

# **THE ORIGINAL THREE ADVENT**

## **MESSAGES!**



STUDY DOCUMENT

NO. 4

IN THIS FOUR PART SERIES.

**THE SABBATH, THE SANCTUARY AND**

**THE THIRD ANGEL'S MESSAGE**

**EXAMINED!**

Tracing the Teachings of Each of these Messages from the Pens of  
those who had an Actual Experience in these Messages

Testimony Press Publications  
PO Box 286 Tonasket WA 98855 USA

[www.testimonypress.org](http://www.testimonypress.org)

This publication may not be altered in any way; it may be freely copied,  
but is never to be sold.

# THE SABBATH, THE SANCTUARY AND THE THIRD

## **ANGEL'S MESSAGE EXAMINED!**

SOURCED DOCUMENTS ENCLOSED: -

AN EXTRACT FROM HIRAM EDSON'S MANUSCRIPT RELATING TO HIS ADVENT EXPERIENCE.

SECTION 1: - ARTICLES AND TRACTS ON THE SABBATH: -

SABBATH TRACTS NO. 1 – 4: -

- "THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK NOT THE SABBATH OF THE LORD." — BY ELDER J. N. ANDREWS & J. W. MORTON – AN EARLY 1850'S TRACT.
- "HISTORY OF THE SABBATH." – AN EARLY 1850'S TRACT.
- "THE SEVENTH DAY OF THE WEEK IS THE SABBATH OF THE LORD." – BY ELDER JAMES WHITE [WITH COMMENTS BY ELDER J. N. ANDREWS & R. F. COTTRELL] – AN EARLY 1850'S TRACT.
- "THE PERPETUITY OF THE ROYAL LAW, OR, THE TEN COMMANDMENTS NOT ABOLISHED." – BY ELDER J. N. ANDREWS – AN EARLY 1850'S TRACT.
- "TIME FOR COMMENCING THE SABBATH" – BY ELDER J. N. ANDREWS; AND, "TIME OF THE SABBATH" – BY ELDER JAMES WHITE – THE ADVENT REVIEW AND SABBATH HERALD, DECEMBER 4, 1855.

SECTION 2: - ARTICLES AND TRACTS ON THE SANCTUARY: -

- "THE SANCTUARY" – BY O. R. L. CROSIER – AS IT APPEARED IN THE ADVENT REVIEW – 48 PAGE SPECIAL, SEPTEMBER, 1850.
- "THE SANCTUARY AND TWENTY THREE HUNDRED DAYS." – 1853 - BY ELDER J. N. ANDREWS.
- "THE JUDGMENT." – BY ELDER JAMES WHITE - THE ADVENT REVIEW AND SABBATH HERALD, JANUARY 29, 1857.
- "DANIEL STANDING IN HIS LOT." – BY HIRAM EDSON - THE ADVENT REVIEW AND SABBATH HERALD, JULY 30, 1857.

### **SECTION 3: - ARTICLES AND TRACTS ON THE THIRD ANGEL'S MESSAGE: -**

- "THOUGHTS ON REVELATION XIII AND XIV." – BY ELDER J. N. ANDREWS – SECOND ADVENT REVIEW, AND SABBATH HERALD – MAY 19, 1851.
- "A BRIEF EXPOSITION OF THE ANGELS OF REVELATION XIV." – BY ELDER JAMES WHITE – AN EARLY 1850'S BOOKLET.
- 1884 GREAT CONTROVERSY, CHAPTER XX – "THE THIRD ANGEL'S MESSAGE." – pages 273 – 286 – Ellen G. White.

### **WHY SHOULD WE REPRINT AND STUDY CAREFULLY THESE EARLY PIONEER DOCUMENTS ON THE SABBATH, SANCTUARY AND THE THIRD ANGEL'S MESSAGE?**

*"I long daily to be able to do double duty. I have been pleading with the Lord for strength and wisdom to reproduce the writings of the witnesses who were confirmed in the faith in the early history of the message. After the passing of the time in 1844, they received the light and walked in the light, and when the men claiming to have new light would come in with their wonderful messages regarding various points of Scripture, we had, through the moving of the Holy Spirit, testimonies right to the point, which cut off the influence of such messages as Elder A. F. Ballenger has been devoting his time to presenting. ... When the power of God testifies as to what is truth, that truth is to stand forever as the truth. No after-suppositions contrary to the light God has given are to be entertained. ... A few are still alive who passed through the experience gained in the establishment of this truth. God has graciously spared their lives to repeat and repeat, till the close of their lives, the experience through which they passed, even as did John the apostle till the very close of his life. And the standard-bearers who have fallen in death are to speak through the re-printing of their writings. I am instructed that thus their voices are to be heard. They are to bear their testimony as to what constitutes the truth for this time."* - Ellen G. White – The Paulson Collection, pp. 207 & 208. [Emphasis supplied by the compiler.]

## AN EXTRACT FROM HIRAM EDSON'S MANUSCRIPT RELATING TO HIS ADVENT EXPERIENCE

During what is called the seventh month movement, in 1844, myself and several other Brn. were engaged in circulating publications on the coming of Christ, day times, and holding meetings at my own private house evenings. As we were about to commence our evening meeting on one occasion, a two horse wagon load of entire strangers came; and after preparing seats for them we commenced our meeting by singing, "Here o'er the earth as a stranger I roam, Here is no rest, is no rest." It was sung with the spirit and with the understanding, and the spirit which accompanied the singing gave to it a keen edge, and before the hymn was sung through, the entire company of strangers were so deeply convicted, that rather than bear the reproach of being convicted, or converted at a Millerite meeting, they all started to leave the house. One man and his wife succeeded in getting out of doors; but the third one fell upon the threshold; the fourth, the fifth, and so on, till the most of the company were thus slain by the power of God. And such agonizing cries and pleading for mercy, is not often witnessed. Some thirteen, or more, were converted before the meeting closed. The man and his wife who left the house labored hard to persuade the rest of their company to leave at once for home; but not succeeding, and rather than remain through the meeting they went home on foot in a dark night, a distance of five, or six miles, carrying a child a year old. But this was not their heaviest burden. Their conviction was too deep to be easily shaken off; they were back again at the next evening meeting and found pardon, and peace in believing. And, "so, mightily grew the word of God and prevailed."

Passing over other like manifestations of the power of God, we glance at our disappointment at the tenth of the seventh month, 1844. Having the true cry, Behold the Bridegroom cometh, on the tenth day of the seventh month, and, having been early taught by modern orthodoxy that the coming of the Bridegroom to the marriage would be fulfilled in the personal second advent of Christ to this earth, (which was a mistaken idea) we confidently expected to see Jesus Christ and all the holy angels with him; and that his voice would call up Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all the ancient worthies, and near and dear friends which had been torn from us by death, and that our trials and sufferings with our earthly pilgrimage would close, and we should be caught up to meet our coming Lord to be forever with him to inhabit the bright golden mansions in the golden home city, prepared for the redeemed. Our expectations were raised high, and thus

we looked for our coming Lord until the clock tolled 12. at midnight. The day had then passed and our disappointment became a certainty. Our fondest hopes and expectations were blasted, and such a spirit of weeping came over us as I never experienced before. It seemed that the loss of all earthly friends could have been no comparison. We wept, and wept, till the day dawn.

I mused in my own heart, saying, My advent experience has been the richest and brightest of all my christian experience. If this had proved a failure, what was the rest of my christian experience worth? Has the Bible proved a failure? Is there no God – no heaven – no golden home city – no paradise? Is all this but a cunningly devised fable? Is there no reality to our fondest hopes and expectation of these things? And thus we had something to grieve and weep over, if all our fond hopes were lost. And as I said, we wept till the day dawn.

A second glance over past experience, and the lessons learned, and how when brought into strait places where light and help was needed by seeking the Lord he had answered by a voice and other ways, I began to feel there might be light and help for us in our present distress. I said to some of my brethren, Let us go to the barn. We entered the granary, shut the doors about us and bowed before the Lord. We prayed earnestly; for we felt our necessity. We continued in earnest prayer until the witness of the Spirit was given that our prayer was accepted, and that light should be given, our disappointment be explained, and made clear and satisfactory.

After breakfast I said to one of my brethren, "Let us go and see, and encourage some of our brn." We started, and while passing through a large field I was stopped about midway of the field. Heaven seemed open to my view, and I saw distinctly, and clearly, that instead of our High Priest coming out of the Most Holy of the heavenly sanctuary to come to this earth on the tenth day of the seventh month, at the end of the 2, 300 days, that he for the first time entered on that day the second apartment of that sanctuary; and that he had a work to perform in the Most Holy before coming to this earth. That he came to the marriage at that time; in other words, to the Ancient of days, to receive a kingdom, dominion, and glory; and we must wait for his return *from the wedding*; and my mind was directed to the tenth ch. of Rev. where I could see the vision had spoken and did not lie; the seventh angel had began [sic.] to sound; we had eaten the littl [sic] book; it had been sweet in our mouth, and

it had now become bitter in our belly, embittering our whole being. That we must prophesy again, etc., and that when the seventh angel began to sound, the temple of God was opened in heaven, and there was seen in his temple the ark of his testament, etc.

While I was thus standing in the midst of the field, my comrade passed on almost beyond speaking distance before missing me. He inquired, "Why I was stopping so long?" I replied, "The Lord was answering our morning prayer; by giving light with regard to our disappointment." I talked these things to my brethren.

In those days I was closely associated with O. R. L. Crosier; and Dr. F. B. Hahn, Crosier making his home with me a portion of the time. He examined the Bible on the subject of the sanctuary. F. B. Hahn and

myself, was [sic] connected with Crosier in the publication of the paper called, "The Day-Dawn." Br. Hahn and myself, held a consultation with regard to the propriety of sending out the light on the subject of the sanctuary. We decided it was just what the scattered remnant needed; for it would explain our disappointment, and set the brethren on the right track. We agreed to share the expense between us, and said to Crosier, "Write out the subject of the sanctuary. Get out another number of the Day Dawn, and we will try to meet the expense." He did so, and the Day Dawn was sent out bearing the light of the sanctuary subject. It fell into the hands of Elders James White, and Joseph Bates, who readily endorsed the view; and it was shown in vision to be light for the remnant.

---

## SECTION 1

### ARTICLES AND TRACTS ON THE SABBATH

#### SABBATH TRACTS NO. 1 – 4

- "**THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK NOT THE SABBATH OF THE LORD.**" – BY ELDER J. N. ANDREWS & J. W. MORTON - AN EARLY 1850'S TRACT.
- "**HISTORY OF THE SABBATH.**" – AN EARLY 1850'S TRACT.
- "**THE SEVENTH DAY OF THE WEEK IS THE SABBATH OF THE LORD.**" – BY ELDER JAMES WHITE [WITH COMMENTS BY ELDER J. N. ANDREWS & R. F. COTTRELL] – AN EARLY 1850'S TRACT.
- "**THE PERPETUITY OF THE ROYAL LAW, OR, THE TEN COMMANDMENTS NOT ABOLISHED.**" – BY ELDER J. N. ANDREWS – AN EARLY 1850'S TRACT.
- "**TIME FOR COMMENCING THE SABBATH**" – BY ELDER J. N. ANDREWS; AND, "**TIME OF THE SABBATH**" – BY ELDER JAMES WHITE – THE ADVENT REVIEW AND SABBATH HERALD, DECEMBER 4, 1855.

SABBATH TRACTS NO. 1  
“THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK NOT THE SABBATH OF THE LORD.”  
BY ELDER J. N. ANDREWS & J. W. MORTON - AN EARLY 1850'S TRACT.

THE  
FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK  
NOT THE  
SABBATH OF THE LORD.

---

“All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.” 2 Tim. iii, 16, 17.

In this text we are assured that every word of the Sacred Scriptures was given by the Holy Spirit; that every doctrine which men should believe, is therein revealed; that every fault is therein reprobated; every error is corrected by its words of truth; and that perfect instruction in all righteousness is therein given.

The design of its Author in providing such a book, was that the man of God might thereby be made perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works. This is the treasure which God has given to his church. Nor is this all that he has done. To those who are willing to obey the teachings of his word, he has promised the Spirit to guide them into all truth.

To men thus situated, Jehovah thus speaks: “Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.” 1 Thess. v, 21. That is, bring every part of your faith and practice to the test of God's sure word; ask the Holy

Spirit's aid, that your mind may be delivered from prejudice, and your understanding enlightened in the word of truth. Then what you find reverend in that world hold fast; it is of priceless value; but relinquish at once every precept or doctrine not therein recorded, lest you make the doctrines of men of equal weight with the commandments of God. What is the church to the wheat? saith the Lord.

As the first day of the week is now almost universally observed in the place of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, we design in this Tract to examine the grounds on which this observance rests. Those who are willing to submit their opinions to the test of scripture and of reason, are invited to unite with us in the examination of this subject. For what reason do men prefer the first day of the week to the ancient Sabbath of the Lord? On what authority do men continually violate the day which God sanctified, and commanded mankind to keep holy? Come, now, and let us reason together. Here is the commandment which it is said has been changed:—

"Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day, and hallowed it." Ex. xx, 8-11.

That this commandment requires men to remember, and to keep holy the Rest-day of the Creator, which he hallowed at the close of the first week of time,

none can deny. We now ask for the authority for the change of this commandment.

Papists believe that their church had power to change the fourth commandment, and, on that authority, alone, they are perfectly satisfied in observing the first day of the week.

Protestants deny the authority of the church of Rome, and attempt to vindicate the change of the Sabbath, by an appeal to the Bible. This is what we wish them to do. We ask them, therefore, to present a single text in which it is said that God has changed his Sabbath to the first day of the week. The advocates of the change have none to offer. If they cannot present such a text, will they give us one which testifies that God ever blessed and sanctified the first day of the week? Its observers admit that they have none to present. But will they not give us one text in which men are required to keep the first day holy, as a Sabbath unto the Lord? They acknowledge that they have none. How then do they dare to exalt the first day of the week above the Sabbath of the Lord, which the commandment requires us to remember, and keep holy?

The Bible thoroughly furnishes the man of God unto all good works. Can Sunday-keeping be a very good work, when the Bible has never said anything in its favor? Or if it is a good work, can men be very thoroughly furnished in its defense, when God has said nothing in its favor? Instead of being a good work, must it not be a fearful sin against God to thus pervert the fourth commandment, when once the mind has been enlightened on the subject? But there are several reasons urged for the obser-

vance of the first day of the week, which we will here notice.

**FIRST REASON.** Redemption is greater than creation; therefore we ought to keep the day of Christ's resurrection, instead of the ancient Sabbath of the Lord. Where has God said this? Sunday-keepers are compelled to admit that he never did say it. What right, then, has any man to make such an assertion, and then to base the change of the Sabbath upon it? But suppose redemption is greater than creation, who knows that we ought to keep the first day of the week on that account? God never required men to keep any day as the memorial of redemption. But if it were duty to observe one day of the week for this reason, most certainly the crucifixion-day presents the strongest claims. It is not said that we have redemption through Christ's resurrection; but it is said that we have redemption through the shedding of his blood. "And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof; for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation." Rev. v, 9. "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace." Eph. i, 7; Col. i, 14; Heb. ix, 12, 15.

Then redemption is through the death of the Lord Jesus; consequently, the day on which he shed his precious blood to redeem us, and said "It is finished," [John xix, 30,] is the day that should be kept as the memorial of redemption, if any should be observed for that purpose.

Nor can it be plead that the resurrection-day is the most remarkable day in the history of redemption.

It needs but a word to prove that in this respect it is far exceeded by the day of the crucifixion. Which is the most remarkable event, the act of Jehovah in giving his beloved and only Son to die for a race of rebels, or the act of that Father in raising that belovèd Son from the dead? There is only one answer that can be given: it was not remarkable that God should raise his Son from the dead; but the act of the Father in giving his Son to die for sinners, was a spectacle of redeeming love on which the Universe might gaze and adore the wondrous love of God to all eternity. Who can wonder that the sun was veiled in darkness, and that all nature trembled at the sight! The crucifixion-day, therefore, has far greater claims than the day of the resurrection. God has not enjoined the observance of either; and is it not a fearful act to make void the commandments of God by that wisdom which is folly in his sight. 1 Cor. i, 19, 20.

But if we would commemorate redemption, there is no necessity of robbing the Lord's Rest-day of its holiness in order to do it. When truth takes from us our errors, it always has something better to take their place. So the false memorial of redemption being taken out of the way, the Word presents in its stead those which are true. God has provided us with memorials, bearing his own signature; and these we may observe with the blessing of Heaven. Would you commemorate the death of our Lord? You need not keep the day of his crucifixion. The Bible tells you how to do it.

"For I have received of the Lord, that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take eat;

this is my body, which is broken for you; this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death, till he come." 1 Cor. xi, 23-26.

Would you commemorate the burial and resurrection of the Saviour? You need not keep the first day of the week. The Lord ordained a very different, and far more appropriate memorial. "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection." Rom. vi, 3-5.

"Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead!" Col. ii, 12.

It is true that the professed church has changed this ordinance to sprinkling, so that this divine memorial of our Lord's resurrection is destroyed. And that they may add sin to sin, they lay hold of the Lord's Sabbath, and change it to the first day of the week, thus destroying the sacred memorial of the Creator's rest, that they may have a memorial of Christ's resurrection!

"The earth is also defiled under the inhabitants thereof; because they have transgressed the laws, changed the ordinance, broken the everlasting covenant." When will the professed church cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord? Not until

"the inhabitants of the earth are burned, and few men left." Isa. xxiv, 5, 6.

**SECOND REASON.** The disciples met on the day of our Lord's resurrection to commemorate that event, and the Saviour sanctioned this meeting by uniting with them. John xx, 19.

If every word of this was truth, it would not prove that the Sabbath of the Lord has been changed. But to show the utter absurdity of this inference, listen to a few facts. The disciples at that time did not believe that their Lord had been raised from the dead; but were assembled for the purpose of eating a common meal, and to seclude themselves from the Jews. The words of Mark and of John make this clear. "He appeared in another form unto two of them, as they walked, and went into the country. And they went and told it unto the residue: neither believed they them. Afterward he appeared unto the eleven, as they sat at meat, and upbraided them with their unbelief, and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen." Mark xvi, 12-14. John says: "Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you." John xx, 19.

It is a fact, therefore, that the disciples were not commemorating the resurrection of the Saviour; it is equally evident that they had not the slightest idea of a change of the Sabbath. At the burial of the Saviour, the women who had followed him to the tomb, returned and prepared spices and ointments to embalm him; the Sabbath drew on;

they rested the Sabbath-day according to the commandment; and when the Sabbath was past, they came to the sepulchre upon the first day of the week to emblem their Lord. Luke xxiij, 55, 56; xxiv, 1. They kept the Sabbath according to the commandment, and resumed their labor on the first day of the week.

**THIRD REASON.** After eight days Jesus met with his disciples again. John xx, 26. This must have been the first day of the week, which is thereby proved to be the Christian Sabbath.

Were it certain that this occurred upon the first day of the week, it would not furnish a single particle of proof that that day had become the Sabbath of the Lord. But who can be certain that "after eight days" means *just a week*? It would be nearer a literal construction of the language to conclude that this was upon the ninth day. As an illustration, read Matt. xvii, 1. "And after six days, Jesus taketh Peter, James, and John," &c. Now turn to Luke ix, 28. "And it came to pass, about an eight days after these sayings, he took Peter, and John, and James," &c. Then "after six days" is about *eight* days in this instance. But if "after eight days" means just a week, how does this prove that Sunday has taken the place of the Lord's Sabbath? Rather how does it prove that Sunday has become the Christian Sabbath, when there is not a particle of evidence that either Christ or his apostles ever rested on that day? There is no such term as Christian Sabbath found in the Bible. The only weekly Sabbath named in the Bible is called the Sabbath of the Lord. Was the act of Christ in appearing to his disciples sufficient to constitute the day on which it occurred

the Sabbath? If so, why did he next select a fishing day as the time to manifest himself to them? John xxi. If it is not sufficient, then the Sunday on which he was first seen of them, the fishing day on which they next saw him, and the Thursday on which he was last seen of them, may not be Sabbaths. It was not very remarkable that Christ should find his disciples together, inasmuch as they had one common abode. Acts i, 13.

**FOURTH REASON.** The Holy Spirit descended upon the disciples on the day of Pentecost, which was the first day of the week. Therefore the first day of the week should be observed instead of the Sabbath of the Lord. Acts ii, 1, 2.

Admitting that the day of Pentecost occurred upon the first day of the week, it remains to be proved that it thereby became the Sabbath. But that it was the feast of Pentecost, and not the first day of the week, that God designed to honor, the following facts demonstrate.

1. While the day of Pentecost is distinctly named, the day of the week on which it occurred is passed in silence.

2. The disciples had been engaged in earnest prayer for the space of ten days; for the day of Pentecost was fifty days from the resurrection of Christ, and forty of those days he spent with his disciples. Acts i. Forty days from his resurrection would expire on Thursday, the day of his ascension. A period of ten days *after* his ascension on Thursday, would include two First-days, the last of which would be the day of Pentecost. If the design of God had been to honor the first day of the week, why did not the Holy Ghost descend on the first of those First-

days? Why must the day of Pentecost come before the Holy Ghost could descend? This answer is obvious. It was not the design of Heaven to honor the first day of the week, but to mark the antitype of the feast of Pentecost. Hence the first day of the week is passed in silence.

The slaying of the paschal lamb on the fourteenth day of the first month, had met its antitype in the death of the Lamb of God on that day. Ex. xii; John xix; 1 Cor. v, 7. The offering of the first fruits on the sixteenth day of the first month, had met its antitype in the resurrection of our Lord on that day, the first fruits of them that slept. Lev. xxiii; 1 Cor. xv, 20, 23. It remained that the day of Pentecost, fifty days later, should also meet its antitype. Lev. xxvii, 15-21. The fulfillment of that type is what the pen of inspiration has recorded in Acts ii, 1, 2. God has spoken nothing in this place respecting a change of his Sabbath. Yet grave men, calling themselves Doctors of Divinity, consider this text one of their strongest testimonies for their so-called Christian Sabbath. They might be profited by this advice of the wise man: "Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar." Prov. xxx, 6.

**Fifth Reason.** Paul once broke bread upon the first day of the week at Troas. Hence this day was observed as the Christian Sabbath. Acts xx, 7.

We answer, that at one period the apostolic church at Jerusalem broke bread every day. Acts ii, 42-46. If a single instance of breaking bread at Troas upon the first day of the week, was quite sufficient to constitute it the Sabbath, would not the continued practice of the apostolic church at Jerusalem

in breaking bread every day, be ample sufficient to make every day a Sabbath? Moreover, as the act of the Great Head of the church in breaking bread, must be quite as important as that of his servant Paul, unless not the day of the crucifixion be pre-eminently the "Christian Sabbath," as Christ instituted, and performed this ordinance on the evening with which that day commenced? 1 Cor. xi, 23-26.

But on what day of the week did this act of Paul occur? For, if it is of sufficient importance to make the day of its occurrence the future Sabbath of the church, the day is worth determining. The act of breaking bread was after midnight; for Paul preached to the disciples until midnight, then healed Eutychus, and after this attended to breaking bread. Verses 7-11. If, as time is reckoned at the present day, the first day of the week terminated at midnight, then Paul's act of breaking bread took place upon the second day of the week, or Monday, which should henceforth be regarded as the Christian Sabbath, if breaking bread on a day makes it a Sabbath.

But if the Bible method of commencing the day, viz., from six o'clock P. M., was followed, it would appear that the disciples came together at the close of the Sabbath, for an evening meeting, as the Apostle was to depart in the morning. (If it was not an evening meeting, why did they have many lights there?) Paul preached to them until midnight, and then broke bread with the disciples early in the morning of the first day of the week. Did this act constitute that day the Sabbath? If so, then why did Paul, as soon as it was light, start on his long journey to Jerusalem? If Paul believed that Sunday was the Christian Sabbath, why did he thus openly violate it? If he did

not believe it had become the Sabbath why should you? And why do you grasp, as evidence that the Sabbath had been changed, a single instance in which an evening meeting was held on Sunday, while you overlook the fact that it was the custom of this same Apostle to preach every Sabbath, not only to the Jews, but also to the Gentiles? Acts xiii, 14, 42, & 14, xvi, 13; xvii, 2; xviii, 4.

Paul broke bread on the first day of the week, and then immediately started on his long journey to Jerusalem. So that this, the strongest argument for the first day of the week, furnishes direct proof that Sunday is not the Sabbath.

**SIXTH REASON.** Paul commanded the church at Corinth to take up a public collection on the first day of the week; therefore it follows that this must have been their day of public worship, and consequently is the Christian Sabbath. 1 Cor. xvi, 2.

We answer, it is a remarkable fact that Paul enjoins exactly the reverse of a public collection. He does not say, Place your alms in the public treasury, on the first day of the week; but he says, "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store."

J. W. Morton in his "Vindication of the true Sabbath," pages 51, 52, says:—

"The Apostle simply orders that each one of the Corinthian brethren should lay up *at home* some portion of his weekly gains on the first day of the week. The whole question turns upon the meaning of the expression, 'by him'; and I marvel greatly how you can imagine that it means 'in the collection box of the congregation.' Greenfield, in his Lexicon, translates the Greek term, 'by one's self, i. e. *at home*'.

Two Latin versions, the Vulgate and that of Castellio, render it, "*apud se*," with one's self, at home. Three French translations, those of Martin, Osterwald, and De Saix, "*chez soi*," at his own house, at home. The German of Luther, "*bei sich selbst*," by himself, at home. The Dutch, "*by hemselfen*," same as the German. The Italian of Diodati, "*appresso di se*," in his own presence, at home. The Spanish of Felipe. Scio, "*en su casa*," in his own house. The Portuguese of Ferreira, "*para isso*," with himself. The Swedish, "*near sig sief*," near himself. I know not how much this list of authorities might be swelled, for I have not examined one translation that differs from those quoted above."

The text, therefore, does not prove that the Corinthian church was assembled for public worship on that day; but, on the contrary, it does prove that each must be at his own home, where he could examine his worldly affairs, and lay by himself in store as God had prospered him. If each one should thus from week to week collect of his earnings, when the Apostle should come, their bounty would be ready, and each would be able to present to him what they had gathered. So that if the first-day Sabbath has no better foundation than the inference drawn from this text, it truly rests upon sliding sand.

**SEVENTH REASON.** John was in the Spirit on the Lord's day, which was the first day of the week. Rev. i, 10.

This is the kind of reasoning which the advocates of Sunday are invariably obliged to adopt. But we ask, What right have they to assume the very point which they ought to prove? This text, it is true, furnishes direct proof that there is a day in the gross,

pel dispensation which the Lord claims as his; but is there one text in the Bible which testifies that the first day of the week is the Lord's day? There is not one. Has God ever claimed that day as his? Never. Has God ever claimed any day as his, and reserved it to himself? He has. "And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." Gen. ii, 3. "To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord." Ex. xvi, 23. "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." Ex. xx, 10. "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day," &c. Isa. lviii, 13. "Therefore, the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." Mark ii, 28. Then the seventh is the day which God reserved to himself, when he gave to man the other six; and this day he calls his holy day. This is the day which the New Testament declares the Son of man to be Lord of.

Is there one testimony in the Scriptures that the Lord of the Sabbath has put away his holy day, and chosen another? Not one. Then that day which the Bible designates as the Lord's day, is none other than the Sabbath of the fourth commandment.

#### THINGS TO BE CONSIDERED.

We have now examined the main pillars on which the first-day Sabbath rests; and it is perfectly apparent that there is not a single particle of divine authority for the observance of that day. Hence, its advocates must observe the Sabbath of the Lord, or they must resort to the tradition of the "fathers" for proof of its change. The history of the change will be given in its place. But we now ask, what

right has the elders of the Christian church to change the fourth commandment, any more than the elders of the Jewish church had, to change the fifth?

The Pharisees pretended that they had a tradition handed down from Moses, which authorized them to change the fifth commandment. The Papist and Protestant Doctors of Divinity pretend that they have a tradition handed down from Christ and the apostles, authorizing them to change the fourth. But if Christ rebuked the Pharisees for holding a damnable heresy, what would he say to the like act on the part of his own professed followers? Matt. xv, 3-9.

The same fathers which changed the fourth commandment, have also corrupted all the ordinances of the New Testament, and have established purgatory, invocation of saints, the worship of the Virgin Mary and prayers for the dead.

The Protestant professes to receive the Bible alone as his standard of faith and practice. The Papist receives the Bible and the tradition of the fathers as his rule. The Protestant cannot prove the change of the Sabbath from his own standard, (the Bible,) therefore he is obliged to adopt that of the Papist, viz., the Bible as explained and corrupted by the fathers. The change of the Sabbath is proved by the Papist as follows:—

"Ques. What warrant have you for keeping the Sunday, preferably to the ancient Sabbath which was the Saturday?

"Ans. We have for it the authority of the Catholic Church, and apostolic tradition.

"Q. Does the Scripture any where command the Sunday to be kept for the Sabbath?

"A. The Scripture commands us to hear the Church, [Matt. xvii, 17; Luke x, 16,] and to hold fast the traditions of the apostles. 2 Thess. ii, 15. But the Scripture does not in particular mention this change of the Sabbath. John speaks of the Lord's day; [Rev. i, 10;] but he does not tell us what day of the week this was, much less does he tell us that this day was to take the place of the Sabbath ordained in the commandments. Luke also speaks of the disciples meeting together to break bread on the first day of the week. Acts xx, 7. And Paul [1 Cor. xvi, 2] orders that on the first day of the week all Corinthians should lay by in store what they designed to bestow in charity on the faithful in Judea; but neither the one nor the other tells us that this first day of the week was to be henceforward the day of worship and the Christian Sabbath; so that truly, the best authority we have for this, is the testimony and ordinances of the church. And therefore, those who pretend to be so religious of the Sunday, whilst they take no notice of other festivals ordained by the same church authority, show that they act by humor, and not by reason and religion; since Sundays and holy-days all stand upon the same foundation, viz., the ordinances of the church.

"Q. What was the reason why the weekly Sabbath was changed from the Saturday to the Sunday? "A. Because our Lord fully accomplished the work of our redemption by rising from the dead on a Sunday; as therefore the work of our redemption was a greater work than that of our creation, the primitive church thought the day on which this work

was completely finished, was more worthy her religious observation than that in which God rested from the creation, and should be properly called the Lord's day."—*Catholic Christian Instructor*. If further testimony is needed listen to the following:—

"Ques. What does God ordain by this commandment? "Ans. He ordains that we sanctify, in a special manner, this day, on which he rested from the labor of creation.

"Q. What is this day of rest?

"A. The seventh day of the week, or Saturday, for he employed six days in creation, and rested on the seventh. Gen. ii, 2; Heb. iv, 1, &c.

"Q. Is it then Saturday we should sanctify, in order to obey the ordinance of God? "A. During the old law, Saturday was the day sanctified; but the church instructed by Jesus Christ, and directed by the Spirit of God, has substituted Sunday for Saturday, so we now sanctify the first and not the seventh day. Sunday means, and now is, the day of the Lord.

"Q. Had the church power to make such a change?

"A. Certainly; since the Spirit of God is her guide, the change is inspired by that Holy Spirit. The uniform, universal, and perpetual tradition of all ages and nations, attest the antiquity of, and consequently the Divine assent to, this change: even the bitterest enemies of God's church admit and adopt it.

"Q. Why did the church make this change?

"A. Because Christ rose from the dead upon Sunday, and rested from the great work of redemption; and because, on this day, the Holy Spirit descended

on the apostles and on the church."—*Catechism of the Christian Religion.*

This testimony shows conclusively that the fourth commandment, which the New Testament has never changed, has been corrupted by the Romish church. It was from Rome, as we may here see, that Protestants learned to say that the Sabbath was changed because redemption was greater than creation. Here we will mention some things for special consideration.

1. Those who are now paying religious respect to the first day of the week, may possibly be led to examine the reasons for this course, by the following significant fact: The church of Rome undertakes to prove purgatory by the Bible, but acknowledges that Sunday-keeping cannot be proved by it, as she instituted that herself. Those, therefore, who despise the Lord's Sabbath, and in its stead honor the sabbath of the Romish church, virtually acknowledge that the authority of that church is above the authority of God, and sufficient to change his times and laws. Here is her statement respecting purgatory:—

"Question. But what grounds have you to believe that there is any such place as a purgatory, or middle state of souls?

"Answer. We have the strongest grounds imaginable from all kind of arguments, from scripture, from perpetual tradition, from the authority and declaration of the church of God, and from reason."—*Catholic Christian Instructed*, page 146.

Hear the Catholic church once more, while she contrasts purgatory with Sunday-keeping:—

"The word of God commandeth the seventh day to be the Sabbath of our Lord, and to be kept holy; you [Protestants] without any precept of scripture,

change it to the first day of the week, only authorized by our traditions. Divers English Puritans oppose against this point, that the observation of the first day is proved out of scripture, where it is said the first day of the week. *Act. xx, 7; 1 Cor. xvi, 2; Rev. i, 10.* Have they not spun a fair thread in quoting these places? If we should produce no better for purgatory and prayers for the dead, invocation of the saints, and the like, they might have good cause indeed to laugh us to scorn; for where is it written that these were Sabbath-days in which those meetings were kept? Or where is it ordained they should be always observed? Or, which is the sum of all, where is it decreed that the observation of the first day should abrogate or abolish the sanctifying of the seventh day, which God commanded everlasting to be kept holy? Not one of those is expressed in the written word of God."—*An Antidote, or Treatise of Thirty Controversies.*  
Reader, shall not such facts as the above open your eyes? Have you any better authority for Sunday-keeping than Romish tradition? What think you of that prophecy which foretells that the Pope should speak great words against God, and think to change times and laws? *Dnn. vii, 25.* That church who styles her head, "Lord God the Pope," has here openly testified, that without any authority from Scripture, she has changed the commandments of God. She also declares that of her two children, Purgatory and Sunday-keeping, the former is the most important personage. Cannot that mother judge impartially between two such darlings?

2. But perhaps the fathers, as they are called, may be regarded by the reader as the best of authority. We are aware that not a few, who profess to be Bi-

ble Christians, rest their Sunday-observance solely upon such evidence. We request the attention of such to the following from Storr's *Six Sermons*. It was written in defense of the author's views of future punishment; but the remarks are of equal value with respect to the Sabbath question.

"It is said, 'The fathers believed in the *endless torments of the wicked*.' In reply, I remark, Our Lord and Master has prohibited my calling any man *father*. But, if the fathers, as they are called, did believe that doctrine, they learned it from the Bible, or they did not. If they learned it there, so can we. If they did not learn it from the Bible, then their testimony is of no weight. It may have been an error that early got into the church, like many others. Mosheim, in his Church History, tells us, as early as the third century, that the defenders of Christianity, in their controversies, 'degenerated much from primitive simplicity,' and that the maxim which asserted the innocence of defending truth by artifice and falsehood, 'contributed' to this degeneracy. And he adds:—

"This disingenuous and vicious method of surprising their adversaries by artifice, and striking them down, as it were, by lies and fictions, produced, among other disagreeable effects, a great number of books, which were falsely attributed to certain great men, in order to give these spurious productions more credit and weight; for as the greater part of mankind are *less governed by reason than authority*, and prefer in many cases, the decisions of fallible mortals, to the unerring dictates of the Divine Word, the disputants of whom we are speaking, thought they could not serve the truth more effectually than by opposing illustrious names, and respectable authorities, to the attacks of its adversaries."

"This practice, spoken of by Mosheim, increased as the darker ages rolled on; and through these dark ages, what there are of the writings of the 'fathers' have come down to us. It is a truth, also, that the practice of corrupting the simplicity of the apostolic doctrine was commenced much earlier than the third century. Enfield, in his *philosophy*, says:—'The first witness of Christianity had scarcely left the world when' this work began. Some of the 'fathers' seemed intent upon uniting heathen philosophy with Christianity, and early commenced the practice of clothing the doctrines of religion in an allegorical dress.'—*Fourth Sermon.*

Those who make the "fathers" their rule, would do well to consider the *above facts*. Every damnable heresy of the Romish church, she proves by those same fathers. Tradition is the *unfailing resort* of Romanists, to prove their dogmas; indeed, they openly acknowledge that tradition is a part of their rule of faith. Protestants claim that they make the Bible their only rule of duty; but, whenever their *unscriptural arguments* for Sunday-keeping are exposed, they fly for refuge to the fathers. Thus Protestants defend their heresies with the same weapons that the Papists employ to defend theirs. The same fountain head of corruption feeds the several streams of error that flow through both these bodies.

3. But, says one, do you not think that it would be safe to believe what those have said who conversed with the apostles, or at least, conversed with some who had conversed with them? If such should tell us that the Sabbath of the Lord was changed, would it not be safe to receive their testimony? We answer, that the holy Scriptures come to us with the divine

Guarantee that every word therein contained was divinely inspired. The tradition of the elders comes to us without a particle of such testimony. Wherefore it follows that the man who fears God will not reject that which he knows came from heaven, for the sake of following that which directly contradicts it, and which by that fact is proved to have come from the great enemy of divine truth.

But does the Bible contain the least intimation that what was written near the days of the apostles is any more sacred than what was written at a later period? Paul told the Thessalonian church that "the mystery of iniquity," or Romish apostasy, had already begun to work. 2 Thess. ii. If Paul was correct, it follows that it is far from being safe to adopt as sacred truth a doctrine which is not found in the New Testament, merely because it is said to have come from some who lived near the days of the apostles. Satan was then busily engaged in nursing in the bosom of the early church, the viper which should long infect with deadly poison a great portion of the professed people of God. Did not Paul warn those with whom he parléd at Ephesus, that grievous wolves were to enter among them, and that of themselves men were to arise speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them? When any doctrine is brought to us from those who lived near the days of the apostles, it is then proper for us to inquire whether this comes from those who spoke the sentiments of the holy apostles, or whether it comes from those grievous wolves who were to follow after them, and speak perverse things.

Is there no way by which we can determine this question? Certainly there is an infallible test. The

New Testament contains the precise language of Jesus Christ and the apostles. Now if the fathers speak according to that word, they speak the precious truths of God. But if they speak that which makes void the word of truth, it is a very strong evidence that they belong to that class which Paul heretofore the church, should arise in their very midst, and speak perverse things, to draw away disciples after them. If the Holy Spirit has given us notice that false teachers were to arise in the very days of the apostles, should it not serve as a warning to us, that things which purport to come from the successors of the apostles, may, for all that, contain the most deadly poison?

4. If it were certain that the *early fathers*, in their zeal to improve upon the New Testament, changed the fourth commandment, it would only prove that they were of the number of grievous wolves that were to arise. But it by no means follows that the mystery of iniquity was able thus early to change times and laws. The testimony given from Stor's Fourth Sermon, evinces clearly that even the fathers themselves do not now come to us with their own words. Their testimony has been corrupted, and many shameless forgeries are palmed off as their genuine testimony.

If the reader ever looked into a Romish controversial work, he will there find the very fathers, who are so much relied upon to prove the change of the Sabbath, quoted to prove all the heresies of that anti-christian church. It follows, therefore, that one of two things must be true: either the testimony of the early fathers has been shamefully corrupted, or those so-called early fathers were wolves in sheep's clothing.

5. If the Lord Jesus Christ and his apostles were now on earth, mingling with the men of this generation, as they once mingled with a former generation, we ask, Would it be safe for the men of the third or fourth generation from this to receive as sacred truth all that the fathers of the present generation might transmit to them? Is it not self-evident that unless human nature should undergo a radical change, the men of the following generations would have handed down to them as Christ's sayings, all the vain and foolish sentiments that different partizans might wish to maintain? In the case supposed, we ask, What would be the safety of the coming generations? There is but one answer, and in this all will agree. If this were the age in which the New Testament was written, the safety of the coming generation would be secured *only*, by faithfully testing, by that sure rule, whatever might be handed down to them as gospel truth from the fathers of the present age. Should they thus rigidly cleare to inspiration, they would be safe; but if they added to that sure word all the fables which satan would instigate the present fathers to attribute to Christ and the apostles, what would become of them?

If the Adrent body itself were to furnish the *fathers* and the *saints* for the future church, Heaven pity the people that should live hereafter! Reader we entreat you to prize your Bible. It contains *all* the will of God, and will make you wise unto salvation through faith in Christ Jesus.

Those who believe in a change of the Lord's Sabbath should look at these facts: 'The Sabbath of the Lord means the Rest-day of the Lord. Six days the Almighty wrought in the work of creation, and

the seventh day he rested from all his work. The Sabbath, or Rest-day of the Lord, is therefore, a definite day, which can no more be changed to one of the days upon which God wrought, than the resurrection-day can be changed to one of the days upon which Christ did not rise; or the crucifixion-day be changed to one of the six days of the week upon which Christ was not crucified. Hence it is impossible to change the Rest-day of the Lord, as it is to change the crucifixion-day or the day of the resurrection.

Men of God, to whom the Scriptures have been committed, can you longer pervert the commandments of Jehovah and not be guilty of willful transgression? Must it not be exceeding sinful in the sight of Heaven for you to change the Sabbath of the Lord for another day, and then to steal that commandment which guards the holy Sabbath, to enforce the observance of that new day? When the hailstones of Jehovah's wrath shall sweep away the refuge of lies, [Isa. xxviii, 17; Rev. xvi, 21] how many of the arguments for Sunday-keeping will be left? The Bible thoroughly furnishes the man of God to all good works. Sunday-keeping is not, therefore, a good work; for the Scriptures furnish nothing in its favor. Why should you be ready of heart to believe what God has never spoken. and slow of heart to believe his plain testimony? Thus saith the Lord, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God;" "Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy." J. N. A.

## SEVENTH PART OF TIME THEORY

*Show me the False by the Following from J. W.  
Morton's Vindication of the True Sabbath.*

---

The only object, direct or indirect, of this [the fourth] commandment, is "the day." What are we commanded to remember? "The day." What are we required to keep holy? "The day." What did the Lord bless and hallow? "The day." In what are we forbidden to work? In "the day?" Now let us inquire:—

1. What day? Not the day of Adam's fall; nor the day Noah went into the ark; nor the day of the overthrow of Sodom; nor the day of the Exodus; nor the day of the Provoction; nor the day of the removal of the ark; nor the day of Christ's birth; nor the day of his crucifixion; nor the day of his resurrection; nor the day of his ascension; nor the day of judgment. It may be, and certainly is, proper, that we should remember all these; but we are not told to do so in this commandment. Neither is it some one day of the week, but no one in particular; for how could we remember "the day," that is no day in particular!—how could we keep holy "the day" that has not been specified!—and how could we say that God had blessed and hallowed "the day," that was no one day more than another? What day, then? God says, Remember *the Sabbath-day*, or *the day of the Sabbath*; Keep holy *the day of the Sabbath*; The Lord blessed and hallowed *the day*

of the Sabbath. He also says, *The seventh day* is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; *in it thou shalt not do any work.* This day, therefore, is "the seventh day," or "the day of the Sabbath."

2. What Sabbath? Not "a Sabbath," or any Sabbath that man may invent, or that God may hereafter keep; for that would be "some Sabbath," but no one in particular. Not some institution yet undetermined, that God may require man to observe weekly; for the command is not, "Remember the Sabbath institution," but, "Remember the *day* of the Sabbath;" not, "Keep holy the Sabbath institution," but, "Keep holy *the day* of the Sabbath." The Lord did not bless and hallow "the Sabbath institution," but "the *day* of the Sabbath." We are not forbidden to do work in "the Sabbath institution," but in "the *seventh day*." In fact, the phrase, "the Sabbath," in this commandment, means neither more nor less than "the rest." It is not *here* the name of any institution at all, though it is often thus used in other parts of the Bible. Hence, this Sabbath is "the Sabbath or rest of the Lord thy God."

3. Which day of the week is "the day of the Sabbath?" No other than that day on which the Lord rested; for the command refers to God's Sabbath. On which day of the week did he rest? "And he rested on the seventh day." Gen. ii, 2. Therefore, "the day of the Sabbath" is the same day of the week on which God rested from the work of creation; and as he rested on the seventh day of the first week, and on no other, the seventh and no other day of every week must be the only "day of the Sabbath."

Let it be particularly observed, that God does not

say, Remember the Sabbath, or, Remember the Sabbath institution, though this is necessarily implied in the command; but, Remember "the day of the Sabbath"—the day on which I have ordained that the Sabbath institution be observed. As if he had said, There is little danger, *comparatively*, that you will forget the fact of my having kept Sabbath; nor is it likely that you will altogether neglect to observe *some* day of rest from your arduous toils, for you will be driven to this by the ever returning demands of your exhausted bodies; but you are, and always will be, in especial danger of forgetting the proper day of the week for honoring me in my own institution. Satan, who takes infinite delight in all kinds of "will-worship," while he hates with a perfect hatred every act of strict obedience to my law, will do all he can to persuade you that some other day will do just as well, or even better. Remember, therefore, the day of my Sabbath, and keep the same day holy in every week; for—mark the reason—I have myself rested on the seventh day, and on that account I have blessed and sanctified that and no other day of the week, that you may observe it, and keep it holy, not because it is in itself better than any other day, but because I have blessed and sanctified it.

There is only one day of American Independence; only one day of the Resurrection of Christ; only one day of the birth of any one man; and only one day of Judgment. And why? Because American Independence was declared on but one day; Christ rose on but one day; the same man cannot be born on two different days; and God hath appointed only one day in which he will judge the world. Now, on the same principle, there can be but one "day of the

Sabbath" of the Lord our God. If I should say that the day of Christ's Resurrection is not any particular day of the week, but only "one day in seven," you would not hesitate to call me a fool, while my ignorance would excite your deepest sympathy; but when you say that "the day of the Sabbath" does not mean that particular day on which the Lord's Sabbath occurred, but only "one day in seven," you expect me to receive your assertion as the infallible teaching of superior wisdom. I cannot, however, so receive it, for the following reasons:—

1. If God had meant "one day in seven," he would have said so. His first and great design, in writing his law on tables of stone, was to be understood by his creatures; but, for more than two thousand years after he gave the law, no human being ever suspected that "the day of the Sabbath" meant anything else than the seventh day of the week, because it was commonly known that that day alone was in reality "the day of the Sabbath." Indeed, this "one-day-in-seven" doctrine is known to have been invented within a few hundred years, with the pious design of accounting for a change of Sabbath, without the necessity of repealing a portion of the moral law. It is a matter of great surprise, that those pious theologians, who first substituted "one day in seven" for "the day of the Sabbath," did not shudder at the thought of presuming to mend the language of the Holy Ghost. "The words of the Lord are pure words; as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times." Ps. xii, 6. Brethren, are you prepared to enter into judgment, and answer for the liberties you have taken with God's word?

In substituting the vague and indefinite expression, "one day in seven," for the definite and unequivocal terms, "the Sabbath-day," and "the seventh day," you have as truly taken "away from the words of the prophecy of this book," as if you had blotted the fourth commandment from the Decalogue; while your leading object has been to make way for the introduction of a new command that, for aught the Scriptures teach, it never entered into the heart of the Almighty to put into his law.

2. God never blessed "one day in seven," without blessing a particular day. He either blessed some definite object, or nothing. You may say, indeed, without falsehood, that God blessed "one day in seven;" but if you mean that this act of blessing did not terminate on any particular day, you ought to know, that you are asserting what is naturally impossible. As well might you say of a band of robbers, that they had killed "one man in seven," while in reality they had killed no man in particular. No brethren, yourselves know very well, that God had not blessed and sanctified any day but *the seventh of the seven*, prior to the giving of the written law. You know, that if God blessed any day of the week at all, it was a definite day, distinct from all the other days of the week. But this commandment says, that "the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day." Therefore the Sabbath-day must be a particular day of the week. Therefore "the Sabbath-day" is not "one day in seven," or an indefinite seventh part of time. Therefore it is not "one day in seven" that we are required to remember, and keep holy, and in which we are forbidden to do any work; but "the seventh day" of the week, which was then, is now, and will

be till the end of time, "the day of the Sabbath" of the Lord our God.

3. No day of the week but the seventh was ever called "the day of the Sabbath," either by God or man, till long since the death of the last inspired writer. Search both Testaments through and through, and you will find no other day called "the Sabbath," or even "a Sabbath," except the ceremonial Sabbath, with which, of course, we have nothing to do in this controversy. And long after the close of the canon of inspiration, the seventh day, and no other, was still called "the Sabbath." If you can prove that any one man, among the millions of Adam's children, from the beginning of the world till the rise of Antichrist, ever called the first day of the week "the Sabbath," you will shed a light upon this controversy, for which a host of able writers have searched in vain.

But, farther; the first day of the week was not observed by any of the children of men, as a Sabbath, for three hundred years after the birth of Christ. Do you ask proof? I refer you to Theodore de Beza, who plainly says so. If you are not satisfied with the witness, will you have the goodness to prove the affirmative of the proposition?

I infer, therefore, that "the day of the Sabbath," or "the Sabbath-day," is the proper name of the seventh day of the week, as much so as "the day of Saturn;" and that to attach this proper name *now* to some other day of the week, and to affirm that God meant that other day, as much as he did the seventh, when he wrote the law on tables of stone, is as unreasonable as it is impious.

If you say, that when God speaks of "the Sabbath-

day." He means "one day in seven, but no day in particular," you are as far from the truth as if you said that, when he speaks of Moses, he does not mean any particular man, but "some one of the Israelites." Moses was one of the Israelites, just as the Sabbath-day is one day in seven. But when God says Moses, he means Moses the son of Amram; and when he says "the Sabbath-day," he means the seventh day of the week. You may give different names to the same object, without interfering with its identity; but to apply the same name to two different objects, and then to affirm that these two objects are identically the same, so that what is predicated of the one must be true of the other, is as though a navigator should discover an island in the Southern Ocean, and call it "England," and then affirm that the late work of Mr. Macaulay, entitled "The History of England," is a veritable and authentic history of his newly discovered empire. Which would you wonder at most, the stupidity or the effrontery of that navigator?

I cannot close this chapter without reminding you that, in attempting to refute the above reasoning, the main thing you will have to show is, that "the Sabbath-day," or "the day of the Sabbath," is an indefinite or general expression, applicable alike to, at least, two different days of the week, and that it is used indefinitely in this commandment. If it has been proved, that "the day of the Sabbath" refers, and can refer, *only* to the seventh day of the week, then it is true, and will remain for ever true, that the original Sabbath law requires the sanctification of no other day.

## HISTORY OR THE SABBATH.

The observance of a different day of the week from that enjoined in the fourth commandment, and for a different reason from that which is there assigned, is by many supposed to be the apostolic mode of rendering obedience to that precept. That such an idea has no foundation in the New Testament, we have already seen. For the benefit of such as wish to learn the manner in which the first day of the week obtained the place of the Lord's Sabbath, we present the following important testimony. It is taken from the "History of the Sabbath," published by the American Sabbath Tract Society, New York. We think that those who will read the testimony on this subject with care, will acquiesce in the frank testimony of Dr. Neander, the distinguished historian of the church. In his "History of the Christian Religion and Church," page 168, he thus remarks: "Opposition to Judaism introduced the particular festival of Sunday, very early, indeed, into the places of the Sabbath. . . . The festival of Sunday, like all other

festivals, was always only a human ordinance; and it was far from the intention of the apostles to establish a divine command in this respect—far from them, and from the early apostolic church, to transfer the laws of the Sabbath to Sunday. Perhaps at the end of the second century, a false application of this kind had begun to take place; for men appear by that time to have considered laboring on Sunday as a sin."

The apostle Paul informed the Thessalonian church that the mystery of iniquity had already begun to work, and that in the predicted period, the man of sin would be revealed. 2 Thess. ii, 7, 8. As the great apostasy had begun to develop itself in the days of the apostles, it follows that the early observance of any precept, or belief of any doctrine does not stamp it as apostolic or divine, if it have no foundation in the word of God. To us, therefore, it is a matter of peculiar interest to trace the gradual corruption of the truths of the Bible, even from the days of the apostles, down to the complete development of the man of sin.

"The History of the Sabbath," after proving from the New Testament that the Lord Jesus and his inspired followers observed the Sabbath according to the commandment, narrates the circumstances connected with its observance in the early church. It speaks as follows:—

OBSERVANCE OF THE SABBATH FROM THE TIME  
OF THE APOSTLES TO CONSTANTINE.

After the period described in the Acts of the apostles, Christianity soon became widely spread in the Roman empire, which, at that time extended over most of the civilized world. But as it receded from the time of the apostles, and the number of its professors increased, the church became gradually less spiritual, and more disposed to deck the simple religion of Jesus with mysteries and superstitious formalities; and the bishops or pastors became ambitious of their authority over the churches. Those churches, even in Gentile cities, appear to have been composed, at first, principally of converted Jews, who not only observed the weekly Sabbath, but also the feast of the Passover, adapted particularly to Christian worship; respecting which, there was much contention. In the mean time, converts were greatly multiplied from among the Gentiles, and were united with those from the Jews, who, not without reason, considered themselves entitled to some distinction as the original founders of the gospel church, and as being better informed in the writings of Moses and the prophets, having been in the habit of reading them every Sabbath in the synagogues.

About three years after the martyrdom of Peter and Paul, according to the common account, Judea was invaded by the Roman armies, and Jerusalem was besieged and destroyed, as our Lord had predicted. By this awful calamity it is supposed that most of the churches in Judea were scattered; for they fled their country at the approach of their enemies, as they were taught by Jesus Christ to do. Matt. xxiv, 16.

OBSERVANCE OF THE SABBATH FROM THE TIME  
OF THE APOSTLES TO CONSTANTINE.

After the period described in the Acts of the apostles, Christianity soon became widely spread in the Roman empire, which, at that time extended over most of the civilized world. But as it receded from the time of the apostles, and the number of its professors increased, the church became gradually less spiritual, and more disposed to deck the simple religion of Jesus with mysteries and superstitious formalities; and the bishops or pastors became ambitious of their authority over the churches. Those churches, even in Gentile cities, appear to have been composed, at first, principally of converted Jews, who not only observed the weekly Sabbath, but also the feast of the Passover, adapted particularly to Christian worship; respecting which, there was much contention. In the mean time, converts were greatly multiplied from among the Gentiles, and were united with those from the Jews, who, not without reason, considered themselves entitled to some distinction as the original founders of the gospel church, and as being better informed in the writings of Moses and the prophets, having been in the habit of reading them every Sabbath in the synagogues.

About three years after the martyrdom of Peter and Paul, according to the common account, Judea was invaded by the Roman armies, and Jerusalem was besieged and destroyed, as our Lord had predicted. By this awful calamity it is supposed that most of the churches in Judea were scattered; for they fled their country at the approach of their enemies, as they were taught by Jesus Christ to do. Matt. xxiv, 16.

city which subsequently arose changing its name, was called *Elias*, in honor of the emperor *Aelius Adrian*; and when the church was collected there of the Gentiles, the first bishop after those of the circumcision was *Marcus*. Thus was extinguished the Hebrew church in Jerusalem, having had a succession of fifteen pastors; "all which," says Eusebius, "they say, were Hebrews from the first. At that time the whole church under them," he adds, "consisted of faithful Hebrews, who continued from the time of the apostles to the siege that then took place."

This church, which heretofore held the first rank in regard to its influence, being now composed entirely of Gentiles, and stripped of its apostolic character and influence, could no longer successfully oppose the growing ambition and influence of the bishops of the church in the metropolis of the empire.

Up to this period, and for some time after, there does not appear to have been any change in the sentiments or practices of the church, in any place, relative to the Sabbath; but from what is related by subsequent writers, which will be noticed in its place, it is certain that it was observed by the churches universally.

This fact is so generally acknowledged by those acquainted with the history of the matter, that we need refer to only a few passages in proof:

The learned Grotius says, in his *Explication of the Decalogue*, "Therefore the Christians also, who believed Christ would restore all things to their primitive practice, as Tertullian teacheth in *Monogamia*, kept holy the Sabbath, and had their assemblies on that day, in which the law was read to them, as appears in *Acts xv, 21*, which custom remained till the

time of the council of Laodicea, about A. D. 365, who then thought meet that the gospels also should be read on that day."

Edward Brerewood, Professor in Gresham College, London, in a treatise on the Sabbath, 1630, says: "It is commonly believed that the Jewish Sabbath was changed into the Lord's Day by Christian emperors, and they know little who do not know, that the ancient Sabbath did remain and was observed by the eastern churches three hundred years after our Saviour's passion."

#### TESTIMONY FOR THE FIRST DAY EXAMINED.

At what time the first day of the week came into notice as a festival in the church, it is not easy to determine. The first intimation we have of this, in any ancient writer of acknowledged integrity, is from Justin Martyr's *Apology* for the Christians, about A. D. 140. He is cited as saying, "that the Christians in the city and in the country assembled on the day called Sunday; and after certain religious devotions, all returned home to their labors;" and he assigns as reasons for this, that God made the world on the first day; and, that Christ first showed himself to his disciples on that day, after his resurrection. These were the best, and probably all the reasons that could then be offered for the practice. He also speaks of Sunday only as a festival, on which they performed labor, when not engaged in devotions; and not as a substitute for the Sabbath. From this author we can learn nothing as to the extent of the practice; for though he says this was done by those "in the city and in the country," he may have intended only the city of Rome and its suburbs, since Justin, al-

though a native of Palestine, in Syria, is stated by Eusebius to have made his residence in Rome. Nor can we determine from this, that he intended any thing more, than that they did thus on the Sunday in which the church of Rome, a short time after this, is known to have closed the paschal feast, which was observed annually.

It is contended, however, that mention is made of keeping the first day previous to Justin. The first intimation of this kind, it is believed, is from an apocryphal writing, styled the *Epistle of Barnabas*. But to this epistle it is objected, that there is no evidence of its genuineness. Eusebius, who lived near the time when it was written, mentions it as a spurious writing, entitled to no credit. Dr. Milnor says it is an injury to St. Barnabas, to ascribe this epistle to him. Moshheim says it is the work of some superstitious Jew of mean abilities. And we think it has but little to recommend it besides its antiquity. Barnabas' theory for observing the first day, rests upon the tradition that the seventh day was typical of the seventh millennium of the age of the world, which would be purely a holy age; and that the Sabbath was not to be kept until that time arrived; and he says, "We keep the eighth day with gladness, in which Jesus arose from the dead."

The citations from Ignatius, are as little to the purpose. In the passage of which most use has been made, he did not say that himself or any one else kept the Lord's day, as is often asserted. His own words are, that the "prophets who lived before Christ, came to a newness of hope, not by keeping Sabbaths, but by living according to a lordly or most excellent life. In this passage, Ignatius was speaking of alto-

gether a different thing from Sabbath-keeping. There is another quotation from him, however, in which he brings out more clearly his view of the relation existing between the Sabbath and Lord's day. It is as follows: "Let us not keep the Sabbath in a Jewish manner, in sloth and idleness. But let us keep it after a spiritual manner, not in bodily ease, but in the study of the law, and in the contemplation of the works of God." "And after we have kept the Sabbath, let every one that loveth Christ keep the Lord's day festival." From this it seems that he would have the Sabbath kept first, as such, and in a manner satisfactory to the strictest Sabbatharian, after which the Lord's day, not as a Sabbath, but as a festival. Indeed with this distinction between the Sabbath and a festival before us, it is easy to explain all those passages from early historians which refer to the first day. We shall find them to be either immediately connected with instructions about such seasons as *Good Friday* and *Holy Thursday*, or in the writings of those who have recommended the observance of these festival days.

It is also said that Pliny, Governor of Bithynia, in A. D. 102, in a letter to Trajan, states that the Christians met on the first day of the week for worship; but by no fair interpretation of his words can he be so understood. He says, in writing about those of his own province, "that they were accustomed to assemble on a *stated day*." This might be referred to the first day, if there were credible testimony, that this day was alone regarded by Christians at that time; but as there is no evidence of this, and as the Sabbath is known to have been the stated day of religious assembling a long time after this, it seems

more proper to refer it to the Sabbath than to the first day.

We will mention but one more of these misinterpreted citations, and this is from Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, who lived a little after Justin. His letter to Soter, bishop of Rome, is cited as saying, "This day we celebrated the holy Dominical day, in which we have read your epistle." As given by Eusebius, it is thus: "To-day we have passed the Lord's holy day," &c. The only ground upon which this phrase can be referred to the first day, is, that this day was at that time known by the same title that God has given to the Sabbath, [see Isa. lviii, 13.] of which there is no proof. Therefore it is not just to cite this passage as evidence of the observance of the first day at that time.

It is indeed, a well known fact, that the first day has come into very extensive use among the great body of Christians, as the only day of weekly rest and worship. The origin of this practice does not appear, however, to be as ancient by some centuries, as many suppose; nor was its adoption secured at once, but by slow and gradual advances it obtained general notice in Christian countries. This is frankly admitted by Morer, an English Episcopalian, in his *Dialogues on the Lord's Day*, page 236. He says, "In St. Jerome's time, (that is, in the fifth century,) Christianity had got into the throne as well as into the empire. Yet for all this, the entire sanctification of the Lord's day proceeded slowly; and that it was the work of time to bring it to perfection, appears from the several steps the church made in her constitution, and from the decrees of emperors and other princes, wherein the prohibitions from servile and civil business

ness advanced by degrees from one species to another, till the day got a considerable figure in the world."

The same author says on the same page: "If the Christians in St. Jerome's time, after divine service on the Lord's day, followed their daily employments, it should be remembered, that this was not done till the worship was quite over, when they might with innocence enough resume them, because the length of time and the number of hours assigned for piety were not then so well explained as in after ages.

It is probable that no other day could have obtained the same notice in ancient times as the first day of the week did; for there were circumstances, aside from the resurrection, that had an influence in promoting its observance. It was at first a celebration of the same character as the fourth and sixth days of the week, and the annual festivals of saints and martyrs. These celebrations were comparatively unobjectionable, when not permitted to interfere with a divine appointment; but when they were made to supersede or cause a neglect of the Sabbath, they were criminal. In respect to these days of weekly celebration, Mosheim, when remarking upon this early period, and the regard then paid to the seventh and first days, says: "Many also observed the fourth day, in which Christ was betrayed, and the sixth day, in which he was crucified." He adds, "the time of assembling was generally in the evening after sunset, or in the morning before the dawn."

#### SUN DAY-KEEPING OF HEATHEN ORIGIN.

*The respect which the Gentiles had for the first day, or Sunday, while they were Pagans, contributed much to render its introduction easy, and its weekly cele-*

bration popular, among such materials as composed the body of the church of Rome in the second, third and fourth centuries. The observance of the first day of the week, as a festival of the Sun was very general in those nations from which the Gentile church received her converts. That an idolatrous worship was paid to the Sun and other heavenly bodies by the Gentiles, the Old Testament abundantly testifies; and this kind of adoration paid to the Sun in later times, is as plainly a matter of historical record. Thomas Bampfield, an English writer of the seventeenth century, quoting Verstegan's Antiquities, page 68, says: "Our Ancestors in England, before the light of the Gospel came among them, went very far in this idolatry, and dedicated the first day of the week to the adoration of the idol of the Sun, and gave it the name of Sunday. This idol they placed in a temple, and there sacrificed to it." He further states, that from his historical reading, he finds that a great part of the world, and particularly those parts of it which have since embraced Christianity, did anciently adore the Sun upon Sunday. It is also stated by Dr. Chambers, in his Cyclopedea, "that Sunday was so called by our idolatrous ancestors, because set apart for the worship of the Sun." The Greeks and Latins also gave the same name to the first day of the week. Dr. Brownlee, as quoted by Kingsbury, on the Sabbath, page 223, also says: "When the descendants of Adam apostatized from the worship of the true God, they substituted in his place the Sun, that luminary, which, more than all others, strikes the minds of savages people with religious awe; and which, therefore, all heathens worship." Attachment to particular days of religious celebration, from habit merely, is

well known, even in our own day, to be very strong; and powerful convictions of duty are often required to produce a change. This was no doubt well understood by the teachers of Christianity in those times. Dr. Mosheim, when treating on that age, says: "That the leaders imagined that the nations would the more readily receive Christianity when they saw the rites and ceremonies to which they had been accustomed, established in the churches, and the same worship paid to Jesus Christ and his martyrs which they had formerly offered to their idol deities. Hence it happened, that in those times, the religion of the Greeks and Romans differed but little in its external appearance from that of Christians."

*Prejudice against the Jews* was another influence against the Sabbath, and in favor of the first day. This was very strong, and directly calculated to lead the Gentile Christians to fix a stigma upon every religious custom of the Jews, and to brand as Judaism whatever they supposed had any connection with the Mosaic religion. Hence it was that in those times, as often occurs in our own, to produce disaffection and disgust to the seventh day as the Sabbath, they spoke of it and reproached its observance as Judaizing. This feeling in relation to Judaism led Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, in Egypt, in the fourth century, who with his people then observed the Sabbath, to say, in his *Interpretation of the Psalms*, "We assemble on Saturday, not that we are infected with Judaism, but to worship Jesus the Lord of the Sabbath." In a community of Christians whose religion was formal, and whose celebrations were designed more to act upon their passions and senses than to improve their hearts or to conform them to divine requirements,

a more powerful argument could scarcely be used against the Sabbath-day, or one that would more effectually promote the observance of the first day, which was raised up as its rival. Dr. Neander says distinctly, "Opposition to Judaism introduced this particular festival of Sunday very early."

*The observance of the Passover, or Easter, by the early Christians, aided the introduction of the first day as a religious festival in the church, if it was not indeed the direct cause of it. This feast was held by the Asiatic Christians, who began it at the same time the Jews began their Passover, and ended it in like manner, without regard to the particular day of the week. The church of Rome does not appear to have observed it until the latter part of the second century, when in the time of Victor, bishop of Rome, it seems that it was observed by the Roman and western churches. Victor insisted upon the fast being closed on the first day of the week, on whatever day it might commence; and he claimed the right as *bishop of Rome*, to control all the churches in this matter.*" Hence," says Eusebius, "there were synods and convocations of the bishops on this question, and all (i. e. the western bishops) unanimously drew up an ecclesiastical decree, which they communicated to all the churches in all places, that the mystery of our Lord's resurrection should be celebrated on no other day than the Lord's day; and that on this day alone we should observe the close of the paschal feasts."

The bishops of Asia, however, persisted for a considerable time in observing the custom handed down to them by apostolic tradition, until, either by the threats of excommunication which were made, or by a desire for peace,

they were induced partially to adopt the custom of the western churches. This change was made, as we are told, "partly in honor of the day, and partly to express some difference between Jews and Christians." But the question does not appear to have been fully settled, for we find Constantine, in an epistle to the churches, urging them to uniformity in the day of the celebration, wherein, after a strong invective against the practice of the Jews, he says, "For we have learned another way from our Saviour, which we may follow. It is indeed most absurd that they should have occasion of insolent boasting on account of our not being able to observe these things in any manner unless by the aid of their instruction."

"Wherefore, let us have nothing in common with that most odious brood of the Jews."

By this contest an important point was gained for the first day, although it was but an annual celebration. The Sabbath, however, does not appear to have been laid aside in any place but continued to be the principal day of religious worship throughout the whole Christian church.

At what time the first day began to be observed weekly, we have no particular account; but from the favor it received from the bishops of Rome and some of the Christian fathers at the close of the third and beginning of the fourth century, we suppose it had then become a practice in Rome and some of the western churches.

This brings us near to the close of the third century. And here it ought to be noted, that Lord's day, or Sunday, was not the only holy-day of the Church during these three centuries. Origen, (as quoted by Dr. Peter Heylyn in his History of the

Sabbath,) names the *Good Friday* as we call it now, the *Parasceve* as he calls it there; the feasts of *Easter* and of *Pentecost*. And anciently, not only the day which is now called *Whitsunday* or *Pentecost*, but all the fifty days from Easter forward, were accounted holy, and solemnized with no less observance than the Sundays were. Of the day of the *AAscension* or *Holy Thursday*, it may likewise be said, that soon after, it came to be more highly esteemed than all the rest. Such was the estimation in which the Lord's day was held. It was on a level with those other holy days which are now disregarded by the body of the Protestant Church. It is to be remembered, farther, that the term Sabbath was applied exclusively to the seventh day of the week, or Saturday. Indeed, wherever, for a thousand years and upwards, we meet the word *Sabbatum* in any writer, of what name soever, it must be understood of no day but Saturday.

#### THE SABBATH FROM THE TIME OF CONSTANTINE TO THE REFORMATION.

We have seen how the matter stood until the commencement of Constantine's career. The Sabbath was generally observed, while the Lord's day was regarded as a festival of no greater importance or authority than Good Friday or Holy Thursday. No text of Scripture, or edict of emperor, or decree of council, could be produced in its favor. But from this time forth may be found emperors and councils combining to give importance to the Lord's day and to oppose the Sabbath.

