

A Written Discussion ... Upon the Sabbath

A WRITTEN
DISCUSSION

BY ELDER J. H. WAGGONER,

AND
ELDER PETER VOGEL,

Of the Church of Christ,

UPON THE SABBATH.

[CD-ROM Editor's Note: This written discussion between J. H. Waggoner and Peter Vogel has material by both men, as indicated throughout the document.]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PROPOSITIONS:	1
FIRST PROPOSITION:	3
SECOND PROPOSITION:	23
THIRD PROPOSITION:	45
FOURTH PROPOSITION:	106
APPENDIX	147

PROPOSITIONS:

I. DO THE SCRIPTURES TEACH THAT THE SEVENTH DAY WAS MADE A SABBATH AT CREATION FOR MAN'S OBSERVANCE?

II. DO THE SCRIPTURES TEACH THAT THE SEVENTH DAY WAS MADE A SABBATH AFTER THE EXODUS OF THE ISRAELITES OUT OF EGYPT?

III. DO THE SCRIPTURES TEACH THAT THE SEVENTH DAY SABBATH IS TO BE OBSERVED CHRISTIANS THROUGHOUT THE GOSPEL DISPENSATION?

IV. DO THE SCRIPTURES TEACH THAT THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK IS TO BE SACREDLY OBSERVED BY CHRISTIANS?

QUINCY, ILL.,

PRINTED AT THE OFFICE OF "THE GOSPEL ECHO AND CHRISTIAN."

1872.

THE DISCUSSION.

FIRST PROPOSITION:

"DO THE SCRIPTURES TEACH THAT THE SEVENTH DAY WAS MADE A SABBATH AT CREATION FOR MAN'S OBSERVANCE?"-Waggoner affirms.

ELDER J. H. WAGGONER'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

The examination of a subject of so great practical importance as this, demands more care than I am able to bestow upon it in the midst of other labors. That which I shall write I most earnestly believe to be truth, though I cannot hope to present it in a form so acceptable as might be done under other circumstances.

To our readers I would say that, *as disputants*, it is expected that the views of the writers should be determined in their own minds, otherwise they could not honestly contend for their faith. But *as readers*, we ask you to suspend judgment, as far as possible, until the evidence is presented. And I pray that *truth* rather than *victory* may be the object of our labors.

The proposition now under consideration embraces two points: (1.) When the Sabbath was made. (2.) For what purpose it was made.

It will be well to consider what is the nature of the evidence required to sustain the proposition. For as all have, to some extent, already formed opinions on the subject, some may be satisfied with less proof than ought by right to be given, while others may ask more, and of a different kind, than the circumstances justly demand. On this I notice that

a. The book of Genesis, which contains the record of the facts of creation, is not a book of law, but a brief history, covering more than 2,000 years from creation. And

b. It was not written at or near the time when the events transpired, but hundreds of years afterward. And, therefore,

c. It was not written for the benefit or use of those who lived during the first 2,000 years, as they were a long time dead when it was written.

As might be expected in a book of this character, we often find evidence of the existence and knowledge of a law, when there is no mention of a law in the record. Thus "Enoch walked with God, and he was not; for God took him." This is a very short biography of a very eminent man who lived several hundred years. It does not furnish the least clue to the rules of life observed by Enoch. But it will not do to infer that, because not a single law is recorded, therefore not a single commandment was observed by Enoch. We must apply the principles involved in the case from our knowledge of the relations and responsibilities of a moral agent.

Again, the imagination of the hearts of men was only evil, in the days of Noah; and Noah alone was righteous before God. But righteousness consists of right doing.-1st Jno. iii., 7. Therefore, the difference between Noah and others was just

this: He was obedient to the requirements of God while they were disobedient and lawless. We are absolutely shut up to this conclusion, though the record makes no mention of any law obeyed by the one, or disobeyed by the others.

4

And again, the men of Sodom were wicked and *sinner*s exceedingly. Now there is no record that any law was given to them; but we know that "sin is the transgression of the law," 1st Jno. iii., 4; and that "where no law is there is no transgression," Rom. iv., 13; and "no imputation of sin," Rom. v., 13. Therefore they had the law given to them, and they were its transgressors. Though the record contains no law, it contains positive proof that it was there. Had the record *been written for them* to point out to them their duty, it must then have contained the law instead of barely referring to it. In all such cases we find in Genesis, not what was necessary in a legal view to guide the lives of those living in that day, for it was not written for such a purpose, nor for them at all; but (we find) all that is necessary in a historical view, to give us full assurance that moral relations were the same then that they are now, and that legal obligations were known by all, and were regarded by some and disregarded by others.

The scriptures having a *direct* bearing on the present question are not numerous; therefore the testimony will not be difficult to collate. But indirect testimony is abundant.

