SECOND ADVENT REVIEW,
AND SABBATH HERALD.

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

VOL. I. PARIS, ME., NOVEMBER, 1850. No. 1.

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

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

When was the Sabbath Instituted?

Some have contended that the Sabbath was not instituted until the law was given to Moses at Mount Sinai. But there are serious difficulties in the way of this belief. In the second chapter of Genesis, after having given an account of the creation, the sacred historian says: "On the seventh day God ended his work which he had made: and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." Now, if any part of this narrative is to be construed literally, the whole of it must be; and if we may not venture to deny or explain away the account which Moses has given of the creation, then we may not deny or explain away this unequivocal statement respecting the original institution of the Sabbath in Paradise. The blessing and sanctifying of the seventh day is mentioned in connection with the first seventh day in the order of time, and it is so mentioned as most forcibly to impress the reader that the Sabbath was then instituted. God's resting on the day is given as the reason for its sanctification; and it cannot be supposed that this reason existed two thousand five hundred years before the institution. We conclude, therefore, that the Sabbath was enjoined immediately after the close of the work of creation.

This opinion is corroborated by some facts recorded in the Scriptures. There are frequent and early notices of reckoning by sevens. Noah observed a period of seven days in sending the raven and dove from the ark; the term *week* is used in the contract between Jacob and Laban; Joseph mourned seven days for his father; and Job and his friends observed the term of seven days.

Nor is it in the sacred volume or among the Jews alone that such facts are found. Nearly all the nations of antiquity were acquainted with the weekly division of time. The Assyrians, Egyptians, Indians, Arabians, and, in a word, all the nations of the East, have in all ages made use of a week of seven days.—And we find that these nations not only divided time thus, but that they regarded as holy the very day which had been sanctified as a Sabbath, although they had forsaken the true worship of God. *Homer*, *Hesiod*, and *Callimachus*, say, "The seventh day is holy." *Theophilus* of Antioch says, respecting the seventh day, "The day which all mankind celebrate." *Josephus* asserts that, "no city of Greeks or barbarians can be found, which does not acknowledge a seventh day's rest from labor." And *Philo* says, that "the Sabbath was a festival not peculiar to any one people or country, but so common to all mankind, that it might be called a public and general feast of the nativity of the world." These authors, who lived in different ages and were of different nations, cannot be supposed to have written thus in order to please the Jews, who were generally despised and persecuted; and this universal reverence for the seventh day cannot be accounted for upon any other supposition than that the Sabbath was instituted at the close of creation, and handed down by tradition to all the descendants of Adam.

If additional proof of this early institution of the Sabbath is needed, it may be drawn from the manner in which it was revived in the wilderness. Before the children of Israel came to Mount Sinai we find them voluntarily making provision for the Sabbath, by gathering on the sixth day a double portion of manna. "And all the rulers came and told Moses. And he said unto them, this is that which the Lord hath said: to-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord." "And it came to pass, that there went out some of the people on the seventh day to gather, and they found none. And the Lord said unto Moses, how long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws? See, for that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath, therefore he giveth you, on the sixth day, the bread of two days."—The rebuke, *how long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws?* implies the previous appointment of the Sabbath; and the positive assertion, *the Lord hath given you the Sabbath*, ought to settle the question in any mind disposed to understand the sacred historian.

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

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

It is plainly recorded that the Creator, after laboring the first six days, in which he completed the work of creation, rested the following day, which was the seventh in the order of creation. This particular day God therefore sanctified and blessed. "And God blessed the *seventh* day." When the law was given at Mount Sinai, the observance of the seventh day was commanded; and the manner in which the fourth commandment is expressed, shows beyond a doubt, that one particular and definite day was known to Israel by this name. Consequently, they needed no instruction as to what day was intended. This is observable in Ex. xvi, 22, where the sixth and seventh days of the week are mentioned by their ordinal names, as a subject with which the people were familiarly acquainted. In this place, also, the seventh day is declared to be the Sabbath. There can be no reasonable doubt but that the day which in the time of Moses was known as the seventh day, was the same in its weekly succession with that which is called the *seventh day* in Gen. ii, 3. If the seventh day mentioned in the fourth commandment was not the same day of the week mentioned in Gen. ii, 3, as some profess to think, it must be perfectly inexplicable, that no intimation is given in the history of those events that another seventh day was intended in the fourth commandment than the one mentioned in the institution of the Sabbath, especially since both are recorded in the same appellation in a direct series of events. But what removes all obscurity from the subject is, that God has positively declared that the day which he commanded to be observed in Ex. xx, is the same on which he rested at the close of the creation. "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." "*The* seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested on the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it." This language is definite; and while it assures us that the day here commanded to be observed is the same in its weekly returns with the day on which God rested, it assures us against any derangement of the week, or loss of time which might have been produced in the long lapse of time from the creation, by the general apostacy from the true worship of God. Had the true Sabbath been lost, it was certainly restored; and the day then known as the seventh day received the divine sanction. The same remark is applicable to the subject during the succeeding history of the Jewish nation. Had the weekly Sabbath fallen into total neglect, and the day of its regular recurrence been forgotten, our Lord Jesus Christ, by giving his divine example in favor of the day known by the Jewish nation as the proper seventh day of the decalogue, has settled the question conclusively, down to that time: so that the day known in the New Testament as the Sabbath, was the seventh day in regular succession from the creation of the world. A perfect uniformity among all the nations in the known world, as to the days of the

week, both before and since the advent of Christ, is a further testimony, that no derangement of the days of the week has ever taken place. Indeed, it will not be pretended that the account of time has been lost since the introduction of Christianity.—Since that period, the Jews as a people have maintained a perfect uniformity in the observance of the ancient Sabbath, though scattered through every nation of the globe; and the Christian church, in all its divisions, has been known to observe either the seventh or the first day of the week; and for a considerable length of time, both of these days. So that we are as certain that the day now known as the seventh day of the week, is the same with that enjoined in the fourth commandment, as we are of any fact, for the knowledge of which we are dependent on the testimony of mankind.

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

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

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

The method commonly pursued by the advocates for a change of the Sabbath, is to impress their readers, 1. That the Jewish prophets predicted such a change; 2. That there was a necessity for the change in order to commemorate the completion of the work of redemption, which was finished by the resurrection of Christ; * * * 4. That on this day of the week Christ freqently met with his disciples after the resurrection; 5. That from that time the Apostles and primitive Christians religiously observed the first day in memory of this event, and as a substitute for the Sabbath; 6. That the day of Pentecost, when the Holy Spirit descended, was the first day of the week; 7. That by "*Lord's day*," (Rev. i, 10,) the first day of the week was intended.