An important change in the regard paid to the first day, was produced soon after the accession of

Constantine, the first Christian emperor, in the early part of the fourth century. When he became master of Rome, he soon gave himself up to the guidance of the Christian clergy. According to Jones' Church History, "He built places of public worship. He encouraged the meetings of synods and bishops—honored them with his presence, and employed himself continually in aggrandizing the church. He was scrupulously attentive to the religious rites and ceremonies which were prescribed to him by the clergy. He fasted, observed the feasts in commemoration of the martyrs, and devoutly watched the whole night on the vigils of the saints," and showed great anxiety for uniformity in the doctrines and observances of religion in the church. He was, therefore, exactly suited to the wishes of the Roman bishop and clergy, in establishing, by his imperial authority, what they had no Scripture to support, and what their influence had hitherto been unable to effect, viz., a uniformity in the celebration of Easter and the first day. In 321, Constantine first published his edicts enjoining upon his subjects these superstitious celebrations. Eusebius in his life of Constantine, says, "He appointed as a suitable time for prayers, the Dominical day, which was then an especial day, and now is undoubtedly the very first. His body-guard observed the day, and offered on it prayers written by the emperor. The happy prince endeavored to persuade all to do this, and by degrees to lead all to the worship of God; wherefore he determined that those obeying Roman power should abstain from every work upon the days named after the Saviour, that they should venerate also the day before the Sabbath, in memory, as seems to me, of the events occurring in those

dara to our common Saviour." He says again, "An edict also, by the will and pleasure of the emperor, was transmitted to the Prefects of the provinces, that they thenceforth should venerate the Dominical day; that they should honor the days consecrated to the martyrs, and should celebrate the solemnities of the festivals in the churches, all which was done according to the will of the emperor." And as quoted by Lucius, he says, that he admonished his subjects likewise that those days which were *Sabbaths* should be honored, or worshipped.

Sozomen in his Ecclesiastical History, b. 1, c. 8, says, "He (Constantine) also made a law that on the Dominical day, which the Hebrews call the first day of the week, the Greeks the day of the Sun, and also on the day of Venus, (i. e., Friday,) judgments should not be given, or other business transacted, but that all should worship God with prayer and supplications, and venerate the Dominical day, as on it Christ rose from the dead; and the day of Venus, as the day on which he was fixed to the cross."

Dr. Chambers says, "It was Constantine the Great who first made a law for the observance of Sunday, and who, according to Eusebius, appointed that it should be regularly celebrated throughout the Roman Empire. Before him, and even in his time, they observed the Jewish Sabbath as well as Sunday; both to satisfy the law of Moses, and to imitate the apostles, who used to meet together on the first day." He adds, "Indeed, some are of the opinion that the Lord's day mentioned in the Apocalypse, is our Sunday; which they will have to have been so early instituted." "By Constantine's laws, made in 321, it was decreed that for the future the Sunday

should be kept a day of rest in all cities and towns; but he allowed the country people to follow their work. In 538, the Council of Orleans prohibited this country labor.

To give the more solemnity to the first day of the week, (as we learn from Lucius' Ecclesiastical History,) Sylvester, who was bishop of Rome while Constantine was Emperor, changed the name of Sunday, giving it the more imposing title of *Lord's day*. It cannot be doubted, that the laws of Constantine did much to make the first day conspicuous throughout the empire, as all public business was forbidden upon it. They changed its character from a special day, in which, as a weekly festival, all kinds of business and labor were performed in city and country, to be, as Eusebius says, *the very first*. This imperial favor for the first day operated against all who conscientiously regarded the Sabbath from respect to the fourth commandment, in obedience to which the seventh day had always been observed; and if it had produced a general abandonment of its observance, it would not have been very surprising, considering the influence of court example, and the general ignorance and darkness of the age. This, however, does not appear to have been the case. The Sabbath was still extensively observed; and to counteract it, the Council of Laodices, about A. D. 350, passed a decree, saying, "It is not proper for Christians to Judaize, and to cease from labor on the Sabbath, but they ought to work on that day, and put especial honor upon the Lord's day, as Christians. If any be found Judaizing, let him be anathematized." But this did not produce any material change, for Socrates, a writer of the fifth century, who resided at

Constantinople, makes the following remarks upon the celebration of the Sabbath at the time he wrote, A. D. 440. He says, "There are various customs concerning assembling; for though all the churches throughout the whole world celebrate the sacred mysteries on the Sabbath-day, yet the Alexandrians and the Romans, from an ancient tradition, refuse to do this; but the Egyptians who are in the neighborhood of Alexandria, and those inhabiting Thebes, indeed have assemblies on the Sabbath, but do not participate in the mysteries, as is the custom of the Christians. At Cesarea, Cappadocia and in Cyprus, on the Sabbath and Dominical day, at twilight, with lighted lamps, the presbyters and bishops interpret the Scriptures. At Rome they fast every Sabbath." This account of the manner of celebrating the Sabbath in the fifth century, is corroborated by Sozomen, in his Ecclesiastical History, b. 7, c. 9. He says, "At Constantinople, and almost among all, the Christians assembled upon the Sabbath, and also upon the first day of the week, except at Rome and Alexandria; the ecclesiastical assemblies at Rome were not upon the Sabbath, as in almost all other churches of the rest of the world; and in many cities and villages in Egypt, they used to commune in the evening of the Sabbath, on which day there were public assemblies."

In regard to fasting on the Sabbath at Rome, referred to by Socrates, it ought to be said, that from the earliest times to the fourth century, the practice had been to observe the Sabbath as a holiday. But the Church of Rome, in its opposition to the Jews, made it a fast day, that the separation might be marked and strong. In the eastern churches they

never fasted upon the Sabbath, excepting one Sabbath in the year, which was the day before the Passover. But in the western churches they celebrated a fast every week. It was in reference to this that Ambrose said, "When I come to Rome, I fast upon the Sabbath; when I am here, I do not fast." Augustine also said concerning this, "If they say it is sinful to fast on the Sabbath, then they would condemn the Roman Church, and many places near to and far from it. And if they should think it a sin not to fast on the Sabbath, then they would blame many eastern churches, and the far greater part of the world." This Sabbath fasting was opposed by the eastern church; and in the sixth general council held at Constantinople, it was commanded that the Sabbath and Dominical days be kept as festivals, and that no one fast or mourn upon them. The practice of fasting, therefore, was chiefly in the western churches, about Rome.

It is perhaps difficult to determine exactly the relative importance attached to the seventh and first days of the week at this time. Sufficient may be found, however, to assure us, that the Sabbath was observed, and that no one regarded Sunday as having taken its place. This is shown by the provision of the Council of Laodicea, A. D. 365, that the Gospels should be read on that day. It is shown by the action of a Council in 517, (mentioned in *Robinson's History of Baptism*,) which regulated and enforced the observance of the Sabbath. It is shown by the exhortation of Gregory of Nyssa, "How can you look upon the Lord's day, if you neglect the Sabbath! Do you not know that they are sisters, and that in despising the one you affront the other?"

And as sisters we find them hand in hand in the ecclesiastical canons. Penalties were inflicted by the councils both of Laodicea and Trullo, on clergymen who did not observe both days as festivals.

How the first day of the week, or Lord's day, was observed in the early part of the fifth century, we may learn from the words of St. Jerome. In a funeral oration for the Lady Paula, he says: "She, with all her virgins and widows who lived at Bethlehem in a cloister with her, upon the Lord's day, repaired duly to the church, or house of God, which was near to her cell; and after her return from thence to her own lodgings, she herself and all her company fell to work, and they all performed their task, which was the making of clothes and garments for themselves and for others, as they were appointed."

St. Chrysostom, patriarch of Constantinople, "recommended to his audience, after impressing upon themselves and their families what they had heard on the Lord's day, to return to their daily employments and trades."

Dr. Francis White, Lord Bishop of Ely, speaking of this matter, says, "The Catholic Church, for more than six hundred years after Christ, permitted labor, and gave license to many Christian people to work upon the Lord's day, at such hours as they were not commanded to be present at the public service by the precepts of the church."

In the sixth century efforts were made to prevent this labor. The following promulgation of a synod held by command of King Junthran, of Burgundy, will show the condition of things, and the means used to improve it: "We see the Christian people, in an unadvised manner, deliver to contempt the Dominical

day, and, as in other days, indulge in continual labor." Therefore they determined to teach the people subject to them to keep the Dominical day, which, if not observed by the lawyer, he should irreparably lose his cause, and if a countryman or servant did not keep it, he should be beaten with heavier blows of cudgels. The council of Orleans, held 538, prohibited the country labor on Sunday which Constantine by his laws permitted. According to Channbers, this council also declared, "that to hold it unlawful to travel with horses, cattle and carriages, to prepare food, or to do any thing necessary to the cleanliness and decency of houses or persons, savors more of Judaism than Christianity." According to Lucius, in another council held in Narbonne, in France, in the seventh century, they also forbid this country work.

Early in the seventh century, in the time of Pope Gregory I, the subject of the Sabbath attracted considerable attention. There was one class of persons who declared, "that it was not lawful to do any manner of work upon the Saturday, or the old Sabbath; another, that no man ought to bathe himself on the Lord's day, or their new Sabbath." Against both of these doctrines Pope Gregory wrote a letter to the Roman citizens. Baronius, in his Councils, says, "This year [603] at Rome, St. Gregory, the Pope, corrected that error which some preached, by Jewish superstition, or the Grecian custom, that it was a duty to worship on the Sabbath, as likewise upon the Dominical day;" and he calls such preachers the preachers of Antichrist. Nearly the same doctrine was preached again in the time of Gregory VII, A.D. 1074, about five hundred years after what we are

now speaking of. This is sufficient to show that the Sabbath was kept until those times of decline which introduced so many errors in faith and practice. Indeed, it is sufficient to show, that wherever the subject has been under discussion, the Sabbath has found its advocates, both in theory and in practice.

According to Lucius, "Pope Urban II., in the eleventh century, dedicated the Sabbath to the Virgin Mary, with a mass." Binius says, "Pope Innocent I., constituted a fast on the Sabbath-day, which seems to be the first constitution of that fast; but dedicating the Sabbath to the Virgin Mary was by Urban II., in the latter part of the eleventh century." About this time we find Eusebius teaching the doctrine that the precept for the observance of the Sabbath is not one of the commandments, because it is not at all times to be observed according to the letter; and Thomas Aquinas, another Romish Ecclesiastic, saying, "that it seems to be inconvenient that the precept for observing the Sabbath should be put among the precepts of the Decalogue, if it do not at all belong to it; that the precept, 'Thou shalt not make a graven image,' and the precept for observing the Sabbath, are ceremonial."

The observance of the first day was not so early in England and in Scotland as in most other parts of the Roman Empire. According to Heylyn, there were Christian societies established in Scotland as early as A. D. 435; and it is supposed that the gospel was preached in England in the first century by St. Paul. For many ages after Christianity was received in those kingdoms, they paid no respect to the first day. Binius, a Catholic writer, in the second volume of his works, gives some account of the bringing into use of the Dominical day [Sunday] in Scotland, as late as A. D. 1203. "This year," he says, "a council was held in Scotland concerning the introduction of the Lord's day, which council was held in 1203, in the time of Pope Innocent III," and he quotes, as his authority, Roger Hoveden, Math. Paris, and Lucius' Eccl. Hist. He says, "By this council it was enacted that it should be holy time from the twelfth hour on Saturday noon until Monday."

Boethius (de Scottis, page 344) says, "In 1203, William, King of Scotland, called a council of the principal of his kingdom, by which it was decreed, that Saturday, from the twelfth hour at noon, should be holy, that they should do no profane work, and this they should observe until Monday."

Binius says that in 1201, Eustachius, Abbot of Flay, came to England, and therein preached from city to city, and from place to place. He prohibited using markets on Dominicinal days; and for this he professed to have a special command from heaven. The history of this singular document, entitled, *A Holy Command of the Dominicinal Day*, the pious Abbot stated to be this: "It came from Heaven to Jerusalem, and was found on St. Simeon's tomb in

#### FIRST-DAY OBSERVANCE INTRODUCED INTO GREAT BRITAIN.

First-day observance in this country being derived from England, mainly, we are interested in learning the origin of the observance in that country. As the great body of the professed church drink from this stream, a knowledge of its fountain head is of much value. The "History of the Sabbath" testifies to the point:

Golgotha. And the Lord commanded this epistle, which for three days and three nights men looked upon, and falling to the earth, prayed for God's mercy. And after the third hour, the patriarch stood up; and Akarius the archbishop stretched out his mitre, and they took the holy epistle of God and found it thus written.

"I, the Lord, who commanded you that ye should observe the Dominical day, and ye have not kept it, and ye have not repented of your sins, as I said by my gospel, heaven and earth shall pass away, but my word shall not pass away: I have caused repentance unto life to be preached unto you, and ye have not believed: I sent pagans against you, who shed your blood, yet ye believed not; and because ye kept not the Dominical day for a few days ye had famine; but I soon gave you plenty, and afterwards ye did worse: I will again, that none from the ninth hour of the Sabbath until the rising of the sun on Monday, do work any thing unless what is good, which if any do, let him amend by repentance; and if ye be not obedient to this command, amen, I say unto you, and I swear unto you by my seat, and throne, and cherubim, who keep my holy seat, because I will not change any thing by another epistle; but I will open the heavens, and for rain I will rain upon you stones, and logs of wood, and hot water by night, and none may be able to prevent, but that I may destroy all wicked men. This I say unto you, ye shall die the death, because of the Dominical holy day and other festivals of my saints which ye have not kept. I will send unto you beasts having the heads of lions, the hair of women, and the tails of camels; and they shall be so hunger-starved that they shall devour your flesh, and ye shall desire to flee to the sepulchres of the dead, and hide you for fear of the beasts; and I will take away the light of the sun from your eyes: and I will send upon you darkness, that without seeing ye may kill one another; and I will take away my face from you, and will not show you mercy; for I will burn the bodies and hearts of all who keep not the Dominical holy day. Hear my voice, lest ye perish in the land because of the Dominical holy day. Now know ye, that ye are safe by the prayers of my most holy mother Mary, and of my holy angels who daily pray for you. I gave you the law from Mount Sinai, which ye have not kept. For you I was born into the world, and my festivals ye have not known; the Dominical day of my resurrec-

tion ye have not kept; I swear to you by my right hand, unless ye keep the Dominical day, and the festivals of my saints, I will send pagans to kill you."

Provided with this new command from heaven, "Eustachius preached in various parts of England against the desecration of the Dominical day, and other festivals, and gave the people absolution upon condition that they hereafter reverence the Dominical day, and the festivals of the saints." And the people vowed to God, that thereafter they would neither buy nor sell any thing but food on Sunday. "Then," says Binius, "the enemy of man, envying the admissions of this holy man, put it into the heart of the king and nobility of England, to command that all who should keep the aforesaid traditions, and chiefly all who had cast down the markets for things vendible upon the Dominical day, should be brought to the king's court to make satisfaction about observing the Dominical day."

Binius relates many miraculous things that occurred on the Sabbath to those that labored after the ninth hour (i. e., after three o'clock in the afternoon) of the seventh day, or Saturday. He says, that upon a certain Sabbath, after the ninth hour, a carpenter, for making a wooden pin, was struck with the palsy; and a woman for knitting on the Sabbath, after the ninth hour, was also struck with the palsy. A man baked bread, and when he broke it to eat, blood came out. Another, grinding corn, blood came in a great stream instead of meal, while the wheel of his mill stood still against a vehement impulse of water. Heated ovens refused to bake bread, if heated after the ninth hour of the Sabbath; and dough, left unbaked, out of respect to Eustachius' new doctrine,

was found on Monday morning well baked without the aid of fire. These ovens were industriously propagated throughout the kingdom; "yet the people," says Binini, "fearing kingly and human power more than divine, returned as a dog to his own vomit, to keep markets of salable things upon the Dominical day."

Mr. Bampfield, in his Enquiry, p. 3, says, "The king and princes of England, in 1203, would not agree to change the Sabbath, and keep the first day, by this authority. This was in the time of King John, against whom the popish clergy had a great pique for not honoring their prelacy, and the monks, by one of whom he was finally poisoned."

Binini (Councils, cent. 13,) states that King John of England, in 1208, in the tenth year of his reign, for not submitting to popish impositions upon his prerogatives, was excommunicated by the Pope, and his kingdom interdicted, which occasioned so much trouble at home and abroad, that it forced him at last to lay down his crown at the feet of Mandulphus, the Pope's agent. After he was thus humbled by that excommunication and interdiction, the king, in the fifteenth year of his reign, by writ, removed the market of the city of Exon from Sunday, on which it was held, to Monday. The market of Lanceston was removed from the first to the fifth day of the week. In the second and third years of Henry III., many other markets were removed from the first to other days of the week, which the king at first would not permit. He also issued a writ which permitted the removal of markets from the first day to other days without special license.

The Parliament of England met on Sundays until the time of Richard II., who adjourned it from that to the following day.

In 1203, according to Boethius, "a council was held in Scotland to inaugurate the king, and concerning the feast of the Sabbath; and there came also a legate from the Pope, with a sword and purple hat, and indulgences and privileges to the young king. It was also there decreed, that Saturday from the twelfth hour at noon, should be holy." The Magdeburgenses say that this Council was about the observance of the Dominical day *newly brought in*, and that they ordained that it should be holy from the twelfth hour of Saturday even till Monday."

Binius says, "A synod was held in Oxford, A. D. 1223, by Stephen, Archbishop of Canterbury, where they determined that the Dominical day be kept with all veneration, and a fast upon the Sabbath."

#### SUNDAY-KEEPING ESTABLISHED BY LAW IN ENGLAND.

According to Bampfield, the first law of England made for the keeping of Sunday, was in the time of Edward VI., about 1470. "Parliament then passed an act, by which Sunday and many holy days, the feasts of all Saints and of holy Innocents, were established as festivals by law. This provided also, that it should be lawful for husbandmen, laborers, fishermen, and all others in harvest, or at any other time of the year when necessity should require, to labor, ride, fish, or do any other kind of work, at their own free will and pleasure, upon any of the said days." By such means as these, the observance of the first day was gradually forced upon the people wherever

they owned allegiance to the Pope as head of the church, and the Sabbath was as gradually brought into contempt and disuse.

The process by which the change was effected appears to be this: By first obtaining an annual celebration of the first day at the close of the Passover, in honor of the resurrection; then a partial observance of the day weekly, it being generally so observed among the heathen; then obtaining for it the support of civil laws, ecclesiastical canons and penalties, and by giving it the title of Lord's day; then by requiring the consecration of the entire day. To abate and ultimately eradicate all respect for the Sabbath, it was first turned into a fast; then it was dedicated to the Virgin Mary, resting upon it was stigmatized as Judaism and heresy, and the preaching of it was called Antichrist; and finally the fourth commandment was pronounced ceremonial, and was effectually abstracted from the Decalogue. And thus, so far as the Roman church was concerned, the point was gained; and thus, probably, she performed her part in the fulfillment of the prophecy of Daniel, [vii, 25.] "He shall 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 cause of the Sabbath must also have been seriously affected by the rise of the Ottoman Empire in the seventh century, and the success of the Mahometans in conquering the eastern division of the church. Mahomet formed the plan of establishing a new religion, or, as he expressed it, of replanting the only true and ancient one professed by Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus, and the prophets; by destroying idolatry, and weeding out the corruptions

which the later Jews and Christians had, as he supposed, introduced. He was equally opposed to both Jews and Christians. To distinguish his disciples from each, he selected as their day of weekly celebration the sixth day, or Friday. And thus, as a writer of the seventeenth century remarks, "they and the Romanists crucified the Sabbath, as the Jews and the Romans did the Lord of the Sabbath, between two thieves, the sixth and the first day of the week." We have thus traced the history of the Sabbath in the Roman church down to the thirteenth century; and we see that through the whole of this period, the seventh day every where retained the honor of being called the Sabbath, and that no other day had ever borne that title; that not until the remarkable letter found on St. Simeon's tomb, had it been asserted by any one, that the observance of the *first day, Lord's day, or Sunday*, was enjoined by the authority of Jesus or his apostles, nor was any example of theirs plead in its favor. Even then it was not pretended that the Scriptures required its observance.

There are some traces of the Sabbath among those Christians who separated from the Catholic communion, or were never embraced in it. The Greek church separated from them about the middle of the eleventh century, and had a larger extent of empire than the Papists. According to *Brerewood's Enquiries*, page 128, this church solemnized Saturday festivals, and forbade as unlawful to fast on any Saturday except in Lent, retaining the custom followed before their separation. The same author states that the Syrian Christians, who composed a numerous body in the East, celebrated divine worship solemnly

on both the Sabbath and First-day, continuing the custom of the Roman church at the time they separated from that community. *Sandy's Travels*, page 173, speak of a Christian empire in Ethiopia that celebrate both Saturday and Sunday, "that they have divers errors and many ancient truths." The Abyssinian Christians, another numerous body are represented as being similar in some respects to the Papists; and Purchas speaks of them as "subject to Peter and Paul, and especially to Christ," and as observing the Saturday Sabbath. They are also mentioned by Brerewood. Moaheim mentions a sect of Christians in the twelfth century, in Lombardy, called Paseninius, charged with circumcising their followers, and keeping the Jewish Sabbath. Mr. Benedict considers the account of their practicing the bloody rite a slander charged on them on account of their keeping the Jewish Sabbath. Binius says that in 1555 there were Christians in Rome who kept the Sabbath, and were therefore called Sabbatarii, and they are represented as differing in other respects from the Romanists. Many of the Armenian Christians are believed to observe the ancient Sabbath. Dr. Buchanan, in his Researches, when speaking of those of them who are settled in the East Indies, says, "Their doctrines are, as far as the author knows, the doctrines of the Bible. Besides this, they maintain the solemn observation of Christian worship throughout our empire on the seventh day."

#### THE WALDENSES KEPT THE SABBATH.

Probably there has not existed a class of Christians, since the times of the apostles, who could more justly claim to be apostolic than the Waldenses, former-

ly a numerous people living in the valleys of Piedmont; whether they retired, says Burnside, on the promulgation of Constantine's laws for the observance of the first day, in the fourth century; and where they remained, according to Scaliger and Brerewood, in the time of Elizabeth of England, in the latter part of the sixteenth century. They adhered firmly to the apostolic faith, and suffered severe persecutions from the Catholics.

Robinson, in his *History of Baptism*, says, "They were called *Sabbati* and *Sabbatii*, so named from the Hebrew word Sabbath, because they kept the Saturday for the Lord's Day." They were also called *Insabbatii*, because they rejected all the festivals, or Sablathas, in the low Latin sense of the word. The account the Papists gave of their sentiments in 1250, was briefly thus: That they declared themselves to be the apostolic successors, and to have apostolic authority; that they held the church of Rome to be the 'whore of Babylon'; that none of the ordinances of the church which have been introduced since Christ's ascension ought to be observed; that baptism is of no advantage to infants, because they cannot actually believe. They reject the sacrament of confirmation, but instead of that their teachers lay their hands upon their disciples. Jones, in his Church History, says, that because they would not observe saints' days, they were falsely supposed to neglect the Sabbath also. Another of their enemies, an Inquisitor of Rome, charged them with despising all the feasts of Christ and his saints. Another, a Commissioner of Charles XII. of France, reported to him, "that he found among them none of the ceremonies, images, or signs of the Romish church, much less

the crimes with which they were charged; on the contrary, they kept the Sabbath-day, observed the ordinance of baptism according to the primitive church, and instructed their children in the articles of the Christian faith and commandments of God.

#### THE SABBATH IN THE REFORMATION.

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

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

Bishop Grammer's Catechism, A. D. 1548, says, "The Jews were commanded in the Old Testament to keep the Sabbath-day, and they observed it every seventh day, called the Sabbath, or Saturday; but we Christian men are not bound to such commandments in Moses' law, and therefore we now keep no more the Sabbath, or Saturday, as the Jews did, but

we observe the Sunday, and some other days, as the magistrates do judge convenient."

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

There was another class among the disputants about the Sabbath, who endeavoured, by strict adherence to the Scriptures, to escape the difficulties and inconsistencies into which others had been led. They contended for the early institution of the Sabbath, for its morality and perpetuity as inferred from its being placed in the Decalogue, and for the seventh day of the week as an essential and necessary part of the commandment. Theophilus Brabourne, in 1628, says: "1. The fourth commandment of the Decalogue is a divius precept, simply and entirely moral, containing nothing legally ceremonial, in whole or in part, and therefore the weekly observation thereof ought to be perpetual, and to continue in full force and virtue to the world's end. 2. The Saturday, or seventh-day of the week, ought to be an everlasting holy-day in the Christian church, and the religious observation of this day obligeth Christians under the Gospel, as it did the Jews before the coming of Christ." 3. The Sunday, or Lord's day, is an ordinary working day; and it is superstition and will-worship to make the same the Sabbath of the fourth

commandment." These opinions were vindicated by Brabourne in two volumes which appeared, one in 1628, and the other in 1632.

To these volumes might be added others, which appeared soon after, and to the results of which, living witnesses have testified from that day to this.

It is believed that there have been Christians in every age who have kept holy the seventh day. During the first three centuries of the Christian Church, the Sabbath seems to have been almost universally kept. It was kept generally in the Eastern Church for six hundred years. And from that time onward to the present, frequent traces of Sabbath-keepers may be found, either in the history of individuals, or in the acts of Councils against those who kept it. These notices extend to the time of the Reformation; and are as frequent as are the references to the first day of the week under the title of Lord's day.

In Germany, according to Ross' "Picture of all Religions," observers of the seventh-day as the Sabbath were common in the sixteenth century, their numbers being such as to lead to organization, and attract attention. A number of these formed a church and emigrated to America in the early settlement of the country. There were Sabbath-keepers in Transylvania about the same time, among whom was Francis David, first chaplain to the Court of Sighisimund, the prince of that kingdom, and afterwards superintendent of all the Transylvanian churches. In France, also, there were Christians of this class, among whom was M. de la Roque, who wrote in defense of the Sabbath, against Bossuet, the Catholic Bishop of

Meaux. But it is difficult to determine to what extent this day was observed in those countries.

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

in the discussion, on both sides of the question. It is evident that the opposers of reform felt the difficulty of defending themselves against the strength of talent and scripture brought to bear in favor of the seventh day. The civil powers attempted to check the progress of all Dissenters by means of the famous *Conventicle Act*. By that law, passed in 1664, it was provided, that if any person, above sixteen years of age, was present at any meeting of worship different from the Church of England, where there were five persons more than the household, for the first offense he should be imprisoned three months, or pay five pounds; for the second, the penalty was doubled; and for the third he should be banished to America, or pay one hundred pounds sterling. This act was renewed in 1669, and, in addition to the former penalties, made the person preaching liable to pay a fine of twenty pounds; and the same penalty was imposed upon any person suffering a meeting to be held in his house. Justices of the Peace were empowered to enter such houses, and seize such persons; and they were fined one hundred pounds if they neglected doing so. These acts were exceedingly harassing to those who observed the Sabbath. Many of their distinguished ministers were taken from their flocks and confined in prison, some of whom sunk under their sufferings. These persecutions not only prevented those who kept the Sabbath, from assembling, but deterred some who embraced their opinions from uniting with them, and discouraged others from investigating the subject. At present the Sabbath is not as extensively observed in England as formerly. But the extent of Sabbath-keeping cannot be determined by the number and magnitude of the

churches, either there or in other countries. For many persons live in the observances of the seventh day and remain members of churches which assemble on the first day; and a still greater number acknowledge its correctness, who conform to the more popular custom of keeping the first day.

At what time the Sabbath became the subject of attention in America we cannot definitely say. The intolerance of the first settlers of New England was unfavorable to the Sabbath. The poor Christian who may have been banished to this country for its observance could find no refuge among the *Pilgrim Fathers*. The laws of Rhode Island were more tolerant than those of some other States, and observers of the Sabbath first made their appearance at Newport in 1671. The cause of the Sabbath has gradually gained ground in this country from that period; but it has found much to oppose its progress, even in Rhode Island. It was in opposition to the general practice of Christians, on which account an odium was put upon it, and those who have kept the Sabbath have been reproached with Judaizing, and classed with Jews. Besides this, they have ever been subjected to great inconvenience in their occupations, especially in cities and towns.

The common English version of the Bible has been found in many instances a sufficient means of converting men to the truth. Churches observing the Sabbath have been formed in Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virginia, South Carolina, Georgia, and in most of the Western States, embracing, as is supposed, a population of forty or fifty thousand.

The foregoing extracts from the "History of the Sabbath," give us a definite understanding of the manner in which the Sabbath was changed. The origin of that institution which has usurped the place of the Lord's Sabbath, we can also clearly see. As we have here been permitted to mark the process by which, step by step, the day of the Sun supplanted the Rest-day of the Lord, let us now retrace the path which we have followed down.

1. First-day observance in this country, was introduced by our ancestors from England.  
 2. The English people received the First-day Sabbath on the authority of a roll which Eustachius, Abbot of Flay, assured them fell from heaven. This was about A. D. 1201. This roll was a forgery of the Romish church.

3. Thus, the Protestants of England obtained their first-day Sabbath from the church of Rome.

4. The church of Rome accomplished the change of the Sabbath by a succession of efforts, each of them claiming but a point, but all of them directed toward the one object. These steps began near the days of the apostles. But this does not stamp as apostolic that which the New Testament has never sanctioned for Paul plainly testifies that the mystery of iniquity, or Romish apostasy, had already begun to work. 2 Thess. ii. This was the power that should speak great words against the Most High, and wear out his saints, and "think to change times and laws." Dan. viii, 25.

5. The Romish church received the first-day festival from the heathen, who very generally observed it in honor of the Sun. This heathen festival the Romanists established in the place of the Lord's

Sabbath. And indeed, all the leading peculiarities of Romanism, are derived from the Pagans.

6. The Pagans derived their Sunday keeping from the Devil. When men apostatized from God, the Devil turned them to the worship of the Sun. And instead of the holy Sabbath which the Creator hul instituted as the memorial of himself, Satan set apart the first day in honor of the Sun. As the Sabbath of the Lord can be traced back to him by whom it was instituted, so this first-day festival, the rival of God's Sabbath, can be traced back to its author, the Devil.

The Sabbath is the great bulwark which God erected against atheism and idolatry. Had men always observed the Sabbath, they never could have forgotten the existence of God; for this institution would always have pointed them back to the time when he created the heaven and the earth. And they never could have been idolaters; for the Sabbath would always have pointed out Him, who, in six days, created heaven and earth, and rested on the seventh. Hence, Satan has ever attempted to destroy the Sabbath of the Lord. To do this, he early led our apostate race to keep the first day in honor of the Sun.

The man of sin, who was to change times and laws, established this heathen festival in the place of the Lord's Sabbath. And thus, on the authority of the Roman Pontiff, the heathen festival of Sunday has usurped the place of the Rest-day of the Lord.

**"THE SEVENTH DAY OF THE WEEK IS THE SABBATH OF THE LORD."**

BY ELDER JAMES WHITE [WITH COMMENTS BY ELDER J. N. ANDREWS &amp; R. F. COTTRELL]

THE  
SEVENTH DAY OF THE WEEK  
*is the*  
**SABBATH OF THE LORD.**

"The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath; therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." Mark ii, 27, 28.

The word *man*, when used in its broadest sense, means all mankind. "Man goeth forth unto his work and to his labor." Ps. civ, 23. "So man lieth down, and riseth not; till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep." Job xiv, 12. Labor and death is the lot of the entire fallen race. In this sense "the Sabbath was made for man"—for the entire race of mankind—Adam and all his posterity.

The Pharisees charged the disciples of our Lord with Sabbath-breaking, for simply plucking the "ears of corn" as they passed through the field on the Sabbath, and were hungry. See Matt. xii, 1. "Behold," said they, "why do they on the Sabbath-day that which is not lawful?" They mistook the real design of the Sabbath, and viewed the institution in a wrong light; as if man was made to serve the Sabbath; that it was a burden to him, and not adapted to his wants. This error our Lord corrects when he says, "The Sabbath was made for man,

and not man for the Sabbath." The Sabbath is perfectly adapted to man's condition. His physical and spiritual wants require rest and a day to devote to the special service of God.

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

Notice the order of the events of the first week of time. First, the creation in six days; second, God rested from the work of creation on the seventh day; and, third, he sanctified and blessed the day in which he had rested. It is evident that God resting on the seventh day did not make it holy; for after he had rested through the entire day, he then "blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because that in it he had rested." To sanctify is "to separate, set apart, or appoint to a holy, sacred, or religious use." In doing this to the seventh day, at the close of the first week of time, God made the Sabbath "for man."

"Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates." Ex. xx, 8-10. This is the great Sabbath law. It is associated with nine other moral precepts, whose perpetuity is universally acknowledged. It lies in the very bosom of the decalogue. We here call attention to several points of interest:—

**1. Sabbath signifies Rest.** Substitute the word **Rest** for **Sabbath**, and the commandment becomes very clear—"Remember the Rest-day to keep it holily. [Certainly some particular day is denoted; for it is *the Rest-day, not a Rest-day.*] Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Rest of the Lord thy God," &c. We have seen the record in Gen. ii, 2, 3, that God rested on the seventh day. That day, and no other day of the week, was his Rest-day. The fourth commandment requires that his Rest-day should be remembered and kept holy; therefore the seventh day, and no other day of the week, is the Rest, or Sabbath of the Lord our God. Those who would observe the first, or either of the other days of the week in which God wrought in the creation, may claim that they keep a rest-day; but it is not *the Rest-day of the fourth commandment.* *The Rest-day of the Lord* is the very day in which the Lord rested. Hence we see that the Sabbath law is based upon the events of the first week of time.

**2. This commandment points back over a period of 2500 years to creation for the reasons, and the only reasons given in the Bible, for the institution of the Sabbath, which are as follows:—(1) "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, (2) and rested the seventh day; (3) wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day, and hallowed it." Verse 11. How natural the conclusion that the existence of the institution dates from, and runs parallel with, the given reasons why the institution should exist. How absurd the idea that the Jews were the only people whose attention should be called to God's work of**

creation and his holy Rest! How much, rather, to be admired is the doctrine of the Lord:—"The Sabbath was made for man."

**3. The fourth commandment declares that "the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day and hallowed it."** When did God bless the seventh-day? At creation. Have we any record that he again hallowed it at a later period? None. Then what did God bless at creation? "The Sabbath-day." The great Law-giver here recognizes the seventh day as the Sabbath, and gives it this name, at the very time he sanctified and blessed it at the close of the first week.

The institution of the Sabbath at creation is not affected by the fact that there is no direct testimony respecting its observance recorded in the book of Genesis. Nor is it very strange when we consider that the history of nearly 2500 years is summed up in its fifty chapters, and that the life of him who was deemed worthy of translation is stated in the sentence: "Enoch walked with God; and he was not; for God took him." No direct mention is made in the book of Genesis of future punishment, the resurrection of the body, the revelation of the Lord in flaming fire, or of the judgment of the great day. Yet it is presumed that no one but a Universalist or a Sadducee would argue from this that these great doctrines were not believed by the Patriarchs. In the absence of direct testimony either way, it is by no means certain that "holy men of old" did not regard the Sabbath. But the fact that they reckoned time by weeks and by sevens of days [Gen. xxix, 27, 28; viii, 10, 12] is no small evidence that they did observe the Sabbath.

The reckoning of time by weeks is not derived from anything in nature. The division of time into months might be suggested by the phases of the moon, and the division into years by the returning seasons; but we look in vain to the natural world for something to which we may refer the origin of the custom of reckoning time by weeks. It can be traced to but one source; viz., the six days' work of creation, and the rest of the seventh.

The brief record of the first 2500 years of time touches only the great events of that period. And because the record of that period does not directly speak of the Sabbath, it is supposed by some that it did not then exist, but that it was only a Jewish institution, having its origin at Mount Sinai. We would respectfully call the attention of such to Ex. xvi, where the Sabbath is mentioned in connection with the giving of the manna.

The Lord said to Moses, "Behold, I will rain bread from heaven for you; and the people shall go out and gather a certain rate every day, that I may prove them, whether they will walk in my law, or no. And it shall come to pass that on the sixth day they shall prepare what they bring in; and it shall be twice as much as they gather daily." Verses 4, 5. On the sixth day the people gathered a double portion of manna. Then said Moses, "This is that which the Lord hath said, To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord; bake that which ye will bake to-day, and seethe that ye will seethe; and that which remaineth over, lay up for you to be kept until the morning. And on the seventh day, Moses said, "Eat that to-day; for to-day is a Sabbath unto the Lord; to-day ye shall not find it in the field.

Six days shall ye gather it; but on the seventh day, which is the Sabbath of the Lord, in it there shall be none. And it came to pass that there went out some of the people on the seventh day for to gather, and they found none. And the Lord said unto Moses, How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws? see, for that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath." Verses 23-29.

All this transpired thirty days before the children of Israel saw Mount Sinai. They departed from Egypt on the fifteenth day of the first month, and came to the wilderness of Sin, where the manna was given, on the fifteenth day of the second month. Ex. xvi. 1. They then journeyed to Rephidim, and then came to the desert of Sinai on the fifteenth day of the third month. Mark this:—The Lord said to Moses thirty days before the children of Israel saw Mount Sinai, where we are sometimes told that the Sabbath was instituted for the Jews alone, at the giving of the law, "How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws? see, for that the Lord [will give you the Sabbath in about a month? No.] hath given you the Sabbath." Thus we see that Ex. xvi. furnishes the best of evidence that the Sabbath had not its origin at Sinai. God and Moses speak of it as of an old institution. The children of Israel had been from the house of bondage, where they could not observe the Sabbath, only thirty days when the Lord called their attention to it, and guarded its observance by a three-fold miracle in giving the manna.

## THE SABBATH A MEMORIAL

A memorial is that which serves to keep in memory. The Passover and Feast of unleavened bread were designed to call to mind the deliverance of the children of Israel from Egyptian bondage, and thus keep in memory their great Deliverer. The Lord's Supper and Baptism were given to remind the church of the death, burial and resurrection of Christ, and thus keep in memory our Lord and Master. The Sabbath was designed to call to mind Jehovah's Rest on the seventh day, after he had created all things in six, and thus keep in memory the living God, the Creator of the heavens and the earth. It is the great safe-guard against Atheism and Idolatry. If men had always kept the Sabbath, they never could have forgotten God; never would have doubted the existence of the Creator, for this institution was designed to point them back to the time when he created the heavens and the earth. And they never would have worshipped other gods, for this institution points out the true God, who created all things in six days, and rested on the seventh.

The Sabbath, then, is a memorial of the living God. The institution is perfectly calculated to call the Creator of all things to mind, and keep him in perpetual remembrance. God wrought six days in the work of creation, and rested on the seventh day. The Sabbath law says, "Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath [Rest] of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." He who observes, and understandingly celebrates Jehovah's Rest-day in its weekly returns, is in a special manner led to contemplate his six days' work of creation. And as he

views the heavens above, and the earth beneath, and surveys the Creator's handy-works, his mind is led upward to the living God. Among all the holy institutions God has given to man, none is more sacred than the Sabbath. It stands in the very front. It is the mighty monument, reared at creation to point our race heavenward to the omnipotent God. It is the chord that binds finite man to the infinite God; the chain that links earth to heaven, and man to his Creator.

But we are told that the Sabbath was instituted for the Jews alone, to commemorate their deliverance from Egypt, and the following passage is cited as proof:—"And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched-out arm; therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath-day." Deut. v. 15.

Give this text all its meaning, and it utterly fails to prove what it is said to prove. Look at the circumstances under which it was spoken. While the children of Israel were slaves in Egypt, they could not keep the Sabbath, and God had stretched out his arm and brought them from the house of bondage where they could observe his Rest-day. Moses here refers to the time when the Lord commanded them to keep the Sabbath, at the giving of the mans, and does not mention one act by which God then made the Sabbath.

But thirty days later, God spake the Sabbath law in the audience of the people, and refers back to creation as the time when, and for the reasons why, the Sabbath was instituted, as follows:— "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." Ex. xx. 11.

But the idea that the Sabbath can commemorate the deliverance of Israel from Egypt will not bear a moment's investigation. That deliverance had two yearly memorials, fit as to their character and time. The passover was a memorial of the destroying angel passing over the houses of Israel when he saw the blood of the lamb stamped upon their door-posts, as he went on his way to destroy the first-born of man and beast in all Egypt. As they prepared and ate the lamb in Egypt, so were they to do annually.

The feast of unleavened bread was a memorial of their sudden departure from Egypt. The destroying angel went on his way, and smote all the first-born in the land of Egypt, from the first-born of Pharaoh unto the first-born of the captive, and there was a great cry in Egypt. Pharaoh rose up in the night and called for Moses and Aaron, and said to them, "Rise up, and get you forth from among my people." "And the Egyptians were urgent upon the people, that they might send them out of the land in haste; for they said, 'We be all dead men.' And the children of Israel "took their dough before it was leavened, their kneading troughs being bound up in their clothes upon their shoulders," and journeyed from Rameses to Succoth, and there "baked unleavened cakes of the dough which they brought forth out of Egypt, for it was not leavened; because they were thrust out of Egypt." The design of the feast of unleavened bread was to keep this circumstance in remembrance; for when their children

should inquire for the reason of this feast, they were to point them back to the time when their fathers were thrust out of Egypt at midnight, taking with them dough which they afterwards baked and ate, unleavened.

We will now take a view of their fitness as to time. The passover lamb was slain in Egypt on the fourteenth day of the month Abib. So was the passover observed: not weekly, nor monthly; but on the same day of the same month, annually. In like manner, as to time, was also the feast of unleavened bread observed. Here, then, are two memorials of the deliverance of Israel, perfectly fitting in their character, and as to their time.

Now we will see if the rest of the holy Sabbath also is a fit memorial of that event. The children of Israel left Egypt in haste. They were even thrust out by night. To say that such a rush could be commemorated by rest, is the very height of folly! Again, that deliverance occurred on the fifteenth day of the first month; and as the fifteenth day of Abib came but once a year, the memorial of that deliverance could not be weekly, but annual.

But the Sabbath is indeed a memorial, and when correctly applied, its fitness to the event to be commemorated will be seen and admired. God *rested* (or ceased to create) after the six days of creation. Man is required to celebrate that rest by ceasing to labor. Rest commemorates rest. God rested on the seventh day of the first week. Man is required to rest the same day of every week.

### PERPETUITY OF THE SABBATH.

We have seen that God laid the foundation of Sabbath by resting on the seventh day, placed the institution upon this foundation at creation when he sanctified his Rest-day and hallowed it, and that the fourth commandment points back to creation for the reasons of the institution; inseparably connecting the Sabbath with Jehovah's Rest on the seventh day.

Pass down through the period of the Prophets, and you will find the greatest blessings promised to those who should keep the Sabbath, and the greatest curses threatened for its desecration. Comes to the period of the First Advent, and there you can not find the least evidence that Christ removed the Sabbath from the foundation on which his Father had placed it. Instead of this, he styles himself "Lord of the Sabbath-day," and declares that it "was made for man." And when citing his examples to the future, as far at least as the destruction of Jerusalem, he says:—"But pray ye that your flight be not in the Winter neither on the Sabbath-day." Matt. xxiv, 20. Our Lord here recognizes the existence of the Sabbath, as much so as the existence of the seasons of the year.

And lest some might get the idea that he had come to destroy his Father's law, or to alter some portion of it, he says:—"Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law." Matt. v, 17, 18.

It is true that the Pharisees accused our Lord of Sabbath-breaking: they also charged him with having a devil; but these charges did not make it

so in either case. We do not give as much credit to the testimony of those accusers and crucifiers of our Lord as some do. Jesus testifies:—"I have kept my Father's commandments." John xv. 10.

All the acts performed by our Saviour on the Sabbath were in accordance with the Sabbath law. We do not say that they were in accordance with the notions of the Pharisees. On one occasion when our Lord was in the synagogue, also the man with the withered hand, "they asked him, saying, Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath-days? that they might accuse him. And he said unto them, What man shall there be among you, that shall have one sheep, and if it fall into a pit on the Sabbath-day, will he not lay hold on it, and lift it out? How much then is a man better than a sheep? Wherefore it is lawful to do well on the Sabbath-days." Matt. xii, 9-13. See also Luke xiv, 3-6.

Lawful, signifies agreeable to law. In these texts the word means, agreeable to the Sabbath law. When the Pharisees accused Christ of Sabbath-breaking, in healing the sick on that day, he referred them to acts of mercy which they would perform even to dumb beasts on that day, thus exposing their hypocrisy. He then declared such well-doing as merciful acts to man or beast on that day, lawful. Now who will take his stand with the Pharisees, and say that Christ's acts of healing on the Sabbath were unlawful? Who will stand with Christ when he declares them lawful? Christians should be on the side with Christ.

But we will trace this point still further. Those who teach a change of the Sabbath, date that change from Christ's resurrection. And those who teach

that there is no Sabbath, date its abrogation from his crucifixion. No one argues any change whatever in regard to the Sabbath prior to the death of Christ. They have to admit that the Sabbath law stood in all its binding force throughout his entire ministry. In fact, the assertion that the Sabbath was abolished at the cross, contains a virtual admission that it was in force up to the cross; for it would be folly to talk of abolishing a law not in force. Then to join the Pharisees and say that Christ transgressed this law when he healed the sick on the Sabbath, is virtually charging him with being a sinner; "for sin is the transgression of the law." 1 John iii, 4. But as "in him was no sin," he did not transgress the law. We have a better sacrifice for sin, than that of a transgressor. Praise his name.

That Christ never taught his followers that any change was to take place in regard to the Sabbath, is evident from the course pursued by the holy women who "followed after, and beheld the sepulchre," and how the body of their Lord was laid. "They returned and prepared spices and ointments, and rested the Sabbath-day according to the commandment," [Luke xxi, 55, 56.] then "upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulchre, bringing the spices which they had prepared," to embalm their Lord. Chap. xxiv, 1.

The Son of God, then, left the Sabbath on the same foundation on which the eternal Father placed it. By healing the sick on that day, and by declaring what was "lawful" to be done on that day, he stripped from the institution the garb of tradition which the blind Jew had thrown around it, and left it standing on its own basis—the fourth commandment.

The writers of the four Gospels, who wrote at different periods after the ascension of Christ, all speak of the Sabbath as then existing, and of the first day of the week as quite another thing. These faithful men, aided by the Holy Ghost to record the most important events that this fallen world ever witnessed, most certainly had down to us the very views they held of those two days at the time they wrote the Gospels. Not one of those four writers give the least intimation that any change had taken place in regard to the Sabbath. If so important an event as the change, or the abrogation of the Sabbath, occurred at our Lord's first advent, they would not have failed to record it.

The same distinction between the Sabbath and the first day of the week is also kept up in the book of Acts. The Sabbath is mentioned as still existing, and the first day of the week is spoken of as another day. "And when the Jews were gone out of the synagogue, the Gentiles besought that these words might be preached to them the next Sabbath. And the next Sabbath-day came almost the whole city together to hear the word of God." Acts xiii, 42, 44. Here are some things worthy of special notice. It was the Gentiles, not the Jews, that invited Paul to preach to them on the Sabbath. If Paul taught the people that the Sabbath was a Jewish institution, and that it had been abolished, it seems really unaccountable that the Gentiles, who were entirely disconnected with the Jewish religion, should request him to preach to them on the Sabbath. It is evident that the reason why they invited Paul to preach to them on the Sabbath, was because they knew he regarded the seventh day as the Sabbath of the Lord.

If that request of the Gentiles had been made to a modern preacher, he might have replied, You need not wait till another Jewish Sabbath. To-morrow is the Lord's day. We will preach to you to-morrow. And if, as Doctors of Divinity teach, it was the design of Heaven that the observance of the first day of the week should rest upon "apostolic example" alone, what an excellent chance the Apostle had to set the example in the city of Antioch, when the people were so very anxious to hear, and were in a good state to receive right impressions. But instead of setting an example favoring the first day of the week, the Apostle entirely overlooked it, and the poor Gentiles had to wait till the Sabbath came round! But was it the Apostle's manner to preach on the Sabbath? "And Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three Sabbath-days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures." Acts xvii, 2. "And he reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks. Chap. xviii, 4. It is sometimes said that the only reason why Paul preached on the Sabbath, was because the Jews were assembled in their synagogues on that day. But this is not true; for we find the Apostle and his companions preaching elsewhere besides in the synagogues, on the Sabbath. "And on the Sabbath we went out of the city by a river side, where prayer was wont to be made; and we sat down, and spake unto the women which resorted thither." Acts xvi, 13.

If that meeting by the river side had been on the first day of the week, then the advocates of the first day might with some degree of propriety talk of apostolic example for observing that day. But there is

no record in the New Testament of a public meeting of the Apostles in the day-time of the first day of the week.

While Paul was a prisoner at Rome, he called the chief of the Jews together and said unto them, "Men and brethren, though I have committed nothing against the people, or customs of our fathers, yet was I delivered prisoner from Jerusalem into the hands of the Romans." Acts xxviii, 17.

If the Apostle had taught the people any change whatever in regard to the Sabbath, his testimony would have been denied by those Jews, and he would have been silenced at once. But instead of this, it is said of him in verses 30, 31, "And Paul dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, no man forbidding him."

The Apostles, then, regarded the Sabbath as resting on the very foundation where Jehovah had placed it at creation, and where his Son Jesus Christ had left it. Whatever weight may be given to their example in regard to the Sabbath, as far as New-Testament writers have spoken, it is all on the side of the seventh day. But God has never left his people to be directed in any important duty with only the example of even inspired men. There is a plain precept for every duty which he requires at our hand. The Sabbath precept is indeed plain. The teachings of our Lord as to the Sabbath, by precept and example, were also plain. And the example of the holy Apostles was in accordance with the testimony of the Father and the Son. Amen.

### OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

**First Objection.**—The Sabbath cannot now be observed as the Jews were required to keep it. The law required them to remain in their houses on that day. “Abide ye every man in his place, let no man go out of his place on the seventh day.” Ex. xvi, 29.

**ANSWER.**—Probably there is no reader of the Holy Scriptures who really believes that God required the whole Jewish nation, for 1600 years, to remain in their houses through the entire Sabbath of twenty-four hours, yet this objection is often repeated. We will here state a few facts:—

1. The text quoted [Ex. xvi, 29] is no part of the great Sabbath law written with the finger of God in the tables of stone. Ex. xx, 8–11.

2. The text had direct reference to the children of Israel going out to gather manna on the Sabbath, after they had been told that on the seventh day none would be found in the field. Ex. xvi, 23–29. And it is decidedly wrong to quote this by-law, given to the Israelites under such circumstances, as the great law of the Sabbath.

3. The law that came from God through Moses required them to go out of their houses on the Sabbath. First, they observed all the offerings on the two lambs, with a meat-offering and a drink-offering. Num. xxviii, 9, 10. Second, they had on the Sabbath a “holy convocation” or religious assembly [Lev. xxiii, 3], therefore they could not remain in their houses on that day.

Now we ask, Did the law which God gave to the

Jews, relative to ordinances, oblige them to break his holy Sabbath? Never! It would make God the veriest tyrant in the universe to cause Sabbath-breakers to be stoned to death, and at the same time give the Jews a system of religion that compelled them to break the Sabbath!!

4. After the children of Israel had passed over Jordan, they went round the city of Jericho with the ark of God seven successive days. One of those days was the Sabbath. It is evident, then, that Ex. xvii, 29, referred only to the case of the manna. The act of going round Jericho on the Sabbath with the ark, was not a violation of the Sabbath law contained in the ark.

**Second Objection.**—The Jews were not allowed to gather sticks to kindle a fire on the Sabbath, and it is not possible to keep the day as strictly as they were required to.

**ANSWER.**—The great universal Sabbath law, the fourth commandment, does not mention gathering sticks, or kindling fires. We have the account [Num. xv, 32–37] that “while the children of Israel were in the wilderness, they found a man that gathered sticks upon the Sabbath-day,” but we are not told for what purpose he gathered them.

The Israelites were commanded to cook on the sixth day the manna to be eaten on the seventh. To have kindled fires on the Sabbath to wash their clothes or cook their manna, would have been doing on the Sabbath the work of one of the six laboring days. They had no need of fires on the Sabbath. They were in a mild climate; their food was rained down from heaven, and their clothes were miraculously preserved. “There was not one feeble person

**among their tribes.**" Pa. cv, 37. For them, under such circumstances, to have kindled a fire on the Sabbath, would have been an open violation of the Sabbath law. We are differently situated. We live in an age when the race has become comparatively feeble, and in the cold season of the year we would kindle a fire on the Sabbath as an act of mercy and necessity, the same as we would water an ox or a horse, or lift a sheep from a pit. Such acts, the "Lord of the Sabbath," pronounced "Lawful." But it is evidently wrong, and a violation of the Sabbath, to neglect to make those necessary preparations for the rest of the holy Sabbath which can be consistently made on the sixth day. The Sabbath law forbids our doing on the seventh day that which can be done on the sixth, and also what is not really an act of mercy and necessity. The Sabbath law did not oblige the Jews to suffer either cold or hunger; neither does it us, for "the law is holy, just, and good."

**Third Objection.**—The law of the Sabbath required that the Sabbath-breaker should be stoned to death; and the same penalty should now be inflicted if the law exists.

**ANSWER.**—We call attention to the following facts:

1. The fourth commandment does not mention stoning the Sabbath-breaker.
2. Temporal death never was the full and final penalty for breaking the law of God. For if it was, then he who murdered, blasphemed, or broke the Sabbath, under the Jewish economy, only had to be stoned to death to satisfy the law. And in the judgment his sin cannot appear against him; for the law was fully satisfied when he suffered temporal death. But the penalty of God's Law was, and still

is, Eternal Death. "Sin is the transgression of the law," and "the wages [penalty] of sin is death."

3. Temporal death was also inflicted upon the Israelites if they transgressed others of the commandments of God beside the fourth. Read Lev. xxiv, 11–16. Here the son of the Israelitish woman "blasphemed the name of the Lord, and cursed," and the Lord said, "Let all the congregation stone him." He broke the third commandment. And it will be seen by comparing Num. xv, 32–36, with Lev. xxiv, 11–16, that he who broke the fourth commandment, and he that broke the third, shared the same fate. Is the third commandment still binding? "Certainly," says the objector, "the commandment, 'Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain,' is binding with all its force." We ask, Should the blasphemer now be stoned to death? The objector will have to acknowledge that although the third commandment is binding in this dispensation, the gospel does not inflict temporal death on the blasphemer. In the Jewish dispensation there was no atonement that could reach his case, therefore he was stoned to death, and removed from Israel. But under the gospel, the stoning blood of Christ can reach his case, and wash away the sin of blasphemy, so mercy now pleads for the transgressor of the third commandment, that he may be spared, that he may repent of the sin of blasphemy and live. This is just the position we would take in regard to the fourth commandment. And we may now see why the Apostle called the gospel covenant the *better covenant*. Mercy now pleads for the Sabbath-breaker, that he may be spared, turn from his sin, find pardon and live. In this respect the ministr-

tion of God's law under the gospel, far exceeds [2 Cor. iii] the ministration of condemnation and death, under the Jewish economy.

**Fourth Objection.**—Deut. v, 2, 3, shows that the Sabbath was made for the Jews alone. “The Lord our God made a covenant with us in Horeb. The Lord made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day.” If the covenant mentioned here is the ten commandments, then the Sabbath was not made for the fathers, but only for the Jews.

**Answer.**—Let us see if this view of the text does not prove too much for the objector. Admitting that the ten commandments are this “covenant,” therefore the duty to keep the Sabbath was not binding on the fathers, does it not prove that the duties enforced by the other nine commandments also were not binding on the fathers? Abraham, then, could disregard the seventh day, because the covenant was not made with the fathers, and Isaac and Jacob could have other gods, bow down to graven images, take the name of the Lord in vain, kill, commit adultery, steal, bear false witness and covet, for the same reason, that the covenant was not made with the fathers!!!

Thirty days before the children of Israel saw Mount Sinai, where the covenant was made, God gave the following rebuke: “How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws? see, for that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath.” This shows that God's commandments and laws, embracing the Sabbath, existed before this covenant was made in Horeb, therefore Deut. v, 2, 3, proves nothing against the Sabbath. The covenant referred to was the mu-

tual agreement between the children of Israel and the Lord, [Ex. xix.] the ten commandments [Ex. xx.] being the moral conditions of the covenant.

**Fifth Objection.**—The word Sabbath is not found in the Bible until after the account of the children of Israel leaving Egypt; so it was not instituted at creation, but at Sinai when the law was given.

**Answer.**—The entire record of about 2500 years from creation is contained in the first fifty-two chapters of the Bible. Only the most important events from creation to the deliverance of Israel from Egypt are noticed, therefore it is no marvel that we do not find the word Sabbath. But what seems really remarkable is that at a later period, even when the Sabbath-breaker was stoned to death, we do not find the word Sabbath in the Sacred Record for more than 500 years.

It is recorded [Gen. ii, 2, 3] that God rested on the seventh day, and that he sanctified and blessed his Rest-day. The fourth commandment points back to what God did on the seventh day, and to the seventh day, as the only reasons why the Sabbath was instituted. But this fact alone, that God and Moses speak of the Sabbath in a familiar style one month before Israel saw Sinai, is perfectly destructive of the idea that it was instituted at the giving of the law.

**Sixth Objection.**—Christ is our example, and he broke the Sabbath.

**Answer.**—We will first notice the Sabbath law. “Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work,” that is, labor necessary to this life. “But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work;” that is, cease from the toil of the six days, and engage in the special service

of God. It may be said of the priests who offered unto the Lord on the Sabbath all the usual daily offerings, and two-lambs extra, that they labored; but what God required them to do on the Sabbath was not what the fourth commandment calls "labor," and "thy work." When Christ was accused of Sabbath-breaking he justified himself on the ground that what he did on the Sabbath was "lawful." His merciful acts on that day cannot with the least propriety be classed with what the Sabbath law calls "labor," and "thy work;" but rather, let those acts be classed with the ministration of the priests in holy things on that day. It is true that Christ declared his disciples "guiltless" in plucking the corn and eating it on the Sabbath. But it is said of them that they "were an hungered;" and where has God forbidden eating on the Sabbath to satisfy hunger? Nowhere. Christ said to the impotent man whom he healed on the Sabbath, [John v, 8.] "Rise, take up thy bed and walk." Two of the Prophets speak against bearing burdens on the Sabbath; but they refer to burdens of merchandise, such as "sheaves, wine, grapes and figs" [Jer. xvii; Neh. xiii.] which were brought into Jerusalem to sell. Now let the objector compare conveying burdens of merchandise to market to sell for worldly gain, with the healed man with his bed praising God, and he may see the difference. One was labor for worldly gain, while the other was for the glory of God. One was a violation of the Sabbath law, but the other was an act of mercy which manifested the power of God.

**Seventh Objection.** The commandment to keep the Sabbath is not given in the New Testament, therefore it is not a Christian duty to keep it.

**Answer.**—It is true that the fourth commandment is not given over a second time in the New Testament; neither is the second, but this falls far short of proving that Christians are released from the duties enjoined by those commandments. If it be said that we have in the New Testament that which is equivalent to the second commandment, then we cite Matt. xxiv, 20; Luke xxiii, 55, 56; Acts xiii, 42, 44; xvi, 13; xvii, 2; xviii, 4, where the Sabbath is mentioned as existing in the gospel.

Not one of the ten commandments is given in the New Testament on a new account, or given as a new law. Christ, Paul, John and James, refer to them as a whole, and have quoted some of them; but they speak of them as the original law of God. And why should a second edition of the Sabbath law be given in the New Testament unless the original [Ex. xx, 8-11.] were abolished? When the objector will prove by plain testimony that the first edition of the fourth commandment has been abolished, then we will either show a second edition from the New Testament, or give up the Sabbath. We teach the Sabbath of the Bible. Let those who assert that it is abolished, produce one plain text to prove their assertion. This is a reasonable request. Will they produce the text? We want none of their infelicities from Rom. xiv; Col. ii, 14-17, which have been a hundred times repeated. They should not be allowed in a case like this. God gave the Sabbath law in the plainest language possible; and no man should be convinced that it has been abolished, unless he can find testimony as positive and plain, coming from as high authority.

Rom. xiv, does not mention the Sabbath. But

the objector infers that the expression "every day alike," [verse 5,] embraces the seventh-day Sabbath. So we might infer from the phrase "him that eateth not," [verse 3,] that a portion of the Christian church in Paul's day lived without eating. Or from the phrase, "gather a certain rate every day," [Ex. xvi, 4,] that God commanded the Israelites to gather manna on the Sabbath, when there was none rained from heaven on that day. The Apostle's subject relates to the Jewish notions of eating, which troubled Gentile believers. And how perfectly natural that Paul is here speaking of feast days. And how very unnatural the inference that in his remarks he is mixing up "meat," "drink," "herbs," and seventh-day Sabbath all together.

Col. ii, speaks of sabbath-days, or sabbaths. Lev. xxiii, shows seven Jewish sabbaths, to be celebrated at their appointed times, "*besides the Sabbaths of the Lord.*" See verses 37, 38. Here the distinction between the two kinds of sabbaths is seen. Paul, in Col. ii, refers to those sabbaths which are classed with "meat," "drink," "new moon" &c, and not to *the Sabbath* which the Law-giver has wisely associated with nine moral precepts.

Behold the display of Divine Power at the giving of the ten commandments. The smoke ascended from Mount Sinai as the smoke of a great furnace; the lightnings flashed, and the thunders of Jehovah rolled down its base. God had descended upon it in awful grandeur to speak in the ears of all the people the ten precepts of his holy law. These precepts were of such a character, of such vast importance, that the great Law-giver did not leave them for man to write; but with his finger engraved them

in tables of stone. Behold them placed in the beautiful ark, overlaid and inlaid with the purest gold. Mark well the victories won by Israel when with the ark of God they crossed Jordan, marched around Jericho, and went forth to battle. See the ark put in the Most Holy of the earthly Sanctuary. It was the center of their religious system, it was the glory of Israel. The fourth commandment was in the ark. And how preposterous the supposition that the Almighty, through his Son Jesus Christ, should abolish his Sabbath, without giving one plain testimony to the fact in the Book of Inspiration. What presumption for men to go on in violation of the fourth commandment, and risk their eternal salvation upon mere inference!! May God help the objector to feel the force of the truth we are here stating.

Now, if the Lord's Sabbath has been abolished, where have the Prophets foretold the event? "Surely the Lord God will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the Prophets." Amos iii, 7. As none of the Prophets have foretold the abolition of the Sabbath, and as none of the Apostles have recorded such an event, we are certain that no such event ever occurred.

**Eighth Objection.**—Paul says that "the ministration of death written and engraven in stones" was abolished; therefore the Sabbath is abolished.

**Answer.**—It will be observed that if this chapter teaches the abolition of the Sabbath, it teaches that all ten of the commandments also are abolished. The Apostle here speaks of two ministrations. He is contrasting the ministration of the law of God under Moses, (which was a ministration of condemnation and death) with the ministration of the same

law under the gospel, (which is the ministration of the Spirit.) It is the ministration of death that is done away, to give place to the more glorious ministration of God's law, called the ministration of the Spirit. A law is one thing, and the ministration of that law is quite another thing.

But we would inquire, Why should all ten of the commandments of God be slain at the cross, even if it was necessary to abolish the fourth? All agree that nine are good, yea, indispensable for the gospel dispensation. Was it an oversight in the Law-giver in placing the Sabbath in the midst of nine moral precepts? And did he have to slay the whole ten in order to get rid of the Sabbath? But if all ten were abolished at the cross, how is it that nine are still binding? "Why," says the objector, "nine of them were re-enacted by Christ for the gospel."

But here is a serious difficulty; the objector has nine of the commandments re-enacted during Christ's ministry, before the ten were abolished at his death!!!

If it be said that the apostles re-enacted nine of the commandments for the gospel after their Lord ascended and the Holy Spirit was poured out upon them, we reply that according to this view there was a space between the abolition of the ten, at the cross, and the re-enactment of the nine; a space when there was no law, consequently, no transgression, and men might blaspheme, murder, &c., and not commit sin!!! But if the objector takes the ground that the nine commandments were re-enacted at the cross at the time when he thinks the ten were abolished, then we shall understand him that Heaven aimed a blow that killed all ten of the commandments, and that the same blow, at the same moment, brought nine of them to

life again!! And all this to get rid of the Sabbath which Christ says was made for man.

We will now illustrate the objector's position by a simple figure. Let his ten fingers and thumbs represent the ten commandments. His fore finger on his right hand represents the Sabbath law. This finger has served him well, but now it is diseased, and past cure, and in his way while attempting to labor. It is against him, contrary to him, and he decides to call a surgeon and have it cut off and taken out of the way. The surgeon comes and pronounces the finger past sure. He tells him, that in all his future life, nine will be sufficient. The surgeon cuts off all of his fingers and thumbs. He then lays aside the diseased finger, and sets himself at work joining on the other nine for the objector's benefit during his future life. What a foolish surgeon! And with what folly does the no-Sabbath system charge the all-wise God. We leave the objector to his reflections.

**NINTH OBJECTION.—**Christ is our law-giver, and he never commanded the observance of the Sabbath. **ANSWER.—**Christ did not come to legislate, but to teach his Father's commandments; to "magnify the law, and make it honorable." "Jesus answered them and said, My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me." John vii, 16. "The word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's which sent me." Chap. xiv, 24. "As my Father hath taught me, I speak these things." Chap. viii, 28; xii, 49, 50.

Says the Apostle, "There is one Law-giver who is able to save, and to destroy." James iv, 12. Who is this law-giver? Let another Apostle answer. "If any man sin, [transgress the law,] we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the right-

eous." 1 John ii, 1. If Christ is our law-giver, who is our advocate? We have none! But God the Father is our Law-giver, and Christ is our Advocate.

**TENTH OBJECTION.—**As the day does not begin at the same time on all parts of the world, east and west, it is not possible for all the inhabitants of the world to keep the same hours for the Sabbath.

**ANSWER.—**The Sabbath law requires the observance of the *seventh day*. God gave the sun to rule the day. At noon, (an easily ascertained point of time,) the twenty-four-hour day is three-fourths past. The seventh day, governed by the sun which is God's great time-keeper, comes in Palestine six or seven hours sooner than in the State of New York. It can be kept there when it arrives, so can it here.

But if the Sabbath law requires that the same identical twenty-four hours should be kept, instead of the *seventh day*, how could the Jews, scattered east and west in the land of Palestine keep it? They would find precisely the same difficulty that the inhabitants of the world around would. Let not the advocates of the first day of the week urge this objection; for their first day is affected by it as much as the seventh. If they assert that God's law requires no particular day, but only a seventh portion of time, we reply, then let them cease talking of commemorating redemption, by keeping the first day, which they say was completed at the resurrection of Christ on the first day of the week. Did Christ rise from the dead on some day of the week, and no day in particular!!! Their own profession binds them to the first day of the week, and destroys their seventh-part-of-time theory.

**ELEVENTH OBJECTION.—**Suppose two should travel around the world, one going east and the other west, when they get round there would be a difference in their reckoning of the days of the week.

**ANSWER.—**This supposition is frequently offered by advocates of the first-day as forming an objection to the seventh alone. They seem to be blind to the fact that if this objection is of any weight, it is as much against the first day as the seventh; and consequently against the Sabbath institution itself; and if against the institution, then against God; for it impeaches the wisdom of the Creator.

**TWELFTH OBJECTION.—**The reckoning of the days of the week may not have been preserved, so that we may not be able to tell when the true seventh day comes.

**ANSWER.** We would first remark that this objection is often urged by those who profess to observe the first day of the week in honor of Christ's resurrection. But are they certain that they observe the true first day of the week? They appear to be. Then they should allow us to be as confident that we observe the true seventh day; for the seventh day is the day before the first.

But God has pointed out the true seventh day, at certain periods of time, in a manner sufficiently plain to satisfy the most sceptical man who has any faith in divine revelation. At the close of the first week, God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because that in it he had rested. Pass down from creation 2500 years to the giving of the manna, [Ex. xvi.] and it will be seen that *there* the God of heaven pointed out the true seventh day. "Six days ye shall gather it; [the manna] but on the seventh

day, which is the Sabbath, there shall be none."

Now, pass down over a period of about 1600 years, to the First Advent. There the Son of God claims to be *Lord of the Sabbath*. It will be admitted that the Lord of the Sabbath knew when the day of the Sabbath came. If the true seventh day had been lost during that 1600 years, he most certainly would have corrected the error. As he corrected no such error, but kept the day then observed as the Sabbath, it is certain that the true numbering of the days of the week had been preserved during that 1600 years.

