

The

SABBATH;

or,
WHICH DAY TO KEEP.

By D. S. WARNER.

Price, 10 cents.

GOSPEL TRUMPET PUB. CO.,
Moundsville, - W. Va, U. S. A.

DIVINE HEALING

OF SOUL AND BODY;

BY E. E. BYRUM.

If you are afflicted, this book will point out the way for your complete healing without expense. It contains many interesting testimonies from those who have been healed. 254 pages. Price, Cloth, **\$1.00.** - - - - - Paper Cover, 35c.

THE GRACE OF HEALING;

OR, CHRIST OUR PHYSICIAN.

BY J. W. BYERS.

A VALUABLE BOOK.

342 PAGES.

In this work the subject of Divine Healing is quite thoroughly analyzed, and presented in a manner which is convincing and reasonable. Divine Healing is shown to be our Redemption Right, embodied in God's plan for redeeming mankind, the same as salvation for the soul.

Points which have proved to be mysterious to the minds of many, when considering this subject, are clearly unfolded.

Fourteen pages are devoted to ANSWERING QUESTIONS which probably cover all the obscure and objectionable points offered by opposers.

LIVING WITNESSES.

Recent testimonies are offered from a large number who have been healed of various diseases, such as Consumption, Rheumatism, Neuralgia, Broken Bones, Spinal Disease, Poisonous Bites, Paralysis, Deformities, etc. This is one of the best and most complete works written on the subject of divine healing, and will prove to be of interest and benefit to all honest truth-seekers, and especially those who are afflicted. Every poor suffering invalid should have a copy.

This book is beautifully bound in cloth, stamped in colors. Contains 342

pages.

Price, postpaid, - - - - - **\$1.00.**

THE SABBATH;

OR, WHICH DAY TO KEEP.

By D. S. WARNER.

Price, 10 cts.; \$1.00 a dozen.

**MOUNDSVILLE, W. VA.
GOSPEL TRUMPET PUBLISHING CO. 1899.**

Index

THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH.....	6
Chapter 1.....	6
Was the Seventh-Day Sabbath ever Commanded and Observed prior to the Exodus?	6
Chapter 2.....	11
What was Contained in the Covenant made on Sinai.	11
Chapter 3.....	17
Is the Ten Commandment Covenant, made on Sinai, how in force?	17
Chapter 4.....	37
Smith's Two Covenants.....	37
Chapter 5.....	42
Moses was the Mediator of the Law, Christ is that of the New Testament.	42
Chapter 6.....	48
"The New Testament," "the Law of Christ"	48
Chapter 8.....	57
Christ's Law the Standard of Uprightness.	57
Chapter 9.....	62
Christ's Law the Standard of Conviction to Sinners,	62
Chapter 10.....	64
The Wicked are Turned over to the Laws of the Land.....	64
Chapter 11.....	65

Comparison of Christ's Law with the Abolished Code.	65
Chapter 12.	78
Was the Seventh-Day Sabbath Repealable?.....	78
Chapter 13.	88
The New Testament Sabbath.....	88
Chapter 14.	89
"Another Day."	89
Chapter 15.	92
"The Lord's Day."	92
Chapter 16.	93
"The Lord's Day" in History.....	93
Chapter 17.	109
Proper Use of History.....	109
Chapter 18.	110
History and Adventism.....	110
Chapter 19.	114
The Christian Sabbath in Prophecy.....	114
Chapter 20.	116
The Christian Sabbath Prefigured.	116
Chapter 21.	118
The Christian Sabbath in the New Testament.	118
Chapter 22.	126
The First Day Called Sabbath Eight Times in the New Testament.	126
Chapter 23.	134

THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH.

Chapter 1.

Was the Seventh-Day Sabbath ever Commanded and Observed prior to the Exodus?

THIS question was thought to be of no vital importance, at the time of writing our former work, but from recent contact with the law teaching sect, we find that they place no small stress upon a supposed pre-Mosaic Sabbath.

Therefore let us attend to the evidences in the case. The first mention of the Sabbath as a rest day enjoined upon man that is recorded in the Bible, is that of Exodus 16, which was 2,500 years after the creation. "This is that which the Lord hath said, To morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord." — Ver. 23. "See, for that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath, therefore he gives you on the sixth day the bread of two days; abide ye every man in his place, let no man go out of his place on the seventh day." — Ver. 29.

This announcement of Moses to the people, together with verse 25, "Eat that today; for today is a Sabbath unto the Lord," clearly shows the introduction of a new command of the Lord. In the language of Dr. Paley, there is no "intimation that the Sabbath, when appointed to be observed, was only the revival of an ancient institution, which had been neglected, forgotten, or suspended."

All who contend for its observance from creation base their claim upon Gen. 2:2, 5. But it should be remembered that these words were not written at the time of creation, but 2,500 years later, and not, indeed, until the law had been given on Sinai in which the seventh-day Sabbath had been enjoined upon the children of Israel. We here quote from Kitto's Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature. "As this narrative, i.e., Gen. 2:2, 3, was composed after the delivery of the law, for their special instruction, so this passage was only intended to confirm more forcibly that institution; or that it is to be understood as if Moses had said, "God

rested on the seventh day which *he has since blessed and sanctified*"

"It is admitted that there is no other direct mention of a Sabbath in the book of Genesis."

"In the establishment of the human race, after the flood, we find in Gen. 9, a precise statement of the covenant which God is represented as making with Noah, in which, while several particulars are adverted to, no mention whatever is made of the Sabbath." — *Article on the Sabbath*.

In exact harmony with the above words drawn from Kitto's work speaks Dr. Paley. "For," says he, "as the seventh day was erected into a Sabbath, on account of God's resting upon that day from the work of creation, it was natural enough in the historian, when he had related the history of the creation, and of God's ceasing from it on the seventh day, to add, "And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it, because that on it he had rested from all his work which God created and made; although the blessing and sanctification, that is, the religious distinction and appropriation of that day, were not actually made till many ages afterward. The words do, not assert that God *then* blessed and sanctified the seventh day, but that he blessed and sanctified it *for that reason*" — *Moral and Political Philosophy, book 4, chap. 7*.

This reasoning we maintain is sound. It must be apparent to all that after the law had been given on Sinai, and Moses understanding that the seventh day had been appropriated as a national Sabbath, because on that day God rested from the work of creation, he would naturally thus speak of the divine blessing upon that day following the description of the world's creation.

Wakefield's theology quotes Dr. Paley as further saying, "That the Sabbath is no where mentioned, or even obscurely alluded to, either in the general history of the world before the call of Abraham, or in that of the first three Jewish patriarchs."

An argument in favor of a pre-Mosaic Sabbath is based upon the fact, that a succession of seven days are spoken of in Gen. and in Job, and a week of years in a contract between Jacob and Laban, Gen. 29.27, 28. But this is very far from proving a weekly day of rest. A good answer to the argument is found in Kitto, as follows: "Among all early nations the *lunar* months were the readiest large divisions of time. * * * The nearest whole number of days in the month which could be sub-divided into

shorter periods, would be either 30 or 28, of which the latter would of course be adopted, as admitting of division into 4, corresponding nearly to those striking phenomena, the phases or quarters of the moon. Each of these would palpably correspond to about a week."

Again," The week, however, is found in various parts of the world. *** And with such a distribution as to make it pretty certain that it had no artificial origin. In fact the four quarters of the moon supply an obvious division of the month." — *Ency. Britannica*.

Thus the subdivision of the lunar month would naturally give rise to four periods corresponding to our weeks, and such a division of time would readily occur, even without any weekly sacred day to mark its beginning or end. Therefore, in the absence of all mention of such a weekly rest, both in sacred and profane history, the ancient round of seven days cannot be said to furnish positive evidence.

The use of the word "remember," in the fourth command of the decalogue, is brought forward as an evidence that the Sabbath had previously been in vogue. The answer to which we will also find in these words in Kitto: "In giving an injunction, the monitory word. 'remember,' is as commonly used in reference to the future recollection of the precept so given, as to anything past. The same argument would show a previous obligation to observe the passover." Even if the words, "remember the Sabbath." be restricted to the remembrance of something given in the past, there is utterly no weight to the argument, because we have seen the Sabbath had already been introduced in Exod. 16.

Kitto proceeds further to say, "The early Christian writers are generally as silent on the subject of a primitive Sabbath as on that of primitive sacrifices. Such examination as we have been able to institute, has disclosed no belief in its existence, while some indications are found of a notion that the Sabbath began with Moses." Then follow short extracts from Justin, Ireneus and Tertullian, affirming that the Sabbath began with Moses. These testimonies we will produce more fully than quoted by Kitto.

Smith and Barnum's Dictionary of the Bible says, "In Exod. 16:23-29 we find the first incontrovertible institution of the day, as one given to, and to be kept by, the children of Israel. Shortly afterward it was re-enacted in the fourth commandment."

"There is no express mention of it, previous to the time of Moses."—

Jahn's Biblical Archaeology.

"The celebration of the seventh day as a day consecrated to Jehovah, is first mentioned after the Exodus from Egypt, and seems to have preceded the Sinaitic legislation, which merely confirmed and invested it with the highest authority. There is no trace of its celebration in the patriarchal times." — *Chambers' Encyclopedia.*

"The first record of its observance by the Jews is mentioned in Exod. 15:25, when, in addition to its being observed in remembrance of the original rest day of the creation, it was celebrated also in memento of the day of freedom of the Jews from Egyptian bondage." — *People's Cyclopedia.*

"There is no record of its celebration in patriarchal times. The significance that was added to it after the Exodus, i.e., as a remembrance of the freedom from" bondage, makes it probable that its first legal promulgation dates (as a Talmudical tradition has it) from Marah, where Moses set them laws and rites. Exodus 15:25."

The writings that come down to us from the first centuries of the church, very clearly and uniformly point to the exodus as the time when the seventh-day Sabbath was first instituted. First we quote from Justin Martyr to Trypho a Jew. Speaking of the righteous patriarchs he says, "Enoch and all the rest, who neither were circumcised after the flesh, nor observed Sabbaths, nor any other rites, seeing that Moses enjoined such observances."

"For if there was no need of circumcision before Abraham, or of the observance of the Sabbaths, of feasts and sacrifices, before Moses, no more need is there of them now."

"As, then, circumcision began with Abraham, and the Sabbath and sacrifices and offerings and feasts with Moses, and it hath been proved they were enjoined on account of the hardness of your people's hearts, so it was necessary, in accordance with the Father's will, that they should have an end in Him who was born of a virgin, of the family of Abraham." This testimony comes down to us from the first part of the second century.

As quoted by Kitto. Ireneus observes, "Abraham without circumcision, and without observance of Sabbaths, believed in God," etc. And Tertullian expresses himself to the same effect."

Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History, page 14, gives us this clear

statement: "Should any one, beginning from Abraham, and going back to the first man, pronounce those who had the testimony of righteousness, Christians in fact, though not in name, he would not be far from the truth. * * * They did not, therefore, regard circumcision, nor observe the Sabbath, neither do we; neither do we abstain from certain foods, nor regard other injunctions, which Moses subsequently delivered to be observed in types and symbols, because such things as these do not belong to Christians."

Here then we have the testimony of the most authentic historical records from the second and third centuries that the Sabbath was not enjoined or observed from the first man down to Abraham, and from Abraham down to Moses, or for twenty-five hundred years after creation, and to this agree the scriptures.

"The Lord our Cod 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. The Lord talked with you face to face in the mount, out of the midst of the fire," etc. Deut. 5:2-4. Then follows a recital of the ten commandments, the covenant referred to. So if we are to credit the inspired statement of Moses we must admit that the law embodying the seventh-day Sabbath had never been given to the ancestors of the Jewish nation. Nay, "The Lord made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day." In the name of the God of the Bible, we affirm that every assumption that the Sabbath had been previously given is a direct contradiction of the Word. We will add the testimony of one more text. "Thou earnest down also upon Mount Sinai, and spakest with them from heaven, and gavest them right judgments, and true laws, good statutes and commandments: and madest known unto them thy holy Sabbath, and commandedst them precepts, statutes, and laws, by the hand of Moses thy servant." — Neh. 9:13, 14.

Though the Sabbath had been introduced a short time before when the manna first fell, it is but natural that Neh. should speak of it in connection with the rest of the law, as given on Sinai, by the audible voice of God, where it was also engraved in stone with the other nine commandments of the covenant, and made a statute in Israel. If then we credit the testimony of Nehemiah we trace the origin of that Sabbath to Moses in the wilderness. There is where God came down and

gave that law.

In the absence of one historic or scriptural proof that the Sabbath was given before Moses, or observed from the creation to the exodus; and moreover, with the testimony of both ancient history and the Bible against it, it is not strange that historians generally agree that there is no evidence to prove a pro-Mosaic Sabbath. But is there really not one proof in the Bible? About the only one that law teachers try to bring forward is the statement of Moses in Gen. 2:2, 3. Which we have showed was not written until after the seventh day had been sanctified to the sacred use in the wilderness. And again, be it, remembered that if we were to admit that God even blessed the seventh day at creation, there is not a word in that account affirming that it was framed into a command at that time, that men should abstain from labor thereon. If, therefore, as Eusebins and Justin Martyr conclude, men could be righteous in the sight of God before either circumcision or the keeping of a Sabbath were required, so can we be without them now since Christ has become "the end of the law for righteousness to all that believe in him."

But let us now come to the Sabbath as instituted in the ten commandment law given on Sinai. This enactment of Jehovah, Saturday keepers insist makes the seventh day obligatory upon all men to the end of the world. With this law the fourth commandment Sabbath stands or falls. Then let us consult the Bible as to its contents, object and duration. Therefore we proceed to show just

Chapter 2.

What was Contained in the Covenant made on Sinai.

"The Lord our God made a covenant with us in Horeb. (Horeb is the name of the mountain region of which Sinai was a distinct summit.) The Lord made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day. The Lord talked with you face to face in the mount out of the midst of the fire. (I stood between the Lord and you at that time, to shew you the Word of the Lord; for ye were afraid by reason of the fire, and went not up into the mount) saying." — Deut. 5:2-5. Then follow the ten commandments which God spake in Exodus 20, at the close of which it is recorded, — ver. 22 — "These

words the Lord spake unto all your assembly in the mount out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness, with a great voice: and he added no more. And he-wrote them in two tables of stone, and delivered them unto me."

Here is the clear, positive testimony of Moses; that the covenant made on mount Sinai, or Horeb, contained the ten commandments and "no more," and that they only were written on tables of stone. "*These words,*" and "*no more,*" constitute the covenant. Namely, these ten words, for they had just been repeated, and the term "words" is from the Hebrew "*dabar*" which is the same that is translated "commandments," where the ten are spoken of. — (See words in the margin. Deut. 10:4).

"And he was there with the Lord forty days and forty nights; he did neither eat bread, nor drink water. And he wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the ten commandments." — Exod. 34:28.

"And he declared unto you his covenant which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments; and he wrote them upon two tables of stone." - Deut. 4:13.

"When I was gone up into the mount to receive the tables of stone, even the tables of the covenant which the Lord made with you, then I abode in the mount forty days and forty nights." — 9:9.

"And it came to pass at the end of forty days, and forty nights, the Lord gave me the two tables of stone, even the tables of the covenant." — 9:11.

"And he wrote on the tables, according to the first writing, the ten commandments, which the Lord spake unto you in the mount out of the midst of the fire in the day of the assembly; and the Lord gave them unto inc." — 10:4.

"And I have set there a place for the ark, wherein is the covenant of the Lord, which he made with our fathers, when he brought them out of the land of Egypt." — 1 Kings 8:21. "And the tables of the covenant." — Heb. 9:4.

In all these scriptures, but one covenant is spoken of as having been made on mount Sinai. And that contained the decalogue, — the ten commandments — and "no more." These and nothing else constituted the covenant, and they only were written on the tables of stone. Therefore it is fixed and settled by all the above quotations, and the concurrence of all other scriptures, that the Sinai covenant only em-

braced the "ten words" of the stone tables. Now the law for the seventh-day Sabbath, is found in this covenant, written on stone. Therefore every time the word of God declares the covenant delivered on Sinai, is abolished, it asserts the abrogation of the seventh-day Sabbath. And because of the strong array of New Testament scriptures which positively assert the abrogation of that ten-commandment covenant made on Sinai, the Adventists have diligently sought out some new device to deny that the decalogue is the covenant that God made with Israel at that time, and to find something else to which they apply the covenant. And this unscrupulous refuge of lies they set up right in the face of God, and the seven declarations of his word we have cited, which positively declare that the ten commandments written in stone, constitute the Sinaitic covenant. But let us examine their new invention. Avoiding the definition that God gives us no less than seven times over, of the covenant that he made on Sinai, they appeal to the dictionary and find this definition: "Covenant, a mutual agreement of two or more persons or parties, in writing and under seal." etc. Then confining the covenant made on Sinai within this single definition, they look for something that answers thereto; or rather they search for something else besides the ten commandments, to which they may apply those scriptures which declare the abrogation of the old covenant. And so in their literature and preaching they light upon Exod. 19:5—8. Here, say they, is an agreement between God and the people; and this promise on the part of Israel to do all that God had spoken, is the covenant made on Sinai. An argument is drawn from the 5th verse, which reads thus: "Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people." The word covenant occurring in the context of the people's promise to obey all that God had spoken, is ingeniously used to prove that that agreement constituted the covenant. U. Smith asserts in a little work that this agreement, and nothing else, was the old covenant, and that nothing else was abolished by the bringing in of the new order under Christ Jesus. In the name of Jesus we now proceed to abolish this subterfuge of falsehood.

1st. The word does not assert that the promise of the people to obey God constitute the covenant made on Sinai. But it is repeatedly declared that the ten words written in the stone tables were the covenant

made with Israel at that time and place.

2d. If the response on the part of Israel to obey what God had spoken was the covenant; and nothing else, as U. Smith affirms, was abolished in Christ, then the ceremonial laws, and the penalty of death for the violation of the Sabbath, and the other judgments written in the book of the law, are all yet in force. Such are the ridiculous pitfalls that men get into when trying to wrest the scriptures for the sake of their idolized creed.

3d. If that agreement on the part of the people of God to obey him was the covenant, and that only was done away in Christ, then it follows that in Christ Jesus we cease to be under covenant obligations to obey God.

We will now show that the argument based upon the idea that the covenant made on Sinai must have been some kind of a mutual agreement, is a deception, of which the propagators must have been aware.

The word covenant in Exodus and Deut., referring to the law of God given on Sinai, is from *berith* in the Hebrew, and the same thing in the New Testament is from the Greek word *diatheke*. It is translated "testament" thirteen times. And in the following instances where rendered covenant, in the margin it is more correctly translated, "testament:" Rom. 9:4; Gal. 3:15; 4:24; Heb. 8:6; 12:24; 13:20. It is seen that in Heb. 9:16 the word is used in the sense of a will, such as men make for the disposition of their property etc., which utterly precludes the idea of a mutual agreement, and is wholly the enactment of one party. In Heb. 9:15, the same word is used with reference to both the Old and the New Testament. If therefore *diatheke* simply means a mutual agreement, then the twenty-seven books we have been in the habit of calling the New Testament are not the New Testament. And, in fact, Elder Horton of Battle Creek, Mich. in discussion recently denied those twenty-seven books constitute the New Testament, but averred that it is the ten commandments. He took the ridiculous position that Christ was only a lawgiver in the ministration of the law on Sinai, and that he gave no new laws when incarnate. That there were only two laws, the Old Testament, which is the book of the law given by Moses, and the New Testament which is the ten commandments. Such are some of the rank abominations of that sect, who, in a very striking manner,

fulfill 2 Pet. 2:1. They "deny the Lord." as a lawgiver while in the flesh. These things we can prove by many witnesses.

Hut let us look at their position again. A covenant is a mutual agreement between two or more parties: therefore the ten commandments were not the covenant made on Sinai, because they are not such an agreement. Again say they, " The new covenant written in the heart are the ten commandments, formerly written in stone." Hut the same word, *diatheke*, occurs in Heb 9: 15 in L peaking of both the Old Testament and the New y Therefore if the "old *diatheke*," cannot be the ten commandments, because the word means a "mutual contract;" then, for the same reason, the new *diatheke* cannot be the ten commandments Thus their scheme to overthrow the fact that the old covenant is the ten stone-written words, overthrows their own position hat the decalogue is the New Covenant. So all who light against God and his word, dig a pit and fall into it.

Let us now see what the real scriptural meaning of the word covenant or testament is. "Testament," 1st. A solemn, authentic instrument in writing, by which a person declares his will as to the disposal of his estate and effects after death.

2d. One of the two general divisions of the canonical books of the sacred scriptures; as, the Old Testament; the New Testament.

These are the only definitions given in the Unabridged Dictionary.

"*Diatheke*, any disposition, arrangement, institution, or dispensation: hence a testament, will, Heb. 9:15." — *Greenfield*.

"*Diatheke*, a disposition, arrangement. A testament, a will The Abrahamic covenant. The Mosaic covenant, entered into at Mount Sinai, with sacrifices and the blood of victims; See Ex. 24:3-12, Deut. 5:2. The new covenant, the Gospel Dispensation." — *Robinson's Lexicon*.

"Thus the covenant of Sinai was conditioned by the observance of the ten commandments (Exod. 34:27, 28; Lev. 26:15) which are therefore called "Jehovah's covenant," (Deut. 4:13) a name which was extended to all the books of Moses, if not to the whole body of Jewish canonical scriptures. (2 Cor. 3:13, 14.) This last mentioned covenant, which was renewed at different periods, is one of the two principal covenants between God and man. They are distinguished as old and new (Jer. 31:31-34; Heb.8:8-13; 10:16)." — *Smith and Barnum's*

Dictionary.

Thus we see by scriptural use and standard authorities that the word rendered covenant, signifies a "will," a "dispensation," etc. and the ten commandment covenant is cited as example. The word is properly used to designate the two general divisions of the Bible. The decalogue, properly speaking, is the old covenant, but, as the last authority has truthfully observed, the old testament is also used in an extended sense, as including all the books of Moses, or the entire body of the Sinaitic law.

Having now exposed the late shift of Adventism, and proved that the very word covenant in its scriptural meaning is in perfect accord with the statements of the Almighty, when, "He declared unto you his covenant which he commanded you to perform, even the ten commandments; and he wrote them on two tables of stone." — Deut. 4:13. But once more, the Advent debater says, "A covenant is an agreement with some one, but such is not the decalogue." Here is God's answer by Moses, "When I was gone up into the mount to receive the tables of stone, even the tables of the *covenant which the Lord made with you*," etc.— Deut. 9:9. Every effort to apply the covenant made on Sinai to something else besides the ten commandments is squarely against the Bible. They constitute the covenant and the only covenant given at that time and place. Nothing else is called that covenant, except, in one text, the fourth command, the seventh-day Sabbath itself is called a covenant. "Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbaths, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant." — Exod. 31:16. This we understand is because it was a part of the covenant that was written on stone. So there is no possible chance for the law teachers to take their idolized Sabbath out of that "first covenant," which is declared abolished. It being included in the ten "words," of the covenant engraved in stone, and actually singled out and called a covenant by itself. All Saturday keepers rest their claims for that day upon that covenant. Its validity stands, or falls with that law. If the ten commandment code is in force, the seventh day is in force, for that is the day specified in that code. But if that enactment of Jehovah was superseded by the New Testament, in this dispensation, then the seventh day is abolished. Let us then appeal to the word of God to ascertain just what is written, and with a determination to im-

plicitly believe the same, and act accordingly.

Chapter 3.

Is the Ten Commandment Covenant, made on Sinai, how in force?

In the name of Jesus Christ, and by the immutable counse of God, we declare the ten commandment covenant abolished, and the complete law, and New Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ, set up, as a perfect rule of christian life, and a standard of judgment to the world of sinners. In several of the epistles the Sinai law is clearly disposed of.

"For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse; for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them." — Gal. 3:10.

Saturday keepers are of the works of the law, hence under the curse. They teach the validity of the ten commandments, but claim the rest of the law is abolished. Hut God's word utterly refutes such a division of the law. He that is under the law at all is "accursed if he continueth not in *all things* which are written in *the book of the law* to do them."

"And the law is not of faith," verse 12, does not blend into the Gospel at all the two are not of each other, nor in force in the same dispensation.

"And this I say, that the covenant, that was before confirmed of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect." — Verse 17.

The covenant which God made with Abraham, just 430 years before the law covenant, embraced Christ and salvation. Sec verses 14, 16. But the law is no part of the present dispensation; it was only one of the preparatory steps, a shadow of good things to come in Christ.

"Wherefore then the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made." Verse 19.

The word "*serreth*" being in *italic*, is not in the Greek text; hence we omit it. The question was not why they served the law; but, why was the law given?

Wherefore then is the law? — *Bible Union*.

Hut if the inheritance was not by the law, but by the promise, as a free gift, why was the law after the promise? It was added on account of

restraining transgressions; and was to continue till the seed should come to whom it was promised, that all nations should be blessed in him. — *James McKnight*.

To what end then was the law? It was added because of the transgressions of men, till the seed should come to whom belongs the promise. — *Conybear & Howson*.

Wherefore then was the law? It was added because of transgression, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made. — *John Wesley*.

Why then the law? It was appointed on account of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise related — *Emphatic Diaglott*.

"It may be asked then what end the law answered, Why was it given? — It was given to restrain wickedness till the gospel should be revealed; and the promise should take effect. But from the very mode of its delivery, it could not *be that promise*. For Moses stood forth a mediator only between God and the *Israelites*: whereas God's original promise was *universal*. It was that promise in which *all the nations of the earth* were to be blessed." — Verses 19:20, as rendered by Gilpins, an English work published in London, A. D. 1793.

To what purpose then was the law? It was added because of transgression, till the seed should come. — *Wakefield*.

To what purpose then was the law? On the account of transgressions it was superadded until the seed should come to whom the promise was made. — *Chr. Thomson, an American translation nearly a hundred years old*.

In about the same way it is rendered by *Young's Bible Translation*, *Rotherham*, *Sawyer*, *William Newcome* -- *English*, A. D. 1796, *New Translation*, *A Layman*, and a late interlinear translation by *Arthur Hines & Co.*, N. Y.

In all these fifteen translations, this text is rendered in a direct question as to what the law was given for, and all answer that it was given because of transgressions, or in order to restrain wickedness. And the time of its duration is as clearly defined. It was only intended as a temporary measure, to hold vice in check until the seed should come through whom salvation was promised in the covenant made with Abraham 430 years before.

Mere then we have clearly stated the object, and duration of the law; not of a part of it, but of the whole Mosaic economy, so often spoken of in contradistinction to the Gospel. Not one word is said about the Saturday Sabbath law extending into, or forming any part of the Messiah's kingdom. The law was then simply to serve as a police force to restrain violence, until Christ came to remove violence out of the heart.

Before the foundation of the world, God devised the plan of human redemption; but ages were necessary for its preparation. In the meantime wickedness so increased upon the earth, that God found it necessary once to destroy the race; and as a second means of restraining sin, the law was given until the fulness of time came for the appearance of the new order; since which we are under the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, which makes us free from the law of sin and death. It does indeed seem one of the most desperate cases of "will worship," an awful deception of the devil, that men yet "desire to be teachers of the law," and for its sake reject the law of life contained in the Gospel of Christ, virtually rejecting the Lord, since the scriptures so definitely state the whole object, and limited duration of the law. The apostle having affirmed that salvation was wholly by the Abrahamic covenant, the question naturally arose, "Why then was the law?" And the answer is clearly given, that it was a temporary forerunner of Christ. The law teachers used to try to evade this scripture, by saying the law added was the ceremonial, which was added to the ten commandments. But the Word puts 430 years between the preceding and the added law. Therefore it is an unscrupulous wresting of the scriptures to apply them to two classes of laws given at Sinai, both of which were given at the same time, or closely following each other. But lately we do not hear them try that. Instead of laboring to wrest every text that affirms the abrogation of the stone-table law, they have invented a new device, and make one general twist of the whole Bible, by an entirely new and unheard-of division of the sacred book. Making the Old Testament, all the law given at Sinai but the ten commandments, and these they say constitute the New Testament, So they have the added law older than that to which it is added. For if the ceremonials, etc. are the Old Testament, and the decalogue the New, and that law which was added because of transgressions, and which was only to remain until the seed

came, is also the Old Testament, then it follows, that the added law came into existence first. For surely the "Old Testament," is older than the New Testament. Hut how utterly sickening and disgusting this whole maze of Advent confusion! How much better it is to forsake our own ways and accept the plain Word.

In this epistle to the Galatians, the Apostle labors to guard and warn the church against the teachers of the law that Satan had sent among them. See 1:6-9; 3:1, 2; 4:9-11; 5:7, 8, 12-14. He assures them that the inheritance of salvation all came through the promises God made to Abraham, and not through the law which was given 430 years later; that the law coming thus after the promises, did not "disannul the promises." nor have anything to do with them. — 3:16-18. Then, anticipating the question these statements would naturally call forth from the law teachers, he asks the same and answers it: "Wherefore then the law?" If the inheritance of salvation was all provided in the promises made to Abraham, which were confirmed and fulfilled in Christ Jesus; and if the law is no means of salvation, and has no place in the kingdom of God, why then did God give the law, after that covenant made with Abraham? The answer is as follows: "It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made."

What was added? "The law;" not a part of it, but the entire law dispensation. Added to what? To the covenant previously made with Abraham. This only was spoken of in the context to which the addition was made. "This I say, that the covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law — the whole legal system — which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect." — Ver. 17.

Here the two systems are placed side by side, and 430 years intervened between the giving of the two. In Ex. 12:40, 41, we are told that was the exact time of the sojourn of Israel in Egypt. It dates from the covenant that God made with Abraham. — Gen. 12:1-3. "In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." And at the same time, God having commanded, Abraham departed from his own country and kindred, and the 430 years of sojourn began; which terminated with the Exodus under the leadership of Moses. The date of Abraham's covenant and departure you will find in your Bible, was B. C. 1921; and that of

the exodus is also given B. C. 1491; and the time elapsing between these two dates is just 430 years. So the Bible statement is correct. The law dispensation, of which the ten commandments was the gist, "came by Moses," just 430 years after the former covenant, to which it is said to have been added.

