeb." And you think that as all the other duties enjoined in the Decalogue must have been binding on their fathers, that it was the precept respecting the sanctified Rest-day of the Lord. Now it is not necessary to spend many words on this point. If your argument, that the covenant which was made in Horeb was the ten commandments, and that it was not made in the days of the patriarchs, proves that the Sabbath did not then exist, it also proves that the first, second, third, and indeed all the commandments were not then in existence.

Your argument proves too much, viz: that none of the moral duties were binding in the days of the patriarchs, or it proves nothing to the point, and leaves the moral duties embodied in the Decalogue, entirely unaffected.

I will test the character of the *inference*, which is your main argument in answering the second question.

The covenant made in Horeb either did or did not institute the duties of the moral law. 1. If it did institute them, then it enables you to prove that the Sabbath, with all the rest of the moral precepts in the Decalogue, was made for the Hebrews only. But this would prove that idolatry, blasphemy, murder, adultery, theft, false-witness and covetousness, as well as Sabbath-breaking, had not been wrong prior to that time, and were not then wrong for any other people than the Hebrews. 2. But if the covenant made in Horeb ONLY EMBODIED these moral duties, WITHOUT creating them, then you have not in this text ONE FRACTION of proof that the Sabbath was made in Horeb for the Jews. Your proof here is an inference drawn from the fact that God then made a covenant with Israel.—But that covenant did not create the Sabbath, for it was in existence BEFORE the covenant was made. Ex. xvi.

But you think that Ex. xxxi, 16 confirms this view that the Sabbath was made with and for the Hebrews only. As the text does not *say* any thing of the kind, it is sufficient to answer, that this is only another inference which is quite too weak to establish the idea.

The language of Christ, that "the Sabbath was made for man," (standing in direct contradiction of your inferences to prove that it was made for the Hebrews only,) you attempt to get over by saying that Christ's testimony does not bear against your view, "unless it can first be proved that the Israelites were not men." Mark the contrast. Christ says "the Sabbath was made for man." You point to a fraction of the human family, and say that it was made for that fraction only, and that Christ's words do not show the contrary, unless I can prove that that fraction is not composed of men! How weak and *unreasonable* is such an assertion! How reasonable the statement, that it was made for Gentiles as well as Jews, unless it can be proved that Gentiles are not men. If you have any proof to offer that they are not men, it will help your case; if you have not, you stand in array against the statement of the Lord Jesus Christ.

That the Sabbath was a sign between God and Israel, simply shows that it designated them as the worshipers of the TRUE GOD in distinction from the nations around them who worshiped "the gods that *have not made the heavens and the earth.*" Jer. x, 10—12; Eze. xx, 20.

The great stress laid on the language of the fourth commandment to prove that the Jews alone should keep it, shows how difficult a case you have undertaken. It is very true that the words, "thou," "thy," and "thine," do often occur; but had you taken the trouble to read the other commandments, you would have found precisely the same words often used. Notice in particular the fifth and the ninth commandments. If the word "thy" and "thine" restrict the duty enjoined in the fourth commandment to the Jews only, then they also restrict to them the duties enjoined in the other precepts. And as the term "*thy* God" occurs five times in the Decalogue, it goes as far to prove that the God of the Bible is a Jewish God as it does to prove that the Sabbath of the Lord is a Jewish Sabbath.

But what is quite as remarkable, the two commandments, which you are pleased to admit as binding on all men in all ages, were given to the Jews as really as were the ten. And these use the same "*Jewish*" pronoun quite as freely as that hard to be got rid of fourth commandment. "THOU shalt love the Lord THY God with all THINE heart, and with all THY soul, and with all THY might." "THOU shalt love THY neighbor as THYSELF."

You deem the language referred to as the most explicit, and unanswerable proof that the fourth commandment belonged to the Jews only, and that whosoever should teach differently exposes himself to the penalty of adding to the law of God.—Now don't be too strong. Whosoever, on this reasoning, shall teach that either of the two great principles, or any of the ten precepts that grow out of these principles, are binding on any other besides the Jews, exposes himself to the penalty of adding to the law. And inasmuch as God is said to be "THY God" he must be "the God of the Jews only, and not of the Gentiles also!"

But to determine who the "thee" and "thou" are to whom the law speaks, I inquire, To how many does the law speak? To the Jews only, or to all the family of fallen man? Paul answers:

"Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law; that *every mouth* may be stopped, and ALL THE WORLD may become guilty before God." Rom. iii, 19.

Our views of the two commandments, and the ten, are in harmony with the words of Christ, of Paul, and of James.—Matt. xxii, 35—40; Rom. xiii, 9; James ii, 8—12. Your statement that we contradict the words of Christ in Matt. xxii, 40, is false.—We regard these two great precepts, and the ten which grow out of them, as the Royal law of God. Your remark that "the Decalogue is inapplicable as a universal and perpetual law," and that it has given way to "the unincumbered moral law," was not intended, we presume, with reference to the statutes that forbid idolatry, blasphemy, disobedience to parents, murder, adultery, theft, false-witness and covetousness. O no. But the precept embodying the Sabbath that was made for man at Creation, was Jewish, and had obtained a place in that "holy, spiritual, just and good law," to get rid of which, it was all abolished.

The Gentiles were amenable to the law of God or they were not. If they were not amenable to the law of God, then they must be regarded as moral beings, but accountable only to the gods of their own creating. But if they were amenable to the law of God, they were amenable to its fourth precept, the holy Sabbath.

To your remark respecting the existence of the Sabbath in the new earth, and your query whether wearisome labor will then exist, I answer that inasmuch as the prophet Isaiah, in speaking of the new earth, says that all flesh shall assemble from Sabbath to Sabbath to worship before Jehovah, we are decidedly of the opinion that it will exist in that holy state.—Nor does this imply that wearisome labor will then exist, any more than the statement of Ex. xxxi, 17, that the Great Creator *rested* on the seventh day and was *refreshed*, implies that he was wearied with his work of Creation.

The institution of the Sabbath is not affected by the fact that there will be nothing of the character of servile labor in the kingdom.

Not being able to discover any connection between your *significant* question, Whether the relation of wives would be perpetuated in the new earth? and the institution of the holy Sabbath, you are requested to point it out, if the question means any thing more than a sneer.

Having noticed the inferences that you have drawn from the expression, "The Lord made not this covenant with our fathers," and from the words "thee" and "thy" in the fourth commandment, to prove that the Sabbath was made for none but the Hebrews, (what proof!) and shown that the first inference may be turned against any, or all of the commandments with equal propriety, and that the second inference bears no more against the fourth commandment than it does against the two and the ten, and that the law of God speaks to all the fallen race of Adam, so that "thee" and "thou" is not limited to the sons of Jacob, I inquire, Are not "Great truths plainly stated?" And are not these inferences contemptable and quite too weak to bear their own weight?