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

1. *Did the prophets predict a change of the Sabbath?*—The first and principal text cited in proof of this is Psalm cxviii, 24—"The stone which the builders refused is become the headstone of the corner. This is the Lord's doing; it is marvelous in our eyes. This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it." In order to make any use of this text, the main points in the argument are assumed. First, it is assumed, that Christ's becoming the head of the corner refers to the day of his resurrection; whereas there is no conclusive evidence that it refers to this rather than to the day of his birth, or of his entrance on his public ministry, or of his final ascension into heaven. Next, it is assumed, that the day spoken of is a natural day of twenty-four hours; whereas this word is often used to designate an indefinite period of time—particularly the gospel era (John viii, 56)—and is very probably so used here. Again, it is assumed, that the day mentioned is the first day of the week; whereas there is nothing which designates this rather than any other, allowing that a natural day is referred to. Of course no confidence ought to be placed in conclusions drawn from such premises.

Reference is sometimes made to Isaiah xi, 10. "In that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek; and his rest shall be glorious." This "rest" is referred to the Sabbath, and the expression "in that day" is supposed to show that it was to be changed by Christ. But whoever reads the following verses will see that the rest here spoken of is not the Sabbath, but that season when the Lord shall have "set up an ensign for the nations, and assembled the outcasts of Israel, and gathered together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth."—Such a rest may well be called "glorious."

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

2. *Is it necessary to change the Sabbath in order to commemorate the completion of the work of redemption?* It is said the work of redemption is greater than that of creation; hence the necessity for a change of the day of the Sabbath. In reply to this we remark, the Scriptures are entirely silent respecting the comparative greatness of the two works; and while they give us no information on this point, we are not warranted in making our own suppositions the ground of practice, to the neglect of a positive injunction. But supposing the work of redemption to be greater than that of creation, is it therefore necessary to celebrate it on a different day? Both these works were conceived by the same mind and wrought out by the same hand. And since God has seen fit to make the seventh day a time to commemorate the completion of his creative work, why not gather together all his merciful works for us, and celebrate them on one and the same day? The greatness of redemption, therefore, instead of being a reason for a change, is a reason why the Sabbath as originally given should be doubly dear to us.

Again, supposing that a change of the day *is* required in order to celebrate the completion of the work of redemption, what day shall be chosen as most appropriate? Shall it be the day of the crucifixion, or of the resurrection, or of the ascension?—If the time of Christ's greatest display of love for mankind and his greatest labor for them should be selected, then we should celebrate the day of his crucifixion. This is the day on which,

(if on any particular day,) the work of redemption may properly be said to have been completed, according to the testimony of the Savior himself, who said on the cross, "*It is finished.*" This is the day and the event in which the Apostle Paul eminently gloried; and it was to the passion of Christ that he constantly directed the minds of his brethren as the ground of hope and source of encouragement. But if we would have the day of Christ's highest exaltation to be the day for celebrating the completion of his work, then certainly we must fix upon the day of his ascension, rather than of his resurrection. The Scriptures say it was "when he ascended on high" that "he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men." Then it was that "all power" was given to him "in heaven and in earth." Then it was that God "highly exalted him, and gave him a name which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow." If then, a day were to be selected as a weekly Sabbath, which was "validly the day of redemption," it seems most proper to select the day of Christ's death, which was the end of his temptation and conflict with the powers of darkness, and the severest test of his obedience; or the day of his final ascension. These things are not said to prove that any sanction is given to those days above others, since only a divine institution will weigh with us; but to show the absurdities into which they are led who pretend to honor the resurrection while neglecting the law of God.

It is evident from such considerations as these, that the argument for a change of the Sabbath from its necessity to commemorate the work of redemption, is not supported by reason or Scripture. It rests alone upon man's authority, and acknowledges a principle which would justify all the innovations and extravagances of Popery. * * * * *

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

On the day he was first seen after the resurrection, Christ appeared three times to different persons and at different places. His first appearance was to Mary, while she was alone at the sepulchre, John xx, 16. There is nothing, however, in the circumstances connected with this meeting which indicate that the least sacredness is to be attached to the time when it occurred. His second appearance was to two of his disciples as they journeyed to Emmaus, Luke xxiv, 13—35. He accompanied them to that place, and both they and he returned to Jerusalem the same day, making a distance of about fifteen miles. There is no indication that this journey was undertaken for religious purposes: and as our Lord did not rebuke the disciples, or instruct them to do differently in future, it is reasonable to suppose he approved of their traveling on that day. Of course, then, this circumstance, instead of indicating a regard for the first day, gives us the example of Christ and the Apostles for traveling upon it.—His third appearance was in the evening of the same day, when the disciples were together, probably at their own house; for we find the eleven not long after this occupying a chamber in Jerusalem. (Compare John xx, 10 with Acts i, 13.) There is not the least intimation here that the disciples have been during the day, or were now, together for worship. On the contrary, the absence of Thomas affords presumptive evidence that this was not a meeting generally agreed upon. And the fact that most of them were not satisfied that Jesus had risen, shows the impropriety of representing this meeting as proof of a regard for the day on account of the resurrection. It was important that the earliest information of the resurrection should be afforded for the consolation of the desponding disciples, and for a testimony to the truth of the Saviour's prediction, that he would rise after three days; and there is nothing in these several appearances which seems intended for any other purpose.

The next and only other meeting of Christ with his disciples, which is held to have been on the first day of the week, is mentioned in John xx, 26—"And after eight days again his disciples were within and Thomas with them." Now had this interview been on the following first day it could afford no strength to its claim for religious regard, since it is not noticed as a meeting designed for worship. Mark, (ch. xvi, 14,) in noticing one appearance of Christ, says, "He appeared unto the eleven as they were at meat," *i. e.* eating a common meal. There is nothing which gives to the meeting a religious character, or indicates regard for the day. But it is by no means certain that the expression "after eight days" means just a week. Who can say that it was not on the *ninth* day after his first appearance?

Other appearances of the Saviour are recorded, which no one will claim as having occurred on the first day. He appeared to the disciples when they were fishing at the sea of Tiberias, (John xxi, 13,) and was seen of them forty days before his ascension, (Acts i, 3.) Now, if the appearance of Christ on the first day proves it to be the Sabbath, then his appearances on other days prove them to be Sabbaths, since as important business was transacted, and as much mention made of the Sabbath, in one case as in the others. And if this be allowed, then we have the example of Christ and the Apostles for traveling, fishing, or doing any other business on the Sabbath. To such results would consistency drive us in applying the principle that example, without precept, is to regulate our practice. But the claims of the seventh day rest upon no such authority. God enjoined it, and then added to the precept his own example of resting upon it.—No argument, therefore, drawn from example without precept can justly weigh against it.