We would say to those who hold that the Sabbath is merely Jewish, that to admit that the true numbering of the days of the week was lost during that 1600 years, would reflect greatly upon the character of their Jewish Law-giver. It would charge him with giving the Jews the Sabbath law, with the penalty of death for its violation, then leaving them without means to retain the knowledge of the day! From the period of the First Advent the true seventh day has been brought down to us with a certainty. The Jews and some Christians have continued its observance, and all agree as to the day on which it occurs. Mahomet selected the sixth day of the week as a Sabbath for his followers, which corresponds with the sixth day of the week as reckoned by Jews and Christians. And the great body of professed Christians have observed the first day of the week, which corresponds with the first day of the week, as reckoned by Jews and Mahometans.

Now have these three great divisions of the human family all made a mistake so that a day may have been lost or a day gained! If so, there was a time when the Jews to a man made this mistake

in reckoning the week; at the same time, and to a man, Christians made a mistake that precisely corresponded; and to crown the whole, the Mahometans made a mistake in the reckoning of the week that precisely corresponded to that of the Jews and Christians! "Believest thou all this?" If a mistake had been made, is it not absolutely certain that there would be a discrepancy somewhere! As there is no such discrepancy, is it not absolutely certain that no such mistake exists? We can hardly find it in our power to believe that the inhabitants of a single school-district could, at the same point of time, have made a mistake in the days of the week, and to heighten the wonder, every one make precisely the same mistake! But when we extend this simultaneous act to all the districts in a town, thence to all the towns in a county, thence to all the counties in a state, and thence to all the states in the Union, we have carried the matter almost an infinite distance beyond reason or credibility.

But all this is not so remarkable as the supposed mistake of Jews, Christians, Mahometans, and all nations! That these classes, each composed of many millions, not confined to any country, but scattered in every land under heaven, should all make a mistake—should all make the *same mistake*, and should all make *the same mistake at the same time*, and no individual of the number ever discover, or ever suspect, that such a mistake had taken place, is an idea not only absolutely unreasonable and in the highest degree absurd, but it is positively beyond the power of those who would, to credit it.

**WHO IS OUR LAWGIVER?**

**T**HERE is one lawgiver, who is able to save and to destroy. James iv, 12. Who is this "one lawgiver?" is an inquiry of vital importance to the Sabbath question, which we shall endeavor to answer from the Scriptures of truth.

By very many it is assumed, first, that Christ is the Christian's lawgiver: and, second, that he has given, in person and by his inspired Apostles, contained in the New Testament, a perfect code of laws for the dispensation of the gospel; then it is asserted that, as the Sabbath law is not repeated in the New Testament, the seventh-day Sabbath is not binding on Christians. This fabric seems very fair; but it rests upon sand.

Deut. xviii, 15-18, is offered as proof that Christ is our lawgiver; but it may be seen that it teaches the reverse. "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him shall ye hearken. . . . And the Lord said unto me, they have well spoken that which they have spoken. I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him." Deut. xviii, 15, 17, 18. Peter speaking of Christ, says, "For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up un-

"to you, of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you."

Acts iii, 22.

Christ, as a prophet, or teacher, was like Moses. We now inquire, Did Moses legislate? Did he make laws for the people? He did not. Moses received words from the mouth of God and spake them to the people. There is no record that he ever assumed the position of an independent lawgiver; while the inspired record furnishes facts quite the reverse. In the case of the man who gathered sticks on the Sabbath, [Num. xv, 32-36.] Moses did not presume to decide his case, but left that for the great Lawgiver. "And they put him in ward, because it was not declared what should be done unto him. And the Lord said unto Moses, The man shall be surely put to death." See also Num. xxvii, 5-7; Lev. xxiv, 11-14.

That Christ, as a prophet, or teacher, was like Moses, we have the united testimony of Moses, [Deut. xviii, 15.] the Lord, [verse 18.] and Peter, [Acts iii, 22.] therefore he was not an independent lawgiver. Says the eternal Father when speaking of his Son, "He shall speak unto them all that I shall command him." Jesus testifies of himself on this subject, and his testimony agrees with that of his Father. Mark well the following declarations of the Son of God:—

"Jesus answered them, and said, My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me." John vii, 16.

"Then said Jesus unto them, When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I am he, and that I do nothing of myself; but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things." Chap. viii, 28.

"For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak. And I know that his commandment is life everlasting: whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak." Chap. xii, 49, 50.

"He that loveth me not, keepeth not my sayings: and the word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's which sent me." Chap. xiv, 24.

By these testimonies from the Father and Son we learn that it was not the work of our Lord Jesus Christ to legislate; but he received the doctrines which he taught, from the mouth of the Father, and spake them to the people. In this respect, as a prophet, or teacher, he was like Moses. In both cases the Father is the lawgiver.

The transfiguration is referred to as proof that Christ is the lawgiver in the gospel age. It is said that the presence of both Moses and Christ, (the teachers of both dispensations,) and Moses, being placed upon the back-ground by the voice from heaven, saying "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased, hear him," shows that Christ is the lawgiver of the present age, and that his teachings take the place of the law of God. But a very important personage is overlooked by those who take this position. It is the Father. He also appears at the mount of transfiguration. His voice is heard as the highest authority—"This is my beloved Son, "Hear him." However much the glory of Christ excelled that of Moses, it did not eclipse the glory of the Author of the ten commandments. The great God spoke the ten precepts of his holy law in the hearing of all the people. He did not leave them with

Moses to write, and deliver to the people: neither was it the work of the Son of God to deliver them, or any portion of them, over a second time for the men of the present dispensation. Under circumstances of awful grandeur the great Lawgiver spoke the ten commandments directly to the people, and wrote them in the tables of stone.

Christ quotes several of them at different times to enforce the doctrines he taught, but not in the sense of giving a new law. He leaves them upon their original basis, as the law of Jehovah, and affirms their immutability. Matt. v, 17-19. He did not take the position of a lawgiver, but, rather, that of a teacher of the law.

If Christ be our lawgiver, who is our advocate? We have none. But the Apostle says, "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." 1 John ii, 1. Here are three parties introduced: (1) the sinner, or transgressor of the law, [Chap. iii, 4.] (2) the Advocate, and (3) the Father whose law the sinner transgresses. The truth on this subject, then, plainly set before us, is that in the dispensation of the gospel, the Father is the lawgiver, and Jesus Christ is the advocate, or mediator, between the offending sinner and an offended Lawgiver.

Now take the view that Christ is the Christian's lawgiver. Then "sin is the transgression of the law" of Christ. "And if any man sin, we have an advocate with" Jesus Christ! But who is this advocate? The Papist may answer, The Pope, while the Protestant remains silent.

We frequently hear it asserted, "It is very strange that nine of the commandments are given in the

New Testament, and the fourth left out, if the Sabbath is binding on Christians." But is it not indeed strange that professed Bible students should thus expose their ignorance of the subject of which they speak? It is a fact that the first four commandments are not repeated in the New Testament. Does this prove that we should not regard the first, second and third? If it does not prove this, then it does not prove that the fourth is not binding upon Christians. Is it said that an equivalent is given to those commandments not repeated in the New Testament? we invite the attention of the cavalier to New Testament testimony in regard to the Sabbath.

1. The testimony of Christ in regard to the duty of Christians relative to the Sabbath, as late as the destruction of Jerusalem, and probably much later. "But pray ye that your flight be not in the Winter, neither on the Sabbath-day." Matt. xxiv, 20. Again, "The Sabbath was made for man."

2. The testimony of the apostle Luke relative to the holy women. "And they returned and prepared spices and ointments, and rested the Sabbath-day according to the commandment." Luke xxiii, 56. If the Sabbath law was abolished at the crucifixion, several years before this fact was recorded, of what commandment does the historian speak?

3. The testimony of the same Apostle in regard to Paul's manner. "And Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three Sabbath-days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures." Acts xvii, 2. "And he reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks." Chap. xviii, 4.

"And when the Jews were gone out of the synagogue, the Gentiles besought that these words might

be preached to them the next Sabbath." "And the next Sabbath-day came almost the whole city together to hear the word of God." Acts xiii, 42, 44. "And on the Sabbath we went out of the city by a river side where prayer was wont to be made; and we sat down and spake unto the women which resorted thither." Acts xvi, 13.

Turn to the "Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him," &c. and mark the distinction made between the commandments of God, and the testimony [teachings] of Jesus. Rev. xii, 17; xiv, 12. Read the testimony of Jesus in Chap. xxii, 14.

"Blessed are they that do his [the Father's] commandments," &c. Now if Jesus is the Christian's lawgiver, he would have said of men in the Christian's age, Blessed are they that do *my* commandments. True, we should keep all the sayings of Christ; but what does he say of his teachings?

"My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me." If it be said that the Apostles in their writings have given a code of laws for the gospel age, we reply, that this view makes twelve lawgivers, whereas James says, "*There is one lawgiver.*"

See the commission to the eleven: "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Matt. xxviii, 19, 20. Christ taught the Apostles what he had received of the Father, and *this* they were to teach men to observe. Notice also the work of the Holy Spirit, and from whom it proceeds. "But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all

*things to your remembrance, whosoever I have said unto you.*" John xiv, 26. "And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever." Verse 16. The Holy Spirit came from the Father, and one object for which it was sent, was to call to the disciple's memory the words of divine truth which the Son had received of the Father, and had spoken to them. We have, then, the plainest testimony that all revealed truth proceeds from the Father, who is the Christian's lawgiver. W.

---

### 2 CORINTHIANS, CHAPTER III.

This CHAPTER is, by many persons, supposed to teach the abolition of the ten commandments. We think this doctrine is not in any wise countenanced by this portion of scripture. Let us carefully attend to what the Apostle has written in this chapter.

Two ministrations are presented. The one is the ministration of death; the other is the ministration of the Spirit. Verses 6, 7. The word "ministration" signifies service performed by a minister or servant. Hence, two classes of ministers are introduced. The one class is Moses and those who, after him, carried out the work of ministration which he began. The other class of ministers is the apostles, and those who carry forward the work commenced by them. The one class is the ministers of the Old Testament; the other class is the ministers of the New.

The two objects concerning which these ministrations are performed, are denominated "death," and

"the Spirit." Let us now inquire respecting the meaning of these terms as here used. What is meant by the word "death," in the sentence, "the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones?" We answer that it can only signify *the words* engraven upon the tables of stone; as though the sentence read, "the ministration of the ten commandments, written and engraven in stone." The reason why the law of God is called "death," may be gathered from the following scriptures: "the letter killeth;" "by the law is the knowledge of sin;" "the law worketh wrath; for where no law is, there is no transgression;" "the law entered that the offense might abound;" "I was alive without the law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died. And the commandment which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death. For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me. Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good. Was then that which was good made death unto me? God forbid. But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good; that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful."

What is meant by the word "Spirit" as used in this chapter? This word is definitely applied in verse 17: "Now the Lord is that Spirit." Then we understand that the law of God slays the sinner, and is hence denominated "death;" while the Lord is that Spirit who makes alive the sinner thus slain. Hence we understand the Lord from heaven to be the life-giving Spirit here referred to.

With these remarks we introduce verses 7 and 8.

"But if the ministration of death, written and engr-

ven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away; how shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious?"

Those who offer this verse as proof that the ten commandments are abolished, have fallen into that error by confounding the *ministration* of that which was engraven upon stones, with the law itself that was there engraven. Thus making the law of God and the ministration of that law mean the same thing. But the next verse by furnishing a perfect parallel to the sentence in question, exhibits the absurdity of that view. "How shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious?" No one will claim that the *ministration* of the Spirit is the Spirit itself. Let them treat verse 7 with as much consistency as they do verse 8, and they will avoid the error that the ministration of the ten commandments is the ten commandments themselves.

But verse 7 must distinctly mark the meaning of Paul in the use of the word "ministration;" and no one who will carefully read the verse need to confound the ministration with the commandments. Notice the first clause of the verse: "But if the ministration of death written and engraven in stones was glorious," now read the explanatory clause and you may understand what that ministration was, and in what its glory consisted: "so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance." Then the last clause of the verse is a distinct explanation of the first. The ministration or service to which Paul refers, was commenced by Moses when he took the ten com-

mandments from Jehovah and brought them down to the people. That ministration was so "glorious" that the minister by whom it was performed, veiled his face to hide its glory. The full account of this interesting ministration of Moses may be read in Ex. xxxiv, 29-35. Nothing can be plainer, therefore, than the fact that by the word "ministration" in verse 7, Paul means not the ten commandments, but the *service* of Moses the minister, in bringing down from God that law which he had just engraven on the tables of stone.

The ministration commenced by Moses, was carried forward through the entire period of the Old Testament. Moses placed the two tables in the ark, and placed the ark in the Most Holy Place of the typical sanctuary. Ex. xi; Deut. x. He then set apart the Levitical order of priesthood to minister before that ark while the typical sanctuary should continue. Ex. xxviii; xxix; Lev. viii; ix. When Moses brought down that holy law, it was to that sinful, rebellious people, but "condemnation" and "death;" for it could only show their guilt in the sight of God. It showed them exposed to its just penalty, and contained in itself no promise of pardon.

But the ministration committed to the apostles and their successors, was expressly appointed to hold out pardon to the guilty, hope to the desponding, salvation to the lost. It recognizes indeed the great fact that the whole human family are under the just condemnation of the law of God, as its transgressors; [Rom. iii, 19:] but it bases its offer of pardon on the fact that Christ has died for the human family thus situated, [2 Cor. v, 14, 15,] and that all who will avail themselves of this great propitiation may be

forgiven freely. The great subject of this ministration is Christ, the life-giving Spirit, who has died for us. The priesthood which Moses appointed to minister before the ark of the testament in the typical sanctuary, offered no sacrifice that could take away sin; it could only cite penitent sinners forward to the great sacrifice that should be offered for the sins of men. But in the heavenly Sanctuary before the ark of God's testament, stands that great High Priest who has laid down his life for the world, and who is able to save to the uttermost all that come to God through him. Heb. vii; viii; Rev. xi, 19.

If therefore the ministration that could only exhibit man's guilt and just condemnation, was so glorious that Moses, its minister, had to veil the glory of his countenance, how unspeakably glorious must that ministration be, that offers life, pardon and salvation to the guilty, the condemned, the lost!

Moses while performing that ministration had a veil upon his face; but in contrast with this, Paul says, "But we all with open [literally *unveiled*] face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory even as by the Spirit of the Lord."

Let us now inquire respecting the thing abolished in verse 7. That the word *glory*, inserted by the translators in its last clause, was rightly placed there, admits of certain proof. For the expression "*teen katargoumenen*," rendered, "which glory was to be done way," is in the feminine accessive, and hence necessarily refers to "*teen doxan*," "the glory," which immediately precedes it, and is in the same gender and case, and not to "*he diakonia*," "the ministration," which is more remote, and is of

a different case. On this point there can be no dispute. Hence the translators by inserting the word "glory" in the last clause of this verse, have faithfully expressed the sense of the original.

Then Paul in verse 7, asserts the abolition of the glory of the former ministration. Verse 10 tells us that though that ministration was made glorious, yet in this respect it had no glory, by reason of the glory that excelleth. Now verse 11 will explain to us how the glory of the former ministration was done away, and also in what respect that ministration had no glory. It is more correctly rendered by Macknight than by our version. For "dodoxes" must signify, "by glory," and not the adjective, "glorious." As rendered by Macknight it reads: "Besides if that which is abolished, is abolished by glory, much more that which remaineth, remaineth in glory." Two important facts are determined by this verse. 1. That the glory of the former ministration was done away by the surpassing glory of the present ministration, just as the glory of the stars is done away by the glory of the sun arising in his strength. 2. And hence we understand that it had no glory by reason of the glory that excelleth, in the same manner that we understand that the stars have no glory when the sun shines. We will now quote verses 13 and 14. "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; but their minds were blinded; for until this day remaineth the same veil untaken away in the reading of the Old Testament; which veil is done away in Christ." Verse 13 being explanatory of verse 7, we have here a

good opportunity to determine what was abolished. And we shall find its statement on this point the same as that of verse 7. When the veil was upon the face of Moses, "the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished." What then did the veil hide? for the answer to this question determines the whole matter. Were the tables of stone hidden by that veil? No verily. But it was the glory of that ministration, which glory in the estimation of the Jews still abides. The veil upon his face hid that which is abolished; but the tables of stone were neither hidden nor obscured by the veil: he held them in his hands. Ex. xxiv, 29.

The veil with which Moses hid the glory of his face still remains upon literal Israel. They still connect in an inseparable manner the great constitution, the ten commandments, with the glory that enshrouded Moses and that attended the Levitical ministration, not seeing that that ministration has given place to another of far surpassing glory. Israel cannot see that the hidden glory is gone; but as they can still see that holy law, they believe that that glory must abide as well as that law. Others at the present day fall into the opposite error. They can see that that glory is gone, and hence conclude that that holy law has gone also. They do not see that in the heavenly tabernacle, where our great High Priest is ministering for us, the *ark of God* abides as well as it did in the earthly tabernacle. Rev. xi, 19. They think highly indeed of the mercy-seat; but the law of God contained in the ark beneath that mercy-seat, is despised and counted a thing of naught. Ex. xxxv, 17-22; Heb. ix, 4. But the dream that the blood of

Christ blotted out the moral law (the very thing that caused it to be shed) will be found vain and delusive in the day of God.

The act of Moses in covering from the sight of Israel the glory that beamed from his face at the commencement of that ministration represented this great truth; viz., that that ministration with its glory was not to abide; and that when it should be succeeded by a ministration that could give life and pardon to guilty man, Israel would not understand the fact. To this day the veil is upon their heart. Every thing relating to the ministration and the Glory in the reading of the Old Testament, is with them inseparably connected with Moses. This veil is done away in Christ; and when the heart shall turn to the Lord, the veil shall be taken away. Every thing relating to salvation and glory will then be associated with Christ and the better ministration.

In this chapter, therefore, there is no intimation that the law of God is abolished. Those who make it teach such a doctrine, wrest the words of Paul to their own destruction. Even the verses on which such persons lay the greatest stress become a complete absurdity when made to teach the abolition of the ten commandments. For in the first place they have to assume that the word "ministration" instead of signifying service performed by a minister, [as the word invariably signifies, and is expressly so applied in the latter part of verse 7,] signifies the ten commandments. This absurd assumption is the basis of the doctrine. Let us see how consistent a doctrine can be erected upon this basis. It stands thus: If the ten commandments were glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the

face of Moses &c. Any one can see how incongruous such a statement would be. To say that the ministration was glorious so that they could not behold the face of the minister, is a statement perfectly consistent, being indeed the very thing that Paul has affirmed; but to say that the tables of stone were the subjects of this glory, and yet, have that glory only appear upon the face of Moses is reasoning from unlike to unlike. If the tables of stone constituted this glorious ministration, why was not the veil which hid that glory wrapped about the tables of stone, and not placed before the face of the minister? The answer is obvious. It was the service performed by Moses that was thus glorious: and that glory was hidden when Moses veiled his face.

It remains that we quote two or three texts in which Paul directly teaches the perpetuity of the law of God. The word of Paul was not *yea* and *nay*, so that he does not affirm a doctrine in one place and deny it in another.

1. The following is Dr. Bloomfield's translation of 1 Cor. vii, 19. with his note appended:

"Circumcision is of no moment, and uncircumcision of no moment; but keeping the commandments of God is something of consequence;" i. e., as being the test of genuine faith."

2. "Children, obey your parents in the Lord; for this is right. Honor thy father and mother; which is the first commandment with promise; that it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long upon the earth." Eph. vi, 1-3. In this text it is certain that Paul enforces the duty of children to their parents, by the commandment which he quotes, thus acknowledging its supreme authority. Nor can the

argument from this text be erased by saying that he quoted it from a revised code which Christ had established. For it is a fact, that although Christ has quoted this commandment, he has never appended a promise to it; much less has he added the one here quoted by Paul. But it is also a fact that this commandment does stand in the decalogue not only as its first commandment with promise, but with the very promise in question annexed. Hence it is certain that Paul acknowledges the fifth precept of the decalogue as the fountain-head of all authority on this point.

3. "Do we then make void the law through faith?" God forbid: yea, we establish the law." Rom. iii, 31. Now it is an interesting fact that the verb "katargeo" which in 2 Cor. iii, is rendered "done away," "abolished," is the same one that in Rom. iii, 31, is rendered "make void." We have shown that the word is not used in 2 Cor. iii, with reference to the law of God. As a demonstration of the truth on this point, we present these words of Paul to the Romans. In the strongest manner he expresses his abhorrence of the sentiment that the law of God is abolished. Those who make Paul in 2 Cor. iii, after a sentiment which in Rom. iii, he solemnly disavows, should pause and reflect, lest they thus wrest his words to their own destruction.

Ministration signifies not a law, but a service performed by a minister. We present every instance where "diakonia," the word rendered ministration in 2 Cor. iii, occurs, the word in italics being its translation:

Luke x, 40. Martha was cumbered about much serving,  
Acts i, 17. had obtained part of this ministry.  
25. he may take part of this ministry

- VII. 1. neglected in the daily ministrations.  
 4. to the ministry of the word.  
 xi, 29. determined to send relief unto the  
 xii, 25. they had fulfilled their ministry,  
 xx, 24. the ministry, which I have received  
 xxi, 19. among the Gentiles by his ministry.
- Rom. xi, 13. I magnify mine office :
- xii, 7. Or ministry, let us wait on our ministering :  
 xv, 31. that my service which I have  
 I Cor. xii, 5. differences of administrations,  
 xvi, 15. themselves to the ministry of the saints,  
 2 Cor. iii, 7. If the ministration of death  
 8. the ministration of the Spirit  
 9. the ministration of condemnation  
 — the ministration of righteousness  
 iv, 1. seeing we have this ministry,  
 v, 18. the ministry of reconciliation ;  
 vi, 3. that the ministry be not blamed :  
 viii, 4. the fellowship of the ministering to  
 ix, 1. the ministering to the saints,  
 12. For the administration of this service  
 13. the experiment of this ministration  
 xi, 8. wages of them, to do you service. [lit. for min-  
 istering to you.]
- Eph. iv, 12. the work of the ministry,  
 Col. iv, 17. Take heed to the ministry,  
 I Tim. i, 12. putting me into the ministry;  
 2 Tim. iv, 5. make full proof of thy ministry.  
 11. profitable to me for the ministry.  
 Heb. i, 14 sent forth to minister for them  
 Rev. ii, 19. know thy works, and charity, and service,
- 

1. The hand-writing of ordinances is here represented as having been blotted out by the shedding of Christ's blood. If this hand-writing of ordinances is the ten commandments, it follows that the blood of Christ was shed to blot out the prohibition against other gods; the prohibition of graven images; the prohibition of blasphemy; the commandment to haul low the sanctified Rest-day of the Lord; the first commandment with promise; and the prohibitions of murder, adultery, theft, false witness and covetousness! Would the Infinite Law-giver give his own Son to die for such a purpose?

2. But to teach that Christ died to blot out the moral law, is to deny the plainest facts. Because that the law of God which was holy, just and good, condemned the whole human family, and showed that all mankind were sinners, and under its just sentence, God provided a method of redemption by which he could be just, and yet could justify him that believeth in Jesus. This did not consist in sending his Son to destroy the law of the Father; but it consisted in this, that the Son of God should take upon himself human nature, and offer up his own life a ransom for many; thus making the great propitiation through which guilty man may come to God and find pardon for the transgression of his holy law.

Rom. iii, 19-31; Matt. xx, 28; 1 Pet. ii, 24: Isa. liii, 10. Having done this he returned to his Father, and became a great High Priest in the heavenly Sanctuary before the Ark containing his Father's law. Whoever, therefore, repents of his transgression, and comes to God through this "Advocate with the Fa-

### COLOSSIANS II, 14-17.

The second chapter of Colossians teaches that the hand-writing of ordinances has been blotted out and nailed to the cross. Many produce this scripture as proof that the ten commandments are abolished. We inquire, therefore, Is the hand-writing of ordinances the ten commandments? Let the following facts answer:—

ther," may find pardon for all his sins. This view of man's redemption is based on the plainest facts of scripture, and presents the character of God in a light in which mercy and truth meet together, and righteousness and peace kiss each other. Ps. lxxxv, 10, 11. Well might Paul exclaim when presenting this great subject, "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law."

3. But what is it that is abolished in consequence of the hand-writing of ordinances being nailed to the cross? We answer, Meats, drinks, feast-days, (for this is the literal rendering of the word,) new-moons and sabbaths, (plural.) Thus upon the very face of this text is found the most decisive evidence that Paul was not referring to the ten commandments. For it is absurd to believe that Paul should speak of the abolition of the ten commandments, and as the consequence of that abolition, should speak of certain unimportant things as having been done away, which, by the way, were never contained in the decalogue. It may be objected, that the decalogue contained the sabbaths (the word is plural) which are here abolished. We answer, Not so. The decalogue contained but one Sabbath of the Lord. But besides the Sabbath of the Lord, embodied in the fourth commandment, the twenty-third chapter of Leviticus presents four annual sabbaths, associated with the feasts and new moons of the typical system. The Sabbath of the Lord "was made for man," but these sabbaths connected with the new moons, &c., are said to be AGAINST him. Mark ii, 27: Col. ii, 14. It is not

the Sabbath (singular) associated with the precepts of the moral law, that is here referred to, but the sabbaths (plural) associated with their feasts and new moons. Lev. xxiii, 24, 32, 37-39. The one was made at creation, the others in the wilderness of Sinai.

4. But while it is plainly stated in Col. ii, that the hand-writing of ordinances, or shadow of good things to come, is abolished, it is elsewhere in the New Testament plainly stated that the royal law, embodying all the ten commandments, is yet in full force. No one can deny this who will carefully read James iii, 8-12. And the fact is distinctly stated that the violation of one of the commandments makes the transgressor guilty of all. It follows therefore, that the hand-writing of ordinances, and the royal law of ten commandments, are two distinct codes.

The reasons presented demonstrate the fact that the ten commandments are not referred to in Col. ii. But those who seize this scripture to prove the abolition of the decalogue, generally point with triumph to the expression, "holy day," which occurs in verse 16. "If the term, sabbath-days," say they, "refers to the ceremonial sabbaths, [Lev. xxiii, 24-39,] the term, holy day, must certainly designate the Sabbath of the fourth commandment." The fact that some, who have the means of knowing better, have applied this expression to the Sabbath, renders it proper that this perversion should be exposed.

This word is translated from *keortē*, which occurs twenty-seven times in the Greek Testament. Twenty-six times it is rendered, in our version, *feast*, and once, viz., Col. ii, 16, it is rendered *holy day*. Matt. xxvi, 5, they said, Not on the feast day.

**Mark** xxiii, 15. at that *feast* the governor was  
xiv. 2. they said, Not on the *feast* day.  
**Luke** xv, 6. Now at that *feast* he released unto  
ii, 41. at the *feast* of the passover.  
42. after the custom of the *feast*,

**xxii,** 1. the *feast* of unleavened bread,  
xxiii, 17. release one unto them at the *feast*,  
ii, 23. at the passover in the *feast* day,  
ix, 45, at Jerusalem at the *feast*: for they also  
went unto the *feast*.

**v.** 1. there was a *feast* of the Jews:  
**vi.** 4. a *feast* of the tabernacles was  
**vii.** 2. the Jews' *feast* of tabernacles was

8. Go ye up unto this *feast*: I go not up  
yet unto this *feast*;

10. went he also up unto the *feast*,  
11. Jews sought him at the *feast*,  
14. about the midst of the *feast*.

37. that great day of the *feast*,  
xi, 56. he will not come to the *feast*?

xii, 12. were come to the *feast*,  
20. to worship at the *feast*:

xiii, 1. before the *feast* of the passover,  
29. need of against the *feast*;

21. by all means keep this *feast*;

ii, 16. or in respect of an *holy day*,

It is thus rendered by several lexicons:

"Heorte, a *feast* or *festival*, *holiday*." *Liddell and Scott*

*Robinson's Lexicon* gives the same. "A solemn *feast*,  
public *festival*, *holy day*." *Grenfield*

**Col.** ii, 16 is thus rendered in different versions:—

"Let no man, therefore, judge you in meat, or in drink,  
or in respect of a *festival*, or of the new moon, or of  
the sabbath."—*Douay Bible*.

"Wherefore, let no one judge you in food, or in drink,  
or in respect to a *holy day*, or the new moon, or the sab-  
bath."—*Machnight*.

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

"Let no one therefore call you to an account about  
meat and drink, or with respect to a *festival*, or a new  
moon, or sabbaths."—*Walkefield*.

It is therefore manifest that the Apostle used this  
word to designate the Jewish feasts—the abolition  
of which he hero teaches. The sabbaths and the  
feast days of the Jewish ritual expired with that  
ritual; but the Sabbath of the Lord, hallowed before  
the fall, abides, with the other precepts of the moral  
law, throughout duration.

J. N. A.

#### The two *Tills* of Matt. v, 18.

THE perpetuity of every jot and tittle of God's law  
is supported by the use of two *tills*. 1. *Till hearen  
and earth pass*. This is quite strong, and carries the  
mind to a period of time which is still in the future.  
On this, I think there can be no disagreement. 2.  
*Till all be fulfilled*. Here is the disputed ground.  
We are told that this reaches only to the crucifixion.  
That Christ fulfilled all the law, and nailed it to his  
cross. But I should think it most natural to reserve  
the stronger expression for the final one. Let us read  
the text to suit the views of our opponents. According-  
ing to their interpretation, the Lord wished to assure  
his hearers that no part of the law would pass, till  
the crucifixion, which was nearly three years and a  
half in the future. Then it would stand like this.  
After cautioning the people not to think he had come  
to destroy the law or the prophets, he would say,  
For verily I say unto you, *Till hearen and earth  
pass*, one jot or one little shall in no wise pass from  
the law, till three years and a half.

It has often been shown, that to fulfill a law is to

obey it, not to abolish it. But leaving this point, I remark that the subject of discourse includes something besides the law, namely, the prophets. He says, " Think not that I am come to destroy the law or *the prophets*: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill." He came in fulfillment of the prophecies. But have all the prophecies been fulfilled? Nay verily. Heaven and earth must not only pass, but new heavens and earth must be created before *all* is fulfilled. The prophet Isaiah says, "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." This must be fulfilled before even the fourth commandment of the law can pass.

I conclude, then, that the second *till* is the stronger of the two. The first reaches to the passing of the present heavens and earth; the second, not only to the making of the new heavens and earth, but to the unlimited extent of their duration. R. F. C.

#### CONSISTENCY.

Consistency is a rare jewel. Truth is consistent with itself; but error has as many heads and horns as the Apocalyptic dragon. This is well illustrated by the following veritable creed.

Article 1. I believe that the Sabbath has been changed to the first day of the week.

Article 2. I believe that Sunday is the true seventh day, and that it should be observed.

**Article 3.** I believe that we cannot tell what day the seventh day is.

**Article 4.** I believe that we are only required to keep one seventh part of time.

**Article 5.** I believe that the commandment to keep the seventh day is abolished.

**Article 6.** I believe that those who keep the Sabbath of the fourth commandment will fall from grace.

**Article 7.** I believe that every one should be fully persuaded in their own mind, whether to keep the Sabbath or not.

Reader, the foregoing is not a mere fancy sketch; I have met with a large number, who in the course of a single conversation, have avowed their faith in all the articles of the above creed. There are plenty of such *all* around you. Is this your creed? If so, permit me to point you to a better one. It consists of ten articles, and may be found in Ex. xx. Allow me to recommend this creed to you as infallible, it having been given by Jehovah in person, and written with his own finger on stone. You will find in its fourth article all the errors of the foregoing creed pointed out. What men have said of certain creeds of their own construction, may be said of this in truth: "If a man keep not this, no doubt he shall perish everlastingly."

J. N. A.

---

#### THOUGHTS ON THE SABBATH.

Those who observe the Sabbath of the Bible, are able to present as its foundation, a divine institution.

"God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it." Gen. ii, 3. To sanctify is "to separate, set apart, or appoint to a holy, sacred, or religious use." Web-

ster. It was by this act of the great Creator, that the Sabbath was made for man. Ex. xx, 11; Mark ii, 27. As God has never taken this blessing from the seventh day, and has never given to secular purposes the day which he here "set apart to a holy use," the original institution still exists. As he has never sanctified another day as a weekly Sabbath, the Sabbath of the Lord is the *only* Sabbathic institution. Ex. xx, 10.

As God made the Sabbath in paradise, when the morning stars sang together and all the sons of God shouted for joy, it follows that it is not Jewish, not carnal ordinance, not a yoke of bondage, but a sacred institution made for the well-being of the human family, while yet upright. The great Creator rested first on the seventh day and was refreshed. Ex. xxxi, 17. The Son of God who kept his Father's commandments, followed this example, [John xv, 10; Ex. xx, 8—11.] and thus, also, did the entire church so far as inspiration gives us the facts.

After giving the institution of the Sabbath, the book of Genesis, in its brief record of 2370 years, does not again mention it. This has been urged as ample proof that those holy men, who during this period were perfect and walked with God in the observance of his commandments, statutes and laws, [Gen. v, 24; vi, 9; xxvi, 5,] all lived in open profanation of that day which God had blessed and set apart to a holy use. But the book of Genesis also omits any distinct reference to the doctrine of future punishment, the resurrection of the body, the revelation of the Lord in flaming fire, and the judgment

of the great day. Does this silence prove that the patriarchs did not believe these great doctrines? Does it make them any the less sacred?

But the Sabbath is not mentioned from Moses to David, a period of five hundred years during which it was enforced by the penalty of death. Does this prove that it was not observed during this period? The Jubilee occupied a very prominent place in the typical system, yet in the whole Bible a single instance of its observance is not recorded. What is still more remarkable, there is not on record a single instance of the observance of the great day of atonement, notwithstanding the work in the holiest on that day was the most important service connected with the worldly Sanctuary. And yet the observance of the other and less important festivals of the seventh month, which are so intimately connected with the day of atonement, the one preceding it by ten days, the other following it in five, is repeatedly and particularly recorded. Ezra iii, 1—6; Neh. viii, 2, 9—12, 14—18; 1 Kings viii, 2, 65; 2 Chron. v, 3; vii, 8, 9; John vii, 2—14, 37. It would be sophistry to say that this silence respecting the day of atonement, when there were so many instances for it to be mentioned, proves that that day was never observed; and yet it is actually a better argument than the similar one urged against the Sabbath from the book of Genesis.

The reckoning of time by weeks was established in Gen. i; ii. This period of time is marked only by the recurrence of the sanctified Rest-day of the Creator. That the patriarchs reckoned time by weeks and

by sevens of days, is evident from several texts. Gen. xxix, 27; 28; viii, 10; 12; vii, 4, 10; L, 10; Job ii, 13. That the reckoning of the week was rightly kept appears evident from the fact that in Ex. xvi, Moses on the *sixth* day declares that "tomorrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord." Verses 22, 23.

But if the opponents of the Sabbath, claim that a knowledge of the true seventh day was lost in the patriarchal age, we will now show that before God gave the ten commandments he pointed out the true seventh day in a manner which could not be mistaken. First. By a direct miracle, God caused the fall of a certain quantity of manna each day of the week to the sixth day when there was a double quantity. Ex. xvi, 4, 5, 29. Second. On the seventh day, which Moses calls the Sabbath, there was none. Verses 25-27. Third. That which was gathered on the sixth day kept good over the seventh, whereas it would corrupt in the same length of time on other days. Compare verses 23, 24, with verses 19, 20. This three-fold weekly miracle continued the space of forty years. Verse 35; Joshua v, 12. The fact is settled, then, beyond all controversy that the Sabbath of the Lord which was made in Paradise, was here directly pointed out by God himself. And to this important testimony we add the declaration of Nehemiah, ix, 13, 14, that God made known to Israel his holy Sabbath.

No one pretends that the true seventh day was lost by the Jewish church after this. And it is certain that as late as our Lord's crucifixion they ob-

served the true seventh day. They rested upon the day enjoined in the fourth commandment; namely, the day which the Lord rested upon and hallowed at creation. Luke xxiii, 55, 56; Ex. xx, 8-11; Gen. ii, 3.

Since the record of inspiration closed, the Jews and the Christians, each scattered in every land under heaven, have carefully kept the reckoning of the week. If a mistake in this reckoning had been made, a discrepancy would at once manifest this. For it is certain that every Jew and every Christian under heaven could not at the same time make the same mistake. The fact that there is no such discrepancy is decisive testimony that such mistake has not been made. Consequently we have the true seventh day from creation.

When God gave his law in person, in the hearing of the people, by the fourth precept of that law he solemnly enforced the observance of the holy Sabbath. Ex. xx, 8-11. In explicit language the great Law-giver states the reason why he made the Sabbath and the time when this act was performed. "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore si. e., for this reason] the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it." This is the reason why God made the Sabbath. It is the same reason that is stated in Gen. ii, 3.

The act by which God made the Sabbath is hero stated with distinctness. It was his act of blessing and hallowing his Rest-day. The time when this act was performed is here given as in Gen. ii, 2, 3; name-

ly, the close of the creation week. And it is worthy of note that in thus giving the fourth commandment, God calls the seventh day the Sabbath at the time when he thus placed his blessing upon it. This most effectually shuts the months of those who deny the institution of the Sabbath at creation.

The great design of the Sabbath was that there might be a standing memorial of God's act of creation. Its observance would have saved the world from atheism and idolatry; for it has ever pointed back to God, the great first cause; and it has ever pointed out the true God, the great Creator, in distinction from "the gods that have not made the heavens and the earth."

We have now considered three important facts in the history of the Sabbath. First, its institution at creation; second, the fact that the true seventh day was pointed out to Israel; and third, the grand law of the Sabbath, the fourth commandment. As we proceed in this investigation we notice three different Sabbaths. First, the weekly Sabbath of the Lord, the seventh day. Ex. xx, 10. Second, the annual sabbaths of the Jews, the first, tenth, fifteenth and twenty-third days of the seventh month. Lev. xxiii, 24, 27-32, 39. And third, the septennial sabbath of the land, the seventh year. Lev. xxv, 1-7. The Sabbath of the Lord was instituted at creation, and at Sinai was embodied in the royal law, every precept of which according to James ii, 8-12, is still binding upon us. But the sabbaths of the Jews and the sabbath of the land were instituted in the wilderness, and embodied in the hand-writing of ordinances with the feasts, new-moons and ceremonies of the

Jewish church. That hand-writing of ordinances, which was a shadow of good things to come, was nailed to the cross by our Lord, thus taking all these festivals out of the way.

The most precious blessings are promised to those who observe the Sabbath of the Lord. Isa. Ivi; Iviii, 13, 14. And it is worthy of notice that this prophecy pertains to a period of time when the salvation of the Lord is near to be revealed. Heb. ix. 28; Isa. xlvi. 17. The blessing is promised to the sons of the stranger; the Gentiles, [Ex. xii, 48, 49; Isa. xiv, 1; Eph. ii, 12.] as well as to the people of Israel. If they will keep the Sabbath holy unto the Lord while dispersed in the four quarters of the earth, God will bring them again to his holy mountain. The promises here made by the prophet shall be verified when the outcasts of Israel and the sons of the stranger shall come from the east and from the west and shall sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of God. Matt. viii, 11.

Notice the distinction between the Sabbath of the Lord and the sabbaths of the Jews as presented in the prophets. Of the perpetuity of the former let us judge after reading Isa. Ixvi, 22, 23, where we are informed of its observance in the New Earth. But the Lord assures us by the prophet that the latter shall cease. Hos. ii, 11. The fulfillment of this prophecy may be read in Col. ii, 14-17. The weekly Sabbath is styled "the Sabbath of the Lord." "my Sabbath," &c. Ex. xx, 10; Isa. Ivi, 4; Eze. xx, 12-24; xxi, 8, 26. The annual and septennial sabbaths are styled "her sabbaths" and "your sabbaths."

Hos. ii, 11; Lev. xxiii, 32; xxxi, 34, 35, 43; 2 Chron. xxxvi, 21; Lam. i, 7.

Though the Scriptures nowhere teach or authorize the change of the Sabbath, yet they plainly point out the power that should do this. Let the reader compare Dan. vii, 25, with the history of the Papal power, and carefully mark its acts of changing and mutilating the divine constitution, the ten commandments.

We have seen the grand law of the Sabbath embodied in the decalogue. We come now to the New Testament. That our Lord did not destroy that law, or lessen our obligation to obey it, he clearly teaches in Matt. v, 17-19. And we may with the utmost safety affirm "that the apostles did not disturb what their Lord left untouched." Rom. iii. 31; James ii, 8-12. We say therefore that the New Testament teaches the perpetuity of God's law, and *for that reason does not re-enact it.*

Our Lord came to "magnify the law and make it honorable." Isa. xlii, 21. He kept his Father's commandments, and solemnly enjoined obedience to them, pointedly rebuking those who made them void that they might keep the traditions of the elders. John xv, 10; Matt. ix, 16-19; xv, 3-9. "The Sabbath was made for man," says the Saviour, "and not man for the Sabbath." Mark ii, 27. If the Sabbath was made for man, then it belongs alike to Jews and Christians, and to all our race. The statement carries the mind back to the creation of our race and evinces that the Sabbath was made in immediate connection with that event. On the one hand our Lord

rebukes the Pharisaic observance of the Sabbath; on the other, he rebukes with equal force that class of modern teachers who affirm that the Sabbath of the Lord which Infiniti Wisdom made for man before the fall, was one of those sabbaths which were *against him, contrary to him and taken out of the way at the death of Christ.* Col. ii.

The fact that those, who had been with Jesus during his ministry, "rested the Sabbath-day according to the commandment," after his crucifixion, and resumed labor on the first day of the week [Luke xxiii, 55, 56; xiv, 1] shows clearly that they knew nothing of the supposed change of the Sabbath. Yet Jesus testifies that all things which he had heard of his Father he had made known unto them. John xv, 15. The fact that God has never *sanctified* the first day of the week shows plainly that it is not sacred time, and not a divinely instituted Sabbath. The fact that God has never required us to rest on that day shows that its observance in the place of the Sabbath of the Lord, is a clear instance of making void the commandments of God to keep the traditions of men. Mark vii, 6-13; Prov. xxx, 6.

That sanctified time exists in the gospel dispensation, or in other words, that there is a day which belongs to God, is clear from Rev. i, 10. That "the Lord's day," is the Sabbath-day is plain from Isa. Ixviii, 13. As the Sabbath was made for man, we find it under all dispensations, and in every part of the Bible. Those therefore who profane the Sabbath, sin against God and wound their own souls.

J. N. A.

**"THE PERPETUITY OF THE ROYAL LAW, OR, THE TEN COMMANDMENTS  
NOT ABOLISHED." — BY ELDER J. N. ANDREWS**

**AN EARLY 1850'S TRACT.**

mandment stands in the midst of nine mortal precepts which Jehovah, after uttering with his own voice, wrote with his own finger on the tables of stone. These nine commandments stand around the Sabbath of the Lord, an impregnable bulwark, which all the enemies of that sacred institution in vain attempt to destroy. It is evident that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment cannot be set aside unless the Decalogue can be destroyed. Hence the enemies of the Sabbath institution have brought their heaviest artillery to bear upon the law of the Most High: calculating that when they had destroyed this strong hold, the Sabbath would fall an easy prey to their attack. We invite attention then to the law and to the testimony. By the unerring word of God we wish to settle this question; and this we believe can be done in the most satisfactory manner.

That the hand-writing of ordinances containing the feasts, new moons and the associated annual sabbaths of the Jews, has been abolished and taken out of the way, we do not doubt. This was not the moral law of God; but was merely the shadow of good things to come. But the royal law in which are the ten commandments of God is the subject of this investigation, and it is the perpetuity and immutability of this law that we affirm. If the law of God has been destroyed, this act must have been accomplished by one of three things; viz., 1. By the teachings of the Lord Jesus;

**THE PERPETUITY  
OR THE  
THE ROYAL LAW,  
OR, THE  
TEN COMMANDMENTS NOT ABOLISHED.**

It is painful to witness the various inconsistent and self-contradictory positions resorted to by those who reject the Sabbath of the Lord. But of all the positions adopted, none seem so dangerous, or fraught with such alarming consequences, as the view that the law of God, by which the Sabbath is enforced, has been abolished, and that we are, therefore, under no obligation to remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy. The question whether God has abolished his law or not, is, indeed, the main point at issue in the Sabbath controversy; for when it is shown that that law still exists, and that its perpetuity is clearly taught in the New Testament, the question is most conclusively settled, that the Sabbath is binding on us, and upon all men.

The Sabbath of the Lord is embodied in the fourth commandment of the Decalogue. This com-

or 2. By his death; or 3. By the apostles. We believe that all will agree to this statement.

1. Was the law of God abolished by the teachings of our Lord Jesus Christ? Let us listen to his own words.

"Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily, I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do, and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." Matt. v, 17-19.

Our Lord here testifies that he did not come to destroy the law or the prophets. Then it is a fact that he did not destroy either. But what is it to destroy the law? We answer, that it can only signify to abolish, or to annul it. And thus Campbell renders the word:—"Think not that I am come to subvert the law." Whiting renders it:—"Think not that I am come to annul the law." It is therefore certain that our Lord did not come to subvert, annul, or destroy, the law of God. Hence it follows that the law of God was not annulled or abrogated by him. He adds, that instead of coming to destroy, he came to fulfill. If this was the object of the Saviour's mission, did he not by this set do away the law, set

it aside, and relieve us from obligation to keep its precepts? Let us see. As Campbell renders the text, it reads, "I am not come to subvert, but to ratify." That is, I am not come to abolish the law, but to confirm, and render still more sacred, its just demands. If that was the object of our Lord's mission, it follows that he did not lessen our obligation to obey the law of his Father.

But let us return to the word "fulfill," Christ came to fulfill the law, hence he did fulfill it. What is it to fulfill a law? Let the apostle James answer: "If ye fulfill the royal law according to the scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, ye do well; but if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors." James ii, 8, 9. It is evident that James here places the transgression of the law in contrast with, or in opposition to, the fulfillment of the law; therefore it follows that the fulfillment of the law is the reverse of its violation. In other words, it is its observance. To fulfill the law in the manner that James enjoins, is to render complete obedience to its divine requirements.

But it may be contended that to fulfill the law in the sense of our Lord's declaration, accomplishes its purpose, and takes it out of the way. To show the absurdity of this view, let us take another of Christ's sayings which is of the same character, precisely. When John refused to baptize the Saviour, Jesus

said, "Suffer it to be so now; for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness." Matt. iii, 15. Did the Saviour, by fulfilling all righteousness, weaken, take out of the way, or destroy all righteousness? Certainly not. No one will claim that he lessened our obligation to fulfill all righteousness also.

But how did Christ fulfill the law of his Father? There is but one way in which this could be accomplished, and that is to answer its just demands. What were these demands? We answer: first, the law of God demands perfect obedience. The justice of this, none will deny. But when the law has been violated, it demands the death of the transgressor. Sin is the transgression of the law." 1 John iii, 4. "The wages of sin is death." Rom. vi, 23. "The soul that sinneth it shall die." Eze. xviii, 4. When Christ came to fulfill the law, he came to do this, not for himself, but in behalf of our race. He came to fulfill the law as the Messiah: an office or character which no other being ever possessed. He came to undertake for fallen men, and in a certain sense placed himself in their situation. What then was the relation which our race sustained to the law of God? We answer: all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God. The law of God stopped every mouth, and showed all men sinners in the sight of God. Rom. iii.

Then, when the Saviour took upon himself our nature, and came to fulfill the law of his Father, that

law not only demanded perfect obedience; but it also justly demanded the death of our race; for all were its transgressors. The work of the Saviour, therefore, in fulfilling the law of his Father, was of a twofold character. He must first render perfect obedience to all its precepts, and then offer up his own life as a ransom for guilty man. To fulfill the law as the Messiah, Christ must perform all this. Did he thus do? He kept his Father's commandments. John xv, 10. In him there was no transgression of the law. 1 John iii, 4, 5. He was the Lamb of God without spot, [1 Pet. i, 19.] in whom the Father was well pleased. Matt. iii, 17. And this was not all; he took upon himself the sin of the world. Isa. lxx, 8; John i, 29. He bore our sin in his own body upon the tree. 1 Pet. ii, 24. He died the just for the unjust, giving his own life a ransom for many. 1 Pet. iii, 18; Matt. xx, 28. God can now be just, and yet justify him that believeth in Jesus. Rom. iii, 25, 26. Thus Christ lived our example and died our sacrifice.

Did this work of the Messiah, in rendering perfect obedience to all the law of God, and then offering up himself as a ransom for its transgressors, weaken that law, or lessen our obligation to obey it? Never. It shows in the most striking light, its perpetuity and immutability. The law of God condemned our race. Jehovah would open the way for man's salvation. He could not destroy his own mor-

al law; but he could give his own beloved and only Son to die for its transgressors. This evinces the estimate which the Father placed upon his own law. Isaiah predicted that Christ should magnify the law, and make it honorable. Isa. xlii, 21. The record of Christ's life and death shows the fulfillment of this prediction.

But Christ adds a solemn affirmation. "For verily, I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot, or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. What is a jot and a tittle? A jot is the smallest letter of the Hebrew alphabet. A tittle is a small point by which some of those letters are distinguished from others. Our Lord therefore solemnly affirms that the minutest point shall not pass from the law till all be fulfilled. Then it is certain that a part will not be destroyed and the remainder of the law be left in force. Consequently as long as a part of the *original* precepts continue, all of them abide without one jot or tittle being destroyed. Further than this, Christ has plainly marked the point of time before which no part of the law of God shall pass. "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." Has heaven and earth passed away? Let those answer who teach the abolition of the law of God. When will heaven and earth pass? Let the beloved disciple answer: "And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat

on it, from whose face the earth and heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them." If the fulfillment of the law of God destroys it, that destruction cannot take place before the final conflagration of the heavens and the earth. 2. Pet. iii. Prior to that time the minutest point shall not be destroyed. If therefore one jot or one tittle shall on no account pass from the law, till all be fulfilled; and if the point before which this shall not be accomplished is the passing of the heavens and the earth, it follows that the Lord Jesus not only designed that the law should be fulfilled by himself for the brief period of his sojourn on earth, but also, that the righteousness of the law should be fulfilled in his church; or as Whiting renders Rom. viii, 4, "that the *precept* of the law might be fulfilled by us, who walk not according to the flesh, but according to the Spirit." The next verse establishes this view.

"Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do, and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." Let us carefully consider this verse. The word "whosoever" takes up all persons through all coming time. The word "therefore" shows that this verse is the conclusion drawn from the premises which the Saviour had just laid down, which were these: 1. "Think not that I am come to destroy

the law." 2. "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled." As not a single particle of this holy law was to be destroyed, it was fitting that the Lord Jesus should speak with distinctness respecting its observance and its violation. This is what he now utters.

"Shall break one of these least commandments?" Then we have here the opposite of fulfilling the law; viz. the breaking of the commandments. We may also learn that the law in verses 17, 18, means the commandments.

"One of these least." Christ had said that not one jot or one tittle should pass from the law till all be fulfilled, so that there could be no excuse for those who teach that a part of the law has been destroyed, and that the remainder is yet in force. But Christ did not leave the subject thus. He now tells what shall be the fate of those who violate the least of the commandments. Those who select nine of them, and omit one of the commandments, which they think not worth their notice, are the very persons that Christ here reproves.

"And shall teach men so." Who are they that teach men to violate the commandments? Those who teach men that they have all been abolished so far beyond the crime that Christ has here noted. The Saviour spoke of those who should violate the least one. Some at the present day teach men that

all of them are abolished. This is the grand and effectual method to teach men to violate the law of God. But those who make any one of the commandments void, that they may keep in its place a tradition of the elders, are doing exactly the work that our Lord has here solemnly warned men against.

"He shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven;" or, as Campbell renders, "shall be of no esteem in the reign of heaven." This is, doubtless, the idea of the Saviour. This is the penalty of a violation of the least precept of the law of God. But how much more fearful must it be to break the commandments and to teach men that they have all been abolished!

"But whosoever shall do and teach them." Here we may learn what it is to fulfill the law of God. It is to do and to teach the commandments. "The same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." Or, as rendered by Campbell, "shall be highly esteemed in the reign of heaven." Here is the ample commission; here is the vast reward of those who teach and keep the commandments of God. Surely, no man ever enjoined obedience to the law of God with such force as did our Lord Jesus Christ. Let us hear his words again:—

"But he answered and said unto them, Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God by your tradition? For God commanded saying, Honor thy father and mother; and, He that curseth father

or mother, let him die the death. But ye say, Who soever shall say to his father or his mother, It is a gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me; and honor not his father or his mother, he shall be free. Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition." Matt. xv, 3-6.

These words disclose to us the sacredness of God's commandments in the mind of the Lord Jesus. He did not deny that he violated the traditions of the Jews, but he boldly arraigned their traditions, and condemned them as worthless in the sight of God. And not only as worthless, but also as sinful, inasmuch as they contradict and make void the commandments of God. The tradition in question was very venerable with the Jews, inasmuch as they supposed that it had been handed down from Moses; thus being equally ancient and sacred in their estimation with the commandment which it so effectually made void. On such authority the Jews thought themselves fully justified in an open violation of the fifth commandment. Nay, they even supposed that the observance of this tradition was more acceptable to God than the observance of the commandment itself.

At the present time we have a case precisely parallel. The professed church of this day hold a tradition which they say came from Christ and his apostles. On the authority of this tradition they

suppose that they are amply justified in violating the fourth commandment. Like the Jews they even think that they are serving God more acceptably by keeping a tradition that contradicts his commandment, than they would be in keeping the commandment itself. The rebuke which Christ applied to the Jews, falls with all its force upon the heads of such: "Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition. Ye hypocrites, well did Esaias prophesy of you, saying, This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoreth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me. But in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." Verses 6-9.

"And behold, one came and said unto him, Good Master, what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life? And he said unto him, Why calllest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is God; but if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments. He saith unto him, Which? Jesus said, Thou shalt do no murder, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Honor thy father and thy mother: and, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Matt. xix, 16-19.

Let us carefully consider these words of our Lord. The young man came to him with the most important question that he could ask. The Saviour re-

turned to him the most simple, direct and appropriate answer. Jesus said to him, "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." The young man, who, it is evident from the narrative, thought himself already observing them all, asked Jesus, "Which?" In answer, Jesus quotes from the second table, five of the ten commandments; and to this list he adds the second of the two great commandments on which hang all the rest. It is often said by our opponents that if we would name only those precepts which our Lord enjoined upon the young man, they would be happy to agree with us; that Christ did not name the fourth commandment, which is not therefore obligatory upon us. We reply that the fourth commandment is no more omitted than is the first, the second, the third, and the tenth, and also the first of the two great commandments on which hang all the rest! Does any one believe that the young man might violate all these and yet enter life eternal?

There can be but one of two positions taken with respect to this text: 1. When the Saviour said, "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments," he named all the commandments which the young man should keep; or 2. When the Saviour said, "Keep the commandments," he enjoined obedience to them all, and then in answer to the young man's inquiry, pointed him to the precepts of the sec-

ond table, namely, his duty to his fellow-men, as that in which he was most deficient.

If the first position be correct, it follows that the young man could enter into life in the character of an idolater, a blasphemer, a Sabbath-breaker, and with an heart full of covetousness; for our Lord omitted to specify any of those precepts which define our duty to God, and he also omitted the tenth commandment: "Thou shalt not covet." This position needs no refutation, and we turn from it to the other.

That the second position is correct, namely, that Christ enjoined obedience to all the commandments, and then in answer to the young man's request, pointed him to the second table, and to the second of the two great commandments—his duty to his fellow-man—the following facts plainly evince:—

1. This is exactly what is recorded in the text. 2. The view that Christ specified all the precepts which the young man should observe has been shown to be false and unreasonable. 3. When the young man insisted that he was blameless in regard to his duty to his fellow men, our Lord applied a test to him which undeceived him at once. 4. When Christ said, "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments," he spoke in harmony with his own words in Matt. v, 17-19. There he had declared that not even the minutest particle should pass from the commandments till the heavens and the earth

should flee away, and that whatsoever shold violate one of the least of them, shold be of no esteem in the reign of heaven. Then, our Lord being allowed to explain his own words, it follows that to keep the commandments, is to observe every one of them; and that the willful violator of the least one, shall have no part in the kingdom of God. And the apostle James, as we shall hereafter see, establishes in the clearest manner the fact that whoever understandingly violates one of the ten commandments is guilty of breaking them all. What will those say to this who affirm that the young man could keep the commandments, and yet violate every one that defines our duty to God the great Law-giver?

"Then one of them which was a lawyer, asked him a question, tempting him, and saying, Master, which is the great commandment in the law? Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." Matt. xxii, 35-40.

Many mistake the question here proposed to Jesus, and read this text as though the lawyer had said, Master what is the great commandment which you will give to take the place of the ten commandments? The question was not asked on that wise;

and those who present this scripture as evidence that Christ gave a new code to take the place of his Father's law, labor under a serious mistake. The question related to the original law of God; what is the great commandment in that?

Christ answered this question by pointing out the two great immutable first principles on which hang all the law and the prophets: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind." This is the sum of our duty to God: on this hang all those precepts which define our duty to him. "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." On this precept hang all those commandments which contain our duty to our fellow men. This is the sum of them, and out of this they all grow.

The Saviour did not abolish the law of his Father by these two precepts; for they were as ancient as any part of the law of God. Deut. vi, 5; Lev. xix, 18. He did not then hang the law and the precepts upon them; for they had ever hung there; nor did Christ teach that on these two precepts all the law and the precepts were abolished. Nay, he showed by this the immutable basis on which the law of Jehovah rests. These two great precepts are, as all admit, unabolished. And the law of God which hangs upon them is like them, immutable, and, must abide as long as they endure.

"And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass

than one title of the law to fail." Luke xvi, 17. Then it is easier for heaven and earth to pass than for one of the commandments of God. How hard then must it be for every precept of the law of God to be abolished and a new law of God enacted to take its place. Easier could heaven and earth be destroyed and new heavens and a new earth be created! Should God abolish his great constitution and establish another in its stead, that event would not only be marked as distinctly as the establishment of the original constitution by himself at Sinai, in person, but it would present even a more extraordinary spectacle than for heaven and earth to flee from the presence of him that sits upon the throne!

It is an important fact that our Lord in presenting portions of the law of God, always brought them forward as such; that is, he appealed to the law of his Father, as a living authority, and quoted from it, not as giving authority to what he quoted, but presenting those quotations as the authority for his statements. This fact evinces that Christ was not engaged in re-enacting a part of his Father's law, as some are ready to affirm. Our Lord did not act in the capacity of legislator with his Father's law. He was its expositor; and as such he laid open its length and breadth and spirituality. Even the golden rule, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them," our Saviour bases

on the fact that this was the law and the prophets. Matt. vii, 12. So that this most admirable saying was not given to take the place of the law of God and the prophets, but as a precious truth resting on their authority.

The scriptures which we have quoted must suffice to show the nature of Christ's teachings respecting the law of God. It shows that by his teaching he did not abolish the commandments of God. It also evinces that Christ not only taught that it was easier for heaven and earth to pass than for one tithe of the law to fail, but that he also taught, *until* heaven and earth pass a single tithe shall not pass from the law of God; and that whosoever would enter into everlasting life must keep the commandments of God, even the least of them. We will now consider the second question.

**2. Was the law of God abolished by the death of Christ?**

That we may answer this question in a proper manner, let us carefully consider Rom. iii. We will first examine that portion of the chapter which presents the human family as condemned by the law of God and speechless in his sight.

"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. Therefore by the deeds

of the law, there shall no flesh be justified in his sight; for by the law is the knowledge of sin. Rom. iii, 19, 20.

This portion of scripture presents in a striking light the state of mankind without a Saviour. The Apostle had been presenting in the previous verses numerous quotations from the Old Testament, showing the fearful state of fallen man. The verses which we have quoted, present us with the holy standard of rectitude by which the unrighteousness of men is made manifest, and their fearful crimes left without excuse. "What things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law." How many, then, are under the law! The remainder of the verse determines this with certainty. "That every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God." This fact then is plainly stated: that the whole human family are addressed by the law of God; that all of its members without distinction of rank, or order, share in one general condemnation; and that condemnation is so just, that every mouth is shut, and all the world stands speechless before the bar of God. The twenty-third verse explains the cause of this: "For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God."

The law of God can justify no flesh in his sight. But why cannot the law justify sinful man? Because by the law is the knowledge of sin. Man is

guilty of transgression, and the law of God discovers and manifests this fact. The law is God's great rule of right; and as such, it shows every departure from rectitude and holiness. We have thus seen the sad state of fallen men. Let us now consider what God does for their salvation. If he takes back his law, one of two things must be true:—

1. He takes back an *unjust* law, and thus acknowledges that he was the cause of man's condemnation. But this is false; for we have seen that the law is so just that none can plead against its righteous sentence. Hence if God has taken back his law we shall be compelled to adopt the second position; namely,

2. He takes back a just law, thus denying his own moral character as expressed in that law, and overthrowing his own moral government. God cannot lie; and it is manifestly absurd to teach that God has abolished the principles of his own moral government. Hence we conclude that God did not, and could not overthrow his own moral law, in order to save its transgressors.

We inquire again, What did the great Law-giver do in order to save men? If he did not take back his law, and abolish his own moral government, what did he do? It would seem that but one other thing could be done; namely, to put the law in force upon its transgressors. In other words, to execute its

penalty upon the human race. If this were done, all must be destroyed; for all were its transgressors; and the wages of sin is death. Let us now with gratitude and adoration look at the wondrous plan which God has devised for man's redemption: a plan in which justice and mercy meet together, and righteousness and peace kiss each other: [Ps. lxxxv, 8-13:] a system of redemption by which God can be just and yet can justify him that believeth in Jesus. It is set forth by Paul in the following language:—

“Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness; that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.” Rom. iii, 24-26.

In these words the great plan of redemption is set forth; but oh! what has it not cost! Man had broken the law of Jehovah and fallen under its awful and yet just condemnation. God could not reverse his holy law without destroying the moral government of the universe; but he so loved our race that he gave his only Son to die for perishing man. John iii, 14-17. He sent his Son to be the propitiation or offering for the sins of men. 1 John iv,

10. Christ came to take the curse of the law upon himself, and to offer his life as a ransom for its transgressors. Gal. iii, 13; 1 Tim. ii, 5, 6.

The Father had two objects of the deepest affection: his own perfect law, and his only Son. He would save man who had revolted from allegiance to that law, and openly set it at naught. To do this, the great Law-giver must sacrifice either his perfect law, or his beloved and only Son. The first he could not do; for God cannot deny himself; and he hath in all ages ever magnified his word above all his name; [Ps. cxxxviii, 2;] but he could give his only Son to die, that revolted man might have a sacrifice to bring to God that could avail to take away sin.

Jesus was delivered for our offenses, and raised again for our justification. He ascended into the true Tabernacle in heaven, the new covenant Sanctuary, where the ark of God stands, containing his holy law—as a Great High Priest, to plead the merits of his blood in behalf of penitent men. Heb. ix; Rev. xi, 19. As the ancient high priest entered the typical tabernacle to sprinkle the ark of the testament with blood, even thus was it necessary that our great High Priest should act. The earthly high priest did not sprinkle the blood of sin-offering upon the ark that he might blot out the ten commandments which it contained, or that he might

lessen the obligation of men to observe them. On the contrary, he entered the tabernacle with blood, because man had violated that holy law, and could not be pardoned without the offering of blood to take away sin.

Even thus did our Lord. By his own blood he entered the true Tabernacle, and presented himself before the Father on our account. In fulfilling the ministration of the true holy places, the two dearest objects of affection to the great Law-giver are again united. But how wondrous the union! Jesus, who has died for the transgressors of that sacred law, now stands as a great High Priest before the ark containing the law of God, pleading in behalf of men, the merits of his own sacrificial death. The Law-giver can accept the offering, and man, who has broken the law of God, can be pardoned.

It is evident, therefore, that the death of our Saviour sustains the same relation to the law of God, that the death of the victim in the ancient typical system sustained to that law. The design of either was not that man should have liberty to violate the law of God, but that man who had violated that law, might have the offer of pardon. The typical system could not, indeed, take away sin; but it pointed out the fact that without the shedding of blood there could be no remission of sins, and clearly

ly pointed forward to the great Sacrifice which should be offered for the sin of the world.

If it were possible for God to give men an adequate idea of the immutability of his sacred law, he has given it in the spectacle of his Son dying upon the cross for us. Those who think that the death of the Son of God abolished the very law which made that death necessary, are requested to consider the following points:—

1. If the law that condemned man could have been abolished, it would not have been necessary that the blood of Christ should be shed, that atonement might be made for its transgressors. But the Son of God died because the law which man had broken could not be taken back. 2. But if the death of Christ destroyed the law which condemned men, then they are delivered from its just sentence, whether they repent or not: in other words, Universalism is true. 3. But this view makes the law of God, and the Son of God, both fall beneath the same blow, and without honoring God, or leading man to repentance: it destroys both the cherished objects of Jehovah's affection: subjecting the Son of God to a shameful death, and overturning the moral government of the great Law-giver. 4. But the conditional offer of pardon made to man through the gospel of the Son of God, plainly evinces that the law of God still exists, and that men can only be delivered

from it, on condition of repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.

Hence the law of the Most High is not abolished by the death of the Son of God. His death indeed permits mercy to enter and offer pardon to guilty man; but the law of God abides all the while; and when the work of mercy is accomplished, our great High Priest will leave the tabernacle of God, no more to plead for sinful men, and the penalty of the law, the second death, will be awarded to its transgressors.

It is clearly established, therefore, that the death of the Son of God did not blot out the law of God the Father. On the contrary, his death is that fact which, above all others, testifies to its immutability. But we cannot employ so strong language on this point as that which Paul has used in summing up this very argument. He says: "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yes, we establish the law." Rom. iii, 31. Having shown conclusively that the law of God was neither abolished by the teaching nor by the death of the Son of God, we will now examine the third question:—

3. Was the law of God abolished by the apostles? It may seem to some individuals that this last question is propounded in a singular form. But if the law of God was not abolished by the teaching nor yet by the death of the Son of God, it fol-

lows that if abolished at all, it must have been by the apostles. Many have asserted that the apostles re-enacted nine of the ten commandments, to take the place of the ten which ceased at Christ's death: but as we have shown that the Son of God offered himself up as the great Propitiation for the transgression of the law, and not as the means of its abolition, it follows that the ten commandments must be abolished by the apostles, before they could re-enact one of them. It is no more absurd to speak of the apostles abolishing the ten commandments than it is to speak of their re-enacting nine of them. And if it seem absurd to any individual to believe that the apostles abolished the ten commandments and then re-enacted nine of them, we ask them to consider whether the doctrine which represents the infinite Law-giver as doing this very thing, is not a still greater absurdity?

If the apostles abolished the law of God, who gave them authority? The Son of God indeed commanded them to teach all things whatsoever he had commanded them; but we have seen, in all his teaching to them, that he maintained the immutability of his Father's law, so that from their divine Master they never received such a commission. If they taught as he taught, we shall find them setting forth the perpetuity and immutability of the law of God. And that they did speak the same doctrine

which their Lord had taught them, we have divine assurance. John xiv, 20. If the apostles abolished the law, they must have done it in the very epistles in which, according to some of our opponents, they re-enacted nine of the commandments for the gospel dispensation. These epistles were written not far from A. D. 60; so that if the law of God was abolished by the apostles, it was abolished about thirty years after the crucifixion.

We have presented the question in this form, that attention might be called to the folly of those teachers who represent the apostles as legislating upon the law of God. A single testimony from the apostle James ought to make those blush for shame who represent the apostles as abolishing the law of God, or as re-enacting a part of it, to take the place of the original code. "There is one Law-giver who is able to save and to destroy." James iv, 12. From the preceding verse it is certain that James thus designates Him who gave the law in person at the first; that law, the authority of which he so distinctly recognizes in chapter i, 25; ii, 8-12. According to James, there is but one such being in the universe; namely, the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God. It is therefore the height of absurdity to represent the apostles as amending, abolishing, or re-enacting the law of God. The twelve apostles never yet attempted to dethrone the

one Law-giver, or to usurp any of his prerogatives.

We shall now present the plain and explicit testimony of the apostles relative to the perpetuity of the law of God, and thus allow them to speak on this subject in their own behalf. The limits of this tract will not admit an extended notice of objections. For this part of the subject the reader is referred to larger works published at *Review Office*. The word of God is not yea and nay; therefore the plain statements of our Lord and his apostles must forever vindicate the immutability of the divine law.

"If ye fulfill the royal law according to the scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, ye do well: but if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors. For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. For he that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law. So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty." James ii, 8-12.

Several important facts are clearly set forth in this quotation. That the royal law to which James refers is the original law, is certain from the fact that he quotes it from the Scripture, the Old Testament. This is further evident from the fact that James in citing two of the ten commandments, presents them

on their original authority; that is, as spoken by God in person. Or if we adopt the marginal reading of verse 11, he expressly acknowledges the authority of that law which contains the sixth and seventh commandments. That law is not abolished: on the contrary, it still stands ready to convince of sin every one who dares to violate it. Verse 9. While those who fulfill it, instead of falling from grace, are said to do well.