How was it added? The act of adding two or more things is modified by the nature of the things added. Two measures of water added to each other become one inseparable mass; because the same elements flow thus into one. So likewise items may be added to, or incorporated into a system, or code of laws, and become a part of it. But things are also said to be added that do not thus assimilate, or absorb each other into one system. One city ordinance, may be added to others on record, and yet be entirely separate in its nature and object. One class of state laws may be superadded to others, whose purpose and sphere have no connection whatever. Thus the legal economy was simply added to the covenant made with Abraham, in the sense of an additional enactment of Jehovah. The two are not antagonistic, neither do they blend into, and form one system. "The law was not against the promise," and yet it was given for an entirely different object, and only for a limited season. "It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come, to whom the promise was made." It was not a law given to righteous men: its jurisdiction was wholly among sinners. Its object was to "restrain wickedness." Here all can see that this law which the scriptures tell us is utterly cast out of the kingdom and church of God, cannot be applied exclusively to the ceremonial part of the law, as Adventists try to do. That class of rites do not restrain transgression. Nay, they foreshadow Christ, while the ten commandments prohibit crime. Therefore these stone-table laws, as well as their ceremonial appendages, were only to remain until the seed came, and then all passed away.

Who is the seed? In Gal. 3:16 the seed in which all the families of the earth were to be blest, is applied to Christ. But in the same covenant with Abraham, God also promised that his seed should be more numerous than the stars of heaven, and as the sand of the sea shore. — Gen. 22:17. And in Gal. 3: 7, 29, we learn that all who believe in Christ, since he has come, constitute that seed. So the terminus of the law may be located either at the appearing of Christ, or of his spiritual seed, or

both together. "For both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one." — Heb. 2:11. "Till the seed should come to whom the *promise was made*" This specification will also apply to either Christ, or they who are born of God. To Christ. Heb. 1:2. To the redeemed. Heb. 6:17. In fact as soon as born into the family of God, we are "heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ." — Rom. 8:17.

But let us follow the inspired apostle in his disposition of the law.

"But before faith came, we were kept under the law, speaks of "the law." "For as many as are under the works of the law are under the curse." "No man is justified by the law." "And the law is not of faith." "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law." "The law which was four hundred and thirty years after." "If the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise." "Wherefore then the law." If there had been a law given which could have given life," etc. "But before the faith came, we were kept under the law." "Wherefore the law was our school-master "

Now it must be clear to any sensible mind, that had the modern division of the law into two laws existed in Paul's day, he would not have expressed himself so vaguely. Indeed were he to talk as he does in the presence of a modern Adventist, he would very likely be interrupted at every sentence with the question, "What law? What law?" But he knew of but one law in the Old Testament. "The law," which he identifies with the covenant on Sinai. It being the base of the whole penal code. And, by inspiration of the Spirit, he informs us that God demanded of Abraham to cast out the bondwoman and her son, even exposing them to starvation in the wilderness, to teach us who now live under the gospel, that we must cast out the law covenant, and such as seek to teach the same. For the son of the bondwoman — ten commandment teachers — shall not be heir with the children of the freewoman. It is truly to be regretted that after God has taught us the duty of separation from the dead law, by such a severe providence, some who are only born of the flesh, are foolish enough to hold to it.

But we must not pass out of the epistle to the Galatians yet. It is a stinging rebuke against certain false teachers who sought to impose the law upon Christians, and will apply to the same class of teachers to day. It also raises an earnest warning of the fatal results of going under the law, and the same is just as necessary to heed now as then.

"I marvel, that you are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel; which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ." — 1:6, 7.

"O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth?" — 3:1. "This only would I learn of you, Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?" — 3:2.

From this we see that those who troubled them, and subverted the gospel of Christ, were "teachers of the law." And upon these false teachers he pronounces this awful judgement. "Let them be accursed." — 1:8, 9.

"Who did hinder you, that ye should not obey the truth ?" You cannot obey the law and the truth both; for the latter commands you to cast out the former. "This persuasion cometh not of him that calleth you." — Ver. 7, 8. Christ sent no teachers of the law. "I would they were even cut off which trouble you." — 5:12.

"For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." — Ver. 14 This is a plain statement that no other element of the old law has any place in the New Testament, except the commandment, to "Love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might." This the Savior pronounced the greatest of all commands. It therefore exceeds in importance the whole decalogue. And the second in rank is this, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Neither of these are found in the stone tables, but recorded in Deut. 6:5. and Lev. 19:18.

Christ himself is the embodiment of the New Testament. Hut Christ is God, and "God is love." Therefore the above precepts breathe the very spirit of the gospel law, which is God-love, revealed in Christ.

Again the apostle argues against the false teachers, "If ye be led of the Spirit ye are not under the law." — 5:18.

But these Galatians had actually been moved to some extent from Christ to the old law. For, says Paul, "I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain." — Gal. 4:11.

What does this mean if not that Christ Is forsaken, and salvation lost, when converted men go back under the law? It is evident that the Sabbath of the law was one of the precepts taught by these deceivers. Hence, says the apostle, "Ye observe days and months, and times, and

years." — Ver. 10. Was not the seventh-day Sabbath one of the days of the law? And the sacred days of the law was the very thing they observed, which caused the apostle to say he was afraid of them, etc. Does not every Saturday keeper pretend to observe the same? And the days here observed cannot mean monthly feasts, for such are spoken of separately: so also are various other times, and years, i.e., annual feasts. The "days" must therefore refer to the weekly Sabbaths. Therefore it is a snare to the soul. "Ye observe days," lawdays, "I am afraid of you." How utterly different this teaching from that of Saturday keepers! The latter cry, "Keep the Sabbath," and call the "ten words," the law of God, which you must obey or be lost. The former turns the whole epistle into a solemn warning not to obey that law; and even speaks directly against observing days specified therein. And with all this renunciation of the law, he never once makes an exception of the seventh day. Therefore it must be plain to any intelligent and unbiased mind, that if Paul was sent of God, this Advent persuasion came from the opposite source.

"Stand fast therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled a-gain with the yoke of bondage." — 5:1.

This exhortation is drawn from the lesson developed in the preceding chapter, that all who hold to the covenant made on Sinai are in bondage. But we, brethren, who have cast out that law, "as Isaac was, are children of the freewoman." Thank God for the liberty we have in Christ Jesus!

The law is also ruled out in the epistle to the Romans. "For sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under grace. What then? Shall we sin because we are not under the law, but under grace? God forbid." — Rom. 6:14, 15.

Freedom from the law is not freedom to sin, but is deliverance from both the law and sin, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, the New Testament. In the next chapter, the Jew's subjection to the law is illustrated by the marriage relation. As that bond is dissolved in the death of one of the parties, "Ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ, — his church, — that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead." — Ver. 4. To profess Christ, and still hold to the law, is spiritual adultery. "But now are we delivered from the law." — Ver. 6. From what law? That ten word, Advent Sabbath law: for in the next verse Paul quotes one of the ten. "I had not

known lust except the law had said, "Thou shalt not covet." So then all that are joined to the Lord, are free from the law of the ten commandments, and are "complete in him."

Need any thing be more plain for men who are not blinded by a false creed and an idolatrous spirit? "We are not under the law," but "dead to the law," and "delivered from the law." And if we ask what law, a precept is selected from the ten that were written in stone, to show us that that is the very law to which he refers.

Hut the Adventist debater will stand right up and say, "Oh yes, we are not under the law, are dead to the law, and delivered from it," and then try to construe these sayings into harmony with the duty of still living under subjection to it. Of all people on earth, we can truthfully say, we have encountered none more perverse. No declaration from the throne of God can be so plain, but what they will attempt to explain it away for the sake of their idol. Hut if language is of any use at all, we maintain that to be "not under the law," "dead to," and "delivered from the law," mean what they say, and not the reverse.

Whoever saw an Adventist of the seventh-day faction that was dead to his Sabbath law? If he should, be dead to every thing else in heaven, and earth, or in the whole Bible, you will find him wonderfully alive to keep Saturday, and to work on the Lord's day. But the same epistle that says we are "dead to the law," also says, "Reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin." And were we to judge of their death to sin by their death to the fourth commandment, we see no occasion for a burial in their case.

Hut, we do humbly thank God that his holy children are indeed dead to, and free from sin, and likewise "delivered from," and dead to the abolished law of the past dispensation. Yea, "dead to the law by the body of Christ," which is his church.

We pass on to the second epistle of the Corinthians. "But our sufficiency is of God; who also hath made us able ministers of the New Testament; not of the letter, but of the Spirit; for the Letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life.

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

glorious? For if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory. For even that which was made glorious had no glory in this respect, by reason of the glory that excelleth.

For if that which is done away was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious.

Seeing then that we have such hope, we use great plainness of speech. And not as Moses, which put a vail 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 vail untaken away in the reading of the Old Testament, which vail is done away in Christ. But even unto this day, when Moses is read, the vail is upon their heart. Nevertheless, when it, shall turn to the Lord, the vail shall be taken away.

Now the Lord is that Spirit. And where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.

But we all, with open 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." — 2 Cor. 5-18.

No Old Testament law teacher is sent of God. In the present dispensation, He only makes men "ministers of the New Testament." It is called the "ministration of the Spirit," therefore no one can receive or teach it without the gift of the Holy Spirit, excepting in the letter, which killeth.

In verse seven the ten words are called, "The ministration of death, written and engraven in stone." And though it was declared glorious, it was done away. "For if that which *is done away was glorious* — the law written on stones see verse 7 — much more that which remaineth is glorious." — Ver. 11. That which remaineth is the New Testament, of which God made Paul an able minister. "And not as Moses which put a vail over his face, that the children of Israel could not look steadfastly to the end of that which is *"abolished"* The abolished law, we are told, was given through Moses, who at the time had his face veiled. Now turn to Exod. 34:28-33, and you will see that it was when he came down from the mount with the tables of the covenant in, his hands, that his face shone, and was veiled.

In verse 14 the abolished law is plainly declared to be the "Old

Testament." The Old Testament, and the old covenant are all the same thing. And though we have seen that it is strictly defined as the ten commandments, yet these being the statute basis of the entire old book, the whole volume is sometimes called the old *diatheke*-testament.

On verse 13 we observe, if it were possible for any one to have always performed all moral duty, that person would stand in the highest glory of the law — justified. To this summit of legal glory we are raised by the first work of gospel grace. And then with open face — having left reading Moses — beholding the glory of the Lord in the glass of his word, "We are changed into the same image — the complete image of Christ, — from glory to glory, as by the Spirit of the Lord." We are changed from the glory of justification, the highest point of legal glory, to the glory of perfect holiness; which is the summit of gospel grace. "By the which will we are sanctified." Thus the second will places us far beyond where the first will could, even if we had kept it. And it is also the perfect and only law by which to live in this mount of New Testament holiness.

We can scarcely conceive how it were possible to employ words that more explicitly assert the abolition of that covenant which was written in the tables of stone. If we were to admit the division of the law, into two laws, as the Adventists contend; and were held to prove that one of those laws was abolished, we certainly would find more abundant proof to dispose of that written on stone than of the ceremonial part. The reason is obvious. The former constituting the real covenant, the statutes of that nation, to which the latter were appended, it was only necessary to remove the statute basis, and, of course, all the rest goes with it. Therefore we have seen in Romans, and Galatians, and shall also find in the epistle to the Hebrews, that the law which the Christian is not under, and with which he is not to be entangled, and which Christ took away, all point directly to the decalogue. And how very specific and unmistakable this language in 2 Cor. 3. All Bible readers know that nothing but the ten commandments were written in the stone tables, and it is affirmed that the very thing that had been "written and engraven in stone" is abolished, and done away. Compare verses seven and eleven. With this, and similar scriptures, the law teachers have no little trouble. They find themselves even in open hostility to the truth. What can they do? One says to us, "It was not the law, but the ministration of death,"

i.e., the annexed penalty of death for its violation. But the inspired testimony is, that it was that which was written and engraven in stone, which was only the ten prohibitory laws, and not the penalties of death for their violation. So Mr. Adventist is bound by the word of God; and the scriptures cannot be broken. But let us look at that theory. Two things are set in contrast in this lesson. The first is called, "the ministration of death," "the ministration of condemnation," "the Old Testament." Verses 7, 9, 14. The second is called, the "ministration of the Spirit," "the ministration of righteousness," "the New Testament." Verses 8, 9, 5. The former was written in stones; the latter is received by the Spirit, which is shed abroad in our hearts. The former is "abolished," "is done away." Verses 13, 11. The latter is "that which remaineth." Ver. 11. So the Old Testament is done away, and the New Testament, of which Christ is mediator, remains in force.

Rut the old, had a degree of glory, notwithstanding it was the ministration of death. Hut would there be any thing glorious in the sight of a man being stoned to death. The mere penalty might be denominated, the ministration of death. Hut the words, "was glorious," would not attach to it at all. But the stone laws were glorious, "So that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance." Verse 7. This was when he came down with the tables of the law in his hands. And it is also the "ministration of death." because death followed its violation. To minister, is to give; ministration, the act of giving. In Gal. 3:21 we are told the law could not "have given life." Hut on the contrary it could give death. Therefore in it was both glory and the ministration of death. But, its glory was done away, and also the thing itself which was glorious, "is abolished."

An attempt was made by an Adventist in our presence, to evade this testimony of the apostle, by saying the language of 2 Cor. 3:7, refers to Joshua 8:30-32. Where he built an altar of stones, and wrote thereon "a copy of the law of Moses." But the fallacy of this device will readily be seen. First, Paul says that "abolished" "Old Testament," was "written and engraven in stones." Joshua did not engrave in the stones of that altar, but only "wrote thereupon." Second, Nothing is said about any glory shining about that altar. Hut that engraving in stone of which Paul speaks was glorious, and the glory that shone in Moses'

face, when he came down from the presence of God with the tables of stone in his hands, is directly referred to as the glory of that ministration. Hence the stones in which the abolished law was written and engraved were those given on Sinai, and nothing else, and there is no possible evasion of the fact.

We come next to that very rich treatise on the law and the gospel, the epistle to the Hebrews.

"For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law." — Heb. 7:12.

The lawist teachers deceive unstable souls by this false logic: "God is unchangeable, therefore no change can occur in his law. But the seventh day was once his appointed Sabbath, therefore it must still be." The premises is correct, God is immutable. But this sophism, that he cannot change his law, is a subtile falsehood. There is no reason why an immutable God may not enact different laws, for different objects, succeeding each other in the order of his plan. And while these Saturday zealots say, there can be no change in God's law, he says, "there is made of necessity a change of the law." Yea, the law teachers themselves, after saying there can be no change in God's law, admit there was a change; namely, the abrogation of the ceremonies. But the change of the law was not by a revision, or modification of the Old Testament, but by its removal, and the establishing of the New in its stead.

"For there is verily a disannulling of the commandment [law] going before for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof; for the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did, by the which we draw nigh unto God.

By so much was Jesus made a surety of a better testament. — Heb. 7:18, 19, 22.

The commandment declared disannulled, is in the next verse defined as the law. These two terms are used interchangeably in Rom. 7:6-8. The word disannulled means, abrogated, made null and void. How can men say that the law continues in existence with the New Testament, when God says, it was only a temporary system "going before it?" Christ is only a "surety" for our soul, when we come under his law, the New Testament. The last verse of the seventh chapter of Hebrews also makes the law covenant a thing of the past. "The Word of the oath, which was *since the law*, maketh the Son, who is consecrated forever more." Since

the law is disannulled, Christ is by the oath of God, made the mediator of a better covenant, which was dedicated in his own blood, and which is the law of the Lord "forevermore."

"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. For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second. For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah. Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord, For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord: I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts, and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people.

In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away. — Heb. 8:6-10, 13.

A better covenant implies two covenants. They are the first and second covenants. Verses 9 and 10 clearly define them. The first being the one God made with Israel when he led them out of Egypt, which we have seen was nothing else but the ten words, written on stone. The second is not like the former, but is that divine law which God puts in our minds, and writes upon our hearts.

"The law — first covenant — was given by Moses, but grace and truth — the second covenant — came by the Lord Jesus Christ." In the present dispensation God only writes the truth, the law of Christ, upon our heart. This alone he puts in our minds, while Satan deceives unstable souls by putting the disannulled law in their hearts. If the lawists fault us for casting out the bondwoman covenant, which contains their idolized Sabbath, they equally accuse Paul; for he called it "weak and unprofitable." The Lord himself also found fault with it.

This statement, we are aware, sounds awful to men and women who are blinded under the law. Nevertheless it is true. We have already been told in Heb. 7:18, 19, that "There is verily a disannulling of the

commandment going before for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof." Is not this finding fault with it? "For the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did." It was therefore not perfect itself, and could not be the law to which David referred when he said, "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul." To be converted is to be justified; and Adventists themselves confess that no person can be justified by the law. Then no one can be converted by it, and David speaks in prediction of the New Testament, which we are told, "is able to save your souls."

But did the Lord really find fault with the law in Heb. 8:8? "For finding fault with them." This, say the lawists, means that the Lord did not find fault with the law, but with the Jews. But the preceding verse has already told us what was faulty, namely, the law. And the two verses are so connected that the same faulty thing is referred to in both. Thus it is rendered word for word from the Greek by Arthur Hinds & Co. "For finding fault, he says to them, Lo, days are coming, saith the Lord, and I will ratify, * * * a new covenant."

"Finding fault, he says to them," etc. — *Emphatic Diaglott*.

"And now he hath obtained a more excellent service, how much also of a better covenant is he mediator, which on better promises hath been sanctioned, for if that first were faultless, a place would not have been sought for a second. For finding fault, he saith to them, Lo, days come, saith the Lord, and I will complete with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah, a new covenant." — *Young's Bible Translation*.

Perhaps no person has studied the epistle to the Hebrews more closely than M. Stuart. From his critical work on the same, we make the following extract: "*Moreover if that first [covenant] had been faultless, then no place for the second would have been sought. Diatheke*, means here, the Jewish dispensation or economy. The meaning is not that the Mosaic economy had positive faults; viz., such things as were palpably wrong or erroneous; but that it did not contain in itself all the provisions necessary for pardon of sin, and the rendering of the conscience peaceful and pure, which the Gospel does effect. The law then was not *teleios*, perfect, i.e. *amemptos*, without fault, free from defect. Nor was it designed to be anything more than a dispensation, preparatory to the Gospel."

Verse 8. "*But finding fault [with the first covenant] he says to them,*

i.e. the Jews. * * * The apostle says, 'The former covenant was not faultless.' Me goes on to prove this; but how? By quoting a passage from Jer. 31:31-34."

"In addition to the argument thus drawn from the writer's purpose, I would also suggest, that the whole of Jer. 31, which precedes the passage quoted, is made up of consolation and promises, instead of re-proof or finding fault. But the declaration that a new covenant should supersede the old one, implies of course that the old one had failed to accomplish all the objects to be desired, that it was defective."

Again, in speaking of the *diatheke*, — covenant. — old and new, he says, "It comes in this way very commonly to designate the whole Jewish economy, as we call it, with its conditions and promises; and by the writers of the New Testament it is employed in a similar way, in order to designate the new economy or dispensation of Christ, with all its conditions and promised blessings."

The two covenants compared in Heb. 8 and quoted from Jer. 31 are plainly defined. The first was made, "In the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt." Now what covenant did God make with Israel after their Exodus? Here is a perfect answer: "And I have set there a price for the ark, *wherein is the covenant of the Lord, which he made with our fathers, when he brought them out of the land of Egypt.*" — 1 Kings 8:21. It was that which Moses deposited in the ark; i.e., "the tables of the covenant." — Heb. 9:4. And turning back to 1 Kings 8: we read in Ver. 9, "There was nothing in the ark save the two tables of stone, which Moses put there at Horeb, when the Lord made a covenant with the children of Israel when they came out of the land of Egypt"

So then, Jer. tells us the former covenant was that which God made with Israel when he took them by the hand to lead them out of Egypt, and that was the covenant which he wrote on tables of stone and put in the ark. There is no possible evading the truth here.

Alter quoting the very scriptures above cited, U. Smith, in his tract on "the two covenants," says, "They ask us, What can be plainer? There was nothing in the ark but the two tables of stone, containing the ten commandments; yet Solomon says that in the ark was the covenant which the Lord made with the fathers of his people, when he brought them out of the land of Egypt. Therefore those commandments were the

covenant. And having established this point, they have but only to quote Paul's testimony, that the old covenant has waxed old, and vanished away, to reach the conclusion so long and anxiously sought, that the ten commandments have been abolished, carrying with them the obnoxious seventh-day Sabbath into their eternal tomb."

Yes, we do humbly ask in the name of all reason, What can be plainer than the positive unequivocal statements of the Bible? And certainly there has been no occasion for any "long and anxious" effort on our part to simply believe the scriptures. Especially where it is so emphatically and repeatedly declared that the tables of stone contained the covenant on coming out of Egypt. Indeed were we to disbelieve all these scriptures, how could we credit the Bible at all? Accepting the inspired record, it is settled that the Old Testament, or first covenant, was the ten stone-table precepts.

But what does the prophet Jeremiah say in reference to the second covenant? First, it was prophesied of by him as something then yet to come. "Days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant," etc. Therefore it was not any law already given. Second, it was to be very different from the former. Whereas that was written and engraven in stone; of this it is said, "I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts." It will be seen in Heb. 10:14-16, that this new covenant is written fully in the heart by the Holy Spirit when we are sanctified.

The Emphatic, and other versions render Heb. 8:8, thus: "I will *complete* a new covenant," etc. In the direct from the Greek it is, "I will *finish* a new covenant." This rendering is precisely correct; for the same had been introduced to Abraham 430 years before the law. The "change of the law" was not that of "new patches on old bottles," Old Testament; but was its abrogation, with which also expired the seventh-day Sabbath. Christ does not teach nor enjoin the first covenant, nor commission any one to do so. He is the "Mediator of the New Testament which is established upon better promises." And having set up the New Testament, as the permanent and perfect government of his church, "He hath made the *first old*. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away." Therefore all the perverse disputers of the Gospel of Christ, and vain janglers for the law of Moses, are hugging an old decayed system which in God's order

vanished away nearly nineteen hundred years ago. And all these modern pharisees are as zealous as their ancient brethren; compassing land and sea, not to convert men to Christ, but to put upon them the yoke of the law; which they themselves cannot bear. Surely this is *Nehushtan* — a piece of brass.

God directed Moses to make a brazen serpent, in the wilderness. It was all right for its object. Rut 765 years after that we find idolatrous Israel worshipping that serpent. But king Hezekiah, we are told, "Removed the high places, and brake the images, and cut down the groves, and brake in pieces the brazen serpent that Moses had made: for unto those days the children of Israel did burn incense to it: and he called it, Nehushtan." — 2 Kings 18:4.

What is the difference between worshipping that serpent and the modern zealots, who, in many cases actually make a god out of that Sabbath, which, though it was appointed of God for a certain purpose and time, as the brazen serpent also had its use, has passed away, in the order of his will?

Doubtless, those ancient idolators reasoned just as the modern ones do. "God is immutable, unchangeable, therefore his laws are unchangeable. Rut 'we know that God spake to Moses,' commanding the children of Israel to look up to this serpent; therefore we will continue to look to it forever."

Having seen what is the old covenant, and what the new, spoken of by Jer. and quoted by Paul in Heb. 8, we remind our readers that he closes by asserting that the former has vanished away.

"In the saying 'new,' he hath made the first old, and what doth become obsolete and is old is nigh disappearing." — Heb. 8:13. *Young's Translation.*

"By calling this a new covenant he hath antiquated the first. Now that which is antiquated, and grown old, is near being abolished." — *Thomson.*

"In that God sayeth, A new covenant, he hath declared the former void. Now that which is declared void and groweth old, is ready to disappear.' — *Wakefield.*

"He calls it, you observe, a new covenant; which plainly implies the abolition of the old." — *Gilpins.*

"By [his] saying: 'of a new sort,' he has made obsolete this first; but

the thing that is becoming obsolete and aged [is] near disappearing." — *Rotherham*.

"In saying a new [covenant] he represents the first [covenant] as old. Of course, if the new one is to take the place of the former one, the former is considered as obsolete."

Then giving the Greek words he adds, this "means to represent a thing as old or as superannuated." "Applied to a law or dispensation it means abolition or abrogation." — *M. Stuart*.

Thus we see that other translations are yet more explicit in asserting the abrogation of the first covenant than the Common. The Old is declared, "obsolete," "antiquated" and "abolished," "void," and "abrogated."

"For it 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 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.

For where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. For a testament is of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth.

Whereupon neither the first testament was dedicated without blood. For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and all the people, saying, This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you." — Heb. 9:13-20.

In this chapter the apostle again compares the covenant made on Sinai, through Moses, and the new covenant through Christ. The first was dedicated by the blood of calves and goats, and "sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh." But the latter was by the blood of Jesus Christ himself, which "purges our conscience from dead works, to serve the living God." As Christ said in the institution of the Lord's supper, "This cup is the New Testament in [dedicated in] my blood, which is shed for

you." — Luke 22:20.

In the above language the apostle ascribes to these two testaments, or covenants, the nature of a will. ¹For where a testament [will] is, there must of necessity be the death of the testator. For a testament is of force after men are dead." And after the death of the testator, his last will and testament is established, and is of force, but all previous wills are null and void. Hence Christ's death established his own Word, and forever took away the law written on stone. Wherefore it is again declared that "Christ is the mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death for the redemption of transgressors, that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." That is eternal sanctification. — Acts 20:32; 26:18; Heb. 10:14, 15.

Then said he. Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. *He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second.* By the which will — testament — we are sanctified, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all." — 10:9, 10. Praise God! The Spirit gives us these words as a present testimony, *We are sanctified.*

Two covenants are set in comparison all the way through this epistle, called the first covenant, and the second. The former is very commonly called the law. And here we reach the same end of the first covenant to which we have been brought time and again in the inspired epistles. Christ, himself, and not Constantine, or the pope of Rome, "took away the first" covenant, and established the second, his own perfect law. And with this change ends the Mosaic Sabbath.

There are two bogs upon which the "teachers of the law" usually hop back and forward, in order to dodge the word of God. Namely, one time they admit that, the law, the old covenant, is abolished, but it only means the ceremonial part. And when driven from that, they shift their position and say "We are only delivered from the law by obeying it through grace; that is from the curse of the law." But the word of God emphatically declares the passing away of the whole legal economy. The word testament, is defined as a "complete arrangement, or dispensation." "So when Christ "took away the first, that he might establish the second," there was a complete dispensational change of the law, the setting up of an entirely new divine order and government. Christ is the "Mediator of the New Testament" which has superseded the entire old economy, which was given to the Jewish nation on Mount

Sinai.

And one small phrase, in the midst of this inspired treatise on the abrogation of the old covenant, and the establishing of the now by Christ, is sufficient to prove that the apostle meant by the first covenant, of which he so frequently speaks, just what it was called when first given. Namely, these words, "And the tables of the covenant." — 9:4.

Here the Sabbath of the Jews, and the heresy of the Ebionites, and Adventists, must die, being thrust through by the "Sword of the Spirit." The old covenant, which was "ready to vanish away," 8: 13, is familiarly spoken of in connection with the tables of the covenant. Paul was well posted in the Old Testament, and knew very well that God "wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the ten commandments," Ex. 34:28, and had given to Moses "thetwo tables of stone, even the tables of the covenant." — Deut. 9:11. And he surely must have known that after speaking of the old covenant vanishing away, and then of "the tables of the covenant," in the same connection, all would naturally understand him as teaching that the covenant written on stones was abolished. And that he intended to teach that very thing is evident from his declarations in 2 Cor. 3, that the very covenant written and "engraven on stone" was "done away" and "abolished."

Here we adopt the language of U. Smith, "Two Covenants," page 5. "That the old covenant has been abolished by being superseded by the new, Paul plainly states; of this there is no question. And we affirm further that nothing has been abolished but the old covenant. * * * If the ten commandments constituted the old covenant, then they are forever gone; and no man need contend for their perpetuity or labor for their revival."

Here we see that by one of its chief representatives, this sect that is so zealous for the Sabbath, hang their only hope of its defense upon making something else the first covenant and not the tables of the covenant. What a precarious foundation! But let us briefly review their effort.

Chapter 4.

Smith's Two Covenants.

"The very first transaction we find taking place between God and the

Israelites after they left Egypt which answers to the definition of the word covenant, must be the first covenant, unless some good reason can be shown why it is not."

So saying he lights upon Exod. 19:7, 8, and calls the promise of the people there to obey God's voice the covenant. Now we propose to give five very good reasons why that is not the covenant that is so much spoken of as having been made when God brought the children of Israel out of Egypt

First, because Mr. Smith does not bring forward one single, passage of scripture in which that agreement is pointed out and called the "first covenant," or the "old covenant," or a covenant at all. Mr. Norton, in his discussion, tried to make the language in verse 5 support the same subterfuge. "Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant," etc But Mr. Smith thinks he sees in it something by which he can prove the ten commandments existed before Moses' day, — see page 8 and being in great need of such scriptures he thinks it best to use it for that purpose: and so leaves his theory without a passage that can even be twisted into a proof text.

Our second very good reason for believing that Smith's new discovery in Exod. 19:7, 8, is not the covenant that God made with Israel when he brought them out of Egypt, is this: the scriptures positively declare that the covenant then made was the ten commandments that were written in stone.

1st	proof	text	Exod 34:28.
2d	"	"	Deut. 5:3 22.
3d	"	"	" 4:13.
4th	"	"	" 9:9.
5th	"	"	" 9:11.
6th	"	"	" 9:15.
7th	"	"	1 Kings 8:21.
8th	"	"	Heb. 9:4.

These eight direct and positive statements of the Bible, besides many indirect proofs, are, we hope, a sufficient apology for not believing Mr. Smith's contrary theory.