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

The first is Acts xx, 7. "And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow, and continued his speech until midnight." But is there any thing in this transaction, or the attendant circumstances, which clearly and undeniably proves an apostolic example in favor of a new Sabbath, or of keeping the first day of the week, in any manner, as a substitute for the former institution? Surely there is not. The passage does not so much as prove that the practice of meeting for worship on the first day of the week was then common and general. But if it did, it would not determine the change contended for. There is nothing said in the narrative which characterizes the day of this meeting as a Sabbath. Assembling for public worship is proper on any day of the week, and so is the breaking of bread. The supper was first administered on one of the six working days; and there is nothing in the Scriptures which restricts its subsequent administration to a particular day—not even the authorized Sabbath. Besides, in this case, the breaking of bread was deferred until after midnight. Of course, according to the Jewish reckoning of time, it was attended actually on the second day; and this must have been the case, also, according to the prevailing custom among observers of the first day, of commencing the day at midnight. It seems, therefore, that the Apostle and his brethren were not very precise in regard to its being done on the first day. Let the most be made of this passage, and it lacks a divine designation of the first day as the Christian Sabbath; and hence it is entirely wanting as to the requisite evidence of a change in the sabbatic law. Surely, if there had been such a change, and this, with one more instance of meeting on the first day of the week, were to contain the evidence for all after generations, we should have been informed of the fact. Something would have been said to determine that the first day of the week was regarded as a Sabbath, and that it had taken the place of the seventh. But there is nothing of this. The record is perfectly silent in regard to either point. Besides, it is evident that the original Sabbath continued to be observed throughout the entire period of New Testament history. This is so plain a fact, that no one who gives the subject a candid examination will deny it. This shows the opinion of a new Sabbath—observed, as it must have been, in connection with the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, and without a word being said on the subject, or the least objection, stir, query, or excitement whatever being raised—to be perfectly preposterous. Such is the result of this reasoning from a supposed apostolic example, giving the passage its widest possible scope, as implying a common practice of meeting for public worship on the firs day of the week. But in reality there is nothing in this tex which proves or implies that such a practice was common a that period. For aught appears, it might have been an occa-

sional meeting, appointed merely in consequence of Paul's being about to depart on the morrow. Therefore, to adopt a practice so important as the one in question, upon such vague, uncertain, and inadequate testimony—especially when, in order thereto, we must dispose of a plain and positive command of God respecting the observance of the seventh day, and of a usage as old as the completion of the creation—is unreasonable in the extreme.

Another passage quoted in proof of an apostolic example of keeping the first day of the week, and, consequently, in support of the opinion that the Sabbath is changed, is 1 Cor. xvi, 2.—"Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come." This passage, like the others, does not imply that the first day was then commonly and generally regarded as a day for public worship. Indeed, it does not necessarily imply a public meeting of any kind. The direction for "every one to lay by him in store," for the benefit of the poor saints at Jerusalem, "on the first day of the week," necessarily amounts to no more than an appointment of this day to make up their bounty *at home*, so that it might be sure to be ready when the Apostle should come. But if it be understood to imply any thing more, it is simply that they should bring their donations together publicly on the first day of the week, so as to be prepared in the fullest manner for the Apostle's visit. Therefore, according to this view of the case, it proves no more than an occasional meeting on this day for the purpose of a public contribution for an important object of benevolence. But even if it could be so construed as clearly to imply that it was then a common and general practice to meet for public worship and instruction on this day, it would not thereby be pointed out to us as the Christian Sabbath, and a substitute for the seventh day, seeing that it contains no information to that effect, and that no divine warrant appears on any part of the New Testament records for the supposed change.—Meetings for public worship, taking up of collections, and even breaking of bread, do not constitute a Sabbath. *To sabbatize* is to rest from our own secular labors, and keep a season to God. These proofs for a change of the Sabbath, therefore, which are unquestionably the best that can be produced, are utterly deficient, and the argument therefrom, as generally presented, is deceptive, and unworthy of confidence.

6. *Descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost.*—Much has been said respecting the descent of the Holy Spirit, on the day of Pentecost. It is urged that this was the first day of the week, and that this circumstance was an intimation that God designed to bestow upon the day in its weekly returns a special honor. This opinion, however, is supported only by assumption. The day on which that remarkable event occurred, is known only as the day of Pentecost, an annual feast of the Jews, fifty days from the feast of the Passover, which was held on the fourteenth day of the first month. It might, therefore, occur on the first, or any other day of the week. This year it probably came on the *fifth* or *seventh* day. But the fallacy of the argument we here oppose, is apparent from the fact, that it is founded in the presumption that they began to count the fifty days from the morrow after the weekly Sabbath, whereas they counted from the annual passover Sabbath. See Lev. xxiii. The descent of the Holy Spirit at this time could not be considered as rendering famous any other day than the Jews' feast of Pentecost. But we have no evidence that God intended by the event to bestow a special honor upon any day. It was the fulfillment of an important promise that the disciples should be baptized with the Holy Ghost.

7. "*Lord's Day.*"—An argument for the change of the Sabbath is founded on the supposed application of the title "Lord's day," to the first day of the week. The only passage referred to for the purpose of sustaining it, is Rev. i, 10. "I was in the spirit on the Lord's day." But that the day here called the Lord's day, is the first day of the week, is merely assumed, and hence is not to be considered as proved. It is not in fact *probable* that this is the day referred to. * * * If these words be understood to refer to a natural day, it is more likely to be the seventh day, which God had blessed and sanctified for his special service, than the first day. The seventh day is called by Him "*my holy day*," and "*the holy of the Lord*"—phrases very similar to the one in this passage. This was also the Sabbath which was made for man, and of which Christ says he is Lord. And since it was observed up to the close of the New Testament history, it would be perfectly natural for John to speak of it as "the Lord's day." Further, there is no evidence that the first day of the week was denominated the Lord's day, at so early a period. Only one writer mentions the expression till towards the close of the second century; and the reputed author of this passage, when speaking, in his Gospel, (which was written some years later than the Apocalypse,) of the resurrection of Christ, and the first day of the week, never intimates that the day should be called by any other name. The learned Morer, though an advocate for the first day, in mentioning the different days to which this phrase may be applied, acknowledges the entire uncertainty as to what day is intended, and says, "It is very likely that the more solemn and public use of the words was not observed until about the time of Sylvester II., when, by Constantine's command, it became an injunction." It is evident, therefore, that this passage cannot justly be used as proof that the Sabbath was transferred to the first day of the week.