In order to strengthen those inferences, you make some effort to redeem several objections, urged by yourself at the first, against the universal observance of the Sabbath. It is with evidence of this kind that "the disputers of this world" are able (in their own estimation) to prove the impossibility of the resurrection of the body.

In answering your first objection, viz: that the Sabbath law forbids the kindling of a fire on that day, I pointed you to the fact that nothing of the kind is found in the grand Sabbath law, the fourth commandment, which is a part of the royal law. And that the hand-writing of ordinances, which regulates this matter, and also shows what offerings should be made on that day &c., was designed only for a particular people in a particular country. You request me to look at what you are pleased to call a "correction" of my "perversion" of the royal law. Your request was complied with in my first letter, and your so-called correction shown to be a flagrant perversion of my words.

The next thing at which you catch is the idea that those who live in the polar regions have half a year of sunshine, and then a half year of darkness, and that if they followed the Sabbath law, they must count this but one day, so that a Sabbath could occur but once in seven years. This idea you think is admitted by me, in my saying that it is doubtless the scripture method to regulate our time by the sun, instead of Palestine, and thus to keep the seventh day *as* it comes to us.

This you think proves that those who live in the polar regions would have a Sabbath only once in seven years, and we in the same time would have 364. Surely, this circumstance is ample proof that the Sabbath is a local institution, and every body ought to be satisfied of this!

Please to read Gen. i, 14—18. God made the sun and moon to rule the day, and to rule the night, and to divide time into days and years. Now, as it is in the highest degree absurd to believe that the Creator then established two contradictory methods of reckoning time; we conclude that those who are favored with the light of the sun and moon as the earth revolves on its axis, enjoy the benefit of these great time-keepers, while those who may be beyond their light for a long period, do not enjoy the benefit of this division. Look at the words of the Review again:

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

"It concedes the 'difficulty' of keeping the Sabbath reckoning while circumnavigating the globe—one day being lost by sailing in one direction, one day being gained by sailing in the other direction."

The following is what you grasp as a concession of "difficulty:"

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

You think every body ought to yield the "untenable" position, that the Sabbath was made for the human family, after reading these "insurmountable objections." And that these are laws of nature with which Scripture does not conflict.

Will you please give attention to a few thoughts from the Volume of Inspiration.

1. It appears that the Sabbath could be kept from the wilderness of Sin, west of Palestine, to the city of Babylon, a long distance to the east. These points are remote from each other, and the variations of time must be considerable.

2. Nor does it appear very evident that those violated the Sabbath, who performed voyages of three years length, by command of that king who thought it the whole duty of man to "fear God and keep his commandments." 1 Kings x, 22—24.

3. I next invite your attention to Isaiah lvi. The promise of gathering to God's holy mountain the outcasts of Israel, and the sons of the stranger, is here distinctly stated on the condition that they would keep the holy Sabbath. If you choose to do so, call this prophecy Jewish, these outcasts literal Jews, and this holy mountain, the land of their inheritance. Now where are these outcasts? Just where the leader of Israel predicted; scattered among all people from the one end of the earth even unto the other. Deut. xxviii, 64. What is the condition of the gathering of these outcasts together? The observance of the holy Sabbath! And if they can do it in every land under heaven, the sons of the stranger, who have the promise of being gathered on the same condition, can do it also.

4. The Holy One of Israel hath spoken on this point, "For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I will make, shall remain before me, saith the Lord so shall your seed and your name remain. And it shall come to pass, *that* from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord:" Isa. lxvi, 22, 23. Then if the Holy One of Israel with whom a lie is impossible, be credited, we may consider one point established.—When the dominion of Christ is from sea to sea, and from the river to the end of the earth, and the kingdom, and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom UNDER THE WHOLE HEAVEN, shall have been given to the people of the saints

of the Most High, ALL FLESH shall come to worship before Jehovah from Sabbath to Sabbath, and from new moon to new moon. Then it is possible for the human family to observe the Sabbath over the whole globe!

Your second article concludes as follows:

"But finally on this point, the *Review* appeals to Barrett's Grammar for help on the passage: 'The Sabbath was made for man.' Mark ii, 27. The rule quoted reads: 'A noun without an adjective is invariably taken in its broadest extension, as: Man is accountable.' Now it happens that this noun has an untranslated article, which Mr. Barrett calls an adjective. It is as follows: '*To sabbaton dia ton anthropon egeneto, ouch ho anthropos dia to sabbaton.*' '*Ton*' *and* '*ho*' are the untranslated articles, agreeing with *anthropon* and *anthropos*, man. So the *Review* fails here again, as it must in every position it takes on this question, if attacked by the simple weapons with which the armory of Scripture and reason is replete, and for this reason, because it is advocating an error."

To show the character of your reply, and the manner in which you attempt to hide the arguments of the Review, I quote its words:

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

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

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

As you have not attempted to reply to any part of the above except the grammatical rule, I remark that the rule being taken from the principles of *English* Grammar is with perfect propriety applied to our *English* version. But you point to an *untranslated* article for the purpose of invalidating the use of the rule. Why did you not have the frankness to say that it was the definite article, THE, instead of calling it an *untranslated* article? Let us read the text with the article *translated*. "The Sabbath was made for THE man, *not* THE *man* for the Sabbath." This language fixes the mind on THE man, Adam, that "was made" of the dust of the ground, just before "the Sabbath was made for" him, of the seventh day.

As this text comes in at the close of our discussion on the questions, "When was the Sabbath instituted?" and, "For whom was the Sabbath instituted?" its testimony is of great value. It exactly reverses your decision, that it was made for the Hebrews after they left Egypt, and shows that it was made for the head of the human family, and consequently made at Creation.

The Sabbath was made for THE man, and not THE man for the Sabbath. Is not this a "great truth plainly stated"?

J. N. ANDREWS.

Rochester, N. Y., May 1852.

Sea on the New Earth.

"You will see a correct rendering of Rev. xxi, 1, in Prof. Whiting's translation, as follows:

'*And I saw a new heaven and a new earth*: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and the sea was no more.'

It is not asserted in the original that there is no sea in the new earth, but that the present earth, heaven and sea will have passed away. It as much asserts that there will be no more heaven and earth in the new creation, as it does that there will be no more sea. All that is affirmed of either, is that the former were passed away—were no more. He beholds the new heavens and new earth, because the former had disappeared. The revelator says nothing about a new sea, as he does a new earth; because the earth often includes both earth and sea. Thus the first verse of Genesis asserts that 'in the beginning God created the heavens and earth.' The sea is not mentioned, and yet the sea was then created; for it covered the entire earth, and had afterwards to be gathered into one place, before the dry land could appear. As the new earth is to be the restitution of all things spoken of by the mouth of all the holy prophets, it must correspond with the Eden state in the existence of a sea, as well as in other particulars."—*Advent Herald, April* 1852.

THE REVIEW AND HERALD.

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

ROCHESTER, THURSDAY, MAY 27, 1852.