Concerning that Sabbath which is the subject of our investigation, Ex. xx., 10, says: "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." On the information I proceed with my argument.

How and when was the seventh day made a Sabbath day? Sabbath means rest; the Sabbath day is the rest day. Then to ascertain how and when the seventh day was made a Sabbath day, we must find the act by which was constituted a rest day; and that will absolutely decide the question. Inasmuch as it is the Lord's Sabbath day, (as himself declared,) this rest must be the Lord's rest; and of course must stand related to the Lord's work. For, as a rest necessarily supposes some work performed, the rest must be his, and his only, who performed the work.

Now I inquire, What was the work to which the seventh-day rest stands related? And no question can be more definitely answered by the Scriptures than is this, Gen. ii., 1-2: "And the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made." Ex. xx., 10-11: "But the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God. . . . For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day." The same in Ex. xxxi., 17: "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested and was refreshed." And it is repeated in Gen. ii., 3, where the reason is given for its sanctification: "And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it; *because* that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made."

This testimony is too plain to need comment, and too decisive to admit of an appeal. Its relations to obligation must be mostly reserved for the second part of my argument.

Though in strict justice nothing is required to prove the relevancy of all of the texts above quoted, or to show their evident connection, yet when wrong impressions have obtained it becomes necessary to guard the truth from its influence. Because the law is not given in form in Gen. ii., and because the observance of the sabbath was directly enforced after the exode, it has been thence inferred that the sabbath of the fourth commandment was instituted in the wilderness of Arabia, and that it is not identical with that of Gen. ii., 3. But that reference is not in harmony with the Scriptures, and is altogether unwarranted.

Ex. xvi. does not give any reason *why* the seventh day was the sabbath of the Lord; why that title was given to that day instead of to another. There is therein a *truth stated*, viz., the seventh day is the sabbath. There is also a *duty enjoined* in view of that truth, viz., to abstain from secular labor on that day. Therefore Ex. xvi. does prove that the seventh-day sabbath existed before it was proclaimed on Sinai; and it does prove that the obligation to keep it holy existed before its proclamation on Sinai. But it does *not* show *why* the seventh day was called the sabbath; it does *not* state either *when* or *by what act* it was *made a sabbath*. It was *recognized*, not *instituted*, and enforced on the recognition. I repeat, in Ex. xvi. there is found neither any act of instituting, nor any reason for the institution.

The commandment given on Sinai gives *the same reason* for the sabbatic institution that is given in Gen. ii., and *it gives no other*. Both Gen. ii. and Ex. xx.

5

say that God made the world in six days; both say that he rested on the seventh day; both say that he blessed the seventh day; and both say that he sanctified or hallowed, his rest day. That which is said by one is said by the other precisely. Though there can be no reasonable doubt that the sabbath of Ex. xx., 8-11 is the same day that was enforced at the falling of the manna, circumstances plainly showing it, as it continued to be pointed out in the same manner for years after the commandment was uttered; yet the identity of these days is not so clearly shown in the record as is the identity of the sabbath of Ex. xx. and the rest day of Gen. ii. For, as above stated, Ex. xvi. does not give the history of the sabbatic institution as it is given in Ex. xx. and in Gen. ii.

That the absence of the word sabbath in our English version of Gen. ii. has no bearing against this position, is shown in that, (1,) the words *rest* and *sabbath* are the same. (2.) The Lord said the seventh day is the sabbath, and this because of his resting thereon. And (3,) he did not make it a sabbath in the act of blessing it. In one text it says "he blessed the sabbath day," and therefore it was already the sabbath day when he blessed it. In the other it says he "blessed the seventh day because that in it he *had rested*," or sabbatized, which teaches the same thing. There may be *local reasons given for enforcing its observance*, as there are in regard to all duties, (see Lev. xix., 35-37, etc.,) but *the reason for the institution* is given in Gen. ii. and Ex. xx. And *there is no act of instituting connected with, or related to, any other reason*, than that therein given, or any other work than that of creation.

As preparatory to the second part of the argument on this proposition, and as showing the importance of a correct construction of the phrase, "the sabbath of the Lord," I notice, that the seventh day sabbath stands apart from all the other

sabbaths, which were afterward ordained, in respect to *its title; the reason of its institution; and the nature of the obligation* to observe it. And

1st. *Its title.* In any and all of the yearly sabbaths, such as were peculiar to the Jewish system, *there is no rest of the Lord from any work* given as their basis; and therefore they are not the sabbaths of the Lord as is the seventh day, his sabbath, or rest day. We find this distinction recognized in the Scriptures, as in Lev. xxiii. The yearly sabbaths are enumerated and enforced, "beside the sabbaths of the Lord;" verse 38. As all the other sabbaths were local and contingent, limited to that dispensation to Israel, it was said in prophesy, "I will cause all *her sabbaths* to cease." Hos. ii., 11.