We have now examined the texts commonly adduced to prove a change of the original Sabbath, and have found them utterly insufficient and deceptive. Hence the claims of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, without alteration, are fully sustained. The advocates for the first day are aware that if an abrogation or change of the original Sabbath law cannot be made out, the seventh day is still the true Sabbath. Dr. Dwight, for instance, makes the following admission: "If we cannot find in the Scriptures plain and ample proof of the abrogation of the original day, or the substitution of a new one, the seventh day undoubtedly remains in full force and obligation, and is now to be celebrated by all the race of Adam." [*From Sab. Vindicator.*

THE SABBATH:

AUTHORITY FOR THE CHANGE OF THE DAY.

It being clear from the Scriptures, that the seventh day was instituted by divine authority for a weekly Sabbath, and religiously regarded throughout the times of the Old Testament, those who now relinquish its observance, and keep the first day of the week, take the ground that the Sabbath was either abrogated and a new institution introduced in its room, or that the time of its observance was changed from the seventh to the first day of the week, in commemoration of the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ. To be consistent with themselves, therefore, they are bound to evince one or the other of these positions. The burden of proof evidently lies on their part. For unless it can be shown, that the fourth commandment, which requires the sanctification of the seventh day, has been abolished, or amended by the substitution of the first for the seventh day of the week, it is clear that the original appointment remains obligatory and is now binding on the entire human family. And to substantiate either of these points, the proof must be clear and decisive. It will not do to rest upon doubtful deductions. We have an unquestionable right to demand that divine warrant, in either case, which pertained to the institution as originally delivered.

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

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

The perpetual obligation of the Decalogue implies, of course, the perpetual obligation of the Sabbath as enjoined in the fourth commandment. But if *that* was abrogated, the Sabbath which it enjoined was also abrogated; and, consequently, it ceases to be binding, unless renewed under the new economy. What, then, is the proof here relied upon? One of the principal passages in which this proof is supposed to be contained is 2 Cor. iii, 7, 8, 13. "But if the ministration of death, written and engraven on stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadily behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance, which glory was to be done away, how shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious? . . . And not as Moses, which put a veil over his face, that the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished." It is argued from this passage, that the clauses "which glory was to be done away," and "to the end of that which is abolished," refer to the whole law, *moral* as well as *ritual*, be-

clause mention is made of "that which was written and engraven in stones," which is an evident allusion to the Decalogue. But, on careful examination, it will be found that "that which was to be done away," was not the *Decalogue itself*, but "the *ministration* of it," which was then appointed—the same being emblematically illustrated by the glory of Moses' countenance, which was merely temporary. This clause refers expressly to the glory of his countenance, and not to the glory of the law itself.—So also the clause "that which is abolished," does not refer to the Decalogue, but to the ministration of Moses, including the appended rights and usages, the priesthood and its sacrifices, which were useful merely for the time being. It cannot be supposed that the Decalogue was abolished, without expressly contradicting Christ's testimony, Matt. v, 17—19, as well as by many other representations of the Scriptures. The abolishment spoken of, therefore, evidently respected no other than what the Apostle calls in another place "the law of commandments contained in ordinances," inclusive of the entire ministration of Moses. There is unquestionably a reference in this chapter to the Decalogue, but not as abolished. It was merely the ministration of it, or the then instituted manner of teaching, illustrating, and enforcing it, which was abolished, to be succeeded by a new ministration of the same law by the Spirit. For it is written, "I will put my law"—(the very law of the ten commandments)—"in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts." Again, "We are not without law to God, but under the law to Christ." What law but the Decalogue is here referred to? Evidently none. For surely we are not under the Mosaic ritual. Again, "Do we make void the law through faith? . . . Yea, we establish the law." The same, no doubt, which was contained in the Decalogue. Hence, the Apostle James says, "If ye fulfil the law according to the Scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, ye shall do well." Here the title "the royal law," is given by way of eminence to the Decalogue; and its permanent obligation is manifestly recognized; for the precept alluded to is a summary of the last six commandments of this code, and the allusion is so made as to imply the continued obligation of the first four, which are summed up in supreme love to God. Again, the Apostle John testifies, "Hereby do we know that we know him, *if* we keep his commandments." And again, "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter through the gates in the city." In both these passages reference is evidently had to the precepts of the Decalogue, as the essential and permanent rule of obedience for Christians. The doing away or abolishment, therefore, spoken of in the above passage, cannot refer to the Decalogue or the moral law *itself*, but to the Mosaic dispensation or ritual.

Another of the proofs alledged for the abrogation of the Decalogue, and consequently of the Sabbath, is Collossians ii, 14—17. "Blotting out the hand-writing of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to the cross; and, having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it. Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days, which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ."

By "the hand-writing of ordinances," is most evidently meant the ceremonial law—not the Decalogue, or the moral law.—This is never characterized as "the hand-writing of ordinances." Therefore, the "blotting out," "taking away," and "nailing to the cross," spoken of, have no reference to this law, but to the Mosaic ritual. This is particularly distinguished from the Decalogue, and fitly described as "the law of commandments contained in ordinances." It was this, and this only, which was "blotted out" and "nailed to the cross." As, therefore, the reference made by the Apostle is expressly to this law, it follows, by a fair inference, that "the sabbath days" alluded to, or, strictly rendered "sabbaths," are those which were contained in this law, or among these "ordinances," and do not include the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. There were, besides the weekly Sabbath, various other sabbaths appointed, which belonged to that ritual, and not to the Decalogue. Accordingly, these were expressly included in "the hand-writing of ordinances," and like the rest were "a shadow of things to come," and ceased to be obligatory at the death of Christ. There is evidently no authority in this passage for including any sabbaths but what properly belonged to the Mosaic ritual. This view of the matter is corroborated by a more literal rendering of the 17th verse, viz: "Let no one therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in a part or division of a festival, or of a new moon, or of sabbaths." The sabbaths alluded to are obviously those which are found in the same place with meats and drinks, festivals and new moons, and which were of the same general character.—The weekly Sabbath, therefore, is not affected at all by their abrogation, but remains in full force, as does every other precept of the Decalogue.

We find the same distinction as to the law which was abolished, in Ephesians ii, 14, 15. "For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us, having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances, for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace." Here the middle wall of partition between Jews and Gentiles, called "the enmity," is expressly defined, as before, to be "the law of commandments contained in ordinances." This, and this only, therefore, was abolished, leaving the Decalogue, or moral law, in its original character and obligation. This is the language of the whole Bible. There is no proof in any of these passages, that the law of the ten commandments was abolished, or that the Sabbath enjoined therein was done away.