THE ARK AND THE MERCY-SEAT.

In the Sanctuary of the first covenant the ark and the mercy-seat were placed in the holiest of all, and were connected, the mercy-seat being placed on the ark. Heb. ix, 1—5; Ex. xxv, 10—21; xxvi, 33, 34. And if one exists in the heavenly Sanctuary, of which Christ is a minister, [Heb. viii, 1, 2,] most certainly both exist there. How natural and reasonable the view that the ark containing the commandments of God the Father, which are the rule of man's life, should be closely connected with the mercy-seat where mercy and pardon may be found through the blood of the Son of God for the transgression of that holy law.

Christians have had much to say relative to the mercy-seat, as really existing in the present dispensation; but they have been almost silent about the ark on which it rests. The mercy-seat has been dwelt upon with pleasure. The servants of the Lord have pointed to it as existing in heaven as really as God and Christ, and saints have, in their prayers and songs of praise, mentioned the mercy-seat with great delight. And why not preach, pray and sing about the ark containing the ten commandments as well as the mercy-seat which rests upon it? Those who will examine the subject will find as much evidence for the existence of the ark in this dispensation as the mercy-seat.

The apostle Paul in speaking of the first covenant Sanctuary [Heb. xi, 1—5] mentions the first tabernacle, or holy place, and its furniture, also "the tabernacle which is called the holiest of all," where the ark and mercy-seat were placed. An account of the typical Sanctuary, its two holies and furniture is given in Exodus.

The idea of a mercy-seat in heaven, in this dispensation, is obtained from the law of types and Paul's commentary upon that law, contained in his epistle to the Hebrews. The Apostle declares that the priests of the law served "unto the *example* and *shadow* of HEAVENLY THINGS." Speaking of the cleansing of the typical Sanctuary, also the cleansing of that Sanctuary in heaven of which Christ is a minister, Paul says: "It was therefore necessary that the patterns of *things in the heavens* should be purified with these, but the *heavenly things themselves* with better sacrifices than these. For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the *figures of the true*; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us." Heb. ix, 23, 24.

In this manner the Apostle shows that the earthly Sanctuary, its holies and furniture were *patterns* of the true in heaven, consequently, the mercy-seat must be there. Hence it has been dwelt upon with great delight as really existing in heaven as much as the literal person of Jesus. And thus they have sung:

"There is a place where Jesus sheds
The oil of gladness on our heads;
A place than all besides more sweet,
It is the blood-bought mercy-seat.

Ah! whither should we flee for aid
When tempted, desolate, dismayed?
Or how the hosts of hell defeat,
Had suffering saints no mercy-seat?"

Now, there is precisely the same evidence in the law of types, and the epistle to the Hebrews, for the existence of the ark of the ten commandments in this dispensation, that there is for the mercy-seat. Let those who doubt, search and see — It would be considered infidelity to doubt the existence of the mercy-seat, and fanciful to believe that the ark of God is in the heavenly Sanctuary. Let one dare teach that the mercy-seat has the ark still to rest upon, and he will be called a fanatic, and represented as fallen from grace if he keeps *all* the holy precepts contained in that ark.

It would be unreasonable to believe that the mercy-seat exists, and reject the ark, if there were as much evidence for one as the other; but it is a fact that there is more evidence that the ark of the ten commandments exists in heaven, than that there is a mercy-seat there.

"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 in heaven was opened." Rev. xv, 5.

Is the ark, mentioned here by John, empty? If it is, how can it be said to be "the ark of his testament"? Is not the *testimony*, the ten commandments uttered by Jehovah, in the Heavenly Sanctuary? If it is not, why does John mention the "tabernacle of the testimony in heaven?" Let it be here understood that John had this view of the Heavenly Sanctuary, A. D. 96, about 26 years after the typical Sanctuary was destroyed.

We have given two texts of *plain bible testimony* that prove the existence of "*the ark of the testimony*." And it is a fact that there is not one such text in the New Testament to prove that there is a mercy-seat. Let those who have much to say relative to the mercy-seat, and think us fanatical for believing that the ark exists, pause a moment and look at these facts.

With great delight we make mention of the ark of God, as well as of the mercy-seat, and believe that both exist in this dispensation. We love the mercy-seat, before which our merciful High Priest now stands ready to plead the case of those who come to him in sincerity and truth, and why not love the ark of God also *beneath* it? Those who do, may with propriety sing:

"From every stormy wind that blows,
From every swelling tide of woes,
There is a calm, a sure retreat,
'Tis found *beneath* the mercy-seat."

Defense of the Truth.

It may be thought unnecessary, by some, to reply to those who write against the Holy Sabbath, and show up their weak and deceptive arguments; but we think such judge in this matter hastily.

It is true that for the last seven years there has been much strife and vain glory among professed advent believers, as they have been engaged in the discussion of subjects of no vital importance, and have left the scattered saints to starve for want of the bread of life, the "meat in due season," that would give life and strength to their faith. And many of the advent people have seen so much strife and bitterness in the advent papers, and with the "shepherds" and "principal of the flock," that they have become tired and disgusted with it. This is as might be expected. We wish, however, to say to such, that it has ever been the duty of God's servants to stand in defense of the truth, and it always will be their duty thus to do; but mark this, those called of God to defend his truth will ever possess and manifest the "Spirit of truth," the Comforter, given to guide into all truth. The truth of God, through which we are to be sanctified, is a unit, and those who have the Spirit of truth, and follow on in its channel, will be one, amen.

How preposterous the idea, that those who have the Spirit of truth, and are called of God to publish his word, will be divided, hating and devouring one another! The reason why many of the advent people are in such a state of perfect confusion, is because they reject the present truth, consequently, have not the Spirit of truth to guide them in its even channel, and are left to follow the promptings of the carnal mind, and cause the world to look on, and wonder, and exclaim, How these brethren hate one another! As an illustration of what we have stated we refer the reader to the "law-suit," the trial of J. V. Himes, in which the whole advent body is more or less interested.

But all this forms no good reason why those who have the truth should not stand in its defense. It is indispensably necessary—it is scriptural and right—that they should in a proper manner defend it. Said the apostle Paul, "I am set for the defense of the gospel."

"Even as it is meet for me to think this of you all, because I have you in my heart, inasmuch as both in my bonds, and in the *defense* and confirmation of the gospel, ye all are partakers of my grace." Phil. i, 7, 17.

"For there are many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, especially they of the circumcision, whose mouths must be stopped, who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake." Titus i, 10, 11.

We are exhorted by Jude to "*contend earnestly* for the faith once delivered to the saints." We have also the example of the apostle Paul for defending the truth among those who will hear, until they become hardened and refuse to listen.

"And he [Paul] went into the synagogue, and spake boldly for the space of three months, disputing and persuading the things concerning the kingdom of God. But when divers were hardened, and believed not, but spake evil of that way before the multitude, he departed from them, and separated the disciples, disputing in the school of one Tyrannus. And this continued for the space of two years." Acts xix, 9, 10.