Our third reason is based upon the fact that Mr. Smith himself, says, page 8: "That the ten commandments are called a covenant we

admit." With this concession, and the fact that it was made at the very time Jer. says that the old covenant was made which Paul said has vanished away, I should think myself very foolish to accept his opposite theory unsupported by one direct proof text.

Our fourth reason is this: A hundred things in the Bible might be picked on for which just as plausible a line of reasoning and arguments could be fabricated as that produced by Mr. Smith for his device. But let every mouth be silent before the Bible, yea, "let God be true and every man a liar."

An argument against God's description of the covenant is taken from Exod. 24:6-8, and 12; and Heb. 8:17-20, and thus summed up: "Before Moses was called up to receive this law of ten commandments, which God had written, the first covenant had been made, closed up, finished and ratified by the shedding of blood. These facts throw a fortification around this point which it is not possible either to break or scale. The first covenant was dedicated with blood. But when that dedication took place, the ten commandments, in visible form, had not been put into the possession of the people; they had no copy of them; hence they were not dedicated with blood. Therefore, the ten commandments were not the old covenant." — Page 14.

In the name of Jesus we have but to attend to the word of God to prove this boasted fortress but a refuge of lies, which the hail of truth shall sweep away. Reader open now your Bible and read in Exod. 19:16-19, and you find that God had already come down upon Sinai in awful majesty, "thunders and lightnings, thick cloud and the voice of a trumpet exceeding loud," etc.

But the Lord sent Moses down to charge the people to keep outside the prescribed bounds of the mount, lest they perish. Ver. 21. Then chapter 20 begins with the voice of God speaking aloud to all the camp of Israel, and the very first things heard are the ten commandments extending to verse 17. "And all the people saw the thunderings and the lightnings, and the noise of the trumpet, and the mountain smoking," and requested that God should not speak to them lest they die. But that Moses should be their mediator. Ver. 18, 19. Then the Lord instructed Moses, concerning an altar and sacrifices to the close of the chapter. Chapter 21 begins a long line of laws called "judgments," extending to chapter 23:13. Then follow national feasts, and promises, etc. And in

chapter 24:4 we read, "*And Moses wrote all the words of the Lord.* and rose up early in the morning and builded an altar." "And he took the *book of the covenant*, and read it in the audience of the people; and they said, All that the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient. And Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it on the people, and said, Behold the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words. Verses 7,8. Now if Moses "wrote all the words of the Lord," he wrote the ten commandments also, for it cannot be denied that the Lord had already spoken them. You see, dear reader, Mr. Smith's theory would require some parenthesis foisted into the text, making the scriptures read as follows: "And Moses wrote all the words of the Lord — excepting the ten commandments." "All that the Lord hath said will we do — excepting the ten commandments," for Smith says they were not included in the book of the covenant. It is a strange thing indeed that Moses would pass by the most solemn and awful words that God had spoken, and not write them. But he did write them. There is no supposition in the case. Happily that "book of the covenant," which Moses dedicated with blood, is still extant. Nor is it hid away as a sacred relic in some foreign museum; but, thank God, a copy of it lies open before our eyes. And in it we read the ten commandments recorded for the very first thing in Ex. 20, after which follow other laws, which Mr. Smith calls the covenant, leaving out the very part which God specially calls the covenant. Indeed it would appear that that writer had forgotten that people generally are blessed with the Bible and can read it. He says at the time of dedication of the book of the covenant, Ex. 24:7, 8, "the ten commandments in visible form, had not been put into the possession of the people; they had no copy of them." Hut turning back to chapter 20, we find the very first thing in that book of laws given on Sinai, is a copy of the ten commandments. God had spoken them; and before the dedication of the volume, "Moses wrote all the words of the Lord." — Ex. 24.4.

And as Paul words it. "For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people, according to the law, he took the blood of calves," etc., "saying, this is the blood of the testament — the same as covenant — which God hath enjoined on you." — Heb. 8: 19, 20. The fact that the ten commandments constitute the covenant, and being the first part, and foundation of the whole book of the law, is just what denominated it

the book of the covenant. "Every precept according to the law," includes the ten precepts. Paul says Moses spake them. But turning back to Ex. 24:7, we see that he read them out of the book which he had written.

So after the whole book of the law had been given, Moses was called up again on the mountain, and God gave him tables of stone in which was a copy of the ten commandments. Ex. 24:12, following which he gave him directions concerning the tabernacle and all its appurtenances, priestly robes, sacrifices, the altar, laver, etc., extending to chapter 32.

Then Moses was informed of the idolatry of the people, and told to go down to them. The two tables were cast down and broken, 32:10. Moses hewed two tables like the first, and went up into the presence of God on the mount. — 34:4. "And the Lord said unto Moses, Write thou these words: for after the tenor of these words I have made a covenant with thee and with Israel. And he was there with the Lord forty days and forty nights; he did neither eat bread, nor drink water. And he wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the ten commandments." — Ex. 34:27, 28. What can be more conclusive? He declared the contents of the first tables, the covenant. And in repeating the same, he says, "After the tenor of these words I have made a covenant with thee and with Israel." What utter folly to deny the word of God! So the props fall, one after another, from the Advent structure, as the hammer of truth strikes them, and light exposes their fallacy.

Speaking of the ten precepts of the covenant, Smith says, "They are never called *the* covenant, referring to the first or old covenant." They are called, "the covenant," in Ex. 34:28; Deut. 9:9, 11; 1 Kings 8:21; Heb. 9:4. Here he contradicts the Word again.

There are many things shamefully crooked and false in the tract under notice we cannot take space to expose. The "darkness" of Sinai hangs over all their writing. A couple more points, directly bearing on this covenant question we will notice. Alluding to the death of the old, and introduction of the new covenant, in Jer. 31:32, and Heb. 8, "I will put my laws into their minds, and write them in their hearts." This he says was the "law of God in the days of Jeremiah." If it does not mean this, then it should have read, "I will put a *new* law into their minds, and write it in their hearts." Shame on such perverse disputings! Does it say I will write the old law in their hearts? No, but it does say, "I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel."

"This shall be the covenant I will make, I will put my laws in their inward parts." The law contained in the new covenant, of course. For we are told there was "*a change of the law.*" When the new covenant was confirmed in Christ, "He took away the first that he might establish the second." — Heb. 10:9. He took away the old, which was written in "tables of stone," that he might write the new in "fleshly tables of the heart." See 2 Cor. 3:3.

Chapter 5.

Moses was the Mediator of the Law, Christ is that of the New Testament.

It may surprise you to learn that some of the late devices of Advent darkness, are these: "Moses never was a mediator. Christ was the mediator, or lawgiver on Sinai, but gave no new laws while incarnate. There have only been two laws given. One the law of God, which is the ten commandments, the other the law of Moses, the remainder of the Old Testament". These positions were taken by R. C. Horton in the discussion, six miles north of Paw Paw, Mich. May 8-12, 1894.

In this chapter we will briefly prove that Moses was the mediator of the entire law system, and Christ is the mediator of the New Testament, in the present dispensation.

What is a mediator? The word is thus defined by the standard dictionary: "One who mediates; especially one who interposes between parties at variance."

"Mediate. 1st. to be in the middle between two. 2d, to interpose between parties as the equal friend of each; to act as a go-between, or umpire, to arbitrate, to intercede."

Mesites, is the Greek. Defined in Young's concordance, "middle man, mediator."

Greenfield, "One who mediates between, and reconciles two adverse parties, one who is the medium of communication between two parties." Gal. 3:19, 20; Heb. 8:6.

Thus Smith and Barnum, "A go-between, one who intervenes between two parties. It is applied to Moses as an interpreter or mere medium of communication between Jehovah and the Israelites. Gal. 3:19, 20. Compare Deut. 5:5. But Jesus Christ is a mediator in a higher

sense, i.e., an intercessor or reconciler. He is the "one mediator between God and men" (1 Tim. 2:5) "the mediator of the new covenant." (Heb. 12:24; 8:6), or "of the N. T." (9:15).

According to the real meaning of the word, Moses was the mediator in the giving of the law to Israel. Therefore we are told that the law — the entire law system, — "was ordained by angels in the hands of a mediator." Gal. 3:19. Both Smith and Barnum, and Greenfield use this passage and apply it to Moses as the mediator between God and Israel.

Jesus Christ never claimed to be the mediator in the giving of the law on Sinai, but he acknowledged Moses as filling that office. Of the many instances we will only cite a few. "Did not Moses give you the law, and yet none of you keepeth the law? Why go ye about to kill me?" — Jno. 7:19. "For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." — Jno. 1:17. "For Moses said, Honor thy father and thy mother; and, whosoever curseth father or mother, let him die the death." — Mark 7:10.

In this last instance Jesus quotes one precept from the decalogue, see Ex. 20:12, and Deut. 5:16, and the second from the judgments that God gave Israel through Moses, immediately following the ten statutes. See Ex. 21:17. This proves that Moses was the mediator of the whole book of the law, ten commandments and all. And the same laws ascribed to Moses in Mark 7:10, are ascribed to God in Matt. 17: 4. Showing, as many other similar passages do, that the whole law system was the law of God, its author; and yet the law of Moses, its mediator, or medium of communication. There is therefore no distinction between the law of God and the law of Moses, as the Adventists teach.

To say that Jno. 1:17, relates only to the ceremonial part of the law is utterly ridiculous. It betrays a false creed which forces the mind out of the channels of good common sense. In the passage the covenants of me two great dispensations are referred to. "The law lame by Moses," he was the mediator of that economy. "But grace and truth — the New Testament — came by Jesus Christ," who is now the mediator of the same. It may seem strange that we should spend a moment to show a fact so obvious to all men whose heads and hearts are not distorted by the dark creed of Adventism. Hut in the name of Jesus, we must do the duty of a watchman, and warn the people against the dark pitfall of legalism. Mr. Horton denied, in the discussion referred to, that there

were two distinct dispensations, said that "it is all law dispensation, and all gospel dispensation," all mingled into one, and Christ the only mediator, giving the law on Sinai, and giving no law since then.

What can be more inconsistent than the extreme prominence that the law teachers give to the decalogue, and yet say that Christ had no allusion to those ten commandments in Jno. 1:17, as if, indeed, they were so insignificant in the law economy, as not to be noticed in the summary of the same. But to such desperate straits are they driven to perpetuate that which Christ has taken away. For "the law and the prophets were until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it." — Luke 16:16. The prophets here denote that Old Testament line of seers who contended for righteousness under the law, and the chief light of whose predictions, was the coming Messiah. They have ceased; for Christ has published a radically different standard; and, having come in the flesh, and given us New Testament predictions of his second coming, the old line of prophets discontinues. Howbeit, all their unfulfilled prophecy remains steadfast; and by these they hold, with the apostles, a fundamental place in the church. Eph. 2:20.

"The law was until John." That is, he was the first herald of the new dispensation. His preaching and baptism, are denominated, "the beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God." — Mark 1:1-4.

Though there were precious promises of Christ mingled in the book of the law; and there is a perfect law found in the gospel, the two dispensations are perfectly separate and distinct. Their distinguishing characteristics are frequently compared, as "law" and "gospel," or "law" and "truth." Christ never said he was the mediator of the former system. But, saith he, "Did not Moses give you the law." Do you ask, what law? The whole law covenant of course. That he included the decalogue in the "law" which he said Moses gave the Jews, is evident. For he adds, "none of you keep the law, why go ye about to kill me?" They purposed in their hearts to violate the law of Moses by killing him, which they also did, even that law which said, "Thou shalt not kill."

Moses was then the mediator of that law, we prove by Christ. But we will now let that ancient mediator speak for himself. The law "was ordained in the hands of a mediator." That is, a "middle man," a "go

between." Who stood between God and the people at the giving of the law? "The Lord our God made a covenant with you in Horeb. The Lord made not this covenant with our fathers but with us." "I stood between the Lord and you at that time, to show you the word of the Lord." — Deut. 5:2, 3, 5. Here Moses asserts that he filled the exact office of a mediator.

But says the son of the bondwoman, "There is but one mediator, the man Christ Jesus." Certainly there was but one under the law, and there is but one now. Moses and Christ did not both officiate in the same dispensation. Christ succeeded Moses, and the New Testament superseded the Old.

Again they say, "A mediator is a Savior and Moses could not save." The idea of a Savior from sin is not in the word mediator. But Moses was a deliverer of the Israelites out of bondage, which is even called a "redemption." Hence, he was a glorious figure of Christ, our Redeemer.

But, said the debater, "If Moses was the mediator between God and Israel, what did they do for a mediator after his death?" Answer, his mediation consisted chiefly in giving them the law, and leading them out of Egypt, and wherein the law system needed further mediation, Jesus said, "The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat." — Matt. 23:2. Their business was to teach and enforce the law.

One more prop we remove. "At least Moses was not a mediator in giving the ten commandments, for God spake them aloud in the ears of all the people, and then wrote them himself on the tables of stone." To this let Moses answer. "I stood between the Lord and you at that time, to show you the word of the Lord: for ye were afraid by reason of the fire, and went not up into the mount."

"Moses gave you the law," i.e., "thou shalt not kill."

"Moses said, Honor thy Father," etc., the fifth commandment.

"The law was ordained in the hands of a mediator." In whose hands were placed the tables of stone? "And Moses turned and went down from the mount, and the two tables of the testimony were in his hands." — Exod. 32:15. "And it came to pass when Moses came down from Mount Sinai with the two tables of the testimony in Moses' hands." — Exod. 34:29.

A few texts will establish the fact that: "the law of Moses," also called "the law of God," is the entire law of that dispensation.

In Neh. 8:1, we read how the people "spake unto Ezra the scribe to bring the book of the law of Moses, which the Lord had commanded to Israel."

It was brought, "So they read in the book, in the law of God." So the law of Moses, and the law of God is the same book. Verse 8. And in Neh. 10:29, we are told the people entered "into an oath, to walk in God's law, which was given by Moses the servant of God, and to observe and do all the commandments of the LORD — Jehovah — our Lord." Here the law teacher is utterly confounded, and his theory proved a fraud and deception. The law of Moses and the law of God are one and the same. It is called, "God's law which was given by Moses," and the same one law includes "all the commandments of the LORD, our Lord."

"Be ye therefore very courageous to keep and to do all that is written in the book of the law of Moses, that ye turn not aside therefrom to the right hand or to the left; that ye come not among these nations, these that remain among you; neither make mention of the name of their gods, nor cause to swear by them, neither serve them, nor bow yourselves unto them." — Josh. 23:6, 7.

The entire law system is called the "law of Moses, and in obeying it they were not even to mention the name of the gods of the heathen, neither swear by them, nor serve them. Here we see the law of Moses covered the first commandment.

"And keep the charge of the Lord thy God, to walk in his ways, to keep his statutes, and his commandments, and his judgments, and his testimonies, as is written in the law of Moses, that thou mayest prosper in all that thou doest, and whithersoever thou turnest thyself." — 1 Kings 2:3.

These words utterly demolish the Advent theory "The charge of the Lord thy God," "his ways," "his statutes," "his commandments," "his judgments" and "his testimonies," were all "written in the law of Moses." What then, we would like to know, was left to constitute, "the law of God," which the vain imaginations of Saturday keepers distinguish from "the law of Moses," and which they say has survived its abolition? Were not the ten precepts, God's commandments? then they were "written in the law of Moses." Were they statutes? there they are written "And his [God's] testimonies" were "written in the law of

Moses." What is meant by these? The ten commandments. Proof, read Exod. 25:16. 31:18 32:15. 34:29. 40:20. Here are five clear statements that the testimonies were the ten laws on the tables of stone. To these may be added many passages which call the place of their deposit, "the ark of the testimonies," all of which prove the same thing. How perfectly these scriptures sweep away the refuge of lies, that the ten commandments are distinct from the law of Moses, and remain still in force, since the law of Moses is abolished!

"Neither will I any more remove the foot of Israel from out of the land which I have appointed for your fathers; so that they will take heed to do all that I have commanded them, according to the whole law and the statutes and the ordinances by the hand of Moses." — 2 Chron. 33:8.

Can a man be honest before God and hold the Advent falsehood after reading such scriptures? All that God commanded them, even the *whole law* and the statutes and the ordinances, were given by the hand of Moses. This proves that Moses was the mediator spoken of in Gal. 3:19, and it also proves that there were not two laws, but one law. Every duty enjoined by Jehovah upon the nation, was by the hand of Moses.

"Thou earnest down also upon mount Sinai, and spakest with them from heaven, and gavest them right judgments, and true laws, good statutes and commandments: and madest known unto them thy holy sabbath, and commandedst them precepts, statutes, and laws, by the hand of Moses thy servant." Neh. 9:13, 14.

Here again, all the laws, statutes, and commandments that God gave the people on mount Sinai, including the Sabbath, were given by the hand of Moses, and is Moses' law as well as Gods law.

This scripture proves that the Sabbath was there given by God, and not before, that Moses was mediator in its ministration, and that all the law forms one system.

"These are the testimonies, and the statutes and the judgments, which Moses spake unto the children of Israel, after they came forth out of Egypt." — Deut. 4:45.

The testimonies, we have seen, were those upon the stone tables; and though God spake them to all Israel, and Moses wrote them in the book, he is represented as having spoken them to the children of Israel, because he was the mediator of the whole law economy. The same are called the "commandments of the Lord our God, his testimonies, and his

statutes," in Deut. 6:17. So it is positively false that the law is divided into two laws. It is all the law of God, and all the law of Moses. But why multiply texts? Surely the foregoing are sufficient to prove these things. And yet upon the contrary theory hangs the Adventist creed. They know very well the New Testament, in the most positive terms, asserts the abrogation of the old covenant, called the law; and indeed they are forced to admit the fact, as we have quoted from U. Smith. Therefore there is no possible chance to maintain their idolized Saturday, except by asserting that there were two laws, one of which, — the decalogue — remains untaken away. But this babel structure the word of God utterly demolishes.

But if that entire code passed away, what now remains? We answer, Just what the inspired apostle says remains.

Chapter 6.

"The New Testament," "the Law of Christ"

"And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills: and all nations shall flow unto it."

"And many people shall go and say, Come ye and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob, and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths; for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." — Isa. 2:2, 3.

The "law" and the "word of the Lord," that is to govern in these "last days," is not that which came forth from Sinai, but that which came "out of Zion." This scripture is repeated in Micah, 4th chapter. It is a clear prophecy of the fact, that "repentance and remission of sins should be preached in all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." Therefore, if any man will now obey "the God of Jacob," and "walk in his ways," he must leave Sinai and receive the law of the Lord that comes down to us from mount Zion, at Jerusalem.

The Adventists are frequently heard to quote that Christ, "magnified the law and made it honorable." But what law is here referred to? The passage is found in Isa. 42:21. The chapter begins thus: "Behold my servant, whom I uphold, mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth, I have

put my Spirit upon him, he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles.

He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street. A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench: He shall bring forth judgment unto truth. He shall not fail nor be discouraged, till he have set judgment in the earth: and *the isles shall wait for his law.*

I the Lord have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles; To open the blinded eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison house." — Isa. 42:1-4, 6, 7.

The chapter is a sublime description of the conquests of the gospel of Christ. In verse 21, is an expression of Christ's satisfaction therein; "The Lord is well pleased for his righteousness' sake: he will magnify the law and make it honorable." There is no allusion here to the Sinai law at all. The "truth," "His [Christ's] law," is the only law spoken of in the chapter. The isles and the ends of the earth waited for this law; it is his standard of "judgment in the earth."

The Adventists now acknowledge Christ as a lawgiver. So we pass many texts by that prove the fact. But they deny him that character and office when incarnate, and confine him to Sinai.

"Look upon Zion, the city of our solemnities: thine eyes shall see Jerusalem a quiet habitation, a tabernacle that shall not be taken down; not one of the stakes thereof shall ever be removed, neither shall any of the cords thereof be broken.

Hut there the glorious Lord will be unto us a place of broad rivers and streams; wherein shall go no galley with oars, neither shall gallant ship pass thereby.

For the Lord is our judge, the Lord is our lawgiver, the Lord is our king; he will save us.

And the inhabitant shall not say, I am sick: the people that dwell therein shall be forgiven their iniquity." Isa. 33:20-22, 24.

For a comment on Zion and Jerusalem see Isa. 52:1 and Heb. 12:22-24. All who are spiritual readily see they mean the church of the firstborn which are written in heaven. "There — in his church — the glorious Lord will be unto us a place of broad rivers and streams." Streams of salvation. The promise related to something yet future when

written. "The glorious Lord will be," etc. And then, speaking from the standpoint of its fulfillment, the prophet says, "For the Lord is our judge, the Lord is our lawgiver, the Lord is our king, he will save." "The people that dwell therein shall be forgiven their iniquity." There is only one city in which no sinners dwell; that is God's church. And in it Christ is the only lawgiver. "Moses verily was faithful in all his house, as a servant, for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after: but Christ as a Sun over his own house; whose house are we." Here are the two successive dispensations and mediators. Christ is a Son over his own house, which was referred to in the above prophecy. "Thine eyes shall see Jerusalem a quiet habitation, a tabernacle that shall not be taken down." If literal, it could not be both a city and a tabernacle; but such is God's church being the anti-type of both Jerusalem and the tabernacle. James tells us plainly that the prophecy is now fulfilled. "There is one lawgiver, who is able to save and to destroy." Jas. 4:12. We have proved that Moses was the mediator of the law, and the Savior being the only lawgiver in this dispensation rules out both Moses and his law. Should the law-teacher attempt to apply Isa. 33:22 to the law then in use, because it is in the present tense, "The Lord is our lawgiver," let him remember that very often prophecy speaks of future things as if present. For instance, "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder." Isa. 9:6. Here the event spoken of in the form of the present was 740 years in the future.

Not only do all the prophets point forward to Christ as the lawgiver of this dispensation, but he is clearly introduced in that capacity by Moses himself. "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken; according to all that thou desiredst of the Lord thy God in Horeb in the day of the assembly, saying, Let me not hear again the voice of the Lord my God, neither let me see this great fire any more, that I die not.

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.

And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken unto my

words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him." Deut. 18:15-19.

There is no conflict between Christ and Moses. The latter understood very well that his office was temporary, and his law but for a time. The above prophecy is applied to Christ, as Peter testified on the day of Pentecost. Acts 3:22, 23. Here Christ, the head of the church, is pointed out as the one lawgiver in her, and destruction from among the people of God is only the result of disobeying him.

The voice of the law is condemnation, and death. The voice of the gospel is mercy, salvation, and life. They that heard the voice of God uttering the ten commandments entreated that the words should not be spoke; to them any more. And we are here told that the "law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus," is a complete gratification of that wish. In this dispensation God puts "his laws in Christ's mouth," who speaks all that the Father commands. So says Christ, "The words which I speak unto you are not mine, but the Father's which sent me." Hence to "keep the commandments of God," or the "law of God," in this dispensation, he tells you to "hearken unto my words, which he [Christ] shall speak." Therefore all this cry of the "law of God," "the law of God." and pointing away from Christ to Sinai, is a snare of Satan.

God does not tell you to keep his law through Christ, in addition to the law that was thundered on Sinai. But he puts all his law for this dispensation in the mouth of Christ. How could the New Testament given through Christ relieve from that law of terror, rigor and death spoken on Sinai if both were yet in force?

In exact parallel with this prophecy are these words of Paul:

"For ye are not come unto the mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire, nor unto blackness, and darkness, and tempest, and the sound of a trumpet, and the voice of words; which voice they that heard intreated that the word should not be spoken to them any more: (for they could not endure that which was commanded, And if so much as a beast touch the mountain, it shall be stoned, or thrust through with a dart: and so terrible was the sight that Moses said, I exceedingly fear and quake.)

But ye are come unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the firstborn, which are written in

heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel.

See that ye refuse not him that speaketh. For if they escaped not who refuse him that spake on earth, much more shall not we escape, if we turn away from him that speaketh from heaven." Heb. 12:18-25.

You will understand the last verse by comparing 10:28, 29. Moses, as the giver of the law, spake on earth, and death was the penalty of disobedience. Jesus Christ also taught pardon and regeneration while on earth, which exceeded the law, and after he was perfected, he spake from heaven the still higher law of perfect holiness, on the day of Pentecost; and continues to minister the same in our hearts by the Holy Spirit.

Verses 18-21 of the above scriptures describe the scene that took place when God spake the ten commandments on Sinai. Paul indeed quotes the very language of Moses. Therefore there can be nothing more strongly asserted than the fact that since Christ has come and set up his church and kingdom, the true worshippers of God are not under the law that was proclaimed from the fiery summit of Sinai, a literal mount, "that might be touched." "But ye are come unto mount Sion, the heavenly Jerusalem," "the church of the firstborn, and to Jesus the mediator of the New Testament," which is the law now in force.

This epistle was addressed to Hebrew Christians, and they were instructed that they had "become dead to the law by the body of Christ," and are under a wholly new law. And as for Gentile converts no Mosaic Sabbath was enjoined upon them.

For all future time the law question was met and settled by the voice of the Holy Spirit through the apostles and elders in A. D. 52. We are told in Acts 15:5 that certain false teachers who had gone out from Jerusalem without the approval of the church of God, taught that Gentile converts should be circumcised and required to "keep the law of Moses." The matter was appealed to the apostles and elders, with the whole church "assembled together with one accord" at Jerusalem. And here is their answer to the question.

"Forasmuch as we have heard, that certain which went out from us have troubled you with words, subverting your souls, saying, Ye must be circumcised, and keep the law: to whom we gave no such com-

mandment.

For it seethed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things; that ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication: from which if ye keep yourselves, ye shall do well. Fare ye well." Acts 15:24, 28, 29.

Observe, that what was called the "law of Moses," in verse 5 is simply called "the law" in verse 24, showing that they only knew of one law in the previous economy. "The law" necessarily included the whole body of the law. Four things only of that abrogated covenant were decided necessary for them to observe under the new covenant. 1. "That ye abstain from meat offered to idols." On this point Paul gave more full instructions and reasons in 1 Cor. 8. 2. "And from blood." 3. "From things strangled." Perhaps this was largely to avoid creating unnecessary prejudice in the minds of the Jews. 4. "And from fornication." This of course the higher law of Christ utterly forbids. "These necessary things." Surely had that been an Adventist general conference they would not have forgotten to strictly charge them to keep the Sabbath of the law. It must indeed be apparent to every candid reader that if this modern sect be right, the apostles and elders and the whole church of God assembled at Jerusalem were culpable of a great neglect of duty. But if they were indeed in God's order then the modern law teachers are far from it.

So that decision at Jerusalem was so far from enjoining the seventh day Sabbath that it pre-emptorially forbade the placing of that yoke upon the neck of Gentile converts. And in the same council Peter declared that God "put no difference between us and them" — between Jews and Gentiles. And in Gal. 3:24-28, after telling us that we are not under the law, we are informed that there is no national distinction in this respect. "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." So neither saved Jews nor Gentiles were held to keep the law. How perfectly all the scriptures agree! Christ took away the first covenant, called "the law," and established the second, called "the New Testament," and accordingly we see the apostles, both in this general assembly and in the epistles, forbidding any one to impose that abrogated law upon the disciples of Christ, and renouncing as troublers

and false teachers all who attempt to do so.

Let us quote 1 Cor. 9:20, 21 as translated by Conybeare and Howson: "To the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews: to those under the law. as though I were under the law (not that I was myself subject to the law), that I might gain those under the law; to those without the law, as one without law (not that I was without law before God, but under the law of Christ), that I might gain those who were without law." Here we see that, while Paul adjusted himself as much as possible to the different customs of all men, he did not place himself under the Sinaitic code, nor ever swerve from "the law of Christ," and in obeying this law, he was obedient "before God." The clause that utterly discards the law is also in the Bible Union, H. T. Anderson, and the Emphatic Diaglott, New Version, Rotherham, A Layman. The Douay Bible translated from the Latin Vulgate, renders as follows: "To them that are under the law, as if I were under the law, (whereas myself was not under the law) that I might gain them that were under the law; to them that were without the law, as if I were without the law, (whereas I was not without the law of God, but was in the law of Christ."

Also William Newcome, Young's Translation, and Wakefield, all render about the same.

The following is the translation by Sawyer, who thus introduces his version: "This is not a work of compromise, or of conjectural interpretations of the sacred scriptures, neither is it a paraphrase, but a strict literal rendering. It neither adds, nor takes away." "To those under the law, as under the law, not being myself under the law." etc.

"To them that are under the law as under the law, not being myself under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law: to them that are without law as without law, (not being without law to God, but under the law to Christ.)" — *Dean Alford*.

That the clause in all these translations which disclaims subjection to the law is genuine, there can scarcely be a doubt. They tell us it is in the best manuscripts, and Dr. Tischendorfe, in his readings of the manuscripts, tells us it is in the Sinaiticus, Vatican and Alexandrian, which are the oldest and best preservations of the pure New Testament.

In this text are two laws spoken of, one simply called "the law," which had been the law of God by Moses. The other the "law of God," through Christ. The apostle was not subject to the former, but to the

latter. He practiced what he preached. He said that Christ had "taken away the first that he might establish the second." So finding the perfect law which Moses had said God would put in the mouth of his Son, even all his will, he disclaimed any real conformity to the "commandment going before," the abrogated code.

"God who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto our fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds:

Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high.

But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom.' — Heb. 1:1-3, 8.

The whole chapter is a sublime vindication of the superiority of Christ, not only over Moses, but infinitely above the angels of heaven. He is the heir of all things. Having with the Father proposed man's redemption, he spent four thousand years in preparatory steps, one of which was the Mosaic economy. — Its severe penalties prepared the world to appreciate the gospel of "peace on earth and good will to man." Its sacrifices impress the idea of a vicarious sacrifice, the death of Christ in our stead. But when these preliminary steps of judges and kings, prophets and priests, were accomplished, God himself, our Emanuel, appeared on earth, and established his empire of love and grace upon the Rock of his eternal Truth, and sent forth his own law from mount Zion, the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.