Nor is there such proof in Romans xiv, 5, 6. "One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth it to the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it. He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks: and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks." This passage is frequently adduced as proof that the obligation to keep the ancient Sabbath has ceased, and that under the Gospel dispensation there is no divinely authorized distinction in the days of the week; that there is no one constituted *holy* in distinction from the *rest;* and consequently that every one is left at his own liberty to keep a Sabbath or not. It will be easily perceived, that if this argument has any weight in reference to the *seventh* day as the Sabbath, it operates equally against the obligation to keep the *first* day, either as a substitute for the seventh, or as a memorial of the resurrection, seeing it places all distinctions whatever as to days on the same ground with the confessedly obsolete rites of the Mosaic ritual. According to this view of the passage, we have under the Gospel dispensation *no Sabbath at all*—not so much as an *authorized* memorial of the resurrection. He who claims the least authority for the observance of the *first* day of the week for *any* purpose, takes a course which completely overthrows the argument based upon this passage. But, in reality, this text has nothing more to do with the subject before us, than either of those which have been examined. It respects merely the distinctions which formerly existed in regard to the six working days of the week—some of them being appointed in the Mosaic ritual as sabbaths, others as days of atonement and purification, and others as festivals. Some of the early Christians thought these distinctions still binding, as also the distinctions in regard to meats and drinks; others thought they were not. Hence the exhortation which is subjoined to mutual forbearance. That the distinctions referred to as to days, were those noted in the Mosaic ritual, and did not include the one contained in the fourth commandment, is manifest from the whole scope of the chapter. There is particular reference made to one's freely eating all things, while another would eat only herbs; and accordingly the following rule, to be respectively observed, is laid down: "Let not him that eateth, despise him that eateth not; and let not him that eateth not, judge him that eateth; for God hath received him." This quotation clearly evinces that the Apostle was treating of *ritual* distinctions, and not of *that* distinction of days which was constituted by the ancient law of the Sabbath.

Again, the abrogation of the Decalogue is supposed to be taught in Romans vii, 4, 5, 6. "Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ, that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God. For when we were in the flesh, the motions of sin which were by the law, did work in our members, to bring forth fruit unto death. But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter." But if the term law here includes the *moral* as well as the *ceremonial* law, it is manifest that believers

are not said to be delivered from it, considered in any other light than as *a covenant of works*. Certainly they are not delivered from it as *a rule of obedience*. To suppose this is inconsistent with Christ's sermon on the mount, before alluded to, and many other decisive proofs of the perpetual obligation of the Decalogue. It is probable the Apostle had special reference to the deliverance of believers from the *curse* of the moral law.—This is reasonably inferred from the clause, "that being dead wherein we were held." If any thing more pertinent to this law be intended, it must be its original character when given to Adam as a covenant of works or of life. For surely we are not and cannot be delivered from it as a rule of obedience, so long as God is what he is, and we are what we are. Seeing that as long as the relation constituted by his character as Supreme Ruler, and by ours as moral subjects, exists, we shall be bound to love him supremely, and our neighbor as ourselves, which is the fulfilling of this law. And to suppose that this law, as a rule of obedience, was actually annulled, and that those precepts only are now to be considered obligatory, which are enacted or published anew under the Gospel, is to suppose that God, at a certain time, actually rescinded the rule requiring supreme love to him, and to our neighbor as ourselves, which is palpably inconsistent, and contrary both to the current of Scripture and the nature of things. It would be maintaining that to be changed which is manifestly unchangeable. It would imply that, for the time being, the obligation recognized by the law did not exist; that the tie by which God and moral beings are united, was sundered, not by rebellion on the part of his subjects, but by his own act of abrogation. Can this be admitted?

But if it *were* admissible, and if no part of this law is binding on Christians but what is newly enacted or particularly recognized under the Gospel dispensation, the Sabbath of the fourth commandment could not in this way be set aside; because its continued obligation is plainly taught in the New Testament.—It is altogether a mistake, that we have no express recognition of this precept under the Christian dispensation. It is plainly recognized by the Saviour in Matt. v, 17—19, where he says, that he "came not to destroy the law, but to fulfill;" that "one jot or tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled;" and that "whosoever shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them, shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." If any commandment of this law is binding, the fourth is binding of course, even if it should be called the least. It is also recognized in the following declaration of Christ, Mark ii, 27—"The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath." The word *man* is here obviously used for the entire race—not for a part—not for the Jews in distinction from the Gentiles—not for those who lived under the Old Testament dispensation, or till the time of Christ's death; but for man in his protracted existence during all future periods of time, i. e. *for mankind in general*. This is the plain import of the declaration. And if we render the original with the article, it is still more evident that the entire race is included. "The Sabbath was made for *the man*," i. e. for Adam, the original parent of man, including, of course, his posterity. But according to either rendering, the entire human race is manifestly included in the term. The Sabbath, then, was as truly made for the Gentiles as for the Jews; and for those who should live after the crucifixion, as for those who lived before; which is an explicit recognition of its perpetual obligation.

The same recognition also appears from its continued observance under the ministry of the Apostles, and there being not the least hint or stir in reference to its abrogation, or to the substitution of another day in its room. The weekly Sabbath is frequently mentioned in the Apostolic records, as a part of practical duty, and it was unquestionably the seventh day. Thus we have the continued obligation of the Sabbath sanctioned by Apostolic example. If, therefore, a new edition, or an express recognition of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment be considered necessary, to bind the consciences of men under the new dispensation, the foregoing considerations will show that we have such an edition or recognition, as truly as we have of the other precepts of the Decalogue. So that nothing is gained in regard to setting aside the seventh day of the week, by attempting to show the abrogation of the Decalogue. If those precepts of that law which require that we should have no other gods before the Lord—that we should not kill, not commit adultry, nor steal—are newly enjoined or expressly recognized under the present dispensation, and, consequently, universally binding; the same is true of the fourth commandment, which requires the keeping of the seventh day.

Again; an attempt is made to prove the abrogation of the original Sabbath, by showing that the entire Decalogue was peculiar to the Jewish nation, constituting a national covenant, which, at the coming of Christ, was annulled, and a new covenant introduced. But admitting that it was delivered immediately to them, in the form of a national covenant, this does not in the least imply that it was not equally binding, as a rule of obedience, upon other portions of the human family. We might as well argue that the New Testament belonged merely to the primitive Christians, because it was delivered directly to them, and constituted the rule of their conduct and the basis of their hopes. Yea, we might as well suppose that no nation except the Jews were bound not to have any other gods before the Lord, not to kill, not to commit adultry, not to steal, not to bear false witness, as to suppose that the Decalogue was purely of a national character, and binding merely on that people during their continuance as a national church. And, as the Decalogue was not merely national *as a whole*, so there was nothing national in the fourth commandment. It belonged, equally with the other nine, to the entire family of man, inasmuch as the essential reasons of all and of either of the commandments, were of universal obligation.