Says the Apostle, "If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men." Rom. xii, 18. But it is not possible for the servant of God, who has the truth burning within him, to hold his peace when he sees that precious truth impiously trampled under foot. The Word justifies him in standing in its defense, God requires it of him, the Holy Ghost will help him.

Those who teach the plain doctrines of the Bible in this age of apostacy may expect a warfare; but they should ever bear it in mind that without Jesus we can do nothing. "The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds; casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God." 2 Cor. x, 4, 5.

LETTERS.

From Bro. Dean.

DEAR BRO. WHITE: The REVIEW AND HERALD to me and my family is a welcome visitor. On the reception of each number, I have a feast of fat things. The letters from the brethren and sisters, to me are full of interest. I like to hear from those of like precious faith. It is encouraging to me to know that others are willing to suffer reproach and persecution, for the sake of the truth, and a good conscience.

But trials and afflictions are the lot of the people of God, and those that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution. The finger of scorn will be pointed at all those who believe and practice the truths of God's Holy Word, instead of the commandments of men. It is painful to think of the deep-rooted prejudice there is against the Sabbath of the Bible.—The greater part of those who profess to be Christians have rejected the commandments of God that they may keep their own traditions. Yet when the Son of man cometh he will find faith on the earth. He will find a remnant of the house of Israel, the true church of Christ, who will be keeping the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus; who will be walking in *all* the laws and ordinances of the house of God blameless.

It is to be feared that the great mass of professors of religion will reject the counsel of God against themselves, and depart farther and farther from the faith of the gospel, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils, and will at last drown themselves in destruction and perdition. Verily, strait is the gate and narrow is the way that leadeth unto life and few there be that find it. We are living in an awfully solemn period of time, when the servants of God are being sealed, and those who reject the present, saving truth do it to their everlasting destruction.

Yours in hope of Eternal Life,

M. L. DEAN.

Ulysses, Penn., May, 1852.

From Bro. Waggoner.

DEAR BRO. WHITE: It may be interesting to the dear scattered ones to hear from the waiting few west of the Wisconsin river. Last week Brn. Case and Phelps came to this place, and have ministered to the little flock in word and doctrine by which we have been much comforted. A few have now heard this message for the first time, and we hope the Lord will open their hearts, and bring them to full obedience to his commandments. Bro. Phelps left this afternoon for Packwaukee, Marquette Co. where a few precious ones are patiently waiting for the coming of the Lord. Bro. Case will leave to-morrow, Lord willing, for Madison. We expect to meet them both in conference in Middleton, Marquette Co. on the first Friday in June. We want the dear brethren and sisters to pray for us and ask the Lord to work in that conference, that this last warning may arouse the Laodiceans to a sense of their poverty and misery. There is much to be done yet in this State, especially in the northern part, where little or nothing has been done yet O that the Lord would send laborers, and wake up his little ones in this country, to the importance of this message. Yours in love,

J. H. WAGGONER.

Baraboo, Sauk Co., Wis., April 30th, 1852.

"WATCHMAN, WHAT OF THE NIGHT?"

In the long, dark night of time since man's expulsion from Eden, how often has this solemn and thrilling question been anxiously addressed to those who have professed to be watching "the signs of the times." As every new occurrence has called attention to the fulfillment of the prophetic word, various have been the answers given to this question; but corresponding always to the situation and real character of the watchman addressed.

Those who have been sleeping at their post, and have been anxious rather to keep those quiet who have entrusted in a measure the care of their souls to them, than to announce the true time of night, and to give the real note of warning, have endeavored to explain away, as a thing of common occurrence, the passing events in which the fulfillment of the prophetic word may be clearly seen. But those who have been watching with no other object than to note the approach of that long expected morning, have been able with Simeon, Anna, and John the Baptist to "mark the tokens" of coming day, and to speak of them to all who are looking for, redemption, and "waiting the consolation of Israel."

"Looking forward" and anxiously watching the dawn of day, and the restoration of the "children of promise" to the Paradise of God has ever been the position of those of whom the world has not been worthy.

But how greatly has this interest been increased, as the fulfillment of predicted events have shown in the clearest manner that "the great day of the Lord is near and hasteth greatly."

When, but a few years since, the voice of warning was every where heard, and the message was borne upon the wings of the wind, "The hour of his judgment is come," presenting at a glance, in a light so clear that he might run who should read it, the expiration of the great prophetic chains, the termination of the prophetic periods, and the fulfillment of the signs promised by our Lord to immediately precede his coming to "judge the quick and the dead;" such was the mighty outpouring of the Spirit of God, and such the evidence and conviction that the message was "from heaven," that with one voice the waiting people of God acknowledged the fulfillment of the first proclamation of Rev. xiv.

Those who rejected it, did it for the same reasons that the Jews rejected the message of John the Baptist, and with the same effect upon themselves. The counsel of God was rejected against their own souls.

Following this, and just preceding the great disappointment, was heard the voice of the second angel, exposing the corruption and wickedness of the religious bodies with which the people of God were connected, and holding up in its true light the purity of Christ's church when separate from "the friendship of the world," which is "enmity with God."

These messages made the Advent people what they were, prior to their being scattered in the time of disappointment and of "patience," through which we have so long been passing. And by a large portion of them they have ever been cherished as the work of the Holy Spirit, and the voice of the God of heaven giving us the words of Eternal Life.

But as the voice of the third angel is beginning to be heard, calling our attention to the fearful oppression of the two-horned beast yet before us, [Rev. xiii, 11—18,] and presenting "the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus," the most of those who would avoid the cross of keeping ALL the commandments of the Father, turn round and deny the first and second messages, in order to apply them elsewhere.

To do this the Advent Herald (which even now claims to be giving the first message) attempts to show that they were fulfilled many hundred years in the past; the Advent Harbinger (which has zealously proclaimed the first two messages) is equally certain that they are all to be fulfilled in a future dispensation; while the Advent Watchman, seeing the absurdity of attempting to destroy, and break down the first and second messages, affirms that the third message has been heard as distinctly as the first and second. An idea of which few persons ever dreamed.

Having heretofore pointed out some of the absurdities of the first two positions named, [See Review and Herald Vol. II. Nos. 3 and 8,] we will briefly notice the last,—the position of the Advent Watchman.

Some one having written to the Editor for help on this subject, the following is what this "Watchman" says of the night:

"By a careful analysis of all the chapters up to xiv, it is very evident that the three angels (chap. xiv, 6—12) who, in turn, fly through the midst of heaven, bear the latest messages of mercy to this fallen world.—It is also very clear that the angel, verse 6, is the same angel of chap. x, and that the sum total of the three messages is no more than is contained in the one angel's message, in chap. x; for both terminate in the judgment—not by Sabbatarians, but by the great God. A careful study of the book will show that the angel of chap. x, is the seventh angel; that his message is the seventh and last message; for with that message, the mystery—gospel—of God is finished. So, also, the gospel drama is finished with all the messages in chap. xiv. From chap. x, we assuredly learn that the advent message is the last message adapted to save men, and the finishing truth of the gospel. The three angels of chap. xiv, are, therefore, advent angels, or are bearers of the advent message; not the first *only*, but all of them bear a part or parts of the message of chap. x, only their work is more minutely defined, and their order given."