"For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." This verse furnishes a perfect parallel to Matt. v. 19. "Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and teach men so, he shall be castled the least in the kingdom of heaven," ["shall be in no esteem in the reign of heaven." Campbell's Translation.] Each of these texts distinctly announce

the doctrine that the willful violation of a single precept of the law of God, is sufficient to exclude the transgressor from the kingdom of God. But it may be denied that this language of James refers to the ten commandments. Those who attempt to maintain such a position would do well to read the next verse, in which he brings the whole force of his argument to bear upon the ten commandments. He that violates one of these precepts is guilty of all. Let those consider this who lightly esteem the fourth commandment. Even were it the least precept in the

Decalogue, those who willfully violate it, and teach men so, shall be of no esteem in the reign of heaven.

This "all" here referred to, means one of two things. 1. It means only those precepts which James has quoted, which makes "the whole law" to consist of the three precepts here cited, and leaves us at liberty to violate the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, eighth, ninth and tenth commandments, and also the first of the two great precepts from which James quotes—and those who think this sensible ground must occupy it at their own peril; or 2. The "all" to which James refers, includes the ten precepts from which he quotes; and he that violates one, has trespassed them all. By this law of liberty, or royal law, men will be judged in the day of God.

"Honor thy father and mother, (which is the first commandment with promise,) that it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth." Eph. vi. 2, 3. There is an important argument contained in this text, which has been generally overlooked. Paul would enforce upon children their duty to their parents. For this purpose he appeals to the fifth commandment for authority. Some have attempted to evade this argument by saying that Paul quoted this precept from the new law which Christ established, by quoting a part of the commandments to take the place of the original code as

given by the voice of God at Sinai. To answer the assertion from which this inference is drawn, we present the fact that there is no intimation in the New Testament that Christ, by quoting a part of the ten commandments, established a new law in the place of the original code. But those who insist on the idea that Christ by quoting a part of the ten commandments established a new code, would do well to ask themselves the question, why Christ never quoted one of the first four commandments. This imaginary new law is no great improvement on the original, when the fact appears that the first four commandments are not quoted by Christ, and consequently on his advocates' own showing, do not form a part of this law.

But there is direct evidence that Paul quotes from the Decalogue. By a word of comment inserted in the parenthesis, he identifies this as the first commandment with promise. It is a fact that though Christ has quoted this commandment, he has never appended any promise to it whatever; much less has he added the one here quoted by Paul. It is also a fact that this commandment does stand in the Decalogue, not only as its first commandment with promise, but with the very promise in question annexed! Hence it is a fact that Paul quotes from the Decalogue, and this too for the purpose of enforcing one of the clearest duties in the word of God: thus distinctly acknowledging the fifth

commandment as the fountain head of all authority on this subject. With this important fact before us, we can judge whether those do not wrest the words of Paul, who represent him as teaching the abolition of all the ten commandments. Paul tells the Ephesians that he had kept back nothing that was profitable to them. Acts. xx, 20. If therefore the moral law had been abolished, Paul must have revealed this important fact to them. What then must the Ephesians have thought when Paul wrote them four years later, appealing to the Decalogue, and not to his apostolic authority, to enforce the duty of children to their parents? Paul was never guilty of such inconsistency; it belongs only to those who teach the abolition of the ten commandments.

"Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yes, we establish the law." Rom. iii, 31. This text has been already quoted as concluding Paul's argument on redemption through the death of Christ. We quote it again to give Paul an opportunity to speak explicitly on the question before us. No one of the apostles has treated so largely upon the doctrine of justification by faith as the apostle Paul. But lest any should conclude from the earnest manner in which he insists upon this doctrine that he believed the law of God abolished, he asks this very question that he may answer it in the most definite manner. His answer should put to the blush those teachers who represent Paul as

setting aside, or teaching the abolition of the moral law. "God forbid," says the Apostle, "yes, we establish the law." Nor can an exception be taken to the form of the Apostle's question; for the same word that is rendered "make void" in this verse, is in 2 Cor. iii, 13; Eph. ii, 15; 2 Tim. i, 10, rendered "abolished." Paul has therefore rendered a definite answer to the question under consideration. And the strong language he uses in denying that he taught the abolition of that sacred law, should forever silence those who lay such an accusation against him.

Paul well understood the fact, that, though men now have the offer of pardon through the blood of Christ, the time will arrive when this work of mercy will be finished, and the just penalty of the law of God be inflicted upon all who are then in their sins. Knowing the terror of the Lord, he labored night and day to persuade men to become reconciled unto God, and thus escape the penalty of the law—the second death. Paul affirms that he did not teach the abolition of the law. Who dare affirm that he did? Yea, said he, we establish the law. Who dare deny it?

"What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, 'Thou shalt not covet.' Rom. vii, 7. The conversion of Paul took place some years after the crucifixion of Christ; so that what he says relative to the law of God has direct bearing upon this subject.

The experience of the Apostle, as here narrated by himself, is a proper example of sound conversion to God. The law of God struck the first blow in Paul's religious experience; and thus it is with all others. The tenth commandment of the decalogue convinced Paul that he was a sinner; and he testifies that had it not been for that precept of the law, he had not known himself a sinner: thus exemplifying his own statement that "by the law is the knowledge of sin," showing that the law is God's great standard of right.

The remainder of chapter vii exhibits the powerful struggle of Paul, as an awakened sinner, to keep the law of God. He is constrained to call the law holy, and the commandment holy and just and good; and he testifies that it is by the commandment that sin becomes exceeding sinful. He adds that the law is spiritual, but that he is carnal, striking manner the power of the carnal mind. Notwithstanding he approved the holiness and excellence of the law of God, he was carnal, sold under sin, and unable to render acceptable obedience to its precepts. The other law of sin in his members baffled all his efforts to keep the law of God. In despair he flies to Christ for refuge and help. He obtains forgiveness of his past transgression of the law of God, through faith in the great propitiation for sin; he is delivered from the carnal mind—that other law of sin in the members—and grace is given

him, that he may hereafter render acceptable obedience to the law of God. Rom. viii, 1-4.

The guilt of transgression, and the just condemnation of the law, are now gone; Paul is under grace; the law of God is now placed in his heart; and he manifests his love to God by keeping his commandments. The first part of Romans viii, presents this happy change. This narration of the Apostle's experience strikingly illustrates the words of David: "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul." Several important truths are clearly brought to view by this portion of scripture.

1. The law of God has not been abolished; for here is direct testimony that it existed in its full strength, several years after the crucifixion.

2. The law here referred to is the decalogue; for Paul quotes its tenth precept. Nor can this be evaded by saying that Paul quoted from the law of Christ. (1.) The words purport to come from "the law," an expression never used with reference to the words of Christ. (2.) The words in verse 7 are a *literal quotation* from the decalogue; but as Christ never used the expression, they are not a quotation from his words. (3.) There is direct proof in verses 22 and 25 that Paul quotes from "the law of God."

3. The law of God is his standard of holy principles; if these were abolished, sin could not be known.

4. The law of God began Paul's experience. If that were abolished, there could be no Christian experience, for there could be no knowledge of sin,

the Apostle being judge. Rom. iii, 20; iv, 15; vii, 7.  
5. "Sin by the commandment" becomes "exceeding sinful." Verse 18. The reference to the law and the commandment, in this chapter cannot be mistaken. No one will attempt to deny that Paul refers directly to the decalogue, using the tenth commandment as a representative of all the rest. The sin forbidden by each of the commandments becomes "exceeding sinful" when viewed in their holy light. How great, then, must be the guilt of those who openly desecrate the fourth commandment, after they have once been enlightened respecting it by the word of God!

Finally, the great design of the gospel is to deliver fallen man from the just condemnation of the law of God, and to place him where he may fulfill the righteousness of the law.

"The Law reveals and makes us know  
What duties to our God we owe;  
But 'tis the Gospel must reveal  
Where lies our strength to do his will."

"Whoever committeth sin Transgresseth also the law; for sin is the transgression of the law. And ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin. Whosoever abideth in him sinneth not: whosoever sinneth hath not seen him, neither known him. Little children, let no man deceive you; he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as he is righteous. He that committeth sin is of the devil." 1 John iii, 4-8.

This text is worthy of careful examination. I. 2  
us notice some important truths here presented.

1. The New Testament definition of sin is here given: "Sin is the transgression of the law." Every sinner is a transgressor of the law of God.

2. John establishes the fact that this is the original law of God, by the statement that Christ was "manifested to take away our sins;" (transgressions of the law); thus showing that it was a law which existed, and was transgressed prior to the first advent.

3. In Christ there was no sin; no transgression of the law. This ought forever to silence those who affirm that Christ broke the fourth commandment. 4. "Ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins." Those who think that Christ was manifested to take away the law of his Father, would do well to consider this verse. He was manifested to take away (not the law of God, but) sin, the transgression of the law. If Christ was manifested to take away the law, it follows that to remove our transgression, he took away the law which we had transgressed: thus showing that he had a greater dislike to the law of his Father than he had to sin, the transgression of that law! But how did Christ take away sins? "He appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." Heb. ix, 26. He shed his own blood as a propitiation for the sins of men; thus honoring the law of God, and opening to guilty man a way of escape.

5. "Whosoever abideth in him sinneth not;" that is "transgression of the law." Many affirm that this is the law of Christ. In the text before us we have

in, whosoever abideth in Christ, doth not transgress the law. This is a truth of the deepest importance to those who think that the law is made void by faith, or done away by the gospel. Not a few who understandingly break the fourth commandment, quiet their consciences with the thought that Christ is in Christ, who understandingly transgress the law of God. In this matter of vital importance, the Apostle utters a solemn warning: "Let no man deceive you: he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as he is righteous. He that committeth sin (transgresseth the law of God) is of the devil;" "All thy commandments" says the Psalmist, "are righteousness." Ps. cxix, 172. Every violation of the law is sin. Those who understandingly transgress the law of God, to use the severe language of the beloved disciple, are "of the devil." To break any one of the commandments of God constitutes a man a sinner, and exposes him to the penalty of the law—

Rom. vi, 23; Eze. xviii, 4, 20; Rev. xx, 14, 15.

"My little children, these things write I unto you that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous. And he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only but also for the sins of the whole world."  
1 John ii, 1, 2. We have already listened to John's definition of sin, and have learned that it is the "transgression of the law." Many affirm that this is the law of Christ. In the text before us we have

the means of deciding this point. John begins by exhorting those to whom he writes, not to sin; that is, not to transgress the law. He adds, "If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." Then it is God the Father whose law is broken, and with whom an advocate is needed, by the sinner. There is one Law-giver, whose holy law has been broken by all mankind; and there is one Mediator between that Law-giver and the transgressor. James iv, 12; Rom. iii, 19, 23; 1 Tim. ii, 5, 6. The one Law-giver is God the Father; the one Mediator is our Lord Jesus Christ. If Christ were the Law-giver, then our mediator must be between Christ and us. But instead of this, God the Father is the being whose law has been transgressed, and Jesus is the great High Priest between that broken law and its guilty transgressors. And this fact is confirmed by the next sentence: "He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." Then Jesus stands between the Law-giver and the sinner, not only as an advocate, mediator and High Priest, but also as the propitiation for the sins of men. In other words, he is the great Sacrifice offered for man's transgression of the law of God.

How deeply interesting is the thought that in the temple of God in heaven, where the ark containing the law of God abides, we have a great High Priest, who has once offered himself for our transgression of that law, and through whom we may obtain full and

free pardon of all our transgressions. Rev. xi, 19; Heb. viii, 1-3.

To the professed people of God who still violate his law, we would address a word of exhortation and entreaty. "As though God did beseech you by us, we pray you in Christ's stead be ye reconciled to God." The carnal mind is enmity against God, and is not subject to his law. Pray that God may deliver you from it. Would you possess that charity or perfect love, so fully described in 1 Cor. xiii, which is the fulfilling of the law? Then heed the words of the apostle John: "This is the love of God that we keep his commandments; and his commandments are not grievous." 1 John v, 3.

The fourth commandment has long been trodden down; but under the latest message of mercy to men, the people of God are seen keeping all his commandments and the faith or testimony of Jesus Christ. Rev. xiv, 9-12. Will you not be of this number? The dragon is yet to make war upon this remnant of the church; but he shall not prevail. Rev. xii, 17. The last testimony respecting the commandments is given by the Son of God in Rev. xxii, 14. "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." This is the fruition of our blessed hope, shortly to be realized.

J. N. A.

## "TIME FOR COMMENCING THE SABBATH"

BY ELDER J. N. ANDREWS

THE ADVENT REVIEW AND SABBATH HERALD, DECEMBER 4, 1855.

### TIME FOR COMMENCING THE SABBATH.

In determining this question, it is evident that much weight should be attached to the manner in which the Creator regulated the commencement of the day in the beginning. For at the same time at which the first day of time began, there also would it end; and where the first day of time began and ended, there also would the second day begin and end; and so of the third, the fourth, the fifth, the sixth, and the seventh day. And where the days of the first week began and ended, there would also the days of all succeeding weeks begin and end. Hence the importance of determining, as nearly as possible, the time at which the day commenced in the Creation week.

What are we to understand by the word day in the first chapter of Genesis? I answer that it is used with two significations. First, it is used by God in giving name to the light, as distinguished from the darkness which was called night. In other words it is applied to that part of the 24 hours which is light. Second, it is used in naming the seventh part of the week, or the entire period of 24 hours. Verse 5 presents an instance in which it is used in each of these senses. "And God called the light day, and the darkness he called night: and the evening and the morning were the first day." It is with the second definition, or use of the word day, that we are now interested.

But here some will meet us with the denial that the word day is used for a period of 24 hours, or in other words, that the night is ever in the Scriptures included in the day. It is proper that that point should be briefly noticed. It is said in Ex. xx, 11, that "in six days the Lord made heaven and earth." This establishes the fact that the six days began with the act of creation; or, to use a different expression, the first day of the week began with God's act of forming heaven and earth. Now it was profound darkness until after the Spirit of God had moved upon the waters. The next act of the Lord was the creation of light. Then having divided the light from the darkness he designates the one as day, and the other as night. This is a demonstration that night was the first division of the first day, and consequently, if the divine order were followed, the first division of all subsequent days. That the force of this argument may appear, we present the first five verses of Genesis.

"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. And God said, Let there be light: and there was light. And God saw the light, that it was good: and God divided the light from the darkness. And God called the light day, and the darkness he called night. And the evening and the morning were the first day."

Dr. Clarke, in his note on Matt. xxviii, 1, states that in Hebrew the same word signifies both evening and night. He cites Gen i, 5, as an instance of its use in this manner. Hence it appears that the expression, "the evening

and the morning were the first day," is the same as though it said, "the night and the morning were the first day." This is a very important fact: for it clearly proves that the night is reckoned, not only as a part of the day of 24 hours, but as forming its first division. Let it be remembered that by the word day as here used I mean one of the seven periods that make up the week. It is worthy of notice that each of the days upon which God wrought in the work of creation, is represented as constituted of the same grand divisions as the first. Thus it is said: Verse 8. "And God called the firmament heaven. And the evening and the morning were the second day." Verse 13. "And the evening and the morning were the third day." Verse 19. "And the evening and the morning were the fourth day." Verse 23. "And the evening and the morning were the fifth day." Verse 31. "And God saw every thing that he had made, and behold, it was very good. And the evening and the morning were the sixth day." It is also to be noticed that even the 2300 days are thus constituted. They are 2300 literal days, symbolizing 2300 years. The margin, which gives the literal Hebrew, calls each of these days, an "evening morning."

The law of Moses bears direct testimony on the point before us. Or rather it may be said to determine in an authoritative manner, the fact that the night is a part of the day, and that the day begins with the evening. Lev. xxiii, 32. "It shall be unto you a sabbath of rest, and ye shall afflict your souls: in the ninth day of the month at even, from even unto even, shall ye celebrate your sabbath." This text defines the tenth day of the seventh month; and in so doing it also defines the other days of that month, and as a consequence, of all other months. It tells us that the tenth day of the seventh month begins with the evening at the close of the ninth day, and that it extends until the next evening. No one can set aside this testimony. In accordance with this fact we read that the Jews, on the afternoon of the day of preparation, wished to have the legs of those who were crucified broken, that they might not remain upon the cross on the Sabbath. John xix, 31. And also that at the time when Jesus was taken down from the cross, on the afternoon of that day, "the Sabbath drew on." Luke xxiii, 54. It is also said, [John xix, 41, 42.] "Now in the place where he was crucified there was a garden; and in the garden a new sepulchre, wherein was never man yet laid. There laid they Jesus therefore, because of the Jews' preparation day; for the sepulchre was nigh at hand." The idea is evidently this: that they buried our Lord in a sepulchre nigh at hand, that they might accomplish his burial on the preparation-day, and before the Sabbath commenced.

In addition to the foregoing, it may not be improper to present several instances in which the night is reckoned as a part of the day, or as included in the day. We call attention to the following: 1 Sam. xxvi, 7, 8. "So David and Abishai came to the people by night: and behold Saul lay sleeping within the trench, and his spear stuck in the ground at his bolster: but Abner and the

people lay round about him. Then said Abishai to David, God hath delivered thine enemy into thine hand this day: now, therefore, let me smite him, I pray thee, with the spear even to the earth at once, and I will not smite him the second time." Here the night is certainly included in the day. The same fact will appear from Ex. xii, 41, 42. "And it came to pass at the end of the four hundred and thirty years, even the self-same day it came to pass, that all the hosts of the Lord went out from the land of Egypt. It is a night to be much observed unto the Lord for bringing them out from the land of Egypt: this is that night of the Lord to be observed of all the children of Israel in their generations. We present also the words of the angel addressed to the shepherds of Bethlehem. Luke ii, 8-11. "And there were in the same country shepherds abiding in the field, keeping watch over their flock by night. And lo, the angel of the Lord came upon them, and the glory of the Lord abode round about them; and they were sore afraid. And the angel said unto them, Fear not: for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day, in the city of David, a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord. In these words the angel certainly recognises the night as a part of the day. Last of all we present the words of the Lord Jesus. Mark xiv, 30. "And Jesus saith unto him, Verily I say unto thee, That this day even in this night, before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny me thrice." Also Luke xxii, 34. "And he said, I tell thee, Peter, the cock shall not crow this day, before that thou shalt thrice deny that thou knowest me." With these words of our Lord, the argument that the days of the week begin with the evening, and that they include the whole 24 hours, may be properly closed. It remains to notice one or two objections to what has been already adduced.

It is objected that the day, according to Matt. xxviii, 1, begins at sunrise. It reads as follows: "In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary, to see the sepulchre." But an inference drawn from this text cannot be sufficient to destroy the direct testimony already presented, that the day begins with evening. But by turning to John xx, 1, we shall find that this inference is inadmissible. "The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early, when it was yet dark, unto the sepulchre, and seeth the stone taken away from the sepulchre." In this text it is plainly stated that those who came to the sepulchre "when it was yet dark," came upon the first day of the week. This is direct evidence that the first day of the week includes at least a part of the night which follows the Sabbath. The note of Dr. Clarke on Matt. xxviii, 1, contains the following words:

*In the end of the Sabbath.]* Οπεράς δια sabbaton. After the end of the week; this is the translation given by several eminent critics; and in this way the word οπεράς is used by the most eminent Greek writers. Matthew, therefore states that the women came to the sepulchre after the Sabbath, early upon the first day of the week.

The creation of the sun at the commencement of the fourth day, is supposed to prove that the day should begin with sunrise, or as others suppose, at noon. We quote the words of Moses: Gen. i, 14-18. "And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven, to divide the day from the night; let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days, and years: and let them be for lights in the firmament of the heaven, to give light upon the earth: and it was so. And God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night: he made the stars also. And God set them in the firmament of the heaven, to give light upon the earth and to rule over the day and over the night, and to divide the light from the darkness."

and God saw that it was good." Those who argue thus, contend that at creation the sun should be just rising, or as others say should be first seen in mid-heaven. But all such reasoning is fallacious. For at the moment when the sun first appeared in the heavens, from the most eastern point at which it could be seen, it would appear just in the act of setting; from a point still further west, it would appear in mid-heaven; while at the extreme western point at which it could be seen, it would be just rising above the horizon. Hence it is not unreasonable to conclude that at that place in the East, (perhaps the garden of Eden,) where day begins the circuit of the globe, the sun at its creation, was just setting. This gives us a harmonious view of the Creator's work. It began each day with evening: and as it thus began on the fourth day, the sun when first seen was just setting; and as it continued its course westward, it carried sunset with it around the globe. And this view that the day begins in the East, and so travels round the world, is of great importance. It takes away the objection that we cannot keep the Sabbath unless we live in Palestine; for we keep the day as it comes to us; and as the Sabbath makes the circuit of the globe, all the human family have the privilege of observing the Rest-day of the Creator.

We think the Scripture testimony adduced, sufficient to establish the fact that the day begins with the evening. The next inquiry therefore properly relates to the commencement of evening. What is the testimony of the Bible on this? Moses thus defines the commencement of evening. Deut. xvi, 6. "But at the place which the Lord thy God shall choose to place his name in, there thou shalt sacrifice the passover at even, at the going down of the sun, at the season that thou camest forth out of Egypt." This text seems to settle the question that evening is at sunset. But Ex. xii, 6, may be supposed to modify the text just quoted. It reads thus: "And ye shall keep it up until the fourteenth day of the same month: and the whole assembly of the congregation of Israel shall kill it in the evening." The margins read, "between the two evenings." This purports to be the literal Hebrew, and is therefore entitled to respect. It is said, that "between the two evenings" is at 3 o'clock p.m. If this is correct, it shows that the "going down of the sun," in Deut. xvi, 6, is an indefinite expression. But Gesenius, in his Hebrew Lexicon, says that between the two evenings, according to the "best supported" opinion, "was the interval between sunset and dark." If this be correct—and there is certainly no higher uninspired authority than Gesenius—it removes the apparent contradiction between Ex. xii, and Deut. xvi, and shows that they both agree on sunset. Greenfield, in his New Testament Lexicon, says that two evenings "were reckoned by the Hebrews; one from the ninth hour, (3 o'clock,) until sunset; and the other, from sunset until dark. Robinson's Lexicon of the New Testament says the same. This would agree very nearly with Gesenius.

We next introduce Lev. xxii, 6, 7. "The soul which hath touched any unclean shall be unclean until even, and shall not eat of the holy things, unless he wash his flesh with water. And when the sun is down, he shall be clean, and shall afterward eat of the holy things, because it is his food." This text seems to need no comment. Even seems to be clearly defined "at sunset." The person who was unclean until even, was clean at sunset. See also Deut. xxiv, 11; xxiv, 13, 15.

The following text seems to teach the same thing: Josh. viii, 29. "And the king of Ai he hanged on a tree until even-tide: and as soon as the sun was down, Joshua commanded that they should take his carcase down from the tree, and cast it at the entering of the gate of

the city, and raise thereon a great heap of stones, that remaineth unto this day." Josh. x. 26, 27, defines evening in the same manner. "And afterward Joshua smote them, and slew them, and hanged them on five trees; and they were hanging upon the five trees until the evening. And it came to pass at the time of the going down of the sun, that Joshua commanded, and they took them down off the trees, and cast them into the cave wherein they had been hid, and laid great stones in the cave's mouth, which remains until this very day." See also Judges xiv, 18; 2 Sam. iii, 35. Evening is also defined in 2 Chron. xxii, 34. "And the battle increased that day: howbeit the king of Israel stayed himself up in his chariot against the Syrians until the even; and about the time of the sun going down he died."

The new Testament defines evening at sunset in two places. Three of the evangelists mention the same fact; two of them stating that it occurred at evening, and two of them that it was at sunset. Matt. viii, 16. "When the even was come, they brought unto him many that were possessed with devils: and he cast out the spirits with his word, and healed all that were sick." Mark i, 32. "And at even, when the sun did set, they brought unto him all that were diseased, and them that were possessed with devils." Luke iv, 40. "Now when the sun was setting, all they that had any sick with divers diseases brought them unto him; and he laid his hands on every one of them, and healed them." From Mark i it appears that this transaction occurred at the even which follows the Sabbath. Hence the reason is plain why they waited till sunset before bringing out the sick; viz., they waited for the close of the Sabbath.

The following scripture is supposed to prove that the day at some seasons of the year does not commence until after the setting of the sun. Neh. xiii, 19. "And it came to pass, that when the gates of Jerusalem began to be dark before the Sabbath, I commanded that the gates should be shut, and charged that they should not be opened till after the Sabbath; and some of my servants set I at the gates, that there should no burden be brought in on the Sabbath day. Perhaps this arises from a careless method of reading the text. It does not say, "when it began to be dark at Jerusalem;" but it says "when the gates of Jerusalem began to be dark." Now the meaning of this I think is simply that toward sunset the gates on their east side would begin to be dark, and that at that time they should be closed so that every thing would be quiet when the Sabbath should commence. This view seems to me reasonable, and it harmonizes the text with all the other testimony presented.

The parable in Matt. xx, 1-12 has been adduced to prove that the day begins at 6 o'clock. It is as follows:

"For the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is an householder, which went out early in the morning to hire laborers into his vineyard. And when he had agreed with the laborers for a penny a day, he sent them into his vineyard. And he went out about the third hour and saw others standing idle in the market-place, and said unto them, Go ye also into the vineyard, and whatsoever is right, I will give you. And they went their way. Again he went out about the sixth and ninth hour, and did likewise. And about the eleventh hour he went out, and found others standing idle, and saith unto them, Why stand ye here all the day idle? They say unto him, Because no man hath hired us. He saith unto them, Go ye also into the vineyard; and whatsoever is right, that shall ye receive. So when even was come, the lord of the vineyard saith unto his steward, Call the laborers, and give them their hire, beginning from the last unto the first. And when they came that were hired about the eleventh hour, they received every man a penny.

But when the first came, they supposed that they should have received more; and they likewise received every man a penny. And when they had received it, they murmured against the good man of the house, saying, These last have wrought but one hour, and thou hast made them equal unto us, which have borne the burden and heat of the day.

The argument drawn from this text is thus: there are twelve hours in the day; that the third hour is nine o'clock; that the sixth hour is noon; that the ninth hour is three o'clock; that the eleventh hour is five o'clock; and that from this time until evening it was but one hour. Hence evening comes at six o'clock. The defects in the foregoing argument are these: 1st. The hours in the New Testament are not the same as our hours. With us an hour is 60 minutes, and is never more nor less. But in the New Testament it is the twelfth part of the space between sunrise and sunset. Consequently the hours were longer or shorter according to the season of the year. It is true that the sixth hour being the middle of the day would always come at twelve o'clock; but the twelfth hour, or evening, would always come at sunset. 2d. The division of the day into hours was not of divine appointment, but originated with the heathen.

The same argument has been drawn from John xi, 9. "Jesus answered, Are there not twelve hours in the day? If any man walk in the day, he stumbleth not, because he seeth the light of this world." It is said that if there are twelve hours in the day, then the sixth hour of the day is noon; and as there would be six hours either side of noon, or twelve o'clock, it follows that the day of twelve hours begins at six in the morning, and ends at six in the evening; and that a day of 24 hours would of course begin and end at six in the evening. This argument would be conclusive if the premises were sound. The same defect exists in this as in the argument drawn from Matt. xx; viz., that the hours were not sixty minutes like ours; but were the twelfth part of the time between sunrise and sunset. Hence the hours were constantly varying in length, but evening would be invariably at sunset. Consequently Matt. xx, 1-12, and John xi, 9, do not conflict with the testimony presented that the day begins at sunset. It will be expected that we prove the point that the hours were the twelfth part of the space between sunrise and sunset. This we shall now do.

The Jews reckoned twelve hours in the day, and of course each hour of the day, thus reckoned, must have been something longer or shorter, according to the different times of the year in that climate.—[Part of Clarke's note on John i, 9.]

The Jews, as well as most other nations, divided the day from sunrise to sunset, into twelve equal parts; but these parts or hours, were longer or shorter, according to the different seasons of the year.—[Part of Clarke's note on John xi, 9.]

The Jews (by a reckoning adopted from the Greeks) divided their day, or the time from sunrise to sunset, into twelve hours, of course varying a little according to the season of the year.—[Bloomfield's note on John xi, 9.]

Now.—In the books of the New Testament we see clearly the day divided into twelve equal hours, after the manner of the Greeks and Romans. These hours were equal to each other, but unequal with respect to the different seasons. The twelve hours of the longest days in Summer were much longer than those of the shortest days in Winter.—[Cruden.]

Day.—The sacred writers generally divide the day and night into twelve unequal hours. The sixth hour is always noon throughout the year; and the twelfth hour is the last hour of the day. But in Summer, the twelfth hour, as all the others were, was longer than in Winter.—[Ency. Religious Knowledge.]

"The day was divided into twelve hours, which, of course, varied in length, being shorter in Winter and longer in Summer."—*Watson's Biblical and Theological Dictionary*.

"The Jews divided the space from sunrise to sunset, were the days longer or shorter, into twelve parts; so that the hours of their day were all the year the same in number, though much shorter in Winter than in Summer.—*Note of the Cottage Bible* on John xi, 9.

"The Jews reckoned their days from evening to evening, according to the order which is mentioned in the first chapter of Genesis, in the account of the work of creation: The evening and the morning were the first day. Their Sabbath, therefore, or seventh day, began at sunset on the day we call Friday, and lasted until the same time on the day following. When our Saviour was in Capernaum, it was thought wrong to bring the sick to him to be healed, while the Sabbath lasted; 'but of even, when the sun did set, they brought unto him all that were diseased, and them that were possessed with devils: and all the city was gathered together at the door.' Mark i, 21-35. The time between the rising and the setting of the sun was divided into twelve equal parts, which were called hours. John xi, 9. As this period of time, however, is longer at one season of the year than at another, it is plain that the hours would also be of different lengths at different times. In Winter they were, of course, shorter than in Summer. They were numbered from the rising of the sun, and not from the middle of the day, as is common with us. Hours are not mentioned till after the captivity; it is reasonable, therefore, to suppose that the Jews borrowed their mode of dividing time from the Chaldeans, from whom also it passed to the Greeks and Romans."—*Nevin's Biblical Antiquities*, pp. 171, 172.

The word *hour*, in Scripture, signifies one of the twelve equal parts into which each day was divided, and which, of course, were of different lengths at different seasons of the year. This mode of dividing the day prevailed among the Jews, at least after the exile in Babylon, and perhaps earlier.—*Cove's Bible Dictionary*.

An hour, one of the twelve equal parts into which the day was divided, and which of course were different at different seasons of the year.—*Gramfeld's New Testament Lexicon*.

"In New Testament an hour, one of the twelve equal parts into which the natural day and also the night were divided, and which of course were of different lengths at different seasons of the year; probably introduced by astronomers, and first so used by Hipparchus about n. c. 140."—*Robinson's Lexicon of the New Testament*.

These testimonies are amply sufficient to establish the fact that the hours of the New Testament do not correspond to hours measured by a clock. And that they were the twelfth part of the space from sunrise to sunset. Hence no argument can be drawn from Matt xx, 1-12; John xi, 9, which is not in perfect accordance with the testimony already presented that even, with which day commences, is at sunset.

A most important consideration is this: if the Sabbath commences at six o'clock, no one can tell when that hour arrives unless they have a clock or watch. Now these were not invented until about 1658. See *Peterson's Hand Book of Useful Arts*. So that for nearly, the whole space of 6000 years the people of God have been without the means of telling when the Sabbath commenced. But such a conclusion would be a manifest absurdity. And we have already seen that there is not a single testimony of Holy Scripture that can be adduced for the six o'clock time. We conclude this article by summing up the argument as follows:

1. There is no Scriptural argument in support of six o'clock, as the hour with which evening commences.

2. If that is the hour, the people of God for about 5,800 years were unable to tell when the Sabbath commenced.

3. The Bible, by several plain statements, establishes the fact that evening is at sunset. J. N. A.

To THE BROTHERS:—The subject presented in the above article, is one of great importance. The testimony of the Bible relative to the time of commencing the Sabbath is here brought together, that it may speak for itself. The result of the investigation is the firm conviction that the commencement and close of each day is marked by the setting of the sun. It will be asked why this conclusion was not earlier arrived at? The answer is this: the subject has not been hitherto thoroughly investigated. In making this statement I would frankly acknowledge my own fault. It is always duty to correct our errors when we see them; and, however, sincerely we may have acted in the past, we can no longer act so, if when we see a fault as such, or a mistake we refuse to acknowledge it.

It may be proper to state the circumstances under which the above article was written. Last August, brother White and other brethren requested me to give the subject a thorough investigation. This I immediately endeavored to do, devoting to the subject each day, as much time as my strength would admit. In a short time I became entirely satisfied that the unanimous testimony of the Scriptures is, that each day commences with the setting of the sun. The Seventh-day Baptists have always held to this doctrine, but I have never happened to meet with their views. Had I done so, I should not have remained in error on this subject. But it will be asked, Did you not learn the truth from the *Messenger*? I answer, No. The article here presented was written several weeks before the *M.* had published anything on the point. I can bear no fellowship for a sheet conducted in the manner that the *M.* has hitherto been. But the testimony of the Bible is equally precious though it may have been presented for the purpose of envy or strife. Besides this, as I now learn a considerable number of our brethren have long been convinced that the Sabbath commences at sunset.

J. N. A.

Battle Creek, Mich., Nov. 12th, 1855.

## "TIME OF THE SABBATH"

BY ELDER JAMES WHITE —

THE ADVENT REVIEW AND SABBATH HERALD, DECEMBER 4, 1855.

### *Time of the Sabbath.*

EQUATORIAL time, or from six o'clock to six o'clock, has been observed by the body of Sabbath-keepers. The truth is, the subject has not been fully investigated till within a few months. We have never been fully satisfied with the testimony presented in favor of six o'clock. While the various communications received for a few years past, advocating both sun-rise and sunset time, have been almost destitute of argument, and the spirit of humility and candor. The subject has troubled us, yet we have never found time to thoroughly investigate it.

In June, 1854, we urged Eld. D. P. Hall to prepare an article on the subject for the Review. When with him in Penn. last Winter we repeated the request. When in Maine last Summer we stated our feelings on the subject to Bro. Andrews, and our fears of division unless the question could be settled by good testimony. He decided to devote his time to the subject till he ascertained what the Bible taught in regard to it, and his article in this No. is the result of his investigations. Some have the impression that six o'clock time has been taught among us by the direct manifestation of the Holy Spirit. This is a mistake. "From even to even," was the teaching, from which six o'clock time has been inferred. We now rejoice that Bro. Andrews has presented the Bible testimony on this question, in his accustomed forcible, candid manner, which settles the question beyond all doubt that the Sabbath commences not only at even, but at the setting of the sun.

J. W.

## SECTION 2: ARTICLES AND TRACTS ON THE SANCTUARY

- “THE SANCTUARY” – BY O. R. L. CROSIER – AS IT APPEARED IN THE ADVENT REVIEW – 48 PAGE SPECIAL, SEPTEMBER, 1850.
  - “THE SANCTUARY AND TWENTY THREE HUNDRED DAYS.” – 1853 - BY ELDER J. N. ANDREWS.
  - “THE JUDGMENT.” – BY ELDER JAMES WHITE - THE ADVENT REVIEW AND SABBATH HERALD, JANUARY 29, 1857.
  - “DANIEL STANDING IN HIS LOT.” – BY HIRAM EDSON - THE ADVENT REVIEW AND SABBATH HERALD, JULY 30, 1857.
- 

### **“THE SANCTUARY”**

BY O. R. L. CROSIER –

AS IT APPEARED IN THE ADVENT REVIEW – 48 PAGE SPECIAL, SEPTEMBER, 1850.

### **THE SANCTUARY.**

BY O. R. L. CROSIER.

The Sanctuary was the heart of the typical system. There the Lord placed his name, manifested his glory, and held converse with the High Priest relative to the welfare of Israel. While we inquire from the scriptures what the Sanctuary is, let all educational prejudice be dismissed from the mind. For the Bible clearly defines, what the Sanctuary is, and answers every reasonable question you may ask concerning it. The name Sanctuary, is applied to several different things in the O. T., neither did the Wonderful Numberer, tell Daniel *what* Sanctuary was to be cleansed at the end of the 2300 days, but called it **THE SANCTUARY**, as though Daniel well understood it, and that he did is evident from the fact that he did not ask *what* it was. But as it has now become a matter of dispute as to what the Sanctuary is, our only safety lies in seeking from the N. T. the Divine comment

upon it. Its decision should place the matter beyond all controversy with Christians. Paul freely discusses this subject in his Epistle to the Hebrews, to whom the typical covenant pertained. "Then verily the first Covenant had ordinances of Divine service and a worldly sanctuary, (Ch. xiii, 11.) For there was a tabernacle made; the first, wherein was the candlestick, and the tables and the shew-bread; which is called [Hagia] Holy. And after the second veil, the tabernacle which is called the [Hagia Hagion] Holy of Holies; which had the golden censer, and the ark of the covenant, overlaid round about with gold, wherein was the golden pot that had manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of the covenant; and over it the cherubims of glory overshadowing the Mercy-seat; of which we cannot now speak particularly." A particular description is found in the last four books of the Pentateuch. "Sanctuary" was the first name the Lord gave it; Ex. xxv, 8, which name covers not only the tabernacle with its two apartments, but also the court and all the vessels of the ministry. This Paul calls the Sanctuary of the first covenant, "which was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices;" verse 9. "But Christ being come an High Priest of good things to come by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands;" verse 11. The priests entered the "figures" or "paterns of the true," which true are the "heavenly places themselves," into which Christ entered when he entered "heaven itself;" vers, 23, 24. When he ascended to the right hand of the Father, "in the heavens," he became "A Minister of the Sanctuary [or Hagion, Holies] and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched and not man;" Ch. viii, 1 2. That is the Sanctuary of the "better (the new) covenant;" verse 6. The Sanctuary to be cleansed at the end of 2300 days is also the *Sanctuary* of the new covenant, for the vision of the treading down and cleansing, is after the crucifixion. We see that the Sanctuary of the new covenant is not on earth, but in heaven. The true tabernacle which forms a part of the new covenant Sanctuary, was made and pitched by the Lord, in contradistinction to that of the first covenant which was made and pitched by man, in obedience to the command of God; Ex. xxv, 8. Now what does the same Apostle say the Lord has pitched? "A city which hath foundations whose builder and maker is God;" Heb. xi, 10. What is its name? "The heavenly Jerusalem;" Ch. xii, 22; Rev. xxi. "A building of God, an house not made with hands eternal in the heavens"; ii Cor. v,

1. "My Father's house of many mansions;" Jno. xiv, 2. When our Saviour was at Jerusalem, and had pronounced its house desolate, the disciples came to him to show him the buildings of the temple. Then he said: "There shall not be left here one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down": Matt. xxiv, 1, 2. That temple was their Sanctuary; i Ch. xxii, 17-19; xxviii, 9-13. ii Ch. xxix, 5, 21; xxxvi, 14, 17. Such an announcement would tend to fill them with sadness and fear, as foretelling the derangement, if not the total prostration of their entire religious system. But to comfort and teach them, he says, "*In my Father's house are MANY MANSIONS*"; Jno. xiv, 1-3. Standing, as he was, on the dividing line between the typical covenant and the anti-typical, and having just declared the house of the former no longer valid, and foretold its destruction; how natural that he should point his disciples to the Sanctuary of the latter, about which their affections and interests were to cluster as they had about that of the former. The Sanctuary of the new covenant is connected with New Jerusalem, like the Sanctuary of the first covenant was with Old Jerusalem. As that was the place where the priests of that covenant ministered, so this is in heaven, the place where the Priest of the new covenant ministers. To these places, *and these only*, the N. T. applies the name "Sanctuary," and it does appear that this should forever set the question at rest.

But as we have been so long and industriously taught to look to the earth for the Sanctuary, it may be proper to inquire, by what scriptural authority have we been thus taught? I can find *none*. If others can, let them produce it. Let it be remembered that the definition of Sanctuary is "a holy or sacred place." Is the earth, is Palestine such a place? Their entire contents answer, *No!* Was Daniel so taught? Look at his vision.

Daniel prayed "Cause thy face to shine upon thy Sanctuary which is desolate;" Ch. ix, 17. This was the typical Sanctuary built by Solomon. "Thou hast commanded me to build a temple upon thy Holy Mount, and an altar in the city wherein thou dwellest, a resemblance of thy holy tabernacle, which thou hast prepared from the beginning"; Wis. Sol., ix, 8; i Ch. xxviii, 10-13. It had shared in the seventy years desolations of Jerusalem; Dan. ix, 2; ii Ch. xxxvi, 14-21. It was rebuilt after the captivity; Ne. x, 39. Moses received the patterns of the Sanctuary, built at Sinai when he was with the Lord forty days in the cloud on the Mount; and David received the patterns of that built by Solo-

mon, which superceded Moses' with its chambers, porches, courts, the courses of the priests and Levites, and all the vessels of service, &c., "by the Spirit," i Ch. xxviii, 10-13. It is manifest that both Moses and David had prophetic visions of the New Jerusalem with its Sanctuary and Christ, the officiating Priest. When that built by Moses was superceded by Solomon's, the Ark was borne from the former to the latter; ii Ch. v, 2-8. The Sanctuary comprehended not only the Tabernacle, but also all the vessels of the ministry, enclosed by the court in which the tabernacle stood; Num. iii, 29-31; x, 17, 21. So the court in which the Temple stood was properly called the Sanctuary.—*Prideaux*. We learn the same from ii Ch. xxix, 18, 21. "We have cleansed all the house of the Lord, and the altar of burnt-offering, with all the vessels thereof, and the shew-bread table with all the vessels thereof." The altar of burnt-offering with its vessels stood before the Temple in the inner court, the whole of which are in ver. 21 called the Sanctuary. Well, says one, is not Palestine called the Sanctuary? I think not. Ex. xv, 17.—"Thou shalt bring them in and plant them in the mountain of thine inheritance, in the place, O Lord, which thou hast made for thee to dwell in; in the Sanctuary, O Lord, which thy hands have established."

What is it which the Lord "has made to dwell in," which his "hands have established?" Paul says it is "A City;" Heb. xi, 10; a "Tabernacle," Ch. viii, 2; "A Building in the heavens;" ii Cor. v, 1. And the Lord has chosen Mount Zion in Palestine for the place of its final location; Ps. cxxxii, 13, 14. "For the Lord hath chosen Zion; he hath desired it for his habitation. This is my rest forever; here will I dwell; for I have desired it." "He brought them to the border of the Sanctuary, even to this mountain;" (Ps. lxxviii, 54,) which was its chosen border or place; but not the Sanctuary itself, any more than Mount Moriah, on which the Temple was built, was the Temple itself. Did they regard that land as the Sanctuary? If they did not, we should not. A view of the text in which the word occurs will show: "Let them make me a Sanctuary;" Ex. xxv, 9. "The shekel of the Sanctuary," (Ex. xxx, 13) and above twenty others, like it. "Then wrought Bezaleel and Aholiab, and every wise-hearted man, in whom the Lord put wisdom and understanding to know how to work all manner of work for the service of the Sanctuary;" Ex. xxvi, 1-6. "Before the veil of the Sanctuary," Lev. iv, 6. "Carry your brethren from before the Sanctuary;" Lev.

x, 4. "Nor come into the Sanctuary;" Lev. xii, 4. "He shall make atonement for the holy Sanctuary;" Lev. xvi, 33. "Reverence my Sanctuary;" Lev. xi, 30; xxvi, 2. "Nor profane the Sanctuary of his God;" Lev. xxi, 12. "Vessels of the Sanctuary;" Num. iii, 31. "Charge of the Sanctuary;" Num. iii, 32, 38. "They minister in the Sanctuary;" Ch. iv, 12. "In the Sanctuary and in the vessels thereof;" ver. 16. "And when Aaron and his sons have made an end of covering the Sanctuary and all the vessels of the Sanctuary, as the camp is to set forward; after that the sons of Kohath shall come to bear it;" Ch. iv, 15; vii, 9; x, 21. "That there be no plague among the children of Israel when the children of Israel come nigh unto the Sanctuary;" Ch. viii, 19. "Thou and thy sons and thy Father's house with thee shall bear the iniquity of the Sanctuary;" Ch. xviii, 1. "He hath defiled the Sanctuary of his God;" Ch. xix, 20. Joshua "took a great stone and set it up there under an oak that was by the Sanctuary of the Lord;" Jos. xxiv, 26. "All the instruments of the Sanctuary;" i Ch. ix, 29. "Build ye the Sanctuary;" Ch. xxii, 19.—"Governors of the Sanctuary;" Ch. xxiv, 5. "The Lord hath chosen thee to build an house for the Sanctuary;" Ch. xxviii, 10; ii Ch. xx, 8. "Go out of the Sanctuary;" Ch. xxvi, 18; xxix, 21; xxx, 8. "Purification of the Sanctuary;" Ch. xxx; 19; xxvi, 17.

I have given nearly every text, and, I believe, every different form of expression in which the word occurs till we come to the Psalms; so that every one can see what they understood the Sanctuary to be. And of the fifty texts quoted, not one applies it to the land of Palestine, nor *any* land. That Sanctuary, though enclosed with curtains, was called "the house of the Lord," (Ju. xviii, 31; i Sam. i, 9-24,) and was pitched at the city of Shiloah at the time of dividing the land; xviii, 1, 10; hence it was called the "Tabernacle of Shiloah," (safety and happiness.) Ps. lxxviii, 60. The Lord forsook it when the Philistines took the Ark (i Sam. iv, 3-11) and delivered his strength into captivity, and his glory into the enemy's hand; ver. 21.

It was brought back to Kirjath-jearim, (i Sam. vii, 1, 2) thence to the house of Obed-edom, thence to the city of David which is Zion, (ii Sam. vi, 1-19; v, 9,) and thence, at the direction of Solomon, the Ark was conveyed into the Holy of Holies of the temple, (i Kg. viii, 1-6,) which was built in Mount Moriah near Mount Zion; ii Ch. iii, 1. The Lord has chosen Zion to dwell in at rest forever; (Ps. cxxxii, 13, 14) but as yet

he had dwelt there but a short time, and then in curtains made with hands ; but when he shall appear in his glory he will have "mercy on Zion" and build it up ; then Jerusalem upon it, shall be "a quiet habitation, a tabernacle that shall not be taken down ;" (Ps. cii ; Isa. xxxiii, 20. And then "the people shall dwell in Zion at Jerusalem"; ver. 18, 19. The Song of Moses (Ex. 15;) is evidently prophetic, and contemplates the happy scenes of the Eden Zion. And so Ezekiel has it. The Lord will bring the whole house of Israel up out of their graves into the land of Israel ; and then set his Sanctuary and tabernacle in the midst of them for evermore. The Sanctuary is not "the land of Israel" nor the people; for it is set in *their midst*, and is built and forms a part of the city whose name is, "The Lord is there."

### THE PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST.

The priesthood of the worldly Sanctuary of the first covenant belonged to the sons of Levi ; but that of the heavenly, of the better covenant, to the Son of God. *He fulfills both the Priesthood of Melchisedec and Aaron.* In some respects the Priesthood of Christ resembles that of Melchisedec ; and in others that of Aaron or Levi. 1. He was "made an High Priest forever, after the order of Melchisedec." *Taxis*, rendered order, properly signifies "series, succession." Christ, like Melchisedec, had no priestly descent or pedigree ; Heb. vii, 3 (margin) i. e. he neither followed nor will have a successor in office ; and "because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable Priesthood," (which passeth not from one to another ; margin) ver. 24.

The Priesthood of Levi to be continuous had many and a succession of priests, "because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death ;" ver. 23. 2. Being after the order of Melchisedec, he is superior to the Sons of Levi; because he blessed and received tithes from them in Abraham ; vs. 1, 7, 9, 10. 3. He is King and Priest ; a King by birth, being from the tribe of Judah, and a Priest by the oath of his Father ; vs. 14, 21. 4. Being himself perfect, and his priesthood unending, he is able to "perfect forever" and "save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them." He was not called after the *order* of Aaron ; i. e. not in his succession ; but this does not at all prove that the Priesthood of Aaron was not typical of the Priesthood of Christ. Paul distinctly shows that it is.

1. After calling upon us to "consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession (or

religion.) Christ Jesus," he lays the foundation of the investigation by drawing the analogy between Moses over his house [oikos, people] and Christ over his. (Heb. iii, 1-6) and says : "Moses verily was faithful in all his house, as a servant, for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after." This clearly shows that the Mosaic economy was typical of the divine. 2. He shows that he was called of God to be an High Priest "as was Aaron ;" Ch. v. 1-5. 3. Like Aaron and his sons, he took upon him flesh and blood, the seed of Abraham, "was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin," was made "perfect through suffering," and "in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren ; that he might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people ;" Chs. ii, iv. 5. Both were ordained for men in things pertaining to God : that (they might) "offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins ;" Ch. v, 1 ; viii, 3.— 6. Paul evidently considered the Levitical priesthood typical of Christ's from the pains he takes to explain the analogies and contrasts between them ; as. 7. "And they truly were many priests, because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death : but this man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood." 8. "Who needeth not daily, as those high priests to offer up sacrifices, first for his own sins, and then for the people's ; for this he did once when he offered up himself." 9. "For the law maketh men high priests which have infirmity ; but the word of the oath which was since the law, maketh the Son who is consecrated [perfected. margin.] for evermore ;" Ch. vi, 23-28. 10. "But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry" than theirs ; Ch. viii, 6. 11. "By how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant" than theirs ; Ch. viii, 6. 12. "But Christ being come an High Priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle" than theirs ; Ch. ix, 11.— 13. "Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood, he entered in once into the holy place," ver. 12. 14. "For if the blood of bulls and of goats and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh ; how much more shall the blood of Christ, who, through the eternal spirit offered himself without spot to God purge your conscience ;" ver. 13, 14. 15. "For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true ; but into heaven itself ;" ver. 24. 16. "Nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest

entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others ;" but now once in the end of the world hath he *appeared* to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself ;" vs. 25, 26. 17. " And as it is appointed unto [the] men [priests] once to die, but after this the judgment : so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many ; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation , " vs. 27, 28. 18. " For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect ;" but " by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified ;" Ch. x, 1, 14. 19. " It is not possible that the *blood of bulls* and of *goats* should take away sins ;" " but a *body* hast thou prepared me ;" vs. 4, 5. These are a part of the contrasts or comparisons the Apostle draws between the Levitical priesthood and Christ's, and there is a resemblance in every instance, but Christ's is superior to Levi's.—I add one more. Ch. viii, 4, 5. " For if he were one earth he should not be a priest, seeing that there (*margin, they*) are priests that offer gifts according to the law : Who serve unto the *example* and *shadow* of heavenly things."

The features of the substance always bear a resemblance to those of the shadow, hence the "heavenly things" referred to in this text must be priestly service "in the heavens" (vs. 1, 2.) performed by our high priest in his Sanctuary ; for if the *shadow is service*, the substance is service also.

As the priests of the law served unto the example and shadow of the heavenly service we can from their service learn something of the nature of the heavenly service. Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle ; for, see (saith he) that thou make *all things according to the pattern* showed to thee in the Mount."

None can deny that, in obedience to this admonition, Moses made or instituted the Levitical priesthood ; it was then "according to the pattern" which the Lord showed him, and that pattern was of heavenly things, Ch. ix, 23. If there was not another text to prove that the Levitical priesthood was typical of the Divine, this would abundantly do it. Yet some are even denying this obvious import of that priesthood ; but if this is not its import, I can see no meaning in it. It is an idle round of ceremonies without sense or use, as it did not perfect those for whom it was performed ; but looked upon as typical of the heavenly, it is replete with the most important instruction. As this is the application

made of it by the New Testament, so we must regard it, while we examine the atonement made under the Levitical priesthood.

" Now when these things [the worldly Sanctuary with its two apartments and the furniture in each] were thus ordained, the priests went always [daily, Ch. vii. 27 ; x. 11] into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service of God ; but into the second went the high priest alone once each year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people." Ch. ix. 6, 7. Here Paul divides the services of the Levitical priesthood into two classes—one daily in the Holy, and the other yearly in the Holy of Holies. Their stated daily services, performed in the Holy and at the brazen altar in the court before the tabernacle, consisted of a burnt offering of two lambs, one in the morning and the other at even, with a meat offering which was one tenth of an ephah of flour mingled with the fourth part of an hin of beaten oil, and a drink-offering which was one-fourth of an hin of strong wine. The meat-offering was burnt with the lamb, and the drink-offering was poured in the Holy ; Ex. xxix, 38-42 ; Num. xxviii, 3-8. In connection with this, they burned on the golden altar in the Holy, sweet incense, which was a very rich perfume, when they dressed and lighted the lamps every evening and morning. Ex. xxx, 34-38 ; xxxi, 11 ; xxx, 7-9. The same was afterwards done at the Temple. i Ch. xvi, 37-40 ; ii Ch. ii, 4 ; xiii, 4-12 ; xiii, 3, Eze. iii, 3.

This did not *alone* for sins either individually or collectively. The daily service described was a sort of continual intercession ; but the making of atonement was a special work for which special directions are given. Different words are used both in the Old Testament and New, to express the same idea as Atonement.

Examples.—The italicised words are, in the text, synonymous with atone or atonement. Ex. xxix, 38 ; " Thou shalt *cleanse* the altar when thou has made an atonement for it."—Lev. xii, 8 ; " The priest shall make an atonement for her and she shall be *clean*." Lev. xiv, 2 ; " This shall be the law of the leper in the day of his *cleansing*." Ver. 21 ; " The priest shall make an atonement for him and he shall be *clean*." The atonement could not be made for him till after he was healed of the leprosy, Ch. xiii, 45, 46. Till he was healed, he had to dwell alone without the camp. Then, Ch. xiv, 3, 4 ; " The priest shall go forth out of the camp; and the priest shall look, and behold if the plague of the leprosy be healed in the leper ; then shall the priest

command to take for him that is *to be cleansed* two birds alive and clean," &c. The law was the same in cleansing a house from the leprosy. Ver. 33-57; The stones affected with the plague were removed and the house "scraped within round about" and then repaired with new material.

Physical uncleanness is now all removed and we would call it clean; but not so; it is only just prepared to be cleansed according to the law. Ver. 48; "And he shall take *to cleanse* the house two birds" &c.—Ver. 49; "And he shall cleanse the house with the blood of the birds" &c. Ver. 52, 53; "And make an atonement for the house, and it shall be *clean*." Ch. xvi, 18, 19; "And he shall go out unto the altar that is before the Lord, and make an atonement for it." "And he shall sprinkle of the blood upon it with his finger seven times, and cleanse it and hallow it from the uncleanness of the children of Israel." Ch. viii, 15; "And Moses took the blood, and put it upon the horns of the altar round about with his finger and purified the altar, and poured the blood at the bottom of the altar, and sanctified it, to make reconciliation upon it," ii Ch. xxix, 29; "And they made reconciliation with their blood upon the altar, to make an atonement for all Israel," Jer. xxxiii, 8; "I will cleanse them from all their iniquities," "and I will pardon all their iniquities." Rom. v, 9-11; "Being now justified by his blood," "by whom we have now received the atonement," ii Cor. v, 17-19; "Who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ," Eph. ii, 16; "And that he might reconcile both unto God," Heb. ix, 13, 14; "The blood of bulls sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; but the blood of Christ shall purge our conscience from dead works." He is the Mediator for the "redemption of the transgressions," and to "perfect forever them that are sanctified." Ch. x, 14; Eph. i, 7; "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our sins," Acts iii, 19; "Be converted that your sins may be blotted out."

From these texts we learn that the words atone, cleanse, reconcile, purify, purge, pardon, sanctify, hallow, forgive, justify, redeem, blot out, and some others, are used to signify, the same work, viz., bringing into favor with God; and in all cases *blood* is the means, and sometimes blood and water.—The atonement is the great idea of the Law, as well as the Gospel; and as the design of that of the Law was to teach us that of the Gospel, it is very important to be understood. The atonement which the priests made for the people in connection with their daily

ministration was different from that made on the tenth day of the seventh month. In making the former, they went no further than in the Holy; but to make the latter they entered the Holy of Holies—the former was made for individual cases, the latter for the whole nation of Israel collectively—the former was made for the *forgiveness of sins*, the latter for *blotting them out*—the former could be made at any time, the latter only on the tenth day of the seventh month. Hence the former may be called the daily atonement and the latter the yearly, or the former the individual, and the latter the national atonement.

The *individual atonement* for the *forgiveness of sins* was made for a single person, or for the whole congregation in case they were collectively guilty of some sin. The 1st Ch. of Lev. gives directions for the burnt-offering, the 2d for the meat-offering, the 3d for the peace-offering, and the 4th for the sin-offering, which, as its name implies, was an offering for sins, in which he who offered it attained *forgiveness of his sins*. The trespass-offering, Ch. v and vi, 1-7, was similar to the sin-offering. "If a soul sin through ignorance," Ch. iv, 2, "when he knoweth of it, then shall he be guilty," Ch. v, 3, "And it shall be when he shall be guilty in any of these things, that he shall confess that he hath sinned in that thing," ver. 5, From Num. v, 6-8, it appears that confession and restitution are necessary in all cases before the atonement could be made for the individual. "When a man or woman shall commit any sin that man commit, to do a trespass against the Lord, and that person be guilty, then they shall confess their sin which they have done, and he shall recompense his trespass with the principle thereof, and add unto it the fifth part thereof, and give it unto him against whom he hath trespassed." Then he or the elders (if it was for the congregation) brought the victim for the sin or trespass-offering to the door of the tabernacle of the congregation on the north side of the altar of burnt-offering in the court, Ch. iv, 24; i, 1; xvii, 1-7, there he (or the elders) laid his hand on its head and killed it, Ch. iv, 2-4, 13-15, 22-24, 27-29. Then, the victim being presented and slain, the priest that was anointed took some of the blood into the Holy, and with his finger sprinkled it before the vail of the Sanctuary and put some of it upon the horns of the altar of sweet incense, then poured the remainder of the blood at the bottom of the altar. Thus he made an *atonement* for the individual, and his *sin was forgiven*, Ch. iv, 5-10, 16-20, 25, 26, 30-35.

The carcasses of the sin-offerings were taken without the camp and burned "in a clean place," Ch. iv, 11, 12, 21.

It should be distinctly remembered that the priest did not begin his duties till he obtained the *blood* of the victim, and that they were all performed in the court (the enclosure of the Sanctuary), and that the atonement thus made was only for the *forgiveness* of sins. These points are expressly taught in this Ch. and the following one on the trespass-offering. Here is an atonement, to make which, the priests only entered the Holy, and to make it they could enter that apartment "always" or "daily." "But into the second [the Holy of Holies] went the high priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people," Heb. ix, 7; "Errors of the people," *Laos* nation. This defines the yearly to be.

*The National Atonement*, of which the Lord "speaks particularly" in Lev. xvi: "And the Lord said unto Moses, speak unto Aaron, thy brother, that he come *not at all times* into the holy place within the veil, before the mercy-seat, which is upon the ark; *that he die not*: for I will appear in the cloud upon the mercy-seat;" ver. 2. For what purpose and when could he enter it? "To make an atonement for *all Israel*, (the whole nation,) for *all their sins once a year*," "on the tenth day of the seventh month," ver. 34, 29. This was the most important day of the year. The whole nation having had their sins previously forgiven by the atonement made in the Holy, now assemble about their Sanctuary, while the High Priest, attired in his holy garments for glory and beauty, ver. 4, Ex. xxviii, having the golden bells on the hem of his robe that his sound may be heard when he goeth in before the Lord, the breast-plate of judgment on his heart, with their names therein that he may bear their judgment, also in it the Urim and Thummim (light and perfection), and the plate of pure gold, *the holy crown*. (Lev. viii. 9,) with "HOLINESS TO THE LORD" engraved upon it, placed upon the fore-front of his mitre that he may bear the iniquities of the holy things, enters the Holy of Holies to make an atonement to *cleanse them*, that they may be *clean* from all their sins before the Lord, ver. 30. The victims for the atonement of this day were, for the priest himself, a young bullock for a sin-offering ver. 3, and for the people, two goats; one for a sin-offering and the other for the scape-goat, and a ram for a burnt-offering, vs. 5-8. He killed or caused to be killed the bullock for a sin-

offering for himself, ver. 11. "Then he shall take a censer full of burning coals of fire from off the altar before the Lord, and his hands full of sweet incense beaten small, and bringing it within the vail: And he shall put the incense upon the fire before the Lord, that the cloud of the incense may cover the mercy-seat that is upon the testimony that he die not. And he shall take of the blood of the bullock, and sprinkle it with his finger upon the mercy-seat eastward; and before the mercy-seat shall he sprinkle of the blood with his finger seven times," vers. 12-14. So much in *preparation* to make the atonement for the people; a description of which follows:

"Then shall he kill the goat of the sin-offering which is for the people and bring his blood within the vail, and do with that blood as he did with the blood of the bullock, and sprinkle it upon the mercy-seat. And he shall make an atonement for [cleanse, see marginal references.] the holy place [within the vail, ver. 2.] because of the uncleanness of the *children of Israel*, because of their transgressions in all their sins: and so shall he do for [i. e. atone for or cleanse,] the tabernacle of the congregation [the Holy] that remaineth among them in the midst of their uncleanness, vs. 15, 16; "And he shall go out [of the Holy of Holies] unto the altar that is before the Lord [in the Holy] and make an atonement for it; and shall take of the blood (for himself,) and of the blood of the goat (for the people,) and put it upon the horns of the altar round about. And he shall sprinkle of the blood upon it with his finger seven times, and *cleanse it*, and *hallow it from the uncleanness of the children of Israel*," ver. 18, 19. This altar was the golden altar of incense in the Holy upon which the blood of individual atonements was sprinkled during the daily ministration. Thus it received the uncleanness from which it is now cleansed. Ex. xxx, 1-10; "Aaron shall make an atonement upon the horns of it once a year, with the blood of the sin-offering of atonement." We see from verse 20, that at this stage of the work "he hath made an end of reconciling the holy place, and the tabernacle of the congregation, and the altar," i. e. the Holy of Holies, the Holy, and the altar in the latter.

We have before seen that atone, reconcile, cleanse, &c., signify the same, hence at this stage he has made an end of cleansing those places. As the blood of atonements for the forgiveness of sins was not sprinkled in the court, but in the tabernacle only, the entire work of cleansing the Sanctuary was per-

formed within the tabernacle. These were holy things, yet cleansed yearly. The holy place within the veil contained the ark of the covenant, covered with the mercy-seat, overshadowed by the cherubims, between which the Lord dwelt in the cloud of divine glory. Who would think of calling such a place unclean? Yet the Lord provided at the time, yea, before it was built, that it should be annually cleansed. It was by blood, and not by fire, that this Sanctuary, which was a type of the new covenant Sanctuary was cleansed.

The high priest on this day "bore the iniquities of the holy things which the children of Israel hallowed in all their holy gifts."—Ex. xxviii, 38. These holy things composed the Sanctuary. Num. xviii, 1. "And the Lord said unto Aaron, Thou, and thy sons, and thy father's house with thee shall bear the iniquity of the Sanctuary." This "iniquity of the Sanctuary" we have learned was not its own properly, but the children of Israel's, God's own people's, which it had received from them. And this transfer of iniquity from the people to their Sanctuary was not a mere casualty, incident on scenes of lawless rebellion, bloodshed or idolatry among themselves, nor the devastation of an enemy; but it was according to the original arrangement and regular operation of this typical system. For we must bear in mind that all the instructions were given to Moses and Aaron before the erection of the Sanctuary. Provision was made to make atonement for sins committed in ignorance; but not till after they were known, Lev. iv, 14; v, 3-6, then of course they became sins of knowledge. Then the individual bore his iniquity, Lev. v, 1-17; vii, 1-8, till he presented his offering to the priest and slew it, the priest made an atonement with the blood, Lev. xvii, 11, and he was forgiven, then of course free from his iniquity. Now at what point did he cease to bear his iniquity? Evidently when he had presented his victim slain; he had then done his part. Through what medium was his iniquity conveyed to the Sanctuary? Through his victim, or rather its blood when the priest took and sprinkled it before the veil and on the altar. Thus the iniquity was communicated to their Sanctuary. The first thing done for the people on the 10th day of the 7th month was to cleanse it, thence by the same means, the application of blood. This done, the high priest bore the "iniquity of the Sanctuary" for the people "to make atonement for them," Lev. x, 17. "And when he hath made an end of reconciling the holy place [within the veil, ver. 2,] and the taber-

nacle of the congregation, and the altar [or when he hath cleansed the Sanctuary,] he shall bring the live goat: And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions and all their sins, *putting them* upon the head of the goat, and shall send him away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness: And the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities into a land not inhabited [margin, of separation.] Lev. xvi, 20-22.—This was the only office of the scape-goat, to finally receive and bear away from Israel all their iniquities into an uninhabited wilderness and there retain them, leaving Israel at their Sanctuary, and the priest to complete the atonement of the day by burning the fat of the sin-offering, and offering the two rams for burnt offerings on the brazen altar in the court, vs. 24, 25. The burning without the camp of the carcasses of the sin-offerings closed the services of this important day.—Ver. 27.

**THE ANTITYPE.**—As this legal system which we have been considering was only a "shadow," a "figure" and "patterns," of no value in itself only to teach us the nature of that perfect system of redemption which is its "body," the "things themselves;" which was devised in the councils of heaven, and is being wrought out by "the only Begotten of the Father;" let us, guided by the Spirit of truth, learn the solemn realities thus shadowed forth. By these patterns, finite as we are, we may like Paul, extend our research beyond the limits of our natural vision to the "heavenly things themselves." Here we find the entire ministry of the law fulfilled in Christ, who was anointed with the Holy Ghost and by his own blood entered his Sanctuary, heaven itself, when he ascended to the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens, as "A minister of the [Hagion] Holies &c., Heb. viii, 6. 2.—Paul, after speaking of the daily services in the Holy, and the yearly in the Holy of Holies, says, Ch. ix, 8. "The Holy Ghost this signifying that the way of the Holies [Hodon Hagion] was not yet made manifest; while as the first tabernacle was yet standing, which was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered" &c., "until the time of reformation: But Christ being come, an High Priest of the [ton] good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, "by his own blood he entered on or into the holy things" (*eis hagia*) Ch. ix, 8-12. The phrase, *eis hagia*, in ver. 12, is the same as that rendered "holy places," ver. 24. *Hagia*, in these two verses, is in the acc. pl. neuter and governed by the prep. *eis* which signifies on, into, upon, or among, *Hagia*, being a neuter adjective, is properly rendered "holy things;" but *Hagia* in ver. 2, is in the nom. sin. fem. and properly rendered, Holy place. The definite article "the," belonging before "good things" in ver. 11 and Ch. x, 1, makes the expression mean things "good in themselves, or abstractly good."—This shows the perfect harmony of Ch. ix, 11, 12, 23, 24, and Ch. x, 1. The "things" are "good in themselves," "holy," or "heavenly," and in "heaven itself" where Christ has entered as our High Priest to "minister" for us; and those "holy things" "in heaven" are connected with the "greater and more per-

fect tabernacle," "which the Lord pitched and not man;" the same as the holy things of the first covenant were connected with their tabernacle, Ch. ix, 1-5; and all those holy things together make the Sanctuary. The Holies (two) ver. 8, the way of which was not made manifest till the time of reformation, when Christ shed his own blood, belong to his "greater and more perfect tabernacle," spoken of in the next verse. I translate the names literal, because they are not literal in our common version. The Doway Bible has them as here given. The word in Ch. ix, 8, 10, 19, is Hagion, "of the Holies," instead of the "holiest of all;" and shows that the blood of Christ is the way or means by which he, as our High Priest was to enter both apartments of the heavenly tabernacle. Now if there be but one place in the heavens, as many say, why were there two in the figure? And why, in applying the figure, does Paul speak of two? Perhaps those who "despise the law" and "corrupt the covenant of Levi" can explain this; if not, we advise them to abide by Paul's exposition of the matter.