Again, that the original Sabbath was peculiar to the Jews, and consequently abrogated by the introduction of the new dispensation, is argued from its being specially urged upon them by the consideration of their deliverance from Egypt. But this argument is of no force, because the same reason is urged in the preface to the entire Decalogue.

For the same purpose, also, an argument is founded upon the fact that the fourth commandment was enforced with a deadly penalty. But this argument also fails; because a similar penalty was annexed to the breach of the other precepts of the law. The truth of the case is, that these penalties belonged not to the Decalogue itself as first promulgated, any more than they belong to it now under the milder dispensation of the Gospel. They were added in the Mosaic ritual, and constituted a part of the political arrangements for the time being. Their abrogation, therefore, affects not the original law. Though there be no civil power now given to the church to enforce obedience to this precept by temporal punishments, as formerly, the sacredness and obligation of the institution are not thereby at all affected. The sin of disobedience will be visited in God's own time.

Again, some have inferred the abrogation of the former Sabbath, or at least its change, from our Lord's vindication of the act of the disciples, in plucking the ears of corn, and rubbing them in their hands, as they passed through the corn-fields on the Sabbath day, and from his saying, that "the Son of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath day," Mark ii, 23—28. But there is evidently nothing in this narrative, or in this declaration, to justify such an inference. It must be admitted on all hands, that the fourth commandment was obligatory, as originally given, till the death of Christ, if no further; and therefore Christ, who "was made under the law," was bound to obey it in its original strictness. Admitting that he possessed the right, in a given instance, to intermit its obligation, it is not consistent to maintain that he did it; because he came to render perfect and universal obedience. Hence he affirmed that one jot or one tittle should in no wise pass from the law "till all be fulfilled." His whole life was a perfect comment on the requirements of the law.—Had he failed in the least particular, he would have been inadequate to the great purposes of our salvation. It is obvious, therefore, that the transaction alluded to was not, under the circumstances, a breach of the fourth commandment, but in perfect accordance with its prescriptions—the labor implied by the act of the disciples being a matter of urgent necessity. "It is lawful," said he, "to do well on the Sabbath day." Neither does the declaration, that "the Son of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath day," imply that he abrogated or changed it, but rather that he was bound and engaged to protect it as a divine institution, and to enforce an enlightened and strict obedience to its requirements.

The foregoing being the principal proofs adduced for the abrogation of the Decalogue, and the original Sabbath, it is evident that this view of the subject cannot be sustained. It is not sanctioned by any plain scriptural evidence. It is, therefore, palpably absurd to rest so important a matter upon so slender a basis. It is laying violent hands on a code of moral and immutable precepts, given by God, and promulgated under peculiar and terrible signs of purity and majesty, to vindicate a

practice which was introduced long after the commencement of the Christian era. [*From Sabbath Tract No. 3.*

THE REVIEW AND HERALD.

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

PARIS, NOVEMBER, 1850.

TO OUR READERS.—The REVIEW and HERALD is designed to be strictly confined to those important truths that belong to the present time. We hope to be able to send you this enlarged size of the paper quite often, containing a simple and clear exposition of those great and sanctifying truths embraced in the message of the third angel, viz: the "commandments of God and the faith of Jesus." It is truly lamentable to see Second Advent papers, that once advocated the pure, naked and cutting truth, applicable to the time, now devoted to the discussion of questions foreign from the present truth, which cannot possibly benefit the dear saints that are perishing for spiritual food. Among other charges given to Timothy by the Apostle Paul is the following,—"But foolish and unlearned questions avoid, knowing that they do gender strifes." This we intend to do. And with much pleasure do we look forward to the predicted period, when the sheep, that have been scattered on the mountains of Israel since a cry at midnight, shall be gathered into the unity of the faith, the rubbish blown away, and the precious "jewels" all brought into the clear light of the third angel's message, and in this second "casket" "shine" forth with "ten times their former glory."

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

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

HOW SHALL WE CIRCULATE PUBLICATIONS?—As our list of names is small, we can send them to but few; and it is impossible for us to give them a wide and faithful distribution, unless the brethren situated in different places help in the work.

First, they should be sure to send the names of those who would candidly read, and

Second, every brother and sister should do all in their power to seek out those who would read with profit, and obtain suitable publications for them. There is a large amount of the "Advent Review," that should be circulated immediately. My brethren, it is time we that were all interested, and zealously engaged in spreading the truth.

We shall send this number to all those whose names are on our list. Then we shall drop the names of those who have expressed no wish for the paper. It is a pleasure to send it free of charge, especially to the "poor of the flock." We once more ask those who wish the paper, and have expressed no desire for it, to notify us immediately by letter. If any are not able to send means, we beseech them not to let this stop them from writing. We greatly desire to hear from such; and will cheerfully pay the postage on their letters.

PUBLICATIONS.

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

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

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

The Third Angel's Message.—16 pages.

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

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

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

☞ As we have no time to answer the many letters received, we have concluded to acknowledge their receipt in the paper. Be careful and see that your letters are receipted.

[Letters received since November 20.]

Lentha A Lockwood; S. R. Burgess: Joseph Bates, 2; F. M. Shimper; Emily C. Brissee; J. T. Wilcox; S. G. Butler; Otis Nichols; H. Bishop, $1; Enoch Jackman, $1; Chastina B. Spaulding, $1; Martha Lockwood, $3; Hatsel Pennfield and others, $6; Leonard Hastings, $5.

For the Review and Herald.

THE LAODICEAN CHURCH.

We believe that this state of the church exists, and that it is composed of second advent ministers and people, who have backslidden and become "lukewarm."

When and where did this state of the church commence? We believe that it commenced in 1845, at the conference in the city of Albany, N. Y., with the two leading teachers in the advent cause, as chairman and secretary *pro tem.*, viz: William Miller and J. V. Himes, and sixty-one acting ministers and delegates. See Advent Herald, May 14, 1845, page 105.