We wish to call attention to the leading ideas stated above:

1. The three angels of Rev. xiv, who in turn fly through the midst of heaven, bear the latest messages of *mercy* to fallen men.—This we believe to be truth.

2. But if the angel of chapter xiv, 6 "is the same angel of chapter x," how can the angel of chapter x be the same as the THREE angels of chap. xiv, 6, 8, 9?

3. The message of the angel of chapter x is not the *final* message, for *that* angel gives John directions to prophesy *again*.

4. The reference to being judged by Sabbatarians reminds us of what has ever been the language of a certain class when the truth has uttered its just condemnation, beginning in the days of Lot: "This one fellow came in to sojourn and he will needs be a judge." Gen. xix, 9; 1 Cor. vi, 2, 3.

5. A little *proof* that the angel of Rev. x, who declares that the mystery of God should be finished in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, is the seventh angel himself already sounding, might be quite as much in place as an assertion without any evidence.

6. The three angels of Rev. xiv, bear the last message adapted to save men, and with them the gospel, or mystery of God is finished. Please to bear these points in mind. Now we will hear this "Watchman" again:

"If, therefore, we have been preaching the advent doctrine in its appropriate time, these angels have flown in succession, as seen in vision by John—the first, the second, and the third. Nearly all professed adventists admit that the first angel has flown, but many deny that the others have followed. The Sabbatarians admit that two have flown before their peculiar message, and claim that they are the third. If they are correct, we can prove very easily that it will be a long time yet before the Lord will come; for a message of vast importance is heard in heaven, after the third angel has made his circuit. But we will keep to the point. If the first angel's message was the first proclamation of the advent (and this Sabbatarians and others admit) then the three messages were given before the Sabbatarians began their work of extravagance and folly. The advent was first proclaimed; then the cry was heard, just as distinctly and extensively, 'Come out of her, my people.' Next, and equally distinct, was the message given to the church, to stand aloof from all organized governments of every kind; and by the faithful this message has been as conscientiously obeyed as was either of the others."

To two or three ideas of the above we call attention; the remainder are not worthy of notice.

1. The three "angels *have flown* in succession, as seen in vision by John."

2. "The three messages *were given* BEFORE the Sabbatarians began their work of extravagance and folly."

Now look at these statements in a connected manner:

1. "The three angels, (chapter xiv, 6—12,) who in turn fly through the midst of heaven, bear the latest messages of mercy to this fallen world."

2. "These angels have flown in succession as seen in vision by John," and "the three messages were given BEFORE the Sabbatarians began their work of extravagance and folly;" that is, *before* they began to do and teach the commandments of God.

The answer, then, to the question, "What of the night?" from this "Watchman" is, "The latest message of mercy" was given several years since.

Such is the conclusion to which this position drives those who occupy it. Such the result of teaching that the third angel's message has been fulfilled in the past, in the face of the fact that no one is able to show how, or by whom.

But the "Watchman" tells us that "a message of vast importance is heard in heaven AFTER the third angel has made his circuit"—that is, *after* the "latest message of mercy." This "message of vast importance," we are presently told, has been heard since the third message in '44; so that since that time, though the church has had this message, there has been no mercy in it. Hear the "Watchman" again:

"But the Sabbatarians say that 'the beast is the papacy.' Indeed! does not the word inform us that the papal beast was to continue but forty and two months.' [See chap. xiii.] How, then, can any now worship the papal beast, since his forty-second month expired more than forty years since? The fact is, the beast named here is the beast from the bottomless pit,

(chap. xi and xvii,) and can never be shown to be the papal beast."

We call attention to the following points:

1. The Scriptures of the prophets teach plainly, that though the dominion of the Papal beast over the saints of God was limited to 1260 years, yet it should live and make war upon them until the judgment.—Dan. vii, 19—26. And that the concluding career of the Papal beast will be in an eminent degree deceptive, and calculated to draw after it many worshipers, is evident from 2 Thess. ii; Rev. xiii, 8.

2. Whoever will take the pains to compare the language of the third angel's message with chapter xiii, cannot fail to identify the beast, the image, the mark &c. as *one and the same*.—But in the next paragraph the "Watchman" denies that that beast which was to make war [margin] forty and two months, and which recieved "the deadly wound" was the Papal beast, a thing which in the last paragraph it affirmed. Hear it further:

"The two-horned beast of chap. xiii, is the beast who commands that an image be made—not to the papal beast, but to the beast which had a wound by the sword, and did live. This was the Dragon, who by the sword was crushed and bound, but not killed, for he must live and ascend out of the pit before the end, and make war with the remnant [last end] of the woman's seed. The beast is a symbol of civil government. The two-horned beast or the beast from the bottomless pit, is the protestant civil government of the world, as opposed to the papacy, originating in the revolt of Henry VIII, which is now an image to the old Roman forms of government."

We offer a few reflections on this:

1. It is distinctly stated [Rev. xiii, 2] that the dragon gave his power and seat *to this beast*. But this "Watchman" says that this beast, which received a "deadly wound" was the dragon itself. Rev. xiii, 3.

2. The "Watchman" says that the dragon *was crushed* and bound by the sword; but John says that he *shall* be bound by an angel from heaven, not with a *sword*, but with the key of the bottomless pit and a *great* chain in his *hand*. Rev. xx, 1—3.

3. It is true that the dragon is to "make war with the remnant [last end] of the woman's seed." But mark, this remnant are designated by the fact that they "keep the COMMANDMENTS OF GOD and have the testimony of Jesus."

4. How could England, under the rule of Henry VIII, or any other monarch, be represented as "another beast" beside the ten-horned beast, when it is, and must remain one of the horns of "the first beast" until he is slain and "given to the burning flame?"

5. But how could the third angel's message be given some seven or eight years since, when, if the "Watchman" has now got the right idea of the two-horned beast, *no one* had the right idea of it then? For it will not be denied that the third angel's message refers directly to the work of that beast. Compare Rev. xiv, 9—12; xiii, 11—18. The "Watchman" continues:

"The woman on the scarlet beast from the pit, chap. xvii., is nominal christendom, of every name, supported by civil government, sustained by the beast. Therefore, all that Sabbatarians claim for the change of the times and laws by the Pope, by way of enforcing their claim to the mission of the third angel, or as enforcing the observance of the Sabbath, is all *gammon*; the papal beast does not come into the scene after the forty-two months, until the judgment. Their whole argument on this point therefore is an entire failure."