"And of the increase and peace of his government there shall be no end." "A sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of his kingdom." Therefore if you would obey God "in these last days," you must respect his plan, leave the temporary systems of the past, and bow to the ministration of the Son. For God, who in divers manners spake to the fathers in time past, "hath in these last days spoken to us by his Son." Therefore the New Testament, of which Christ is the mediator, contains the "faith of Jesus," and the only "commandments of God" now in force. How utterly different this sounds from the Advent theory! To suit them it should read that God in time past spake on Sinai by his Son, but the

language positively refutes the idea of God speaking through Christ until in these last days. It clearly overthrows their theory that Christ was the mediator of the ten commandments.

"Bear ye one another's burdens and so fulfill the law of Christ." Gal. 6:2.

After all the apostle says in this epistle about Christians not being under the ten commandment law and its annexed judgments, etc., he gives them to understand that theirs is a perfect law for them to walk in, namely, "the law of Christ."

"And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.

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: and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen." Matt. 28:18-20.

"And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." Mark 16:15.

Here is the final universal commission of Christ. His imperative orders to all the preachers and teachers in the kingdom of God, "to the end of the world." Everything else is excluded but Christ's gospel, and his commandments. They stand over against every form of sin, and they only are to be preached to sinners, as a means of conviction and salvation, and to believers as their perfect rule of life. And to show that he is not subject to, nor in need of any former code, he announces the fact that "all power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." Here Christ sets up his supreme authority, removes all temporary systems, and demands subjection to his own gospel and commandments. So then, any person that teaches for commandments, any thing but truth, the gospel of Christ, is an anti-christ, and not commissioned of Christ. All the teachings of the inspired apostles strictly follow this divine order. They preached Christ, and him only. We find in the New Testament, preach the gospel, fifty times; preach Christ, twenty-three times; preach the Word, seventeen times; preach the kingdom, eight times. But preach the law, not a single instance. Hence the law teachers are entirely out of the New Testament order. Yea the curse of God is upon them. For Paul who utterly ignored the law written on stone, and "determined to know nothing among men save Christ and him crucified," in direct all

us on to the law teachers that "troubled the Galatians, said, "But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, If any any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." Gal. 1:8, 9.

No wonder that those rank heretics of the second century called Ebionites, who were the first to attempt a resurrection of the expired law, and who "observed the Sabbath and other discipline of the Jews," "thought the epistles of (Paul) the apostle ought to be rejected, calling him an apostate from the law." See Eusebius page 102. It is indeed a marvel that; any one would ever attempt to teach the perpetuity of the law without utterly discarding all the epistles of Paul.

Two things are most prominent in all his writings. "Christ is all and in all." "Ye are complete in him." And let every one be accursed that would impose any law that proceeded him, or any later production. Therefore let us "fulfill the law of Christ."

Chapter 8.

Christ's Law the Standard of Uprightness.

It was the teaching of the early church fathers that the living Christ himself in the hearts of the re deemed constitute their real law and rule of life in all things. To this indeed agree the scriptures. The old law was a covenant; so is the new. Thus saith Jehovah to his Son. "I will preserve thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people." Isa. 49:8. Christ in us is the embodiment of all righteousness, and his own holy life its standard. His "life is manifest in our mortal flesh." Hut while his perfect law is written in our inward minds and hearts, the New Testament is a copy of the same, and the very gospel which saves the soul, is the law that governs the life. A few plain proofs of this fact will be sufficient.

"But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews." Gal. 2:14.

To walk uprightly, is to walk according to the truth of the gospel and not by the old raw.

"O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you" Gal. 3:1. "Ye did run well; who did hinder you that you should not obey the truth? This persuasion cometh not of him that calleth you." Gal. 5:7, 8.

Truth, which came by Christ, is the complete rule of life. Hut this law-wrangling persuasion "cometh not of him that calleth you."

"I have no greater joy than to hear that my children walk in truth." 3 John 4.

"Grace be with you, mercy and peace, from God the Father and from the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Father, in truth and love."

"I rejoice greatly that I found of thy children walking in truth, as we have received a commandment from the Father." 2 John 3, 4.

We have received a commandment from the Father to walk in the truth. Yes, the Father had said through Moses, that in the last days he would put all his words in the mouth of this prophet, who is Christ, "the way and the truth, and the life." John 14:6. "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased, HEAR YE HIM." Matt. 17:5. Here, in the presence of Moses, God introduces his Son, as the illustrious subject of prophecy, who was to rule the saints of the Most High by his own law, and he that will not hear and obey him shall be destroyed from among the people. No wonder it is said the Father commanded us to walk in the truth. So to obey God, even the Father, we must leave the law, which was given by Moses, and walk in the truth which came by the Lord Jesus Christ. This only is the Christian's path of duty.

"Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience and of faith unfeigned: from which some having swerved have turned aside unto vain jangling; desiring to be teachers of the law; understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm.

But we know that the law is good, if a man use it lawfully: knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers, for whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, for menstealers, for liars, for perjured persons, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine: according to the glorious gospel

of the blessed God, which was committed to my trust." 1 Tim. 1:5-11.

One would think that Paul had come in contact with the law-ventist sect of modern Babylon, so perfectly does his rebuke apply to these "vain jangers."

The Jew having been purged by the blood of Christ, thus came to the end of the law, not a part of it, but the law, the whole law; its Sabbath and all, there ended. So all that desire to be teachers of the law — any part of it — have swerved from God's order unto "vain jangling," and thereby show their ignorance in the things of God. Not having the Spirit, they understand neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm. But did not Paul say the law was good? Yes, "if a man use it lawfully." And does he point out its sphere? He does immediately. First he says, it "was not made for a righteous man." He does not say that some parts of the law were not made for those having received the "righteousness of God" by faith: but the law, the whole Sinaitic code, is excluded from the government of such as have received "Christ our righteousness." What could be more absurd than the notion that the apostle, thus speaking of the law as a whole, did not include the ten commandments, the basis of the whole system? If then the law was not made for a righteous man, the Sinaitic Sabbath was not made for the redeemed saints. Then the apostle tells us just whom the law was made for. I need not repeat the list, but you see the characters are just such as the ten commandments restrain. This corresponds with Paul's object of the law in Gal. 3. Now we affirm by the authority of Christ, that none of these characters, for whom the law was made have any place at all in the church of the living God. Hence the law has no jurisdiction there at all. But in the 10th and 11th verses, we have "the glorious gospel of the "blessed God," set up as a perfect moral standard by which every thing "contrary to sound doctrine" is condemned.

"The law was added because of transgression," and in the epistle to the Romans Paul identifies death to the law with death to sin. So the only place for the law was over sinners. But he that is born of God doth not commit sin. So charity out of a pure heart is the terminus of the law, and the pure in heart are under altogether a different standard, even "the glorious gospel of the blessed God."

"Only let your conversation be as it becometh the gospel of Christ: that whether I come to see you, or else be absent, I may hear of your

affairs, that ye stand fast in one "Spirit, with one mind striving together for the faith of the gospel." Phil. 1:27.

Conversation here means, conduct, deportment, or behavior, and is so rendered in other translations. The gospel is set up as the rule of our actions. It is the Christian's guide in all things.

Take a complete concordance and glance over the words "obey," "obedience," in the New Testament, and what do you find? Frequently you come to the words, "obey the truth," but never a command to obey the law. "But unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath." Rom. 2:8. Here truth and all unrighteousness are set in opposition. Hence, the truth, which came by Jesus Christ "since the law," contains every element of righteousness. In exact harmony with this teaching is the statement that, "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." Rom. 10:4. The reason of this statement is found in all those scriptures which refer to the gospel and truth as the present source and standard of righteousness. Having such an abundance of scriptures that declare the abrogation of the law, the above testimony has not been previously called forward; but it is very strong. A law teacher sought to evade its force by citing Jas. 5:11, with this false reasoning, that if the "end of the law" in Rom. 10:11 means its actual termination, then the passage in James would prove the end of God's existence. But all can see that the thought in James is not expressed in full. The ellipsis is thus supplied in the translation by Newcome, "Ye have heard of the patience of Job, and have seen what the Lord did in the end: for the Lord is of tender mercy, and full of compassion." The little word "end" is from *telos*, which simply means the end, the terminus, as any one can see in all such texts as Matt. 10:22. 24:6, 13, 14. Mark 3:26. Luke 1:33. John 13:1. Rom. 6:21. 1 Cor. 15:24, and everywhere used. So it is forever settled in heaven and upon earth, that the law covenant has nothing to do with our righteousness in Christ Jesus.

"Casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." 2 Cor. 10:5.

Here perfect obedience is unto Christ. Then we need no other law but that which God spake through him in these last days. All now depends upon our obedience to him. "Being made perfect, he became the Author

of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him." Heb. 5:9. And whoever will not obey his voice shall be destroyed from among the people. Acts 3:23.

Again the gospel is set forth as the means and measuring line of our righteousness, and as containing the law that we must obey. "But they have not all obeyed the gospel." Rom. 10:16. "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, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." 2 Thess. 1:7-9.

We find also that "the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints," Jude 3, is a perfect system, having both the promises upon which to build our faith, for salvation, and preservation, and for every thing needed for soul and body, and also containing the moral law by which we are to be governed. Hence the faith of Jesus never saves a soul, and turns it over to the law of Moses. But the obedience required is to the law contained in the new covenant of faith in Christ; hence we read, "By whom we have received grace and apostleship for obedience to the faith among all nations for his name." Rom. 1:5. "According to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith." Rom. 16:26. "And a great company of priests were obedient to the faith." Acts 6:7.

Once more, the law of the Christian is called the word. "That if any obey not the word, they also may, without the word, be won by the conversation of the wives." 1 Pet. 3:1.

"And if any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed." 2 Thess. 3:14. What is meant by the word? Ans. "But the word of the Lord endureth forever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." 1 Pet. 1:25. The "word" and the "gospel" are the same thing. How is it the word of the Lord, and yet Paul calls it "our word?" We will let the apostle answer for himself. "If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord." 1 Cor. 14:37.

So to be obedient to God in this dispensation we are required to obey Christ, the truth, the gospel, the faith of the Son of God, the word of

God; but never are we commanded to obey the law. The whole New Testament corroborates the passages which assert that the law had passed away, and the teaching of the inspired apostles carry out the commission of Christ, which enjoins obedience only to his commandments, and to his law in these words, "Take my yoke upon you and learn of me." Christ's yoke is placed upon us, but all who attempt to impose the "yoke of bondage," the law, have the curse of God pronounced upon them.

Chapter 9.

Christ's Law the Standard of Conviction to Sinners,

A law of itself is of no force. The severe penalties gave authority to the first covenant. But that these are taken away, even Saturnarians admit. Hence the law they enforced is powerless. But what gives efficacy to the law of Christ, the second covenant? Answer, the Holy Spirit. This is pre-eminently the dispensation of the Spirit. He not only regenerates and sanctifies believers, and guides them into all truth, but he also convicts sinners, and makes them "willing in the day of his power." But by what standard does he convict them? Ans. "When he is come he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: of sin, because they believe not on me; of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more; of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged." John 16:8-10. Not because they had broken the first covenant, but because they had slighted Christ and his law. It is a fact that the voice of Christ, backed by his dying love for the sinner, and applied to the conscience by the Spirit, speaks a hundred times louder than all the thunders of Sinai. It is a fact that the awakened sinner is wholly melted because of sin against Christ, and his law. In his deepest distress he scarcely thinks of the Sinaitic code, for the simple reason that the Holy Spirit never arraigns offenders before that abrogated law. "This is condemnation — says Christ — that light is come into the world." And he is the light of the world, hence the condemnation is because men "have not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." Jno. 3:18, 19. Christ "sets judgment in the earth" by the light of "His law," "brings forth judgment unto truth." Isa. 42:3, 4. It is the truth, the word of God spoken by his Son, that "is quick, and

powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart. Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight: but all things are naked and open unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do." Heb. 4:12. Christ came to send "a sword," the sin-searching "sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God." And by it "the thoughts of many hearts are revealed." Luke 2:35.

It is true as the apostle said, "The law was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ." But he also said, that, "What things soever the law saith, it saith to them that are under the law." Rom. 3:19. And he further informs us that "the Gentiles have not the law." Rom. 2:14. So even while the law was in force, it only extended to the Jew. And the Gentile was convicted or acquitted only by the moral law written in the heart. Rom. 3:14, 15. And since the abrogation of the law we have seen that all sinners are condemned before the bar of the law of Christ. To convert sinners the apostles only preached Christ, his gospel, his truth, yea, and his holy life. Nothing else but his gospel did Christ commission men to preach, as a means of making disciples in all nations. No where is the law mentioned in the process of converting men to Christ. "To make the Gentiles obedient, by word and deed, through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God; so that from Jerusalem, and round about unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ." Rom. 15:18-20. Had the law been preached as a means of conviction, repentance would have led to obedience to the law. But we read of no sinner repenting and obeying the law. Nay, they "were obedient to the faith." They believed and obeyed the gospel. The means of salvation is well described in 1 Pet. 1:22, 23, as follows: "Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently: being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever." They were purified from their sins, and born again by "obeying the truth," "the word of God;" and in verse 25, the saving word is defined as the gospel. So to convict and convert sinners, and to discipline and govern his church, Christ makes no use of the law given on Sinai, but commissions his ambassadors to preach Jesus only, his

gospel and his commandments. By the light of his own word he "condemns sin in the flesh," and makes the whole world guilty before God. Therefore the law given on Sinai is utterly ruled out from the government of Christians, and the conviction of sinners. But again, says the "teacher of the law," if that code was only designed as a civil law to restrain transgressions, are there not plenty of sinners who need it to day? Answer.

Chapter 10.

The Wicked are Turned over to the Laws of the Land.

Thus Paul, who so often affirms the end of the national law of the Jews, directed Titus: "Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, to be ready to every good work." Titus 3:1.

"Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God.

Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.

For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: for he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for 'wrath, but also for conscience' sake.

For, for this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing.

Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor." Rom. 13:1-7.

"Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme; or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evildoers, and for the praise of them that do well.

For so is the will of God, that with well doing ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men.

Honor all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honor the king." 1 Pet. 2:13-15, 17.

Jesus came into this world and set up a spiritual kingdom which is "righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit." The condition of entrance is a new and heavenly birth, John 3:3-5, and all who are born of God do not commit sin, 1 Jno. 3:9; 5:18, hence the law of ten commandments was not made for them, and they are free from the same. His church is also defined as a "spiritual house," "a holy, nation," and to her he gave the perfect law of the New Testament. And as to the unsaved, he does not hold them under the national code delivered on Sinai, but recognizes their obligations as well as that of all his disciples, to abide by the laws of whatever government under which they live. To fear and obey kings, governors, and magistrates, and be loyal citizens in their own country. Here again the law teacher is unable to find a shadow of excuse for his idolized law. It has no place inside the kingdom of God, nor yet outside.

Chapter 11.

Comparison of Christ's Law with the Abolished Code.

In this comparison we will begin with the Savior's sermon on the mount. "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: for I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." Matt. 5:17, 18. Here the law teacher thinks he has a strong proof text in his favor. But we will readily see that these words are not against other scriptures. It is an undeniable fact that some sects of the Jews, "made their boast in the law," and, though they daily violated some parts of it, like modern law-ventists, the law was factually their god. Looking out of their eyes of superstition and jealousy, Christ appeared to them as in open hostility to the law. In the promulgation of his law, they thought him in rivalry with God and Moses. In order to disabuse their minds of these false ideas, and allay their prejudice Jesus said, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets." His kingdom is not in opposition to either God or Moses, but it is the kingdom of the God of heaven himself. Dan. 2:44. Therefore he came not to destroy the law, as a king destroys the

government of a nation whom he conquers.

"I am not come to destroy but to fulfill." The word fulfill is defined by, "to fill up, to make full or complete, to complete by performance, to answer the requisitions, to bring to pass." Christ fulfilled the law and the prophets in every way. He fulfilled the law in obeying it, for he was "made under the law." He fulfilled it as the wonderful antitype of all its sacrifices, types and shadows. He fulfilled all its prophecies that related to him. He fulfilled or filled up the law in this sense, i.e., the law "was added because of transgression till the seed should come to whom the promise was made." Therefore his coming filled up, and accomplished the designed duration of the law. He fulfilled and brought to pass all those predictions which had announced that, "A king should reign in righteousness," and "the isles shall wait for his law." And how perfectly he answered to that sublime declaration of Moses, in Deut. 18:15-19. So Christ fulfilled the whole legal system, by obeying it, by answering its types, by setting up the divine kingdom, supplanting the law system which came by Moses, and establishing his own supreme and eternal code of laws, called the "New Testament," all of which was plainly anticipated in the abolished law.

"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." Mat. 5:19.

No law can be broken in the kingdom of heaven that is not in force in it. But "the law and the prophets were until John, since then the kingdom of heaven is preached." This text, with all other scriptures, draws a clear line of distinction between the law and the kingdom of heaven, and the former terminated at the appearing of the latter. What then does he mean by "these commandments?" He means the precepts of his own law, as the words that follow clearly show. "For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven." Ver. 20. That is, the precepts of Christ's code are so much higher than the law given on Sinai, that the most reputed righteous, under that law, could not so much as enter his kingdom, without a better righteousness. Then he proceeds to compare "these commandments" of his kingdom, with those of the law.

"Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment: but I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment: and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca. shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire.

Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery: but I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.

It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement: but I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery, and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery.

Again, ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths: but I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by heaven: for it is God's throne: nor by the earth; for it is his footstool: neither by Jerusalem: for it is the city of the great King. Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black. But let your communication be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil.

Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: but I say unto you, That ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy light cheek turn to him the other also.

And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.

And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twin.

Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away.

Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you." Mat. 5:21, 22, 27, 28, 31-44. "These commandments" are seen to be much higher than the corresponding precepts of the "old time," law of Moses, of which "there

is verily a disannulling." Christ puts the ten commandments on the same plane with the rest of the book of the law. Hence he quotes indiscriminately from those written upon stone, and from others not in the decalogue, and then shows that his own law is a far "more excellent ministry," which if a man break in the least, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven. As Moses spake of God sending another lawgiver, and intimated the chief difference between the law of God that would be spoken by his mouth, and that given on Sinai, i.e., his law would be love and mercy, instead of rigor and death; and as the prophet Jeremiah [31] also foretells a new covenant that would be written in men's hearts instead of upon stone; in fulfillment of all this, Christ appeared in due time, and as a supreme lawgiver, boldly published his heavenly code in the sermon on the mount, and indeed in all his three and a half years public ministry. As the God of Moses, "Lord of the Sabbath," King of angels, creator of the worlds, heir of all things, "the mighty God," the everlasting Father, and yet he to whom the Father saith, "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever;" whose law is love, and his sceptre righteousness; having all power in heaven and on earth, he came, defeated Satan, conquered death, took away the law off death-penalties, and purged away the sin that made that rigorous code necessary; he boldly published the everlasting laws of his kingdom in the name of the Father who had "in old time" spoken through Moses. He shows the higher nature of his laws, freely drawing comparisons between the two ministrations, and indeed points out some precepts of the old covenant that were quite to the opposite of his commandments, as seen in the above lesson on the mount.

O what depths of darkness must veil the heart that cannot see the beautiful and perfect law that flowed from the lips that spake as never man spake!

The rejection of Christ as the supreme lawgiver while incarnate, can only be accounted for as Christ did in John 8:43, 44. "Why do ye not understand my speech? even because ye cannot hear my words. Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do." This is a strong charge; but while many poor Adventists are, no doubt, sincere, having been drilled and educated into their anti-christ doctrine, just as the Roman Catholics have been tutored in their religion; it is nevertheless true that every spirit that denies Christ in any of his

attributes and works, is anti-christ, and proceeds from the devil. How the Holy Spirit of God loves to proclaim Christ all and in all! His words of heavenly wisdom and truth, and his own blameless life, and perfect example, constitute the Christian's complete rule and magna Charta.

Having seen the higher character of Christ's law we proceed to notice the fact that Moses' law was enjoined upon one nation, Christ's upon all. Hence it is written, "The Gentiles which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these having not the law, are a law unto themselves." Rom. 2:14. "For he is our peace who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace." Eph. 5:14, 15. "The Gentiles had not the law," and this constituted a mark of distinction between them and the Jewish nation. This becomes a matter of enmity between the two. To apply this to only a part of the law is a perversion of the truth; the ceremonial ordinances were all enacted under the ten commandments. The latter constituted the covenant, but this "covenant had also ordinance of divine service and a worldly sanctuary." Heb. 9:1. On these words the law teacher attempts to base an argument that the covenant consisted in ordinances, hence not in the ten commandments. But the word proves the argument false. It does not say the first covenant was ordinances, but had ordinances; it possessed them, and surely that possessed is not identical with the possessor. Nay, right in this very verse we have positive proof that the covenant that was abolished was distinct from the legal ordinances, though of course the latter passed away with the former. Let us read, "Then verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary." Observe that the ordinances sustained the same relation to the covenant that the tabernacle did. Therefore they were no more the covenant, nor a part of it, than that worldly structure was. Just as there was no tabernacle engraved upon the tables of stone, there were no ordinances in the covenant proper. But the covenant had the ceremonials, and had the tabernacle, as things provided under it, yet distinct from it. The same thing is meant by the language of Eph. 2:15: "Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments *contained* in ordinances." The law of the ten commandments, around which clustered all the ordinances, was a wall

of partition between the Jew and Gentile. Had that law been given to Gentiles also, the Jewish nation would not have been fenced off from the rest of the world by it. The very fact that they were a separate people under the law proves that their code was not a universal law. "For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law." Gal. 5:2. This is clear; only the circumcised Jew and proselyte were under the law. An appeal to the ten commandment law itself, shows that it was always and only addressed to the house of Israel. The first commandment is prefaced by, "I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage." Ex. 20:2. The fourth commandment, the Sabbath law, is only made obligatory upon Israel. "In it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thine ox, nor thine ass, nor any of thy cattle nor thy stranger that is within thy gates." Deut. 5:14. "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." Ver. 15.

Need any thing be plainer than this? The Sabbath law was only enjoined upon the one nation that was brought out of Egypt, and it was given as a memorial of that fact. Hence the very object of its institution does not apply to any other nation. It cannot be proved that God ever commanded a Gentile to keep the seventh day. The jurisdiction of the law is invariably thus expressed, "to you and your children, to your manservants and maidservants, and to the stranger that is within thy house."

Thus David speaks: "He showed his word unto Jacob, his statutes and his judgments unto Israel. He hath not dealt so with any nation." Psa. 147:19, 20. This needs no comment. To say that God gave his law on Sinai to any but the Israelite nation were to contradict the Psalmist and all the scriptures.

"Now we know — saith the apostle — that what things soever the law saith, it saith — not to all men, but — to them who are under the law." Rom. 3:19. Then the law never said to a Gentile, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy," etc., because the "Gentiles have not the law." Rom. 2:14. The law never said to a Christian, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy," "In it thou shalt do no work," etc., because

"what the law saith it saith to them that are under the law," and "we are not under the law but under grace." Rom. 6:15. It were utter folly to deny the fact that the whole charge of the law was exclusively upon the Jewish nation and circumcised proselytes.

Hut the law of Christ is addressed to and is made obligatory upon all nations without distinction. We need not multiply scriptures to prove a thing so undeniable. "All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord: and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee. For the kingdom is the Lord's: and he is the governor among the nations." Psa. 22:27, 28. The Father having "given him the heathen for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession," Christ gave commission to his messengers, saying, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth, Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Matt. 28:18-20.

"And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." Mark 16:15. To every creature of Adam's race the law of the Lord goes forth. He "commandeth all men every where to repent." "This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come." Mat. 24:14. Every creature, of all nations, race and color, must hear this perfect holy law, and be judged by the same in the last day.

Another very apparent difference between the two covenants is this: the first is chiefly a civil prohibitory law adapted to carnal men; the second is, a spiritual law for holy men. Eight of the ten commandments were only negative prohibitions. Let us examine the decalogue and see if this is not true. The first commandment was very seasonable for that Israel who were only born after the flesh, and at a time when they were expected to pass into a land filled with all manner of idol worship. "Thou shalt not make thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth; thou shalt not bow down thyself to them." Such a prohibition we say was suited to a carnal Israel, surrounded by idolatrous nations. But how ridiculous to serve such a law upon spiritual Israel, whose sanctified nature is illuminated with the knowledge of God, and wholly imbued with his love!

The second, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain," is a needed restriction for unrenewed hearts.

The fourth and fifth are the only two that enjoin positive duty. Namely, keep the Sabbath, and honor thy father and thy mother.

Sixth, "Thou shalt not kill;" seventh, "Thou shalt not commit adultery." Eighth, "Thou shalt not steal." at Ninth, "Thou shalt not bear false witness." Tenth, "Thou shalt not covet." Sure enough, such a "law was not made for a righteous man;" but "for murderers," — "Thou shalt not kill;" "for whoremongers," — "Thou shalt not commit adultery;" "for menstealers," — "Thou shalt not steal;" "for perjured persons," — "Thou shalt not bear false witness."

Thus compare Exodus 20 with 1 Tim. 1:9, 10. It will be seen by the above examination that the ten commandments partake far more of the nature of a civil code, prohibiting crime, than of a religious law, enjoining devotion to God. It is suited to the ungodly and not to the righteous. Only the last precept goes back of outward actions, and speaks against inward evil desire. "Thou shalt not covet." It forbids the worship of idols, but never commands the worship of God. It neither enjoins benevolence to man, nor love to God, which all must admit are among the first principles of a truly religious code. The reason such things are not found there was doubtless given by the apostle when he informed us that "the law was not made for a righteous man." And yet the law worshipers see no perfect law but the decalogue. The Advent tract entitled, "A Discussion of the Sabbath Question," page 7, says, "The decalogue is the only code that teaches what true love to God and man is, and what it enjoins. It is as perfect a revelation of God's character as infinite wisdom could give." This is a direct denial of Christ and his perfect law; and is a clear manifestation of the anti-christ spirit. Does the Bible anywhere point to the Sinaitic covenant, as a revelation of God's character? "Neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him." Mat. 11:27. Not in the law, but in the gospel "is the righteousness of God revealed." Rom. 1:17. The assertion that the decalogue is the only code that teaches what love to God and man is, is unblushing falsehood. How infinitely superior is Christ's standard as compared with the law in Mat. 5. How utterly sectish and disgusting the idea that the law of terror delivered amid the thunders and lightning of Sinai, more fully teaches true love

to God and man, than the holy life and teaching of Christ, and even his death upon the cross! Oh the blindness and idolatry of Adventism!

The chief voice of the law written on stone, is, "Thou shalt not" do this and that sin. And on the same fiery summit soon followed the penalty of death attached to these stone-carved laws. So the first covenant was a civil code, made for the ungodly, and the penalty for its violation was literal death. The second covenant which was confirmed of God in Christ Jesus, is a spiritual law, made for spiritual men, and the result of its violation is spiritual death.

One more important difference we will note. The first covenant was written on visible stones, and related almost wholly to outward actions. The second is written in the hidden man of the heart, and produces perfect inward righteousness. This contrast is beautifully drawn in these words of the apostle Paul: "Forasmuch as ye are manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshly tables of the heart." 2 Cor. 3:3. As he preached Christ unto them the Holy Spirit transformed their souls into the image of God, wrote the nature and law of Christ upon their hearts. "Not in tables of stone," for that law has passed away, "but in the fleshly tables of the heart." The stone tables are suggestive of the hardness of the hearts that needed that law. "Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered you to put away your wives; but from the beginning it was not so." Mat. 19:8. Much of the law of Moses was made necessary because of the people's hard hearts.

There be some who profess to be Christians, and yet prefer Moses' law to Christ's. The reason is evident: they are affected with the same old disease, known as hardness of heart. They profess to be disciples of Christ and yet wish to use Moses' law for hard hearts to put away their companions. But that provision for divorcement has no place in the kingdom of God; for there are no hard hearts in it. But ye are "epistles of Christ," "known and read of all men." "The life of Christ is manifest in our mortal flesh;" hence the world reads the pure law of Christ in the Christian's walk.

The passage from the stone-table law, for stony hearts was predicted by Ezekiel 36:26, as follows: "A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart

out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh."

David pictured the coming law of the Lord Jesus Christ when he said, "Behold thou desirest truth in the inward parts: and in the hidden parts thou shalt make me to know wisdom. Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean: wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow." Ps. 51:6, 7.

The "truth," which enters within the heart, purifies and governs, we are told, "came by Jesus Christ."

Under this head we call attention again to that clear prediction of Jer. 31:31-34. A new covenant is promised to the house of Israel, and the house of Judah, and other scriptures show that the same was to be extended to all nations. It was to supersede the one written on stone: And the chief difference between the two is this: The law of God in the new covenant would be "put in their inward parts, and written in their heart." And all who receive this law of the kingdom of heaven should know God from the least to the greatest. Instead of an outward law threatening death for its violation, the new covenant is the very righteousness of God stamped upon the fleshly tables of the heart, and infused through all our moral being; making an holy life as natural and easy as the production of good fruit by a good tree planted in good soil.