This organization proceeded by a series of conferences in the cities of Philadelphia, Baltimore and Boston. Page 112, Col. 3. The result was most cheering to their hearts, particularly to J. V. Himes and S. Bliss. See Col. 2 of the same page; also the Herald for May 21. We think that this organization was completed April 5, 1846, in the city of Rochester, N. Y. See VOICE OF TRUTH, April 22, page 25; also page 29, Col. 1, "*Conference Address:*" "Our brethren, east, west, north and south, are harmoniously, (with a few exceptions,) united in the faith and hope of the gospel, and *well engaged* in extending *their* benign influence and blessings to others. They are making preparations for *going to work* the PRESENT SEASON *understandingly*, and *effectually*, for the SALVATION OF PERISHING THOUSANDS *around them.*"

The editor of the Voice of Truth was not ready to unite at the first conferences; for he, with some others, adhered strenuously to the Cry at Midnight. See his article on this point, in the Voice of Truth for June 11, 1845, and then his decided change in Nov. 11, 1846. Here we see the perfect union with the advent editors and their adherents. See the view of the Laodicean church by the editor of V. T. Aug. 13, 1845, published since in the Advent Review Extra. This shows the decided *change* and *departure* from the Philadelphia state of the church, where they all professed to be, at the tenth day of the seventh month, 1844. See the "*Advent Review*," of 48 pages, published at Auburn, N. Y., containing their *thrilling testimonies.*

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

When they changed from the Philadelphia to the Laodicean state, we believe they influenced hundreds of honest souls to go with them.—These are the ones we are trying to seek out, by this article, and every other possible way, and show them their perilous and helpless condition, and utter destruction, if they do not forsake them and turn back immediately to the open door in the Philadelphia church; for there is no promise, or hope for them where they are. See Rev. iii: 16, 19.

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

The Advent Herald for March 2, 1850, at last came out and proved to a demonstration that the position of the tenth day of the seventh month, relative to the end of the 2300 days was right. But, said one of them to me; nothing was accomplished. Daniel was told that the sanctuary should be cleansed; but nobody knew anything about it, NO, NOT EVEN HIMSELF! In 1844, it moved the whole church to change their position into the open door, in the Philadelphia state of the church, and to sacrifice their houses, lands, and personal characters to the God of Israel, because they believed it, and that the Lord Jesus also was coming. In the Laodicean state now, the opposite is the case. If proof is wanted, read the Advent Herald, the HIGHEST PROFESSED STANDARD published in the world, to enlighten and prepare the church of God for the great and dreadful day of the Lord, right upon them.

What is the matter? Answer—personal character is at stake. Who is in the wrong? The greatest difficulty is to ascertain who among them is right. Just call at the city of Boston, where, in 1844, the citizens trembled under their thrilling appeals, to be ready for the coming of Jesus. What now? The reverse. Slandering and devouring one another with their Extras, Vindicators, &c. &c. Is this the true church? God forbid! Why, methinks the very angels in heaven would shudder to see them appear there in their present state. Will they grow any better? If the past is a criterion by which to judge, we answer, never, no, never. Then you that hope for salvation, flee quickly, flee, I say, for your lives! You have not one moment to spare. Utter destruction awaits every soul that is found in this Laodicean state.

To get a right understanding of the Laodicean state of the church, let us examine a few things concerning the seven states of the churches. The first, second and third chapters of Revelation present to our view seven distinct and different states of the church under the gospel. Some have supposed that these churches described in the second and third chapters of Revelation were literal, because there were seven literal churches in Asia Minor, bearing the same names.—But we think the bible definitions of these names describe the spirit and qualities of the seven states of the churches. They cannot be literal, for several reasons. First, this is a revelation, or prophecy of the future. "The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to show unto his servants, things that must SHORTLY COME TO PASS, Rev. i, 1. John had his vision, A. D. 96, but the literal churches existed A. D. 60, 36 years before. Second: "I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches," &c. Ch. xxii, 16. This brings us down to the close of time. Nothing has been known of those literal churches for hundreds of years. More may be said on this point, if necessary; let this suffice now.

As the first four states of the church were in the past, (about A. D.

---

*We admit that about all classes of Advent brethren helped in this work up to the fall of 1845.

1798,) let us confine our exposition relative to the last three, which are all in an organized state, at the present time.

Fifth state, Sardis, signifies "that which remains, that are ready to die." Rev. iii, 2. "Her works are not perfect before God."—v. 2. Jesus warns them to get ready before he comes upon them. v. 3. "Thou hast a few names, even in Sardis, which have not defiled their garments; and they shall walk with me in white; for they are worthy. He that overcometh the same shall be clothed in white raiment; and I will not blot out his name out of the book of life; but I will confess his name before my Father," &c. verses 4, 5.

This, we understand to be the present nominal church, the Babylon, which God's people came out from under the second angel's message, which closed up at the tenth day of the seventh month, 1844. They were then "about to die," and are now spiritually DEAD.

Those that came out of Babylon under the cry, in obedience to the call from heaven. Rev. xviii: 4; and overcome, i. e. continue in the third and other angel messages, Jesus will acknowledge before his Father, and their names will not be blotted from the book of life. Six years ago, there were thousands that did witness to the above state of things, of whom the greater part are alive unto this day, and the greatest portion are now in the seventh, or Laodicean state of the church. How did they get there? Answer—they passed into the sixth, or Philadelphia state of the church, in the fall of 1844; and staid there long enough to prove to their entire satisfaction that they had changed their *position*, to one which was *true* and *clear*. For proof, please read their own statements *once more*, in the "Advent Review" of 1850.

Symptoms of uneasiness were soon discovered in our leader. It was evident that his sphere of action was too limited to remain with those who had entered the open door in the Philadelphia church.

He sends forth an article in the "Morning Watch," for January 16, 1845, headed, "IN THE FIELD AGAIN;" and says "we have put the press in full operation again, our work—is to the saints, and re-arouse the slumbering churches.

We should *agitate,* AGITATE, AGITATE! until they see the falsity of their position." On he goes with conferences in Waterbury and other places in Vermont, and Western New York. See pages 21, 22. This strengthened him and others, so that the call for the Albany conference was made, to convene April 29, 1845. Hence we see the sudden change from a *true position*, to another. But, says the reader, what of that? Answer, he is the leader, and when he moves the others follow. You may ask again why confine this work for the whole church right here, in this country? Because the great burden for the advent labor has moved out from this continent; something, no doubt, is doing in other countries; but this is the great field for the three Advent Messages. It is in vain, however, to attempt to prove that J. V. Himes has not been the leader and leading editor in the Advent cause, for ten years past. This does not prove that he has taken one right step since January, 1845. He has led on others to fulfill prophecy, to their utter destruction. I pity him, and really wish that his many, and deep trials had have driven him to God.

Sixth state, Philadelphia signifies brotherly love. This is the state that all advent believers were merging into, when that united thrilling cry was rushing through the land, like many waters, "Behold the Bridegroom cometh, go ye out to meet him." Babylon's Sectarian organizations (in the Sardis state) were shaken in every direction, and their most pious and efficient members were led and moved *directly* to the state of brotherly love. Not an *advent* believer went any where else, until the dispersion, after the cry ended. Chap. iii, 7, shows the *shut door*, and the *open* door, that no man can shut.