Chap. vi, 19, 20, is supposed to prove that Christ entered the Holy of Holies at his ascension, because Paul said he had entered within the veil. But the veil which divides between the Holy and the Holy of Holies is "the second veil," Ch. ix, 3; hence there are two veils, and that in Ch. vi, being the first of which he speaks, must be the *first* veil, which hung before the Holy, and in Ex. was called a curtain. When he entered within the veil, he entered his tabernacle, of course the Holy, as that was the first apartment; and our hope, as an anchor of the soul, enters within the veil, i. e. the atonement of both apartments, including both the forgiveness and the blotting out of sins.—Those who hold that Christ entered the Holy of Holies at, and has been ministering therein ever since his ascension, also believe, as of course they must, that the atonement of the gospel dispensation is the antitype of the atonement made on the tenth day of the seventh month under the law. If this is so, the events of the legal tenth day, have had their antitypes during the Gospel Dispensation. The first event in the atonement service of that day, was the cleansing of the Sanctuary, as we have seen from Lev. xvi. Then, upon their theory, the Sanctuary of the new covenant was cleansed in the early part of the Gospel Dispensation. Evidence is not wanting that neither the earth nor Palestine, their Sanctuaries, was then cleansed. I call them their Sanctuaries, for they are not the Lord's. But if the Lord's new covenant Sanctuary was then cleansed, the 2300 days ended then; but if they are years, which we all believe, they extend 1810 years beyond the 70 weeks, and the last of those weeks was the first of the new covenant or Gospel Dispensation. The fact that those days reach 1810 beyond the 70 weeks, and that the Sanctuary could not be cleansed till the end of those days, is demonstration that the antitype of the legal tenth day is not the Gospel Dispensation: Again, if the atonement of that day is typical of the atonement of the Gospel Dispensation, then the atonement made in the Holy, Heb. ix, 6, previous to that day, was finished before the Gospel Dispensation began. It has been shown that that atonement was made for the *forgiveness of sins*, and I have found no evidence that such an atonement was made on the tenth day of the seventh month. The Gospel Dispensation began with the preaching of Christ, and if it is the antitype of the legal tenth day, one of two things is true; either the Saviour, instead of fulfilling, has destroyed the greater part of the law, the daily service of the Holy which occupied the whole year except one day, the tenth of the seventh month; or else he fulfilled the whole law except one three hundred and sixtieth part of it before the Gospel Dispensa-

sation began, and before he was anointed as the Messiah to fulfill the law and the prophets. One of these two conclusions is inevitable on the hypothesis that the Gospel Dispensation and the atonement made in it, is the antitype of the legal tenth day, and the atonement made in it. Upon which of these horns will they hang? If on the former the declaration, "I came not to destroy the law," pierces them; but if they choose the latter, it then becomes them to prove that the law, which had a shadow of good things to come, was fulfilled within itself, that the shadow and substance filled the same place and time; also they will need to prove that the entire atonement for the *forgiveness of sins* was made before the Lamb was slain with whose blood the atonement was to be made. Now it must be clear to every one, that if the antitype of the yearly service (Heb. ix, 7,) began at the first Advent, the antitype of the daily (Heb. ix, 6,) had been previously fulfilled; and, as the atonement for forgiveness was a part of that daily service, they are involved in the conclusion that there has been no forgiveness of sins under the Gospel Dispensation. Such a theory is wholly at war with the entire genius of the Gospel Dispensation, and stands rebuked, not only by Moses and Paul, but by the teaching and works of our Saviour and his commission to his apostles, by their subsequent teaching and the history of the Christian church. But again, they say the atonement was made and finished on Calvary, when the Lamb of God expired. So men have taught us, and so the churches and world believe; but it is none the more true or sacred on that account, if unsupported by Divine authority. Perhaps few or none who hold that opinion have ever tested the foundation on which it rests.

1. If the atonement was made on Calvary, by whom was it made? The making of the atonement is the work of a Priest? but who officiated on Calvary?—Roman soldiers and wicked Jews.

2. The *slaying* of the victim was not making the atonement: the sinner slew the victim, Lev. iv, 1-4 13-15, &c., after that the Priest took the blood and made the atonement. Lev. iv, 5-12, 16-21.

3. Christ was the appointed High Priest to make the atonement, and he certainly could not have acted in that capacity till after his resurrection, and we have no record of his doing any thing on earth after his resurrection, which could be called the atonement.

4. The atonement was made in the Sanctuary, but Calvary was not such a place.

5. He could not, according to Heb. viii, 4, make the atonement while on earth. "If he were on earth, he should not be a Priest." The Levitical was the earthly priesthood, the Divine, the heavenly.

6. Therefore, he did not begin' the work of making the atonement, whatever the nature of that work may be, till after his ascension, when by his own blood he entered his heavenly Sanctuary for us.

Let us now examine a few texts that appear to speak of the atonement as passed. Rom. v, 11; "By whom we have now received the atonement," [margin, reconciliation.] This passage clearly shows a present possession of the atonement at the time the apostle wrote; but it by no means proves that the entire atonement was then in the past.

When the Saviour was about to be taken up from his apostles, he "commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father," which came on the day of Pentecost when they were all "baptized with the Holy Ghost." Christ had entered his Father's house, the Sanctuary, as High Priest, and began his intercession for his people by "praying the Father" for "another Comforter," John xiv, 15, "and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost," Acts ii. 33 he shed

it down upon his waiting apostles. Then, in compliance with their commission, Peter, at the 3d hour of the day began to preach, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins," Acts ii, 38. This word remission, signifies forgiveness, pardon or more literally sending away of sins.

Now put by the side of this text another on this point from his discourse at the 9th hour of the same day, Ac. iii, 19, "Repent ye therefore; and be converted that your sins may be blotted out when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord." Here he exhorts to repentance and conversion (turning away from sins); for what purpose? "That your sins *may be* (future) blotted out." Everyone can see that the blotting out of sins does not take place at repentance and conversion; but follows, and must of necessity be preceded by them. Repentance, conversion, and baptism had then become imperative duties in the present tense; and when performed, those doing them "washed away" (Ac. xxii, 16) remitted or sent away from them their sins.—(Ac. ii, 28;) and of course are forgiven and have "received the atonement;" but they had not received it entire at that time, because their sins were not yet blotted out. How far then had they advanced in the reconciling process? Just so far as the individual under the law had when he had confessed his sin, brought his victim to the door of the tabernacle, laid his hand upon it and slain it, and the priest had with its blood entered the Holy and sprinkled it before the vail and upon the altar and thus made an atonement for him, and he was forgiven. Only that was the type, and this the reality. That prepared for the cleansing of the great day of atonement, this for the blotting out of sins "when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord, and he shall send Jesus." Hence, "by whom we have now received the atonement" is the same as "by whom we have received forgiveness of sin." At this point the man is "made free from sin." The Lamb on Calvary's cross is our victim slain; "Jesus the Mediator of the new Covenant" "in the heavens" is our interceding High Priest, making atonement with his own blood, by and with which he entered there. The essence of the process is the same as in the "shadow." 1st, Convinced of sin; 2d, Repentance and Confession; 3d, Present the Divine sacrifice bleeding. This done in faith and sincerity we can do no more, no more is required.

Then in the heavenly Sanctuary our High Priest with his own blood makes the atonement and we are forgiven. i Peter ii, 24; "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree." See also Matt. viii, 17; Isa. liii, 4-12. His body is the "one sacrifice" for

repenting mortals, to which their sins are imputed, and through whose blood in the hands of the living active Priest they are conveyed to the heavenly Sanctuary. That was offered "once for all," "on the tree;" and all who would avail themselves of its merits must through faith, there receive it as theirs, bleeding at the hands of sinful mortals like themselves. After thus obtaining the atonement of forgiveness we must "maintain good works," not the "*deeds of the law*;" but "*being dead to sin should live unto righteousness.*" This work we all understand to be peculiar to the Gospel Dispensation.

An inferential objection arises, which in many minds overwhelms any amount of Bible argument on this point. It is, New Jerusalem cannot be defiled, hence needs no cleansing; therefore, New Jerusalem is not the Sanctuary. A very summary process of inferential deduction truly, especially for those who have said so much on the insufficiency of mere inferential testimony. We would advise them to review the grounds of their faith, and see how many and strong arguments they have for the earth or Palestine being the Sanctuary, and how many objections to the Sanctuary of the new covenant being where its Priest is, that are not entirely inferential; and then in place of their inferences, take the plain testimony of the Word and teach it. But how was the Sanctuary defiled? The Sanctuary of the Old Testament, being on earth, could be, and was, defiled in various ways—by an unclean person entering it; "She shall touch no hallowed thing, nor come into the Sanctuary, until the days of her purifying be fulfilled;" Lev. xii, 4. It could be profaned by the high priest going out of it, while the anointing oil was upon him, for the dead; (Lev. xxi, 12;) by a man's negotiating to purify himself; Num. xvii, 20. All the chief of the priests and of the people polluted it by transgressing very much after all the abominations of the heathen; ii Ch. xxxvi, 14. "Surely, because thou hast defiled my sanctuary with all thy detestable things, and with all thine abominations [idolatry,] therefore will I diminish thee." Eze. v, 11.

Moreover this they have done unto me; they have defiled my sanctuary in the same day, and have profaned my Sabbaths: for when they had slain their children to their idols, then they came the same day into my sanctuary to profane it; Eze. xxiii, 38, 39. "Her priests have polluted the sanctuary; they have done violence to the law." Zeph. iii, 4. Antiochus polluted it by offering swine" flesh upon its altar, Mac. From these texts

we can clearly see, that it was moral rather than physical uncleanness that defiled the sanctuary in the sight of the Lord. True, it did become physically unclean, but that uncleanness had to be removed *before* the atonement was made by which it was reconciled or cleansed. See ii Chap. 29. And that, we have seen was the law of cleansing, Lev. xii to xv Chaps.; the object must be made visibly clean, so to speak, so that we would call it *clean*, to *prepare* it for its real cleansing with blood. Now no one supposes that New Jerusalem is unclean or ever has been, as its type was when overrun, desecrated and desolated by Syrian, Chaldean or Roman soldiery, or trod by wicked priests. Even if it were, the removing of such defilement would not be the *cleansing* it was to undergo at the end of the 2300 days. The sanctuary was unclean in some sense, or else it would not need to be cleansed; and it must in some way have received its uncleanness from man. Removed, as the heavenly sanctuary is from the midst of mortals and entered only by our Forerunner, Jesus, made an High Priest, it can only be defiled by mortals through his agency, and for them cleansed by the same agency. The legal typical process of defiling and cleansing the sanctuary through the agency of the priest has been examined. With that in our minds, let us go to the New Testament. Paul says, Col. i, 19, 20, "For it pleased the Father that in him should all fullness dwell, and having made [margin, making] peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him I say, whether they be things on earth or things in heaven." When "things on earth" are spoken of in connection or contrast with "things in heaven," no one can understand them all to be in the same place. "Things in heaven" are to be reconciled as well as "things on earth."

If they needed reconciling they *were* unreconciled; if unreconciled, then unclean in some sense in his sight. The blood of Christ is the means, and Christ himself the agent of reconciling to the Father both the things in heaven and the things on earth. People have an idea that in heaven where our Saviour has gone, every thing is, and always was perfect beyond change or improvement. But he said, "In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you." He went into heaven, and Paul says that the "building of God, an house not made with hands" is in the heavens; ii Cor. v, 1.

For what did he go to his Father's house? "To *prepare* a place for you." Then it was unprepared, and when he has prepared it, he will come again and take us to himself.—

Again, Heb. ix, 23, "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." What were the patterns? "The tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry," (ver. 21,) which constituted the worldly Sanctuary; ver. 1. What were the heavenly things themselves? The greater and more perfect tabernacle, (ver. 11,) and the good things and the holy things; (vers. 11, 12.)—These are all in heaven itself. "For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself," ver. 24. Paul here shows that it was as necessary to purify the heavenly things, as it was to purify their patterns, the worldly.

#### THE SCAPE-GOAT.

The next event of that day after the Sanctuary was cleansed, was putting all the iniquities and transgressions of the children of Israel upon the head of the Scape-goat and sending him away into a land not inhabited, or of separation. It is supposed by almost every one that this goat typified Christ in some of his offices, and that the type was fulfilled at the first Advent. From this opinion I must differ; because, 1st, That goat was not sent away till after the High Priest had *made an end* of cleansing the Sanctuary, Lev. xvi, 20, 21; hence that event cannot meet its antitype till after the end of the 2300 days. 2d, It was sent away from Israel into the wilderness, a land not inhabited, to receive them. If our blessed Saviour is its antitype, He also must be sent away, not his body alone, but soul and body, for the goat was sent away alive, from, not to nor into this people; neither into heaven, for that is not a wilderness or land not inhabited. 3d, It received and retained all the iniquities of Israel; but when Christ appears the second time He will be "without sin." 4th, The goat received the iniquities from the hands of the priest and he *sent it away*. As Christ is the priest the goat must be something else besides himself, and which he can *send away*. 5th, This was one of two goats chosen for that day, one was the Lord's and offered for a sin offering; but the other was not called the Lord's, neither offered as a sacrifice. Its only office was to receive the iniquities from the priest after he had cleansed the Sanctuary from them, and bear them into a land not inhabited, leaving the Sanctuary, priest and people behind and free from their iniquities. Lev. xvi, 7-10, 22. 6th, The Hebrew name of the scape-goat, as will be seen from the margin of ver. 8, is "Azazel." On this verse, Wm. Jenks, in his Comp. Com. has the following remarks: ["Scape-goat.] See

diff. opin. in Bochart. Spencer, after the *oldest* opinion of the Hebrews and Christians, thinks Azazel is the name of the devil; and so Rosenmire, whom see. The Syriac has Azazel, the angel, (Strongone) who revolted." 7th, At the appearing of Christ, as taught from Rev. xx, Satan is to be bound and cast into the bottomless pit, which act and place are significantly symbolized by the ancient High Priest sending the scape-goat into a separate and uninhabited wilderness. 8th, Thus we have the Scripture, the definition of the name in two ancient languages both spoken at the same time, and the oldest opinion of the Christians in favor of regarding the scape-goat as a type of *Satan*. In the common use of the term, men always associate it with something mean, calling the greatest villains and refugees from justice scape-goats. Ignorance of the law and its meaning is the only possible origin that can be assigned for the opinion that the scape-goat was a type of Christ.

Because it is said, "The goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities into a land not inhabited." Lev. xvi, 21; And John said, "Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh [margin, beareth] away the sin of the world," it is concluded without further thought that the former was the type of the latter. But a little attention to the law will show that the sins were borne from the people by the priest, and from the priest by the goat. 1st. They are imparted to the victim. 2d, The priest bore them in its blood to the Sanctuary. 3d, After cleansing them from it on the 10th of the seventh month, he bore them to the scape-goat. And 4th, The goat finally bore them away beyond the camp of Israel to the wilderness.

This was the legal process, and when fulfilled the author of sins will have received them back again, (but the ungodly will bear their own sins,) and his head will have been bruised by the seed of the woman; the "strong man armed" will have been bound by a stronger than he, "and his house (the grave) spoiled of its goods (the saints). Matt. xii, 29; Lev. xi, 21, 22. The thousand years imprisonment of Satan will have begun, and the saints will have entered upon their millennial reign with Christ.

The Sanctuary must be cleansed before Christ appears; because, 1, He "was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation."—Now as his last act in bearing the sins of many is to bear them from the Sanctuary after he has cleansed it, and as he does not appear till after having borne the sins of many, and

then without sin it is manifest that the Sanctuary must be cleansed before he appears. 2, The host are still under the indignation after the Sanctuary is cleansed, Dan. viii. Both the Sanctuary and the host were trodden under foot. "Unto 2300 days then shall the *Sanctuary* be cleansed," or justified (margin.) This is the first point in the explanation, and after this Daniel still "sought for the meaning of the vision," and Gabriel came "to make him know *what* should be in the *last end* of the indignation." In the explanation which follows; he says nothing about the Sanctuary, because that had been explained by the Wonderful Numberer. He now tells him about the host upon whom the last end of the indignation still rests after the Sanctuary is cleansed.

\* \* \* \* \*

The last end of the indignation is evidently the bitter persecutions, and the severe and searching trial of God's people, after the Sanctuary is cleansed, and before the indignation is *made to cease* in the destruction of the little Horn, the fruit and the successor of the Assyrian, Dan. viii, 25; Is. x, 12, xxv, 3. The Sanctuary must be cleansed before the resurrection, for the Lord has provided a comforting message for his people, telling them that it is done. "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God. Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her that her warfare [appointed time, margin] is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned: for she hath received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins," Is. xl, 1, 2. Jerusalem and the Lord's people are here spoken of, as the Sanctuary and host are in Dan. viii. His people, when Jerusalem's appointed time is accomplished, are affected and are to be comforted by telling them that her iniquity is pardoned. This must be New Jerusalem, for there was never any time set for pardoning the iniquity of Old Jerusalem which must have had iniquity of some kind and from some source, else she could not be pardoned of it. The fact that the Lord has commanded to comfort his people by telling them that Jerusalem's iniquity is pardoned, is proof positive that she had iniquity, and that it will be removed before his people are delivered and enter her with songs and everlasting joy. This message is similar to that in Isa. lii, 9. After the good and peaceful tidings have been published, saying unto Zion, *Thy God reigneth*, it is declared, "The Lord has comforted his people, he *hath redeemed* Jerusalem."—Jerusalem was in a state from which she had to be redeemed, and that before the resurrection; for the next verse says, "All the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of our God."—*Day Star Extra* 1846.

## SANCTUARY

—138—

## TWENTY THREE HUNDRED DAYS

BY J. N. ANDREWS.

"**THREE THOUSAND AND THREE HUNDRED DAYS; THREE THOUSAND AND THREE HUNDRED DAYS;**  
"SACRED AND HOLY DAYS."

No apology can be needed for the presentation of this subject. Those who have any interest in the past Advent movement, cannot be otherwise than deeply interested in the question of our disappointment. To examine this question with candor and fairness, and to set forth the reasons why our expectations were not realized, is the object of this Work.

Several points presented in these pages may, however, need to be briefly noticed. On pages 21 and 22 we quoted from the *Advent Herald*, a denial of the connection between the 70 weeks and 2300 days by S. Bliss. But Justice to Elder Himes, demands that we here state that in a recent number of the *Herald* he has acknowledged their connection. Referring to the first lecture which he heard Mr. Miller deliver, he remarks :

" He poured forth a flood of light from other scriptures upon every part of his subject, and fully shut me up to the faith, both as to the number and time of our Savior's Second Advent. And although the time has passed without the event being realized, I have never been able to solve the mystery. The connection of the seventy weeks with the 2300 days vision still looks clear, but it cannot be harmonized with the light we now have on chronology; but having done our duty, we wait patiently for the clear light of heaven upon the subject, in expectation of the full and speedy realization of all we ever hoped for in the fulfillment of prophecy, both as to the nature of the events, and the time of their realization, at the end of the days. And we are exhorted in view of this, not to cast away our confidence which hath great recompence of reward, for we have need of patience, that after we have done the will of God, we might receive the promise." —*Advent Herald* Feb. 26th, 1853.

That this subject should be shrouded in mystery to those who believe that the earth is the *sanctuary*, is not strange; for if the connection between the 70 weeks and the 2300 days be admitted, it is certain that the period has ended—And if the earth is the *sanctuary*, the prophecy has failed; for no part of the earth has as yet undergone a change. Hence, there is no way to explain the passing of the time, unless we deny the connection of the 70 weeks and the 2300 days, or conclude that the earth may not be the *sanctuary*. The first of these positions is adopted by S. Bliss. Elder H., however, still admits the connection of the two periods, but contends himself with calling our disappointment a mystery.

ROCHESTER, N. Y.  
PRINTED BY JAMES WHITE,  
1852.

But does the Bible call the earth the *sanctuary*? Does it warrant the conclusion that at the end of the period the earth would be barren? Does it not, on the contrary, by a mass of testimony, teach that something else is the *sanctuary*.

## P R E F A C E.

---

No apology can be needed for the presentation of this subject. Those who have any interest in the past Advent movement, cannot be otherwise than deeply interested in the question of our disappointment. To examine this question with candor and fairness, and to set forth the reasons why our expectations were not realized, is the object of this Work.

Several points presented in these pages may, however, need to be briefly noticed. On pages 21 and 22 we quoted from the *Advent Herald*, a denial of the connection between the 70 weeks and 2300 days by S. Bliss. But Justice to Elder Himes, demands that we here state that in a recent number of the *Herald* he has acknowledged their connection. Referring to the first lecture which he heard Mr. Miller deliver, he remarks :

" He poured forth a flood of light from other scriptures upon every part of his subject, and fully shut me up to the faith, both as to the number and time of our Savior's Second Advent. And although the time has passed without the event being realized, I have never been able to solve the mystery. The connection of the seventy weeks with the 2300 days vision still looks clear, but it cannot be harmonized with the light we now have on chronology; but having done our duty, we wait patiently for the clear light of heaven upon the subject, in expectation of the full and speedy realization of all we ever hoped for in the fulfillment of prophecy, both as to the nature of the events, and the time of their realization, at the end of the days. And we are exhorted in view of this, not to cast away our confidence which hath great recompence of reward, for we have need of patience, that after we have done the will of God, we might receive the promise." —*Advent Herald* Feb. 26th, 1853.

That this subject should be shrouded in mystery to those who believe that the earth is the *sanctuary*, is not strange; for if the connection between the 70 weeks and the 2300 days be admitted, it is certain that the period has ended—And if the earth is the *sanctuary*, the prophecy has failed; for no part of the earth has as yet undergone a change. Hence, there is no way to explain the passing of the time, unless we deny the connection of the 70 weeks and the 2300 days, or conclude that the earth may not be the *sanctuary*. The first of these positions is adopted by S. Bliss. Elder H., however, still admits the connection of the two periods, but contends himself with calling our disappointment a mystery.

But does the Bible call the earth the *sanctuary*? Does it warrant the conclusion that at the end of the period the earth would be barren? Does it not, on the contrary, by a mass of testimony, teach that something else is the *sanctuary*.

ary of the Lord? And does it not also teach a different method of cleansing the sanctuary, than by fire? The answer to these questions will be found in the following pages.

On Pages 44—46, the prophecy of Ezekiel [Chap. x.—xviii] respecting the restoration of the typical sanctuary is noticed. The position is there taken that these blessings were offered to Israel on certain conditions, and that they belonged to the period of the typical dispensation. And further, that as those conditions were never complied with, the promised blessings were never bestowed upon that people. The reasons for this view are there presented. The following from Elsie's *Commentary on the Apocalypse*, Pages 7 and 9, may be of value to the reader.

"**CONDITIONAL PROPHECY** is when the fulfillment is dependant on the compliance of those to whom the promise is made, with the conditions on which it is given. Examples.—'If ye walk in my statutes and keep my commandments, and do them: then I will give you rain in due season, and the land shall yield her increase, and the trees of the field shall yield her fruit.' Lev. xxvi, 3, 4. 'But if ye will not hearken unto me, and will not do all these commandments; and if ye shall despise my statutes, or if your soul abhor my judgments, so that ye will not do all my commandments, but that ye break my covenant: I also will do this unto you, I will even appoint over you terror, consumption, and the burning ague, that shall consume the eyes, and cause sorrow of heart: and ye shall sow your seed in vain: for your enemies shall eat it.' Verses 14—16. 'And it shall come to pass, if thou shalt hearken diligently unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe and to do all his commandments which I command thee this day: that the Lord thy God will set thee on high above all nations of the earth: and all these blessings shall come on thee, and overtake thee, if thou shalt hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God.' Deut. xxviii, 1, 2. 'But if it shall come to pass, if thou wilt not hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe to do all his commandments and his statutes which I command thee this day: that all these curses shall come upon thee, and overtake thee,' &c. Verse 15.

Predictions of mere national prosperity, or adversity, are usually conditional. When the condition is not expressed, it is implied.

**Example.**—The Lord said unto Jonah, 'Arise, go into Nineveh, that great city, and preach unto it the preaching that I bid thee. \*\*\* And Jonah began to enter into the city a day's journey, and he cried, and said, Yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown. So the people of Nineveh believed God, and proclaimed a fast, and put on sackcloth, from the greatest of them even to the least of them. \*\*\* And God saw their works, that they turned from their evil way: and God repented of the evil that he said he would do unto them: and he did it not.'

For all cases of this kind, the Lord has given the following general Rule: 'At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, and to pull down, and to destroy it; if that nation against whom I have pronounced, turns from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them. And at what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant it: if it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then I will repeat of the good wherewith I said I would benefit them.' Jer. xxviii, 7—10."

## THE SANCTUARY.

In presenting this most important subject for the consideration of the people of God, we invite the candid and prayerful attention of all who have ears to hear. It is well understood by thoughtful believers, that the great disappointment of the Advent believers arose from the fact that they believed the cleansing of the sanctuary to be the burning of the earth, or some event to transpire at the second Advent of the Lord Jesus; and as they could clearly establish the fact that the 2300 days would terminate in the Autumn of 1844, they looked with the full assurance of faith and hope for the glorious appearing of the Son of God at that time. Painful and grievous was the disappointment; and while the heart of the trusting was bowed with sorrow, numbers were not wanting who openly denied the hand of God in the Advent movement, and made utter shipwreck of their faith.

As the subject of the sanctuary of the Bible involves the most important facts connected with our disappointment, it is worthy of the serious attention of all who wait the consolation of Israel. Let us then examine again with care, the vision of the man greatly beloved, recorded in Daniel viii. We call attention to the symbols presented in this chapter. The first thing presented to the eye of the prophet, was

**THE VIEW OF THE RAM.**—"Then I lifted up mine eyes, and saw, and behold, there stood before the river, a ram which had two horns: and the two horns were high; but one was higher than the other, and the higher came up last. I saw the ram pushing stand before him, neither was there any that could deliver out of his hand; but he did according to his will, and became great." Verses 3, 4.

**THE VIEW OF THE GOAT.**—"And as I was considering, behold an he goat came from the west on the face of the whole earth,

and touched not the ground; and the goat had a notable horn between his eyes. And he came to the ram that had two horns, which I had seen standing before the river, and ran unto him in the fury of his power. And I saw him come close unto the ram, and he was moved with choler against him, and smote the ram, and brake his two horns; and there was no power in the ram to stand before him, but he cast him down to the ground, and stamped upon him; and there was none that could deliver the ram out of his hand. Therefore, the he goat waxed very great; and when he was strong, the great horn was broken; and for it, came up four notable ones toward the four winds of heaven." Verses 5-8.

**THE VIEW OF THE LITTLE HORN.**—"And out of one of them came forth a little horn, which waxed exceeding great, toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land. And it waxed great, even to the host of heaven; and it cast down some of the host and of the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them. Yea, he magnified himself even to the Prince of the Host, and by him the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down. And an host was given him against the daily sacrifice by reason of transgression, and it cast down the truth to the ground; and it practised, and prospered." Verses 9-12.

**THE VIEW OF THE SANCTUARY AND 2300 DAYS.**—"Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto that certain saint which spake, How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot? And he said unto me, Unto 2300 days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." Verses 13, 14.

#### GABRIEL COMMANDED TO EXPLAIN THIS VISION.

"And it came to pass, when I, even I Daniel, had seen the vision, and sought for the meaning, then behold there stood before me as the appearance of a man. And I heard a man's voice between the banks of Ulai, which called, and said, Gabriel, make this man to understand the vision. So he came near where I stood; and when he came, I was afraid, and fell upon my face; but he said unto me, Understand, O son of man; for at the time of the end shall be the vision. Now as he was speaking with me, I

was in a deep sleep on my face toward the ground; but he touched me, and set me upright. And he said, Behold, I will make thee know what shall be in the last end of the indignation; for at the time appointed the end shall be." Verses 15-19.

**SYMBOL OF THE RAM EXPLAINED.**—"The ram which thou sawest having two horns are the kings of Media and Persia," Verse 20. Then the meaning of the first symbol cannot be misunderstood. By it, the Medo-Persian empire was presented to the eye of the prophet. Its two horns denoting the union of these two powers in one government. This vision, therefore, does not begin with the empire of Babylon, as do the visions of the second and seventh chapters, but it commences with the empire of the Medes and Persians at the height of its power, prevailing westward, northward and southward, so that no power could stand before it. The explanation of the next symbol will show what power overthrew the Persian empire and succeeded to its place.

**SYMBOL OF THE GOAT EXPLAINED.**—"And the rough goat is the king of Grecia; and the great horn that is between his eyes is the first king. Now that being broken, whereas four stood up for it, four kingdoms shall stand up out of the nation, but not in his power." Verses 21, 22. The explanation of this symbol is also definite and certain. The power that should overthrow the Medes and Persians, and in their stead, bear rule over the earth, is the empire of the Greeks. Greece succeeded Persia in the dominion of the world n. c. 331. The great horn is here explained to be the first king of Grecia; it was Alexander the great. The four horns that arose when this horn was broken, denote the four kingdoms into which the empire of Alexander was divided after his death. The same was represented by the four heads and four wings of the leopard. Dan. vii, 8. It is predicted without the use of symbols in Dan. xi, 3, 4. These four kingdoms were Macedonia, Thrace, Syria and Egypt. They originated b. c. 312.

**SYMBOL OF THE LITTLE HORN EXPLAINED.**—"And in the latter time of their kingdom, when the transgressors are come to the full, a king of fierce countenances, and understanding dark sentences, shall stand up. And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power; and he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper, and practice, and shall destroy the mighty and the holy people. And through his policy also he shall cause craft to

prosper in his hand ; and he shall magnify himself in his heart, and by peace shall destroy many ; he shall also stand up against the Prince of princes ; but he shall be broken without hand." Verses 23-25.

To avoid the application of this prophecy to the Roman power, Pagan and Papal, the Papists have shifted it from Rome to Antiochus Epiphanes, a Syrian king who could not resist the mandates of Rome. See notes of the Doway [Romish] Bible on Dan. viii; viii; xi. This application is made by the Papists, to save their church from any share in the fulfilment of the prophecy ; and in this, they have been followed by the mass of opposers to the Advent faith. The following facts show that

#### THE LITTLE HORN WAS NOT ANTOUCHUS.

1. The four kingdoms into which the dominion of Alexander was divided, are symbolized by the four horns of the goat. Now this Antiochus was but one of the twenty-five kings that constituted the Syrian horn. How, then, could he, at the same time, be another remarkable horn ?

2. The ram, according to this vision, became great ; the goat waxed very great ; but the little horn became exceeding great. How absurd and ludicrous is the following application of this comparison :

Great.	Very Great.	Exceeding Great.
Persia.	Grecia.	Antiochus.

How easy and natural is the following :

Great.	Very Great.	Exceeding Great.
Persia.	Grecia.	ROME.

3. The Medo-Persian empire is simply called *great*. Verse 3.

4. The Bible informs us that it extended "from India even unto Ethiopia, over an hundred seven and twenty provinces." Esther i, 1. This was succeeded by the Grecian power, which is called **VERY GREAT**. Verse 8. Then comes the power in question which is called **EXCEEDING GREAT**. Verse 9. Was Antiochus exceeding great when compared with Alexander, the conqueror of the world ? Let an item from the Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge answer :

"Finding his resources exhausted, he resolved to go into Persia, to levy tributes and collect large sums which he had agreed to pay to the Romans."

Surely we need not question which was exceeding great, the Roman power which exacted the tribute, or Antiochus who was compelled to pay it.

4. The power in question was "little" at first, but it waxed or grew "exceeding great toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land." What can this describe but the conquering marches of a mighty power ? Rome was almost directly northwest from Jerusalem, and its conquests in Asia and Africa were, of course, towards the east and south ; but where were Antiochus' conquests ? He came into possession of a kingdom already established, and Sir Isaac Newton says, "He did *not* enlarge it."

5. Out of many reasons that might be added to the above, we name but one. This power was to stand up against the Prince of princes. Verse 25. The Prince of princes is Jesus Christ. Rev. i, 5 ; xvii, 14 ; xix, 16. But Antiochus died 164 years before our Lord was born. It is settled, therefore, that another power is the subject of this prophecy. The following facts demonstrate that

#### ROME IS THE POWER IN QUESTION.

1. This power was to come forth from one of the four kingdoms of Alexander's empire. Let us remember that nations are not brought into prophecy, till somehow connected with the people of God. Rome had been in existence many years before it was noticed in prophecy ; and Rome had made Macedonia, one of the four horns of the Grecian goat, a part of itself n. c. 168, about ten years before its first connection with the people of God. See 1 Mac. viii. So that Rome could as truly be said to be "out of one of them," as the *ten horns* of the fourth beast in the seventh chapter, could be said to come out of *that beast*, when they were ten kingdoms set up by the conquerors of Rome.

2. It was to wax exceeding great toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land. [Palestine. Ps. cvi. 24; Zech. vii, 14.] This was true of Rome in every particular. Witness its conquests in Africa and Asia, and its overthrow of the place and nation of the Jews. John xi, 48.

3. It was to cast down of the host and of the stars. This is predicted respecting the dragon. Rev. xii, 3, 4. All admit that the dragon was Rome. Who can fail to see their identity ?

4. Rome was emphatically a king of fierce countenance, and one that did understand dark sentences. Moses used similar lan-

guage, when as all agree, he predicted the Roman power. Deut. xxviii, 49, 50.

5. Rome did destroy wonderfully. Witness its overthrow of all opposing powers.

6. Rome has destroyed more of "the mighty and the holy people," than all other persecuting powers combined. From fifty to one hundred millions of the church have been slain by it.

7. Rome did stand up against the Princes of princes. The Roman power nailed Jesus Christ to the cross. Acts iv, 26, 27; Matt. xxvii, 2; Rev. xii, 4.

8. This power is to "be broken without hand." How clear the reference to the stone "cut out without hand" that smote the image. Dan. ii, 34. Its destruction then does not take place until the final overthrow of earthly power. These facts are conclusive proof that Rome is the subject of this prophecy. For an extended notice, see *Advent Library*, No. 33.

The field of vision, then, is the empires of Persia, Greece and Rome.

That part of the vision that now engages our attention is the time—the reckoning of the 2300 days.

#### THE 2300 DAYS NOT EXPLAINED IN DAN. VIII.

Gabriel did explain to Daniel what was meant by the symbols of the beasts and of the horns, but did not in this vision explain to him the 2300 days and the sanctuary. Hence, Daniel tells us at the end of the chapter that he "was astonished at the vision, but none understood it." But there are several facts that will give us some light on this matter.

1. It is a fact that 2300 literal days (not quite seven years) would not cover the duration of a single power in this prophecy, much less extend over them all. Therefore, the days must be symbols, even as the beasts and horns are shown to be symbols.

2. It is a fact, that a symbolic or prophetic day is one year. Ex. iv, 5, 6; Num. xiv, 34. Hence, the period is 2300 years.

3. It must begin with "the vision;" consequently it commences in the height of the Medo-Persian power.

But the angel has not yet explained the "manner of time," or given its date to the prophet. If Gabriel never did explain this subject to Daniel, he is a fallen angel; for he was commanded in plain terms thus to do. Dan. viii, 16. But he is not a fallen

angel as appears from the fact that some hundred years after this, he was sent by Jehovah to Zacharias and to Mary. Luke i. Gabriel did explain to Daniel at that time more than he could bear, [verse 27,] and at a later period, as we shall now show, he did make Daniel understand the vision.

#### GABRIEL EXPLAINS IN DAN. IX. WHAT HE OMITTED IN DAN. VIII.

As we have seen, the charge had been given to Gabriel to make Daniel understand the vision. Verse 16. But in the last verse of the chapter we learn that "none understood" the vision. This must refer particularly to the 2300 days, and to the sanctuary, as the other parts of the vision had been clearly explained.

But in the first verse of chapter x he informs us that a thing was revealed to him; "and the thing was true, but the time appointed was long; and he understood the thing, and had understanding of the vision." Hence, it is evident that between chapters viii and x, he must have obtained the desired understanding of the time. In other words, the explanation must be found in chapter ix.

Dan. ix commences with the earnest, importunate prayer of the prophet, from the reading of which it is evident that he had so far misunderstood the vision of chapter viii, that he concluded that the 2300 days of treading under foot the sanctuary would terminate with the 70 years desolation of the city and sanctuary predicted by Jeremiah. Compare verses 1 and 2 with verses 16 and 17. The man Gabriel is now sent to undeceive him, and to complete the explanation of the vision. "While I was speaking in prayer," says Daniel, "even the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning, [here he cites us back to chapter viii, 15, 16,] being caused to fly swiftly, touched me about the time of the evening oblation. And he informed me, and talked with me, and said, O Daniel, *I am now come forth to give thee skill and understanding.* At the beginning of thy supplications the commandment came forth, and *I am come to shew thee;* for thou art greatly beloved; therefore understand the matter, and consider the vision."—Verses 21—23.

Note these facts: 1. In verse 21, Daniel cites us to the vision of chapter viii. 2. In verse 22, Gabriel states that he had come to give Daniel skill and understanding. This being the object of

Gabriel's mission, Daniel, who at the close of chapter viii did not understand the vision, may, ere Gabriel leaves him, fully understand its import. 3. As Daniel testifies at the close of chapter viii that none understood the vision, it is certain that the charge given to Gabriel, "*Make this man to understand the vision*," still rested upon him. Hence it is that he tells Daniel, "I am now come forth to give thee skill and understanding," and in verse 23, commands him to "understand the matter, and to consider the vision." This is undeniable proof that Gabriel's mission in chapter ix, was for the purpose of explaining what he omitted in chapter viii. If any ask further evidence, the fact that Gabriel proceeds to explain the very point in question, most fully meets the request. That he does do this, we will now show.

#### GABRIEL'S EXPLANATION OF THE TIME.

"Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy." Dan. ix. 24. Whiting's Translation.

The facts which are set before us in the above, from Litch and Whiting, should not be forgotten. 1. The word rendered "determined," [verse 24.] literally signifies "cut off." 2. "*The vision*" which Gabriel came to *explain*, contained the period of 2300 days; and in the explanation he tells us that "seventy weeks have been cut off" upon Jerusalem and the Jews. This is a demonstration that the seventy weeks are a part of the 2300 days. Hence the commencement of the seventy weeks is the date of the 2300 days. And the fact that the seventy weeks were fulfilled in 490 years as all admit, is a demonstration that the 2300 days from which this period of 490 days was cut off, is 2300 years.

#### THE ANGEL'S DATE OF THE SEVENTY WEEKS.

We have seen that the seventy weeks are cut off from the 2300 days. Hence, when the date of the seventy weeks is established, the key to unlock and understand the reckoning of the days is in our hand. The date for the commencement of the weeks is thus given by Gabriel: "Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince, shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks; the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times." Dan. ix. 25.

"Thus Chaldaic and Rabbinical authority, and that of the earliest versions, the Septuagint and Vulgate, give the single sig-

nification of 'cutting off' to this verb. Should it be inquired why a tropical sense has been attributed to it, such as 'determining' or 'decrewing,' it may be answered that the reference of the verse (in which it occurs) to Dan. viii. 14, was unobserved. It was therefore supposed that there was no propriety in saying 'seventy weeks are cut off,' when there was no other period of which they could have formed a portion. But as the period of 2300 days is first given, and verses 21 and 23, compared with Dan. viii. 16, show that the ninth chapter furnishes an explanation of the vision in which Gabriel appeared to Daniel, and of the 'matter'—(the commencement of the 2300 days)—the *literal* (or rather, to speak properly, the *only*) signification demanded by the subject matter, is that of 'cut off.'"  
—PROF. WHITING. *Midnight Cry*, Vol. IV, No. 17.

"Seventy weeks have been cut off upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sin-offerings, and to make atonement for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy." Dan. ix. 24. Whiting's Translation.

The facts which are set before us in the above, from Litch and Whiting, should not be forgotten. 1. The word rendered "determined," [verse 24.] literally signifies "cut off." 2. "*The vision*" which Gabriel came to *explain*, contained the period of 2300 days; and in the explanation he tells us that "seventy weeks have been cut off" upon Jerusalem and the Jews. This is a demonstration that the seventy weeks are a part of the 2300 days. Hence the commencement of the seventy weeks is the date of the 2300 days. And the fact that the seventy weeks were fulfilled in 490 years as all admit, is a demonstration that the 2300 days from which this period of 490 days was cut off, is 2300 years.

#### "DETERMINED," IN VERSE 24, MEANS CUT OFF.

"Seventy weeks are *determined*," literally 'cut off.' The Hebraists all admit that the word determined, in our English version, does signify 'cut off.' Not one has disputed it." —JOSUAH LITCH. *Midnight Cry*, Vol. IV, No. 25.

We present the following important testimony from the *Ad-*

*Saint Herald.* It is a calm, dispassionate vindication of the original dates, which establishes them beyond dispute. It was written in the years 1850 and 1851; and, consequently, cannot be supposed to be given with a desire to prove that the days ended in 1844, as the *Herald* is not willing to admit that fact. Therefore it must be regarded as candid and honorable testimony to important facts. That it demolishes every view which has been put forth to readjust the 2300 days, no one, who can appreciate the force of the arguments presented, will fail to perceive. For further testimony, the reader is cited to a very valuable work by S. Bliss, entitled, "Analysis of Sacred Chronology." The *Herald* speaks as follows:

"The Bible gives the data for a complete system of chronology, extending from the creation to the birth of Cyrus, a clearly ascertained date. From this period downwards we have the undisputed Canon of Ptolemy and the undoubted era of Nabonassar, extending below our vulgar era. At the point where inspired chronology leaves us, this Canon of undoubted accuracy commences. And thus the whole arch is spanned. It is by the Canon of Ptolemy that the great prophetical period of seventy weeks is fixed. This Canon places the seventh year of Artaxerxes in the year B. c. 457; and the accuracy of the Canon is demonstrated by the concurrent agreement of more than twenty eclipses. The seventy weeks date from the going forth of a decree respecting the restoration of Jerusalem. There were no decrees between the seventh and twentieth years of Artaxerxes. Four hundred and ninety years, beginning with the seventh, must commence in B. c. 457, and end in A. D. 34. Commencing in the twentieth, they must commence in before B. c. 444, and end in A. D. 47. As no event occurred in A. D. 47 to mark their termination, we cannot reckon from the twentieth; we must, therefore, look to the seventh of Artaxerxes. This date we cannot change from B. c. 457 without first demonstrating the inaccuracy of Ptolemy's Canon. To do this, it would be necessary to show that the large number of eclipses by which its accuracy has been repeatedly demonstrated, have not been correctly computed; and such a result would unsettle every chronological date, and leave the settlement of epochs and the adjustment of eras entirely at the mercy of every dreamer, so that chronology would be of no more value than mere guess-work. As the seventy weeks must terminate in A. D. 34, unless the seventh of Artaxerxes is wrongly fixed, and as that cannot be changed without some evidence to that effect, we inquire, What evidence marked that termination? The time when

the apostles turned to the Gentiles harmonizes with that date better than any other which has been named. And the crucifixion, in A. D. 31, in the midst of the last week, is sustained by a mass of testimony which cannot be easily invalidated."—*Advent Herald*, March 2, 1850.

"The Saviour attended but four passovers, at the last of which he was crucified. This could not bring the crucifixion later than A. D. 31, as is recorded by Aurelius Caiusiodorus, a respectable Roman Senator, about A. D. 514: 'In the consulate of Tiberius Caesar Aug. V. and Julius Sejanus, [V. c. 784, A. D. 31.] our Lord Jesus Christ suffered on the eighth of the Calends of April.' In this year, and in this day, says Dr. Hales, agree also the Council of Cesarea, A. D. 196, or 198, the Alexandrian Chronicle, Maximus Monachus, Nicephorus Constantinus, Cedrenus; and in this year, but on different days, concur Eusebius and Epiphaneus, followed by Kehler, Bucher, Patinus, and Petavius."—*Advent Herald*, August 24, 1850.

"There are certain chronological points which have been settled as fixed; and before the seventy weeks can be made to terminate at a later period, those must be unsettled, by being shown to have been fixed on *wrong principles*; and a new date must be assigned for their commencement based on *better principles*. Now, that the commencement of the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus was B. c. 464-3, is demonstrated by the agreement of above twenty eclipses, which have been repeatedly calculated, and have invariably been found to fall in the times specified. Before it can be shown that the commencement of his reign is wrongly fixed, it must first be shown that those eclipses have all been wrongly calculated. This no one has done, or ever will venture to do. Consequently the commencement of his reign cannot be removed from that point.

The seventy weeks must date from some decree for the restoration of Jerusalem. Only two events are named in the reign of Artaxerxes for the commencement of those weeks. The one is the decree of the seventh year of his reign, and the other, that of the twentieth. From one of these, those four hundred and ninety years must reckon. As his reign began B. c. 464-3, his seventh year must have been B. c. 458-7; and his twentieth, B. c. 445-4. If the seventy weeks date from the former, they cannot terminate later than A. D. 34; and if from the latter, they cannot have terminated earlier than A. D. 46-7.

In addition to the above, sixty-nine of the seventy were to extend to the Messiah the Prince. It does not read that they are to terminate when he is called the Prince, or that he is to begin to be the Prince when they terminate. They were to extend to

the MEASTAH—the words, the Prince, being added to show who was signified by the Messiah. Sixty-nine weeks of years are four hundred and eighty-three years. Beginning these with the seventh of Artaxerxes, they extend to A. D. 26-7; dating from the twentieth, they terminate in A. D. 39-40. Was there anything in either of those years which would make the words, ‘unto the Messiah the Prince,’ appropriate? When Jesus was baptized of John in Jordan, a voice was heard from heaven, acknowledging the Saviour as the Son of God, in whom the Father was well pleased. Consequently he was ‘the Messiah the Prince,’ whose coming had been predicted. With that baptism, the Saviour commenced the work of his public ministry—the Messiah the Prince had then come, as it was predicted he should at the end of the sixty-nine weeks. When he was acknowledged as the Son of God—the Messiah—he went into Galilee preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God, and saying, ‘*The time is fulfilled.*’ The time then fulfilled, must have been some predicted period. There was no predicted period which could then terminate but the sixty-nine, or seventy weeks. Did either of these then terminate? We have seen that the former, reckoned from the seventh of Artaxerxes—as it is fixed by astronomical calculations, would end in A. D. 26-7; and A. D. 27 we find is the precise point of time when the Saviour must have been about thirty years of age, when he was baptized of John, and declared the time fulfilled. At the first passover the Saviour attended, which could not have been later than the Spring of his second year, the Jews told him that the temple had then been forty-six years in building: reckoning back forty-six years from A. D. 28, they began B. C. 19, which is the precise year when Herod began the work of rebuilding the temple. From the eclipse which marked the death of Herod, before which the Saviour had been born, his birth could not have been later than B. C. 4, which would make him about thirty at the very time of his baptism of John. Such a concurrence of chronological, astronomical, and historical testimony, can only be set aside by testimony still more conclusive.

Your argument that he was not called a prince till after his crucifixion is of no weight; for the Jews could not have crucified ‘the Prince of life,’ as Peter accused them, if he was not the Prince of life till after his crucifixion. Nor is your argument respecting the midst of the week any more to the point. Your criticism has respect only to the English word *midst*. If you wish to show that it does not mean middle in the present case, you must first show that the Hebrew word *chatzah*, which is here translated *midst*, from the verb *chatzah*, has no such meaning; and that its verb has not a special signification of dividing into two parts, or

to halve; and that it has not ‘a general sense of dividing into any number of equal parts,’ as Hebraists tell us it has. Till you show this, you make no progress whatever towards proving that it does not mean ‘middle.’ But what was to occur in the *midst* of the week? ‘The sacrifice and oblation’ were then to cease. Those Jewish ordinances could only cease actually or virtually. They did not actually cease till A. D. 70. They ceased virtually only at the crucifixion: they then ceased to foreshadow the sacrifice then offered. Was that in the *midst* of the week? 3 1-2 years from A. D. 27 bring us to the Spring of A. D. 31, where Dr. Hales has demonstrated the crucifixion took place. The week during which the covenant was confirmed, was that in the ‘midst’ of which the sacrifice and oblation virtually ceased. Consequently it could not extend beyond A. D. 34—the latest time to which seventy weeks from the seventh of Artaxerxes Longimanus could reach.”

“Eusebius dates the first half of the Passion Week of years as beginning with our Lord’s baptism, and ending with his crucifixion. The same period precisely is recorded by Peter, as including our Lord’s *personal* ministry: ‘All the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from the baptism of [or by] John, until the day that he was taken up from us,’ at his ascension, which was only forty-three days after the crucifixion. Acts i. 21, 22. And the remaining half of the Passion Week ended with the martyrdom of Stephen, in the seventh, or last year of the week. For it is remarkable, that the year after, A. D. 35, began a new era in the church, namely, the conversion of Saul, or Paul, the Apostle, by the personal appearance of Christ to him on the road to Damascus, when he received his mission to the Gentiles, after the Jewish Sanhedrim had formally rejected Christ by persecuting his disciples. Acts ix. 1-18. And the remainder of the Acts principally records the circumstances of his mission to the Gentiles, and the churches he founded among them.”—Dr. Hales, as quoted in the *Advent Herald*, March 2, 1850.

‘The foregoing testimony from the *Herald* establishes the following important points: 1. The decree referred to in Dan. ix, from which the 70 weeks are dated, is the decree of the seventh of Artaxerxes, and not that of his twentieth year. Ezra vii. And to this point we deem it duty to append an extract from Prof. Whiting:

“We are informed in Ezra vii. 11, ‘Now this is the copy of the letter that the king Artaxerxes gave unto Ezra the priest, the scribe, even a scribe of the words of the commandments of the

**Lord, and of his statutes to Israel.' The letter then follows, written not in Hebrew, but in Chaldaic (or the Eastern Aramic) the language then used at Babylon. At the 27th verse, the narrative proceeds in Hebrew. We are thus furnished with the original document, by virtue of which Ezra was authorized to 'restore and build Jerusalem'; or, in other words, by which he was clothed with power, not merely to erect walls or houses, but regulate the affairs of his countrymen in general, to 'set magistrates and judges which may judge all the people beyond the river.' He was commissioned to enforce the observance of the laws of his God, and to punish those who transgressed, with death, banishment, confiscation or imprisonment. See verses 23-27. No grant of powers thus ample, can be found in the case of Jeremiah, or in any other instance after the captivity. That the commission given to Ezra authorized him to proceed in rebuilding the walls of Jerusalem, is evident from the fact that in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes, Nehemiah, who was then in the Persian court, received information that 'the remnant who were left of the captivity, then in the province, were in great affliction and reproach; the wall of Jerusalem was broken down, and the gates thereof burned with fire.' See Nehemiah i, 1-3. The fact is, that Ezra and his associates met with continued opposition from the Samaritans, so that during the whole of the seven weeks, or forty-nine years from the time that Ezra went up, to the last act of Nehemiah in obliging the Jews to put away their strange wives, the prediction of the prophet was verified—the street shall be built again, and the wall even in troublous times.' After Nehemiah reached Jerusalem, he examined the city by night. The result of his examination is thus stated, Nehemiah ii, 13, 'And I went out by night, by the gate of the valley, even before the dragon-well, and to the dung-port, and viewed the walls of Jerusalem, which were broken down, and the gates thereof were consumed with fire.' It is evident that 'the walls and gates' which had been destroyed, were the works of Ezra. The impropriety of referring the language of Nehemiah to the destruction of the city by Nebuchadnezzar will be seen at once, if we recollect that he reduced it to ruins on the capture of Zedekiah, B. C. 588, one hundred and forty-four years previous to the time when Nehemiah went up to Jerusalem."—*Advent Shield*, No. I, Article, Prophetic Chronology, pages 105-6.**

That Ezra understood that power was conferred upon himself, and upon the people of Israel, to rebuild the street of Jerusalem and the wall, is certain from his own testimony recorded in chapter ix, 9. 2. The second point in the evidence which the *Herald* has adduced, is this: the seventh year of Artaxerxes from which

the decree is dated, is fixed beyond dispute in B. C. 457. 3. The commencement of Christ's ministry in A. D. 27 is clearly established, being just 69 weeks, or 483 prophetic days from the decree in B. C. 457. 4. The crucifixion in the midst of the week is proved to have occurred in the Spring of A. D. 31, just three and a half years from the commencement of Christ's ministry. 5. And it further demonstrates that the remaining three and a half years of the seventieth week, ended in the Autumn of A. D. 34. Here the seventy weeks, which had been cut off upon the Jews, in which they were "to finish the transgression," close with the Jewish Sanhedrim's act of formally rejecting Christ by persecuting his disciples, and God gives the great Apostle to the Gentiles his commission to them. Acts ix.

These important dates are clearly and unequivocally established by historical, chronological and astronomical testimony. Sixty-nine of the 70 weeks from the decree in B. C. 457, ended in A. D. 27, when our Lord was baptized, and began to preach, saying, "The time is fulfilled." Mark i. Three and a half years from this bring us to the midst of the week in A. D. 31, where it is demonstrated that our Lord was crucified. Three and a half years from A. D. 31, the period of 70 weeks terminate in the Autumn of A. D. 34. Or to be more definite, the first three and a half years of the seventieth week ended in the first Jewish month [April] in the Spring of A. D. 31. The remaining three and a half years would therefore end in the seventh month, Autumn of A. D. 34.

Here then we stand at the end of the great period which Gaibril, in explaining the 2300 days to Daniel, tells him was cut off upon Jerusalem and the Jews. Its commencement, intermediate dates, and final termination are unequivocally established. It remains then to notice this one grand fact: the first 490 years of the 2300 ended in the seventh month, Autumn of A. D. 34. This period of 490 years being cut off from the 2300, a period 1810 years remains. This period of 1810 years being added to the seventh month, Autumn of A. D. 34, brings us to the seventh month, Autumn of 1844. And here, after every effort which has been made to remove the dates, all are compelled to let them stand. For a moment let us recur to the events of 1843 and 1844. Previous to the year 1843, the light on the going forth of the decree in B. C. 457 had been clearly and faithfully set forth. And as

the period of 457 years before Christ, subtracted from the 2300, would leave but 1843 years after Christ, the end of the 2300 years was confidently expected in 1843. But if the 2300 years began with the commencement of A. D. 457, they would not end till the last day of A. D. 1843, as it would require all of 457, and all of 1843, to make 2300 *full* years.

But at the close of 1843, it was clearly seen that as the crucifixion occurred in the midst of the week, in the Spring of A. D. 31, the remainder of the seventieth week, *viz.*: three and a half years, or 490 years, ended in the seventh month, Autumn of A. D. 34, it is a settled point that the days began, not in the Spring, with Ezra's starting from Babylon, but in the Autumn, with the commencement of the work at Jerusalem. Ezra vii. And this view, that the days begin with the actual commencement of the work, is much strengthened by the fact that the first seven weeks, or 49 years, are manifestly allotted to the work of restoration in "troubulous times." And that period could only begin with the actual commencement of the work. Dan. ix, 25.

When it was seen that only 456 years and a fraction had expired before Christ, it was at once understood that 1843 years and a portion of 1844, sufficient to make up a full year when joined to that fraction, was required in order to make 2300 full years. In other words, the 2300 days in full time would expire in the seventh month 1844. And if we take into the account the fact that the *midst* of the seventieth week was the fourteenth day of the first month, and consequently the end of the seventy weeks must have been at a corresponding point in the seventh month A. D. 34, we perceive at once that the remainder of the 2300 days would end about that point in the seventh month 1844.

It was with this great fact before us, that the 2300 days of Daniel, which reached to the cleansing of the sanctuary, would terminate at that time, and also with the light of the types, that the high priest in "the example and shadow of heavenly things" on the tenth day of the seventh month, entered within the second veil to cleanse the sanctuary, that we confidently expected the Advent of our Redeemer in the seventh month 1844. The prophecy said, "Then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." The type

said that at that season in the year the high priest should pass from the holy place of the earthly tabernacle to the most holy, to cleanse the sanctuary. Lev. xvi.

With these facts before us we reasoned as follows: 1. The sanctuary is the earth, or the land of Palestine. 2. The cleansing of the sanctuary is the burning of the earth, or the purification of Palestine, at the coming of Christ. 3. And hence, we concluded that our great High Priest would leave the tabernacle of God in heaven and descend in flaming fire, on the tenth day of the seventh month, in the Autumn of 1844.

It is needless to say that we were painfully disappointed. And, though the man does not live who can overthrow the chronological argument, which terminates the 2300 days at that time, or meet the mighty array of evidence by which it is fortified and sustained, yet multitudes, without stopping to inquire whether our conceptions of the sanctuary and of its cleansing were correct or not, have openly denied the agency of Jehovah in the Advent movement, and have pronounced it the work of man.

#### AN INEXPLICABLE POSITION.

The position of those Adventists who have attempted to re-adjust the 2300 days, in order to extend them to some future period in which Palestine should be purified, or the earth be burned, has been, to say the least, extremely embarrassing. In the *Herald* for Dec. 28, 1850, Josiah Litch remarks as follows:

"Chronologically, *the period is at an end*, according to the best light to be obtained on the subject; and where the discrepancy is, I am unable to decide. But of this we shall know more in due time."

"God is his own interpreter, and he will make it plain."<sup>1</sup>

But not being able to longer maintain a position in denying the termination of the 2300 years in the past, while at the same time they were setting forth an unanswerable vindication of the original dates for the commencement of the period, the *Herald* has at last denied the connection between the 70 weeks and the 2300 days. We write this with deep regret. A correspondent asks the following questions, and the Editor of the *Herald* gives the answers which are enclosed in brackets:

"In your 'Chronology' the cross is placed A. D. 31. What are the principal objections which bear against its being placed in A. D. 391 [Ans. 1. The absence of any evidence placing it there.]

2. The contradiction of the wonderful astronomical, chronological, and historical coincidences which show beyond the shadow of controversy, that the seventh of Artaxerxes was in B. C. 457-8, that the birth of Christ was B. C. 4-5, that the thirtieth year of Christ was 483 years from the seventh of Artaxerxes, that the crucifixion was in A. D. 31, and that that was the point of time in the last week, when the sacrifice and oblation should cease.]

If the seventy weeks of Dan. ix do not commence in the twentieth of Artaxerxes, how can the 2300 days begin at the same time with them, and yet terminate in the future? [Ans. They cannot.] Must we not henceforth consider that they have different starting points? [Ans. Yes.]—*Advent Herald*, May 22, 1852.

That this is a serious departure from the "original Advent faith," let the following, which once formed a part of a standing notice in the Advent papers, under the head of "points of difference between us and our opponents," answer:

"We claim that the ninth of Daniel is an appendix to the eighth, and that the seventy weeks and the 2300 days or years commence together. *Our opponents deny this.*"—*Signs of the Times*, 1843. "The grand principle involved in the interpretation of the 2300 days of Dan. viii., 14, is, that the 70 weeks of Dan. ix., 24 are the first 490 days of the 2300, of the eighth chapter."—*Advent Shield*, page 49. Article, *The rise and progress of Adventism*.

If it is not a serious defection from the original Advent faith to deny "the grand principle involved in the interpretation of the 2300 days of Dan. viii., and in its place to take the position of "our opponents," then we greatly err. Hear the opinion of

Apollo Hale in 1846:

"The second point to be settled, in explaining the text, [Dan. ix., 24] is, to show what vision it is which the 70 weeks are said to seal. And it should be understood that this involves one of the great questions which constitute the main pillars in our system of interpretation, so far as prophetic times are concerned. If the connection between the 70 weeks of Dan. ix., and the 2300 days of Dan. viii., does not exist, the whole system is shaken to its foundation; if it does exist, as we suppose, the system must stand."—*Harmony of Prophetic Chronology*, page 38.

Then the act of those who deny the connection of the 70 weeks and the 2300 days, is of a fearful character. It is a denial of "one of the main pillars in our system of interpretation so

far as prophetic times are concerned. If the connection between the 70 weeks of Dan. ix., and the 2300 days of Dan. viii., does not exist, the whole system is shaken to its foundation." And now reader will you listen to their reasons for denying the connection between those two periods, which as we have seen is fortified by a mass of direct testimony? They are as follows:

"We have no new light respecting the connection between the 70 weeks and 2300 days. The only argument against their connection is, the passing of the time. Why that has passed, is a mystery to us, which we wait to have revealed."—*Advent Herald*, Sept. 7, 1850.

"Before 1843 we became satisfied of the validity of the arguments sustaining their connection and simultaneous commencement. There has nothing transpired to weaken the force of those arguments, but the passing of the time we expected for their termination. We now have no other fact to advance against their connection; and therefore can only wait for the mystery of the passing of time to be explained. But of the commencement and termination of the 70 weeks, we are satisfied that they cannot be removed from the position which Protestants have always assigned them."—*Advent Herald*, Feb. 22, 1851.

In its appropriate place, we offered conclusive testimony to prove the connection of the 70 weeks and 2300 days. And it is submitted to the reader's judgment whether the reasons offered to disprove that connection, are entitled to any weight or not. It will be seen that they grow out of the assumed correctness of the view that the earth, or the land of Canaan is the sanctuary, and that the cleansing of the sanctuary is the burning of the earth, or the purification of Palestine at the coming of Christ. Before the reader adopts the conclusion that the 70 weeks, which Gabriel says were "cut off," are no part of the great period contained in the vision which he was explaining to Daniel, we request him to follow us in the inquiry: What is the sanctuary, and how is it to be cleansed? This we shall presently follow out, and in doing it, we may discover the cause of our disappointment.

**THERE ARE TWO "DESOLATIONS" IN DAN. VIII.—**This fact is made so plain by Josiah Litch, that we present his words:

"The daily sacrifice" is the present reading of the English text. But no such thing as sacrifice is found in the original. This is acknowledged on all hands. It is a gloss or construction put on it by the translators. The true reading is, 'the daily

and the transgression of desolation,' daily and transgression being connected together by 'and'; the *daily desolation* and the *transgression of desolation*. They are two desolating powers, which were to desolate the sanctuary and the host."—*Prophetic Expositions*, Vol. I., page 127.

It is plain that the sanctuary and the host were to be trodden under foot by the daily and the transgression of desolation. The careful reading of verse 13 settles this point. And this fact establishes another, viz.: that these two desolations are the *two grand forms* under which Satan has attempted to overthrow the worship, and the cause of Jehovah. Mr. Miller's remarks on the meaning of these two terms, and the course pursued by himself in ascertaining that meaning, is presented under the following head:

#### THE TWO DESOLATIONS ARE PAGANISM AND POPERY.

"I read on, and could find no other case in which it [the daily] was found, but in Daniel. I then [by the aid of a concordance] took those words which stood in connection with it, '*take away*; *he shall take away* the daily; 'from the time the daily shall be taken away,' &c. I read on, and thought I should find no light on the text; finally I came to 2 Thess. ii, 7, 8. 'For the mystery of iniquity doth already work; only he who now letteth will let, until he be *taken out of the way*, and then shall that wicked be revealed,' &c. And when I had come to that text, O, how clear and glorious the truth appeared! There it is! That is 'the daily!' Well, now, what does Paul mean by 'he who now letteth,' or hindereth? By 'the man of sin,' and the 'wicked' Popery is meant. Well, what is it which hinders Popery from being revealed? Why, it is Paganism; well, then, 'the daily' must mean Paganism."—*Second Advent Manual*, page 66.

It needs no argument to prove that the two grand forms of opposition, by which Satan has desolated the church, and trod under foot the sanctuary of the living God, are none other than Paganism and Popery. It is also a clear point that the change from one of these desolations to the other did occur under the Roman power. Paganism, from the days of the kings of Assyria, down to the period when it became so far modified that it took the name of Popery, had been the daily [or, as Prof. Whiting renders it, "the continual"] desolation, by which Satan had stood up against the cause of Jehovah. And, indeed, in its priests, its altars and its sacrifices, it bore resemblance to the Levitical form of Jehovah's worship. When the Christian form of worship took

the place of the Levitical, a change in Satan's form of opposition, and counterfeit worship, became necessary, if he would successfully oppose the worship of the great God. And it is in the light of these facts that we are able to understand our Lord's reference to the abomination of desolation in Matt. xiv, 15. It is evident that he there cites Dan. ix, 26, 27. Now, although we do not understand that Paganism in the year 70 had given place to Popery, we do understand that that same power which then appeared, modified somewhat in name and form, was the very power that should, as the abomination of desolation, wear out the saints of the Most High.

The language of Paul is to the point: "For the mystery of iniquity [Popery] doth *already work*; only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the Spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." 2 Thess. ii, 7, 8. That Paul refers to Paganism and Popery, none question. And here is direct proof that Popery, the abomination of desolation, had in Paul's day already begun to work. Nor was it a very great change of character when Satan transformed his counterfeit worship from Paganism to Popery. The same temples, altars, incense, priests and worshippers were ready, with little change, to serve as the appendages of the Papal abomination. The statute of Jupiter readily changed to that of Peter, the prince of the apostles; and the Pantheon, which had been the temple of all the gods, without difficulty became the sanctuary of all the saints. Thus the same abomination that desolated Jerusalem, in a degree changed and modified, became the wonderful desolator of the saints and martyrs of Jesus. And in its so called temple of God, it set at naught and trod under foot the true temple of Jehovah, and he who is its minister, Jesus Christ. The change from Paganism to Popery is clearly shown in John's view of the transfer of power from the dragon of Rev. xii, to the beast of Rev. xiii. And that they are essentially the same thing, is evident from the fact that both the dragon and the beast are represented with *the seven heads*; thus showing that, in a certain sense, either may be understood to cover the whole time. And in the same sense we understand that either abomination covers all the period.—Christ's refer-

ence to the abomination of desolation [Matt. xxiv, 15; Luke xxi, 20] is an absolute demonstration that Rome is the little horn of Dan. viii, 9-12. Having shown that there are two desolations, by which the sanctuary and the host are trodden down, we now notice the fact that there are

#### TWO OPPOSING SANCTUARIES IN DAN. VIII.

To the careful reader this fact will at once appear. They are as follows: First, the sanctuary of the daily desolation. Verse 11; xi, 31. Second, the sanctuary which the daily and the transgression of desolation were to tread under foot. Verses 13, 14. The one is the sanctuary of Satan; the other is the sanctuary of the Lord of hosts. The one is the dwelling place of "all the gods;" the other is the habitation of the only living and true God. If it be said that a sanctuary is never connected with heathen and idolatrous worship, we cite the direct testimony of the Bible. Heathen Moab had a sanctuary. And that sanctuary was a place of prayer and worship for that heathen nation. Isa. xvi, 12. The chapel erected by the king of Israel at Bethel, as a rival to the temple of God at Jerusalem [1 Kings xii, 27, 31-33] was called his sanctuary. Amos vii, 13, margin. And the places in which idolatrous Israel [the ten tribes] worshiped, are called sanctuaries. Amos vii, 9. The same is true of idolatrous Tyre. Eze. xxviii, 18. Attention is called to the following from Apollo's Hale:

"What can be meant by the 'sanctuary' of Paganism? Paganism, and error of every kind, have their sanctuaries, as well as truth. These are the temples or asylums consecrated to their service. Some particular and renowned temple of Paganism may, then, be supposed to be here spoken of. Which of its numerous distinguished temples may it be? One of the most magnificent specimens of classic architecture is called the Pantheon. The name signifies 'the temple or asylum of all the gods.' The 'place' of its location is Rome. The idols of the nations conquered by the Romans were sacredly deposited in some niche or apartment of this temple, and in many cases became objects of worship by the Romans themselves. Could we find a temple of Paganism that was more strikingly 'his sanctuary?' Was Rome, the city or place of the Pantheon, 'cast down' by the authority of the state? Read the following well-known and remarkable facts in history. 'The death of the last rival of Constantine had sealed the peace of the empire. Rome was once more

the undisputed queen of nations. But, in the hour of elevation and splendor, she had been raised to the edge of a precipice. Her next step was to be *downwards* and *irrecoverable*. The change of the government to Constantinople still perplexes the historian. Constantine abandoned *Rome*, the great citadel and throne of the Caesars, for an obscure corner of Thrace, and suspended the remainder of his vigorous and ambitious life in the double toil of raising a colony into the capital of his empire, and degrading the capital into *the feeble honors and humiliations of a colony*."—Second Advent Manual, page 68.

And not only did Satan possess himself of a rival to the sanctuary of Jehovah in the period of Pagan worship, but, throughout the Christian dispensation, has that arch fiend possessed a rival temple of God. 2 Thess. ii, 4. Thus much for the rival sanctuary of Satan. The sanctuary of God remains to be noticed at length. Connected with these two sanctuaries,

#### THERE ARE TWO HOSTS IN DAN. VIII, 9-13.

The one is the host that was given to the little horn against the daily, when it had filled its measure of transgression; and by the aid of this host, the little horn was able to cast down the truth. Verse 12. This host is mentioned in Dan. xi, 31. By this host, the sanctuary of the daily desolation, and its services, were transferred to the transgression, or abomination of desolation. This host is the forces of Satan, and it is intimately associated with his sanctuary. The other host is "the host of heaven." Verse 10. Michael is the Prince of this host. Dan. x, 21. Against the Prince of this host, the little horn stands up. Verses 11, 25. [Prof. Whiting remarks that in the original, "Prince of the host" occurs in Joshua v, 14.] None dispute that the host, of whom Michael [Christ] is Prince, is the church of the living God. Dan. xii, 1. This host, the true church, is fitly represented by a green olive tree. Jer. xi, 15-17. And when some of the branches [members of the Jewish church] were broken off through unbelief, others were grafted in from the Gentiles, and thus the host continues to exist. Rom. xi, 17-20. This host, or church, is the worshippers of God, and is intimately connected with his sanctuary. That sanctuary we are now prepared to consider.