Many other scriptures show this glorious internal writing of the law of God in Christ. But let us look at the law of Christ itself. What is it? When Christ was asked the question which was the greatest commandment of the law, did he point to the fourth of the decalogue, and say, "Keep the Sabbath?" No. To the first? No, nor to any commandment in that list. But, "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." Mat. 22:37-39. We have spoken of the decalogue being the basis of the whole law code; but we simply meant the penal code. But here the Savior points out two commandments upon which "hang all the law and the prophets." God is love, and love is the original law of his empire. After the fall of man, all the dealings of God with the race were for the purpose of finally restoring man to the blissful reign of love. Among these preliminary steps was the ministration of death written and engraven in stone; hence these tables hung for a time, and for a purpose, upon the tree of love in the plan of God. These two commandments were the greatest because

they were expressions of the perfect law of Christ in this most glorious dispensation of the Holy Spirit. "Owe no man any thing, but to love one another: for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law." Rom. 13:8. The apostle, having in this same epistle showed that the law from Sinai had come to an end at the appearing of Christ, had no allusion to that code, but to the law in force in the kingdom of heaven. "For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Rom. 13:9. Observe he does not quote the Sabbath precept here, for it is a positive institution, resting on the will of the lawgiver, and not in man's moral constitution. But five precepts of the decalogue are cited which are principles of right without any enactment to make them such; which are written in man's moral nature; all, these, and if there be any other commandment of the abrogated code that is yet in force it is briefly comprehended in this saying; namely, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

The law of the new covenant is love. Enlightened love always does right. Therefore it leads to the performance of all acts which, within themselves, are right, and eschews all actions within themselves morally wrong. In the above words the apostle informs us that the new covenant, the perfect law of love, embodies no element of the first covenant except such principles of moral law which are written in men's heart and conscience, and which were the natural laws of God before any decree was given to enforce them. See Rom. 2:14, 15. How much then, we may here inquire, of the law system was abolished! Answer. Every obligation that the law given on Sinai created, passed away when that law was abolished. But every principle of moral right and wrong that were such before the law was published on Sinai, remain unchangeably such since that covenant was abolished.

To follow this digression another step we observe that the claim of Adventists that the ten commandments had been given before published on Sinai, is a fallacy. They base it upon the fact that Cain was condemned for killing his brother, and many other deeds were denominated sinful; and lives of righteousness are also acknowledged before Moses received the law. Therefore, they say, the ten command-

ments must have been already given; for where there is no law there is no sin, nor standard of righteousness. But because men's actions were either righteous or evil before God spake on Sinai is no proof at all that he had previously given the ten commandments. God created in man from the beginning a conscience, placing him under a perfect moral law written in his very constitution. Therefore his actions are either good or bad regardless of any outward law. The reasoning that the seventh-day Sabbath was enjoined from creation, because it was a sin for Cain to kill Abel, is a myth of falsehood. So blinded by their sectarian zeal they see no moral law but the ten commandments; therefore every moral obligation before Moses or since the coming of Christ, they refer to that standard.

Hut to return, love is the law of the kingdom of heaven. A wonderful fact! Herein is found the "glorious liberty of the sons of God." The freedom wherein Christ makes us free indeed. Just think of it. Love is the law, the law is love. Law is a standard of human action. Love is a passion which prompts to action. So then that which moves to action or desire is identical with that which circumscribes action and desire. Reader, do you comprehend this wonderful truth? There is no action or desire springing from a pure heart that is not moved by the love of God that dwells within; and all that action and desire are without restraint; from the fact there is no law over them but love, the very thing that moves them. Love is the highest law in the universe. Therefore we read, "The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, * * * against such there is no law." Gal. 5:22, 23. There can be no law against love; for love is supreme law itself. There is no tribunal in the universe before which the acts of love can be arraigned; because love is identical with God, the supreme judge of all.

"God is love." So we have in this blessed fullness of the gospel dispensation, these three in identity; namely, law, love, God. "He that loveth another hath fulfilled the law." Rom. 13:8. This is true both toward God and man. This perfect law, which is love, and is God himself, dwells within our hearts. "As God hath said, I will dwell in you." "The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts." And "I will put my laws into their minds and write them in their hearts."

It is perfect liberty to do what we love to do. Therefore the new covenant is called the "law of liberty." Jas. 1:25. 2:12. The precept to

"love your neighbor," etc., is called "the royal law." Jas. 2:8. Though placed on record in the old law, it is really the law of king Jesus, and is fulfilled in his heavenly kingdom.

Since the law of God now in force is love, the possession of the law is that of an inward moral state. Here we see why the Spirit of God convicts sinners by this law, and not by the law of outward works. If by the latter, it could only lead to outward reformation. But the Spirit convicting sinners of their wretched sinful state, as well as of their evil doings, repentance toward God, and faith in our Lord Jesus, results in a new creature, a radical change of inward condition, followed by a change of outward works. Having the law of the Lord, which convicts the sinner in the sight of God, as soon as he looks upon a woman with a lustful eye and mind, there is no need of the old law, which only condemned the overt act? Surely not. So every precept of the decalogue is superseded by the more perfect law of Christ. And yet the law teachers, in the face of Christ's own word, have the audacity to tell the people that if the decalogue is abolished, then it is no sin to murder, commit adultery, etc. Any reasonable sinner can understand that the abrogation of the law which says, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," does not give license to commit that abomination, since the higher law of Christ now in force makes even the look of lust the commission of that sin in the heart.

Does the abrogation of the law against false swearing, give license to do so under the law of Christ, which says, "Swear not at all?" Yet such is the deceptive and ungodly teaching of Advent lecturers, by which they blind the minds and deceive the souls of the unwary. In a sly way they endeavor to create the idea that Christ gave no laws while here on earth; and then reason that the abrogation of the law which came by Moses would leave no restraint against sin and crime.

We repeat, the ten commandments were chiefly a civil code, the object of which was to hold in check the commission of outward transgression, while "grace and truth," stand against all unholy outward acts, and also change the moral condition, and implant righteousness in the heart, which the law could not do.

The law made nothing perfect, the bringing in of a better hope — Christ's law — did.

"The law was not made for a righteous man." The New Testament is

the law of the pure in heart.

The law "was weak and unprofitable," "the gospel is the power of God unto salvation."

The ten commandments never enjoined love. The new covenant is love.

The law written on stone was the "ministration of death." The new covenant is "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus."

Chapter 12.

Was the Seventh-Day Sabbath Repealable?

By reading Rom. 2:12, 14-16, it is seen that there are two kinds of precepts: those that exist in man's consciousness, independent of law to enforce them, and those duties that are wholly created by the code that enjoins them. The former are commanded because they are inherent principles of right; the latter are only right because they are commanded. The former are unchangeable, the latter rest wholly on the will of the lawgiver, and may be changed whenever his wisdom dictates. The law stamped by the Creator upon our inner being, is that which Paul says we "establish by faith." Therefore, with the exceptions of the few positive monumental ordinances of the New Testament, it is simply the re-impress of that holy law of our being which was stamped upon us by the Creator, and which was partly obscured by sin; but is fully restored to the soul in entire sanctification. Heb. 10:14, 15. While the written New Testament is a duplicate copy of the same perfect law. The passage in Rom. 13:9 asserts that there is nothing of the law system carried over into the new covenant, but that which love itself dictates; that which existed as a principle of right back of all outward legislation. Now the question to be settled and upon which the perpetuity of the seventh-day Sabbath depends is this, Was that institution written in man's inward conscience? or was it wholly the product of positive legislation? If the former, it remains unchangeable. If the latter, it has passed away. We shall now prove that that seventh-day Sabbath was created wholly by legislation; belonged to the monumental and shadowy rites of the Jews' religion; was for a temporary purpose, and was therefore, repealable, and actually was abolished.

First, we prove that its object was to serve as a sign between God and

the Israelite nation. "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak thou also unto the children of Israel, saying, Verily my Sabbaths ye shall keep: for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you.

Ye shall keep the Sabbath therefore; for it is holy unto you: every one that defileth it shall surely be put to death: for whosoever doeth any work therein, that soul shall be cut off from among his people. Six days may work be done; but in the seventh is the Sabbath of rest, holy to the Lord: whosoever doeth any work in the Sabbath day, he shall surely be put to death.

Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant. It is a sign between me and the children of Israel forever." Ex. 31:12-17.

Here we are twice told that the Sabbath of the law was a sign between God and the Jewish nation throughout their generations. It is strictly confined to them, and there is not a word that indicates God would ever make it anything else but a national statute in Israel. A sign of the redemption of that nation from Egyptian bondage. For that deliverance is called a redemption in Ex. 15:12, 13. We have positive proof that the Sabbath was instituted to commemorate that event. After repeating the command to keep the seventh day, thus we read, "And remember that thou was 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. 5:15. Can any thing be more plain? The Sabbath was given as a remembrancer to the Jews; a monument of their bondage in a strange land, and God's deliverance therefrom. To deny this is to dispute the Bible. But if that be the object of that rest day, no one else has any thing to do with it, nor it with them. In Neh. 9:9-14, this redemption out of the land of bondage, and the Sabbath, as a sign and monument of the same are again seen coupled together.

Now let us show you a parallel sign, or monument of the same redemption from bondage. "Unleavened bread shall be eaten seven days; and there shall no leavened bread be seen with thee, neither shall there be leaven seen with thee in all thy quarters.

And thou shalt shew thy son in that day, saying, This is done because

of that which the Lord did unto me when I came forth out of Egypt. And it shall be for a sign unto thee upon thine hand and for a memorial between thine eyes, that the Lord's law may be in thy mouth: for with a strong hand hath the Lord brought thee out of Egypt." Ex. 13:7-9. The passover was instituted for a "sign," a "memorial" of the deliverance of Israel out of Egypt. And we have seen that the Sabbath was given expressly for the same object, and to the same people, throughout their generations. If, therefore, the passover feast belonged only to the Jewish rites, so did the Sabbath. If the passover feast is abolished, and no one denies it, so is its like sign, the Jewish Sabbath. These conclusions cannot be gainsayed.

That the Sabbath was a sign of redemption out of Egypt we again prove in Eze. 20:10, 12, as follows: "Wherefore I caused them to go forth out of the land of Egypt, and brought them into the wilderness.

Moreover also I gave them my Sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them."

Here we have again the redemption out of Egypt followed by the Sabbath as a sign or monument of that deliverance. "A sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them." Namely, separated them from the heathen among whom they were in bondage. How could that Sabbath have been designed for all nations which was given expressly as a sign or mark of separation of the Jews from all other nations? In fact it could not be universal and at the same time the peculiar badge of one nation. We leave it classified just where the Bible places it, among the signs and rites of the Jews, and as such it has passed away. But says the Saturday keeper, That Sabbath must yet be in force because God said, "The children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations for a perpetual covenant," and "It is a sign between me and the children of Israel forever." Ex. 31:16, 17. While the word forever, speaking of spiritual things, and of future destinies, etc. means unending, it is also used in speaking of laws, as something in continuous force, a standing law, or permanent statute. In such case it indicates a law unchangeable and irrevocable while the system lasts of which it is a part. This we shall now prove by the Bible. When the passover was first instituted in Egypt, God said, "Ye shall observe this thing for an ordinance to thee and to thy sons for ever." Ex. 12:24. After giving directions for the use

of olive oil in the lamps of the tabernacle, we read, "It shall be a statute forever unto their generation." Ex. 27:21. Following directions for the high-priestly garments that Aaron and his sons were to wear in their ministration, it is written, "It shall be a statute for ever unto him and his seed after him." Ex. 28:43. And the same thing is affirmed of nearly every ceremonial precept of the law. So then the Sabbath was to be a "sign for ever," just as the passover, and other types and shadows were. They have passed away long ago; so also has that Sabbath. The Bible leaves no peg upon which to hang its perpetuity.

As we have proved that both the passover and the law Sabbath were signs and memorials of the deliverance of the children of Israel out of Egypt, and from the slaying angel, we shall now prove that the latter as well as the former, was a type and shadow of things to come in the dispensation of Christ. That the passover pointed back to Egypt, and also cast its shadow forward to Christ upon the cross, all see and admit. So was the Sabbath a sign of things past and things to come. The very fact that it commemorated the exod from Egypt makes it a type of our redemption, because that deliverance sustains a typical relation to our salvation from the bondage of sin.

"And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses; blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross." Col. 2:13, 14.

The law expired with Christ upon the cross, with all its ordinances and shadowing rites. "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days: which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ." Col. 2:16, 17. Let no man judge you by the laws of that code which had served its time and purpose, and vanished away. The laws respecting meats and drinks are no longer to be bound upon our conscience. Neither "holy day," law-feast days, etc., nor yet monthly feasts determined by the moon; yea, and let no man judge you of the Sabbath days. These Sabbath days cannot be specially referred to annual or monthly Sabbaths, for such are included in the former specifications. They must therefore have special reference to the round of weekly Sabbath. But should the word be applied to law Sabbaths in general, it

would none the less certainly include the seventh day. Let no man judge you therefore for the non-observance of any Sabbath of the law. They are all nailed to the cross and taken away. The Sabbath was a "shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ." That is, it had typical reference to things "of Christ." So we see the Sabbath was an exact parallel with the passover. Both were signs between God and the Jews; both were memorials of the deliverance out of Egypt; both pointed forward to Christ; and both have met their antitype and passed away. The former foreshadowed the offering of the body of Christ upon the cross. Of what was the second a shadow? Its distinguishing feature was rest, absolute cessation from labor. And just as certainly as "Christ our passover is sacrificed for us," Christ is our rest. Hear his gracious words: "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest," "and ye shall find rest for your souls." Mat. 11:28, 29. This beautiful rest in Christ will be more fully considered farther on. There is scarcely an item in the entire law system that does not shadow some fact in the plan of salvation. Christ is our rest, but there is something significant in that rigid law of the Sabbath. "Thou shalt do no work at all therein." "For whosoever doeth any work therein, that soul shall be cut off from among his people." "He shall surely be put to death." Ex. 31:14, 15. Is it not strange that God would issue such a law? What pleasure could the Almighty take in such a rigorous prohibition, exposing them to temptation, and consequent loss of life, as the mere result of gathering a little fuel and making a fire? Ah, like many other laws of that penal code, this was chiefly justified because of the intense spiritual lesson it was designed to teach. Here is the great truth impressed by it. As natural death was the penalty of doing any work on that day, so spiritual death results from any works that we attempt to bring forward as a ground of justification in the sight of God. For the spiritual interpretation of the Sabbath law read these words: "Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay: but by the law of faith.

Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." Rom. 3:27, 28.

"But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness.

Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom

God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered." Rom. 4:5-7.

Just as peremptorily as all works were excluded on that Sabbath, so must men utterly cease from their own works in taking Christ our rest. The law said, Do no work, but rest and live. The gospel says, Believe in God, without bringing a single meritorious work, and in Christ you shall find rest, and your soul shall live. And even more certain than the penalty of death for Sabbath work, is death to the soul that would seek or maintain justification before God on the ground of good works.

Yes, "the Sabbath days; which are a shadow of things to come; but the body (the substance) is of Christ." This inspired testimony is true. The Sabbath was a striking shadow of a condition in our salvation, and with all other types and shadows, passed away, when the type met its antitype; when Christ our salvation appeared.

Under this head, the Sabbath repealable, we now, by the weapons of truth attack and demolish one of the strongholds of the law-wrangling sect. That is, the relation of the Sabbath to creation. "It is a sign between me and the children of Israel forever: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested, and was refreshed." Ex. 31:17, Along with the other memorial and typical elements of that institution, it was commemorative of the work of creation. Upon this fact they base an argument that it was universal for all mankind. But we accept the uniform statements of Jehovah that he gave that Sabbath law exclusively to the Israelites through their generations, as an all-sufficient refutation of this argument. Again they tell us the Sabbath being commemorative of creation proves it unchangeable. They quote Alex. Campbell as saying that before God could change the day of the Sabbath he would have to make a new creation. Such talk is very natural, and doubtless very plausible with the wisdom of this world. Hut to the spiritual it only betrays their spiritual ignorance. Salvation would reveal to such reasoners that a "new creation," has indeed taken place. Accordingly we read, "The first man Adam was made a living soul, the last Adam was made a quickening spirit." "The first man is of the earth, earthly; the second man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthly such are they also that are earthly; as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly." 1 Cor. 15:45, 47, 48.

Two Adams suggest a new creation. The first man Adam was the

head of the original creation of God: but falling into sin, his race became "earthly," and disqualified for the lofty end of their existence. But in due time appears another, an "heavenly" Adam, a "quickening spirit," the lifegiving power of God. He defeats Satan and sin, and works a new creation. As the first Adam stands at the head of the spoiled creation, the second Adam heads a new creation. "And as is the heavenly, [second Adam] such are they also that are heavenly." All in this new creation are of heavenly character.

How came we into the creation headed by the first Adam? By natural birth. How do we enter the new and heavenly race? By being "born again." "Marvel not that I say unto thee, Ye must be born again." This was an incomprehensible mystery to Nicodemus, and is not better known by the earthly to day. The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, neither can he know them." Jesus confessed that the disciples had "followed him in the regeneration." Mat. 19:28. And John testifies that "as many as received him," "were born *** of God." 1 Jno. 1:12, 13. "Being born again," is the testimony of 1 Pet. 1:23. John gives us the heavenly character of all who are thus inducted into the new creation. "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God." 1 Jno. 3:9. Lest some might conclude that John had drawn the standard too high he repeats with an emphasized assurance, "We know that whosoever is born of God sinneth not; but he that is begotten of God keepeth himself, and that wicked one toucheth him not." 1 Jno. 5:18.

Comparing their own lives with this standard, the Adventists, Russelites, and other modern pharisees and Sadducees, found themselves far beneath it. Therefore they have concluded and do teach that only spiritual conception takes place, and in the resurrection, or in some event of the future the birth will take place. This is another new doctrine of devils. Both John and Peter in the above testify that the birth had taken place in all who believed in Christ.

"Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of firstfruits of his creatures." Jas. 1:18.

The apostles having been begotten of God, were a kind of firstfruits of his creatures. First in the new creation.

"Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away: behold, all things are become new. And all things are

of God." 1 Cor. 5:17, 18. Five different translations render, "If any one is in Christ, he is a *new creation*" "So that if any one be in Christ there is a *new creation*."

A wonderful fact. And as God created the physical world himself, without the aid of creatures, so we are told in "the new creation," "And all things are of God." "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works." Eph. 2:10. God first created man in his own image. And "the new man which is after God — after the pattern of his moral image — is again created in righteousness and true holiness." Eph. 4:24. In Col. 3:10, we are plainly told that the new creation restores the soul to the image of the Creator. "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature." Gal. 6:15 By seven translations it is very properly translated: "*A new creation*." If, therefore, the seventh day was appointed to commemorate the first creation which was wrecked in sin, it is very natural that we should expect a new Sabbath to commemorate the new creation in Christ. In many places redemption is compared to the creation. Take, for instance, the creation of light. "For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." 2 Cor. 4:6. They who are of the first Adam are earthly, they of the second Adam are heavenly. The law, including the seventh day, was not given for the righteous, but for the ungodly, the earthly. Will God translate us from the earthly into the heavenly and yet leave us under the Sabbath that was made for the earthly? How utterly ridiculous the idea that the second Adam should come into this sin-lost world, start a new creation, and leave us under a Sabbath that identifies us with the fallen Adam and the world that lieth in iniquity, and not give us a new Sabbath that shows our proper relation to the second Adam, that acknowledges and memorializes the glorious new creation, the redemption of our souls, a spiritual sabbath for the "spiritual house" of God. Since, therefore, the seventh day was partly enacted to celebrate the creation, and it is a fact that God has wrought a new creation in Christ, these things instead of perpetuating the former Sabbath, furnish strong evidence that a new Sabbath has been given in honor of Him who sits upon the throne and saith, "I make all things new."

Behold the striking analogy! When God completed the work of

creation "he rested from his labors, and was refreshed." And 2500 years later, when he saw fit to command a day of utter abstinence from labor, he chose that day which commemorated the finishing of creation, so that in its observance the children of Israel not only commemorated the miraculous hand of God which had brought them out of Egypt, but also kept before their eyes the fact that God is the Creator of all things. Such a remembrancer was needed by a people only born after the flesh, and who were soon to enter a land flooded with gross idolatry, where God was not known as the Creator. But how ridiculous the idea that redeemed and illuminated Christians, who know God, even the one true and living God, need a Sabbath to keep them from deifying some other object besides the Creator!

There is a beautiful agreement between the institution of the Sabbath of the old creation, and that of the new. God finished the work of creation, then rested and the day was made a memorial of that finished work. Jesus Christ, the second Adam, step by step filled the types, and wrought the work of redemption. And by his death and resurrection he met the last great conditions on his part of perfect salvation, and finished his work. Then he rested from all his work, and the same day became from that time forth the day of rest and spiritual devotion to God, in commemoration of the finished "new creation," just as the seventh day had celebrated the finishing of the old creation. This we shall prove by the Word and by ancient history.

The seventh-day Sabbath, therefore, embodied no element that made it unchangeable and unrepeatable. It was a positive statute, created wholly by the decree of the divine Lawgiver, and was therefore subject to removal by his decree, when, with the rest of the code in which it was embodied it had served its time and object; and when God moved forward in the order of his plan, and the new dispensation and creation sprang forth.

It was a sign that God had sanctified Israel, that is, separated them from the heathen nations; and it came to an end when in his justly provoked wrath they were dispersed again among all nations.

It was a sign or memorial of that nation's deliverance out of Egypt, and it passed away when that nation forfeited their place as the chosen people of God.

It was a shadow of things to come and was nailed to the cross with

all the shadows and types.

It was a memorial of creation, and was superseded by the day chosen of God to commemorate the "new creation."

It was a part of the covenant written on stone, and the New Testament teaches in the most positive manner, and by a large number of passages, that that covenant was abolished, that Christ himself, the mediator of the New Testament, took away the first that he might establish the second. Therefore it was not only repealable, but actually was repealed by authority of Him who has all power in heaven and earth, and in so doing he showed that he is "lord of the Sabbath also."

And should any law teacher attempt to argue that the Sabbath of the Jews survived that Sinaitic law because it was introduced before the general giving of the law, as seen in Ex. 16, we answer, so was the passover instituted prior to the ministration of the law on Sinai, even before Israel came out of Egypt, see Ex, 12, and yet it passed away with the death of the first covenant and its shadows. It, and its sister "sign," the Sabbath, were both incorporated in the law system when given on Sinai, and both passed away with it. The old Sabbath is then dead and gone. And is there any occasion for mourning over its decease? Have we lost any thing in the death and decay of the old covenant, since Christ is the "Mediator of a better covenant established upon better promises?" Is there anything mournful in the death of that "wherein we — the Jews — were held," since married to Christ?

There was a woman bound to a husband who continually stood watching her with his hands full of rocks threatening to stone her to death as certain as she violated his orders. Do you think there was much love and happiness in such a union? But it came to pass that the man died, and fortunately the woman has become married to another, to one who is all love: and though he also requires perfect obedience, he is such a fountain of love and virtue, that his ecstatic embraces remove from her heart and will all inclinations of insubjection, and infuses a rapturous delight in doing all his will; so that all is a love service of joyful freedom. Do you see any good reason for gloomy crape, or sackcloth of mourning upon that woman's person? Surely not. Well that first husband was the law, the seventh-day Sabbath: that woman the Jews who were under his "yoke of bondage." The second husband is Christ. Reader, this is no tale but the very thing recorded in Rom. 7:1-7. "Wherefore, my

brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead." Yea, "Now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held."

Those desiring to be teachers of the law, now tell us that "we are not under the law only in the sense that we obey the law, and therefore do not come under its condemnation." How directly this conflicts with the word of God! It teaches that we are "not under the law," and are "delivered from the law," just as a woman is no longer under the obligations of the marriage covenant after her husband is dead. The law that bound her in obedience has passed away. "She is freed from that law." His lips are silent. He issues no commands; she obeys none from him. Thus by the plain illustration God teaches us that the converted Jew is not under the law in the sense that he no longer obeys it. Rut the false teacher says that both Jews and Gentiles are not under the law, in the sense they must all obey it. No wonder Paul pronounced the curse of God upon all such.

Chapter 13.

The New Testament Sabbath.

The "laws," "testimonies," and "Sabbaths" of the Old Testament having finished their course and passed away, we now turn to the New Testament to find what is therein enjoined respecting the keeping of sacred days. Though John, the forerunner of Christ, and the Savior himself, were born under the law, and doubtless kept it in the main, until it ended at the cross, they never commanded their disciples to keep the seventh-day Sabbath. Neither did one of the apostles of the Lamb, who were inspired by the Holy Spirit to deliver the law of the Lord to the church, ever in a single instance, enjoin upon the church of God the keeping of the old Sabbath. There is absolutely not one passage from the first of Matthew to the last word of Revelation, re-enacting and enforcing the Sabbath of the former covenant as a law of the New. And from the crucifixion of Christ, when the first covenant, with all its handwriting of ordinances; "meats," "drinks," "holy days," "new moon," and "Sabbath days" were "nailed to the cross" and "blotted out," — Col. 2:14,16 — to the last writing of the New Testament,

there is not a single example of the church of God using the seventh day as a day of assembly for worship, a day of rest, or in any way as a day sacred to the church. In the inspired history of the church, covering a period of 63 years, from A. D. 33 to A. D. 96, not one mention is made of the observance of the seventh day by the church of the new dispensation. We ask, in all candor and reason, does not this show that what the apostles taught in word, i.e. that that law with its Sabbath had passed away, they also carried out in practice? But what do we find in the New Testament?

Chapter 14.

"Another Day."

The epistle to the Hebrews is a sublime treatise upon entire sanctification or perfection. And, being addressed to Hebrew Christians, it is confined to arguments drawn from the law system. It is a very thorough comparison of the elements of the two dispensation. Of their respective mediators, covenants, laws, sacrifices, purifications, priests, sanctuaries, promises. And in chapter 4 there is reference made to the old and the new Sabbath, and that with which the former stood in typical relation.

In chapters 3 and 4 the apostle draws an analogy between Israel in the wilderness and disciples not yet fully saved; also between Canaan and the spiritual rest "we which have believed do enter into." Of this rest the apostle tell us, the seventh-day Sabbath was a type. "For he spake in a certain place of the seventh day on this wise, And God did rest the seventh day from all his works. And in this place again, If they shall enter into my rest." Heb. 4:4, 5. Immediately after speaking of the seventh day a rest is spoken of which was to be entered; showing conclusively that the seventh day was typical of that rest. Hence, here again the law Sabbath is placed among the types and shadows, which have been fulfilled and passed away. The antitype was twofold; first, literal Canaan, which the first generation of Israel did not enter because of unbelief; second, and more especially, the spiritual Canaan, which is Christ himself, our sanctification, into which "we that have believed do enter." As the Israelites in the wilderness refused to obey God and enter Canaan, so also that nation in general rejected Christ, who is our peace;

these two events being analogous. The Lord God had promised to give Israel "rest from all their enemies round about in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee for an inheritance." Deut. 25:19. To this rest the Sabbath given them in the wilderness looked forward. And how perfectly all typified the complete redemption we have in Christ Jesus! So it was interpreted by the Holy Spirit, speaking in Zacharias. Luke 1:67-75. God had "raised up an horn of salvation for us." "That we might be saved from our enemies," and "might serve him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him all the days of our life." It is a fact that salvation only destroys our spiritual or inward enemies: and they only prevent us from serving God in holiness. So in the fulness of Christ we find our Canaan rest from all our enemies, our spiritual "inheritance among them that are sanctified by faith that is in Christ Jesus." Acts 20:32. 26:18. Eph. 1:11. Col. 1:12. How strong the figure! The Canaanites had been bred and born in the land, and yet the decree of heaven was they must all be put to death, utterly exterminated. So the various bents of evil, pride, covetousness, etc. are born in us, but Christ condemns sin in the flesh, and "destroys the works of the devil out of us; leaving not one enemy lurking in the walls of "man's soul."

"He spake in a certain place of the seventh day on this wise, And God did rest the seventh day from all his works." Heb. 4:4. "Again, he limiteth a certain day, saying in David, To day, after so long a time; as it is said, To day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts." Ver. 7. The *Emphatic Diaglott* renders, "He again defines a certain day." "Defineth a certain day." — *New Version*. "Again he limits a certain day." — *Bible Union*. "Again determineth a certain day." — *Doddridge*. "Again he marks cut a certain day." — *Rotherham*. "He again fixeth a certain day." — *Conybeare and Howson*. "Again he delemines a certain day." — *Anderson*. "Again a certain day he determines." — *Classic Tran*. "He again determinately pointed out a day." — *Thomson*. "Again he designates or definitely names a certain day." — *Stewart*. Here it is declared that God definitely enacted and pointed out "another day," in the place of the seventh day already spoken of. "Saying in David, To day, after so long a time; as it is said, To day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts." The passage is quoted from Psalms 95:7, 8. It refers to the first day of the week in which the gospel has been regularly preached from the time of the resurrection

until now. It has been the great day of convocation to hear the gospel in all nations. The day when hearing the voice of God, men must either obey or harden their hearts by disobedience. But he makes this still plainer in verses 8 and 9. "For if Jesus had given them rest, then would he not afterward have spoken of another day. There remaineth therefore a rest to the people of God." Remember that in verses 4 and 5 he speaks of the "seventh day," and of a "rest." The Jewish Sabbath and the Canaan and spiritual rests it typified. Now if he were going to speak of some other rest, he would have said, "again he fixed a certain rest," "another rest." But it is very clear that he was speaking of something that took the place of the "seventh day," hence, in contradistinction of that "seventh day," he "marks out a certain day," "another day." And that he refers to another Sabbath succeeding the seventh day, is further proved beyond the shadow of a doubt in verse 9. "There remaineth therefore — because of the other day spoken of — a rest to the people of God." But for a correct rendering see the margin, "There remaineth a keeping of a Sabbath to the people of God." Though the first covenant with its Sabbath was taken away by Christ, and the Jewish nation has dispersed and fallen into darkness, we are not left without a Sabbath under the new covenant; but there still "remains the keeping of a Sabbath." First the "seventh day," then "another day," namely, "the keeping of a Sabbath." The word is not *Katapausis*, rest, but *Sabbatismos*, Sabbath. Rendered in the Interlinear Classic version, "Then remains a Sabbatism to the people of God." "There remaineth therefore a Sabbath rest for the people of God." — *A Layman*.

"There is then a Sabbath rest left for the people of God." — *Thomas*.

"Hence there is being left over a Sabbath-keeping for the people of God." — *Kotherham*.