The Master of the house, our Great High Priest, in the Sanctuary in heaven, [Heb. viii, 1, 2; ix, 1—5,] rose up and *shut the outer door* of his daily ministration with the world, and no man can *open* it, and *opened the door into the holiest of all;* where the ten commandments are seen, [Rev. xi, 19,] and "*no man can shut it.*" This was done when the 2300 days ended, on the tenth day of the seventh month, 1844, and no where else. Here was the perfect harmony of shadow and substance. Aaron once a year in the shadow; Jesus, in the substance at the end of 2300 years. This proves the day and year that the door was shut; and that the last, and only safe one was then opened for the overcomers in the Philadelphia church, The Philadelphia church *kept the Saviour's word* and have not *denied his name.* Those that left this state, and became Laodiceans, took the opposite, *i. e,* they did not hold fast his word, and hence they denied his name. See Rev. iii, 8.

Jesus, in verse 10, promises to keep all from the hour of temptation, or trial that have kept the word of his patience. That is, all that are patient waiters, in this state of the church, he will keep, when the decree goes forth from the Dragon [Rev. xiii, 15] to kill them.

Then Jesus is to come quickly, and the true church is exhorted to hold fast their experience in the past, verse 11. If they do not some one will take their crown. See what befalls those that give up their experience. Verse 9. In verse 12, is the precious overcoming promise to all in this church. They are to be pillars in the temple of God, and have the name of God, the Holy City, and Jesus' own new name written upon them. Here we see that all the precious promises are made to this church that believe in the shut door, and keep in the open door. They cannot be claimed by those remaining in the Sardis, or Laodicean state of the church.

Seventh state, Laodicea signifies, the judging of the people, "These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true Witness." "*I know thy work* that thou art neither *cold nor hot:* I would thou wert *cold or hot* so then, because thou art *lukewarm*, and neither *cold nor hot*, I will spue thee out of my mouth." Verses 16, 17. This state neither *cold nor hot,* represents their unsettled state for six years past while they have been continually changing the chronology to prove the end of the 2300 days in the future, which they had acknowledged did end in the fall of 1844.

Jesus would have them either believe their true position or stop, and let the chronology alone; for as often as their calculations failed it caused their own and others faith to wane: and thus they have been continually sinking into a *lukewarm state*, neither one thing nor yet another. In this state it is impossible for them to be saved; for Jesus says that he will spue them out of his mouth, or destroy them.

"Because thou sayest, I am *rich*, and increased in goods, and have need of *nothing*; and knowest not that thou art *wretched*, and *miserable*, and *poor*, and *blind*, and *naked*" verse 17. If you want the truth on any point of doctrine, especially, any thing relative to the second coming of the Lord, the Advent Herald and Harbinger are the professed standards. They are professedly *rich* in Biblical knoweledge. Their continued reading and writing *on* the subject of the advent, and all subjects connected with it, in the Bible, make them *rich*. And yet they know not that they are "*wretched* and *miserable*, and *poor*, and *blind*, and *naked.*" How! Answer, spiritually; because they would certainly know it, if they were literally in this state. Then with all their Bible knowledge, they have not got the meet in due season. At their general conference last May, a question arose about their declaration of principles for the future. It was finally settled that the Address that they sent forth from the *Mutual Conference of Adventists at Albany, N. Y.*, April 29, 1845, should be their principles of faith for this present 1850. It is true they have given the right view in the general, that was to guide them to the end of the 2300 days; but as they are to proceed on in their course of action, in their proclamation of an *open door for Babylon*, and *all the world*, just as they came from the Albany Conference in 1849, they prove clearly that they have gained nothing; made no progress. They have only run almost round a circle, in a five years race, beating the air, and now they declare their starting point from April 29, 1845, to be the best they can give for May, 1850. It looks clear that they have acknowledged their Laodicean state of neither cold nor hot. They have neither one position nor yet another. How unlike the path of the just, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day.

It is in vain for them to apply the Laodicean state of the church, now existing, (and must exist before Jesus comes,) to any other class of believers on earth. The shut door believers are in the Philadelphia church. The nominal church, are back of 1844, in the Sardis state, spiritually dead. "I counsel of thee to buy of me gold tried in the fire, [present truth, that has stood the trial of six years opposition, and now is shining brighter and brighter,] that thou mayest be rich; and white raiment that thou mayest be clothed, [righteousness, or righteous acts of the saints,] and eye-salve that thou mayest see." [See the present truth.] Verse 18. Jesus counsels no one to buy of him earthly riches, &c., no; it is the present truth that the Laodiceans must have to be saved. "As many as I love, I rebuke and chasten; be zealous, therefore, and repent." Verse 19. Jesus still loves some that are in the Laodicean church, and calls on them to repent. If they were deceived by false teachers, they must leave them as soon as possible, and be "zealous" and "repent;" for every one that is found in that state when Jesus leaves the Sanctuary, and ceases to plead for the honest ones among them, will be destroyed. They must get back into the open door in the Philadelphia church that no man can shut, where they came from; for that is the only true church, or place of safety. Read, in verse 20, the last, loving message of Jesus to you,—"Behold I stand at the door, and knock. If any man hear my voice, and open the door, [the door of the heart,] I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me." Jesus will commune with you if you will open your heart and receive the truth. "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne." Thus the promise is extended from verse 18th to the 22d. Now is the time to repent and turn to the truth. Be quick! Hasten for your life!!

Jesus is cleansing the Sanctuary, or is blotting out the errors of the house of Israel. When this work is finished, he will take his place on the great white cloud. Then, the seven Angels will pour out the seven last plagues. This will begin the "great day of his wrath," Rev. vi, 17. This is the day of Babylon's plauges. Her plagues will come in one prophetic "day, death, and mourning, and famine, and she shall be utterly burned with fire: for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her." Rev. xviii, 8.

"In all the land saith the Lord; TWO PARTS therein shall be cut off, and die; but the THIRD shall be left therein. God says he will bring the THIRD PART through the fire, and refine them. They shall call upon him, and he will hear them. He will say IT IS MY PEOPLE; and they shall say the LORD IS MY GOD." First part, SARDIS, the nominal church or Babylon. Second part, *Laodicea*, the nominal Adventist. Third part, *Philadelphia*, the only true church of God on earth, for they ask to be translated to the city of God. Rev. iii, 12; Heb. xii, 22—24. In the name of Jesus, I exhort you again to flee from the Laodiceans, as from Sodom and Gomorrah. Their teachings are false and delusive; and lead to utter destruction. *Death!* DEATH!! eternal DEATH!!! is on their track. Remember Lot's wife.

JOSEPH BATES

Fairhaven, Mass., Nov. 10, 1850.