2ndly. *The reason of its institution.* We take the first sabbath given to Israel as peculiar to their dispensation; the fifteenth and twenty-first days of the first month, connected with the feast of the Passover. These, as each of the other sabbaths peculiar to their system, were (1,) to commemorate an event in their experience; (2,) they were typical of future events; (3,) they were yearly and not weekly Sabbaths. The weekly sabbath, the seventh-day sabbath, was made at creation, and commemorated that work; and in its institution it was related to God's work only. But the others are *relative to man's action and condition as a sinful being*. I cannot conceive how a greater difference could exist.

Had man never sinned, it would then have been forever true, as it is to-day, that God made the world in six days. Had no system of redemption been devised or needed, it would still have been eternal truth that God rested the seventh day, and that he blessed and sanctified his rest day.

But, on the other hand, had not man sinned; had no system of redemption been promised; had no types of the Redeemer's work been ordained, then none of the typical or yearly sabbaths would have been instituted. Had man not sinned, the whole train of circumstances by which those sabbaths were called into being, would not have existed. They all stand related to man's action as a sinner, and to Christ's work as Redeemer. And as they point to, and have their fulfillment in, his work, they are appropriately denominated, "A shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ." Col. ii., 14-17. But the Lord's sabbath, as has been shown, is of an entirely different nature. It is not so related to man's action as a sinner, or to the work of redemption. It was not based upon any contingency, or upon any future work. But it had for its foundation a glorious work all finished and complete "when the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy;" a work

6

in which Jehovah himself delighted, and which he pronounced "very good."

And 3rdly. *The nature of its obligation.* A difference in this is the necessary result of the truths before stated. In three respects I notice this difference.

a. The obligation to keep the seventh-day sabbath is based on primary and eternal truth. By *primary truth* I here mean that which grows out of the action of God alone-out of the original constitution of things; truth that existed before the fall of man, and would ever have existed had he never sinned. There is a class of *secondary truths* growing out of a perversion of God's work; out of the contingent relation we sustain to God since the fall. And all institutions, and obligations

corresponding thereto, growing out of these secondary relations are necessarily limited by their nature; they are typical or shadowy. I think that no person, on reflection, will dispute the ground I here take, that, No typical institution or merely positive duty can grow out of original relations; i. e., out of those relations existing from creation, and by virtue of creation. And, on the other hand, No moral obligation can originate in, or spring from, a secondary relation; i. e., a relation growing out of man's act of rebellion. In God's own mind all moral relations and duties originate. Man may, and he did, create the necessity for a scheme of restitution and redemption; but no part of this plan is elementary. It owes its origin to *wrong-doing*; its necessity is laid in *sin* and *rebellion*.

b. The seventh day was from the beginning a hallowed or sanctified day. It was "holy to the Lord." Ex. xvi., 23; xxxi., 15. "The, holy of the Lord." Isa. lviii., 13. "My [the Lord's] holy day." *id.* The obligation to observe it has *sacredness* as its basis; the commandment guarded an original, sacred institution. The sabbath, like its twin sister, marriage, though often and much abused, comes down to us from Eden's purity and glory.

c. It is based on the right of property. God always claimed he seventh day as his; and this claim he based on facts as old and as unalterable as creation itself, as has been abundantly shown. But the obligation of the other sabbaths did not rest on any such original relation; and, coming yearly, they fell at different times on all the different days of the week which God gave to man for his own work. The days of the week on which any of them fell, (except when they fell on the seventh day,) were not holy by reason of any blessing or sanctification ever put upon those particular days. The consecration, in their cases, attached to institutions which were temporary, and (as to the days of the week,) were movable. God never claimed the right in them that he did in the seventh day. *He did not rest from his work on any of them.* They could not be the Lord's sabbaths, or rest, as the seventh day was and is. In a word, the duty to keep the seventh day holy is based on *the original right of property*, specifically declared. And if the eighth commandment is moral because it guards the right of property, evidently the fourth is moral for the same reason. Certainly, every relation upon which the institution and obligation of the seventh-day sabbath depended is as old as creation itself-as old as any of man's moral relations possibly can be.

The second part of this proposition-"For man's observance"-has very positive statements of scripture to sustain it. But were that not the case, it grows so naturally out of the evidence here adduced that it might even then be easily maintained if this argument be not overthrown.