#### WHAT IS THE SANCTUARY OF GOD?

Before answering this question, we present the definition of the word *sanctuary*: "A holy place."—Walker. "A sacred place."—

**Webster.** "A holy or sanctified place, a dwelling-place of the Most High."—Cruden. A dwelling-place for God. Ex. xxv, 8. Thus much for the meaning of the word. We now inquire respecting its application.

**Is THIS EARTH THE SANCTUARY?** To this question we answer emphatically: *It is not.* And if we are requested to prove a negative, we offer the following reasons: 1. The word sanctuary is used 145 times in the Bible, and it is not in a single instance applied to the earth. Hence there is no authority for this view, except that of man. 2. Every one knows that the earth is neither a dwelling-place of God, nor yet a holy, or sacred place. Those, therefore, who affirm that it is the sanctuary of God, should know better than to make such a statement. 3. In almost every instance in which the word sanctuary occurs in the Bible, (and the exceptions nearly all refer to Satan's rival sanctuary,) it refers directly to another definite object which God calls his sanctuary. Hence, those who teach that the earth is the sanctuary of the Lord of hosts, contradict his positive testimony an hundred times repeated. For the benefit of those who think that the earth will become the sanctuary after it has been cleansed by fire, we add, that God does not even then call it his sanctuary; but simply "the place" of its location. Isa. lx, 13; Eze. xxxvii, 26-28; Rev. xxi, 1-3. The earth, then, is not the sanctuary, but merely the *place where it will be located hereafter.*

**Is THE CHURCH THE SANCTUARY?** We answer: It is not. The following reasons in support of this answer are to the point: 1. The Bible never calls the church the sanctuary. 2. In a great number of texts, God has called another object his sanctuary, and has uniformly associated the church with that object, as the worshippers; and that sanctuary itself, as the place of that worship, or toward which their prayer was directed. Ps. xx, 2; xxviii, 2, margin; xxix, 2, margin; lxxii, 24; lxxii, 17; exxxiv, 2; cl. 1; v. 7. 3. The following inference is *all* that we have ever seen urged in favor of this view. God has many times called the tabernacle or temple, which are the patterns of the true, his sanctuary. And because that the church is spiritually called the temple of God, some have supposed that they were at liberty to call the church the sanctuary. 4. But there is one text that some may urge. It is this: "When Israel went out of

Egypt, the house of Jacob from a people of strange language; Judah was his sanctuary, and Israel his dominion." Ps. cxxv, 1, 2. But, at most, this would only prove that one of the twelve tribes was the sanctuary, and that the whole church was not. But if the fact be remembered, that God chose Jerusalem, [2 Chron. vi, 6,] which was in Judah, [Josh. xv, 63; Judges i, 8; Zech. i, 12; Ezra i, 3,] as the place of his sanctuary, [1 Chron. xxvii, 9, 10; 2 Chron. iii, 1,] we think the following from another Psalm will fully explain the connection between Judah and the sanctuary of God, and show that Judah was the tribe with which God designed to locate his habitation: "But chose the tribe of Judah, the Mount Zion which he loved. And he built his sanctuary like high palaces, [see 1 Chron. xxix, 1.] like the earth which he hath established for ever." Ps. lxxxviii, 68, 69. 5. But if a single text could be adduced to prove that the church is called a sanctuary, the following plain fact would prove beyond controversy that it is not the sanctuary of Dan. viii, 13, 14. The church is represented in Dan. viii, 13, by the word "host." This, none will deny. "To give *both* the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot." Then the church and the sanctuary are two things. The church is the host, or worshipers; the sanctuary is the place of that worship, or the place toward which it is directed.

**IS THE LAND OF CANAAN THE SANCTUARY?** Of the 145 times in which the word sanctuary occurs in the Bible, only two or three texts have been urged, with any degree of confidence, as referring to the land of Canaan. Yet strangely enough, men have claimed that the supposed meaning of these two or three texts ought to determine the signification of the word in Dan. viii, 13, 14, against the plain testimony of more than a hundred texts! For none can deny that in almost every instance in which the word does occur, it refers directly to the typical tabernacle, or else to the true, of which that was but the figure or pattern. But we now inquire whether the two or three texts in question do actually apply the word sanctuary to the land of Canaan. They read as follows: "Thou shalt bring them in, and plant them in the mountain of thine inheritance, in the place, O Lord, which thou hast made for thee to dwell in, in the sanctuary, O Lord, which thy hands have established." Ex. xx, 17. "And he led them on safely, so that they feared not; but the sea overwhelmed-

ed their enemies. And he brought them to the border of his **sanctuary**, even to this mountain, which his right hand had purchased." "And he built his **sanctuary** like high palaces, like the earth which he hath established for ever." Ps. lxxviii, 53, 64, 69.

The first of these texts, it will be noticed, is taken from the song of Moses, after the passage of the Red Sea. It is a prediction of what God would do for Israel. The second text was written about five hundred years after the song of Moses. What Moses utters as a prediction, the Psalmist records as a **matter of history**. Hence the Psalm is an *inspired commentary* on the song of Moses. If the first text be read without the other, the idea might be gathered that the mountain was the **sanctuary**, though it does not directly state this. Even as one might get the idea that the tribe of Judah was Mount Zion, were they to read only the expression, "but chose the tribe of Judah, the Mount Zion which he loved," [Ps. lxxviii, 68.] and omit those texts which inform us that Mount Zion was the city of David, a part of Jerusalem [2 Sam. v, 6, 7] and was located in *Judah*, as one of its cities. Ezra i, 3; Ps. lxxix, 35.

But if the second text be read in connection with the first, it destroys the possibility of such an inference. The Psalmist states that the mountain of the inheritance was the border of the **sanctuary**. And that God, *after* driving out the heathen before his people, proceeded to *build his sanctuary* like high palaces. See 1 Chron. xxix, 1. 1. The land of Canaan was the mountain of the inheritance. Ex. xv, 17. 2. That mountain was the *border* of the **sanctuary**. Ps. lxxviii, 54. 3. In that border God *built* his **sanctuary** Ps. lxxviii, 69. 4. In that **sanctuary** God dwelt. Ps. lxxiv, 7; Ex. xxxv, 8. 5. In that border the people dwelt. Ps. lxxviii, 54, 55. These facts demonstrate that the same Spirit moved both those "holy men of old." These texts perfectly harmonize, not only with each other, but with the entire testimony of the Bible, respecting the **sanctuary**. If the reader still persists in confounding the **sanctuary** with its border, the land of Canaan, we request him to listen while a king of Judah points out the distinction:

"Art not thou our God, who didst drive out the inhabitants of this **land** before thy people Israel, and gavest it to the seed of

Abraham thy friend for ever? And they dwelt therein, and have built thee a **sanctuary** therein for thy name, saying, If, when evil cometh upon us, as the sword, judgment, or pestilence, or famine, we stand before this **house**, and in thy presence, (for thy name is in this **house**) and cry unto thee in our affliction, then thou wilt hear and help." 2 Chron. xx, 7-9.

This language is a perfect parallel to that of Ps. lxxxvii, 54, 55, 69. In the clearest manner it points out the distinction between the land of Canaan, and the **sanctuary** which was built therein; and it does clearly teach that that **sanctuary** was the house erected as the habitation of God.

But there is another text by which some attempt to prove that Canaan is the **sanctuary**. "The people of thy holiness have possessed it but a little while: our adversaries have trodden down thy **sanctuary**." Isa. lxiii, 18. No one offers this as direct testimony. As it is only an inference, a few words are all that is needed. 1. When the people of God's holiness were driven out of the land of Canaan, (as here predicted by the prophet, who uses the past tense for the future,) not only were they dispossessed of their inheritance, but the **sanctuary** of God built in that land, was laid in ruins. This is plainly stated in 2 Chron. xxxvi, 17-20. 2. The next chapter testifies that the prophet had a view of the destruction of God's **sanctuary**, as stated in the text quoted from 2 Chronicles. This explains the whole matter. Isa. lxiv, 10, 11; Ps. lxxiv, 3, 7; lxxix, 1.

A fourth text may occur to some minds as conclusive proof that Canaan is the **sanctuary**. We present it, as it is the only remaining one that has ever been urged in support of this view. "The glory of Lebanon shall come unto thee, the fir-tree, the pine-tree, and the box together, to beautify the place of my **sanctuary**; and I will make the place of my feet glorious." Isa. lx, 13. This text needs little comment. The place of God's **sanctuary**, we fully admit, is the land of Canaan, or the new earth, for Isaiah refers to the glorified state. And as God has promised to set his **sanctuary** in that place, [Eze. xxxvii, 25-28.] the meaning of the text is perfectly plain. But if any still assert that the place of the **sanctuary** is the **sanctuary** itself, let them notice that the same text calls the same "place" the place of the Lord's feet; and hence the same principle would make the land of Canaan

the feet of the Lord! The view that Canaan is the sanctuary is too absurd to need further notice. And even were it a sanctuary, it would not even then be *the* sanctuary of Daniel; for the prophet had his eye upon the habitation of God. Dan. ix. Canaan was only the place of God's sanctuary or habitation.

We have found that the earth is not the sanctuary, but simply the territory where it will finally be located. That the church is not the sanctuary, but simply the worshipers connected with the sanctuary. And that the land of Canaan is not the sanctuary, but that it is the place where the typical sanctuary was located. Now we inquire for the sanctuary itself.

#### BIBLIC VIEW OF THE SANCTUARY.

The sanctuary of the Bible is the habitation of God. It includes, first, the tabernacle pitched by man, which was the pattern of the true; and second, the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched and not man. The tabernacle erected by man, as the pattern of the true, embraced, first, the tabernacle of Moses, second, the temple of Solomon, and, third, the temple of Zerubbabel. The true tabernacle of God is the great original of which Moses Solomon and Zerubbabel erected "figures," "patterns" or "im-ages." We trace the pattern of the true from the time it was erected by Moses, until it was merged in the larger and more glorious pattern which Solomon caused to be established. We trace this building down to the period when it was overthrown by Nebuchadnezzar, and suffered to remain in ruins through the Babylonish captivity. And from the time that Zerubbabel re-built the sanctuary, we trace the history of the pattern until we reach the true tabernacle, the great sanctuary of Jehovah. We trace the history of the tabernacle from the time that our Lord entered it to minister in "the holy places" for us, forward to the time when it shall be located on the New Earth, when the tabernacle and sanctuary of God shall be with his people for ever.

We are compassed about with a great cloud of witnesses. To the law and to the testimony. We gather our first instruction respecting the sanctuary, from the book of Exodus. In chapter xxiv, we learn that Moses went up into the cloud that enshrouded the God of Israel, upon the Mount Sinai, and that he was there forty days. It was during this period that the building of the sanctuary was explained to Moses, and the pattern of it shown to

him in that mount. Heb. viii, 5. The next chapter commences with

**THE COMMANDMENT TO ERECT THE SANCTUARY.**—"And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, that they bring me an offering: of every man that giveth it willingly with his heart ye shall take my offering. And this is the offering which ye shall take of them, gold, and silver, and brass, and blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine linen, and goat's hair, and rams' skins dyed red, and badger's skins, and shittim-wood, oil for the light, spices for anointing oil, and for sweet incense, onyx stones, and stones to be set in the ephod, and in the breast-plate. And let them make me a sanctuary; that I may dwell among them. According to all that I shew thee, after the pattern of the tabernacle, and the pattern of all the instruments thereof, even so shall ye make it." Ex. xxv, 1-9.

We have here learned several important facts. 1. The sanctuary was the habitation of God. It was erected for this express purpose, that God might dwell among his people. And Moses had his eye upon this habitation, or sanctuary, in that very chapter in which he is supposed by some to teach that the land of Canaan is the sanctuary. "He is my God," says Moses, "and I will prepare him an habitation." Chap. xv, 2. It is plain that even then, Moses understood the difference between the habitation of Jehovah, and the place of its location. 2. The Sanctuary, which God commanded Moses to erect, was the tabernacle. The tabernacle of witness was the sanctuary of God. 3. Moses was solemnly enjoined to make the sanctuary, and all its vessels, according to the pattern showed to him in that place. Hence, we are now to have a model of the habitation of God set before us.

**THE PLAN OF THE SANCTUARY.**—Its walls on the north, the west, and the south sides, were formed of upright boards, set in sockets of silver. These boards were ten cubits in length, by one cubit and a half in breadth. And as there were twenty of them on each of the two sides, we learn that it was thirty cubits in length and ten in height. In the same manner we ascertain that it was about ten cubits in width. The sockets in which the boards were set, are termed, "the sockets of the sanctuary." Chap. xxxviii, 27. Five bars running the length of the sides, and pa-

ing through rings in the boards, joined them all together. And the whole was overlaid with gold. The sanctuary was covered with four different coverings. The east end was closed by a vail, or hanging, called the door of the tent, or tabernacle. A second vail divided the tabernacle into two parts called the holy place, and the holiest of all. Chap. xxvi, 1-29; 31-37; xxxvi, 8-38; Lev. xvi, 2; Heb. ix, 3.

**THE VESSELS OF THE SANCTUARY.**—These were all made after the pattern which the Lord showed to Moses. Ex. xxv, 9, 40. They were as follows: 1. The ark. This was a small chest about four feet six inches in length, and about two feet six inches in width and height, overlaid with pure gold, within and without. This was made for the express purpose of containing God's testament, the ten commandments. Chap. xxv, 10-16; 21; xxxi, 8; xxxii, 15, 16; xxxvii, 1-5; Deut. x, 1-5; 1 Kings viii, 9; 2 Chron. v, 10; Heb. ix, 4. 2. The mercy-seat. This was the top of the ark. On either end of it stood a cherub. The cherubim and the mercy-seat being one solid work of beaten gold. Ex. xxv, 17-22; xxxvii, 6-9; xxvi, 34; Heb. ix, 4, 5. 3. The altar of incense. This was overlaid with gold, and was about three and a half feet in height, and nearly two feet square. It was for the purpose of burning incense before God. Ex. xxx, 1-10; xxxvii, 25-28; Luke i, 9-11. 4. The golden censer. This was used to burn incense before the Lord, particularly in the holiest. Lev. x, 1; xvi, 12; Heb. ix, 4. 5. The candlestick, with its seven lamps, was one solid work of beaten gold, about the weight of a talent. It was made after the express pattern showed to Moses. Ex. xxv, 31-40; xxxvii, 17-24; Num. viii, 4. 6. The table of shew-bread. This was about three and a half feet in length, two and a half in height, and two in width. It was overlaid with pure gold, and on it shew-bread was always kept before the Lord. Ex. xxv, 23-30; xxxvii, 10-16; Heb. ix, 2, 7. The altar of burnt-offering. This was about nine feet square, and nearly five and a half feet in height. It was overlaid with brass, and was, as its name implies, used for the purpose of offering up sacrifices to God. Ex. xxvii, 1-8; xxxviii, 1-7. 8. The laver. This was made of brass, and contained water for the use of the priests. Chap. xxx, 18-21; xxxviii, 8. The court of the tabernacle was one hundred cubits in length, by fifty in breadth, and five cubits,

or about nine feet, in height. Chap. xxvii, 9-19; xxxviii, 8-20. God called those who were to execute this work, by name and filled them with the spirit of wisdom. Chap. xxxi, 1-11; xxxv, 30-35. They knew "how to work all manner of work for the service of the sanctuary." Chap. xxxvi, 1. They received the offering of the children of Israel for "the service of the sanctuary." Verse 3. They came from "the work of the sanctuary," [verse 4.] and testified that more was offered than could be used. And Moses commanded that none should "make any more work for the offering of the sanctuary." Verse 6. The construction of every part of the sanctuary is minutely described in Chaps. xxvi —xxxix. Every thing was then submitted to Moses for inspection, and he pronounced the work such as God commanded, viz.: a true pattern. Chap. xxxix, 33-43. God then commanded Moses to set up the sanctuary, and to place every thing in order. Chap. xl, 1-16.

**MOSES ERECTS THE SANCTUARY.**—And Moses reared up the tabernacle, and set up its boards in the sockets of silver, and united them together by the bars, and spread over the whole, the covering of the tabernacle. He then placed the testimony in the ark, and set the mercy-seat upon it, and carried the ark into the tabernacle. Chap. xl, 17-21. He then hung up the vail in front of the ark, and thus divided between the holy places. Verse 21; xxvi, 33; Heb. ix, 3. He placed the table without the vail, on the north side of the holy place, and set the bread in order upon it. Verses 22, 23. He then placed the candlestick on the south side of the holy place, and lighted its lamps before the Lord. Verses 24, 25. He placed the golden altar before the vail, in the holy place, and burned sweet incense upon it. Verses 26, 27. He set up the hanging for the door of the sanctuary, and he placed the altar of burnt offering at the door, and set the laver between the tabernacle and this altar, and around the whole, he set up the court of the tabernacle. Verses 28-33. The sanctuary erected for the habitation of Jehovah [Ex. xv, 2; xxxv, 8] is now ready to receive the King Eternal.

**GOD TAKES POSSESSION OF THE SANCTUARY.**—"Then a cloud covered the tent of the congregation, and the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle. And Moses was not able to enter into the tent of the congregation, because the cloud abode thereon, and

**the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle.**" Verses 34, 35. We now have found the habitation or sanctuary of the Lord. In the book of Exodus, Moses calls this building the sanctuary at least eleven times. But do you ask for the words of the New Testament on the point? Then listen.

**PAUL'S VIEW OF THE SANCTUARY OF THE FIRST COVENANT.—**"Then verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary. For there was a tabernacle made; the first, wherein was the candlestick, and the table, and the shew-bread; which is called the sanctuary. And after the second veil, the tabernacle which is called the Holiest of all: which had the golden censer, and the ark of the covenant overlaid round about with gold, wherein was the golden pot that had manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of the covenant; and over it the cherubim of glory shadowing the mercy-seat." Heb. ix, 1-5; xiii, 11. It is settled, therefore, that we have the right view of this subject thus far, and that the tabernacle of God, and not the land of Canaan, was the sanctuary.

**THE WORLDLY SANCTUARY WAS THE PATTERN OF THE TRUE.—**"After the pattern of the tabernacle, and the pattern of all the instruments thereof even so shall ye make it." "And look that thou make them after their pattern, which was shewed thee in the mount." Ex. xxv, 9, 40. "And thou shalt rear up the tabernacle according to the fashion thereof which was shewed thee in the mount." Chap. xxvi, 30. "As it was shewed thee in the mount so shall they make it." Chap. xxvii, 8. "According unto the pattern which the Lord had shewed Moses, so he made the candlestick." Num. viii, 4. "Our fathers had the tabernacle of witness in the wilderness, as he had appointed, speaking unto Moses, that he should make it according to the fashion that he had seen." Acts vii, 44. "Who serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle; for, saith he, that thou make all things according to the pattern shewed to thee in the mount." Heb. viii, 5. "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." Heb. ix, 23, 24. From these

texts we learn two important facts. 1. We are many times certified that the tabernacle of witness was made according to the pattern which God showed to Moses. 2. That that pattern was a representation of the heavenly sanctuary itself. Heb. viii, 2. We trace the history of the sanctuary in the book of Leviticus. Every instance in which the word occurs, it is admitted, refers to the tabernacle of the Lord. The blood of sin-offering was sprinkled "before the vail of the sanctuary." Lev. iv, 6. For offering strange fire before the Lord in his tabernacle, two of the sons of Aaron were slain. They were then carried "from before the sanctuary." Lev. x, 4. The unclean were not to "come into the sanctuary," or tabernacle. Lev. xii, 4, 6. "The holy sanctuary" was to be cleansed. Lev. xvi, 16, 33. "Ye shall keep my Sabbath, and reverence my sanctuary: I am the Lord." Lev. xix, 30; xxvi, 2. Those who worshiped Moloch, defiled the Lord's sanctuary. Lev. xx, 3. "Sanctuaries," used for the two holy places. Lev. xxi, 23; xxvi, 31. See also Jer. li, 51. God commanded that the high priest should not "go out of the sanctuary, nor profane the sanctuary of his God," to mourn for the dead. Lev. xxi, 12.

God placed his tabernacle in the charge of the tribe of Levi, who pitched around it. Num. i, 50-53. Under the standard of Judah on the east, of Reuben on the south, of Ephraim on the west, and of Dan on the north, the tribes of Israel were to pitch around the tabernacle in four great bodies, during their sojourn in the wilderness. Num. ii. God then divided the tribe of Levi according to his three sons, Gershon, Kohath and Merari. These three divisions were to pitch severally on the west, south and north sides of the tabernacle. Num. iii. The Kohathites were to keep "the charge of the sanctuary," and also of "the vessels of the sanctuary." Verses 28, 31. And Eleazar, the priest, was to have the oversight of those who thus kept "the charge of the sanctuary." Verse 32. But on the east side of the tabernacle, Moses, Aaron and his sons were to encamp and keep "the charge of the sanctuary." Verse 38.

When the camp was to set forward, the priests were to take down the tabernacle, [Num. iv,] and cover the sacred vessels, and "all the instruments of ministry wherewith they minister in the sanctuary;" [verse 12:] and when they had made an end of cov-

ering the sanctuary, and all the vessels of the sanctuary, the sons of Kohath were to bear it. Verse 15. And God commanded that Eleazar should have "the oversight of all the tabernacle, and of all that therein is, in the sanctuary." Verse 16. "The service of the sanctuary," belonging unto the Kohathites, was to bear it upon their shoulders. Num. vii, 8. The Levites were given to Aaron to do the service of the tabernacle, that there be no plague "when the children of Israel come nigh unto the sanctuary." Num. vii, 19. "The Kohathites set forward bearing the sanctuary." Num. x, 21.

The priests were to "bear the iniquity of the sanctuary." Num. xxviii, 1. The Levites were not to "come nigh the vessels of the sanctuary." Verse 3. And the priests should "keep the charge of the sanctuary." Verse 5. The man that neglected purification, "defiled the sanctuary of the Lord." Num. xix, 20. "The shekel of the sanctuary," or tabernacle, was the standard in Israel. The word sanctuary, meaning the habitation of God, occurs in this connection twenty-five times. Ex. xxx, 13, 24; xxxviii, 24, 25, 26; Lev. v, 15; xvii, 3, 25; Num. iii, 47, 50; vii, 13, 10, 25, 31, 37, 43, 49, 55, 61, 67, 73, 79, 85, 86; xviii, 16.

The word sanctuary does not occur in the book of Deuteronomy. One chapter refers to it as "the tabernacle of the congregation." xxxi, 14, 15. We have traced the history of the sanctuary, from the time that it was erected, through the period of Israel's sojourn in the wilderness. From Acts vii, 45, we learn that the tribes of Israel carried it with them into the promised land. In the book of Joshua it is called the house of God, or tabernacle; and we learn that it was set up at Shiloh. Josh. ix, 23; xviii, 1; xix, 51; Jer. vii, 12. It is called the Lord's tabernacle. Josh. xxii, 19. It is called "the sanctuary of the Lord." Josh. xxiv, 20. In the book of Judges it is simply called "the house of God," located at Shiloh. Judges xviii, 31; xx, 18, 26, 31; xxi, 2. In 1 Samuel it is termed the house of the Lord. Chap. i, 7, 24; iii, 15. In chapters i, 9; iii, 3, it is called the temple of the Lord. In chapter ii, 32, God calls it, "my habitation," or tabernacle, margin. It still abode in Shiloh. Chap. iv, 4.

**God forsakes the sanctuary.**—For the gross wickedness of

the enemy, the Philistines. Ps. lxviii, 60-62; Jer. vii, 12-14; 1 Sam. iv. It does not appear that after the ark of God was taken from the tabernacle at Shiloh, and God there forsook his habitation, that his glory, or the ark of his covenant, ever returned to that building. The other sacred vessels remained with the tabernacle, which in the days of Saul seems to have been located at Nob; [1 Sam. xxi; Matt. xii, 3, 4; Mark ii, 26;] and in the days of David, at Gibeon. 1 Chron. xvi, 39; xxi, 29, 30; 1 Kings iii, 4; 2 Chron. i, 3. And here we leave it for the present to follow the ark.

The ark was taken by the Philistines, and kept in their land seven months. In which time they were smitten with sore plagues, and Dagon, their god, twice fell before it. They then returned it to Israel to Bethshemesh. At this place 50,000 of Israel were smitten for looking into the ark. 1 Sam. iv, v, vi. From thence it was removed to Kirjath-jearim to the house of Abinadab, where it abode twenty years. 1 Sam. vii, 1, 2. In this period it is said that all Israel "lamented after the Lord." From this place it was removed to the house of Obed-edom where it abode three months. 2 Sam. vi, 1-11; 1 Chron. xiii. From this place, David removed it to his own city, Jerusalem, and placed it in a tabernacle which he had pitched. 2 Sam. vi, 12-17; 1 Chron. xv; xvi, 1. It was at this time, when the Lord had given David rest from all his enemies, and he dwelt securely in his own house, that the habitation of his God came before his mind.

**DAVID DESIRES TO BUILD A GLORIOUS SANCTUARY.**—The situation of God's house came into the mind of David, and he "desired to find a tabernacle for the God of Jacob." Acts vii, 46; Ps. cxlii, 1-5. He set this matter before Nathan the prophet, who said to him, "Do all that is in thy heart, for God is with thee." But that night God charged Nathan to say to David, "Thus saith the Lord, thou shalt not build me a house to dwell in." 1 Chron. xvii, 1-4; 2 Sam. vii 1-5. This was because David had been a man of war, and had shed blood abundantly. But God promised that Solomon, his son, should build the house. 1 Chron. xxii, 7-10. Then David proceeded to make great preparation for the building. Chap. xxii; xxix. The place where the angel of the Lord appeared to David, at the time when the plague was stayed,

*viz:* the threshing-floor of Ornan the Jebusite, [Chap. xxi, 14–18,] upon Mount Moriah, [2 Chron. iii, 1; Gen. xxi, 2, 14,] which was near to Mount Zion, was the place of God's habitation. Ps. lxxviii, 68, 69; cxliii, 13, 14. And here, "like high palaces," God's sanctuary was built. 1 Chron. xxix, 1.

**SOLOMON AND THE PRINCES CHARGED TO BUILD THE SANCTUARY.**

—"Now set your heart and your soul to seek the Lord your God ; arise therefore, and build ye the sanctuary of the Lord God, to bring the ark of the covenant of the Lord, and the holy vessels of God, into the house that is to be built to the name of the Lord." Chap. xxii, 19. "Take heed now ; for the Lord hath chosen thee to build an house for the sanctuary ; he strong, and do it." Chap. xxviii, 10. Then David gave to Solomon explicit directions respecting the building of the sanctuary. Verses 11–21. A full account of the erection of this glorious sanctuary may be read in 1 Kings vi; vii; 2 Chron. iii; iv. It occupied seven years and six months in building, and when finished was of wonderful magnificence. It principally differed from the tabernacle, in being an enlargement of that plan, and in being a permanent, instead of temporary building. The vessels of the sanctuary were also increased in size and number.

**THE TABERNACLE GIVES PLACE TO THE TEMPLE.**—Every thing being finished in the temple of the Lord, and all Israel assembled at its dedication, we read as follows : "And they brought up the ark of the Lord, and the tabernacle of the congregation, and all the holy vessels that were in the tabernacle, even those did the priests and the Levites bring up." "And the priests brought in the ark of the covenant of the Lord unto his place, into the oracle of the house, to the most holy place, even under the wings of the cherubims." 1 Kings viii, 4, 6. The tabernacle which had been at Gibeon for a long while was, as we have here read, brought up to the temple of the Lord, and the sacred vessels, and the priesthood, were transferred to that more glorious sanctuary. The ark, which had for some time been kept at Jerusalem, was carried into the most holy place in the temple. And now the habitation for the God of Jacob, is complete.

**GOD TAKES POSSESSION OF THE SANCTUARY.**—"And it came to pass, when the priests were come out of the holy place, that the cloud filled the house of the Lord, so that the priests could not

stand to minister because of the cloud ; for the glory of the Lord had filled the house of the Lord. Then spake Solomon, the Lord said that he would dwell in thick darkness. I have surely built thee an house to dwell in, a settled place for thee to abide in for ever." 1 Kings viii, 10–13. The Shekinah, or visible glory of God, which had dwelt in the tabernacle, has now passed into the temple, and that temple is thenceforward the sanctuary of the Lord God.

**THE TEMPLE WAS A PATTERN OF THE TRUE SANCTUARY.**—"Then David gave to Solomon his son the pattern of the porch, and of the houses thereof, and of the treasures thereof, and of the upper chambers thereof, and of the inner parlors thereof, and of the place of the mercy-seat, and the pattern of all that he had by the Spirit, of the courts of the house of the Lord, and all the chambers round about, of the treasures of the house of God, and of the treasures of the dedicated things ; also for the courses of the priests and the Levites, and for all the work of the service of the house of the Lord, and for all the vessels of service in the house of the Lord." "All this," said David, "the Lord made me understand in writing by his hand upon me, even all the works of this pattern." 1 Chron. xxviii, 11–13, 19. "Thou hast commanded me [Solomon] to build a temple upon thy holy mount, and an altar in the city wherein thou dwellest, a resemblance of the holy tabernacle, which thou hast prepared from the beginning." Wisdom of Solomon ix, 8. "The pattern of things in the heavens," "the holy places made with hands which are the figures of the true." Heb. ix, 23, 24.

The history of the sanctuary is stated very fully in the books of Kings, and in 2 Chronicles. But we can only quote those texts in which it is called the sanctuary. In 1 Chron. ix, 29, we read of "the instruments of the sanctuary," referring either to the tabernacle, or the temple. In 1 Chron. xxiv, 5, we read of "the governors of the sanctuary," or "house of God."

The Psalmist prays that God would send "help from the oracle of thy sanctuary." Ps. xxviii, 2, margin. See 1 Kings vi, 19, 20. He calls upon the saints to "worship the Lord in his glorious sanctuary." Ps. xxix, 2, margin. He prays "to see thy power and thy glory, so as I have seen thee in the sanctuary."

**Ps. lxxii, 2.** He speaks of "the goings of my God, my King, in the sanctuary." **Ps. lxviii, 24, 29.** In **Ps. lxxviii, 54**, he styles the land of Canaan "the border of the sanctuary." And in verses 68, 69, he testifies that God "built his sanctuary like high palaces" at Mount Zion in Judah. He "went into the sanctuary of God," and saw the end of the wicked. **Ps. lxxiii, 17.** He testifies that "thy way O God is in the sanctuary." **I's. lxxvi, 13.** He predicts the future desolation of God's temple, or sanctuary. **Ps. lxxiv, 3, 7; lxxix, 1.** In **Ps. xevi, 6**, he declares that "strength and beauty are in his sanctuary." And in verse 9, margin, he says, "O worship the Lord in the glorious sanctuary." "Lift up your hands in the sanctuary, and bless the Lord." **Ps. cxxxiv, 1, 2.** "Praise God in his sanctuary." **I's. cl, 1.** From the period in which the Psalms were written, we pass down in the history of the kings of Judah to Jehoshaphat. In prayer he states that God gave the land of Canaan to the people of Israel, "and they dwelt therein, and have built thee a sanctuary therein." **2 Chron. xx, 7, 8.** And in verse 9, he quotes the words used at the dedication of the temple. **1 Kings viii, 33–39.**

After this, we read that Uzziah, king of Judah, being lifted up with pride, went into the temple to burn incense. And the priests ordered him to go out of the sanctuary. **2 Chron. xxvi, 16–18.** Still later, we read that Hezekiah offered a sin-offering for the kingdom, and for the sanctuary, and for Judah. **2 Chron. xxix, 21.** And he called upon all Israel to yield themselves unto the Lord, and enter into his sanctuary. And he prays for those who were not cleansed according to the purification of the sanctuary. **2 Chron. xxx, 8, 19.**

About this time, God says by Isaiah, "I have profaned the princes of the sanctuary, and have given Jacob to the curse, and Israel to reproaches." **Isa. xliii, 28.** Next, Zephaniah complains that her prophets are light and treacherous persons; her priests have polluted the sanctuary, they have done violence to the law. **Zeph. iii, 4.**

After this, Ezekiel says, "Thou hast defiled my sanctuary." **Eze. v, 11; viii, 6.** And in his view of the men with the slaying weapons, they were charged to "begin at my sanctuary." "And they began at the ancient men which were before the

house." **Eze. ix, 9.** And in chapter xxi, 38, 39, he says, "Moreover, this they have done unto me: they have defiled my sanctuary in the same day, and have profaned my Sabbath. For when they had slain their children to their idols, then they came the same day into my sanctuary to profane it; and lo, thus have they done in the midst of mine house." And in chapter xxiv, 21, God says, "I will profane my sanctuary."

**GOD FORSAKES HIS SANCTUARY.**—"But go ye now unto my place which was in Shiloh, where I set my name at the first, and see what I did to it for the wickedness of my people Israel. And now, because ye have done all these works, saith the Lord, and I spake unto you, rising up early and speaking, but ye heard not; and I called you, but ye answered not; therefore will I do unto this house, which is called by my name, wherein ye trust, and unto the place which I gave to your fathers, as I have done to Shiloh." **Jer. vii, 12–14; xxvi, 6.**

What did God do to the sanctuary at Shiloh? "When God heard this, he was wroth, and greatly abhorred Israel: so that he forsook the tabernacle of Shiloh, the tent which he placed among men: and delivered his strength into captivity, and his glory into the enemy's hand." **Ps. lxxviii, 59–61.** Then when God told the people that he would do to the temple, as he had done to the tabernacle at Shiloh, it was a solemn declaration that he would forsake it. **Eze. viii, 6.** That this prediction was accomplished we shall now show.

**THE SANCTUARY DESTROYED.**—"But they mocked the messengers of God, and despised his words, and misused his prophets, until the wrath of the Lord arose against his people, till there was no remedy. Therefore he brought upon them the king of the Chaldees, who slew their young men with the sword in the house of their sanctuary, and had no compassion upon young man or maiden, old man, or him that stooped for age; he gave them all into his hand. And all the vessels of the house of God, great and small, and the treasures of the house of the Lord, and the treasures of the king, and of his princes; all these he brought to Babylon. And they burnt the *house of God*, and brake down the wall of Jerusalem, and burnt all the palaces thereof with fire, and destroyed all the goodly vessels thereof." **2 Chron. xxxvi, 16–19,**

The predictions of Asaph, [Ps. lxxiv, 3, 7; lxxix, 1,] of Isaiah [chapter lxiii, 18; lxiv, 10, 11,] and of Ezekiel, [chapter xxiv, 21,] were now verified. The heathen then entered "into the sanctuaries [the holies] of the Lord's house." Jer. li, 51. "The heathen entered into her sanctuary, whom thou didst command that they should not enter into thy congregation." Lam. i, 10. And the Lord "cast off his altar," and "abhorred his sanctuary;" and the priest and the prophet were "slain in the sanctuary," and "the stones of the sanctuary were poured out in the top of the street." Lam. ii, 7, 20; iv, 1. In this time of their dispersion, and of their sanctuary's desolation, God promises to be to them "as a little sanctuary." Eze. xi, 16; Isa. viii, 14. The sanctuary thus destroyed, lay desolate till the reign of the kingdom of Persia. 2 Chron. xxxvi, 19-23; Ezra i, 1-3; Isa. xlii, 28. It was near the close of the seventy years captivity that Daniel prayed, "cause thy face to shine upon thy sanctuary that is desolate." Dan. ix, 2, 17.

#### EZEKIEL OFFERS TO ISRAEL A SANCTUARY.

It was fourteen years after the sanctuary had been destroyed, that God gave Ezekiel the "pattern" of another, to show to the house of Israel. Chaps. xi-xviii. This building consisted of two holy places. Chap. xli. And the most holy place was of the same size with that in the temple of Solomon. Verse 4; 1 Kings vi, 19, 20. To this building the word sanctuary is applied in the following texts: Eze. xli, 21, 23; xlii, 20; xliii, 21; xliv, 1, 5, [verses 7, 8, refer to Solomon's temple.] 9, 11, 15, 16, 27; xlvi, 2, 3, 4, 18; xvii, 12; xviii, 8, 10, 21. It was offered to the house of Israel then in captivity on this condition, that they should be "ashamed" of their iniquities, and put them away. If they did this, God would cause this building to be established, and would cause "the twelve tribes" to return. Chap. xl, 4; xlii, 10, 11; xliv, 5-8; xvii, 13-33; xlviii. But the house of Israel were not at all ashamed. For when the decree for Israel's restoration went forth, all Israel could go up to the land where God's abundant blessing was promised. See the decree of Cyrus. 2 Chron. xxxvi, 22, 23; Ezra i, 1-4; vii, 13. But the ten tribes slighted the offer of Cyrus, as well as the promised blessings of God, and the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, with a portion of the tribe of Levi, and a few others, were

all that went up. Ezra i, 5; vii, 7; viii, 15. Thus the house of Israel rejected the gracious offer of the Lord, and slighted the inestimable blessings which God would have given them. Eze. xvii, 18. Hence this sanctuary was never erected. But that this prophecy does not belong to the future reign of Christ and his saints, the following facts demonstrate:

1. The Prince that shall reign over God's people Israel, for ever, is none other than Jesus Christ. There is to be but one Prince and Shepherd that shall be the King over Israel in the glorified state, and that one is Jesus. Luke i, 32, 33; Eze. xxxvii, 22, 24; Jer. xxxiii, 5, 6; Micah v, 2. But the prince here spoken of by Ezekiel is not Christ, but a poor frail mortal. For (1.) he is commanded to offer a bullock as a sin-offering for himself. Eze. xiv, 22. But Jesus Christ is himself the great sin-offering for the world. 1 John iii, 1, 2. (2.) He was to offer all manner of offerings for himself. Eze. xlii, 1-8. But Jesus Christ caused all this "to cease" at his death. Dan. ix, 27. (3.) God says to these princes, "Take away your exactions from my people." Eze. xlv, 9. But when Christ reigns, there will be nothing oppressive, for the officers will be peace, and the exactors righteousness. Isa. lx, 17-19. (4.) And this prince is to have sons and servants to whom, if he will, he may give an inheritance. But that which he gives to his servants will return to the prince in the year of Jubilee. Eze. xlii, 16, 17. And he is forbidden to oppress the people. Verse 18. Surely, it would be blasphemous to apply this to our Lord Jesus Christ. Hence, Ezekiel is not predicting the future reign of Christ over the house of Israel.

2. Christ says, "the children of this world [or age] marry, and are given in marriage; but they which shall be counted worthy to obtain that world, [or age,] and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage." Luke xx, 35. Now hear Ezekiel: "Neither shall they [God's priests] take for their wives a widow, nor her that is put away; but they shall take maidens of the seed of the house of Israel, or a widow that had a priest before." Eze. xlii, 22. In the prediction of Christ, respecting that age, or world to come, he positively affirms that there shall be no marrying or giving in marriage there; but in Ezekiel we find the Lord's priests marrying, and have intimations, even that divorce and death are not unknown!

Therefore it is evident that Ezekiel does not refer to the age to come. Certain it is that had those priests been "counted worthy to obtain that world," they would not be represented as marrying in it! And thus, too, in the promised land, the very *heart* of the future kingdom!

3. And Christ adds: "Neither can they die any more; for they are equal unto the angels." Luke xx, 36. And Paul testifies that at the last trump, "this mortal shall put on immortality," and death shall be swallowed up in victory. 1 Cor. xv, 51-54. But Ezekiel has *death*, even in the families of God's priests, and they themselves defiled by attending their burials, and obliged to offer for themselves a sin-offering! See Eze. xlii, 25-27. Are such persons equal to the angels? Are they where they can die no more? Surely they are not. Then it is demonstrated that Ezekiel does not refer to the world or age to come.

That the sanctuary, priesthood and offerings, with the accompanying blessings, would have been realized in the Mosaic dispensation, had the twelve tribes of Israel accepted the proffered boon, we will now show. 1. It was to be fulfilled while circumcision was in force. Eze. xlii, 9. But that was abolished at the first Advent. Gal. v, 2; vi, 12; Col. ii, 11-13. 2. It was while divorce was allowed. Eze. xliiv, 22. But that is now done away. Matt. v, 31, 32; xix, 8, 9. 3. The distinction between meats, clean and unclean, is recognized. Eze. xliii, 23, 31. But no such distinction is now recognized by the Bible. Rom. xiv. 4. Sacrifice, offerings, burnt offerings and sin-offerings, of bulls and goats, were then in force. Eze. xlvi. But they are not now acceptable to God. Heb. x. 5. The feasts and the Jubilee were then in force. Eze. xlvi, 21-25; xlvi, 9, 11, 17. But they were nailed to the cross. Col. ii. 6. The Levitical priesthood was then in force. Eze. xl, 46; xliiv, 15. But the priesthood of Melchisedec, which passeth not to another, has taken its place. Heb. v-ix.

7. "The middle wall of partition" then existed, as all these ordinances prove, as well as the acknowledged distinction between "the seed of the house of Israel" and the stranger. Eze. xliiv, 22; xlvi, 22. But it is now broken down. Eph. ii. But we leave the sanctuary offered to the twelve tribes, that we may follow the history of Judah and Benjamin.

## THE SANCTUARY REBUILT.

Cyrus, the king of Persia, in the first year of his reign, put forth a decree for the restoration of God's sanctuary which had so long been in ruins. Ezra i, 1-4. And in this decree he not only gave permission to the whole house of Israel to go up to the city of their fathers, where God had chosen to place his name, but he actually provided help for those who needed aid to go up. And yet, ten of the twelve tribes chose to remain in their iniquity, and dwell with the heathen. But we learn in verse 5, that the chief of the fathers of Judah and Benjamin, and the priests, and the Levites, and a few others, went up. The vessels of God's house, which had been in Satan's sanctuary at Babylon, [Ezra i, 7, 8; v, 14; 2 Chron. xxxvi, 7; Dan. i, 2.] were delivered to them to carry up to the temple of God which they were to rebuild at Jerusalem.

And in the second year of their coming unto the house of God at Jerusalem, with Zerubbabel for their governor, and Jeshua for their high priest, they laid the foundation of the temple of the Lord. Ezra iii, 8, 10. After many serious hindrances, it was completed in the sixth year of Darius, its building having occupied a period of twenty years. Ezra vi, 15. The decree from which the 2300 days are dated did not go forth until the seventh year of the grandson of Darius. So that the sanctuary was in existence when that period commenced. Ezra. vii. This temple of Zerubbabel was but the temple of Solomon rebuilt, as we may learn from Ezra v, 11, though it seems to have been larger than that building. Ezra vi, 3, 4; 1 Kings vi, 2. Hence it was but a continuance of the pattern of the true, which Solomon had erected. And thus we understand Paul's language in Heb. ix, as referring to these buildings, which, as a whole, make up the sanctuary of the first covenant, when he pronounces that sanctuary a figure or pattern of the true.

While Zerubbabel was building the Lord's house, the prophets Haggai and Zechariah encouraged the builders. Ezra v, 1; vi, 14. Haggai promised that though it were not as rich in silver and gold as was the first house, yet the glory of this latter house should be greater than of the former, as the Desire of all nations would come to it. Hag. ii.

**God dwelt in this sanctuary.—**"Therefore, thus saith the

Lord; I am returned to Jerusalem with mercies: mine house shall be built in it, saith the Lord of hosts." *Zeich. i, 16.* "Sing and rejoice, O daughter of Zion; for lo, I come, and I will dwell in the midst of thee, saith the Lord." *Zeich. ii, 10.* "And whoso shall swear by the temple, sweareth by it, and by him that dwelleth therein." *Matt. xxiii, 21.*

Nehemiah calls this building the sanctuary, and declares that "we will not forsake the house of our God." *Chap. x, 39.* While God's house lay in ruins, Daniel prayed that God would cause his face to shine upon his sanctuary that was desolate. In answer to his prayer, the angel Gabriel is sent to inform him that at the end of 69 weeks from the going forth of the decree to restore and to build Jerusalem, the Messiah would come, and would finally be cut off. And after this, the city and the sanctuary, which we have now seen rebuilt, would be destroyed, and never again be rebuilt, but left in ruins till the consummation. *Dan. ix.* At the end of the 69 weeks, *A. D. 27,* the Messiah the Prince came, and began to preach. *Mark i, 15.* Israel proceeded to "finish the transgression," for which God would cut them off from being his people, by rejecting the Messiah. *Dan. ix, 24;* *John i, 11;* *Matt. xxiii, 32;* *1 Thess. ii, 15, 16.*

**GOD FORSAKES THE SANCTUARY.**—"O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! *Behold, your house is left unto you desolate.*" *Matt. xxiii, 37, 38;* *Luke xiii, 34, 35.* After uttering these words, Jesus departed from the temple, which was no longer God's habitation. And as he went out, he declared that it should be thrown down, and not one stone left upon another. *Matt. xxiv, 1, 2.* And what Gabriel and Jesus had thus predicted, the Romans in a few years fulfilled, and the "worldly sanctuary" ceased to exist.

**DATES.**—Moses erected the sanctuary, (according to the chronology in the margin,) *B. C. 1490.* It was forsaken at Shiloh, *B. C. 1141.* Solomon erected the sanctuary, *B. C. 1005.* It was forsaken of God, *B. C. 588.* Rebuilt by Zerubbabel, *B. C. 515.* Forsaken and left desolate, *A. D. 31.* We have now followed the typical sanctuary to its end. And here let us pause for reflection and inquiry. Why did God ordain this extraordinary ar-

rangement? The sacrifices offered in this building could never take away sins. Why then were they instituted? The priests which here ministered were so imperfect that they had to offer for themselves. Why then was such a priesthood ordained? The building itself was but an imperfect, temporary structure, though finished to the perfection of human art. Why then was such a structure erected? Surely, God does nothing in vain, and all this is full of meaning. Nor will the student of the Bible be at a loss to answer these questions. The building itself was but a "figure of the true," a "pattern of things in the heavens." The priests which there ministered, served "unto the example and shadow of heavenly things," and the sacrifices there offered, continually pointed forward to the great sacrifice that should be made for the sin of man. These great truths are plainly stated in *Heb. viii-x.* We shall now pass from the shadow to the substance.

#### THE TYPICAL SANCTUARY GIVES PLACE TO THE TRUE.

1. The sanctuary of the first covenant ends with that covenant, and does not constitute the sanctuary of the new covenant. *Heb. ix, 1, 2, 8, 9;* *Acts vii, 48, 49.* 2. That sanctuary was a figure for the time then present, or for that dispensation. *Heb. ix, 9.* That is, God did not, during the typical dispensation, lay open the true tabernacle; but gave to the people a figure or pattern of it. 3. When the work of the first tabernacle was accomplished, the way of the temple of God in heaven was laid open. *Heb. ix, 8;* *Ps. xi, 4;* *Jer. xvii, 12.* 4. The typical sanctuary and the carnal ordinances connected with it, were to last only till the time of reformation. And when that time arrived, Christ came, an high priest of good things to come by a greater and more perfect tabernacle. *Heb. ix, 9-12.* 5. The rending of the veil of the earthly sanctuary at the death of our Saviour evinced that its services were finished. *Matt. xxviii, 50, 51;* *Mark xv, 38;* *Luke xxi, 45.* 6. Christ solemnly declared that it was left desolate. *Matt. xxiii, 37, 38;* *Luke xiii, 34, 35.* 7. The sanctuary is connected with the host. *Dan. viii, 13.* And the host, which is the true church, has had neither sanctuary nor priesthood in Old Jerusalem the past 1800 years, but has had both in heaven. *Heb. viii, 1-6.* 8. While the typical sanctuary was standing, it was evidence that the way into the true sanctuary was

not laid open. But when its services were abolished, the tabernacle in heaven, of which it was a figure, took its place. Heb. xi, 1-9; ix, 6-12. 9. The holy places made with hands, the figures or patterns of things in the heavens, have been superseded by the heavenly holy places themselves. Heb. ix, 23, 24. 10. The sanctuary, since the commencement of Christ's priesthood, is the true tabernacle of God in heaven. This is plainly stated in Heb. viii 1-6. These points are conclusive evidence that the worldly sanctuary of the first covenant has given place to the heavenly sanctuary of the new covenant. The typical sanctuary is forsaken, and the priesthood is transferred to the true tabernacle. Now, unless it can be changed back from the true to the type again, the old will never be rebuilt.

#### GABRIEL'S EXPLANATION OF THE SANCTUARY.

But the most important question in the mind of the reader is this: How did Gabriel explain the sanctuary to Daniel? Did he point out to him the transition from the "figure" or "pattern," to the "greater and more perfect tabernacle," the true holy places? We answer he did. 1. Gabriel explains to Daniel what portion of the 2300 days belonged to Jerusalem and the Jews. "Seventy weeks have been cut off upon thy people, and upon thy holy city." Dan. ix, 24.—Whiting's Translation. Then the whole of the 2300 days does not belong to Old Jerusalem, the place of the earthly sanctuary, nor do they all belong to the Jews, the professed people of God in the time of the first covenant. 2. For in that period of 70 weeks, the transgression was to be finished, that is, the Jewish people were to fill up their measure of iniquity, by rejecting and crucifying their Messiah, and were no longer to be his people or host. Dan. ix, 24; Matt. xxiii, 32, 33; xxi, 33-43; xxvii, 25. 3. Gabriel showed Daniel that the earthly sanctuary should be destroyed, shortly after their rejection of the Messiah, and never be rebuilt, but be desolate till the consummation. Dan. ix, 26, 27. 4. The angel brings the new covenant to Daniel's view. "He [the Messiah] shall confirm the covenant with many for one week." Dan. ix, 27; Matt. xxvi, 28. 5. He brings to Daniel's view the new covenant church or host, viz.: the "many" with whom the covenant is confirmed. Verse 27. 6. He brings to view the new covenant sacrifice, viz.: the cutting off of the Messiah, but not for himself. Verse 26. And

also the Prince or mediator of the new covenant. Verse 25; xi, 22: Heb. xii, 24. 7. He brings to Daniel's view the new covenant sanctuary. Gabriel informed Daniel that before the close of the 70 weeks, which belonged to the earthly sanctuary, the Most Holy should be anointed. That this "Most Holy" is the true tabernacle in which the Messiah is to officiate as priest, we offer the following testimony:

"And to anoint the Most Holy;" *kodesh kodashim*, the Holy of holies."—Adam Clark. Dan. ix, 24.

"Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people, and the city of thy sanctuary: that sin may be restrained, and transgression have an end; that iniquity may be expiated, and an everlasting righteousness brought in; that visions and prophecies may be sealed up, and the Holy of holies anointed." Houbigant's translation of Dan. ix, 24, as cited in Clark's Commentary.

"To anoint the Most Holy." Hebrew, literally 'Holy of holies,' Heaven itself, which Christ consecrated, when he ascended and entered it, sprinkling or consecrating it with his own blood for us."—Litck's *Restitution*, page 89.

"And the last event of the 70 weeks, as enumerated in verse 24, was the anointing of the 'Most Holy,' or the 'Holy of holies' or the 'Sanctum Sanctorum.' Not that which was on earth, made with hands, but the true tabernacle, heaven itself, into which Christ, our high priest, is for us entered. Christ was to do in the true tabernacle, in heaven, what Moses and Aaron did in its pattern. See Heb. vi; vii; viii; ix. And Ex. xxx, 22-30. Also Lev. viii, 10-15."—*Advent Shield*, No. I, page 75.

The fact is plain, then, that of the vision of 2300 days concerning the sanctuary, only 490 pertained to the earthly sanctuary; and also that the iniquity of the Jewish people would in that period be so far filled up, that God would leave them, and the city and sanctuary would soon after be destroyed, and never be rebuilt, but left in ruins till the consummation. And it is also a fact that Gabriel did present to Daniel a view of the true tabernacle, [Heb. viii, 1, 2,] which about the close of the 70 weeks did take the place of the pattern. And as the ministration of the earthly tabernacle began with its anointing, so in the more excellent ministry of our great High Priest, the first act, as shown to Daniel, is the anointing of the true tabernacle or sanctuary of which he is a minister. Ex. xl, 9-11; Lev. viii, 10, 11; Num. vii, 1; Dan. ix, 24.

It is therefore an established fact that the worldly sanctuary of the first covenant, and the heavenly sanctuary of the new covenant, are both embraced in the vision of the 2300 days. Seventy weeks are cut off upon the earthly sanctuary, and at their termination the true tabernacle, with its anointing, its sacrifice and its minister, is introduced. And it is interesting to notice that the transfer from the tabernacle made with hands, to the true tabernacle itself, which the Lord pitched and not man, is placed by Gabriel at the very point where the Bible testifies that the shadow of good things to come ceased, being nailed to the cross. Col. ii, 14-17. Where the offering of bulls and goats gave place to the great sacrifice; [Heb. ix, 11-14; x, 1-10; Ps. xl, 6-8; Dan. ix, 27;] where the Levitical priesthood was superseded by that of the order of Melchisedec; [Heb. v-vii; Ps. cx;] where the example and shadow of heavenly things was terminated by the more excellent ministry which it shadowed forth. Heb. viii, 1-6. And where the holy places, which were the figures of the true, were succeeded by the true holy places in heaven. Heb. ix, 23, 24. In the first part of this article we saw that Gabriel did not explain the 2300 days and the sanctuary in Dan. viii. We now see that in Dan. ix, he explained both. With Gabriel's explanation of the sanctuary, and the time, we are entirely satisfied.

#### THE HEAVENLY SANCTUARY.

"Now of the things which we have spoken this is the sum: we have such an high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man." Heb. viii, 1, 2. "A glorious high throne from the beginning is the place of our sanctuary." Jer. xvii, 12; Rev. xvi, 12; Ps. xi, 4. "For he hath looked down from the height of his sanctuary; from heaven did the Lord behold the earth." Ps. cii, 19.

**THE HEAVENLY SANCTUARY HAS TWO HOLY PLACES.**—The following testimony on this point is conclusive. We gather it from the Old and New Testaments, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. 1. The tabernacle erected by Moses, after a forty days inspection of the one showed to him in the mount, consisted of two holy places, [Ex. xxvi, 38

:13,] and is declared to be a correct pattern or model of that building. Ex. xxxv, 8, 9, 40, compared with Chap. xxix, 32-43. But if the earthly sanctuary consisted of two holy places, and the great original, from which it was copied, consisted of only one, instead of likeness, there would be perfect dissimilarity. 2. The temple was built in every respect according to the pattern which God gave to David by the Spirit. 1 Chron. xxviii, 10-19. And Solomon in addressing God says, "Thou hast commanded me to build a temple upon thy holy mount, and an altar in the city wherein thou dwellest, a resemblance of the holy tabernacle which thou hast prepared from the beginning." Wis. Sol. ix, 8. The temple was built on a larger and grander scale than the tabernacle; but its distinguishing feature, like the tabernacle, consisted in the fact that it was composed of two holy places. 1 Kings vi; 2 Chron. iii. This is clear proof that the heavenly tabernacle contains the same. 3. Paul plainly states that "the holy places [plural] made with hands" "are the figures [plural] of the true." And that the tabernacle, and its vessels, are "patterns of things in the heavens." Heb. ix, 23, 24. This is direct evidence that, in the greater and more perfect tabernacle, there are two holy places, even as in the "figure," "example" or "pattern." 4. The Apostle actually uses the word holies, [plural] in speaking of the heavenly sanctuary. The expression "holiest of all," in Heb. ix, 8; x, 19, has been supposed by some to prove that Christ began to minister in the most holy place at his ascension. But the expression is not "hagia hagion," holy of holies, as in chapter ix, 3; but is simply "hagion" holies. It is the same word that is rendered sanctuary in Heb. viii, 2. In each of these three texts, [Heb. viii, 2; ix, 8; x, 19.] Macknight renders the word, "holy places." The Doway Bible renders it "the holies." And thus we learn that the heavenly sanctuary consists of two "holy places."

**VESSELS OF THE HEAVENLY SANCTUARY.**—We have noticed particularly the vessels of the earthly sanctuary, and have cited divine testimony to show that they were patterns of the true in heaven. This is strikingly confirmed by the fact that in the heavenly sanctuary we find the like vessels. 1. The ark of God's testament, and the cherubim. Rev. xi, 19; Ps. xcix, 1. 2. The golden altar of incense. Rev. viii, 3; ix, 13. 3. The candlestick

**with the seven lamps.** Rev. iv, 5; Zech. iv, 2. **4. The golden censer.** Rev. viii, 3. This heavenly sanctuary is called by Jesus, "my Father's house;" [John xiv, 2.] by David, Habakkuk and John, "the temple of God in heaven;" [Ps. xi, 4; Hab. ii, 20; Rev. xi, 19.] God's "holy habitation;" [Zech. ii, 13; Jer. xxv, 30; Rev. xvi, 17.] "greater and more perfect tabernacle;" [Heb. ix, 11.] "the sanctuary and true tabernacle which the Lord pitched and not man." Heb. viii, 2.

#### THE TREADING DOWN OF THE SANCTUARY.

The agents by which the sanctuary is trodden under foot are the daily, or continual desolation, and the transgression, or abomination of desolation. Dan. viii, 13; xi, 31; xii, 11. These two desolations, as we have already seen, are Paganism and Papacy. It is often urged as a sufficient argument against the view of the sanctuary of God in heaven, that such a sanctuary is not susceptible of being trodden under foot. But we answer, this is not impossible, when the New Testament shows us that wicked men (apostates) tread under foot the Minister of the heavenly sanctuary, our Lord Jesus Christ. Heb. x, 29; viii, 1, 2. If they can tread under foot the Minister of that sanctuary, then they can tread under foot the sanctuary itself. It is not impossible that the Pagan and Papal desolations should be represented as treading under foot the heavenly sanctuary, when the same vision represents the little horn as stamping upon the stars. Dan. viii, 10. And when it is expressly predicted that the Papal power should war against the tabernacle of God in heaven. Rev. xiii, 5-7. The language of this vision, that these blasphemous powers should cast down the truth to the ground, stamp upon the stars, and tread under foot the sanctuary and the host, is certainly figurative, as it would otherwise involve complete absurdities.

Let us now briefly trace the manner in which Satan has, by Paganism and Papacy, trod under foot the sanctuary of the Lord. We have already seen that he has done this by erecting rival sanctuaries, where, in the place of the only living and true God, he has established "new gods that came newly up." Deut. xxxii, 16, 17. In the days of the Judges and of Samuel, Satan's rival sanctuary was the temple of Dagon, where the Philistines worshipped. Judges xvi, 23, 24. And when they had taken the ark of God from Israel, the Philistines deposited it in this temple.

**1 Sam. v.** After Solomon erected a glorious sanctuary upon Mount Moriah, Jeroboam, who made Israel to sin, erected a rival sanctuary at Bethel, and thus drew away ten of the twelve tribes from the worship of the living God, to that of the golden calves. **1 Kings xii, 26-33;** Amos vii, 13, margin. In the days of Nebuchadnezzar, the rival to the sanctuary of God was the temple of Nebuchadnezzar's god at Babylon. And into this temple he carried the vessels of the Lord's sanctuary, when he laid it desolate. **Dan. i, 2; Ezra i, 7; v, 14; 2 Chron. xxxvi, 7.** At a still later period, Satan established at Rome, a temple or sanctuary of "all the gods." **Dan. viii, 11; xi, 31.**

After the typical sanctuary of the first covenant had given place to the true sanctuary of God, Satan baptized his Pagan sanctuary and heathen rites and ceremonies, calling them Christianity. Thenceforward he had at Rome a "temple of God," and in that temple, a being exalted above all that is called God or that is worshiped. **2 Thess. ii, 4.** And this Papal abomination has trod under foot the holy city, [Rev. xi, 2; xxi, 2.] by persuading a large portion of the human family that Rome, the place of this counterfeit temple of God, was "the holy city," or "the eternal city." And it has trod under foot, and blasphemed God's sanctuary or tabernacle [Rev. xiii, 6; Heb. viii, 2] by calling its own sanctuary the temple of God, and by turning away the worship of them that dwell on the earth, from "the temple of God in heaven," to the sanctuary of Satan at Rome. It has trod under foot the Son of God, the minister of the heavenly sanctuary, [Heb. x, 29; viii, 2.] by making the Pope the head of the church, instead of Jesus Christ, [Eph. v, 23.] and by leading men to the worship of that "son of perdition," as one able to forgive past sins, and confer the right to commit them in the future, and thus turning men from Him who alone has power on earth to forgive sins, and to pardon iniquity and transgression. Such has been the nature of the warfare which Satan has maintained against the sanctuary and the cause of God, in his vain attempts to defeat the great plan of redemption which God has been carrying forward in his sanctuary. In order to present the cleansing of the sanctuary of God in heaven, it is necessary to notice briefly

## THE MINISTRATION AND CLEANSING OF THE EARTHLY SANCTUARY.

We have before shown that the earthly sanctuary consisted of two holy places, and that it was a pattern of the true tabernacle of God in heaven. We shall now present, in a brief manner, the work of ministration in both those holy places, and also the work of cleansing that sanctuary, at the end of that ministration, every year, and shall prove that that ministration was the example and shadow of Christ's more excellent ministry in the true tabernacle.

The ministration in the earthly sanctuary was performed by the Levitical order of priesthood. Ex. xxviii; xxix; Lev. viii; ix; Heb. vii. The act, preparatory to the commencement of the ministration in that earthly tabernacle, was the anointing of its two holy places, and of all its sacred vessels. Ex. xl, 9; xxx, 26-29; Lev. viii, 10. The entire work of the priests in the two holy places is summed up by Paul as follows: "Now when these things were thus ordained, the priests went always into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service of God; but into the second went the high priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people." Heb. ix, 6, 7. The ministration in the earthly sanctuary is thus presented before us in two grand divisions. First, the daily service in the holy place, which consisted of the regular morning and evening burnt-offering, [Ex. xxix, 38-43; Num. xxviii, 3-8], the burning of sweet incense upon the golden altar, when the high priest lighted the lamps every morning and evening, [Ex. xxx, 7, 8, 34-36; xxxi, 11,] the special work upon the Lord's Sabbaths, and also upon the annual sabbaths, new moons and feasts, [Num. xviii, 11-31; xxix; Lev. xxiii.] and beside all this, the special work for individuals as they should present their particular offerings through the year. Lev. i-vii. And second, the yearly work, in the most holy place, for the sins of the people, and for the cleansing of the sanctuary. Lev. xvii. Thus each of the two holy places had its appropriate work assigned.

The glory of the God of Israel was manifested in both apartments. When he entered the tabernacle at the first, his glory filled both the holy places. Ex. xl, 34, 35. See also 1 Kings viii, 10, 11; 2 Chron. v, 13, 14; vii, 1, 2. In the door of the first apartment, the Lord stood and talked with Moses. Ex. xxxviii,

9-11. In this place, God promised to meet with the children of Israel, and to sanctify the tabernacle with his glory. Ex. xix, 42-44; xxx, 36. In the holiest, also, God manifested his glory in a special manner. Ex. xxx, 21, 22; Lev. xvi, 2.

In the first apartment, stood the priests in a continual course of ministration for the people. He that had sinned, brought his victim to the door of this apartment to be offered up for himself. He laid his hand upon the head of the victim to denote that his sin was transferred to it. Lev. i; iii. Then the victim was slain on account of that transgression, and his blood, bearing that sin and guilt, was carried into the sanctuary, and sprinkled upon it. Lev. iv. Thus, through the year, this ministration went forward. The sins of the people being transferred from themselves to the victims offered in sacrifice, and through the blood of the sacrifices, transferred to the sanctuary itself.

On the tenth day of the seventh month, the ministration was changed from the holy place, where it had been continued through the year, to the most holy place. Lev. xvi, 2, 29-34. The high priest entered the holiest with the blood of a bullock, as a sin-offering for himself. Verses 3, 6, 11-14. He then received of the children of Israel two kids of the goats for a sin-offering. Upon these goats he cast lots; one lot for the Lord, and the other lot for the scape-goat. Verses 5, 7, 8. He next proceeded to offer the goat, upon which the Lord's lot fell, as a sin-offering for the people.

We shall now show that he offered this blood for two purposes: 1. "To make an atonement for the children of Israel, for all their sins," 2. To cleanse, or "make an atonement for the holy sanctuary." Let us read a portion of the chapter. "Then shall he kill the goat of the sin-offering that is for the people, and bring his blood within the veil, and do with that blood as he did with the blood of the bullock, and sprinkle it upon the mercy-seat, and before the mercy-seat; and he shall make an atonement for the holy place, because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions in all their sins; and so shall he do for the tabernacle of the congregation that remaineth among them in the midst of their uncleanness. And there shall be no man in the tabernacle of the congregation when he goeth in to make an atonement in the holy place, until he

come out, and have made an atonement for himself, and for his household, and for all the congregation of Israel. And he shall go out unto the altar that is before the Lord, and make an atonement for it; and shall take of the blood of the bullock, and of the blood of the goat, and put it upon the horns of the altar round about. And he shall sprinkle of the blood upon it with his finger seven times, and cleanse it, and hallow it from the uncleanness of the children of Israel. And when he hath made an end of reconciling the holy place, and the tabernacle of the congregation, and the altar, he shall bring the live goat; and Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat, and shall send him away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness; and the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a land not inhabited; and he shall let go the goat in the wilderness." "And this shall be a statute for ever unto you; that in the seventh month, on the tenth day of the month, ye shall afflict your souls and do no work at all, whether it be one of your own country or a stranger that sojourmeth among you; for on that day shall the priest make an atonement for you, to cleanse you, that ye may be clean from all your sins before the Lord." "And he shall make an atonement for the holy sanctuary, and he shall make an atonement for the tabernacle of the congregation, and for the altar; and he shall make an atonement for the priests, and for all the people of the congregation. And this shall be an everlasting statute unto you, to make an atonement for the children of Israel for all their sins once a year." Verses 15-22, 29, 30, 33, 34.

We have here read several important facts. 1. On the tenth day of the seventh month the ministration was changed from the holy place to the holiest of all. Verses 2, 29-34. 2. That in the most holy place, blood was offered for the sins of the people to make an atonement for them. Verses 5, 9, 15, 17, 30, 33, 34; Heb. ix, 7. 3. That the two holy places of the sanctuary, and also the altar of incense were on this day cleansed from the sins of the people, which, as we have seen, had through the year been borne into the sanctuary and sprinkled upon it. Verses 16, 18-20, 33; Ex. xxx, 10. 4. That the high priest, having by

blood removed the sins of the people from the sanctuary, bears them to the door of the tabernacle [Num. xviii, 1; Ex. xxviii, 38] where the scape-goat stands, and putting both his hands upon the head of the goat, and confessing over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel in all their sins, he puts them upon the head of the goat, and sends him away, with all their iniquities, into a land not inhabited. Verses 5, 7-10, 20-22. The sanctuary was then cleansed from the sins of the people, and those sins were borne by the scape-goat from the sanctuary. The foregoing presents to our view a general outline of the ministration in the worldly sanctuary. The following scriptures show that that ministration was the example and shadow of Christ's ministry in the tabernacle in heaven: "Now of the things which we have spoken, this is the sum: We have such an high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens: a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man. For every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore it is of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer. For if he were on earth, he should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law; who serve unto the *example* and *shadow* of *heavenly things*, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle; for, See (saith he) that thou make all things according to the pattern shewed to thee in the mount. But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises." Heb. viii, 1-6; Col. ii, 17; Heb. x, 1; ix, 11, 12.

The facts stated in these texts are worthy of careful attention.

1. We have a High Priest in the heavens. 2. This High Priest is a minister of the sanctuary or true tabernacle. 3. As the earthly high priests were ordained to offer sacrifice for sins, so it is of necessity that our High Priest should have something to offer for us in the heavenly sanctuary. 4. When upon earth, he was not a priest. 5. The ministry of the priests in that tabernacle, made after the pattern of the true, was the example and shadow of Christ's more excellent ministry in the true tabernacle itself. 6. The entire typical service was a shadow of good things to come. 7. In the greater and more perfect tabernacle, Christ

is a minister of these good things, thus shadowed forth. With these facts before us let us now consider that more excellent ministry in the temple of God in heaven.

#### THE MINISTRATION AND CLEANSING OF THE HEAVENLY SANCTUARY.

At the close of the typical services, He of whom Moses in the law and the prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth, came and laid down his life for us. The death of the Lord Jesus is the dividing point between the two dispensations, as it put an end to the typical services, and was the great foundation of his work as a priest in the heavenly tabernacle. On Jesus was laid the iniquity of us all, and he bare our sins in his own body on the tree. Isa. lxxi, 6; 1 Pet. ii, 24; Heb. ix, 28. He was raised from the dead for our justification, and ascended into heaven to become a great High Priest in the presence of God for us. Rom. iv, 25; Heb. ix, 11, 12, 24.