On this paragraph we offer a few thoughts:

1. With the definition of the woman of Rev. xvii, or Babylon, we see no reason to find fault. It is certainly much more reasonable than to limit the mass of corruption, represented by that symbol, to the Romish church; or to teach that Babylon is the literal city of Rome, and that its fall is its utter destruction by fire, after which fall the people of God are called out of it.

2. How the writer is able to prove from what he has advanced, that the blasphemous powers described in Dan. vii, 23—25; Rev. xiii, 1—10, do not synchronize; or how he has been able to hide from himself the fact that the Papacy in exalting itself above all that is called God, and in changing times and laws, has laid hold on, and attempted to *change* several of the commandments spoken by Jehovah's own voice: and has actually, to use the expression of J. B. Cook in his recent discourse on the subject, sabbatized Sunday, is something which we are not able to explain.—

3. The charge of "*gammon*," "entire failure" &c. rightly belongs to such an argument as this of the "Watchman." The "Watchman" adds:

"To stand entirely aloof from all present forms of government, is to refuse to worship the beast or his image, and to avoid his mark in every form. The third angel, bearing this message to the church, followed in close succession after the cry, 'Come out of her, my people,' and was distinctly heard as early as the spring of '44; since which, a voice has been heard from heaven, from all the church, 'Blessed are the dead, &c., from henceforth'—verse 18. This verse is evidently a symbolic representation of the promulgation of the doctrines of life and death, or immortality only through Christ, which voice has been heard in all the symbolic heaven, since the disappointment of '44, and it is the last part of the last message of the 7th angel. Thus the Sabbatarians by their claim are shown to be at least seven years behind the *through train*."

We call attention to some of the above statements:

1. The third angel's message was "distinctly heard as early as the spring of '44; since which a voice has been heard from heaven, from all the church 'Blessed are the dead, etc., from henceforth.'" Now mark: this "message of vast importance is heard in heaven AFTER the third angel HAS MADE HIS CIRCUIT," with "the LATEST message of MERCY." Then the latest work of mercy *preceded* this "message of vast importance."

2. But how does this view lessen down to a mere nothing the solemn realities of the third angel's message! "To stand entirely aloof from all *present* forms of government is the substance of the message according to the "Watchman?" Who that will compare the fearful warning of Rev. xiv, 9—11, with the no less fearful scene described in Rev. xiii, 11—17, can hesitate for a moment to reject this idle notion.

3. How little similarity there is between the "voice from heaven saying unto me, Write, Blessed are the dead *which die in the Lord* FROM HENCEFORTH," and the message, "The dead know not any thing" I need not now stop to point out.

4. But this message respecting the state of the dead "is the last part of the last message of the seventh angel." That is, if we can gather any idea of what the "Watchman" means, "the angel of chapter x is the seventh angel;" his message is "the sum total of the three messages;" and the "last message of the seventh angel"(?) is the third angel's message; the last part of this last message is "the promulgation of the doctrine of life and death." This is in direct contradiction of its previous statement, that this "message of vast importance is heard in heaven *after* the third angel HAS MADE HIS CIRCUIT."

5. "Thus the Sabbatarians by their claim, are shown to be at least seven years behind the *through train*." How so, Dear Sir? Why they claim to be giving *now* the latest message of *mercy*; but they are mistaken, for it was "*given*" *seven years* since.

6. But the commandment-keepers are IN "the *through train*"—the only one that will ever reach the Holy City: "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that THEY may have a right to the tree of life, and MAY ENTER IN THROUGH THE GATES INTO THE CITY." But those who violate them and teach men so, will be of "no esteem in the reign of heaven," and will be *left* "*without*," to be "consumed" of "the second death."—But the "Watchman" continues:—

"But, suppose they are the third angel; what are they doing? They say they are finishing the mystery—GOSPEL—of God. Pray, what has the law of Moses to do with the finishing up of the gospel?—Are we so foolish, having begun in the spirit (the gospel is the ministration of the spirit), to end in the flesh? (The works of the law are the works of the flesh.)

On this we remark, that these statements of the "Watchman" are either the result of ignorance or of malice:

1. We have neither claimed to be the third angel, nor taught that we were finishing the mystery of God. But we do believe that we are in "the days of the voice of the seventh angel," and that the message of Rev. xiv, 9—12 is now addressed to us: consequently we have united "to do and teach" "the commandments of God," which the "Watchman" is pleased to call "the law of Moses."

2. Those who keep the commandments, leave the Spirit and "end in the flesh." "The works of the law are the works of the flesh."—Now let us contrast this statement with the word of God. What is the character of God's law? "The law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just and good." "We know that the law is *spiritual*; but I am *carnal*, sold under sin." "The *carnal* mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. Rom. vii, 12, 14; viii, 7. What are "the works of the flesh?" "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these, adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulation, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like." Gal. v, 19—21.

What a blasphemous libel on the God of truth and holiness to say that these are "the works of the law," whose sacred character has just been stated by Paul! But hear the words of the law itself on these points: "Thou shalt not commit adultery;" "Thou shalt have no other gods before me;" "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself;" "Thou shalt not kill;" "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might."—The "Watchman" adds:

"O! we are told that Christ informed the young man that, in order to be saved, he must keep the commandments. Certainly; but the instruction of the Saviour to the young man was before the crucifixion. The law of Moses, in harmony with the gospel of the kingdom at hand, was binding until the crucifixion, The gospel of faith—of remission of sins through the blood of Christ—of the resurrection from the dead—the new and living way, was not opened and made binding until the crucifixion—until sealed by the blood of Christ. It was therefore right for the young man to keep the law; for Jesus kept it; for the law was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ—i. e., to the faith of the gospel. But the law was all nailed to the cross, and the economy of Moses was then and there forever wound up—it was finished; and the gospel, just as it was taught by Jesus is the only saving economy of God."

We notice a few of the above ideas:

1. Christ *then* enforced the commandments as the condition of entering eternal life. This is much more reasonable than the position of those who teach that he *then* enforced but a part of them.—But since Christ enforced them, they have all been abolished! The proof on this point the writer forgot to offer.

2. Though the New Testament or covenant dates from the "death of the testator," yet it is a plain matter of fact that the only way by which fallen, guilty man could ever hope to escape the just sentence of God's holy law, is through the blood of the Lord Jesus, shed for his sins. Thus the Apostle says that the gospel was preached before "unto Abraham [Gal. iii 8] *saying*, In thee shall all nations be blessed."

3. But it was "*right* for the young man to keep the law." How does that happen when "the works of the law are the works of the flesh?"

4. But Jesus kept the law. So he did; but this "great truth" though "plainly stated" [John xv, 10; 1 John ii, 4, 5] is often denied by those who wish to excuse themselves in violating the law of God. But if "the works of the law are the works of the flesh" how does it happen that the spotless Lamb of God kept such a law as that?