ELDER PETER VOGEL'S FIRST REPLY

It is with pleasure that I enter upon the work now before me and attempt to throw some light on this and kindred questions. I am quite as busy as Elder Waggoner with other duties, and am in addition under the following disadvantage: With him the questions to be discussed are daily themes and daily studies, and have been so for years, while with me this is not the case. Having once fully settled in my mind on which side the truth lies, I have dismissed the

subject, to be recalled only on occasions like this, or once in a long while as a brief pulpit topic. Should Elder Waggoner's argument prove inconclusive, it will most likely be, not for the want of careful preparation, but for the lack of Scriptural

7

basis. Having an abiding faith that truth will triumph, I welcome this opportunity to give it expression.

So far as our readers are concerned, I expect a careful weighing of the evidence in order to an enlightened conclusion. I cannot ask you to lay aside prejudice save in that mean sense which closes one's eyes against the admission of light; but in that noble sense of having already judged the case, so far as investigated, you cannot but cling to present convictions, unless a fuller and juster view of truth should compel a change. No one can set aside his convictions at will, but only upon evidence preponderatingly to the contrary. Remember, however, that *willful* ignorance is sin. "He that knew not (his lord's will), and did commit things worthy of stripes shall be beaten."

For the sake of future reference as helps to investigation, and in order to prevent tedious repetitions, I will proceed to lay down some rules on which, I think, we will not disagree. These I denominate

FIVE DIFFERENT WAYS OF ASCERTAINING BIBLE TEACHING

Evidence may be of five different kinds; that is, Bible truths may be taught or made known to us in five different ways.

1. *By express command or statement.*
2. *By necessary implication or inference.*
3. *By probable implication or inference.*
4. *By inference less than probable.*
5. *By approved precedent or example.*

(1). An express command or statement is one where the command, fact, or truth involved is fully, clearly, and unmistakably expressed; as, "Thou shalt not kill."-Deu. v., 17.

So clear and express is this language that by no possible construction could a Jew make it lawful to kill.

(2). A necessary inference or implication is one where the doctrine taught, or the truth or fact communicated, is not expressly stated, but necessarily implied; as, "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers," etc.-2nd Cor. vi., 14-18.

Marriage with infidels is here not named as forbidden, yet who can escape the conclusion that it is unlawful to marry an unbeliever?

(3). A probable inference or implication is one where the matter involved is neither expressly stated nor yet necessarily implied, but quite likely meant; as, among the works of the flesh Paul names "revelings," Gal. v., 21. The revel (*koomos*) was "a festive procession in honor of Bacchus, (which was led through the villages, *koomoi*, with songs, games, etc.) In N. T. a nocturnal revel, lascivious feasting and revelings with songs and music, Ro. xiii., 13, Gal. v., 21, 1. Pet. iv., 3.-Greenfield.

This is a darker picture than the modern dance presents, yet has so many features like it as to be *probably* included in this prohibition.

(4). An inference less than probable is one where the evidence is not definitely in favor of a given position, and yet there is nothing against it; or, where facts seem to point both ways, but with unequal force, and the preponderance is feeble.

Thus, the Jewish Christians were in doubt respecting *meats* and *days*. The fact that God had formerly forbidden them to eat certain meats, and had enjoined certain days as holy, led them to think that these observances may yet be acceptable to Him; while the fact that they were now under a new dispensation seemed to indicate that they could now only in such ways please Him as were enjoined or divinely recognized under this new dispensation. This is the field of "doubtful disputation," and here all are free to do as they think best.-See Ro. xiv., 1-6.

(5). An approved precedent or example is such practice of the Apostles or apostolic churches as met apostolic approval and was not in its nature temporary or local. Thus

a. It is right to follow the approved practice of Apostles and apostolic churches. See Phil. iii., 17. 1 Thess. i. 7; ii., 14.

b. Some practices were not approved; these we are not to follow. See Acts xv., 37-37. Tit. iii., 9.

c. Some practices were temporary and local in their nature; such as

(a). *The Nazaritic vow with its attendant sin-offerings*. Acts xxi., 23-86; xviii., 18. Comp. Nu. vi., 1-21. This was local, being practiced only by Jewish Christians; and temporary, having met its antitype in Christ, and the temple being now destroyed no such sin-offerings can be made. It took some time to fully understand the fact that Christ was the end of these things.

(b). *Circumcision*. This was local, being

8

practiced by converts from the Jews (Acts xvi., 3; xxi., 21. 1 Cor. vii., 18-19), but not by the Gentile Christians (Gal. ii., 3; v., 2. Acts xxi., 21-25); and temporary, having an antitype, Col. ii., 11.

(c). *Paul kept Jewish sabbaths*. We read, Acts xviii., 21, that he bade the Ephesians farewell, saying, "*I must by all means keep this feast* which cometh at Jerusalem." This feast I think was Pentecost, which was a yearly sabbath. I am aware that some commentators think it was the Passover; if so, there were two yearly sabbaths to be observed in keeping this feast, since it began and ended with a sabbath. See also Acts xx., 16. The sacrifices which were included in keeping such feasts we have already seen to be local and temporary, and so were the feasts and sabbaths which Paul kept. Col. ii., 16-17.