It is rendered similarly by other versions. The language does not refer to a rest state, but an institution of the present law of the Lord. Not a spiritual attainment, but an actual "Sabbath keeping," or "the keeping of a Sabbath." Thus M. Stewart on the word *Sabbatismos*, "rest, Sabbatism, holy, religious, spiritual rest," "means Sabbath by way of eminence, seems to be a word coined by the writer purposely for the occasion, and is very appropriate to his design. The regular word for Sabbath is *Sabbaton*, but here, speaking of the new pre-eminently spiritual and religious Sabbath that has succeeded the seventh day, the

apostle employs *Sabbatismos*. How remarkably the words of Stewart describe the Christian Sabbath! The seventh day was a national institution whose only law and distinct feature was that there be n labor thereon; whereas the Christian Sabbath under the leading of the Spirit is wholly devoted to divine worship; and the idea of abstinence from labor is secondary, or for the sake of the former.

"For he that is entered into his rest, he also hath ceased from his own works, as God did from his." Heb. 4:10.

While speaking of this Sabbath that remains since the shadowy Sabbath has passed away, and especially since perfection is the real thread that runs through this epistle, the subject of the same, it is natural the writer would speak of this Canaan rest into which we have entered. As God ceased from all his works and rested, so we ceased from all our works and by faith entered into perfect soul rest: the antitype of both the Jewish Sabbath and of Canaan. Many ignorantly suppose this rest alludes to heaven, or a millennium. Hut he that has entered knows its meaning. It is not found in conversion, because the Hebrew Christiana had been converted, Heb. 3:1. 12:22-24, and yet they were urged on to this rest. 4:1. 6:1, 11, 12. Neither was it to be deferred to a future state, "for we which have believed do enter into rest." It lies between conversion and the future world, and is entered by faith.

"Another day" is called "the keeping of a Sabbath" in the gospel dispensation. And as we proceed we shall see that it is both called the "Lord's day" and the Sabbath, and that it was the first day of the week.

Chapter 15.

"The Lord's Day."

While an exile on the "isle called Patmos, for the word of God and for the testimony of Jesus," John the beloved apostle informs us, saying, "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day." Rev. 1:10.

It is true, this is the only instance of such language in the New Testament history, yet it is an important link combining inspired and uninspired history. Passing just beyond the writers of the New Testament to that of the early church fathers we have abundance of clear testimony that the first day of the week was observed as the Christian Sabbath and called the "Lord's day" in honor of the Lord Jesus, and his

resurrection. Therefore this one scripture instance, corroborated by the strong array of genuine early history makes a clear chain of evidence. It must be apparent to all that John referred to a sacred day that was peculiar to the new dispensation of the Lord Jesus Christ. Never between the lids of the Bible is the law Sabbath called "the Lord's day." The only reason for the introduction of a new phrase here, is the fact that a new Sabbath had appeared. A Sabbath memorial of the Lord Jesus, the author of the "new creation." John speaks of that day in a familiar way, by which we see that it was well known in his day by that name.

Though we shall prove to the satisfaction of all fair minds by the scriptures that the first day of the week is the Christian Sabbath, having now introduced the "Lord's day" by the last inspired writer, we deem it proper to follow him with the testimony of early history.

Chapter 16.

"The Lord's Day" in History.

We begin with the testimony of Justin Martyr. He was born about the close of the first, or the beginning of the second century. His first defence of the Christian religion is addressed to the emperor Antoninus Verus. In the introduction to his writings in the *Anti-Nicene library*, the writer says, "The first class embraces those which are *unquestionably genuine*; viz., the *two apologies*, and the *Dialogue with Trypho*"

In Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History, which is the first historic work written after the close of the inspired records, is found a statement of the books of Justin that had come down to Eusebius' time. Says the historian - book 4, chap. 18 — "Another work comprising a defence of our faith, which he addressed to the emperor of the same name, Antoninus Verus." Here the genuineness of this work of Justin is established beyond the shadow of a doubt.

"Before his conversion to God he studied in the schools of philosophy."

"The writings of Justin Martyr are among the most important that have come down to us from the second century." *Anti-Nicene library*.

He speaks to us from the first half of the second century. We quote from his first defence or apology, which we have seen is acknowledged

by Eusebius' Ancient History. The head of this article is, chap. 67,

"THE WEEKLY WORSHIP OF THE CHRISTIANS."

"And on the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gather together to one place and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read as long as time permits.

And they who are well to do, and willing, give what each thinks fit: and what is collected is deposited with the president, who succors the orphans and widows, and those, who through sickness or any other cause, are in want, and those who are in bonds, and the strangers sojourning among us, and in a word takes care of all who are in need. BUT SUNDAY IS THE DAY ON WHICH WE ALL HOLD OUR COMMON ASSEMBLY, because it is the first on which God, having wrought a change in the darkness and matter, made the world; and Jesus Christ our Savior on the same day rose from the dead. For he was crucified on the day before that of Saturn (Saturday), and on the day after that of Saturn, which is the day of the Sun, having appeared to his apostles and disciples, he taught them these things, which we have submitted to you also for your consideration." You perceive that Justin describes the weekly worship of the early church just as Paul directed, on Sunday or the first Sabbath, in 1 Cor. 16. Our next quotation is from his Dialogue with Trypho. Of the genuineness of this work we again have the most positive historic evidence. Eusebius, book 4, chapter 18, says, "He — Justin — also wrote a dialogue against the Jews which he held at Ephesus with Trypho, the most distinguished among the Hebrews of the day."

In such a disputation would very naturally be brought out the very points at issue between Jews and Christians then, and between Christians and all who now occupy common ground with the Jews. In other words, if the early Christians kept the old law, or any part of it, that would be urged by them as a means of procuring respect for, and confidence in the Christian system from Jewish quarters. On the other hand, if the primitive Christians utterly discarded the whole Sinaitic law and the seventh-day Sabbath, then we might expect Jewish prejudices arising therefrom, and the Christians put to the necessity of giving their reasons for abandoning that ancient law and Sabbath. Hence this discussion between Justin, an eminent Christian and philosopher, and Trypho, a learned Jew, is of important service to us, on all points of

difference between Christians and Jews. And we will find that it contains in abundance the very matter we have anticipated. We first quote from

"Chap. 10. — Trypho blames the Christians for this alone — the non-observance of the law."

"And when they ceased, I again addressed them thus: Is there any other matter, my friends, in which we are blamed, than this, that we live not after the law, and we are not circumcised in the flesh as your forefathers were, and *do not observe Sabbaths as ye do?*"

To which Trypho replies as follows:

"I am aware that your precepts in the so-called gospel are so wonderful and so great, that I suspect no one can keep them; for I have carefully read them. But this is what we are most at a loss about: that you, professing to be pious, and supposing yourselves better than others, are not in any particular separated from them, and do not alter your mode of living from the nations, in that you observe no festivals or Sabbaths, and do not have the rite of circumcision; and further, resting your hopes on a man that was crucified, you yet expect to obtain some good thing from God while you do not obey his commandments."

Trypho had read the precepts of the gospel. He was not quite so law-blinded as modern law teachers. He could see precepts in the gospel. He saw that Christ had given a new law, and it impressed his mind as "wonderful and great." That is very high and pure, "so great that I suspect no man can keep it." He saw the truth, but knew not that "grace and truth" came together. Observe also that Trypho viewed the law Sabbath in the light the Bible places it; namely, as the badge of separation from all other nations, which, being rejected by Christians, he accuses them of not being separate from other nations. He accused Justin just as the Adventists now accuse Christians, i.e., for not obeying God's commandments. But in his charge that the Christians keep no Sabbath he misrepresents them, as Justin has already showed, and further maintains in his following speeches.

The next reply is headed as follows:

Chap. 11. — "The law abrogated: the New Testament promised and given by Cod."

"There will be no other God, O Trypho, nor was there from eternity any other existing, but he who made and disposed all this universe. * *

* But we do not trust through Moses, or through the law; for then we would do the same as yourselves. But now, for I have read that there shall be a final law and a covenant, the chiefest of all, which it is now incumbent on all men to observe, as many as are looking after the inheritance of God. *For the law promulgated on Horeb is old, and belongs to yourselves alone;* But *this* is for all universally. Now, law placed against law *has abrogated that which is before it*, and a covenant which comes after in like manner has *put an end to the previous one* [is not this just what the word says. "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to all them that believe?"]; and an eternal and final law—namely, Christ — has been given to us and the covenant is trustworthy, after which there shall be no law, no commandment, no ordinance. Have you not read this which Isaiah says: 'Harken unto me, harken unto me. my people; and ye kings, give ear unto me: for a law shall go forth from me, and my judgment shall be for a light to the nations. My righteousness approaches swiftly, and my salvation shall go forth, and nations shall trust in mine arm.' And by Jeremiah concerning this same new covenant, he thus speaks: 'Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah; not according to the covenant which I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt.' If, therefore, God proclaimed a new covenant which was to be instituted, and this for a light of the nations, we see and are persuaded that men approach God, leaving their idols and other unrighteousness, through the name of him who was crucified, Jesus Christ, and abide by their confession even unto death, and maintain piety. Moreover, by the works and by the attendant miracles, it is possible for all to understand that he is the new law, and the new covenant, and the expectation of those who out of every people wait for the good things of God. For the true spiritual Israel and descendants of Judah, Jacob, Isaac, and Abraham (who in uncircumcision was approved of and blessed by God on account of his faith, and called the father of many nations) are we who have been led to God through this crucified Christ, as shall be demonstrated while we proceed."

Chap. 12. — "The Jews violate the eternal law and interpret ill that of Moses."

"I also adduced another passage in which Isaiah exclaims: " Hear my

words, and your soul shall live; and I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David. * * * This same law you have despised, and his holy covenant you have slighted; and now you neither receive it, nor repent of your evil deeds. For your ears are closed, your eyes are blinded, and the heart is hardened. Jeremiah has cried; yet not even then do you listen. The Lawgiver is present, yet you do not see him; to the poor the gospel is preached, the blind see, yet you do not understand. You have now need of a second circumcision, though you glory greatly in the flesh. The new law requires you to keep perpetual Sabbath, and you, because you are idle for one day, suppose you are pious, not discerning why this has been commanded you; and if you eat unleavened bread, you say the will of God has been fulfilled. The Lord our God does not take pleasure in such observances: if there is any perjured person or a thief among you, let him cease to be so; if any adulterer let him repent; then he has kept the sweet and true Sabbath of God. If any one has impure hands, let him wash and be pure."

We next quote from *Chap. 18*. — "*Christians would observe the law if they did not know why it was instituted.*"

"For we too would observe the fleshly circumcision and the Sabbaths, and in short all the feasts, if we did not know for what reason they were enjoined on you — namely, on account of your transgressions and the hardness of your hearts. For if we patiently endure all things contrived against us by wicked men and demons, so that even amid cruelties unutterable, death and torments, we pray for mercy to those who inflict such things upon us, and do not wish to give the least retort to any one, even as the new Lawgiver commanded us: how is it, Trypho, that we should not observe those rites which do not harm us — I speak of fleshly circumcision, and Sabbaths and feasts?"

"Therefore to you alone this circumcision was necessary, in order that the people may be no people, and the nation no nation; as also Hosea, one of the twelve prophets, declares. Moreover, all those righteous men already mentioned, though they kept no Sabbaths, were pleasing to God."

"And you were commanded to keep Sabbaths that you might retain the memorial of God."

The next chapter from which we quote is headed as follows: *Chap. 21*. — "*Sabbaths were instituted on account of the people's sins, and not*

for a work of righteousness."

"Moreover that God enjoined you to keep the Sabbath, and imposed on you other precepts for a sign, as I have already said, on account of your unrighteousness and that of your fathers."

"Wherefore I gave them also statutes which were not good, and judgments whereby they shall not live."

The next quotation is from *Chap. 23.* — "*The opinion of the Jews regarding the law does an injury to God.*"

"But if we do admit this, we shall be liable to fall into foolish opinions, as if it Were not the same God who existed in the times of Enoch and all the rest, who neither were circumcised after the flesh, nor observed Sabbaths, nor any other rites, seeing that Moses enjoined such observances; or that God has not wished each race of mankind continually to perform the same righteous actions: to admit which seems to be ridiculous and absurd. Therefore we must confess that he, who is ever the same, has commanded these and such like institutions on account of sinful men."

Dear reader, consider these things. The law teachers of our day tell us that the immutability God requires that the law given on Sinai must be the unchangeable standard of righteousness. But Justin reminds us that God counted the patriarchs righteous before the law was given on Sinai; and therefore if he afterward measured righteousness by the Sinaitic law, this would prove God changeable. So to make the Sinaitic code a standard of righteousness slanders the character of God. But just as the New Testament teaches, that righteousness is not by the law, Gal. 3:21, that Abraham, who lived before the law is set before us as the sample of our faith and righteousness, that he is indeed the father of the faithful, and all who believe in Christ are the seed of Abraham, see Rom. 4:3-22. Gal. 3:29, and all who seek to be righteous by the law fail to attain unto righteousness, Rom. 9:31. 10:3, we say, just as the New Testament rules out the law written on stone as a means to, or standard of righteousness, so does Justin. As the apostles teach us that the law was not given for righteous men, but for the ungodly, and because of transgressions, so Justin proves the unchangeableness of God by showing that his law of righteousness was substantially the same in holy men before Moses, and in the gospel dispensation, since the Mosaic system has passed away. And that the law was simply a

temporary code for the restraint of the wicked. Un e this head, "*The law was given by Moses on account of the hardness of their hearts,*" Justin says, "Until Moses, under whom your nation appeared unrighteous and ungrateful to God, making a calf in the wilderness: wherefore God, accomodated himself to that nation," — i.e., in giving them the law he did. Thus we see the immutability of God vindicated both by the scriptures and by the early writers of the church of God, by leaving the law code out of the question, and basing righteousness before and after it upon the same general principles. Even though Abraham was circumcised, the apostle is very particular to inform us that his righteousness, which is the same as ours, was that ascribed to him before he was circumcised. Rom. 4:9, 11

But let us continue to hear Justin. "Wherefore, Trypho, I will proclaim to you, and to those who wish to become proselyte, the divine message which I heard from that man. Do you sec that the elements are not idle and keep no Sabbaths? Remain as you were born. For if there was no need of circumcision before Abraham, or the observance of Sabbaths, or feasts and sacrifices before Moses, no more need is there of them now, after that, according to the will of God, Jesus Christ the Son of God has been born without sin, of a virgin springing from the stock of Abraham."

Observe that Justin always associates the Sabbath of the Jews with feasts, sacrifices, etc., the shadows or ceremonies of the law. Just so does St. Paul in Col. 2:14, 16, 17, where the apostle classifies it with meats and drinks, and tells us that persons converted from the Jews to Christ were as much at liberty to disregard the Sabbath of the abrogated code as its discrimination in meats. It is most always mentioned in the Old Testament with that class of precepts. Such as reverencing the sanctuary, Lev. 19:30, the celebration of national feasts, "Her feast days, her new moons and her Sabbaths, and all her solemn feasts." Hosea 2:11. In Eze. 45:17 it is associated with "burnt offerings, and meat offerings, and drink offerings, in the feasts, and in the new moons, and in the Sabbaths."

Observe again, Justin shows that the Sabbath of the law was out of harmony with the laws of nature. Hence, one of the "statutes he had given them that was not good, and judgments whereby they should not live." Eze. 20:25. The elements keep no Sabbath. To remain inactive a

whole day was contrary to nature; and yet to labor was death.

While the Lord's day is a day of rest from ordinary labor, it is, by the leading of the Spirit, a day of great activity in the vineyard of the Lord.

The next chapter from Justin is, *Chap. 24. — "The Christian circumcision far more excellent."*

"Now, sirs," I said, "it is possible for us to show how the eighth day possessed a certain mysterious import, which the seventh day did not possess, and which was promulgated by God through these rites. Hut lest I appear now to diverge to other subjects understand what I say: the blood of that circumcision is obsolete, and we trust in the blood of salvation; *there is now another covenant, and another law has gone forth from Zion.*"

The inference is clearly this, that in the new covenant and law of Christ the eighth day has taken the place of the seventh, as the Christian Sabbath.

Our next quotation is from *Chap. 43. — "He concludes that the law had an end in Christy."*

"As, then, circumcision began with Abraham, and the Sabbath and sacrifices and offerings and feasts with Moses, and it has been proved they were en-enjoined on account of the hardness of your people's hearts, so it was necessary in accordance with the Father's will, that they should have an end in him who was born of a virgin."

A question. *Chap. 47. "And Trypho again inquired, But if some one, knowing that this is so, after he recognizes that this man is Christ, and has believed in and obeys him, wishes, however, to observe these [institutions of the law], will he be saved?"*

"I said, in my opinion, Trypho, such an one will be saved, if he does not strive in every way to persuade other men * * * to observe the same things as himself."

Here we see again the very sentiment of the apostle. "Let not him that eateth not judge him that eateth," etc. "He that is weak eateth herbs." Just so, "One man esteemeth one day [of the law] above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every one be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it. He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks; and he that eateth

not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks." Rom. 14:6

How utterly different this sounds from the old Sabbath law. It imperatively commands abstinence from all labor on that day, under penalty of death, while the above gives liberty to "esteem every day alike," and allows every one to be "fully persuaded in his own mind," whether to regard one day more specially unto the Lord than another. Both he that does so, and he that does not are recognized as doing it unto the Lord; and accepted of him. Can any one imagine that the old "ministration of death," and "yoke of bondage," and this New Testament "law of liberty," can both blend into one system, and be in force at the same time? The old would be a cold grating discord in the government of this dispensation.

But let us return and read Justin's answer to the above question a little farther. He says, "But if some, through weak-mindedness, wish to observe such institutions as were given by Moses, for which they expect some virtue, but which we believe were appointed by reason of the hardness of the people's hearts, along with their hope in this Christ, and [wish to perform] the eternal and natural acts of righteousness and piety, yet choose to live with the Christians and the faithful, as I said before, not inducing them either to be circumcised like themselves, or to keep the Sabbath, or to observe any other such ceremonies, then I hold that we ought to join ourselves to such, and associate with them in all things as kinsmen and brethren."

Here Justin ascribed the disposition of persons to hold on to the old law, and observe the Sabbath, after professing faith in Christ, to ignorance. He also teaches that "eternal and natural" law of righteousness of which the apostle speaks in Romans, originally written in man's conscience, and perfectly covered by the law of Christ, whereas the law containing the Sabbath, is no part of that natural internal law of our moral being, but a temporary restraint against sin, occasioned by hardness of heart.

Again we observe that Justin expressed the very sentiments of the inspired apostle when he said that such may be saved, and should be received by the church, who, through ignorance, still held to the law, and kept that Sabbath, provided they also evinced the humble spirit of Christ, and did not seek to propagate their notions. "If he does not strive in every way to persuade other men" under the yoke of the law. This

answer of Justin leaves o hope for the Adventists, for they do the very thing he says they must not do. And, indeed, the very thing that brings them under the apostolic curse. Gal. 1:8, 9.

Here we leave Justin, having heard enough in his discussion with Trypho to strongly corroborate all that is said in the New Testament about the end of the old law and its Sabbath, and the fact that the first day of the week was the Lord's day, and Christian Sabbath.

We will now hear from an ancient witness by the name of Barnabas. Though this epistle is now generally believed not to have been written by Paul's companion in travel by that name, of its antiquity there is no room for doubt. It is spoken of by Clement of Alexandria. "Origen describes it as a 'Catholic epistle' and seems to rank it among the sacred scriptures. Other statements have been quoted from the fathers to show that they held this to be an authentic production of the apostle Barnabas, and certainly no other name is ever hinted at in Christian antiquity as that of the writer."

"The general opinion is, that its date is not later than the middle of the second century."

"Hilgenfield, who has devoted much attention to this epistle, holds that it was written at the close of the first century by a Gentile Christian of the school of Alexandria." — Introduction to Barnabas in the Anti-Nicene library. As to just what Barnabas was its author, and the exact time of the writing is quite immaterial. The fact is it was an early production, for it was spoken of and quoted by early writers, hence its testimony cannot be set aside. "We quote from chapter two under this head, *"The Jewish sacrifices are now abolished."* "Since, therefore, the days are evil, and Satan possesses the power of this world, we ought to give heed to ourselves, and diligently enquire into the ordinances of the Lord."

"Incense is a vain abomination unto me, and your new moons and Sabbaths I cannot endure. He has therefore abolished these things, that the new law of our Lord Jesus Christ which is without the yoke of necessity, might have a human oblation.

Next we quote from chapter fifteen, headed, *"The false and the true Sabbath."* They are thus described: "Further, also, it is written concerning the Sabbath in the decalogue which (the Lord) spake, face to face to Moses on mount Sinai, "And sanctify ye the Sabbath of the Lord

with clean hands and a pure heart." Further, he says to them, "Your new moons and your Sabbaths I cannot endure." Ye perceive how he speaks: Your present Sabbaths are not acceptable to me, but that is which I have made, — namely this — when giving rest to all things, I shall make a beginning of the eighth day, that is, a beginning of another world. Therefore, also, we keep the eighth day with joyfulness, the day also on which Jesus arose from the dead. And when he had manifested himself, he ascended into the heavens." *Apos. Fathers, page 127 and 128.* Then in that day there was a true Sabbath for Christians to observe, and another one, still kept by such as clung to the law, but which was a false one, not of the Christian dispensation. After naming the Jewish Sabbath, which was no longer acceptable to God, because its dispensation was past, he says, "but that is which I have made." Namely, that Sabbath, which is clearly pointed out "the eighth day." "Wherefore we keep the eighth day with joyfulness." Here we see the eighth, or the first day is called the Sabbath, and kept by the Christians at the close of the first century.

We next come to the writings of Ignatius. Whatever predictions of a later date may have been falsely ascribed to Ignatius, there are certain epistles of his that are certainly well authenticated. His epistle to the Magnesians and several others are quite universally received by critics as genuine. The following record we take from Eusebius' *Ancient History*, book 3, chapter 36: "Ignatius, also, who is celebrated by many even to this day, as the successor of Peter at Antioch, was the second that obtained the episcopal office there."

"When he came to Smyrna, where Polycarp was, [Polycarp was a convert by the apostle John] he wrote one epistle to the church of Ephesus; another also the church of Magnesia, in which he makes mention of Demas the bishop; another to the Trallians."

"After he left Smyrna he wrote an exhortation from Troas to those in Philadelphia."

Mention is also made of his epistle to the Romans and some others.

Here then we have impeachable proofs of the authenticity and genuineness of Ignatius' epistles to the Magnesians and Philadelphians, from which we will make extracts. All his epistles come down to us in two forms, embodying about the same matter, but the one is longer than the other, and is supposed to have been an interpolation of the shorter.

The latter therefore are the more pure and reliable. From the shorter form of his epistle to the Magnesians we make this brief extract.

"*Chap. 8. — Caution against false doctrines.*"

"He not deceived with strange doctrines, nor with old fables, which are unprofitable. For if we still live according to the Jewish law, we acknowledge that we have not received grace."

Again, "*Chap. 9. — Let us live with Christ.* If therefore those who were brought up in ancient order of things have come to the possession of a new hope, *no longer observing the Sabbath, but living in the observance of the Lords day*, on which also our life has sprung up again by him and by his death."

So for a Jew to be converted to Christ he was expected to leave the Sabbath of the Jews and observe the Lord's day, which marks the resurrection of Christ. And this voice comes down to us from the very time of the apostles. Ignatius is included among the contemporaries of the apostle in the "Anti-Nicene library." He succeeded Peter at Antioch, and history tells us he suffered martyrdom A. D. 107. We make one more extract from his epistle to the Philadelphians, shorter form, headed, "*Chap. 6. — Do not accept Judaism.*" "But if any preach the Jewish law unto you, listen not to him. For it us better to hearken to Christian doctrine."

"Flee therefore the wicked devices and snares of the prince of this world."

We come now to the testimony of Eusebius, who was born in Palestine A. D. 270, who is recognized as the father of ecclesiastical history. His collation and arrangements of ancient historic matter being the first of the kind that followed the inspired records. It has been preserved in various languages, and is a very valuable work. We quote from a version "from the accurate Greek text, published by Valesius, a learn civilian of the Gallican church." — *Bohn's edition.*

The following is from Eusebius' description of the Ebionites, book 3. chapter 27. "These are properly-called Ebionites by the ancients, as those who cherished law and mean opinions of Christ. For they considered him a plain and common man, and justified only by his advances in virtue, and that he was born of the Virgin Mary by natural generation. With them the observance of the law was altogether necessary, as if they could not be saved only by faith in Christ and a

corresponding life. * * * These indeed thought on the one hand that all the epistles of (Paul) the apostle ought to be rejected, calling him an apostate from the law: but on the other only using the gospel according to the Hebrews, they esteem the others as of but little value. They also observe the Sabbath and other discipline of the Jews just like them; but on the other hand, they also celebrate the Lord's days very much like us, in commemoration of his resurrection. Whence, in consequence of such a course, they have also received their epithet, the name of Ebionites, exhibiting the poverty of their intellect."

Here is plain and unmistakable evidence that the early Christians did not generally keep the Sabbath of the Jewish code, but that they observed the Lord's day which was the first day of the week, for it was observed in commemoration of his resurrection. Do you not see the perfect harmony of the New Testament scriptures and the early writers in the church of God?

Again we quote from book I, chapter 4: "Should any one, beginning from Abraham, and going back to the first man, pronounce those who have had the testimony of righteousness, Christians in fact, though not in name, he would not be far from the truth. For as the name Christian is intended to indicate this very idea, that a man, by the knowledge and doctrine of Christ, is distinguished by modesty and justice, by patience and a virtuous fortitude, and by a profession of piety towards the one and only true and supreme God; all this was no less studiously cultivated by them than by us. They did not, therefore, regard circumcision, nor observe the Sabbath, neither do we; neither do we abstain from certain foods, nor regard other injunctions which Moses subsequently delivered to be observed in types and symbol's, because such things as these do not belong to Christians."

Here we see, as well as from the still earlier writings of Justin, that it was understood by those ancients that the seventh-day Sabbath had never been given nor observed prior to Moses, and that it and the other shadowy rites of the Mosaic code have no place in the Christian system.

In book 4, chapter 23, speaking of a letter from Dionysius to the Romans, he says: "In this same letter he mentions that of Clement to the Corinthians, showing that it was the practice to read it in the churches, even from the earliest times. *To day,' says he, 'we have passed the

Lord's holy day, in which we have read your epistle.'" In this book, chapter 26, he speaks of a work written by Melito that was extant in his day, a discourse "*On the Lord's day*" So among the early Christians the Lord's day was held in much regard.

We quote once more from Eusebius. his commen upon the 92d Psalm. "The word [Christ] by the new covenant transferred the feast of the Sabbath to the morning light, and gave us the symbol of true rest, — *the saving Lord's day* — the first [day] of light in which the Savior obtained the victory over death, etc. On this day, which is the first of the light, and of the true Sun, we assemble after an interval of six days, and celebrate holy and spiritual Sabbath: even all nations redeemed by him throughout the world assemble, and do those things according to the spiritual law which were decreed for the priests to do on the Sabbath: all things which it was a duty to do on the Sabbath [i.e. the Jewish Sabbath], these we have transferred to the Lord's day, as more appropriately belonging to it, because it has the precedence, and is first in rank, and more honorable than the Jewish Sabbath. It is delivered to us that we should meet on this day, and it is evident that we should do these things announced in this Psalm." (Psa. 92.) — *Ancient Christianity Exemplified*, page 530, 531.

Here again we have recorded the ancient Sabbath in the church of God. "Even all nations redeemed by him throughout the world, assembled," on the Lord's day, the first day of the week. And that day had been delivered to the church to keep; it is therefore, a part of the "faith once for all delivered to the saints."

Says Lyman Coleman in his "*Ancient Christianity Exemplified*," "In common with the other apostles, this minister of the Gentiles [Paul] sanctioned the observance of the first day of the week, instead of the seventh, as the Christian Sabbath." "It is in reality the only sacred season of the Christian church." These statements he clearly sustains by early historic evidence. Passing by such records as we have already presented from the original books, we quote from Coleman these passages.

"Tertullian, at the close of the second century says, 'We celebrate Sunday as a joyful day.' "

"A true Christian, says Clement of Alexandria, contemporary with Tertullian, A. D. 180, according to the commands of the gospel,

observes the Lord's day by casting out all bad thoughts, and cherishing all goodness, honoring the resurrection of the Lord, which took place on that day." Again the same Clement, from *Stromati*, book 6, chapter 16: "The eighth day is properly the Sabbath, and the seventh a working day." — *The One Sabbath. Page 17.*

Origen (A. D. 184) says, "Leaving the Jewish ordinances let us see how the Sabbath ought to be kept by a Christian," and concludes by saying, "This is the observance of the Christian Sabbath." — *The One Sabbath. Page 17.*

The Jewish ordinances are here spoken of in contradistinction to the Christian Sabbath, they are therefore separate and distinct.

Hilary (A. D. 360) said, "On the Lord's day Christians enjoy the felicity of a perfect Sabbath." — *Prologue on Psalms in Sabbath Essays, page 222.*

We have heard the testimony of the leading fathers of the church from the apostles into the fourth century; let us hear a testimony from Leo the Great (not pope) of the fifth century.

"On this day the world had its origin. On the same day, through the resurrection of Christ, death came to an end, and life began. It was upon this day also that the apostles were commissioned by the Lord to preach the gospel to every creature, and to offer to all the world the blessings of salvation. On the same day came Christ into the midst of his disciples and breathed upon them, saying, 'Receive the Holy Ghost,' and finally on this day the Holy Ghost was shed forth upon the apostles. So that we see as it were an ordinance from heaven evidently set before us, showing that on this day, on which all the gifts of God's grace have been vouchsafed, we ought to celebrate the solemnities of Christian worship." — *Ancient Christianity, page 530.*

By Tertullian, who wrote in the latter half of the second century, the Christians are described as, "Putting off even their business on the Lord's day, lest they might give place to the devil." — *Chambers' Ency*
We take the following from the *Ency. Britannica* article on Sunday: "The fourth gospel describes a second appearance to his disciples as having occurred eight days afterward." John 20:26.