The ministration in the heavenly sanctuary is performed by the Melchisedec order of priesthood, in the person of our Lord. Ps. cx; Heb. v-viii. We have already proved that the temple of God in heaven consists of two holy places, as did the earthly tabernacle; and that the ministration in the two holy places of the worldly sanctuary was the example and shadow of Christ's ministry in the true tabernacle. But it is contended by some that Christ ministers only in the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary. Let us examine this point.

1. His anointing the most holy place of the true tabernacle, at the commencement of his ministration, may be urged as proof that he ministers only in the second apartment of the heavenly sanctuary. Dan. ix, 24. But this objection vanishes at once if we consider that before the Levitical priesthood began to minister in the earthly sanctuary, that entire building, the holiest as well as the holy place and all the sacred vessels, were anointed. Ex. xl, 9-11; xxx, 23-29; Lev. viii, 10; Num. vii, 1. And when this anointing was accomplished, that ministration began in the first apartment. Lev. viii-x; Heb. ix, 6, 7. And this order, let it be remembered, was "the example and shadow of heavenly things."

2. It has been urged by some that the text, "this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right

hand of God," [Heb. x, 12,] forbids the idea of his ministring in the two holy places. But we answer, that so far as the idea of sitting down is concerned, it would be equally proper to represent him as standing on the Father's right hand. Acts vii, 56. And if the Saviour is at "the right hand of the power of God" when descending from heaven, as he testifies respecting himself, [Matt. xxvi, 64; Mark xiv, 62; Luke xxi, 69,] then he certainly can be at the Father's right hand, in both the holy places. But we have direct testimony here. Paul says that Christ is a "minister of the sanctuary." Heb. viii, 2. That the word "*hagion*," here rendered sanctuary, is plural, no one can deny. It is literally rendered by the Douay Bible, "the holies." As translated by Macknight, Heb. viii, 1, 2, reads thus: "Now of the things spoken the chief is, we have such a High Priest as became us, who sat down at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens, a minister of the holy places, namely, of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched and not man." We draw two conclusions from the foregoing. (1.) Our Lord can be a minister of the two holy places, and yet be at the Father's right hand. (2.) He *must* minister in both the holy places, or Paul's language that he is a minister of the holies or holy places, [plural,] is not true. An high priest that should minister simply in the holiest of all, is not a minister of the holy places.

3. But another argument to prove that Christ ministers only in the most holy place, has been urged by some, from the following texts: "The Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing." Heb. ix, 8. "Having, therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus." Chap. x, 19. But as has been before remarked, the word rendered "holiest of all," is the same that is rendered "sanctuary" in chapter viii, 2, and is not "*hagia hagion*," holy of holies, as in chapter ix, 3, but is simply "*hagion*," holies, plural. The rendering of Macknight, which correctly translates the word in the plural, removes all difficulty. He translates these two texts as follows: "The Holy Ghost signifying this, that the way of the holy places was not yet laid open, while the first tabernacle still standeth." "Well then, brethren, having boldness in the entrance of the holy places, by the blood of Jesus." These texts,

therefore, do not favor the doctrine that Christ is a minister of **only one of the holy places**. With a literal rendering of the word, giving it in the plural in our language, just as it was written by Paul, the objection to Christ's ministration in the two Holy places of the heavenly sanctuary is entirely removed. The way into the holy places of the heavenly sanctuary was not laid open, while the ministration in the earthly tabernacle continued; but when that ministration was abolished, the way of the heavenly holy places was laid open, and we have boldness to enter **by faith, where our High Priest is ministering for us.**

It may be proper to add, that the phrase rendered, "into the holy place," in Heb. ix, 12, 25, and "into the sanctuary," in chapter xiii, 11, is the same that in chapter ix, 24 is literally rendered in the plural, "into the holy places." Macknight renders them all in the plural. Then the heavenly tabernacle, where our Lord Jesus Christ ministers, is composed of holy places, as really as was its pattern or image, the earthly tabernacle; and our great High Priest is a minister of those holy places while at the Father's right hand.

Let us now examine those scriptures which present our Lord's position and ministry in the tabernacle in heaven. In vision at Patmos, the beloved disciple has a view of the temple of God, the heavenly sanctuary. A door was opened in heaven. This must be the door of the heavenly tabernacle, for it disclosed to John's view the throne of God, which was in that temple. Rev. iv, 1, 2; xvi, 17; Jer. xvii, 12. It must be the door of the first apartment, for that of the second apartment (which discloses the ark containing the commandments) is not opened until the sounding of the seventh angel. Rev. xi, 19. And the view, that John was looking into the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary, when he saw the Lord Jesus take the book from the hand of him that sat upon the throne, is strikingly confirmed by what he saw before the throne. He testifies that "there were seven lamps of fire burning before the throne, which are the seven Spirits of God." Rev. iv, 5; Zech. iv, 2. He also saw the golden altar of incense before the throne, and witnessed the ministration at that altar with the golden censer. Rev. viii, 3. In the earthly tabernacle, which was the pattern of things in the heavens, the golden candlestick with its seven lamps, and the golden altar of incense, were

both represented, and, by God's express direction, placed in the first apartment, Num. viii, 2-4; Heb. ix, 2; Lev. xxiv, 2-4; Ex. xl, 24-27. The scene of this vision is the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary. Here it was that John saw the Lord Jesus, Rev. v, 6-8.

Let us read Isaiah's description of this place. "In the year that king Uzziah died, I saw, also, the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple. Above it stood the seraphims: each one had six wings; with twain he covered his face, and with twain he covered his feet, and with twain he did fly. And one cried unto another, and said, Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory. And the posts of the door moved at the voice of him that cried, and the house was filled with smoke. Then said I, Wo is me! for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips; for mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of hosts. Then flew one of the seraphims unto me, having a live coal in his hand, which he had taken with the tongs from off the altar." Isa. vi, 1-6.

That this was a view of the heavenly tabernacle, and not of the temple at Jerusalem, may be proved by comparing John xii, 39-41, with Isa. vi, 8-10. Words written by Isaiah, while looking into the temple of God, are quoted by John with the declaration that Isaiah spake them while beholding Christ's glory. That John and Isaiah both beheld the same place is evident; both beheld the throne of God, and him that sits upon it; [Isa. vi, 1; Rev. iv, 2;] both beheld the living beings with six wings; [Isa. vi, 2; Rev. iv, 6-8;] each heard from these beings a like song; [Isa. vi, 3; Rev. iv, 8;] and both beheld the golden altar before the throne. Isa. vi, 6; Rev. viii, 3; ix, 13. That John and Isaiah both saw our Lord Jesus Christ, we have already proved. And the scene of their visions was in the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary, the place of the golden candlestick with its seven lamps, and the golden altar of incense. And in this apartment our High Priest commenced his ministration, like the priests in the example and shadow of heavenly things. In the shadow, each part of the work was many times repeated; but in the substance, each part is fulfilled once for all. Once for all, our sacrifice is slain; [Rom. vi, 9, 10; Heb. ix,

25-28:] and once for all, our High Priest appears in each of the holy places. Heb. ix, 11, 12, 24, 25. Hence, our Lord must continue his ministration in the first apartment until the period arrives for his ministration within the second veil, before the ark of God's testament.

The sins of the world were laid upon the Lord Jesus, and he died for those sins according to the Scriptures. The blood of the Lamb of God, which was shed for our transgressions of God's law, is that by which our High Priest enters the heavenly sanctuary, [Heb. ix, 12,] and which, as our advocate, he offers for us in that sanctuary. Heb. xii, 24; 1 Pet. i, 2; 1 John ii, 1, 2. His great work, which began with the act of hearing the sins of the world at his death, he here carries forward by pleading the cause of penitent sinners, and presenting for them his blood which had been shed as the great sacrifice for the sins of the world. The work in the earthly sanctuary was essentially the same thing. The sins were there laid upon the victim, which was then slain. The blood of that sacrifice, bearing that guilt, was sprinkled in the sanctuary to make reconciliation for the sinner. Lev. iv, 4-6. And thus in the shadow of heavenly things, we see the guilt of the people transferred to the sanctuary itself. This can be easily understood. And it is a plain fact that its great design was to give an example of heavenly things. As the sin of him who came to God through the offering of blood by the high priest, was, through that blood, transferred to the sanctuary itself, so it is in the substance. He who bore our sins at his death, offers for us his blood in the heavenly sanctuary. But when he comes again, he is "without sin;" [Heb. ix, 28;] his great work for the removal of sin is fully completed before he comes again. We now inquire respecting the removal of the sins of the church, or host, from the sanctuary.

We have seen that only 490 of the 2300 years belonged to the earthly sanctuary, and that the remaining 1810 years, belonging to the true sanctuary, which Gabriel introduces to Daniel in his explanation in chapter ix; consequently, the sanctuary to be cleansed from the sins of the church, or host, at the end of the 2300 years, is the heavenly sanctuary. We have also examined those portions of the Bible that explain how and why the earthly sanctuary was cleansed, and have seen that that cleansing was ac-

complished, not by fire, but by blood. We have seen that that work was ordained for the express purpose of shadowing forth the work in the heavenly sanctuary. And we have also seen that the sins of those who come to God through our great High Priest are communicated to the sanctuary as was the case in the type. But we are not left without direct testimony on this important point. The apostle Paul states the fact of the cleansing of the earthly and the heavenly sanctuaries, and plainly affirms that the latter must be cleansed for the same reason that the former had been. He speaks as follows: "And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission. 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, 22-24. Two important facts are stated in this portion of scripture. 1. The earthly sanctuary was cleansed by blood. 2. The heavenly sanctuary must be cleansed by better sacrifice, that is, by the blood of Christ. It is plain, then, that the idea of cleansing the sanctuary by fire has no support in the Bible.

These words, as rendered by Macknight are very clear: "And almost all things according to the law, are cleansed with blood, and without the shedding of blood, there is no remission. There was a necessity, therefore, that the representations indeed of the holy places in the heavens, should be cleansed by these sacrifices; but the heavenly holy places themselves, by sacrifices better than these. Therefore Christ hath not entered into the holy places made with hands; the images of the true holy places; but into heaven itself, now to appear before the face of God, on our account." Heb. ix, 22-24. Then the fact of the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary is plainly taught by the apostle Paul in his commentary on the typical system. And this great truth, plainly stated, is worthy of lasting remembrance.

By many, the idea of the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary, will be treated with scorn, "because," say they, "there is nothing in heaven to be cleansed!" Such overlook the fact that the holy of holies, where God manifested his glory, and which no one but

the high priest could enter, was, according to the law, to be cleansed, because the sins of the people were borne into it by the blood of sin-offering. Lev. xvi. And they overlook the fact that Paul plainly testifies that the heavenly sanctuary must be cleansed for the same reason. Heb. ix, 23, 24. See also Col. i, 20. It was unclean in this sense only: the sins of men had been borne into it through the blood of sin-offering, and they must be removed. This fact can be grasped by every mind.

The work of cleansing the sanctuary, changes the ministration from the holy place to the holiest of all. Lev. xvi; Heb. ix, 6, 7; Rev. xi, 19. As the ministration in the holy place of the temple in heaven began immediately after the end of the typical system, at the close of sixty-nine and a half weeks, [Dan. ix, 27,] so the ministration in the holiest of all, in the heavenly sanctuary, begins with the termination of the 2300 days. Then our High Priest enters the holiest to cleanse the sanctuary. The termination of this great period, marks the commencement of the ministration of the Lord Jesus in the holiest of all. This work, as presented in the type, we have already seen was for a two-fold purpose, viz: the forgiveness of iniquity, and the cleansing of the sanctuary. And this great work our Lord accomplishes with his own blood; whether by the actual presentation of it, or by virtue of its merits, we need not stop to inquire.

No one can fail to perceive that this event, the cleansing of the sanctuary, is one of infinite importance. This accomplishes the great work of the Messiah in the tabernacle in heaven, and renders it complete. The work of cleansing the sanctuary is succeeded by the act of placing the sins, thus removed, upon the head of the scape-goat, to be borne away for ever from the sanctuary. The work of our High Priest for the sins of the world, will then be completed, and he be ready to appear "without sin unto salvation." The act of placing the sins upon the head of the scape-goat, in the type, has already been noticed. Lev. xvi, 5, 7-10, 20-22. The following valuable remarks on this important point are from the pen of O. R. L. Crozier, written in 1846.

"**The Scape-Goat.**—The next event of that day, after the sanctuary was cleansed, was the putting of all the iniquities and transgressions of the children of Israel upon the scape-goat, and send-

ing him away into a land not inhabited, or of separation. It is supposed by almost every one that this goat typified Christ in some of his offices, and that the type was fulfilled at the first Advent. From this opinion I must differ, because, 1. That goat was not sent away till after the high priest had *made an end of* cleansing the sanctuary. Lev. xvi, 20, 21. Hence that event cannot meet its antitype till after the end of the 2300 days.

2. It was sent away from Israel into the wilderness, a land not inhabited, to receive them. If our blessed Saviour is its antitype, he also must be sent away, not his body alone, but soul and body, (for the goat was sent away alive,) from, not to, nor into, his people; neither into heaven, for that is not a wilderness, or land not inhabited. 3. It received and retained all the iniquities of Israel; but when Christ appears the second time, he will be 'without sin.' 4. The goat received the iniquities from the hands of the priest, and he *sent it away*. As Christ is the priest, the goat must be something else besides himself which he can *send away*. 5. This was one of two goats, chosen for that day, of which one was the Lord's, and was offered for a sin-offering; but the other was not called the Lord's, neither offered as a sacrifice. Its only office was to receive the iniquities from the priest, after he had cleansed the sanctuary from them, and bear them into a land not inhabited, leaving the sanctuary, priest and people, behind, and free from their iniquities. Lev. xvi, 7-10, 22. 6. The Hebrew name of the scape-goat, as will be seen from the margin of verse 8, is Azazel. On this verse, Wm. Jenks, in his Comp. Com., has the following remarks: 'Scape-goat. See diff. opin. in Bochart. Spener, after the *oldest* opinion of the Hebrews and Christians, thinks Azazel is the name of the devil; and so Rosenmire, whom see. The Syriac has Azazel the angel (strong one) who revolted.' 7. At the appearing of Christ, as taught in Rev. xx. Satan is to be bound and cast into the bottomless pit, which act and place are significantly symbolized by the ancient high priest sending the scape-goat into a separate and uninhabited wilderness. 8. Thus we have the scripture, the definition of the name in two ancient languages, both spoken at the same time, and the oldest opinion of the Christians in favor of regarding the scape-goat as a type of *Satan*. In the common use of the term, men always associate it with some-

thing mean, calling refugees from Justice, scape-goats. Ignorance of the law and its meaning is the only possible origin that can be assigned for the opinion that the scape-goat was a type of Christ.

"Because it is said, 'The goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities into a land not inhabited,' [Lev. xvi, 22.] and John said, 'Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh [margin, beareth] away the sin of the world,' it is concluded without further thought that the former was the type of the latter. But a little attention to the law will show that the sins were borne from the people by the priest, and from the priest by the goat. 1. They are imparted to the victim. 2. The priest bore them in its blood to the sanctuary. 3. After cleansing it from them, on the tenth day of the seventh month, he bore them to the scape-goat. 4. The goat finally bore them away beyond the camp of Israel to the wilderness.

"This was the legal process, and when fulfilled, the author of sins will have received them back again, (but the ungodly will bear their own sins,) and his head will have been bruised by the seed of the woman; 'the strong man armed' will have been bound by a stronger than he, and his house (the grave) spoiled of its goods, the saints. Matt. xii, 29; Luke xi, 21, 22."

The great work of atonement is now complete, and the work of our Lord as priest, accomplished. The sins of those who have obtained pardon through the great sin-offering are, at the close of our Lord's work in the holy places, blotted out, [Acts iii, 19.] and being then transferred to the scape-goat, are borne away from the sanctuary and host for ever, and rest upon the head of their author, the devil. The Azazel, or antitypical scape-goat, will then have received the sins of those who have been pardoned in the sanctuary, and in the lake of fire, will suffer for the sins which he has instigated. God's people, the host, will then be free for ever from their iniquity. "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still; and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still; and he that is holy, let him be holy still. And behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be." Rev. xxi, 11, 12. "And to you, who are troubled, rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty

angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ."  
2 Thess. i, 7, 8.

#### CAUSE OF OUR DISAPPOINTMENT.

Why were those disappointed, who looked for Jesus in 1844? This important question, we believe, can be answered in the most satisfactory manner. Our disappointment did not arise from mistaking the commencement of the 70 weeks. The argument by which the original date is sustained, is, as we have seen, invulnerable. Nor did our disappointment arise from a mistake in believing that the 70 weeks form a part of the 2300 days; for every part of that argument, as we have shown, still stands good. These two points being susceptible of the clearest proof, we were not mistaken in believing that the 2300 days would terminate in the seventh Jewish month, 1844. Neither did our disappointment arise from believing that at the end of the 2300 days the work of cleansing the sanctuary would take place. For it is plainly stated, "Unto 2300 days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed."

But when we said that this earth, or a part of this earth, was the sanctuary, and that Christ must descend from heaven at the end of the 2300 days, to purify the earth by fire, we looked for that which the Bible did not warrant us to expect. Here was the cause of our disappointment. For we have seen that there is no scriptural authority to support the view that any part of the earth is the sanctuary, or that the burning of the earth, and the melting of the elements, [2 Pet. iii.] is the cleansing of the sanctuary. By a multitude of witnesses, we have proved that the tabernacle of God is the sanctuary to be cleansed, and that its cleansing is a work performed in that sanctuary, with blood, and not with fire. Our disappointment, then, arose from a misunderstanding of the work to transpire at the end of the days.

Our evidence established two points: 1. The fact that the sanctuary should be cleansed at the end of the 2300 days, and that they would terminate in the seventh month, 1844. 2. The types in the example and shadow of heavenly things, set before us the work of the high priest in the seventh month, viz.: his act of passing from the holy place to the holiest of all, to cleanse the sanctuary. We reasoned, that as the paschal lamb, which was

slain on the fourteenth day of the first month, met its antitype in the death of the Lamb of God, on that day; [Ex. xii, 3-6, 46; 1 Cor. v, 7; John xviii, 28; xix, 36;] and the offering of the first-fruits on the sixteenth day of that month, met its antitype in the resurrection of Christ, on that day, the first-fruits of them that slept; [Lev. xxiii, 10-15; 1 Cor. xv, 20, 23; Matt. xxviii, 1, 2;] and the feast of Pentecost met its antitype on the day of its occurrence; [Lev. xxiii, 15-21; Acts ii, 1, 2;] so the cleansing of the sanctuary in the seventh month, [Lev. xvi,] at that time in the year when the 2300 days world end, we believed would meet its antitype at the end of that period.

Could we then have understood the subject of the heavenly sanctuary, our disappointment would have been avoided. Our evidence did not prove that our High Priest would descend from the holy place of the heavenly sanctuary, in flaming fire to burn the earth, at the end of the 2300 days; but so far from this, it did prove that he must, at that time, enter within the second veil, to minister for us before the ark of God's testament, and to cleanse the sanctuary. Dan. viii, 14; Heb. ix, 23, 24. Such has been the position of our High Priest since the end of the days, and this is the reason that we did not behold our King in 1844. He had then ministered in only one of the holy places, and the termination of the 2300 days marked the commencement of his ministration in the other. For believing in a literal sanctuary in heaven, consisting of two real holy places, and that our High Priest, while at the Father's right hand, is a minister of both these holy places, we are ranked as spiritualizers, by our enemies. From this unjust charge we appeal to the Judge of all the earth, who will do right.

When John, who saw the door of the first apartment of the heavenly tabernacle opened at the commencement of Christ's ministry, was carried in vision down the stream of time to "the days of the voice of the seventh angel," he saw the most holy place of God's temple opened. "And the temple of God was opened in heaven, and there was seen in his temple the ark of his testament; and there were lightnings, and voices, and thunderings, and an earthquake, and great hail." Rev. xi, 10. Here, by the ark of God's testament, is where our High Priest ministers, since the close of the 2300 days. To this open door in the heavenly

sanctuary, [Rev. iii, 7, 8; Isa. xxii, 22-25,] we invite those to come for pardon and salvation, who have not sinned away the day of grace. Our High Priest stands by the MERCY-SEAT (the top of the ark,) and here he offers his blood, not merely for the cleansing of the sanctuary, but also for the pardon of iniquity and transgression. But while we call men to this open door, and point them to the blood of Christ, offered for us at the mercy-seat, we would remind them of the LAW OF GOD beneath that mercy-seat, which made the death of God's beloved Son necessary in order that guilty man might be pardoned. That ark contains God's commandments, and he that would receive the blessing of God, at the hand of our High Priest, must keep the commandments contained in the ark, before which he ministers. Many affirm that God has abolished his law; but this is so far from the truth, that that law occupies the choicest place in heaven. It is that "justice and judgment," which are the habitation of God's throne. Ps. lxxxix, 14; xcvi, 2; Rev. xi, 19.

Two of the messages of Rev. xiv, had been given prior to the end of the 2300 days in 1844, as nearly all Advent believers once admitted. The third angel, with the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus, gives the last message of mercy, while our High Priest ministers for us before the ark containing the commandments. While he is thus ministering, the host, or church, are waiting the completion of the great work, the putting away of their sins. They are "in the last end of the indignation," which occupies a space of time, as is evident from Dan. viii, 19. The close of the third angel's message is marked by the Son of man taking his position upon the white cloud. Rev. xiv, 9-14. The last message of mercy will then have closed, and there will be no Intercessor between an offended God and guilty, offending man. The angels with the vials of God's wrath, who are now stayed by the ministration of our great High Priest, will then come out of the temple of God, and pour out the vials of unmixed wrath upon the heads of all the wicked. The plagues, the earthquake, and the great hail, "every stone about the weight of a talent," will follow; the enemies of God will be destroyed, and the little horn will be broken without hand. Rev. xv; xvi; xi, 19; Dan. xii, 1; viii, 25. The sanctuary and the host will then

be vindicated, and all opposing power overwhelmed in irretrievable ruin.

Beyond this time of trouble, such as never was, the scenes of the earth made new, rise before us. In the midst of that Paradise of God, where his saints will ever remain, we behold his glorious sanctuary ; [Eze. xxxvii ; Rev. xxi, 1-4 ;] and here we leave it, content, if we may be of the number who shall serve God in that temple, for ever and ever. Rev. vii, 13-15. The prophetic views of Moses, and of Nathan, respecting God's sanctuary, will then be fully realized ; the Lord will reign for ever and ever, and Israel will be planted to be removed no more. Ex. xv; 2 Sam. vii.

Reader, would you escape the things that are coming on the earth ? The warning voice of the third angel points out the way. Know for yourself that you have a personal interest in that work which our High Priest is consummating before the ark of God's testament, and when he shall come again, it will be without sin unto your salvation. We entreat you, heed not the voice of those who break the commandments, and teach men so, for they will soon receive their reward ; but rather unite with those who teach and keep them, and you will have life eternal, and free admittance through the gates into the Holy City.

## "THE JUDGMENT."

BY ELDER JAMES WHITE - THE ADVENT REVIEW, AND SABBATH HERALD, JANUARY 29, 1857.

### THE REVIEW AND HERALD

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

BATTLE CREEK, MICH. JAN. 28, 1857.

#### THE JUDGMENT.

For the time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God, and if it first begin at us, what shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God? And if the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear? 1 Pet. iv, 17, 18.

This text we must regard as prophetic. That it applies to the last period of the church of Christ, seems evident from verses 5-7, 12, 13. In the judgment of the race of man, but two great classes are recognized—the righteous and the sinner, or ungodly. Each class has its time of judgment; and, according to the text, the judgment of the house, or church, of God comes first in order.

Both classes will be judged before they are raised from the dead. The investigative judgment of the house, or church, of God will take place before the first resurrection; so will the judgment of the wicked take place during the 1000 years of Rev. xix, and they will be raised at the close of that period.

It is said of all the just, "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection," therefore all their cases are decided before Jesus comes to raise them from the dead. The judgment of the righteous is while Jesus offers his blood for the blotting out of sins. Immortal saints will reign with Christ 1000 years in the judgment of the wicked. Rev. xx, 4; 1 Cor. vi, 2, 3. The saints will not only participate in the judgment of the world, but in judging fallen angels. See Jude 6.

"Some men's sins [the righteous] are open before hand, going before judgment, and some men [the wicked] they follow after." 1 Tim. v, 24. That is, some men lay open, or confess their sins, and they go to judgment while Jesus' blood can blot them out, and the sins be remembered no more; while sins unconfessed, and unrepented of, will follow, and will stand against the sinner in that great day of judgment of 1000 years.

That the investigative judgment of the saints, dead and living, takes place prior to the second coming of Christ seems evident from the testimony of Peter. "Who shall give account to him that is ready to judge the quick [living] and the dead. For, for this cause was the gospel preached also to them that are dead, that they might be judged according [in like manner] to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit. But the end of all things is at hand: be ye therefore sober, and watch unto prayer." 1 Pet. iv, 5-7.

It appears that the saints are judged while some are living, and others are dead. To place the investigative judgment of the saints after the resurrection of the just, supposes the possibility of a mistake in the resurrection, hence the necessity of an investigation to see if all who were raised were really worthy of the first resurrection. But the fact that all who have part in that resurrection are "blessed and holy," shows that decision is passed on all the saints before the second coming of Christ.

The judgment of the house of God is evidently shadowed forth by the events of the tenth-day atonement of the house of Israel. That, in a certain sense, was a day of judgment. The high priest wore the breast-plate of judgment on which was represented the tribes of Israel. Ex. xxviii, 8-21. "For whatsoever soul it be that shall not be afflicted in that day, he shall be cut off from among his people. Lev. xxii, 29.

The 2300 days [Dan. viii, 14] reached to the cleansing of the Sanctuary, or to the great day of atonement in which the sins of all who shall have part in the first resurrection will be blotted out. These days terminated in 1844. We think the evidence clear, that since that time the judgment of those who died subjects of the grace of God has been going on, while Jesus has been offering his blood for the blotting out of their sins.

#### THE BLOTTING-OUT TIME.

When are sins blotted out? Is it at the time when they are forgiven? We think not. We must look to the great day of atonement as the time when Jesus offers his blood for the blotting out of sins. It is at the time of the cleansing of the Sanctuary. Said Peter to the wondering multitude who witnessed the lame man healed, "Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord; and he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you: whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." Acts iii, 19-21.

Here the time for blotting out of sins is placed forward just prior to the second appearing of Jesus. It is evidently the last great work in the ministry of Christ in the heavenly Sanctuary.

#### ARE SINS WRITTEN IN HEAVEN?

We think the Scriptures fully warrant the view that a record of the acts of all accountable men are written in heaven. "And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of these things which were written in the books, according to their works." Rev. xx, 12; Dan. vii, 10. "Then they that feared the Lord spake often one to another: and the Lord hearkened, and heard it, and a book of remembrance was written before him for them that feared the Lord, and that thought upon his name." Mal. iii, 16.

The book of life contains the names of all who become the special subjects of divine favor. See Dan. xii, 1; Rev. iii, 5; Phil. iv, 3. In the other books are recorded sins, also the pardon of sins repented of, and forgiven with those good works necessary to secure the favor of God. This whole-account stands, as written during the probation of every subject of special divine favor since the fall of man, till the time of the judgment of the house of God; till Jesus enters the Most Holy to offer his blood for the blotting out of the forgiven sins of all the just.

#### CHRIST OFFERS HIS BLOOD IN THE MOST HOLY FOR THE BLOTTING OUT OF THE SINS OF THE WHOLE ISRAEL OF GOD.

Christ is the only Savior offered to the race of man. All who are saved will be saved through him. All, of every age, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation, who shall be redeemed, will be redeemed to God by the blood of Jesus Christ. His blood was shed for all. At the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens, he is ready to plead the cause of every repeating sinner, and through him sinners may find pardon. He also offers his blood in the Most Holy for the blotting out of the sins of all the lusts of every age.

"For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling the navel, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit of

fired himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God? And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." Heb. ix, 13-15.

In the great day of atonement for the blotting out of the sins of all of every age, the cases of patriarchs and prophets, and sleeping saints of all past ages will come up in judgment, the books will be opened, and they will be judged according to the things written in the books. It is thus, at the end of the 1335 days, [Dan. xii, 13, 14] that

#### DANIEL STANDS IN HIS LOT.

The first and second definitions of the word lot, as given by Webster, are, 1. "That which in human speech, is called chance, hazard, fortune, but, in strictness of language, is the determination of Providence; as, the land shall be divided by lot." 2. "That by which the fate or portion of one is determined; that by which an event is committed to chance, that is, to the determination of Providence; as, to cast lots; to draw lots."

By reference to the Englishman's Hebrew Concordance, we find that the Hebrew word from which lot in Dan. xii, 13 is translated, is "gah-rakh" This word occurs, and is translated lot, seventy-five times in the Old Testament, besides Dan. xii, 13. That the reader may be able to determine the signification of the word, we will give the seventy-six instances of its use.

"Lev. xvi, 8. Aaron shall cast lots, one lot for the Lord, and the other lot for the scape-goat.

9. upon which the Lord's lot fell.

10. on which the lot fell.

Num. xxvi 55. the land shall be divided by lot.

56. according to the lot shall the.

See also Num. xxxiii, 54; xxxiv, 13; xxxvi, 2, 3; Josh. xiv, 2; xv, 1; xvi, 1; xvii, 1, 14, 17; xviii, 6, 8, 10, 11; xix, 1, 10, 17, 24, 32, 40, 51; xxii, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 20, 40; Jud. i, 3; xx, 9; 1 Chron. vi, 54, 61, 63, 65; xxiv, 5, 7, 21; xxv, 8, 9; xxvi, 13, 14; Neh. x, 24; xi, 1; Est. iii, 7; iv, 24; Ps. xvi, 5; xxii, 18; xxxv, 3; Prov. i, 14; xvi, 33; xviii, 18; Isa. xvii, 14; xxix, 17; lvii, 6; Jer. xii, 25; Eze. xpi, 5; Dan. xii, 13; Joel iii, 3; Obad. 11; Jonah i, 7; Micah ii, 5; Nah. iii, 10.

There is another word [gheb-nef] which is translated "region," "country," "lot of inheritance," &c., in Deut. iii, 4, 13, 14; xxxii, 9; Josh. xvii, 5, 14; xix, 9, 29.

It will now be seen that Daniel does not stand in the "lot of his inheritance," as it has been expressed; at the end of the 1335 days, but he stands in his lot in the decisions of the judgment of the righteous dead.

When did those days end? Evidences are conclusive that the 1335 days ended with the 2300, with the Midnight Cry in 1844. Then the angel [Rev. x, 1-6] swore that time should be no longer. Time here cannot mean duration, as measured in months and years, for 1000 years are measured after this; but it must refer to prophetic time, which was the burden of the angel's message. As Daniel was to stand in his lot at the end of the days, we must conclude that the judgment of the righteous dead commenced at that time, and has been progressing more than twelve years.

When will the cases of the living saints pass in review in the investigative judgment of the house of God? This is a question worthy the candid and most solemn consideration of all who have a case pending in the court of heaven, and hope to overcome. In the order of heaven, we must look for their judgment to follow that of the dead, and to occur near the close of their probation.

It is most reasonable to conclude that there is a special call to the remnant, and a special work to be performed by them, and for them, preparatory to the decisions of the judgment in regard to them, and that

their salvation depends upon fully obeying the calls and counsel to them. And we most solemnly believe that this preparatory call and work is brought to view in the testimony to the Laodiceans, and parallel portions of the word of God.

The judgment call and counsel to the Laodiceans finds them lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot. It finds them in a state where it is necessary for them to be zealous in the work of repentance, that they may find pardon, and obtain that preparation necessary to stand in the judgment. Those who do not fully receive and obey this testimony, but remain lukewarm, Christ will spue out of his mouth, or cast them from his favor and blot their names out of the book of life. The decisive hour is at hand. In this awful hour either sins or names will be blotted out. Those who are zealous and repent of all their sins, buy the gold tried in the fire, (true faith,) the white raiment, (the same as the wedding garment, or white linen, which is the righteousness of Jesus Christ that saints will be clothed with—but one place to buy it—Jesus says, buy of me,) and have their eyes anointed with eye-salve, (the anointing of the Holy Ghost,) will have their sins blotted out, while those who remain careless, disobedient and lukewarm, will have their names blotted out of the book of life. Life and death are in this judgment call of the dear Saviour. It is life to fully receive it; death to be careless and neglect it. Now is the time to fully understand what it is to

#### OVERCOME.

"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, and before his angels." Rev. iii, 5.

The white raiment in this text is the same as that offered by the true Witness. Hence we conclude that the overcoming, which is necessary in order to have the names of the people of God retained in, and not blotted out of, the book of life, consists in obeying the testimony to the Laodiceans.

Dear brethren, perfect faith by works, be clothed with the righteousness of Jesus Christ, and get the anointing of the Holy Ghost, which will enable you to see sin in its sinfulness, holiness in its beauty, and the path to life as straight and as narrow as it really is, and retain these priceless treasures, for in this you overcome. And your names will be retained in the book of life, and Jesus, in the judgment of the living just, will confess your names before the Father, and your sins will be blotted out.

We feel confident that but very few realize the consecration necessary to stand the judgment. Behold that dying saint. He first gives up the world and all its hopes. How carefully he reviews his past life, and confesses from the heart every wrong act and feeling. He then commits his family to the Lord, and himself he throws upon the mercy of God. O what a struggle! But when this work is done, Jesus smiles; and leaning upon the bosom of his Saviour, the saint breathes his life out sweetly there. His probation is closed, and his case rests till the record of his life is opened, and his case passes in review in the judgment. His sins were all repented of, therefore, in the great day of atonement, the blood of Jesus Christ can blot them out.

A consecration every way as complete as this will be necessary in order for the names of the living saints to be retained in the book of life, and their sins blotted out. What a struggle to die to this world while in full strength! We feel confident that many will go with the people of God who will fall in their feeble efforts to overcome. But very few realize what a real Bible death to this world is. O church of Christ awake! arise! The judgment is passing! Very soon will your names either be confessed by Jesus Christ before his Father, or they will be blotted out of the book of life. Consecrate all to God, then you will be prepared to act your part in saving others from ruin. The great work of consecration now required is set forth in the following scriptures:

"Seek ye the Lord, all ye meek of the earth, which have wrought his judgment; seek righteousness, seek meekness: it may be ye shall be hid in the day of the Lord's anger." Zeph. ii, 3.

"Therefore also now, saith the Lord, turn ye even to me with all your heart, and with fasting, and with weeping, and with mourning: and rend your heart and not your garments, and turn unto the Lord your God." Joel ii, 12, 13.

"Wherefore he saith, God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace unto the humble. Submit yourselves therefore to God. Resist the devil, and he will flee from you. Draw nigh to God, and he will draw nigh to you. Cleanse your hands, ye sinners; and purify your hearts, ye double-minded. Be afflicted, and mourn, and weep: let your laughter be turned to mourning, and your joy to heaviness. Humble yourselves in the sight of the Lord, and he shall lift you up." James iv, 6-10.

"As many as I love, I rebuke and chasten; be zealous therefore and repent."

We leave this subject for the present and give room for the pointed communications from Bro. Ingraham and Stone.

J. W.

## "DANIEL STANDING IN HIS LOT."

— BY HIRAM EDSON - THE ADVENT REVIEW AND SABBATH HERALD, JULY 30, 1857.

### DANIEL STANDING IN HIS LOT.

According to Webster, "to stand," signifies "Not to fail or become void; to succeed; to maintain one's ground; not to fail; to be acquitted; to be safe; to appear prominent; to have relief; to stand trial is to sustain the trial or examination of a cause, rank, post, station," &c.

"Lot" signifies, that which in human speech is called chance, hazard, fortune, but in strictness of language is the determination of providence; as the land shall be divided by lot. Num. xxvi. 2d. That by which the fate or portion is determined, that by which an event is committed to chance, that is to the determination of providence as to cast lots, to draw lots. The lot is cast into the lap, but the whole disposing thereof is of the Lord. Prov. xvi. 3d. The part, division or fate which falls to one by chance, that is by divine determination. Josh. xix. Lot. v. t. To allot, to assign, to distribute, to sort, to catalogue, to portion, &c.

Daniel's Lot, and the lot of the whole human family, is cast into, or in other words, is referred to the judgment. In other words, the determination of divine providence relative to the fate or future eternal destiny of Daniel and the whole human family is cast into or referred to the period of the judgment when and where the fate or eternal destiny of all is determined by divine providence.

The human family are all destined to stand before God in the judgment, [see Rom. xiv, 10; 2 Cor. v, 10; Rev. xx, 12.] at which time divine providence will determine the fate or future eternal destiny of all mankind. It is written, [Ps. i. 5] "Therefore the ungodly shall not stand in the judgment. That is to say, the ungodly shall not stand or endure the judgment trial they shall not be safe nor be acquitted in the judgment trial when divine providence shall determine their fate, or future eternal destiny.

But in contradistinction from this declaration to the ungodly, the blessed promise and assurance was given to Daniel, the man greatly beloved, that he should stand in his lot; that is to say, he should stand or endure the judgment trial, he should be acquitted and be safe in the judgment trial when divine providence should determine his fate or future eternal destiny. This promise or assurance to Daniel that he should stand in his lot at the end of the 2300 and 1335 days was a promise that he should stand or endure the judgment trial and be acquitted and be safe. It amounted to a blessed promise and an assurance to Daniel, the man greatly beloved, that he should have eternal life awarded to him in the judgment when divine providence should determine his fate or future eternal destiny.

Daniel understood the vision [see chap. x, 1,] hence he understood that the cleansing of the Sanctuary at the end of the 2300 and 1335 days would be the canceling and atoning for and blotting out and putting away the errors and sins of the whole Israel of God, and that this would be the judging or judgment of the house of God; or in other words, it would be the time when all Israel would stand in their lot, when all Israel should be judged and acquitted and divine providence would determine and award to them eternal life. This important fact of the judgment upon the Israel of God at the end of the 2300 and 1335 days being brought before the mind of Daniel it could but be a matter of deep anxiety to Daniel to know whether he should stand or endure the judgment trial and be acquitted and be safe. How blessed then was the promise to Daniel that he should stand in his lot at the end of the days and be acquitted in the judgment trial and be safe and have eternal life.

H. Edson.

## SECTION 3:

### **ARTICLES AND TRACTS ON THE THIRD ANGEL'S MESSAGE**

- "THOUGHTS ON REVELATION XIII AND XIV." – BY ELDER J. N. ANDREWS – SECOND ADVENT REVIEW, AND SABBATH HERALD – MAY 19, 1851.
- "A BRIEF EXPOSITION OF THE ANGELS OF REVELATION XIV." – BY ELDER JAMES WHITE – AN EARLY 1850'S BOOKLET.
- 1884 GREAT CONTROVERSY, CHAPTER XX – "THE THIRD ANGEL'S MESSAGE." – pages 273 – 286 – Ellen G. White.

## "THOUGHTS ON REVELATION XIII AND XIV."

### THOUGHTS ON REVELATION XIII AND XIV.

What position do we now occupy? No question of greater importance can now engage our attention. As a people who are waiting for the coming of their Lord, and noting with the deepest interest the events which precede the coming of the Just One to reign in glory, we ought ever to be able from the testimony of the word of God, to answer the solemn enquiry, "What of the night?" The great landmarks which stand along our pathway are here distinctly noticed, and thus we have given to us by the God of Heaven, an accurate chart of the great pathway which leads onward to the kingdom of God. That the great outlines of prophecy cover all time, from the commencement of the first great empire down to the destruction of the fourth, at the time when the Ancient of us shall sit in judgment, is a fact well understood. That we may learn from the fulfilment of these prophecies the relative position which we occupy, is also conceded; nay further, that the prophetic periods have expired, or that they are on the point of expiration, and that the signs which were to mark the end of all things at hand, have nearly all appeared, is also believed and taught. But there is another class of prophecies in which we are still more deeply interested; we mean those prophecies which describe the Advent movement itself. For though we may close our eyes to the fact, the word of God gives us a clear prophetic view of this subject, and exhibits in an unmistakable light the position of the classes which are connected with the movement. The word of God is the lamp by which our pathway is lighted; hence we may learn from that word where we now stand, and what we ought now to do; thus we may be able to give a reason of the hope that is within us with meekness and fear. As present duty is ever inseparably connected with present truth, we cannot engage aright in the work of God without a knowledge of this. The pathway on which we travel is marked at every step by the fulfilment of prophecy. As prophecy is fulfilled, the light of truth moves onward down this pathway toward the kingdom of God. If we would continue in the light of the truth, we must advance with the light lest we be enshrouded with darkness. The Advent movement itself is clearly described in Rev. xiv.

**THE FIRST ANGEL.** "And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach to them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, Saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment is come: and worship him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters."

"That such an emanation has been made to the world that the hour of his judgment is come this generation cannot deny. It has indeed gone to the four winds of heaven." The proclamation of the hour of God's judgment, here called "the everlasting gospel," synchronizes with "this gospel of the kingdom," of which Jesus speaks. The preaching of Paul at Athens was enforced by the declaration that God hath "appointed a day in the which he will judge the world;" but this is a specific message announcing that "the hour of his judgment is come."—The world and church have been tested by this great truth, and nearly all have rejected the counsel of God against themselves. It has tested the present generation as the great truths of the first advent tested the people of that time. John xii, 31. It was based on unanswerable evidence, viz. historic prophecy, prophetic time, and the signs of the times, and gave to the world the warning needed, that the day of God might not overtake them as a snare. The announcement contained time.—

"The hour of his judgment is come." That the great prophetic period of 2300 days was given correctly, is now demonstrated with great clearness. See *Advent Herald*, Vol VI..

That the first message was not to last till the coming of Jesus Christ, is evident from the fact that the time, which was its great burden or point, has ended. It is further evident from the fact that two angels intervene between the first angel and the position of the Son of Man in the white cloud. Nor can this point be met by saying that the three messages are given at the same time. For they are represented as following each other, and order is clearly given to them. There would be quite as much propriety in believing that the seven angels of Rev. viii, sounded their trumpets at the same time, as there would be to believe that the messages of the three angels, which follow in succession, are all to be given at once. The same propriety in making the first of the seven angels last till the coming of Jesus, or the first of the four beasts last till the judgment, and the remaining ones of each series fulfilled afterward, as to teach that the message of the first angel lasts till the coming of Jesus Christ, and that the remaining messages of the angels are given after that event. Because in each of the cases named, the history of the world is given, whilst men are in a state of probation.—Hence to teach that the first angel must continue his flight till the coming of Jesus, and that the second and third are to give their messages afterward, or to believe that the first angel does not commence his flight till the coming of Jesus, and that the three then give their messages together, are follies of which we ought not to be guilty.

That literal angels are concerned in this work we do not deny; for they are ministering spirits, and doubtless co-operate in the great work of salvation, but we fully believe that the three messages will be understood, and responded to by the people of God. That angels will work independent of human agency we cannot believe, for it is contrary to the order of God that they should become visible, and preach the gospel to the nations. But that they should act in unison with men is reasonable, and accords with the past dealings of God with man.

**THE SECOND ANGEL.** "And there followed another angel, saying; Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city, because she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication."

This angel follows or comes after the judgment hour cry. That such a message has been given, all are aware who have in any manner heeded the mighty work of God through the land. That a false fulfilment should occur at the right time for the real one to take place, is not only a thing in itself impossible, but it is a real libel on the character of God, as it makes a speedy end to faith or trust in him on the part of his people. For how can it ever be known that God is in a work, if those which come in the order of prophetic fulfillment, and accomplish the predicted work are to be discarded and we left to look elsewhere for the real event?

That a work worthy of being noted as the fulfillment of prophecy, could ever be accomplished by calling the people of God out of Rome, no one can seriously pretend. Further than this, if the fall of Babylon be the burning of Rome, how in the name of reason and of Scripture, can the people of God be called out of her that they receive not of her plagues when she has already been destroyed by fire which is the consummation of her plagues? Rev. xviii, 8.

We regard Babylon as the professed church united with the kingdoms of the world. In other words, "Babylon is the apostate church."—We cannot restrict the term to the Papal church, for it evidently includes all those religious bodies which have become corrupt like the "mother of harlots." The proclamation of the coming kingdom was made to her by the first angel, and the message having been rejected no further work could ever be done for her.

The people of God are then called out, for they may no longer remain in her communion. 2. Cor. vi, 14—18; Isa. lii, 11; 1. Tim. vi, 3—5; Rev. xviii, 4. The fall of this great city leaves her the habitation of devils, and the hold of foul spirits, &c. This is a moral fall, and de-

notes the rejection of the professed church. She has rejected the only truth by which she could have been healed of her maladies. Hence the people of God are commanded to flee out of her, that they partake not of her sins, and receive not of her plagues. It is evident that the fall of Babylon precedes her destruction, for the people of God are called out of her after her fall, and while her destruction is yet pending. Rev. xviii. Her fall then denotes her rejection, and precedes her destruction by the plagues and by fire. Her merchants are the great men of the earth; and in the enumerated articles of Babylonian traffic, Protostants are, if possible, more extensively engaged than Papists. Notice all the gaudy trappings of this world, and in addition to this, "slaves and souls of men." How unlike what God designed that his people should be, has this great city become! The Church of Christ was to be the light of the world, a city set on a hill which could not be hid. Matt. v., 14—16. But instead of this, his professed people have united with the kingdoms of this world, and joined affinity with them. They are now planted on the decrees of kings, and the laws of the nations of earth, instead of that word which God gave to be the only foundation of his Church. Thus has the wisdom of man taken the place of the power of God. The unlawful connection of the people of God with the wicked world [James iv, 4] has resulted in their rejection at last; for how can the God of truth and holiness any longer recognize as his people, those who in addition to all these things, have rejected the tidings of the speedy coming of their rightful Lord? That they have actually fallen, let the facts in the case bear witness.

This cry of Babylon's fall, must be made in order that the people of God may understand and make their escape. Has this cry been heard? Has the predicted work been accomplished? We answer unhesitatingly, yes. It has been responded to by the most humble, and devoted, the very persons that Christ promised should know of a doctrine, whether it was of God or not. John vii, 17. This message of the second angel, in connection with the Midnight Cry, moved forward with the power of the God of heaven, and accomplished his purpose in causing it to be given. We may deny the message of the second angel and go back and attempt to give the first message again, but it would be a more scriptural course to heed the voice of the third. There is but one course by which we can avoid the message of the third angel, and that is to reject the second and pronounce it the work of man. Those who are prepared to do this, can do it.

**THE THIRD ANGEL.** "And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast, and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb: And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever: and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name. Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus."

The order as given in this chapter need not be mistaken,—nay it is not possible to mistake it, without doing violence to the language of inspiration. The warning voice of the third angel is not heard until the first and second angels have flown through the midst of heaven. Says a recent writer:

"But the fourteenth chapter [of Rev.] presents an astounding cry, yet to be made, as a warning to mankind in that hour of strong temptation. Rev. xiv, 9—11. A denunciation of wrath so dreadful, cannot be found in the book of God, beside this. Does it not imply a strong temptation, to require so terrible an admonition?"—*Facts of Humanism*, p. 112.

The difference between this message and the preceding ones cannot fail to be noticed. The first two were indeed solemn and pointed declarations, but this message is one of most fearful import. It is indeed a solemn and awful threatening of the judgments of God, unequalled elsewhere in the Bible. The first and second angels are in the past, and the message of the third is now before us. With its voice of warning sounding in our ears, how can we slumber on, and dream of peace and safety! It is not merely because that men are inclined to worship the beast and his image and to receive his mark, that they are so solemnly warned against it, for we have in the thirteenth chapter of Revelation an account of the real danger.

**THE BEAST, WHAT IS IT?** This question may be answered by referring to Rev. xiii, 1—10. When Daniel, in his vision of the seventh chapter, was shown the various empires which should successively bear

rule over the earth, they were represented under the symbols of beasts arising from the sea. Three of these having passed away, it is proper that the fourth of the series only, should be shown to John. The beast with ten horns, described by Daniel, is also seen by the Revelator to ascend out of the sea. In him are blazoned the marks of all the preceding beasts,—the body of the Leopard, the feet of the Bear, the mouth of the Lion. Dan. vii, 4, 5, 6. This beast is evidently the Papal form of the fourth beast, for it receives its seat and dominion from the dragon, Rome Pagus. The seat is Rome, which was given to him at the same time that his power was given. This dreadful beast was to possess this power and dominion over the saints for a period of 1260 years; but, altho' his dominion over them is thus limited, he is to make war on the saints until the coming of the Ancient of days. Dan. vii, 19—22. At the close of this period, he received a deadly wound which has been healed, and all the world now wonder after the beast. And we may safely affirm that the beast, after his recovery from the deadly wound, is to continue till the battle of the great day of God Almighty, when he is to be taken and cast into the lake of fire. Rev. xix, 19, 20; Dan. vii, 7—11. Hence we conclude that there is no other beast which is to take the place of the fourth beast, for the empire of this beast in its divided state, as represented by the ten horns, is to continue till the God of heaven shall set up his everlasting kingdom. Dan. vii; ii, 44.

**THE TWO-HORNED BEAST.** And I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth, and he had two horns like a lamb, and he spake as a dragon. Rev. xiii, 11.

We have already seen that the fourth beast of Daniel, which is the same as the beast whose "deadly wound was healed," of whom John speaks, does not give his seat to another beast; hence the location of the two-horned beast is not in the ten kingdoms of the fourth beast. We cannot take the horns of the fourth beast and constitute another beast, or the horns of another. It is another beast beside the ten-horned beast. It is not the first beast healed of his deadly wound, for the work of the two-horned beast, is in the sight of that beast. The first beast was to possess the power and dominion for a period of 1260 years only, at the end of which period its dominion was taken away. Dan. vii, 25, 26; Rev. xiii, 5. But if the two-horned beast is but another form of the Papal power, then is the Papacy again to bear sway with all its former authority. Rev. xiii, 12. It would indeed be a surprising change if the ten horns were to be plucked up, and in their stead two other horns should arise. Yet such is a necessary conclusion if the two-horned beast is but another form of the first beast. Hence we conclude that the two-horned beast is another and distinct power.

It is however, from the time of its rise, a power *contemporary* with the beast whose deadly wound was healed. It acts in the sight of the first beast in performing its wonders. This point we will notice again.

The manner of its rise is not to be overlooked. The four beasts of Daniel, of which series John's first beast constituted the fourth, are all seen to arise out of the sea in consequence of the stirring of the winds. Dan. vii, 2, 3; Rev. xiii, 1. They arose by overturning the powers that preceded them, by means of general war. Winds denoting war or strife among men, and waters or sea denoting people, nations, &c.—Rev. vii, 1—3; xiii, 15. But this power seems to arise in a peaceful, or lamb-like manner from the earth.

When was this power to arise? Not prior to the *first* beast, certainly. Not at the same time, for then there would be no propriety in designating either as the first beast. It is said that it shall exercise all the power of the first beast before him. Then we may look for it to come on the stage of action about the close of the first beast's dominion, at the end of the 1260 years. Again, it is to cause the world to worship the first beast whose deadly wound was healed, which shows that its period of action is this side 1798.

"The two-horned beast is represented as a power existing and performing his part, after the death and revival of the first beast. If asked for my opinion as to what will constitute that beast with two-horns, or the false prophet, I must frankly confess I do not know. I think it is a power yet to be developed or made manifest as an accomplice of the Papacy in subjugating the world. It will be a power which will perform miracles, and deceive the world with them. See Rev. xix, 20."—*Litch's Restitution* pp. 181, 182.

One fact of interest may be noticed here. The course of empire beginning with the first great empire near the garden of Eden, has been ever tending westward. Thus the seat of the Babylonian and Persian empires was in Asia. The seat of the Grecian and Roman empires was in Europe. The Roman empire, in its divided state as represented by the ten horns, occupies all the remaining territory west to the Atlantic

ocean. Hence we still look westward for the rise of the power described in this prophecy.

This power is evidently the last one with which the people of God are connected, for the message of the third angel which immediately precedes the view of Jesus on the white cloud, pertains almost entirely to the action of the two-horned beast. Compare Rev. xiv, 9—11; xiii, 11—18. And it is a fact which ought not to be overlooked, that those powers with which the people of God are connected, are the only ones noted in prophecy. It is also plain that the march of civilization and of Christianity, like the course of the natural sun, has ever been westward. And it is evident that the territory of this last power is to be the field of the angels' messages, the land where the crowning truths of the gospel, ere it finishes its course, are to be brought out.

The rise of each of the great powers has been gradual. For a series of years they were preparing for the stations which they afterward assumed, but they begin to figure in prophecy, from the time when they are prepared to act their part in the great drama. We come now to trace the rise of an empire which has come up in the sight of the first beast; a power still further toward the setting sun, with the history of which the great circuit of empire will be accomplished, for the boundary of the vast Pacific has been reached.

A short time before the Reformation, in the days of Martin Luther, a new continent was discovered. The rise of the reformers brought out a large class who were determined to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience. They desired a greater measure of civil and religious freedom; hence they with many others fled to the wilds of America and laid the foundation of a new empire. They did not establish their power by overthrowing another power, but they planted themselves in an uncultivated waste and laid the foundation of a new government. The preceding powers had arisen through the strife of the winds on the great sea,—but this power arose out of the earth. That is, the first powers arose through the action of wars in overturning and subverting other nations, to be in turn overthrown and anointed by their successors, but this power appears to arise from the earth in a peaceful manner. It comes up in the sight of the first beast like the settlement and growth of a new country. "The Dublin Nation" thus notices the progress and the power of this republic:

"In the east there is arising a colossal cestaur called the Russian Empire. With a civilized head and front, it has the shrews of a huge barbaric body. There one man's brain moves 70,000,000. There all the traditions of the people are of aggression and conquest in the west. There but two ranks are distinguishable,—serfs and soldiers. There the map of the future includes Constantinople and Vienna as outposts of St. Petersburg.

"In the west an opposing and still more wonderful American empire is emerging. We Islanders have no conception of the extraordinary events which, amid the silence of the earth, are daily adding to the power and pride of this gigantic nation. Within three years territories more extensive than those three kingdoms, France and Italy put together, have been gained, and in almost "scatter of course" fashion annexed to the Union.

"In seventy years, seventeen now sovereignties, the smallest of them larger than Great Britain, have peacefully united themselves to the federation. No standing army was raised, no national debt sunk, no great exertion was made, but there they are. And the last mail brings news of the organization of three more great States about to be joined to the thirty. Minnesota in the northwest; Oregon in the southwest, and California on the shores of the Pacific. These three states will cover an area equal to one half the European continent.

"Nor is this a mere addition on the map.—It is not piling laurel upon unencultivated Ocean. It is an actual conquest of new strength and resources. Already has Minnesota its capital,—St. Paul—which has its journals, churches, schools, parties, interests and speculations. The Mormon founders of Deseret are doing what the Puritans did in Massachusetts two centuries ago,—taking care to possess themselves of the best lands and waters in their new state. Instead of becoming a lawless horde of adventurers the settlers in California are founding cities, electing delegates, magistrates, sheriffs, and Congressmen, as methodically and as intently as if they trod the beaten paths of life on the Atlantic shore of the continent.

"And with this increase of territory, there is a commensurate increase of industry in the older States.—The census of 1850 about to be taken in the United States, will show a growth of numbers, territory, and industry entirely unexampled in human history. Let the "gray powers of the old world look to it—let the statesmen of France, Germany, and Russia, read the census carefully though it should startle them. Let despotism count every man of these millions as a mortal enemy, and every acre of that vast commonwealth as an inheritance of mankind mortgaged to the cause of freedom.—America is as grand a field for human enterprise as when the ships of Columbus first neared the shores of Guanahana."

The progress of our own country since its first settlement, has indeed been wonderful. We trace its rise from the time of its settlement by those who fled from the oppression of the fourth empire, onward till it assumes its station among the great powers of earth, a little previous to the end of the 1850 years. Its territory has trebled since that period, by the addition of the vast territories of Louisiana, Florida, Texas, New Mexico and California, and the extension of an undisputed title to Oregon. Thus extending its dominion to the vast Pacific. This power

was seen arising from the earth, as though it had not time to develop itself in full, before the end. Mark its onward progress and tell, if it be possible, what would be its destiny, if the coming of the Just One should not check its astonishing career!

The youth, as well as the apparent mildness of this power, seems to be indicated by its lamb-like horns. What do these horns mean? This symbol is not used elsewhere in the prophetic Scriptures. Nor do we, as in the case of other powers, find that these symbols are explained in the connection. But we may learn from those symbols which are explained some facts which will throw light on this. The horns of the ram, Dan. viii, denoted the kings of Media and Persia. The great horn between the eyes of the goat denoted the first king. The ten horns of fourth beast, denoted the ten kingdoms into which the fourth empire was divided. Dan. viii, 23—25; Rev. xvii, 12. The little horn which came up after them denoted the Papal church which was afterward clothed with civil power. And it is evident that the horns of these beasts, symbolize the entire power of the beasts. From these facts we learn that the horns of the preceding beast, denoted civil and religious power. Hence we regard the horns of this latter beast as symbols of civil and religious power. But they are not horns with crowns like the preceding horns, but they are horns like those of a lamb. In appearance, if we may judge from the symbols used, this beast represents the mildest power that ever arose. For in the prophetic history of the governments which have preceded it, no one of them has been represented by symbols like this. We understand these horns to denote the civil and religious power of this nation—its Republican civil power, and its Protestant ecclesiastical power. If it be objected that "Republican civil power is its form of government, and that it ought to represent the beast, rather than a horn of the beast," we answer that the civil power of the Macedonian kingdom, was represented by the great horn of the goat. And that when that civil power was broken the beast still remained, and in the place of that one civil government, four arose in its stead. And we may add further that when the dominion of the different beasts of Dan. vii, was taken away, their lives were prolonged for a season and time. That is the nation still lived, though the dominion of the nation was destroyed. Hence we understand that the beasts denote the nations which constitute the different kingdoms, and the horns of the beasts denote the civil government or governments of these nations. If it be objected that Protestantism cannot constitute one of these horns, we answer that Papacy was reckoned as a horn, before it had plucked up three of the first horns,"—before it had civil power conferred on it. If it be objected that Papacy and Protestantism must constitute these horns on account of their professedly religious ("lamblike") character, we answer that Papacy is represented by a horn unlike that of a lamb, Dan. vii, 8—20. And moreover, the Papacy figures as the little horn of the fourth beast, and cannot without doing violence to language, be made to act as the horn of another beast. The seat of Papacy is not in America but in Europe, and definitely in Rome.

No civil power could ever compare with Republicanism in its lamb-like character. The grand principle recognized by this form of power, is thus expressed: "All men are born free and equal, and endowed with certain inalienable rights, as life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Hence, all have a right to participate in making the laws, and in designating who shall execute them. Was there ever a development of civil power so lamb-like before! And what, in religious matters, can be compared with Protestantism! Its leading sentiment is the distinct recognition of the right of private judgment in matters of conscience. "The Bible is the only religion of Protestants." Was there ever in the religious world any thing to equal this in its lamb-like profession? Such we consider the meaning of the "two horns like a lamb."

"And he speaketh like a dragon." With all these lamb-like appearances the real spirit by which he is actuated is that of the dragon,—the Devil. "For out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." Matt. xii, 34. What he is to speak we may notice hereafter. Verso 14.

"And he exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him, [or in his sight as Whiting translates,] and causeth the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast whose deadly wound was healed." Here is conclusive proof that the two-horned beast is distinct from the ten-horned beast, and cotemporary with it, from the time that its deadly wound was healed, about the commencement of the present cen-

tury. This exercise of power is the very scene of trouble and danger before us, respecting which the third angel gives us warning. "If any man worship the beast," &c. The anguish of that period may be learned from reading the history of the first beast. Verses 5—7; Dan. vii, 23—26.

"He doth great wonders, so that he maketh fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men." That we are living in an age of wonders is a well known fact: indeed, the language is oftentimes repeated, "There is nothing too wonderful to happen." "The increase of knowledge" in every department of the arts and sciences, has indeed been without precedent in the world's past history. We see the chariots with the speed of lightning courting their way through the land, and with similar speed are men enabled to traverse the mighty deep. Nahum iii. "The fire of God" (the lightning, Job i, 16; Exodus ix, 16) is literally brought down from heaven. Such is the wonderful power man has obtained over the elements. And the lightning thus brought down from heaven is sent as a messenger from one end of the land to the other. They "send the lightnings, and they go and say here we are!" Job xxxviii, 35. And all these wonders bid fair to be eclipsed by others still more astonishing. But it is another class of wonders which we regard as the complete fulfillment of this prophecy. The world may indeed be deceived by these things, and caused to believe that "bitter days are coming," and that the earth is being prepared for the residence of man, and that men are becoming more virtuous and enlightened, but there are other wonders in course of development, which are indeed miracles by which the world is deceived. It may not be necessary to notice the wonders of Psychology, Biology, &c., in which all the wonders of past ages seem to be revived; but we notice those astonishing developments from the land of spirits, which are causing the world to wonder. It would seem that communications with the spirits of the departed dead are now freely held, and men are brought into immediate connection with the spirit world. Such communications, though rare in past ages, have become of every day occurrence. We are told of pious people who are now holding converse with the spirits of the evangelists Mark and Luke, &c. The spirits communing with the greatest freedom, not with the pious alone, but with all classes do they hold free communication. And Protestants are the chief actors in all this. It is evident that those things are but the beginning of the miracles with which the world is to be deceived. For the coming of Christ is "after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and LYING WONDERS." 2. Thess. ii, 9. That all this is the work of the Devil is evident from the fact that God has forbidden necromancy in his word. Deut. xxviii, 11; Isa. viii, 19. Hence it is certain that the spirits of good men do not come to commune with those who brook the divine command. And we may go further than this, and say that even the spirits of bad men are not there. For if they are conscious, the sixteenth chapter of Luke shows that they are not permitted to return to earth; and if indeed "the dead know not anything," [Eccl. ix, 5.] then it is certain that their spirits are not sent into the world to instruct men.

No form of government ever arose in any past age in which these remarkable elements of deception were combined. It is of itself a wonder, a system of government which has not its like elsewhere. What is needed throughout the world to relieve its inhabitants of their oppressions, but that Republicanism should remodel all their civil governments! The leaven of its principles has deeply diffused itself throughout the nations of earth. In proof of this, witness the revolution of 1848, which shook nearly all the thrones of Europe. And what is so well calculated to develop, and to maintain religious freedom, as Protestantism. With the diffusion of these free principles may we not expect a scene of prosperity and triumph to the church; a period of emancipation to the poor enslaved nations of earth? The gathering in of the period when the nations shall learn war no more, and a universal spiritual kingdom shall be set up, and fill the whole earth. Micah iv, 1—5. And these wonders which we have briefly noticed, seem to promise a better revelation than the Scriptures of truth afford us.—We look forward indeed to the time when the Lamb, who is King of kings and Lord of lords shall reign in person over the whole earth. But with the mass this view has given place to the more congenial idea of the spiritual reign, and of temporal prosperity and triumph. Those things hold out to men the prospect of peace and safety, [1. Thess. v.] notwithstanding the voice of the first angel has been heard proclaiming that the hour of God's judgment had come, and showing that no better state of things

could ever exist till the curse should be removed from the earth; and still another messenger has flown through the midst of heaven proclaiming that the professed churches, who are now listening with such interest to these wonders, had become the hold of foul spirits, and a cage of unclean and hateful birds. But the great mass having rejected these truths, are left to the deception which is already beginning to come on the nations of earth. They dream that the earth with all its progress, and with all its improvements, is far too lovely and excellent for God to destroy. Peace and safety is the delusive dream in which men indulge whilst the wrath of God hangs over them.

We regard this two-horned beast, then, as the symbol of a civil and religious power, differing in many respects from those which have preceded it. It is in appearance the mildest form of power which ever existed, but it is after having deceived the world with its wonders, to exhibit all the tyranny of the first beast. Are the pretensions of this power well founded? Let us examine. If "all men are born free and equal, how do we then hold three millions of slaves in bondage? Why is it that the Negroe race are reduced to the rank of chattels personal, and bought and sold like brute beasts? If the right of private judgment be allowed, why then are men expelled from these religious bodies for no greater crime than that of attempting to obey God in some thing wherein the word of God may not be in accordance with their creed? Read Charles Beecher on "The Bible a sufficient Creed." Why are men far no other crime than that of looking for the coming of Jesus Christ, expelled from the churches of those who profess to love his appearing.

To these and many other questions of a similar character, we can only answer that the lamb is such only in pretensions. He is dragon in character. His eatable appearance is that of the lamb; the power by which he speaks is that of the dragon. The true kingdom of the Lamb, —the King of kings,—is not set up on the earth, until the wicked are destroyed out of it. Then the Jubilee will end the bondage of the saints. God speed the right.

A further view of the two-horned beast may be obtained by comparing his history with that of the false prophet. The two-horned beast is represented as working miracles in the sight of the first beast. The same is affirmed respecting the false prophet. Rev. xix, 20. The nations of the earth are deceived by these miracles, and caused to worship the image of the first beast, and to receive his mark. The same work is ascribed to the false prophet. Still further, we may say that the Bible gives us the origin of the two-horned beast, but does not, under that name, give us its final destiny. The origin of the false prophet is not given under that name, but his destiny is clearly revealed. Rev. xix, 20; xx, 10. Inasmuch as their work is identical, and they act on the stage at the same time, we cannot doubt their identity. This is another clear proof that the two-horned beast is from the time of its rise a power contemporary with the first beast, and not the first beast in another form. What power has ever arisen in the past history of the world which could answer the description of this lamb-dragon, or false prophet? If Satan has been permitted to make use of Paganism as an instrument of deception, and also of Papacy, which is Christianity in a corrupt form, why may he not be permitted to make use of Protestantism also, when it becomes corrupt, as, if possible, a more efficient instrument of deception than either of the former? Mahomedanism is introduced in this prophecy under the symbol of locusts, but its power departed with the second woe. Rev. ix. But the two-horned beast, or false prophet, acts as an accomplice of Papacy in Satan's great work of final deception, and unites in the great conflict with the King of Kings. Rev. xix.

The work of deception is followed by the dragon voice of this beast. He says to them that dwell on the earth that they should "Make an image to the beast which had the wound by the sword and did live." We have noticed in a previous verse that he was to enforce the worship of the beast which had lost its civil power. And now we have something further. An image to the beast that received the deadly wound must be made. That beast was, in truth, a church clothed with civil power and authority by which it put to death the saints of God. Rev. xiii, 5—8; Dan. vii, 23—26. An image to the beast then must be another church clothed with civil power and authority to put the saints of God to death. This can be nothing else but the corrupt and fallen Protestant church. If it be asked from whence the beast receives this power, we can only answer, that by permission of God, the dragon, that old serpent, called the Devil and Satan, is without doubt the very being who communicates this power to the beast. The kingdoms of this world

are claimed by him, and the right to give them to whom he will. Luke iv, 5, 6. Should it be objected that the world is too much enlightened to submit to such deception, or to unite in such a work of persecution, we answer that the word of God gives us this prophecy in clear language; and it is with reference to this scene of danger that the third angel utters his solemn warning. Look at the Jewish church, and mark how soon after it had rejected the Messiah at his first coming, they put him to a cruel death, and slew also many of his apostles and saints! They said indeed (Matt. xxiii) that had they lived in the days of their fathers, they would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets. But when their "hour and the power of darkness" come upon them, how completely did it show them under the power of Satan! Luke xxii, 53; John vii, 30. The rejection of the truth of God, leaves men the captives of Satan, and the subjects of his deception. 2. These, ii, 9-12. The greater the light which men reject, the greater the power of deception and of darkness which will come upon them. The Advent message has been given in our own land, and by the mass rejected, and no greater, and indeed no other light can ever be given to those who have turned away from that. The third angel gives us warning of the danger which is now before us. The warning precludes the danger that we by reasonable admonition may make our escape.

The warning of danger is a warning which refers directly to the scene of trouble described in Rev. xiii, 11-18. This warning shows that that trouble is yet to come. Its fearful character may be learned from the thrilling and dreadful import of the angel's message. The Bible nowhere else depicts such dreadful wrath. On one side stands the dove of the beast who is to exercise all the power of the first beast before him, that all who will not worship the image and receive his mark shall be put to death; on the other hand stands the solemn warning of the third angel. Here then is the strait before us. We can worship the beast and his image, and at the penalty, drink the wine of the wrath of God, or we can refuse, and peril our lives that we may obey God.

This message will draw a line between the worshippers of God and the worshippers of the beast and his image, for on either hand it reveals a dreadful penalty and leaves no chance for half way work. Those who disregard this warning will be found with the worshippers of the beast and his image, and will drink of the wine of the wrath of God. Those who heed this warning will obey God at the risk of their lives. The one class is designated by the mark of the beast, the other class is seen in the patience of the saints keeping the commandments of God. That the law of God should thus be made a great testing truth to draw a line between the subjects of the fourth and fifth kingdoms, is an idea not unworthy of the God of the Bible. That the commandments of God are the great subject of controversy between the dragon and the remnant of the seed of the woman, is plain from Rev. xii, 17. The issue of this struggle cannot be a matter of doubt, for as in all past ages those who have had the ark of God, and have kept his commandments have triumphed, even so will it be now.