The reason why Paul and other enlightened teachers observed all these things and allowed others to regard them is found in 1 Cor. ix., 20, and is declared to be one of expediency. "Unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under (the) law, as under (the) law, that I might gain them that are under (the) law."

When summed up we have the following as

THE VALUE OF THESE FIVE DIFFERENT KINDS OF EVIDENCE:

I. An inference which is less than probable has only speculative value; that is, it may be a basis for an *opinion*, but not a basis for faith, being too far removed from certainty.

II. A probable inference partakes more or less of certainty, and is a sufficient basis for moral action. Where nothing better can be had it is decisive, but can never outweigh or stand against an approved precedent, a necessary inference, or an express command or statement.

III. A necessary inference is as conclusive as an express command or statement, since it admits no other conclusion.

IV. An approved precedent is an authoritative example and remains in force till authoritatively set aside.

V. An express command or statement is an end to all controversy.

With these preliminaries I proceed to review Elder Waggoner's first letter. Let it, however, be well understood that I am strictly on the negative, that I have nothing to establish, but that it is my duty to examine the Scriptures relied on by Bro. W. and show that they are inconclusive as respects his affirmation. This may be done in two ways: (1) by showing that they are irrelevant, or (2) by showing *that they are fully accounted for on the supposition that the sabbath was not enjoined on man for sacred observance till after the Exodus out of Egyptian bondage.*

I agree with Elder W. that the design of Genesis was not to furnish a rule of life for the Patriarchs, but to give the Israelites and posterity a bare outline of the history of that period which it covers. That Moses wrote it is conceded by all Christians; and that he did this after he had written Exodus and Leviticus can be clearly established by such considerations as these: (1) There can be nothing but unsupported conjecture urged in favor of an earlier date. (2) He could not have written it before he came to deliver the Israelites from bondage, for in Gen. xvii. circumcision is so impressed on his mind as to render such neglect as is recorded in Ex. iv., 24-26 improbable. (3) From the exode till Exodus and Leviticus were written, or at least the history therein contained had transpired, we find Moses so busy as to have no time for such a work.

That the Patriarchs, especially the antediluvians, had rules of life traditionally preserved and enlarged by their prophets, which are very meagerly reproduced in Genesis, is unquestionably true. But in speaking of these things Eld. W. makes an unwarranted assertion. " 'Sin is the transgression of the law,' 1 Jno. iii., 4. . . . Therefore they had the law given to them." The expression "the law," when "the" is not the result of renewed mention, has a definite meaning and refers to the whole Mosaic code, as I shall show under the third proposition. But with Elder W. it means only the ten commandments, and all of them. This is a convenient way he has of begging the question by assuming that the sabbath then existed. The Patriarchs had indeed a law, for "where no law is there is no transgression," but they had not *the* law. McKnight justly renders 1 Jno. iii., 4 thus: "Every one who

worketh sin, worketh also the transgression of law; for sin is the transgression of law."

"Ex. xvi.," Bro. W. says, "does prove that the seventh-day sabbath existed before

9

it was proclaimed on Sinai; and it does prove that the obligation to keep it holy existed before its proclamation on Sinai." Granted; but this is no proof that man was under obligation from creation to keep it. What he says respecting its not having its origin there and then will be remembered and refuted when I take the affirmative of the next proposition.

I freely admit (1) that Gen. ii. speaks of the sabbath as hallowed for man; and (2) that Ex. xvi; xx; and Gen. ii. are identical as to the day of the week. I know well what has been said to the contrary on both of these points, especially on the last by Peter Akers in his Chronology; but all these positions are untenable and untrue, as will abundantly appear, though indirectly, as we proceed.

My brother reasons from the fact that the sabbath in the ten commandments is associated with the Lord's resting at creation that it existed for man's observance ever since. "*Sabbath* means *rest*; the sabbath day is the rest day. Then to ascertain how and when the seventh day was made a sabbath day, we must find *the act by which it was constituted a rest day*; and that will absolutely decide the question. . . . As a *rest* necessarily supposes some work performed, the rest must be his, and his only, who performed the work." Just so; but as man performed no work in creation he could not rest, could have no sabbath then, since "a *rest necessarily* supposes some work *performed*." There may have been a sabbath then for the Lord to keep, and for Him only; He only worked, and "the rest must be his, *and his only*, who performed the work."