5. "The law was our school-master to bring us to Christ." So says Paul to the Galatians, and the manner in which this school-master brought Paul to Christ, some years after it is said to have been abolished, may be read in Rom. vii, 7—25; viii, 1—7. He *learned* from this teacher his duty to God, his inability to perform that duty, and the startling fact that he was a sinner, justly condemned in the sight of God. He fled to the blood of Jesus for refuge, and found pardon, justification and forgiveness. He was no longer under the condemnation of God's holy law, [Rom. iii, 19,] but was under grace, the state of pardon and forgiveness, and from the heart "fulfilled the righteousness of the law." Rom. viii, 1—7. The same school-master (not an abolished law) brought the Galatians to Christ many years after this.

6. "But the law was *all nailed* to the cross." As the words of inspiration are quite as proper as any other, we remark that it was "the hand-writing of ordinances" that was nailed to the cross, but the royal law "*remaineth.*" James ii, 8—12. We think it quite proper to follow the footsteps of Jesus; he kept the commandments and taught men so, and we will through grace do the same. Matt. v, 19. But the "Watchman" continues:

"We aver, therefore, that to enforce or keep the law, since the resurrection of Christ, is to prefer Moses to Christ—the law to the gospel; and, as no man can serve two masters, such as serve the law commit adultery by putting away Christ.—Christ becomes of no effect to such, however devoted and pious they may appear."

Let us compare these statements with the Divine Record:

1. John says that "Sin is the transgression of the law."—But the "Watchman" says, that, "To keep the law is to prefer Moses to Christ."

2. James says, "If ye FULFILL THE ROYAL LAW according to the scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself YE DO WELL;" but the "Watchman" says, that those who keep the law since the resurrection of Jesus "commit adultery by putting away Christ." "Christ becomes of no effect to such!"

We repudiate the idea of serving two masters, but as Jesus says, "I and my Father are one," we believe in keeping the commandments of God the Father, and the testimony of his Son Jesus Christ. But hear the "Watchman" further:

"Instance; Suppose I can now be sealed an heir of the kingdom by keeping the seventh day according to the law of Moses; of what avail to me are the groans of Calvary? Of what avail is the whole gospel arrangement?"

We append to this a single question: What good does the blood of Christ do me, if I am still under obligation to keep the commandments of God? Rom. iii, 31. The "Watchman" adds:

"All such as depend on the keeping of the Sabbath, in order to be sealed for the kingdom, are depending on the works of the law instead of the gospel; they have forfeited the mercy of God in Christ, unless they repent—so certain as Christ is our law-giver."

To this we answer:

1. We are not sufficiently Antinomian to believe that justifying faith makes "void the law" of God; or that the "blood of Christ," when sprinkled upon the mercy-seat, (the top of the ark,) blots out the holy law contained within that ark. Heb. ix, 4; Rev. xi, 19.

2. But look at the directions which this "Watchman" has given: (1.) We must become truly sorry, (penitent,) that we have kept the commandments; (2.) We must ask God's forgiveness for the same, and promise through *grace* to do so no more for ever, or we have forfeited the mercy of God in Christ—"so certain as Christ is our law-giver." Now it is an interesting fact that the writer of this article in the "Watchman" has publicly taught the duty of keeping the seventh-day, only he had the seventh day come on the day which the "Popes have sabbatized." In the "Bible Advocate" for Sept. 23d, 1847, he writes as follows:

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

We present the next remarks of the "Watchman," without comment, to show who it is that possess the judging spirit:

"The spirit and kindness of the gospel, by those who bear this message, is exchanged for the spirit of the law, which said, Do this, and live; disobey one jot or tittle, and be damned. It says, as in ancient times, 'An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth;' it severs the dearest christian friends, leaving the christian to weep and sigh on account of such sad effects, while the once loved one, now made into a Jew, rejoices in a kind of frenzied, fiendlike spirit of triumph, and in the language of the Pharisee, cries out, I thank God that I am not as other men; I am sealed; I am holier than thou!"

The "Watchman" concludes as follows:

"We would affectionately warn all our readers to beware of the smile and apparent love that appears on the first presentation of this (so called) message. Meet the argument promptly with the word of God, and you will soon find that we have spoken truthfully—will shortly hear your doom from the lips of the infatuated Judaizer; and, if you are steadfast in the gospel, you will rarely be visited by them the second time.—Brethren, abide in Christ.

J. TURNER.

We have in these paragraphs presented the entire article of the "Watchman," the preface excepted. It concludes with an *affectionate* warning against the deception of those who present the third angel's message. The brethren must "meet the argument promptly with the word of God," that is with the weapons which the "Watchman" has here presented.

They must show these "infatuated Judaizers" that "the three angels, (Chap. xiv, 6—12,) who in turn fly through the midst of heaven, bear the *latest* messages of *mercy* to this fallen world;" and that "the third angel made his circuit" before these deluded Sabbath-keepers commenced "their work of extravagance." They must show these persons that since the close of the latest message of mercy, a "message of vast importance" has been heard concerning the *state of the dead.*—They must show the Sabbatarians that though Rev. xiii proves that the Papal beast should continue but forty and two months, yet the beast there referred to is not the Papal beast, but the dragon; and they must prove to these poor fanatics that the dragon was crushed and *bound* with a *sword* instead of being bound by an angel "with a great chain:" they must show them that this message was given at a time when it was so far from the oppression of the two-horned beast, that nobody knew what the two-horned beast was: they must show them that the two-horned beast is one of the ten horns of "the first beast." And that the third angel's message which is the latest message of mercy was given some seven years since.—And finally that "the *law* was all nailed to the cross," so that whosoever shall now be guilty of keeping the commandments, has committed adultery, and Christ has become of no effect to such, for "they have forfeited the mercy of God in Christ, unless they repent."

We think with the Editor of the "Watchman" that if his brethren are able to maintain all this they will not be very likely to be visited a second time by those who "keep the commandments of God."—But with pain and sorrow of heart we confess that this answer of the "Watchman" to the question, "What of the night?" sounds much more like the language of a man talking in his sleep, than the voice of a faithful watchman.—In the language of inspiration we answer: "Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus." The morning of deliverance to God's saints cometh; the night of trouble and darkness begins already to enshroud a wicked world.

Ye who rose to meet the Lord—.
Ventured on his faithful word,
Faint not now, for your reward
Will be quickly given. J. N. A.

THE REVIEW AND HERALD.

ROCHESTER, THURSDAY, MAY 27, 1852.

A PRESSING WANT OF BIBLE ARGUMENT

Is seen in those who relate what they have heard of the faults of individuals as arguments against the truth. For it is a fact, that in any case of importance, a man will produce his best evidence, and if he resorts to slander and ridicule, and offers what he has heard of the faults of individuals to bring into disrepute the faith of any body of Christians, it shows that he has nothing better to present. Such a being is to be pitied. Poor creature! Feeding upon the hear-say faults of others, and dealing them out to prejudice those with whom he has influence, to bring them into the same low, narrow channel with himself.