"Afterward, at all events, when Christians had been carried to other places, where from the nature of the case daily meetings for worship were impossible, *the first day of the week was every where set apart for*

this purpose. Thus Acts 20:7 shows that the disciples in Troas met weekly on the first day of the week for exhortation and the breaking of bread. 1 Cor. 16:2 implies at least some observance of the day; and the solemn commemorative character it had very early acquired is strikingly indicated by an incidental expression of the writer of the Apocalypse (1:10), who for the first time gives it that name (the Lord's day) *by which it is at most invariably referred to by all writers of the century immediately succeeding the apostolic times*. Among the indications of the nature and universality of its observance during this period may be mentioned the precept in the *(recently discovered) teachings of the apostles*. 'And on the Lord's day of the Lord (*Kata Kuriaken Kurion*) come together and break bread and give thanks after confessing your transgressions, that your sacrifice may be pure.'

Then follow many of the passages we have already produced from the church fathers. By their admission as evidence in all histories, encyclopedias, etc., it must be seen that the learned minds of the world acknowledge the genuineness of these ancient writings. In the above language there is an exact corroboration of what we have said about the "Lord's day" being always applied to the first day of the week in early church history. A newly discovered ancient production is referred to as teaching the same thing as the well known writings of Justin, and all the fathers.

There is preserved to us a very interesting letter from Pliny, governor of Bithynia, to Trajan, the Roman emperor, written about A. D. 103, in which the writer states the result of his inquiries into the peculiarities of the Christians. He says, "They meet on a *certain* stated day, before it is light, and address themselves in a form of prayer to Christ, as to some god, binding themselves by a solemn oath, not for the purposes of any wicked design, but never to commit any fraud, theft, or adultery; never to falsify their words," etc.

Here we learn from heathen sources the same thing that the Christians say of their primitive day of worship. "A certain stated day" certainly means that it is specially and exclusively the Christian's day of worship. No: upon the old Sabbath of the Jews which was well known; but they met upon a day that was peculiar to the Christian faith. "Another day." There is a remarkable agreement between the words of Pliny and those of Heb. 4. "A certain stated day." "Again, he

limiteth a certain day."

Chapter 17.

Proper Use of History.

That history should be received with the same confidence we repose in the inspired records, no one is foolish enough to maintain. On the other hand, to utterly discard, and treat as false all the testimony of history, were equally bigoted and absurd. What then are the proper bounds within which the testimony of history should be credited?

First. We hold that history is not absolutely needed to establish or prove any scriptural doctrine.

Second. Some scriptural doctrine and practices are not set forth by as many passages as others, and the corroboration of these by clear well authorized historic evidences is useful and edifying.

Third. No doctrine or teaching taught in history, that conflicts with the word of God should be received or practiced.

Fourth. When we read in history that the primitive church, held and practiced certain things, if we find the same things taught in the inspired Word, there is no reason to doubt such historic records.

Fifth. If we receive the testimony of any of the church fathers, as to what the church held and practiced in their day, we are not therefore compelled to receive as sound all that they teach, their application of scripture, etc.

Sixth. When early writers uniformly tell us that God's people, in their day, believed and practiced certain things, such testimony cannot be set aside. It were, indeed, next to impossible that such testimony were untrue. For should one person or a few hold and teach differently from the Christian body, the general record would stand over against it. Therefore, as we have seen, when all the writers in the church for the first three centuries, who speak of the law, and the seventh-day Sabbath it enjoined, tell us that it was abolished by Christ, when he came and set up his everlasting kingdom, and proclaimed his eternal law, and, moreover, the New Testament teaching the same thing, it is stark folly to deny that the church so held and practiced. Also, since the voice of the church from the beginning acknowledges that the first day of the week was the time of their regular weekly worship; that it is frequently

called the "Sabbath," of the present dispensation, it and no other is called "the Lord's day:" and, since also, the New Testament record presents no instance of assembling in weekly worship upon any other day, the fact of the Christian Sabbath is established beyond the shadow of a doubt.

There are some things in which writers in the church of the first centuries are not uniform, from which it is supposed that on those points there were different ideas held; and that in different countries the practice of the church somewhat differed. But there are some things in which the practice of the church evidently was uniform. Among these was the sacred use of the first day of the week.

"There are certain laws whose authority and obligation were universal, and indispensable among Christians. *All Christians were unanimous in setting apart the first day of the week, on which the triumphant Savior arose from the dead, for the solemn celebration of public worship.* This custom was derived from the example of the church of Jerusalem; was founded upon the express appointment of the apostles, *and was observed universally by all the Christian churches, as appears from the united testimony of the most credible writers.*" — *Mosheim*, 1 century, part 2, chap. 4, sec. 4.

These words express the results of all honest inquiries on this subject; the unanimous confession of historians.

Chapter 18.

History and Adventism.

There are few classes of people that dwell more upon history in all their writings and lectures, than the above mentioned. History is their principle key to unlock the meaning of prophecy. Wherever its testimony can be construed in their favor, it is readily received, and there are no scruples as to whether it is genuine. But just offer to shed the light of early history on the subject of the Sabbath, and immediately every thing reliable has dropped out of history; every thing is spurious, and by them utterly abhorred.

After the publication of our answer to "Questions for Sunday Keepers," and the questions to Saturday keepers which they never have attempted to answer, we received a letter from Mr. Colcord, one of

their prominent men, containing propositions for discussion They were so worded as to exclude historic evidence; and his offer was to discuss them in the GOSPEL TRUMPET. When, in reply, we wished to give the people the benefit of history along with scripture, he construed our proposed amendment as indicating an unwillingness to meet him, and spake very lightly of history. When he peremptorily refused to admit the light of history, we put our name to the propositions and agreed to meet him on the Bible alone, either in public, or in the GOSPEL TRUMPET and their paper at Battle Creek, when the man refused to meet us on his own propositions.

Last spring Mr. Horton also tried hard to keep silent the voice of history. Reader, is it any wonder they shun (that testimony? He that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light lest his deeds,

— and his (abominable creed — should be reprov'd. They get along much better to keep history closed, and assert what they please. They twist the scriptures and impeach the entire record of early history, and then ask us to believe their assertions without the support of either. For instance we quote from Mrs. White, "Great Controversy," — published 1887 — page 55. "Satan tampered with the fourth commandment also, and assayed to set aside the ancient Sabbath, * * * and in its stead to exalt the festival observed by the heathen as "the venerable day of the Sun." "In the first centuries the true Sabbath — meaning the seventh day — had been kept by all Christians." "Constantine, while still a heathen, issued a decree enjoining the general observance of Sunday as a public festival throughout the Roman empire." "Another step must be taken; the false Sabbath must be exalted to an equality with the true. A few years after the issue of Constantine's decree, the bishop of Roman conferred on the Sunday the title of Lord's day; * * * still the original Sabbath was kept." She goes on to say that by Romish councils the seventh-day Sabbath was put down, and the first day exalted, and finally says, "The observance of Sunday as a Christian institution has its origin in the mystery of lawlessness," and calls the Lord's day "a child of papacy." But you see dear reader, for all this she does not attempt to cite one passage of history. Now that false prophetess either chose to remain ignorant of the whole range of ancient ecclesiastical history, and teach her positive falsehoods in ignorance, or if having read, she did so knowingly. How does the woman know all these things? They occurred

after the close of inspired history, so she could only have recourse to the uninspired. Why then did she not give her authorities? Evidently because she could find nothing to her purpose. So she "speaks a vision out of her own heart." So while Adventists pronounce spurious all the ancient records which teach the abrogation of the law and its Sabbath, and also abundantly show the Christian Sabbath from the resurrection of Christ, records which have been recognized by critics and scholars generally, as true, — while we say, they reject these, they spin their own history to suit themselves and require you to ask no questions as to where they get it.

Look at the impudence of this prophetess! The apostle John called the Christian Sabbath, 'the Lord's day' in A. D. 96. She says that title was conferred upon it by the bishop of Rome in the fourth century. She speaks of the "false," and the "true Sabbath," calling the first day of the week the false and the seventh day the true. But eighteen hundred years before she was born, Justin Martyr wrote under the same head, — "The false and the true Sabbath," and denounced the Jewish Sabbath as the false, and declared the first day the true. He wrote in the virgin purity of Christianity; she writes under the thick fogs of Babel confusion. He wrote as the apostle did who pronounced the curse of God upon the false teachers who troubled the Galatian church, "subverting the gospel of Christ" by enjoining the law and its "days." She writes largely the doctrine of the Ebionites, one of the first and most abominable heresies.

She says in the first centuries the seventh day had been kept by all Christians. And her own say-so is the only proof she offers. But we have seen that both the word of God and the early church fathers teach us that only persons who were weak and ignorant of the liberties of the sons of God thought it necessary to observe the law respecting meats and the Sabbaths. And Justin told Trypho that the Sabbath of the law only belonged to the Jews, and that it was not proper for Christians to observe the same: and by others we are positively told that Saturday was a common work day in the primitive church of God. The subtle lie of Satan in the mouth of this false prophetess leaves the impression that Constantine, as a heathen, enjoined the observance of Sunday, as a public festival, and after his professed conversion he still adhered to it, making him the author of that day of worship. So all Adventism teaches. But all readers of the New Testament and of early history know it is a

positive falsehood. For two hundred years before Constantine's day, in fact from the resurrection of Christ, the first day was kept by the church of God as the regular Sabbath and weekly day of worship. Constantine had nothing to do with the establishment of the Lord's day in the church. God's institutions need no kingly decrees. But what that emperor did simply related to the day in his empire.

Should the head of the Chinese empire become specially favorable to the Christian religion, nothing would be more more natural than that he would adopt the first day of the week as their national holiday. This is substantially what Constantine did. Yet there is no more reason of truth in ascribing to him the origin of the Christian Sabbath, than there would be in making the emperor of China the father of it, were he to do the same thing in this century. That Constantine called the first day "the venerable day of the sun," had no reference to any idolatrous use of that day. Over a hundred years before, the days of the week had all been named after planets as follows: the first day, after the Sun — Sunday, the next after the moon — Monday, the last after Saturn — Saturday, etc. And these names had passed into common use. Constantine, having been convicted of the truth of the Christian religion would naturally speak of the pre-eminence of their day of worship, of which pre-eminence he had a beautiful illustration, in the fact that the sun is the greatest planet of the solar system, and the source of all light. So this constant cry of Adventism that "Constantine changed the Sabbath," etc., is as false as Satan himself. And no person can inform himself of the Historic facts and make the assertion without knowing he is telling a falsehood. Says Mr. Andrews in his history of the Sabbath, pages 173 and 206: "The churches of Judea kept the seventh day. No father ever called the first day Christian Sabbath, or Sabbath of any kind." The many passages we have quoted from those early fathers place Mr. Andrews, and all who make such assertions, before the public as either ignorant or willful teachers of falsehood. Such is the unblushing heterodoxy of that dark sect. They dispute the plain scriptures, renounce all early history that exposes their creed, and virtually make their own history to suit their purpose.

They are now sending out two pamphlets; the first of which is entitled, "Rome's Challenge, Why do Protestants keep Sunday?" The second, "Our Answer." In the first of which Roman authorities are

quoted affirming that they changed the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day, and that there is no evidence in scripture or early history in favor of the first-day Sabbath. That it only rests upon Rome's authority to change the laws of God.

To this false statement Adventism gives consent; and then claim to be persecuted because they do not keep the day Rome made Thus the mother of harlots unblushingly lies, and her Hagaristic daughter sanctions the falsehood But God's word and the writings of the church fathers rebuke both.

Chapter 19.

The Christian Sabbath in Prophecy.

Any spiritual mind that will read Isa. 53; 54:1-4 will see Christ and his church pre-announced. The same crop out in chapters 55 and 56. "Unto the eunuchs that keep my Sabbaths, — i.e. in the dispensation of Christ already introduced — and choose the things that please me, and take hold of my covenant — that written in the heart; — even unto them will I give in mine house — church — and within my walls — salvation — a place and a name better than of sons and of daughters." Namely, they shall be married to the Lord. "Also the sons of strangers that join themselves to the Lord." — See Acts 5:14. "Every one that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and taketh hold of my covenant — the new covenant in Christ; — even them will I bring to my holy mountain," "my house of prayer," "spiritual house." 1 Pet. 2:5 — Isa. 56:4-7. Thus there remains a Sabbath in the new covenant, under which strangers — Gentiles — have equal rights to enter the house of God to serve him, and are not shut out as by the law. "And it shall come to pass that from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord." Isa. 66:23. Here is a continued description of the gospel dispensation and of its holy Sabbath. The seventh-day Sabbath was for the Jews only, a sign between God and that nation throughout their generations. But here on the Sabbath of the Holy Spirit dispensation "shall all flesh" come together. This may be defined by that other prophecy which says, "I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh." Namely, men and women of all nations without distinction. So all receiving the Holy Spirit would

assemble for divine worship on the new dispensation Sabbath. Here is the feature that distinguishes the Lord's day from the law Sabbath. The old was marked by the single idea of physical rest, entire abstinence from labor. There was no command for public worship on that day. But the Lord's day is and has been from the resurrection of Christ to this time, the Christian's day of holy and joyful convocation. "I will make them joyful in my house of prayer," where "all flesh come to worship" "from one Sabbath to another." And Tertullian says, "We celebrate Sunday as a joyful day." "On the Lord's day we think it wrong to fast, or to kneel in prayer." They felt that all their worship should be characterized by joy and triumph on that day in which Christ triumphed over death for us.

We have a beautiful description of this same Sabbath of joyful praise in Psalms 118:21-24. "J will praise thee: for thou hast heard me, and art become my salvation.

The stone which the builders refused is become the head stone of the corner.

This is the Lord's doing; it is marvellous in our eyes. This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it."

Christ only is our salvation. Him the Jews rejected and put to death. To the third day he lay in the tomb, and the disconsolate disciples said, "We trusted that it had been he which should have redeemed Israel." Luke 24:21. With his death their hope seems to have expired. All was lost, and they returned to their fish nets. But on the third day after the crucifixion they hear of his resurrection. Mary had seen her Lord and tells the rest. Though their faith was weak, hope began to revive. In the evening they are drawn together in assembly. Behold he appears in their midst. So it is true, the Lord has risen. His resurrection confounds the Jews who rejected and crucified him. The stone they had rejected suddenly triumphs and becomes the head of the corner. He in whom they had hoped for redemption had actually now "become their salvation." "This is the LORD'S doing; it is marvelous in our eyes. *This is the day which the Lord hath made*; we will rejoice and be glad in it." The day of triumph, when Jesus rose from the dead, is "the day which the Lord hath made;" which the revelator called the "Lord's day." A day in which all the Christian world from the resurrection to this same time have been led to set apart, for the assembling together in prayer and

praise to God. "In it we will rejoice and be glad," said prophecy. "We celebrate Sunday as a joyful day," said Tertullian. And so say all the redeemed of the Lord.

Other texts might be brought forward to show the Lord's day in prophecy, but we pass on to consider

Chapter 20.

The Christian Sabbath Prefigured.

We begin with the feast of harvest. "Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, When ye be come into the land which I give unto you, and shall reap the harvest thereof, then ye shall bring a sheaf of the firstfruits of your harvest unto the priest: and he shall wave the sheaf before the Lord, to be accepted for you: on the morrow after the Sabbath the priest shall wave it." Lev. 23:10, 11.

This wave offering of the sheaf before the Lord was to take place "on the morrow after the Sabbath." That is on the first day of the week. What did it foreshadow? Here is the application of the figure. "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the firstfruits of them that slept." 1 Cor. 15:20. That wave sheaf pointed to the resurrection of Christ, which took place on the same day of the week. The particular day of the wave offering was a part of the law of the service; therefore a part of the shadow. Therefore, just as certain as the sheaf that was waved before the Lord pointed to the resurrection of Christ, so sure the first day of the week on which it took place pointed to the day on which he rose; or typified the Christian Sabbath.

"Christ, the firstfruits, afterward they that are Christ's at his coming." 1 Cor. 15:23. As the wave sheaf was a sample of the entire crop, so the resurrection of Christ is a sample and pledge of the resurrection of the whole church. "For if the firstfruit be holy, the lump is also holy." Rom. 11:16.

Next in order followed the feast of pentecost. "And ye shall count unto you from the morrow after the Sabbath, from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the wave offering; seven Sabbaths shall be complete, Even unto the morrow after the seventh Sabbath shall ye number fifty days: and ye shall offer a new meat offering unto the Lord.

And ye shall proclaim on the selfsame day, that it may be a holy

convocation unto you: ye shall do no servile work therein; it shall be a statute for ever in all your dwelling throughout your generations." Lev. 23:15, 16, 21.

How beautiful and glorious the lessons taught us in these shadowy rites! The sheaf was waved upon the first day of the week, and was fulfilled upon the morning of the resurrection of Christ. Just seven weeks later fell upon the first day of the week again. Then they were to "offer a new meat offering unto the Lord." This was the feast of pentecost. So counting seven weeks or 49 days from the resurrection of Christ, we come to the time when the one hundred and twenty disciples were all on the altar, in prayer with one accord to God; fulfilling the figure of "the new meat offering." And we read, "When the day of pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place, and suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind," "And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost." It is universally acknowledged that the outpouring of the Spirit came on the first day of the week, and was the antitype of this feast. Looking back at the figure we see two prominent features which must have something corresponding thereto in the substance. First, that ancient first day of the week was a rest day. "Ye shall do no servile work therein." Then it follows that the day it typified is a Sabbath day. But it being on the first day of the week, and the outpouring of the Spirit, to which it pointed, actually taking place upon the same day, it could not properly be a figure of rest upon any other day; it was an exact foreshadow of the Christian Sabbath. It was an annual Sabbath, a figure of good things to come, and it met its substance upon the first day of the week; therefore the first day of the week is the Sabbath of the dispensation of the Holy Spirit.

The second feature prominent in the figure is this, "And ye shall proclaim on the selfsame day, that it may be an holy convocation unto you." Here is strikingly shadowed forth the holy convocation of God's people to worship him, and hear the gospel preached, all the way down through this dispensation from the resurrection of Christ to this very day. The law keepers try to give Col. 2:16, 17 an exclusive application to these annual Sabbaths; therefore, according to their own reasoning, the Lord's day is the substance of the annual Sabbaths which were on the first day of the week.

Speaking again of this pentecost shadow of the first-day Sabbath, we read in ver. 25, "Ye shall do no work therein: but ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord." The first-day Sabbath, and the fire of the Holy Spirit are clearly read in this type. But the greatest annual feast was that of unleavened bread; three things stand out conspicuous in that service. First the passover lamb, a type of Christ our sacrifice. Second, two Sabbath days of rest; and third, on these two rest days there was to be a solemn assembly. "On the first day shall be an holy convocation: ye shall do no servile work therein.

Seven days ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord: on the eighth day shall be an holy convocation unto you; and ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord: it is a solemn assembly; and ye shall do no servile work therein." Lev. 23:35, 36.

Since these things were ordained of God to be a shadow of good things to come in Christ, who cannot see the design of the Lord in commanding that during that solemn feast, the "first day," and again the "eighth day," should be singled out as days of rest, annual Sabbaths, and days of general convocation? The two great triumphant events in the plan of redemption, *i.e.* the resurrection of Christ and outpouring of the Holy Spirit are thereby set forth in shadow, and also the weekly Sabbath of the gospel dispensation. Behold what care has been manifest in the law to make the first day of the week stand out in great prominence as typical of the Lord's day, the great "day of atonement." No wonder the early church fathers saw and confessed how God had attached a significance to the eighth day, that did not apply to the seventh. "On the eighth day ye shall have a solemn assembly, ye shall do no servile work therein." — Num. 29:35. "On the eighth clay they made a solemn assembly." — 2 Chron. 7:9. "And they kept the feast seven days, and on the eighth day was a solemn assembly." — Neh. 8:18. Thus the propitious day of the gospel Sabbath, and Christian assembly, is clearly introduced in the law going before.

Chapter 21.

The Christian Sabbath in the New Testament.

Having proved by the Word the law Sabbath passed away at the cross; that "another day" has been ordained in the gospel; that it is called

the "*Lord's day*," and that the unanimous voice of history applies that expression to the first day of the week; that the same is seen in prophecy and figure, we shall now bring forward positive proofs in the New Testament history that the first day of the week was the weekly day of assembly for divine worship in the primitive church.

Says T. Lean, in his excellent little work, "*The One of the Sabbaths*," published by T. W. Smithson & Co., Clio, Mich., "The early Christians did not think Christ had left the world without a sacred day, nor them to their own weak reasonings to make or change their faith and institutions. He himself was the *"author of their faith"* speaking as the Father gave him commandment (Jno. 12:49.). He left them no legacy of uncertainties and half truths to quarrel over and by which to divide the household of faith, but a *"faith once for all delivered to the saints"* (Jude 3), *"the truth as it is in Jesus"* (Eph. 4:21), *"that they might know the things freely given us of God"* (John 8:33).

Hence, we may add, there was no questions or strife respecting which day to keep. Just how and when the Head of the church had communicated his will to the disciples that the first day should be observed in his kingdom instead of the seventh, it is not so necessary to know. Their example proves that they were in some way drawn together of God on the first day of the week. This fact we shall now prove, and hereafter see about the time and manner in which they had been instructed. After the Lord Jesus had revealed himself to the two disciples with whom he had walked out to Emmaus, the day of his resurrection, we are told, "They rose up the same hour and returned to Jerusalem, and found the eleven gathered and them that were with them." Luke 24:33. Perhaps the entire hundred and twenty made up that assembly. Here then we have an example of the church assembled together in their own meeting. They may only have been drawn together by the Spirit of God. Nevertheless the fact is on record that the very day that Jesus rose from the dead they assembled together. And while the two disciples were rehearsing how the blessed Savior had made himself known to them, lo, "Jesus himself stood in the midst of them and said unto them, Peace be unto you." Ver. 36. So the Lord met with and blessed this first meeting on the new Sabbath. Should the Saturday keeper say this meeting was after night, and therefore not on the first day, but the second, we will let the word of God answer you.

"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." Jno. 20:19. It was the same day that Jesus rose, and how particular the Spirit of inspiration is to tell that it was on "*the first day of the week!*" It must therefore be conceded that they convened before the close of the Jewish day, or else the text proves that right there, in the change of dispensation the Lord no longer reckoned the day to sunset, but included in it the first part of the night, as we do now. One thing is sure, this meeting of the infant church was on the resurrection day of our Lord. Neither is there a word said about them assembling on the next Saturday. But we are told, "And after eight days again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them: then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you." Jno. 20:26.

This evidently records a second meeting one week from the former. The Jews were familiar with the two great annual Sabbaths connected with the feast of unleavened bread, called the "first day" and "the eighth day." And both were Sabbath days of rest. What, therefore, would be more natural than the use of the above language to express the Sabbath which came one week from the first Sabbath? "The same day, being the *first day*, the disciples were assembled." "And after eight days again." These expressions agree so perfectly with the language of Lev. 23:35, 36, that it would seem that they were selected purposely to connect in our minds type and antitype. "On the first day shall be an holy convocation," and "on the eighth day shall be an holy convocation." As certain as this eighth day was one week from the first day, so also the eighth day of John 20:26 was one week from the "first day" of ver. 19. Owing to these two prominent Sabbaths in the great feast of the Jews, upon the first and the eighth day, "after eight days," meaning after the arrival of the eighth day, very naturally fell into use to designate one week. The same expression is in common use to this day in the German language. Their regular way of saying in one week from to day is "*Heute ueber acht Tage*," — to day over eight days. So the disciples, assembled together upon the eve of the resurrection day and in one week from that time again. Here starts in the weekly worship of the Christians so freely spoken of in early history.

Having seen the infant church assembled together on two successive

first days after the resurrection, we follow her inspired history to A. D. 45, twelve years later. Paul availed himself of the opportunity to publish the glad tidings of redeeming grace to both Jews and Gentiles assembled on the Jewish Sabbath in their synagogue at Antioch (Acts 13:14-44.). "And when the Jews were gone out of the synagogue, the Gentiles besought that these words might be preached to them the next Sabbath." Ver. 42. Turning to the margin, you find, instead of next Sabbath, "In the week between, or *in the Sabbath between.*" The last reading is the exact rendering of the Greek text. *Metaxu Sabbaton*, on the between Sabbath, or on the Sabbath between. So there was a Sabbath coming in between that day and the next Sabbath of the Jews. Dr. Wallis says, "*metaxu Sabbaton* is the Sabbath between, or intermediate between two Jewish Sabbaths." — *Defence of the Sabbath*, page 34.

Dear reader, this one text is sufficient to prove that there is "another day." A Christian Sabbath coming between the weekly Sabbaths of the Jews. Not only does the word *metaxu* — between — prove this, but the language of verse 44 agrees with the same idea. "The next Sabbath," is from *erkomeno Sabbato*, the coming Sabbath. It properly expresses the idea of the Lord's day which was the following day. The apostles were requested by the Gentiles to preach again from the same: words "on the *metaxu* — between — Sabbath." and "on the *erkomeno* — coming — Sabbath day came almost the whole city together to hear the word of God," doubtless in some outdoor place of concourse. "These two descriptive words — says T. Lean — apply well to our own Sabbath." They could not refer to the Jewish day; that could not come *after* or *between* its own set time. Anxious and interested people would not desire to wait, or be kept waiting seven days, for the *cpionsa* (next of the same kind) Sabbath. So this meeting of almost the whole city was not Jewish, nor at their synagogue, not to hear Moses read, but a Christian meeting on the Christian Sabbath, to proclaim and to hear the gospel, on the *eighth day* which *came after* and *between* that of the Jews. Young and some other translations render *erkomeno*, "on the coming Sabbath." The words *to metaxu Sabbaton* in verse 42 are rendered by Thomson as follows: "*On the interim till the next Sabbath.*" This were exactly according to the text, except the introduction of three words — "till the next" — for which there is nothing in the orig-

inal, as all can see, *to metaxu Sabbaton*, is simply the interim Sabbath, "the between Sabbath," or the intervening Sabbath.

"As they were going out they were beseeching for the *intervening Sabbath* that these words might be spoken." — *Rotherhams translation*. This is a very precise and literal version.

"The Gentiles besought them that these words might be spoken on the *Sabbath between*" — *John Wesley*. Here are three translators that render according to the meaning of the word. There was then in the time of the apostles "another day." An interim Sabbath intervening between the Jewish Sabbaths.

The first definition given to *metaxu* in Greenfield and other lexicons, is "between." Young's Concordance defines the word "*in between*" But to the Christian mind there is something more conclusive and satisfactory than all lexicons, and even translators, in the determination of the meaning of the words of divine inspiration. That is an examination of the use of the same word wherever it occurs in the New Testament. To this means of knowing the truth we have continually resorted. By means of the Greek-English Concordance, we find that *metaxu* only occurs nine times in the New Testament. Six times it is rendered *between*, as follows: Mat. 18:15. 23:35. Luke 11:51. 16:26. Acts 12:6. 15:9. Twice it is translated "meanwhile," as follows, John 4:31, and Rom. 2:15, and in this last instance it is correctly rendered "*between*" in the margin. The last instance is that of the text under consideration — Acts 13:42. This you see is the only place where it is rendered "next," and here again the margin corrects by making it "between." So out of the nine instances it is translated "between" eight times, including the marginal readings. And to look at its use any candid mind must conclude that it does not mean "next," but "in between." Let us try a few instances. "Go and tell him his fault *between* thee and him alone." Mat. 18:15. To, put "next" in the place of between reduces it to nonsense. "Whom ye slew *between* the temple and the altar." Mat. 23:35. "The same night Peter was sleeping; *between* two soldiers." Acts 12:6. "And put no difference *between* us and them." Acts 15:9. "In the meanwhile," Jno. 4:31, *i.e.*, in the time between. So all must see the word expresses the idea of an intervening Sabbath. And there could be no place for such language if there were not another Sabbath day besides that of the Jews, and coming in between its observance.

We next come to a clear case of the church of God meeting on the first day of the week for worship, which Adventists themselves admit.

"And we sailed away from Philippi after the days of unleavened bread, and came unto them to Troas in five days; where we abode seven days.

And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight." Acts 20:67.

This text is very valuable in arriving at a knowledge of the Sabbath observed by the apostolic church. It contains both a negative and a positive testimony. Paul, in company with seven other brethren, who were his companions in travel (see verse 4), abode seven days at Troas. Nothing unusual seems to have occurred on Saturday. If they had any meeting at all it was only such as they had daily. Surely the mention of no meeting at all on that day is good evidence that the church attached no special sanctity to the day nor held any weekly services thereon.

"And *upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together* to break bread, Paul preached unto them." Reader, does not this prove in inspired history just what we have seen in the writings that immediately followed? "The seventh day is a common work day, but we keep the first day of the week, the day upon which Jesus rose, and our life also sprang up."

Such was the uniform testimony of the early fathers, and what little is said in the Word about these secondary elements of Christianity, all agrees in exactly the same thing. "Upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together." "And on the first of the week, when we had gathered together to break bread." — *Rotherham*. The language clearly indicates that their meetings were regularly held on that day. It does not simply state that they held a meeting on that day; but fairly intimates that they were in the habit of doing so. *When the disciples came together*. This speaks as though it were a matter of course they would assemble on that day. No such example can be found in the New Testament of the holy church meeting on Saturday. Nay, they passed it by and met on the Lord's day. This communion meeting occurred in A. D. 60. The year before, the same apostle wrote his first epistle to the Corinthians in which he gave directions respecting their duty on the day as follows: "Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have

given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye.

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

And when I come, whomsoever ye shall approve by your letters, them will I send to bring your liberality unto Jerusalem." 1 Cor. 16:1-3.