Another religious power enforces the claims of the first beast, and his image, and causeth the world to receive his mark. What is this mark of the beast? It is the mark of that beast to whom the image was made, —the first beast. Rev. xix, 20; xvi, 2. But it is enforced by the two-horned beast. Hence, we understand it as an institution of Papacy, enforced by Protestantism. The beast and his image unite in this thing, denoting the union of the great systems of false Christianity, in opposition to the saints, who are engaged in keeping the commandments of God. Have we such an institution, really the child of Papacy, which the civil power supports, and to which the religious world pays homage? We have. It is found in a weekly sabbath which the "Mass of Sin" has placed in the stead of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. —Mark this. The Pope in his arrogance, was to exalt himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped, and to "THINK TO CHANGE TIMES AND LAWS." 2. Thess. ii; Dan. vii, 25. It is not said that he should be able to change them; but he should think to do it; or as the Catholic version reads, "he shall think himself ABLE to change times and laws." They are not the times and laws of men which he thinks to change, for these he might be able to change as other powers have done; but it is an act of arrogance in which he does not succeed. The times and laws of God are doubtless intended. The Pope in the exercise of his blasphemous assumptions, has attempted to change the fourth commandment, which guards the institution left by God as the memorial of himself. The ordinance of baptism commemorates the resurrection

of Jesus Christ, [Col. ii, 12; Rom. vi, 3-5.] but as this ordinance has been changed to sprinkling, something else must be introduced to commemorate that event; hence the Sabbath was gradually changed to the resurrection day. This act of changing the Sabbath, was performed by the power that should exalt itself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped. *Another day is kept for another reason.* The institution of the Sabbath commemorates God's rest from his work of creation; [Gen. ii, 2, 3.] this institution was designed for man,—the whole human family. The ordinances of the Lord's supper and of baptism, commemorate the death and resurrection of our Lord, [1. Cor. xi, 23-26; Rom. vi,] and were intended only for his church. Thus creation and redemption are both commemorated by their appropriate memorials.—But the presumptuous arrogance of man has changed these memorials throughout. The Sabbath and baptism, as observed by the mass, no longer commemorate the events for which they were designed. "The mystery of iniquity" had in the days of Paul, already begun to work. At first it appeared in a harmless form, but it gradually developed the man of sin. To notice one particular, the observance of the first day.

"The first intimation we have of this, is in any writer of acknowledged integrity, is from Justin Martyr, about A. D. 140. He is cited as saying "that the Christians in the city and in the country assembled on the day called Sunday; and after certain religious devotions, all returned home to their labors;" and assigns as reason for this, that God made the world on the first day; and, because Christ first showed himself to his disciples on that day, after his resurrection. These were the best, and probably all the reasons that could then be offered for this practice. He also speaks of Sunday only as a festival, on which they performed labor, when not engaged in devotions; and not as a substitute for the Sabbath."—*History of the Sabbath*, p. 21.

Dr. Chambers says, "By Constantine's laws, made in 321, it was decreed that for the future the Sunday should be kept for a day of rest in all cities and towns; but he allowed the country people to follow their work. In 338, the Council of Orleans prohibited this country labor."—*Encyclop. Art. Sunday.*

"To give the more solemnity to the first day of the week, Sylvester, who was Bishop of Rome while Constantine was Emperor, changed the name of Sunday, giving it the more imposing title of *Lord's Day*."—*Hist. Sabbath*, p. 21.

Thus we see that the change was effected the very year that the man of sin began his reign. The observance of Sunday was not however introduced into England until the thirteenth century, and it was not then effected without the aid of a new revelation. [Hist. Sab. p. 27.] The first law for its observance in England, was enacted in 1470. Yet does the whole Protestant world wonder after the beast. And nearly all of them in their creeds recognize this counterfeit Sabbath as a divine institution. But those who understandingly turn away from the commandments of God, and in their stead obey the institution of the beast, not only recognize him as equal with God, as an object of worship, but as being above God; for they acknowledge him as able to change the laws of God.—We regard this counterfeit Sabbath as THE MASK of that power which should "think to change times and laws." The force of this may be seen when the dragon makes war on "the remnant who keep the commandments of God;" or when the two-horned beast shall cause the world to worship the image of the first beast and to receive his mark.

Says Dr. Dutie: "I infer therefore that the civil magistrate may not be called upon to enforce the observance of the Sabbath, as required in the spiritual kingdom of Christ; *but where the moral and spiritual life of the State, the State is bound, through her magistrates to prevent the open violation of the holy Sabbath, as a measure of self-preservation.* She cannot without injuring her own vitality, and incurring the Divine displeasure, be recreant to her duty in this matter."—*Christian Advocate and Journal*.

"This mark is very conspicuous in the forehead or hand, and signifies, not a literal mark, but a prominent profession that all may see and know."

Hear the testimony of a Roman Catholic: "The first precept in the Bible is that of sanctifying the seventh day; God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, Gen. ii, 8. This precept was enforced by God in the Ten Commandments: Remember the Sabbath Day to keep it holy. The SEVENTH DAY is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. Ex. xx. On the other hand, Christ declares that he did not come to destroy the law, but to fulfil it. Matt. v, 17. He himself observed the Sabbath; and as his custom was, he went into the Synagogue on the Sabbath day. Luke iv, 16. His disciples likewise observed it after his death: they rested on the Sabbath day according to the commandment. Luke xxiii, 56. Yet with all this weight of Scripture authority for keeping the Sabbath or seventh day holy, Protestants, of every denomination, make this a profane day, and transform the obligation of it to the first day of the week, the Sunday. Now what authority have they for doing this? None at all, but the unscriptural Word or tradition of the Catholic church, which declares that the apostles made the change in honor of Christ's resurrection, and the descent of the Holy Ghost on that day of the week."—*Milner's End of Controversy*, page 89.

The Protestant church may, if taken as a whole, be considered as a unit; but how near its different sects number six hundred three scores and six, may be a matter of interest to determine. The different organizations are all upheld by the laws of the land. That they are oppressive when possessed of civil power, let the case of the Puritans, themselves fugitives from oppression, bear testimony. Witness their per-

cution of the Quakers, even unto death. Witness also the martyrdom of Michael Servetus under the sanction of John Calvin.

The fearful penalty threatened by the third angel, deserves particular notice. The wine of the wrath of God, and torment with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels and in the presence of the Lamb. The torment with fire and brimstone, comes doubtless, when the enemies of the Lord are cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, as described in Rev. xx; xxi. But the wine of God's wrath, is filled up in the seven last plagues. They are poured out after the temple of God is opened in heaven, which event transpires under the sounding of the seventh angel. Rev. xv, 5; xi, 10. And it is to be further noticed that the first plague comes on the very class threatened by the third angel. Rev. xvi, 2; xiv, 9, 10. Hence we understand that the seven last plagues which fill up the wine of the wrath of God, threatened by the third angel, are *future* and as real as the plagues poured out on Egypt. See the account in Exodus. See also Rev. xvi.

"Here is the patience of the saints." That is, in this period commencing with their disappointment, they are in a day of affliction, a scene of trial and darkness, keeping the word of Christ's patience [Rev. iii, 10,] and waiting for redemption at the coming of the Son of man. They are seen keeping the commandments of God, and in the possession of the faith or testimony of Jesus. The commandments of God in distinction from the testimony of Jesus, mean the ten commandments. Matt. xix, 17—19; v, 17—19; Rom. vii, 7—14; Luke xxiii, 56; Matt. xv, 3, 4; Eph. vi, 2. We shall indeed need the faith of Jesus that we may stand in that awful hour when the last plagues shall be poured out on the earth. Blessed in truth, are they who die in the Lord. They rest from their labors and their works do follow them.

Paris, Me., May, 1861.

J. N. ANDREWS.

## A BRIEF EXPOSITION OF THE

## ANGELS OF REVELATION XIV.

THERE are a number of conflicting views being presented at the present time relative to the first Three Angels of the fourteenth chapter of Revelation, which are calculated to confuse the minds of some, unless the truth is clearly stated, and spread out before them. Perhaps there is no portion of the Holy Scriptures of so much importance to the followers of the Lamb at the present time, as the thirteenth and fourteenth chapters of Revelation, from the fact that most of these chapters apply to the history, trial and final deliverance of those who are looking for Christ, at his appearing.

Different chains of important events, such as the trumpets, seals, churches and angels, beginning at a given point, and leading down the stream of time to a definite period, is the order of much of the book of Revelation. This may be seen in the thirteenth and fourteenth chapters.

The thirteenth chapter of Revelation and the first five verses of the fourteenth chapter present a connected chain of past, present and future events, down to the complete redemption of the 144,000, when they will stand on Mount Zion with the Lamb. Then the sixth verse of the fourteenth chapter introduces another chain of events. Those who live in the time of the fulfillment of much of these chapters can see that the division should be between the fifth and sixth verses of the fourteenth chapter. Let this point be carefully examined, and the difficulty in many minds relative to the prophecy of the 144,000 being introduced at the beginning of the fourteenth chapter, just before the messages of the angels, will be removed.

Before entering upon the subject of the angels of the fourteenth chapter, we will take a brief view of the thirteenth. This chapter, down to the tenth verse, is a prophetic description of the beast with seven heads and ten horns. The dragon of the twelfth chapter [Pagan Rome] gave this beast his power, seat, and great authority. Power was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them for forty and two months, or 1260 years. During this period the beast had power to lead the saints into captivity, and to kill them with the sword; but at its end, he was to be led into captivity, and be killed with the sword. This beast represents Papal Rome. In 538 he obtained power to lead the saints into captivity, and to kill them with the sword. This power he was to have for 1260 years, which reached down to 1798, when "General Berthier, at the head of the Republican army of France, entered the city of Rome and took it. On the 15th of the same month, the pope and his cardinals were taken prisoners, and shut up in the Vatican. The papal government was abolished, and Rome and Italy, at the request of the people, was erected into the Roman republic. The pope was carried a captive to France, where, in 1799, he died a prisoner and an exile. See Dr. A. Clarke, on Dan. vii. 25. Croley on the Apocalypse. Theirs' History of the French Revolution."

The tenth verse of this chapter, which speaks of this beast being led into captivity, brings us down to 1798, at which period John sees another beast "coming up," as stated in verse 11. "And I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth, and he had two horns like a lamb, and he spake as a dragon." This beast was not "up," or in full strength and power when the Papal beast was led into captivity in 1798, but was "coming up."

When we consider the peaceful manner, and the time of the rise of this beast, and that it is "another beast," beside the Papacy, we confess that we know

not where to look for it but in our own country. The rise of our own nation, with its two leading principles, Protestantism and Republicanism, answers the prophetic description of the beast "coming up out of the earth" having "two horns like a lamb." This will be more fully noticed in another place.

The remainder of this chapter, from the twelfth verse, we fully believe to be unfulfilled prophecy. The "wonders" and "miracles," which are to deceive "them that dwell on the earth," mentioned in the prophecy of the two-horned beast, are mainly in the future, yet they are evidently beginning to appear in the wonders of the present day, such as Psychology, Biology, &c., and what is commonly called "magical rappings." Already men talk of accounting for all the miracles of our Divine Lord by the wonders of the present day; and thus they are doing away the power of God, and preparing the way for Satan's last deception.

The deliverance of Israel from Egyptian bondage was certainly typical of the final and glorious deliverance of the saints. Then the sorcerers and magicians of Egypt were permitted, by the power of Satan, to deceive Pharaoh and the Egyptians by their enchantments. So in the struggle with the Image beast, prior to the final triumph of the saints, we may expect to see manifested all the spiritual deceptions that have existed for six thousand years. This will be followed by the wrath of that dragon power that is to oppress the saints in the "time of trouble, such as never was." Dan. xii. 1. But the view does not stop here with the thirteenth chapter, and leave the saints in the time of trouble, under the oppression of the beast and his image. John looks but a step further, and sees the saints in triumph and victory on Mount Zion with the Lamb, as recorded in the first five verses of the fourteenth chapter. Thus we see that the thirteenth, and the first five verses of the fourteenth chapter of Revelation are connected

chain of prophecy, pointing out the tyrannical rule of the beast and image over the saints, also of the saints' final triumph on Mount Zion with the Lamb, with psalms of victory, singing the new song of victory over the beast and his image. Here the view closes with the fifth verse, and John in vision is taken back, and brought down through the events connected with the proclamation of the coming and kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ, represented by angels following each other with a message.

This next prophetic chain commences with the sixth verse of the fourteenth chapter. Here six angels are introduced, five of them having sayings or cries. The messages of the first three angels are directed to those living on the earth. And as literal angels are not sent to preach the gospel to the inhabitants of this world, we must conclude that these angels and their messages are symbols, representing three distinct messages of bible truth to be proclaimed by God's called and chosen servants. That John in vision saw literal angels in heaven, and heard their voices, is evident; but the fulfillment of the prophecy must certainly be on earth, where the messages were needed to bring out, and to perfect the church of Christ, preparatory to his second coming. The fact that the position of the Son of man upon the great white cloud, with his sharp sickle, ready to reap the harvest of the earth, is the next link in this prophetic chain, is strong evidence that these proclamations relate to the Second Advent, and that they immediately precede it.

These three angels are the same in character, though their messages differ, and each symbolizes a distinct proclamation to be given by God's servants in this mortal state, prior to the Second Advent.

These angels follow each other. It is expressly stated in reference to the second angel, "And there followed another angel, saying, Babylon is fallen, is fallen." Also, of the third it is said, "And the third

*angel followed them.*" The first angel delivers the burden of his message, and then gives place to the second, who follows. The second gives his important message, and gives place to the third, who finishes his work and retires from the field before the "Son of man" is seen on the great white cloud.

To say that these three messages are to be given at the same time, is as absurd as to teach that the seven angels of Revelation all sound at once. "*Order is heaven's first law.*" But what perfect confusion would be caused in the church of Christ, if the messages of these three angels, so unlike each other, should be proclaimed with loud voices at the same period of time!

All Advent believers have been ready to admit that the first of these three angels symbolized the proclamation of the second coming of Christ and the judgment, that has been given, especially in this country, and has called out a people who profess to be looking <sup>for</sup> ~~out~~ <sup>on</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>in</sup> ~~time~~. As this view, which has been so universally adopted, is the only consistent view that can be taken of this subject, we feel in duty bound to adhere to it. But when this view of the first angel is taken, we are naturally led to look for two other distinct messages to be given to the people of God, in fulfillment of the sayings of the second and third angels. Those who admit that the messages of the first angel has been given, to be consistent, should not teach that it lasts to the coming of the Lord; for in so doing they give no place for the two that follow and two important links of this prophetic chain are taken out and laid aside. This will not do. Each angel's cry must have a distinct fulfillment prior to the Second Advent. To say that the first message is to be given before the Lord comes, and the second and third after that event, is too gross an absurdity to be advanced by any one.

We do not say that the "everlasting gospel" has ceased to have effect upon all, for some are now en-

bracing the doctrine of the speedy coming of the Lord, who have not been identified with the Advent people in the past movements. But that the burden of the message of the first angel is in the past, let the facts in the case testify. We have only to compare the present state of the Advent cause with the past, say from 1840 to 1844, to see that the special slight and proclamation of the first angel is in the past. Neither do we say that the message of the second angel, setting forth the fallen state of the various sects, can not be seen by those honest children of the Lord who find themselves bound by sectarian creeds. But when we compare the wonderful movement under the second angel in 1844, when the entire Advent body, with very few exceptions, came away from the several churches, with what has been done since that time in this respect, we shall not fail to see that the burden of the second angel is in the past, and that its place was prior to our great disappointment in 1844. Those who are giving the warning message of the third angel have followed down the simple chain of prophecy. While the first message was being given, our eyes were holden that we did not see the second, and so in relation to the third, while the second was being given. Now we see the third message as clearly as we saw the former ones. In fact, we are able to define our position with much more clearness than ever before, for this reason, we can now see the several links of the prophetic chain contained in this chapter.

To avoid the natural and reasonable conclusion that the third message is to be given now, efforts are being made to show that the Advent people have been entirely mistaken in their application of the first and second.

Henry Jones, in an article in the "Advent Harbinger," labored to show that the three angels would be heard after Christ was seen coming in the clouds of heaven. We are of the opinion that he will have to

enjoy this view alone, or nearly so, for certainly but few, if any, can be found who will adopt a view so absurd. Really, we should think it would be too late to dispatch three angels, with each a different message, "to preach unto them that dwell on the earth," after Christ is seen coming in the clouds of heaven.

On the other hand, C. Stowe, in an article published in the "Advent Herald," labors hard to remove the bounds, and carry the messages of the three angels back to the 12th, 14th, and 18th centuries, to the days of Waldo, Wickliffe and Luther. But as the history produced does not at all fit the prophecy, we think the view nearly as absurd as that which places the three messages after Christ is seen coming.

We will now examine the messages of the three angels.

**FIRST ANGEL.** "And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue and people, saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him: for the hour of his judgment is come: and worship him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of water."

This proclamation not only relates to the judgment, but also to the hour, period, or time of the judgment. It fitly applies to the proclamation of the judgment at hand, that has been given to the present generation, and it cannot possibly apply to any other period of the church.

We say that this angel's message cannot be properly applied to the preaching of the apostles, because they did not preach that the period of the judgment had come. Paul reasoned before Felix of "righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come." Acts xxiv, 25. He declared to the Athenians that God "now commandeth all men everywhere to repent; because he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world." Acts xvii, 30, 31. That the Thessalonians had received the ideas that

the period of the coming of Christ and the judgment had come, or was at hand, is evident. But Paul corrected this error, as will be seen from the following, which we copy from his second epistle to them.

"Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand.

Let no man deceive you by any means; for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God." 2 Thess. ii, 1-4.

Paul here declares to the Thessalonians that the day of Christ was not at hand, and warns them against being deceived in this matter. He also shows that the period of the judgment was to be after the apostacy, and the 1260 years of triumph and blasphemy of the "man of sin," or the Papacy. It is clear, therefore, that the apostles did not give the proclamation, "the hour of his judgment is come."

Again, this first message is based on prophecies (the prophecy of Daniel in particular) which were to be "closed up and sealed" [Dan. xii, 4, 9] till the time of the end, which has been clearly proved by second advent writers to be since about 1798. How perfectly absurd then to suppose that the message, relating to the period of the judgment, should be given while the prophecies on which it is based, which show the relative distance of the judgment, were "closed up and sealed," so that they could not be understood. This fixes the message to the present generation.

And again, Christ has given signs of his coming, and of the judgment, in Matt. xxiv; Luke xxi, and Mark xiii, also Rev. vi. The object of these signs, in connection with the prophecies of Daniel and John

unsealed, was, as stated by Christ, that his people might "know" that his coming was "nigh, even at the doors." This generation alone being able to "know" this, could give the judgment hour message, which no other generation could do. Therefore we are bound by the facts in the case, to apply this angel's proclamation to the advent movement witnessed in our day.

The "Advent Herald" of Nov. 22d, 1851, speaking of the advent cause, says :

"It is the cause of God, and is a work that must be done in these last days." (Rev. xiv. 6, 7.) We believe it to be the will of God that this class should maintain this position, for on it devolves the duty of giving to the church and world the final message—"The hour of His judgment is come."

We can not agree with the "Herald" that the first of the three, is the final message. It can not be the last, because two distinct messages follow it, prior to the Son of man taking his place on the "white cloud." But that it applies to the past proclamation of the Advent, we fully believe.

But some, who profess to be looking every day for Christ's coming, and say, "he may come to-day, or at any time," object to the view that the first angel is fulfilled in the past, for they think the "everlasting gospel" of the coming kingdom has not yet been preached sufficiently extensive to fulfill the prophecy of Rev. xiv. 6, 7. But if the prophecy is not fulfilled, then certainly they should not expect the Advent now. Those looking for the world's conversion cannot expect Christ's coming now; neither should those who are looking for a much wider spread of the first angel's message profess to be looking for the Second Advent, until that work shall first be accomplished.

But when we look to the past mighty movement relative to the coming and kingdom of Christ, we see the prophecy fulfilled, the great work accomplished.

Advent Lecturers and Editors have testified that Rev. xiv, 6, 7, was fulfilled. The "Voices of Truth" for Dec. 1844, says :

"No case can be more clearly demonstrated with facts than that this message has been borne to every nation and tongue under heaven, within a few years past, in the preaching of the coming of Christ in '43 or near at hand. Through the medium of lectures and publications, the sound has gone into all the earth, and the word unto the ends of the world."

Our advent brethren well know that from about the year 1840 to 1844, the judgment hour message was given with astonishing success and power, and that the public mind was moved by it. They also know that the message has ceased to arrest the public mind, that the world and church have fallen asleep to the subject, and that those who profess to be giving this message now, have lost the energy and power they once had. With these facts before us we have no reason to expect that the first angel's message will again arrest the public mind. And those who are looking for a much more extensive proclamation of this message than the past movement, may as well look for the conversion of the world.

**SECOND ANGEL.** "And there followed another angel, saying, Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city, because she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication."

This angel did not go on his mission and deliver his message in company with the first, but "followed," after the first angel had delivered the burden of his message. The first message was to the churches; but soon their papers refused to publish it, and the doors of their houses of worship were closed against it. They rejected the good news of the coming kingdom, and Jesus and the Spirit of truth departed from them, as their present state plain-

ly shows. The few living souls in all these churches who had received the Advent message, and who loved to talk of the Advent and the Restitution, were not allowed to speak freely of their faith and hope. Their testimony being crushed, the way was fully prepared for the second message, "Babylon is fallen, &c. This message we heard, our voices proclaimed it, and we saw its effect when the oppressed children of God burst the bands that bound them to the various sects.\*

The fall of Babylon is evidently a moral fall, and not its final destruction. This may be seen from Rev. xviii, 2, where it is stated that Babylon is fallen, and is become the hold of every foul spirit, &c. It must exist after its fall in order to be a hold of foul spirits after that fall. In its fall and becoming a hold of foul spirits is clearly seen a moral change. If the term Babylon is applied to the Catholic church, then we inquire, when did that church meet with such a moral change? When did she morally fall? The fact that she was always corrupt forbids such an application.

God's people, who heard the first angel's message, and came out under the message of the second, were prior to their coming out, in Babylon. Were they in the Catholic church? And did they come out of that church? Certainly not. But we know that many thousands did come out of the Protestant sects. As the Catholic church has not morally fallen, being always about as low as it possibly could be, and as God's people were not there, we say that it can not be the Babylon mentioned by the second angel.

It is said that the city of Rome is Babylon, and that her fall is the burning of that literal city. But can the city of Rome be a hold of foul spirits after it is burnt? And will God's people be called out of Rome after it is consumed by fire? They are called out of Babylon to escape her threatened plagues, Rev. xviii, 4. But will they flee out of Rome after it is burnt to escape plagues of which her being burnt is the last? "Her plagues shall come in one day, death, and mourning, and famine: and she shall be utterly burned with fire." Rev. xviii, 8.

Babylon signifies "mixture or confusion," which well applies to the many sects, holding a great variety of sentiments. But Christ designed that his church should be *one*. We do not say that the sects became Babylon by falling. They, while in their divided and sub-divided state, and united with the world, were always Babylon. God permitted his people to remain there, until the first angel's message was rejected, then he called them out.

That the nominal churches have fallen, let their own admissions, and the facts relative to their present condition bear testimony. When their state is compared with what it was ten years since, their fall is clearly seen.

We think the "foul spirits" that Babylon was to become a "hold" of, after her fall, refer to the spiritual wonders of the present day, such as Mesmerism, Biology, Psychology, and the "Mysterious Rappings." And we think it is evident that just before the plagues are poured out, the voice from heaven, "Come out of her my people," will be heard as never before.

\*We can say only a few words in relation to Babylon in this small work, and refer the reader to a lengthy article on this subject in No. 8, Vol. 2, of the "Advent Review and Sabbath Herald," taken from the "Voice of Truth" for Sept. 11, 1844. The "Review and Herald" is published at Saratoga Springs, (N. Y.), *Terms, Gratis*. We have a quantity of No. 8 for distribution.

**THE THIRD ANGEL.** "And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast, and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and

brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb: And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever: and they have no rest day nor night who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name. Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus."

This is indeed an awfully solemn message. And if it applies to the present time, it is certainly of the highest importance that its import be earnestly sought for and understood. Mark well the language, "And the third angel followed them." If, as we have shown, the messages of the first and second angels have been given within a few years past, it is certain that the message of this angel that followed them is addressed to us also. Such a warning implies great danger. And shall we, who are in danger of the worship of the Beast and his Image, and of drinking the unmingled cup of the wrath of Almighty God, slumber on, and neglect to examine this all-important message? God forbid. With the aid of the Holy Spirit we will investigate this subject, and seek to understand the duties it so solemnly enforces. The following is from a work entitled, "Facts on Romanism," page 112, published by J. V. Himes.

"But the fourteenth chapter [of Rev.] presents an sounding cry, yet to be made as a warning to mankind in that hour of strong temptation. Rev. xiv, 9—11. A denunciation of wrath so dreadful, can not be found in the book of God, beside this. Does it not imply a strong temptation to require so terrific an admonition?"

In examining this message we will notice the particulars contained in it as follows:

1. The Beast.
- II. The Image.
- III. The Mark.
- IV. The Worship of the Beast and Image.
- V. The Wrath of God.
- VI. The Torment in the Presence of the Holy Angels and the Lamb.

VII. The Patience of the Saints.  
VIII. The Commandments of God, and  
IX. The Faith of Jesus.

**I. THE BEAST.**—It is mentioned in Rev. xv. 2; xvi. 2; xix. 20; xx. 4, in connection with the Image, in a similar manner that it is spoken of in this message. The connection does not show what beast is meant; but it is spoken of as though it had been previously explained, and was well understood. It evidently is the beast with seven heads and ten horns of chapter thirteen, representing the Papal form of the fourth kingdom. It receives its seat, power and authority from the dragon, Pagan Rome.

This beast was to have power to lead the saints into captivity, and to kill them with the sword, for the term of 1260 years, [Dan. vii, 25, 26; Rev. xiii. 5, 10,] then he was to have his dominion "taken away," and "go into captivity." This was in 1798, when he received a "deadly wound," which has been healed. At this point of time John sees "ANOTHER BEAST coming up out of the earth" with "two horns like a lamb." Before noticing the IMAGE of the Papal beast, the TWO-HORNED BEAST claims our attention. Relative to this beast there are some things of special interest and importance, as follows:

**1. The time of its rise.** It certainly did not rise prior to the *first beast*. Neither at the same time; for then there would be no propriety in calling either the first. But as it follows the first beast, it is evident that we should look for it to rise to notice about the time that the first beast goes into captivity, at the close of the 1260 years. It was also to cause the world to "worship the first beast whose deadly wound was healed." This proves his period of action to be since the dominion of the first beast was taken away in 1798.

**2. It is "ANOTHER BEAST," beside the ten-horned**

best. Although the dominion of the first beast was limited to the period of 1260 years, yet he was to make war until the judgment, [Dan. vii, 19—22,] when he, with the false prophet, [two-horned beast,] is to be cast "alive" into the "lake of fire." Rev. ix, 20.

"The two-horned beast is represented as a power existing and performing his part, after the death and revival of the first beast. If asked for my opinion as to what will constitute that beast with two horns, or the false prophet, I must frankly confess I do not know. I think it is a power yet to be developed or made manifest as an accomplice of the Papacy in subjugating the world. It will be a power which will perform miracles and deceive the world with them. See Rev. xix, 20."—*Litch's Restitution*, pp. 131, 133.

The two-horned beast performs its wonders in the sight of the first beast. Rev. xiii, 13, 14. This not only shows it to be distinct from the ten-horned beast, but also, that both exist at the same time.

*3. The MANNER of its rise.* The four beasts, [Dan. vii,] of which the ten-horned beast, [Rev. xiii, 1,] is the fourth, all arose out of the sea, [sea or "waters" denoting "peoples, nations, &c." Rev. xvii, 15.] by reason of the four winds striving. [Winds represent strife among men.] They arose by overturning the powers which preceded them, by means of war. But not so with the two-horned beast. He was seen coming up out of the "earth," growing to power in a peaceful manner. He does not overturn any preceding power by means of war.

*4. The location of this beast.* The seat of the first beast is in Europe, and definitely at Rome. And as it lives and makes war until the judgment, we should not look among the Papal kingdoms of Europe for the location of the two-horned beast. "And I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth, and he had two horns like a lamb." No symbol could better represent the rise, growth, and apparent mildness of our own nation than this.

*5. The two LAMB-LIKE horns.* The mildness and youth of this power seem to be indicated by its lamb-like horns. These, we understand, represent the civil and religious powers of this nation—its Republican civil power, and its Protestant ecclesiastical power. For a more full explanation of this subject we must refer the reader to a lengthy article written by Bro. J. N. Andrews, entitled "Thoughts on Revelation xiii and xiv," published in the "Advent Review and Sabbath Herald," No. 11, Vol. I. From the article we take the following:

"The horns of the ram, Dan. viii, denoted the kings of Media and Persia. The great horn between the eyes of the goat denoted the first king. The ten horns of the fourth beast, denoted the ten kingdoms into which the fourth empire was divided. Dan. viii, 23—25; Rev. xvii, 12. The little horn which came up after them denoted the Papal church which *was afterward clothed with civil power*. And it is evident that the horns of these beasts, symbolize the entire power of the beasts. From these facts we learn that the horns of the preceding beast, denoted civil and religious powers. Hence we regard the horns of this latter beast as symbols of civil and religious power.

"No civil power could ever compare with Republicanism in its lamb-like character. The grand principle recognized by this form of power, is thus expressed: All men are born free and equal, and endowed with certain inalienable rights, as life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.' Hence, all have a right to participate in making the laws, and in designating who shall execute them.' Was there ever a development of civil power so lamb-like before? And what, in religious matters, can be compared with Protestantism? Its leading sentiment is the distinct recognition of the right of private judgment in matters of conscience. 'The Bible is the only religion of Protestants.' Was there ever in the religious world anything to equal this in its lamb-like professions? Such

we consider the meaning of the 'two horns like a lamb.'

**6. The power exercised by this beast.** "And he exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him, for "in his sight," as Whiting translates,] and causeth the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast whose deadly wound was healed. Here is conclusive evidence that the two-horned beast is distinct from the "first beast." It is cotemporary with the ten-horned beast from the time that its deadly wound was healed. This exercise of power is certainly future, and is the scene of trouble and danger before us of which we are warned by the third angel.

**7. The wonders and miracles performed by this beast.** "He doeth great wonders, so that he maketh fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men; and deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles which he had power to do in the sight of the beast." Here we will quote from the article before mentioned:

"That we are living in an age of wonders is a well known fact: indeed, the language is oftentimes repeated, 'There is nothing too wonderful to happen.' The increase of knowledge' in every department of the arts and sciences, has indeed been without precedent in the world's past history. We see the chariots with the speed of lightning coursing their way through the land, and with similar speed are men enabled to traverse the mighty deep. Nahum ii, 'The fire of God' [the lightning, Job i, 16; Ex. ix, 16.] is literally brought down from heaven. Such is the wonderful power man has obtained over the elements. And the lightning thus brought down from heaven is sent as a messenger from one end of the land to the other. They 'send the lightnings, and they go and say here we are!' Job xxviii, 35. And all these wonders bid fair to be eclipsed by others still more astonishing.

"But it is another class of wonders which we regard as the complete fulfilment of this prophecy. The world may indeed be deceived by these things, and caused to believe that 'better days are coming,' and that the earth is being prepared for the residence of man, and that men are becoming more virtuous and enlightened; but there are other wonders in course of development, which are indeed miracles by which the world is deceived. It may not be necessary to notice the wonders of Psychology, Biology, &c. in which all the wonders of past ages seem to be revived; but we notice those astonishing developments from the land of spirits, which are causing the world to wonder. It would seem that communications with the spirits of the departed dead are now freely held, and men are brought into immediate connection with the spirit world. Such communications, though rare in past ages, have become of every day occurrence. We are told of pious people who are now holding converse with the spirits of the evangelists Mark and Luke, &c. The spirits commune with the greatest freedom, not with the pious alone, but with all classes do they hold free communication. And Protestants are the chief actors in all this. It is evident that these things are but the beginning of the miracles with which the world is to be deceived.

"That all this is the work of the devil is evident from the fact that God has forbidden necromancy in his word. Deut. xviii, 11; Isa. viii, 19. Hence it is certain that the spirits of good men do not come to commune with those who break the divine command. And we may go further than this, and say that even the spirits of bad men are not there. For if they are conscious, the sixteenth chapter of Luke shows that they are not permitted to return to earth. And if indeed 'the dead know not any thing,' [Eccl. ix, 5] then it is certain that their spirits are not sent into the world to instruct men. No form of government

ever arose in any past age, in which these remarkable elements of deception were combined."

"As Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses," with their enchantments, when God was about to deliver his people from Egyptian servitude, so, in the "pernicious times" of the "LAST DAYS," was the truth of God to be resisted. Then, God wrought miracles by the hand of Moses and Aaron, and sent plagues upon Egypt to show that his people should go free; yet the devil had so completely deceived Pharaoh and his host, through the enchantments of the magicians, that they even dared to enter the channel that the Almighty had opened through the Red Sea for the escape of his chosen people.

The wonders of the present day, especially those that seem to imitate the work of God, are perfectly calculated to deceive those that know not God. And unless the people of God are warned against the deceptive power of satan in these things, they will be in danger of being blinded by them. Already has this power stolen over the multitude who have "a form of godliness," so that if the "POWER THEREOF" should be manifested, as was witnessed in this land a few years since in powerful revivals, ten thousand voices would at once join the cry of "Messianism, Fanaticism," &c. May God save his people amid the perils of the last days; and while those who deny the power of godliness are led on by the "spirits of devils working miracles," to "the battle of the great day of God Almighty," may his people watch and keep their garments.

**II. THE IMAGE.** The two-horned beast was to make "an image to the beast, which had the wound by a sword and did live," [Rev. xiii, 14.] therefore it is to be, when made, an image of the Papal beast. In order for it to be an image of that beast, it must resemble it, in many respects at least. That beast was a church clothed with civil power and author-

ity to dictate in matters of religion, and to put the saints of God to death. The image, then, must be another church, clothed with civil authority to do the same work. This will be clearly seen by comparing verse 15, with Dan. vii, 25—28; Rev. xiii, 1—5. And as the two-horned beast causes the image to be made, and gives it life, we conolnde that it can be no other than the Protestant churches clothed with authority "to speak," as the Papal church has done, and to carry its decrees into execution by laws and severe penalties.

If it is said that the world is too enlightened to unite in such persecution, we answer, the word of God is plain on this point, and it is in reference to this scene of danger that the third angel gives his solemn warning. The rejection of the truth of God leaves men the subjects of satan's deception. 2 Thess. ii, 9—12. Mark, how soon the Jewish church crucified the Son of God after they had rejected him as the Messiah. "If we had been in the days of our fathers," said they, "we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets." Matt. xxiii, 30. But when their "hour and the power of darkness" came upon them, they were led on by the power of satan.

We do not suppose that Rev. xiii, 15, teaches that the saints are to be put to death; but that a decree, at least, is to go forth to that effect, the text plainly shows. In view of this decree, and the dangers before us, the Prophet has given the following exhortation: "Before the DECREE bring forth, before the day pass as the chaff, before the fierce anger of the Lord come upon you, before the day of the Lord's anger come upon you: Seek ye the Lord, all ye meek of the earth, which have wrought his judgment; seek righteousness, seek meekness; it may be ye shall be hid in the day of the Lord's anger," Zeph. ii, 2, 3.

**III. THE MARK OF THE BEAST.** This mark is mentioned in Rev. xiii, 16; xiv, 9, 11; xv, 2; xvi, 2; xix, 20; xx, 4. In all these places the words "the mark" or "his mark" are used, showing that some one particular mark is referred to. This mark is not explained, only as the mark of the Papal beast, to be enforced by the two-horned beast, and as standing in direct opposition to "the commandments of God," and "the seal of the living God." This mark is very conspicuous, in the forehead or hand, and signifies, not a literal mark, but a prominent religious profession, as clearly seen and known as a literal mark in the forehead or hand. It must be an institution of the Papal beast, a prominent point of religious faith, on which the Papal and Protestant churches agree. Relative to this mark we shall speak more fully hereafter.

**IV. THE WORSHIP OF THE BEAST AND IMAGE.** In the final conflict, relative to which the third angel utters his dreadful warning, but two classes are seen. One class keep the commandments of God, are marked with the seal of the living God, [Eze. ix, 2—6; Rev. vii, 1—3; xiv, 1,] and are seen on Mount Zion with the Lamb. The other class receive the mark of the beast and image, and experience the wrath of God. One class are the worshippers of God, for they honor him by keeping his commandments. The other class receive the mark [a prominent religious institution and requirement] of the beast, therefore, are the worshippers of the beast, for they honor his institution. We therefore conclude, that the observance of some institution of Papacy, (which is yet to be enforced by the two-horned beast,) that stands opposed to the commandments of God, constitutes the worship of the beast and his image.

**V. THE WRATH OF GOD.** "And I saw another sign in heaven, great and marvelous, seven angels

having the seven last plagues, for in them is filled up the wrath of God," Rev. xv, 1. This testimony is sufficient proof that the wrath of God, threatened by the third angel, is the **SEVEN LAST PLAGUES**. These plagues are evidently shadowed forth by the plagues of Egypt, and will be as real and literal as those were. Compare Ex. vii—xii, with Rev. xvi.

The plagues of Egypt were just prior to the deliverance of Israel. The seven last plagues will be poured out just before the final deliverance of the saints. The deceptive power of satan was manifested by the magicians that withstood Moses, just before, and in connection with, the plagues of Egypt. And prior to, and in connection with, the last plagues, the worshippers of the beast, and his image are to be deceived by the "wonders" and "miracles" performed by the two-horned beast.

The wrath of God in the seven last plagues will constitute the "time of trouble such as never was," after Michael stands up. Dan. xii, 1. The mediation of Jesus in the Heavenly Sanctuary, prevents the wrath of God from coming on a guilty world. The four angels [Rev. vii, 1—8] hold the four winds until the servants of God are sealed by the last warning message. When that work is done, Christ will lay aside his priestly attire, put on the "garments of vengeance," [Isa. lir. 17.] and take his position on the white cloud, [Rev. xiv, 14.] with "a sharp sickle" to reap the harvest of the earth. Then the four angels will cease to hold the four winds [Rev. vii, 1—8,] and the wrath of God, in the seven last plagues, will be poured out.

The period of the pouring out the vials of the wrath of God is clearly shown [Rev. xi, 18] to be under the sounding of the seventh angel, after the "temple of God" was opened in heaven, and the "ark of his testament" was seen. See verse 18. This could not have been prior to the termination of the 2,800 days, when the new covenant Sanctuary was

to be cleansed. See Heb. viii, 1—6; ix, 1—8, 28, 24. In order for our Great High Priest to accomplish this portion of his priesthood he must, at the end of the 2300 days, pass within the second veil, into the "tabernacle of the testimony," according to the typical priesthood. And it is not until the tabernacle, containing the ten commandments, of the Heavenly Sanctuary is opened that the seven angels are commanded to go their way and pour out the vials of wrath. "And after that I looked, and behold, the "temple of the tabernacle of the testimony in heaven was opened. And the seven angels came out of the temple," &c. Rev. xv, 5, 6.

VI. THE TORMENT IN THE PRESENCE OF THE HOLY ANGELS AND THE LAMB, mentioned in the message of the third angel, we think, refers to the second death, at the end of the 1000 years of Rev. xx. It cannot possibly be inflicted upon wicked men in their present state, for they could not stand one moment in the presence of angels and the Lamb, much more, for a length of time, as described in the message, Rev. xiii, 10, 11.

The presence of one angel, at the resurrection of Christ, caused the Roman guard to "shake," and to become "as dead men." And when the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, and all the holy angels with him, when the whole heavens shall blaze with glory, and the earth shake at the presence of the Lord, then those who are not cut down by the seven last plagues, will not be able to stand a moment before the burning glory of that scene. Speaking of "the man of sin," Paul says, "whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming," 2 Thess. ii, 8.

We therefore conclude that the message of the third angel contains not only a warning of the terrors of the first death of the worshippers of the beast and

his image, by the seven last plagues, but, also, of that scene of torment at the second resurrection, when the wicked dead will be raised with bodies capable of standing in the presence of the Lamb and the holy angels. And as the host of "Gog and Mongog" gather up around the Beloved City the final execution of the judgment will take place. "Fire from God out of heaven" will "detonate" them.

VII. THE PATIENCE OF THE SAINTS. "Here is the patience of the saints." Where? After the second angel has given his message, and the great work designed by it is accomplished. It is well known by those who participated in the advent movement, that this was in the autumn of 1844, at the time of our great disappointment. The period since that disappointment may properly be called the time of the patience of the saints. Relative to our disappointment, and our waiting position since the time of confident expectation, the Apostle speaks as follows:

"Cast not away therefore your confidence, which hath great recompence of reward. For ye have need of PATIENCE, that, after ye have DONE THE WILL OF GOD, ye might receive the promise. For yet a little while, and he that shall come will come, and will not tarry.

"Now the just shall live by faith: but if any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him. But we are not of them who draw back unto perdition; but of them that believe to the saving of the soul." Heb. x, 35—39.

This testimony of the Apostle shows, first, that a people were to have great confidence which would be pleasing to God; second, that they would be disappointed, after doing "the will of God," and would need great patience to endure the trials of their position; and third, that they would have to live by faith. In calling to "remember the former days, in which they were especially "illuminated," they would live "by faith" in their past experience, and in

the sure promises of God relative to the glorious future.

This testimony of the Apostle can apply only to that people who have a corresponding experience. And that people, we fully believe, are those who have looked with great confidence for Christ's coming at a definite period of time, have been disappointed, and have passed through, and are still experiencing, severe trials arising from their waiting position. The expression, "For yet a little while, and now THEAT small come will come," &c. shows that this testimony can apply nowhere in the history of the church, but just prior to Christ's coming.

The third angel (who follows the second, consequently the period of his message is since our disappointment in 1844,) declares, "HERE is the patience of the saints," which Paul more fully explains, and shows that it is the "little while," just before the Second Advent.

VIII. THE COMMANDMENTS OF GOD. We have now come to an important division of this subject. Mark well this portion of the testimony of the third angel: "HERE are they that keep the commandments of God, [the Father,] and the faith of Jesus," [the Son.] The distinction between the commandments of the Father, and the *faith* of his Son Jesus Christ, is too plain to be misunderstood.

"And the dragon was wroth with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and have the TESTIMONY of Jesus Christ." Rev. xii, 17. The "faith," and "testimony of Jesus Christ," are evidently the same. The remnant of the seed of the woman, who heed the message of the third angel, not only keep the commandments of the Father, but also the faith or testimony of the Son.

It is said by some that the commandments of God mean only the doctrines and precepts of the New

Testament taught by Jesus and his apostles. To this view we object, and would ask those who hold it, What, then, is the testimony of Jesus Christ? Both the commandments of God, and the testimony of Jesus Christ are observed by the remnant. As the faith or testimony of Jesus embraces all the doctrines and precepts taught by Christ and his apostles, peculiar to the new covenant, the commandments of God must of necessity be something besides, which are binding during both the old and new dispensations. We say that the commandments of God, are the ten commandments, which the Father spake with an audible voice, and wrote with his finger in the tables of stone.

"A new commandment I give unto you," said Jesus, "that ye love one another," John xiii, 34. "This is my commandment, That ye love one another, as I have loved you," Chap. xv, 12. "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ." Gal. vi, 2. Peter also speaks of the commandments of the apostles of the Lord and Saviour, 2 Pet. iii. 2. But these are certainly included in the faith or testimony of Jesus Christ. This is the reason why the doctrines and commandments of Christ and his apostles are nowhere called, in the New Testament, the commandments of God.

"Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." Rev. xxii, 14. Precious promise indeed to those who obey. But whose commandments are these that must be obeyed in order to enter the Golden City, and have right to the Tree of Life? To this question some may be ready to answer, "The commandments of Jesus." But stop my brethren! First see who is speaking. It is the "True Witness," the Lord Jesus Christ, who says, "Blessed are they that do his commandments." The word "his" must refer to God the Father; there-

fore this promise, of entering the City of God, is to those who keep the Father's ten commandments.

**IX. THE FAITH OF JESUS.** We have before stated that the testimony of Jesus Christ, mentioned in connection with the commandments of God, Rev. xii, 17, is the same as the faith of Jesus, named in Chap. xiv, 12. Both texts apply to the same period. One to the "remnant," or last portion of the church of Christ, just before the Second Advent, the other is a portion of the last message of mercy to the scattered members of the body of Christ, just prior to the pouring out of the wrath of God.

Some have supposed that the faith of Jesus was faith to heal the sick, &c. while others have thought that it was faith necessary to stand in the day of wrath without an Intercessor. But it seems most consistent that the faith or testimony of Jesus Christ embraces all the precepts and doctrines of the New Testament taught by Christ, and afterwards by his holy apostles who were his special witnesses. HERE, in the time of the patience of the saints, is a people —thank heaven—who love the whole Bible. They seek to honor both the Father and the Son, in keeping the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus.

The testimony of Jesus Christ does not stand opposed to, or take the place of, the commandments of God. Says the Son of God, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law," &c. He shows by referring to the decalogue, that he is speaking of the law of commandments, and then affirms that while heaven and earth should remain, one jot or tittle should in no wise pass from it. See Matt. v. 17—88.

We view the doctrine that the faith of Jesus takes the place of the law of God, and abrogates it, one of the fables of the last days, [2 Tim. iv, 4] which, if believed, will sink souls in perdition. Paul rebukes this heresy when he says, "Do we then make void

the LAW, through FAITH? God forbid: yes, we ESTABLISH THE LAW." Rom. iii, 31. The Apostle also says, [chap. vii.] "Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good." Here, let it be understood, that this epistle to the Romans was written A. D. 60, twenty-nine years after the "hand-writing of ordinances," of the book of Moses, was abolished. Though the typical law of Moses was then abolished, having met its antitype in the gospel, yet the law of God, the ten commandments, was certainly a living law when this epistle was written.

Paul's opinion of the law of God differs widely from the views of some at this day. We are often told that it is "abolished," "dead," "a curse to man," &c. But Paul pronounces it "HOLY, JUST and GOOD," By some it is considered very irksome, especially the observance of the fourth commandment. But, says Paul, "I DELIGHT in the law of God," and "we know that the law is spiritual. The apostle John also agrees with Paul. He says, "For this is the LOVE of GOD, that we KEEP HIS COMMANDMENTS; and his commandments are NOT grievous," 1 John v. 3. [See our works on the law of God, and the Sabbath.]

In that time of trouble, relative to which the third angel gives his important message, two classes only will appear. One will worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark. The other class will heed the message of the third angel, and keep the commandments of God. They will be sealed or marked with the seal of the living God; and will, with the Lamb of God, stand on Mount Zion. See Rev. chapters xiii.—xvi.

These two classes will stand in opposition to each other. Their marks [prominent religious professions] will be directly opposite. While one class will bow to an institution of the Papal beast, enforced by the two-horned beast, the other will be keeping all of the commandments of God. But what is to constitute this mark of the beast, in that time when men will

have to decide to worship God, or the beast and his image? We think it will be to observe the first day of the week, instead of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment.

The first day of the week, so generally observed, is not the Sabbath of the Lord. The only weekly Sabbath of the Bible is that which commemorates the Creator's Rest on the seventh day. Christ and his apostles have spoken of no other.

There is no record that Christ met with his disciples in the day-time of the first day, after his resurrection; neither that the apostles met together for worship in the day-time of that day. Search and see. Paul held a meeting at Troas [Acts xx. 7—14] in the evening of the first day of the week, to break bread; but let it be understood that he journeyed to Assos on foot, and sailed to Mitylene, the same day that he broke bread. In the instruction of the Apostle concerning the collection for the poor saints [1 Cor. xvi. 1—8.] he says nothing of resting from labor, or a public meeting. His words, "Let every one of you lay by him in store," &c. show that they were to lay up their liberalities at home, ready for the Apostle when he should visit them.

It is generally admitted by those who have searched the New Testament for proof that the Sabbath has been changed, that there is no divine authority for it. But many, in the absence of divine testimony, try to content themselves with human authority, the testimony of the so called "Christian Fathers." But we venture to say that no conscientious Christian, who loves the word of God, and seeks to know his duty from that precious book, will rely on such testimony, instead of the commandment of God. Such a course is at war with the great principle of Protestantism—"the Bible the only religion of Protestants." Here was the struggle of the great Reformer.

"As to me," says Martin Luther, "I do not cease my cry of 'The Gospel! the Gospel!—Christ! Christ!' and

my enemies are as ready with their answer—"Custom! Custom!—Ordinances!—Fathers! Fathers! That your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men but in the power of God," says St. Paul."

The "MAN OF SIN" was to exalt himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped, and "TRUNK TO CHANGE TIMES AND LAWS." 2 Thess. ii, 4; Dan. vii, 25. The times and laws of God are doubtless referred to here. He could change the laws of men as other powers have done. But it was in his heart to change God's times and laws, and thus exalt himself above God. The Pope has attempted to change the fourth commandment, which guards an institution left by God as the memorial of himself. In the very act of instituting his counterfeit sabbath, to be observed instead of the Sabbath of the Lord, he has exalted himself above God. If he had placed the observance of the first day of the week on a level with the Sabbath, then he would have made himself only equal with God; but in treading down the Sabbath of the Bible, and enforcing his own in its stead, he has "exalted himself above all that is called God."

That the first day of the week was observed at quite an early period of the church, as a festival of about the same authority as Good Friday or Holy Thursday, we do not deny. The "mystery of iniquity" worked even in the days of the apostles. 2 Thess. ii, 7. But the following important facts of history show that it did not begin to take the place of the Sabbath till about the beginning of 1260 years of Dan. vii, 25, when the saints, and the "times and laws" of God, were given into the hands of the "little horn."

*Athanasius, A. D. 340, says—*"We assemble on Saturday, not that we are infected with Judaism, but only to worship Christ the Lord of the Sabbath."

*Socrates, an ecclesiastical historian, A. D. 412, says—*"Touching the communion there are sundry observations and cautions, for almost all the churches throughout the whole world do celebrate and receive the holy mysteries

every Sabbath; yet the Egyptians adjoining Alexandria, together with the inhabitants of Thebes, of a tradition, do celebrate the communion on Sunday. "When the festival meeting throughout every week was come, I mean the Saturday and Sunday upon which the Christians are wont to meet solemnly in the church."

Eusebius, A. D. 325, as quoted by Dr. Chambers, states that in his time "the Sabbath was observed no less than Sunday."

"To give the more solemnity to the first day of the week, Sylvestre, who was Bishop of Rome while Constantine was Emperor, changed the name of Sunday, giving it the more imposing title of *Lord's Day.*"—*Hist. Sabbath*, p. 21.  
*Gregory* expostulates thus—"With what eyes can you behold the Lord's day, when you despise the Sabbath? Do you not perceive that they are sisters, and that in slighting one you affront the other?"  
*Sazomen* says—"Most of the churches carefully observed the Sabbath."

*Gratius* observes—"The Christians kept the holy Sabbath, and had their assemblies on that day, in which the law was read to them, which custom remained to the time of the council of Laodicea, about A. D. 355."  
*Edward Brereton*, Professor of Gresham College, London, in a treatise on the Sabbath, 1630, says:—"They know little that do not know the ancient Sabbath did remain and was observed by the eastern churches three hundred years and more after our Saviour's passion."—*Bret. on the Sabbath* p. 77.

*Dr. Chambers* says—"By Constantine's laws, made in 321, it was decreed that for the future the Sunday should be kept a day of rest in the cities and towns; but he allowed the country people to follow their work. In 532, the council of Orleans prohibited this country labor."—*Enclop. Art. Sabb. Lond. 1791.*

From this time, [538] the observance of the first day was gradually but forcibly urged upon the people, and the Sabbath dismissed wherever they owned allegiance to the Pope as head of the church, and in England and Scotland as late as the thirteenth century. Then it was decreed that it should be kept from Sunday noon until Monday.

Then if the observance of the first day of the week is not sustained by divine authority, but is an institution of Papacy, we conclude that it will constitute "the mark of the beast," mentioned by the third angel. This angel gives a warning to prepare to stand on the side of the commandments of God in that decisive hour when the mark of the beast shall be enforced.

The cries of the other angels of this chapter all to be fulfilled in the future after the Son of man takes his place on the "white cloud," represent messages of prayer. They will be much better understood about the time of their fulfillment, while the saints are passing through the time of trouble. It is said of the first angel that his message was given with a "Loud voice." It attracted general notice. Not so with the second. But the third is said to be given with a "Loud voice." It will evidently increase and spread, until it reaches the hearts of God's humble people, and calls out the opposition of those who esteem this world and the commandments of men, of more value than the commandments of God, and a right to the tree of life.

# 1884 GREAT CONTROVERSY, CHAPTER XX

## “THE THIRD ANGEL’S MESSAGE.”

— pages 273 – 286 — Ellen G. White.

When Christ entered the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary to perform the closing work of the atonement, he committed to his servants the last message of mercy to be given to the world. Such is the warning of the third angel of Revelation 14. Immediately following its proclamation, the Son of man is seen by the prophet coming in glory to reap the harvest of the earth. {4SP 273.1}

As foretold in the Scriptures, the ministration of Christ in the most holy place began at the termination of the prophetic days in 1844. To this time apply the words of the Revelator, "The temple of God was opened in Heaven, and there was seen in his temple the ark of his testament." [REV. 11:19] The ark of God's testament is in the second apartment of the sanctuary. As Christ entered there, to minister in the sinner's behalf, the inner temple was opened, and the ark of God was brought to view. To those who by faith beheld the Saviour in his work of intercession, God's majesty and power were revealed. As the train of his glory filled the temple, light from the holy of holies was shed upon his waiting people on the earth. {4SP 273.2}

They had by faith followed their High Priest from the holy to the most holy, and they saw him pleading his blood before the ark of God. Within that sacred ark is the Father's law, the same that was spoken by God himself amid the thunders of Sinai, and written with his own finger on the tables of stone. Not one command has been annulled; not a jot or tittle has been changed. While God gave to Moses a copy of his law, he preserved the great original in the sanctuary above. Tracing down its holy precepts, the seekers for truth found, in the very bosom of the decalogue, the fourth commandment, as it was first proclaimed: "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." [EX. 20:8-11.] {4SP 273.3}

The Spirit of God impressed the hearts of these students of his word. The conviction was urged upon them, that they had ignorantly transgressed the fourth commandment by disregarding the Creator's rest-day. They began to examine the reasons for observing the first day of the week instead of the day which God had sanctified. They could find no evidence in the Scriptures that the fourth commandment had been abolished, or that the Sabbath had been changed; the blessing which first hallowed the seventh day had never been removed. They had been honestly seeking to know and do God's will, and now, as they saw themselves transgressors of his law, sorrow filled

their hearts. They at once evinced their loyalty to God by keeping his Sabbath holy. {4SP 274.1}

Many and earnest were the efforts made to overthrow their faith. None could fail to see that if the earthly sanctuary was a figure or pattern of the heavenly, the law deposited in the ark on earth was an exact transcript of the law in the ark in Heaven, and that an acceptance of the truth concerning the heavenly sanctuary involved an acknowledgment of the claims of God's law, and the obligation of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. Here was the secret of the bitter and determined opposition to the harmonious exposition of the Scriptures that brought to view the ministration of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary. How hard men tried to close the door which God had opened, and to open the door which he had closed! But "He that openeth and no man shutteth, and shutteth and no man openeth," had declared, "Behold, I have set before thee an open door, and no man can shut it." [REV. 3:7, 8.] Christ had opened the door, or ministration, of the most holy place, light was shining from that open door of the sanctuary in Heaven, and the fourth commandment was shown to be included in the law within the ark; what God had established, no man could overthrow. {4SP 275.1}

Those who had accepted the light concerning the mediation of Christ and the perpetuity of the law of God, found that these were the truths brought to view in the third message. [SEE APPENDIX, NOTE 7.] The angel declares, "Here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." This statement is preceded by a solemn and fearful warning: "If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation." [REV. 14:9, 10.] An interpretation of the symbols employed was necessary to an understanding of this message. What was represented by the beast, the image, and the mark? Again those who were seeking for the truth returned to the study of the prophecies. {4SP 275.2}

In the book of the Revelation, under the symbols of a great red dragon, a leopard-like beast, and a beast with lamb-like horns, [REV. 12; 13.] are brought to view those earthly governments which are especially engaged in trampling upon God's law and persecuting his people. Their war is carried forward to the close of time. The people of God, symbolized by a holy woman and her children, are greatly in the minority. In the last days only a remnant exists. John speaks of them as those that "keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ." [REV. 12:17.] {4SP 276.1}

Through the great powers controlled by paganism and the papacy, symbolized by the dragon and the leopard-like beast, Satan for many centuries destroyed God's faithful wit-

nesses. Under the dominion of Rome, they were tortured and slain for more than a thousand years; but the papacy was at last deprived of its strength, and forced to desist from persecution. [REV. 13:3, 10.] At that time the prophet beheld a new power coming up, represented by the beast with lamb-like horns. The appearance of this beast and the manner of its rise seem to indicate that the power which it represents is unlike those brought to view under the preceding symbols. The great kingdoms that have ruled the world obtained their dominion by conquest and revolution, and they were presented to the prophet Daniel as beasts of prey, rising when the "four winds of the heaven strove upon the great sea." [DAN. 7:2.] But the beast with horns like a lamb is seen "coming up out of the earth;" [REV. 13:11.] signifying that instead of overthrowing other powers to establish itself, the nation thus represented arose in territory previously unoccupied, and grew up gradually and peacefully. {4SP 276.2}

Here is a striking figure of the rise and growth of our own nation. And the lamb-like horns, emblems of innocence and gentleness, well represent the character of our government, as expressed in its two fundamental principles, Republicanism and Protestantism. The Christian exiles who first fled to America, sought an asylum from royal oppression and priestly intolerance, and they determined to establish a government upon the broad foundation of civil and religious liberty. These principles are the secret of our power and prosperity as a nation. Millions from other lands have sought our shores, and the United States has risen to a place among the most powerful nations of the earth. {4SP 277.1}

But the stern tracings of the prophetic pencil reveal a change in this peaceful scene. The beast with lamb-like horns speaks with the voice of a dragon, and "exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him." The spirit of persecution manifested by paganism and the papacy is again to be revealed. Prophecy declares that this power will say "to them that dwell on the earth, that they should make an image to the beast." [REV. 13:14.] The image is made to the first or leopard-like beast, which is the one brought to view in the third angel's message. By this first beast is represented the Roman Church, an ecclesiastical body clothed with civil power, having authority to punish all dissenters. The image to the beast represents another religious body clothed with similar power. The formation of this image is the work of that beast whose peaceful rise and mild professions render it so striking a symbol of the United States. Here is to be found an image of the papacy. When the churches of our land, uniting upon such points of faith as are held by them in common, shall influence the State to enforce their decrees and sustain their institutions, then will Protestant America have formed an image of the Roman hierarchy. Then the true church will be assailed by persecution, as were God's ancient people. Almost every century furnishes examples of what bigotry and malice can do under a plea of serving God by protecting the rights of Church and State. Protestant churches that have followed in the steps of Rome by forming alliance with worldly powers have manifested a similar desire to restrict liberty of conscience. In the seventeenth century thousands of non-conformist ministers suffered under the rule of the Church of England. Persecution always follows religious favoritism on the part of secular governments. {4SP 277.2}

The beast with lamb-like horns commands "all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads; and that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name." [REV. 13:16, 17.] This is the mark concerning which the third angel utters his warning. It is the mark of the first beast, or the papacy, and is therefore to be sought among the distinguishing characteristics of that power. The prophet Daniel declared that the Roman Church, symbolized by the little horn, was to think to change times and laws, [DAN. 7:25.] while Paul styled it the man of sin, [2 THESS. 2:3, 4.] who was to exalt himself above God. Only by changing God's law could the papacy exalt itself above God; whoever should understandingly keep the law as thus changed would be giving supreme honor to that power by which the change was made. Such an act of obedience to papal laws would be a mark of allegiance to the pope in the place of God. {4SP 279.1}

The papacy has attempted to change the law of God. The second commandment, forbidding image worship, has been dropped from the law, and the fourth commandment has been so changed as to authorize the observance of the first instead of the seventh day as the Sabbath. But papists urge as a reason for omitting the second commandment, that it is unnecessary, being included in the first, and that they are giving the law exactly as God designed it to be understood. This cannot be the change foretold by the prophet. An intentional, deliberate change is brought to view: "He shall think to change times and laws." The change in the fourth commandment exactly fulfills the prophecy. For this change the only authority claimed is that of the church. Here the papal power openly sets itself above God. {4SP 279.2}

The claim so often put forth, that Christ changed the Sabbath, is disproved by his own words. In his sermon on the mount he declared: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of Heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of Heaven." [MATT. 5:17-19.] {4SP 280.1}

Roman Catholics acknowledge that the change of the Sabbath was made by their church; and they cite this change as evidence of the authority of the church to legislate in divine things, and declare that Protestants, by observing the Sabbath as thus changed, are recognizing her power. The Roman Church has not relinquished her claim to supremacy; and when the world and the Protestant churches accept a Sabbath of her creating, while they reject the Bible Sabbath, they virtually admit this assumption. They may claim the authority of apostles and Fathers for the change; but in so doing they ignore the very principle which separates them from Rome,--that "the Bible, and the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants." The papist can see that they are deceiving themselves, willingly closing their eyes to the facts in the case. As the Sunday institution gains favor, he rejoices, feeling assured that it will eventually bring the whole Protestant world under the banner of Rome. {4SP 280.2}

The fourth commandment, which Rome has endeavored to set aside, is the only precept of the decalogue that points to God as the Creator of the heavens and the earth, and thus distinguishes the true God from all false gods. The Sabbath was instituted to commemorate the work of creation, and thus to direct the minds of men to the true and living God. The fact of his creative power is cited throughout the Scriptures as proof that the God of Israel is superior to heathen deities. Had the Sabbath always been kept, man's thoughts and affections would have been led to his Maker as the object of reverence and worship, and there would never have been an idolater, an atheist, or an infidel. {4SP 281.1}

That institution which points to God as the Creator is a sign of his rightful authority over the beings he has made. The change of the Sabbath is the sign, or mark, of the authority of the Romish Church. Those who, understanding the claims of the fourth commandment, choose to observe the false in place of the true Sabbath, are thereby paying homage to that power by which alone it is commanded. The change in the fourth commandment is the change pointed out in the prophecy, and the keeping of the counterfeit Sabbath is the reception of the mark. But Christians of past generations observed the first day, supposing that they were keeping the Bible Sabbath, and there are in the churches of today many who honestly believe that Sunday is the Sabbath of divine appointment. None of these have received the mark of the beast. There are true Christians in every church, not excepting the Roman Catholic communion. The test upon this question does not come until Sunday observance is enforced by law, and the world is enlightened concerning the obligation of the true Sabbath. Not until the issue is thus plainly set before the people, and they are brought to choose between the commandments of God and the commandments of men, will those who continue in transgression receive the mark of the beast. {4SP 281.2}

The most fearful threatening ever addressed to mortals is contained in the third angel's message. That must be a terrible sin which calls down the wrath of God unmingled with mercy. Men are not to be left in darkness concerning this important matter; the warning against this sin is to be given to the world before the visitation of God's judgments, that all may know why they are to be inflicted, and have opportunity to escape them. {4SP 282.1}

In the issue of the great contest, two distinct, opposite classes are developed. One class "worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark," and thus bring upon themselves the awful judgments threatened by the third angel. The other class, in marked contrast to the world, "keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus." [REV. 14:9, 12.] Though the powers of earth summon their forces to compel "all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond," to receive the mark of the beast, yet the people of God do not receive it. The prophet of Patmos beholds "them that had gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, stand on the sea of glass, having the harps of God," [REV. 15:2.] and singing the song of Moses and the Lamb. {4SP 282.2}

Such were the momentous truths that opened before those who received the third angel's message. As they reviewed

their experience from the first proclamation of the second advent to the passing of the time in 1844, they saw their disappointment explained, and hope and joy again animated their hearts. Light from the sanctuary illuminated the past, the present, and the future, and they knew that God had led them by his unerring providence. Now with new courage and firmer faith, they joined in giving the warning of the third angel. {4SP 283.1}

The work of Sabbath reform to be accomplished in the last days is clearly brought to view in the prophecy of Isaiah: "Thus saith the Lord, Keep ye judgment, and do justice; for my salvation is near to come, and my righteousness to be revealed. Blessed is the man that doeth this, and the son of man that layeth hold on it; that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and keepeth his hand from doing any evil." "The sons of the stranger, that join themselves to the Lord, to serve him, and to love the name of the Lord, to be his servants, every one that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and taketh hold of my covenant; even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer." [ISA. 56:1, 2, 6, 7.] {4SP 283.2}

These words apply in the Christian age, as is shown by the context: "The Lord God which gathereth the outcasts of Israel saith, Yet will I gather others to him, beside those that are gathered unto him." [ISA. 56:8.] Here is foreshadowed the gathering in of the Gentiles by the gospel. And upon those who then honor the Sabbath, a blessing is pronounced. Thus the obligation of the fourth commandment extends past the crucifixion, resurrection, and ascension of Christ, to the time when his servants should preach to all nations the message of glad tidings. {4SP 283.3}

The Lord commands by the same prophet, "Bind up the testimony, seal the law among my disciples." [ISA. 8:16.] The seal of God's law is found in the fourth commandment. This only, of all the ten, brings to view both the name and the title of the Lawgiver. It declares him to be the Creator of the heavens and the earth, and thus shows his claim to reverence and worship above all others. Aside from this precept, there is nothing in the decalogue to show by whose authority the law is given. When the Sabbath was changed by the papal power, the seal was taken from the law. The disciples of Jesus are called upon to restore it, by exalting the Sabbath of the fourth commandment to its rightful position as the Creator's memorial and the sign of his authority. {4SP 284.1}

"To the law and to the testimony." While conflicting doctrines and theories abound, the law of God is the one unerring standard to which all opinions, doctrines, and theories are to be brought. Says the prophet, "If they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." [ISA. 8:20.] {4SP 284.2}

Again, the command is given, "Cry aloud, spare not, lift up thy voice like a trumpet, and show my people their transgression, and the house of Jacob their sins." It is not the wicked world, but those whom the Lord designates as "my people," that are to be reproved for their transgressions. He declares further, "Yet they seek me daily, and delight to know my ways, as a nation that did righteousness, and forsook not the ordinance of

their God." [ISA. 58:1, 2.] Here is brought to view a class who think themselves righteous, and appear to manifest great interest in the service of God; but the stern and solemn rebuke of the Searcher of hearts proves them to be trampling upon the divine precepts. {4SP 284.3}

The prophet thus points out the ordinance which has been forsaken: "Thou shalt raise up the foundations of many generations; and thou shalt be called, The repairer of the breach, the restorer of paths to dwell in. If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable; and shalt honor him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words; then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord." [ISA. 58:12, 13.] This prophecy also applies in our time. The breach was made in the law of God when the Sabbath was changed by the Romish power. But the time has come for that divine institution to be restored. The breach is to be repaired, and the foundation of many generations to be raised up. {4SP 285.1}

With peculiar fitness may the Sabbath be called the foundation of many generations. Hallowed by the Creator's rest and blessing, it was kept by Adam in his innocence in holy Eden; by Adam, fallen yet repentant, when he was driven from his happy estate. It was kept by all the patriarchs, from Abel to righteous Noah, to Abraham, to Jacob. When the chosen people were in bondage in Egypt, many, in the midst of prevailing idolatry, lost their knowledge of God's law; but when the Lord delivered Israel, he proclaimed his law in awful grandeur to the assembled multitude, that they might know his will, and fear and obey him forever. {4SP 285.2}

From that day to the present, the knowledge of God's law has been preserved in the earth, and the Sabbath of the fourth commandment has been kept. Though the man of sin succeeded in trampling the Sabbath under foot, yet even in the period of his supremacy there were, hidden in secret places, faithful souls who honored the Creator's rest-day. {4SP 286.1}

Since the Reformation, there have been in every generation witnesses for God to uphold the standard of the ancient Sabbath. Though often in the midst of reproach and persecution, a constant testimony has been borne to this truth. Since 1844, in fulfillment of the prophecy of the third angel's message, the attention of the world has been called to the true Sabbath, and a constantly increasing number are returning to the observance of God's holy day. {4SP 286.2}