But those who keep the commandments of God may expect to meet with opposition of this character. We think this may be learned from the following scripture:

"Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city. FOR without are dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idolaters, and whosoever LOVETH AND MAKETH A LIE." Rev. xxii, 14, 15.

The father of lies, the devil, and his devoted children have ever been extensively engaged in lie-making, and they have always found admirers, who have loved their lies when made; but here the loving and making lies by one class, is mentioned in connection with another class who do the commandments of God. This will be seen fully in the history of the "remnant" on whom the dragon was to make war for keeping the commandments of God, and having the testimony of Jesus Christ. Rev. xii, 17.

Let advent ministers, who report what they have heard respecting those who keep the Sabbath, look back eight or ten years, and see what opposition they then met with. Stories of ascension-robes, insanity produced by believing the Lord was coming, &c., &c., prejudiced the public mind, and were the most powerful weapons used against the advent. Would not those who now take a similar course relative to Sabbath-keepers, were they placed back eight or ten years with the spirit they now possess, join with the meanest and most bitter opposition to the advent? Let the candid answer.

The following is from the *Advent Shield* of May, 1844:

"But the most wonderful and overwhelming of all arguments which have ever been presented against the doctrine, is '*Mr. Miller has built some stone wall on his farm!!!*' But I forgot myself; I said the most wonderful; there is another quite its equal: '*Mr. Miller refuses to sell his farm!!! How, O! how can Christ come, when Mr. Miller will not sell his farm?*

But this is not all; for the truth is, '*Mr. Himes has published and scattered,* (a large part of them gratuitously,) *more than five million of books and papers. He must be engaged in a speculation; and how can the Lord come? O! how CAN he come?*'"

☞ As the Committee, Agents, and the Scattered Brethren would doubtless wish to know our present condition as to means, we would say to them that we were obliged to borrow $90, which we still owe. Should not all those interested in the paper, and who would esteem it a privilege to help sustain it, be invited to contribute?

Bro. Andrews' Letters

Now being published in the REVIEW AND HERALD will be read with deep interest by many, and we hope that all our readers will carefully examine them. We are pleased with the candid and thorough manner in which Bro. Andrews is treating the subject. As we have before said, those who have the truth can afford to be fair. They will be willing to let the strength of argument on both sides be seen, while those who are on the side of error, and have to argue against facts, often show the weakness of their position by their unfairness, and their sweeping, denunciatory assertions.

The importance of the subject of the Sabbath, when realized, is sufficient to lead every candid inquirer after truth, to give it a prayerful and thorough investigation. Let no one think that the subject is beyond their grasp Study it, and pray over it, until this precious truth shines into your mind, and you are filled with peace and joy, the result of believing, and of obeying God.

☞ HYMN BOOK.—We noticed some months since, that we wished to publish a collection of appropriate Hymns, larger than our small Hymn Book now in use; but have not been able to commence the work until now. We intend to get it out as soon as circumstances will allow. Let those who are interested in the Hymn Book send in select or original Hymns immediately, applicable to our faith and hope.

We do not design to get out a large book cumbered with Hymns of no special interest, but a small, choice collection of those only which are appropriate. We very much need more good Hymns on the Sabbath, and hope the friends will send them in at their earliest convenience.

☞ We can supply those who wish, with any or all of the Nos. of Vol. II. There are several hundred of No. 14, containing Bro. Mead's illustrated article, also of Nos. 11 and 12, containing Bro. Andrews' Review of O. R. L. Crozier. Let those who can circulate them judiciously, send for them.

☞ The entire cost of Printing Materials is $600, of which $296 are receipted in this and the previous number. It is necessary that this sum should be received the present month, as it must be paid about the middle of June. Let the friends bear it in mind, and be in season.

Appointments.

There will be a Conference of the brethren in Rochester and vicinity, to commence May 28th, at 6 o'clock P. M., and hold over Sabbath and First-day. The Meeting will be held at No. 124 Mount Hope Avenue. The Advent Brethren in this city and region round about are cordially invited to meet with us.

It is thought best to have a Conference in Canaan, Me., at the residence of Bro. Robert Barnes, to commence Friday, June 11th, at 2 o'clock P. M., to continue over the Sabbath and First-day, and longer if thought best. Bro. Joseph Bates and other servants of the Lord are invited to attend.

S. W. FLANDERS.

Brn. G. W. Holt and H. Edson will hold meetings as follows: Champlain, N. Y., the 5th and 6th of June, and at Farnham, C. E., the 8th, at 5 o'clock P. M. where Bro. Rockwell may appoint.

There will be a Conference of the brethren in Melbourne, C. E, at the house of Bro. Asa Hazeltine, to commence Friday, June 11th, at 2 o'clock P. M; and hold over Sabbath and First-day. Brn. Holt and Edson expect to attend. A general attendance of the brethren is desired.

For the Brethren, JOHN LINDSEY.

Publications.

THE REVIEW AND HERALD, Vol. I, bound in paper covers.
" " " Vol. II, " " "
EXTRA COPIES of Nos. 6, 8, 11, 12 and 14 of Vol. II.
THE ADVENT REVIEW, containing thrilling testimonies relative to the past Advent movement.
THE BIBLE SABBATH, or a careful selection from the publications of the American Sabbath Tract Society, including the History of the Sabbath.
PERPETUITY of the LAW of GOD.
THE SEVENTH-DAY SABBATH.
THE PARABLE, MATTHEW XXV, 1—12.
Brief Exposition of the Angels of Rev. xiv.

For Printing Materials.

A Friend indeed,	$25 50	E. R. Seaman,	5 00
J. C. Bowles,	5 00	C. Stevens,	1 00
A. Woodruff,	5 00	E. Potter,	50

Letters received since May 6th.

G. W. Holt, W. Morse, S. Griggs, F. H. Howland, F. Wheeler, J. G. Foy, S. W. Flanders, S. Everett, L. H. Prior, J. Bates, E. L. Barr, J. H. Waggoner, A. A. Marks, M. L. Dean, J. Lindsey 2, N. N. Lunt, S. M. Bassett, T. B. Mead, F. M. Shimmer, E. M. Barrows, J. Barrows, O. Hewett, W. S. Ingraham, S. W. Rhodes, D. Moody.

Receipts.

N. Mead, S. B. Craig, D. Clow, J. Louden, N. A. Perry, B. P. Thompson, M. Cramer, J. Lewis, S. Aldrich, T. Angel, H. A. Hannaford, G. F. Smith, E. Andrews, S. C. Gilbert, E. Elmer, A. H. Huntley, C. Davis, E. Hardy, H. B. Simons, Sister Woodard, [will Bro. Rhodes give us her first name,] each $1.

N. Denison, L. Hall, a Sister, L. Titus, each $2.

J. C. Bowles, E. Goodwin, S. W. Rhodes, each $5. R. Harmon $3. T. B. Mead $4.