I would further add, that there is no such moral or necessary connection between God's resting and man's, that man must rest simply because God rested; for if man must rest simply because God rested, then man must work six days because God worked six in succession, and he dare not take a holiday at the peril of his salvation! This argument proves too much, and therefore nothing. The fact is, God's resting on the seventh day had nothing to do with man's resting *till God sanctified or set apart that day* by express command, *for man's observance*. The connection between God's resting and man's having a sabbath to observe is not necessary or moral, but arbitrary and positive. The sabbath, therefore, is a positive institution, founded not in the original constitution of things, but based on the mere will of the Law-giver. Before, then, any one can prove a sabbath for man's observance to have existed from the beginning, it must be shown that *at* creation God so sanctified it. This Ex. xx. does not do. It simply tells us that God "blessed" and "hallowed" the seventh day, but not *when*. For aught that appears in this chapter to the contrary God may have blessed and hallowed it but the day before. Note also, it does not read that "God rested on the seventh day and *this* hallowed it," but He "rested the seventh day; *wherefore* the Lord blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it." Since man's obligation to observe the sabbath depends solely on the Law-giver's will, when God saw fit to enjoin on man a Sabbath any day could have been made equally holy.

That God had some reason for hallowing the seventh day in preference to any other, and that this reason was commemorative, may be very true. *But all commemorative institutions are positive, and dependent as to obligation on the will of the institutor, and hence are not binding on man till formally proclaimed.* If there is an exception to this, I hope my brother will produce it.

From the preceding it follows, that all that Elder W. has said concerning the nature of the sabbath's obligation falls to the ground, and needs no detailed reply. I would only add, that the sabbath *as obligatory on man* is the Lord's property in no higher sense than any other positive or commemorative institution.

My brother talks about "the reason" of the sabbath's obligation. Had he said reasons (for there are at least two) he would be nearer the truth. The sabbath is an edifice built on two foundation stones; namely, God's resting from his work, and Israel's resting from bondage, Deu. v., 15. As a wise Master-builder God would not erect His superstructure till all the corner stones are laid. And the fact that the sabbath is built also on the last-named stone destroys much of the difference which my brother attempts to find between it and the annual sabbaths.

He asserts that, "The commandment given on Sinai gives *the same reason* for the sabbatic institution that is given in Gen. ii. and *it gives no other.*" Again; "*The reason for the institution* (of the sabbath) is given in Gen. ii. and in Ex.

10

xx. And *there is no act of instituting it connected with, or related to, any other reason* than that therein given, or any other work than that of creation." Can it be possible that my brother never reads Deuteronomy? In Ch. v., 16 we read, "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." Is not this another "reason" than that given in Ex. xx.; and another work than that of creation? And is this found in Gen. ii.? Did not the Lord assign this as a reason on Sinai and Himself write it on the two tables of stone? Moses certainly is competent to testify, and he says: "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." Deu. v., 22.

With my brother's argument from Gen. ii. I find the same fault as with that from Ex. xx. It does not say *when* God "blessed" the seventh day and "sanctified it." That passage was written long after the exodus, after the sabbath had been given. It merely identifies the seventh day of the creation week with that seventh day which was at *some* time made a sabbath for man's observance. But of this more fully hereafter.

ELDER J. H. WAGGONER'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

I have received and read your rejoinder, and am happy to continue my argument, believing with you that "truth will triumph," and praying that God may order our discussion to his own glory.

1. It is quite possible to lay down rules of evidence, and still violate the principles of just reasoning. Of this, I think, you have already given an illustration which I will notice when I come to speak of the sanctification of the sabbath day. It is not the *statement* of rules that is important, but conformity to them.

2. Your exception to the literal quotation and use of i. Jno. iii., 4, "Sin is the transgression of *the* law," was to be expected from one occupying your position. Dropping the article from that text will not avail your purpose, as I think will be shown when we come to an examination of the New Testament.

3. You say of the sixth commandment, "So clear and express is this language that by no possible construction *could a Jew* make it lawful to Kill." This seems to imply (and I notice it because *I think* you so intended) that *it bound only the Jew*. Will you take a definite position on this point? Or will you leave it a matter of doubt just what you intend by this expression? Much is involved in this. There is no mention of the sin of profanity, not even by implication, in all the book of Genesis. Was blasphemy, or profaning the name of God, a "transgression of *the* law"-or of *any* law-in that age? This question is really involved now; but if you do not choose to avow your position now, it will be relevant under another proposition, and then we will canvass this field.

I will resume my argument.

Having examined the Scriptures in regard to *the time when* the seventh day was *made a sabbath*, I come now to consider the second point, to-wit: *for what it was made*.

We have already seen that, according to the Scriptures, "the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord," in a two-fold sense:

1. It is his sabbath, or rest day, because that in it *he rested*. No other fact is revealed whereby it became his sabbath. It is God's sabbath alone, because none but God rested from the work to which it stands related. It is emphatically the *Creation Sabbath*, and as such is the sabbath of the Creator.