The subject is "concerning collections for the saints." The word collections, financially speaking, means the gathering of means together into a treasury, ready to be disbursed for the designed object. This collection was to be taken up on the first day of the week, and the object is clearly stated; namely, "that there be no gatherings when I come." Let us read some other translations. "And concerning the collection which is for the saints; — as I directed the congregations of Galatia, so also do you, Every first day of the week, let each of you lay something by itself, depositing as he may be prospered, so that when I come collections may not then be made." 1 Cor. 16:1, 2. — *Emphatic Diaglott*.

"But concerning collections," etc., "On the first of the week, let each one of you put by itself, treasuring up, whatsoever he may be prospered with; lest, whensoever I may come, then collections may be in progress." — *Rotherham*.

The following is a correct rendering of the German: "But concerning the collections for the saints, as I ordered the churches of Galatia, so do ye. On each of the Sabbaths, lay aside by yourselves each one among you, and gather what ye think is proper; in order that when I come collections must not first of all be taken."

James McKnight renders: "On the first day of every week, let each of you lay somewhat by itself, according as he may have prospered, putting it into the treasury, that when I come there may be then no collections." The law teachers argue that this only means that each one should put something in a treasury at home every first day. But the word is too plain to be thus twisted. The following facts prove their interpretation false: Two things were to be done; first, "lay somewhat by itself," second, "putting it into the treasury," "depositing." Now we shall prove that the church in every city kept one general treasury; and there is not the slightest hint of every man keeping a private treasury at home. The order of the apostle to deposite in the general chest at the

weekly meetings every first day we find regularly carried out from that time on through the first centuries. Thus says Justin in the middle of the second century, under the head of

"THE WEEKLY WORSHIP OF THE CHRISTIANS."

"And on the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country, gather together to one place, and the memories of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read as long as time permits. And they who are well to do, and willing, give what each thinks fit: and what is collected is deposited with the president, who succors the orphans and widows, and those in want."

Here is the practice of the very same thing recorded in 1 Cor. 16:1, 2.

Says the writer of "*Ancient Christianity Exemplified*, page 73, "The custom in these primitive times seems to have been for every one, on the Lord's' day, at the close of pubic worship, to bring to the notice of the assembly the case of the poor, the aged, the widow, or the orphan of whose necessities he had any knowledge; and forthwith provision was made for such from the public fund created by their weekly contributions."

Tertullian, at the close of the second century says, "What is collected in the public chest is no dishonorable sum as if it belonged to a purchased religion. Every one Snakes a small contribution *on a certain day* or when he chooses; provided only he is willing and able, for no one is compelled, all is voluntary." He further says that upon this general fund was drawn to feed the poor, etc.

Many other ancient writers speak of this collection on the first day for the needy. This fund was kept in the church, and only at the time of assembling together were the voluntary collections made by which it was kept up.

What reason or object could there be in requiring every one to deposit something at home every first day? Why single out that day? Would it not do as well on any other day? Would it not be better to leave the day optional, so they could make the deposit whenever most able to give? Nay, that day was pointed out as the time to give, because the treasury chest was kept in the place of public meeting, and being assembled they had an opportunity to deposit what they had separated for that purpose. Remember the subject is "concerning collections." But

nothing of that kind could occur if there were no assembly on that day. Every man putting something away at home is no collection at all. The Advent theory is directly opposite to the apostolic order. It would require, for the first thing, after the apostle's arrival, that collections be made of all the home deposits. But the system enjoined by the apostle was to avoid that very thing, "That there be no gatherings when I come." "So that when I come collections may not then be made." — *Emphatic Diaglott*. The collections were to be made on the first day of the week "in order that when I come collections must not first of all be taken." — *German*.

Had this modern theory been in Paul's mind he would naturally have explained the object of laying their benefactions in store at home in language something like this, "That when I come collections of the same may, for the first thing, take place." But no, the whole matter of collections was to be accomplished before his arrival. "Lest whensoever I come, then collections may be in progress." He speaks of only one thing in reference to the matter to be attended to after his arrival at Corinth. "But whensoever I may arrive, whomsoever ye may approve, the same will I send to bear away your favor unto Jerusalem." Ver 3. — *Rotherham*.

These few instances of the church's assembly on the first day, with this apostolic law pointing out a duty to be performed upon "*every first day*" which could only be done in public meeting, are sufficient to convince any humble honest mind of the Lord's or Christian Sabbath. Especially since the inspired record furnishes not one instance of the church meeting on any other day.

But we are not yet through hearing the evidences in the case. Even if "first of the week" were a correct rendering, that day, and no other, is the Sabbath of the New Testament. But we shall now find very positive evidence of the fact by an appeal to the German version, Young's Bible translation, and to the original Greek.

Chapter 22.

The First Day Called Sabbath Eight Times in the New Testament.

This statement may surprise you; but we have never been led of

God to look upon King James' as the only translation of the scriptures. Other scholars are just as competent as those employed by him, and indeed, they are now blessed with far better facilities of rendering the scriptures. Therefore, other translations, and especially the pure Greek text, are equally, if not more worthy to be called the word of God.

The words, "first day of the week," in Mat. 28:1, are rendered in the German scriptures thus, "*Ersten Jeiertages der Sabbathon*," which in English reads: "First holy day of the Sabbaths." In this the German translators followed the Greek text, which is "*Opse de Sabbaton to epiphoskouse mian Sabbaton*. Directly rendered in the Diaglott, "After now Sabbath to the dawning into first of week." You see that the same word in the Greek occurs twice, applied in the first instance to the Sabbath of the law, in the second to the first day of the week. Therefore the German rendering is correct, and as sure as Saturday was a Sabbath — the Sabbath of the Jewish law — so sure the first day was also a Sabbath, the new Sabbath of the gospel.

The gospel of Matthew having been written about nine years after the crucifixion, it was natural that in recording these things he would speak of the seventh day as the Sabbath kept up to the crucifixion, and also called the first-day Sabbath which had been kept as such by the Christians the past nine years.

Matthew introduces us to this new Sabbath by saying it was "Late but *Sabbaton*, the dawning into *mian Sabbaton*, when Mary Magdalene came to see the tomb" (28:1). From this it is plain he spoke of two days of like character, both Sabbaths, one ending, the other dawning — the Sabbath of the seventh day and a Sabbath of the eighth day, describing both by the same word: "*Late but of Sabbaths the dawning into one of Sabbaths*." Mere the Greek article *tone* (the) and the word *hemeran* (day) are not in the Greek original. Grammarians say the words *Sabbaton* are in the generative plural, so when translated they require the word "of" before them. The German translators followed this rule; *of the Sabbaths* is their wording, and *Sabbatn* the sense in their translation."

"*Mian * * ** is the first of the cardinal numbers, meaning one. Sixty-three times it is translated *one* in our Testament, and always has that meaning. Matt. (17:14), Mark (9:5), and Luke (9:33) all say that Peter

on the mount of Transfiguration said, 'It is good to be here; make here three tabernacle, *mian* for thee, *mian* for Moses, and *mian* for Elijah.' By *mian Sabbaton*, therefore, Matthew must have meant a new Sabbath — *the "one," the single and the only Sabbath* of the new covenant age, knowing well that Hebrews under the old covenant had three Sabbaths, but the Christians under Christ have one Sabbath only."

"Mark (16:1, 2) confirms this by saying the *Sabbaton* was *diagenomenon* (past) when Mary of Magdala and Mary the mother of James and Salome brought spices. By this uncommon word he plainly intended more than a common day — ending — literally, *a becoming through with* (Young's Concordance), a passing away of that Sabbath institution, with the old covenant, whose sign it was (Ex. 31:17), having run out their allotted time: an end of its divine authority and covenant life, at that point where the new covenant and its *one Sabbath began*." — *T. Lean*, in "*The One of the Sabbaths*."

Thus we see, the more men are acquainted with the pure Greek, if they possess that moral stamina which cannot be held in the old ruts of error, the more they see in the text to prove the Christian Sabbath.

Our second instance of the first day of the week being called Sabbath is in Mark 16:2. The words of the Common Version, "first day of the week," are translated in the German Bible, "*Einen Sabbath*er." — "One of the Sabbaths." This is a literal translation of the Greek text. "And being past the *Sabbaton*," etc. Ver. 1, "very early of the *mias-Sabbaton*." The first, or the "one of the Sabbaths" they came to the sepulchre. Here again the last, and the first day of the week are both called Sabbath in the original scriptures. Only the first-day Sabbath is expressed in the plural, have the sound of "o" (tone).

The third instance is in Mark 16:9, The German reads, "*Ersten tage der Sabbath*er" — First day of the Sabbaths, The Greek is "*prote Sabbaton*." "For the meaning of *prote* we may turn to the word proto-martyr in Webster's Unabridged Dictionary or to Mark's own words (12:29): "One of the scribes asked him, Which is the *prote* commandment of all? Jesus answered, The *prote* is, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul; this is the *prote* commandment." Matthew (22:38) says, "is the *prote* and great commandment." And in Hebrews (8:7) it is said: "For if the *prote* covenant had been faultless there would no place have been sought for a

second." — *Lean*.

The fourth instance, Luke 24:1, "Of the week," English. "*Sabbather einen*." — One of the Sabbaths. — German. Here again the German is right with the Greek which is *Te de mia ton Sabbaton*. — And in the one of the Sabbaths. Both Mark and Luke speak of the law Sabbath just before the resurrection in the singular, and of the new Sabbath in the plural. They rested the *Sabbath* according to the law, and very early the first of the *Sabbaths* they came to the sepulchre. The use of the same word would lead common sense to decide that both were real Sabbaths. But the slight difference in form suggests a difference in the two rest days. On this again we quote from Mr. Lean. "Luke (23:56 and 24:1) the best Greek writer of them all, like Matthew, speaks of two Sabbaths; speaks of them in contrast — uses *men* * * * *de*, words that make an antithesis, saying, "The women rested on the *men Sabbaton* (short "o") according to the commandment." *Te de mia tone Sabbaton* (long "o") — the but one the of Sabbaths, etc. "If these two days were not both Sabbaths, there could be no ground for Luke's antithesis; and if the two Sabbaths were alike in every respect, then neither the acts of the women nor the days could be set in contrast. Luke has made *men* and *Sabbaton* inseparable, therefore he spoke of two distinct Sabbaths. One, *the ante-resurrection Sabbath*, on which rest, according to the fourth commandment, was the one and only duty, and must have been so regarded by the women as in force from the day at Sinai down to that day, for they kept it by resting, as there and then commanded. The other, *the one of the Sabbaths*, unlike it, was a day for activity; the women keep it and come to the tomb. A Sabbath for doing good."

The fifth instance is John 20:1. "The first day of the week." — English. "*Sabbather einen*" — *one* of the Sabbaths. — German. *Te de mia tone Sabbaton* — the first, or the one of the Sabbaths.

The sixth place is Jno. 20:19. Here the Greek is, *Te mia tone Sabbaton* — the one of the Sabbaths. The German, "*Am Abend aber desselbigen Sabbaths*," — in the evening of same Sabbath. In the preceding verse John alludes to the morning of the resurrection, then he speaks of the meeting together of the saints the evening of that day, and calls it "the same Sabbath." So according to the German scriptures, the resurrection day is the Christian Sabbath; so also according to the Greek text. The day is uniformly called Sabbath by all four of the

writers of the gospels, and we know it was the first day of the week; because it came right after the Jewish Sabbath.

Our seventh instance is that of the communion meeting held at Antioch by Paul and his fellow laborers. Acts 20:7. *En de te mia tone Sabbaton*. Which is word for word rendered in the Emphatic Diaglott, *In and the first of the Sabbaths*." Any Greek scholar must admit that this is an exact translation. The German reading is, "*Auf einen Sabbath*" — upon one of the Sabbaths.

Our eighth, and last instance where the first day of the week is called Sabbath in the pure word of God is 1 Cor. 16:2. Here again it is Sabbath both in the original and in the German. In all these passages Sabbath is in its plural form, except in Mark 16:9. where it is *Sabbaton* — Sabbath. Now either the singular or plural form would readily apply to the Lord's day Sabbath; but the plural form cannot be construed as meaning the first of the week at all. It is proper to say they came to the tomb early the first Sabbath or the first of the Sabbaths. As there were two Sabbaths observed in the week at that time, the Jewish and the Christian. And the latter coming on the first day of the week would naturally be called the "first Sabbath," or the "first of the Sabbaths." If they wished to say the week, the singular would answer, but the plural would not at all. The event spoken of only relating to a single morning, could not cover the space of a whole week, much less a plurality of weeks. To say they came to the sepulcher early the first of the weeks, were ridiculous. Therefore to substitute week for Sabbath, they have to wrest the word and make it singular, whereas the text is plural. But if these scriptures could be properly rendered, the first of the week, they still establish the fact that the first day of the week is the only day that the primitive Christians regularly devoted to the worship of God. But the word of the Lord is right, and nothing seems plainer than the fact that it is but the following of an old rut of error that was started in the dark middle age when men render the same word in one verse Sabbath, and in the next week.

Chrysostom (A. D. 347) said, "The term Sabbath is used here (1 Cor. 16:2) to mean the Lord's day." "St Jerome (A D. 330) rendered the words *mian Sabbaton* by *unum Sabbati*, saying: 'On one of Sabbaths:' which is the Lord's day." — Note on 1 Cor. 16:2. *T. Lean*.

"St. Augustine (A. D. 354) said, 'The Lord's day coming after the

seventh must be the eighth, and is also to be reckoned the first, for it is called *una Sabbati* — *one of Sabbaths* " T. Lean.

"Saint Columba (the learned Culdee) said, "This day is called *the Sabbath* in the sacred volume; and on this coming *dominica nocte* (the Lord's night) I shall go the way of my fathers." *Life by Adamna* page 230.

Calvin rejects the phrase, "The first day of the week," and words his translation, "One day of the Sabbath," "Cue of the Sabbaths." and "the day on which they held their sacred assemblies (Calvin's Commentary on Acts 20:7 and 1 Cor. 16:2.)

Young's Bible Translation, which is in the main, the most strictly literal rendering of the scriptures that we have, renders Mat. 28:1 as follows: "And on the eve of the Sabbaths, at the dawn, toward the *first of the Sabbaths* came Mary," etc.

The same renders Mark 16:1, 2: "And the Sabbath having past," etc. "And early on the morning of the *first of the Sabbaths*, they came unto the sepulcher." You see he follows closely the text, putting the law Sabbath in the singular, and the Lord's day in the plural; for so it is in Mark.

"And he, having risen in the morning of the *first of the Sabbaths*." Mark 16:9.

"And on the *first of the Sabbaths*, at early dawn, they came to the tomb." Luke 24:1.

"And on the *first of the Sabbaths*." Jno. 20:1.

"It being, therefore, evening, on that day, *the first of the Sabbaths*, and the doors having been shut where the disciples were assembled, through fear of the Jews, Jesus came and stood in the midst, and saith to them, Peace to you." John 20:19

With the knowledge of the fact that the disciples used Sunday as their day of worship, and the Jews their day, what can be more sensible than the above translations To make the same word change its meaning from one verse to another, to say the least, looks like twisting the word of God back and forward to suit a bad creed that cannot stand a straight-forward Bible. It certainly has a tendency to unsettle the meaning of the words of inspiration, and reduce the book of heaven to uncertainty. And yet says U. Smith in his "Greek False," "The same word and the same form of it, *Sabbaton*, * * * is used to signify both the Sabbath and

the week." To which Mr. T. Lean replies, "No word is such a 'jack of all trades.' *Tree* never means a *forest*, nor *house* a *village*. It is against reason and universal usage that the same word should denote *one day* and *seven days* also."

In our former tract *on the Sabbath* we allowed that possibly *Sabbaton* sometimes means week. Of course we had no evidence of it, and now having more fully investigated we are confident no such use occurs in the New Testament. And says Mr. T. Lean: " Here we meet the objection that the word sometimes means *week*, for the Pharisee (Luke 18:52) fasted twice in the *Sabbaton*. Would we have him fast twice in the same day? (Greek False., p. 11.) Why not? To fast is to omit customary food-taking. Three meals daily were customary (Jno. 21:12. Luke 14:12). The parable turned not on *the Pharisee* doing more, but *unlike* other men, and it was to present a contrast. *He* is a devout, a model, and a perfect law-keeper. *Others* are plunderers, unjust ones, adulterers. *He* tithes all he acquires, believes himself to be righteous, and despises others for unlawful acts; at a time when *chief Pharisees* disregarded the restful purpose of *their Sabbath*, and *made feasts* upon it (Luke 14:1-4), perhaps on meats slain that day in sacrifice, treating it as "a day of gladness, for eating, drinking and wearing their best clothes" (Encyc. Brit., Sab.); when priests and Levites reveled, perhaps were drunken (Isa. 28:7), and on the Sabbath extra and double portion of wine and food (Num. 28:3, 10. Deut. 18:4), when Rabbas said, "Meet the Sabbath with a lively hunger, let thy table be covered with fish, flesh and generous wine: * * * at such a time this Pharisee came into the temple of the all-seeing God, and honestly thanked him that he is not like them, or lawless like the publican; but he denies himself; and eating only once on the Sabbath he keeps the day holy." How could he boast if he only refrained from eating twice in seven days? To render this *Sabbaton* by week obscures the entire parable, and perverts the meaning of the word and arrays it against itself in the other places where it used."

Dr. Schaff's Herzog (Art. week) says, "*Hebdomas* is the Greek word for *week*, but it is not found in the New Testament. The Greek word for week was not *Sabbaton*. * * * It cannot be translated *week* without doing violence to the Greek text."

"Dr. Sunderland, before the senate Rest Bill committee in 1889, said: 'The day on which he arose is called *a Sabbath* or *the one of the*

Sabbaths, and that phrase, *the first day of the week*, which we find in our own English version, ought never to have been there. If any man will examine the original Greek text he will see that there is nothing in the word about *the first day of the week*.' (Sen. Doc., p. 53.)"

Dr. Hessey (Bramton lectures, 1860) says: 'The writers of the two first centuries from the death of John treat the Lord's day as part and parcel of apostolic and scriptural Christianity. It was never defended for it was never impugned; never confounded with the Sabbath, but carefully distinguished from it; not of severe Sabbatical character, but of joy and cheerfulness; a day of solemn feasting for the Eucharist, united prayer, instruction and alms-giving. In no passage that has come down to us is the fourth commandment appealed to as a reason for observing the Lord's day. The writers say again and again: 'Let no man rule you in respect to a holyday, new moon or the Sabbaths.' If the facts be allowed to speak for themselves, it was purely a Christian institution, sanctioned by apostolic practice, mentioned by apostolic writings, and so possessed of the same divine authority all New Testament ordinances and doctrines possess."

"We have nothing to do with Sabbaths, or with the Jewish festivals, much less with those of the heathen. We have our own solemnities, the Lord's day, for instance, and Pentecost. The heathen confine themselves to their festivals and do not observe ours." (Tertullian, quoted in Sunday Question, p. 88.) We have cited this force of competent scholarship, ancient and modern, to show that Adventists falsify when they teach that all scholars agree that "first of the week" is the proper rendering of those New Testament scriptures which so clearly Sabbatize the first day of the week. We give yet the following points of history from Mr. T. Lean's tract, "*The One of the Sabbaths*" They briefly show how the Christian Sabbath was shifted from its New Testament basis, where we have seen it rested in the first centuries, free from both the Mosaic and civil law as a support. It no more needed them than any other doctrine of Christ.

177

"There was no Sunday legislation till A. D. 321, by which time statesmen had discovered that peace and prosperity were increased where the dominical day was kept, and to promote that keeping came to be an object of national law.

"On this basis the Christian Sabbath stood until about A. D. 1125, when Barnard Abbot of Clairveaux introduced the fourth commandment as a ground for keeping the Lord's day and the other holy days" (Lecture 3, Sunday, Hessey).

"About 395 years later (in the time of Luther, A. D. 1520) the Anabaptists and Carlostadt revived the keeping of the seventh day (Unit, of Sab., p. 456). About A. D. 1595 (63 years later) Dr. Nicholas Bound and Babbington originated the doctrine of a change of day, and keeping the fourth commandment, by keeping a seventh part of time (The Sabbath, p. 58; Hist, of Sab., p. 472).

"These new views virtually removed the Lord's day from its simple and divine foundation to one new and foreign, defenseless against foes and incomprehensible to friends, and leading to a denial of its existence."

Yes it was in the dense darkness of the apostacy, when men had lost all ability to "rightly divide the Word of truth." Yea, were even too blind to properly distinguish between the Old and New Testament, hence they confused and mixed up law and gospel, and enforced the Sabbath of the New Testament with the commandments of the Old. And this ignorance passed down from the mother of harlots into the man old creeds, catechisms, and theological standards of all her Protestant daughters. Hence the masses, having been drilled from childhood up in the decalogue and its Sabbath are not to blame for their confused education. But this utter inconsistency which keeps the first day, and yet points to the abrogated law of the seventh day to enforce it has exposed the membership of all Protestantism to the pitfall of Adventism. But thank God, "knowledge shall increase," "at evening time it shall be light," and the people are learning better than to "leach the fear of God by the precepts of man." The Lord's day as set forth in the New Testament is rapidly being understood and the Babel structure of legalism that was reared upon the rubbish of past ignorance is fast crumbling before the light of God. Amen.

Chapter 23.

When and How the Lord's Day was Enjoined.

The Saturday keepers and worshipers say there was no law given for

the observance of the first day until that of Constantino. They are ignorant of the law of love in the heart, which sees the obligation of obedience, no matter how the pleasure of the Master has been indicated. Living in the cold regions of law, they have n conviction of duty, unless there is an imperative, "Thou shalt."

Hut we are living in the dispensation of the Holy Spirit. "They that are led of the Spirit they arc the children of God." "*Thou shalt*" is scarcely heard in the gospel, "But if you know these things happy are ye if ye do them." We read not, "Thou shalt once every week, or in every month, break bread and drink of the fruit of the vine." But the King whose sceptre is love, hath said, "As oft as ye do this do it in remembrance of me." Love, and a knowledge of God's will now induces perfect obedience, and not "thou shalt," backed up by deadly stones.

It may be that the assembly of the saints on the day of Christ's resurrection was wholly the result of the Spirit's leading. Hut they met together, and in one week again, and each time Christ owned and blest the meeting with his presence in their midst, and upon them he breathed his Spirit. And there he and his church set the example of keeping the Lord's day as a time of assembling together. After that he was "seen of them forty days, speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God: and being assembled together with them, commanded them," etc. Acts 1:3, 4. Here was all-sufficient opportunity to instruct the church as to what day they should observe; and who can say he did not do so? He had told them before his crucifixion that he had "yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." Jno. 16:12. No doubt the idea of the utter abrogation of the law, and the abandonment of the Sabbath they had held sacred from childhood, and the enactment of another day in its stead, were among the very things they could not, in their unsanctified state, have been able to bear. We find even after the reception of the Spirit, some of them had trouble in getting entirely free from that yoke of bondage. Hence the wisdom of Christ in deferring the appointment of his day, at least until alter the disciples had been strengthened by his resurrection. Hut whether he taught them this duty during the forty days he met with them, or not until the reception of the Spirit, it is a fact that he drew them together on the first day of the week from the time of his resurrection; and that after they had received the Holy Spirit to

"guide them into all truth," they showed by their actions that they understood it was the will of God that they should regularly assemble upon that day. This they did, and the fact is recorded in the New Testament, and is a part of the book which Christ has given us to direct us in all things how to worship and follow him. And these meetings occurring under the direct presence and control of Jesus Christ and his inspired apostles, is all any spiritual, intelligent and obedient child of God needs to apprehend the will of God in Christ. The pure in heart only want an intimation of the Lord's will and it is sufficient. Yea, he can "guide them with his eye."

And, indeed, had the Lord's day been enjoined by a more positive command, it would have led to an investment of that day with some of the legalistic rigor of the law Sabbath; and, like the old Jews and Adventists, the disciples might have concluded that man was made for the Sabbath, and not the Sabbath for man; and thus it would have been a detriment instead of a help to their spirituality. The Lord knew very well that several repeated examples recorded in his Word, with the leading of his Spirit, is sufficient for all who have his Spirit. And as for the world he did not come to legislate for them, but leaves the nations to frame and enforce their own civil laws. And here we observe that Christians have no disposition to enforce holiday laws upon the world. If, for their welfare and prosperity, the nations are disposed to adopt and practice this element of the Christian religion, amen, it has always proved a national blessing. Hence Christians may pray God to dispose the rulers of the land to do so. But not that they should enact penal laws to compel its observance; for that were contrary to the genius of the Christian system. Therefore, if the law keepers are disposed to worship their day, and show their zeal to work upon the Lord's day, though it is indeed a curse to society, it would only make the matter worse to compel them to do otherwise. Love of truth and persuasive power are all the means by which men can be constrained to embrace Christ and his heavenly law.

But to return, we observe, it makes no difference to the Christian just how or when Christ made his church and apostles understand that the first day of the week is the Sabbath of his kingdom. It is enough that he in some way thus taught and led them, and that the fact went on record in the canon of the scriptures, and thank God, has come down to

us.

Hut we must yet meet an objection raised by the teachers of that "*other gospel*" "*which is no gospel*" Says U. Smith. "Unless it can be proved that Christ instituted his Sabbath before the crucifixion, it were too late, as nothing can be added after the death of the Testator."

A silly argument. Was he that had all authority in heaven and earth compelled to comply with the business laws of men in this world? What desperate disregard for the truth, in order to establish their creed? In direct contradiction to this false prophet we read that after Christ's resurrection he spent forty days with the disciples, "Speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God." Acts 1:3. So he continued to teach the laws of his kingdom after his crucifixion.

That all the New Testament had been taught before the crucifixion is proved false in Jno 16:12, 13. "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye can not bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide into all truth." Truth is the law of Christ's kingdom. But much of his holy law was not given to the church until he ascended to the Father, and sent the Sanctifier and Illuminator to give them a capacity for it. The Comforter not only brought to mind what Christ had taught, but showed them also, the "many things" they could not receive before. Yea. he guides into all truth. Hence Paul affirms that the things he wrote were "the commandments of the Lord." 1 Cor. 14:37.

We have intimated that Adventists worship their Sabbath. They think this a hard saying of us; for of course they are blinded to their idolatry. But alas! it is true; and in the day of judgment they will find that they are rejecters of Christ, by holding another law and not his. Christ is an exclusive Christ. No man can hold to him and at the same time to any other system besides his truth. To be under the law is to be without Christ, just as much as to be under Confucius or Mohammed. Though the law emanated from God, it "was to be done away," and "is done away." Therefore to hold it is to reject Christ just as much as to hold to a system that God never gave. The word of God is clear on this. Paul tells us in Galatians that they who "*desire to be teachers of the law,*" its "*days,*" etc, were guilty of teaching "*another gospel,*" and on them he pronounced the curse. In Col 2 he tells us plainly that to go under the old law concerning "meats, holydays and the *Sabbath* days is

not "*holding the head*," Christ. Then Christ shall profit them nothing.

One small sentence from Advent literature is enough to prove that their Sabbath is all the god they have. "*What then is Sabbath-keeping? — It is all and in all to the Christian.*" This language is found on page 27, of a tract entitled "Christ and the Sabbath," written by W. W Prescott, and published by the Adventists. The Word teaches that "Christ is all and in all," but these lawists have the impudence to put that old stone-table Sabbath right in the place of Christ. Instead of Christ, keeping Sabbath is all and in all. They here plainly tell us that they have no other god but the Sabbath, no Savior but their own works. The tract from which we quote is one of Satan's most subtle webbs. It labors to locate Christ all in the law, and obliterates the scriptural distinction between the law and the gospel, between Moses and Christ, between the Jew and the Christian. It virtually neutralizes Christ in the law and the law in Christ. In the following words it really denies the saving power of God, or else makes deliverance out of temporary bondage a greater miracle than salvation from the bondage of sin: — "You ask from one end of heaven to the other, and you go back to the very day that man was created, the first display of creative power, and inquire whether there has been from that time to this present time such a display of the power of God as was seen in the deliverance of the children of Israel from Egypt."

In the name and love of Jesus we warn all men against the dark pit of legalism. We renounce the Advent creed and spirit as positively antichrist, and one of the most fatal coils that can be thrown about a soul. We speak these things in the light of God, with the knowledge of what we say, and in conscious love for every person in that "*strong delusion*," and for all who are in danger of falling into the same. Of the sincerity of many in that unhappy sect we have no doubt. But how sad and awful their condition! They are indeed the foolish virgins Destitute of the oil of divine grace, or present salvation, they all expect to purchase it when Christ comes. And yet they are plainly told that such will any wake to find their hope gone out, too late, too late, the door of the kingdom closed, and they forever shut out. Oh that I could only prevail upon every poor soul in that dark spell of error to exchange the law for Christ.

But how the light of God is shut out of their hearts! The plain New

Testament scriptures have no more influence upon their conscience than if, indeed, they had no soul. Reason itself is paralyzed, and desperate will worship, spiritual blindness and death reigns. And nothing but the thunders of judgment will wake them from the fatal spell. O my dear Adventist friend, *seek Christ now. Be saved now, and obey the truth* which will make you free.

THE BETTER TESTAMENT.

BY W. G. SCHELL.

Price, 10c. - - - Per doz., 80c.

"By so much was Jesus made a surety of a better testament." — Heb. 7:22

The Old and New Testament, or the Law and the Gospel are set forth, showing the greater privileges to be enjoyed under the present dispensation, as compared with that of the Law 76 pages.

THE ORDINANCES

OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

By W. G. SCHELL.

112 pp. Cloth, 25c. Paper Cover, 15c.

This work fully sets forth the New Testament ordinances and the proper mode of observing the same, considered from a scriptural and a historical standpoint.

THE BOY'S COMPANION.

92 pp. Illustrated. Cloth, 25c. Paper, 15c.

This book contains valuable information for boys and young men, just the things they need to understand.

THE SABBATH;

OR, WHICH DAY TO KEEP.

186 pp. Cloth, 30c. Paper, 10c.

A very thorough work, proving by the scriptures and history that Christ took away the old law and its Sabbath and the first day is the Christian Sabbath, or "Lord's Day," of the New Testament.