2. It is the Lord's *by right and special claim*. When he said, "The seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God," it was not merely to establish the fact that he rested on that day; but it was the proclamation of a proprietary right in it, for it was the basis of the precept, "In it thou shalt not do any work." And again he said, "If thou turn away thy foot from the sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on

11

my holy day." Isa. lviii., 13. See also Ex. xvi., 23-25; xxxi., 13-15; Eze. xx., 20; Rev. i., 10. And though "the sabbath was made for man," all those Scriptures wherein God claims a special right in it prove that it was "made for man" as a proprietor makes houses for his employes; they are his property, and to be used by them only in his service.

I have before called attention to the truth that the book of Genesis is not a book of law, but a history; and the evidence of the existence of obligation, and not the law itself, is what we are to expect to find in that book in regard to moral duties in that age. He who takes an opposite position; who claims that no duty existed before the exodus of Israel from Egypt except what is specifically recorded, or that nothing was wrong except what was expressly forbidden in the record, places himself in a singular position in regard to the revealed truths of

that book. Perhaps no one would *directly* dissent from the position I here take. I pass to the record for proof of sabbath obligation from creation.

First, I inquire, what is sufficient proof of the obligation of an institution? Two things, and two only, are necessary to prove an institution and its obligation:

1. The act of instituting.
2. The record of appointment.

I say, these are all that can in justice be required; but if we go farther, and produce a precept enjoining its observance, in which the obligation is based entirely on the two facts, of institution and appointment, the conclusion is unavoidable that these facts determine the obligation.

I am willing to bear all the burden that justly belongs to an affirmant on such a question as this. And I freely confess that if I could not produce the act of making the institution, nor the act of its appointment, I would be ashamed to claim the existence of an institution, much more to urge any duty to observe one.

And 1st, *On the act of Instituting*. I have admitted that if we find no act of instituting, or no direct evidence of such an act, we have no right to infer the existence of an institution. But on this there is no just ground for controversy here. The evidence already presented on the making of the sabbath is sufficient on this point, to-wit: that God rested on the seventh day from the work of creation, and blessed the rest day, and claimed it as his own day *because of these acts*, making them expressly the basis of the obligation to observe it. Scarcely any other institution in the Bible has evidence in its favor so clear, so strong, and so complete as this, that *the sabbath was instituted at creation*.

2nd, *On its appointment*. The evidence of the act of instituting is positive proof of the existence of the institution, but it does not positively determine any measure of obligation in regard to it. The Scripture declarations that God rested on the seventh day, and that he blessed the rest day, indicate the regard he had for his rest day—the "sign" or memorial of his creative work. This alone would entitle the day to our high regard, and would be to us a sufficient; reason for highly regarding it if we had proper respect and reverence for *the mind and blessing* of our great Creator. But that would not determine *how we should show our regard for it*. This is, however, determined with the utmost certainty by *its appointment*.

The position taken in the above paragraph shows how pointless are the remarks of Eld. Vogel on the "necessary connection between God's resting and man's," and "man must rest *simply* because God rested." As he says, he is on the negative, and when I take that position it will be time for him to combat it. The reader will remember that I reserved the direct argument on the obligation to this number. I laid down some principles which he will never set aside; and I did say, and I repeat it, that God's resting on the seventh day is *the basis, and the only basis, of the institution*. And he need not query in astonishment whether I have read the book of Deuteronomy. I think he has read it to little purpose if he cannot make a better use of it than he has done in this article. If Deut. v. gives *the reason of the institution* I would like to have it pointed out. Is the seventh day the rest day of the Lord *because* Israel came out of Egypt? Did God bless the seventh day *because* he brought Israel out of Egypt? Did he sanctify the sabbath

day because he delivered Israel from bondage? And if so, will Bro. Vogel show us the record? Here I stand on safe, Bible ground. *The reason, and the only reason* ever given in the Bible *why* the seventh day is the sabbath, and for the blessing and sanctification of the sabbath day is that God rested from all his work of creation. *You say* it was the sabbath

12

because Israel rested from Egyptian bondage. But that is a reason of your own making; the Bible does not teach so. "The rest" which was promised them when they came out of Egypt, they did not obtain until they gained their inheritance. It was the peaceable possession of the land of Canaan. Please see Deut. iii., 18-20; xii., 9-10; Josh. i., 12-15; xxi., 43-44. Your conclusions on these points I will notice hereafter.

Now I inquire, *When* did the Lord appoint the sabbath? The answer to this question settles the second point in this proposition; for in its appointment we must find the duty of observance. The evidence of its appointment is found in the word *sanctified*, in Gen. ii., 3. and *hallowed*, Ex. xx., 11. The verb sanctified is a correct translation of the original, which is defined by Gesenius, "To make holy, to sanctify, to hallow. 1. To hold sacred, to regard and treat as holy; to keep holy. 2. To pronounce holy, to sanctify, e. g. the sabbath. Gen, ii., 3. Also to institute any holy thing, to appoint. 3. To consecrate."

Dr. Clarke, whose ability on such a question is as much beyond dispute as is that of Gesenius, says:

"To sanctify, *kadash*, signifies to consecrate, separate, and set apart a thing or person from all secular purposes, to some religious use." Again, "Here the word *kadash* is taken in its proper literal sense, signifying the separating of a thing, person or place, from all profane, or common uses, and devoting it to a sacred purpose."

The English word *sanctify* is thus defined by Webster: 1. "To make sacred or holy; to set apart to a religious use; to consecrate by appropriate rites; to hallow." The second definition refers to moral agents; the third to means. The fourth is thus given: 4. "To impart sacredness, inviolability; title to reverence and respect, or the like to; to secure from violation; to give sanction to." Hallow is from the same Hebrew word, and of course means the same.

I trust we shall have no difficulty on this point. Indeed the question on the sabbath is not so encumbered with philological difficulties as are some others, for instance, baptism. On the word baptism Webster does not conform to the uniform usage of the old Greek writers, nor to the general consent of Greek lexicons; so that in regard to baptism the English reader may become bewildered. But on the sabbath the only difficulty is to believe the united testimony of the Bible and of Hebrew and English scholars. That no institution can be "appointed" or "set apart to a religious use," except by an injunction or precept to those who are to observe it, is beyond denial. I would give scripture illustrations of the use of the word sanctified, to sustain this declaration, did I think it necessary to so occupy the space. Or, I will yet do so if it becomes necessary. Inasmuch as the sanctification of a day consists in a precept for its observance for a special or sacred purpose, the record of such sanctification or appointment is positive proof

of the obligation to observe it. But just such evidence is found in Gen. 2, in the record concerning the creation and the rest day. From that point the obligation dates.

Compare this strong evidence in Genesis for the sabbath with the facts concerning some other moral duties-say the third commandment. In all that book we find not a single intimation concerning this. Shall we therefore conclude that profanity was not sinful before the law was given on Sinai? Or was this also "Jewish," and not sinful in the other nations? Evidently it was sinful, for the name of God was holy then as it is now. And so also of the sabbath; only in regard to the latter we have *recorded facts* to sustain our position, while Genesis is silent in regard to the former.

The assumption that God did not sanctify his rest day at creation, but a long time afterward, is "an inference less than probable," doing violence both to the record and to reason. It does violence to the record, for it denies the order laid down by inspiration, wresting the third verse from the second chapter of Genesis in its relation to recorded events, and placing it where inspiration never placed it. Such a perversion of sacred scripture as that is very rarely seen. For if the events there recorded did not then transpire according to the order laid down, the record is calculated to mislead the reader; and he who takes a position involving such a consequence, should have a very necessary, plain, and decisive reason for his position. But no such reason exists. How incongruous, as a record of creation, is the following reading of Gen. ii., 3.: "And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it when he brought Israel out of Egypt; because that in it he had rested from all his

13

work which God created and made." And such an incongruity is produced by that theory. *He who asserts that Gen. ii. records events which transpired after the exode, should be able to furnish an obvious reason. Whenever the sanctification of the sabbath is spoken of in the Bible, it is based only upon the facts connected with creation.* If there were some other reason given, which originated at some other time, then there would be some show of consistency in that position. But to thus mutilate the record, and take the facts of Gen. ii., 3., from their evident and oft-declared connection is without any reason, or necessity-except that, which is found in the theory which gives rise to the perversion.

Eld. Vogel, in his effort to sustain this assumption, asserts that Genesis was written after Exodus and Leviticus, and I must notice his reasoning. 1. He says the opposite has in its favor only "unsupported conjecture." Not a very strong reason where there is only conjecture on either side. 2. He thinks if Moses had written Genesis before the exode circumcision would have been so "impressed on his mind" by chap. 17, as to render the neglect spoken of in Ex. iv., 24-26, improbable. That might be so and not affect the question. But if that is a reason, how shall we account for the neglect of circumcision during the 40 years journeying in the wilderness under the leadership of Moses? Had not circumcision been "impressed on the mind" during that whole time? See Lev. xii., 3; Josh, v., 5-7. 3. From the exode till Exodus and Leviticus were written, he thinks Moses was too busy to write Genesis! In this he assumes to know at just

what time those two books were written. How did he learn it? Is this a "necessary inference" from any scripture declaration? It is all groundless assumption. Dr. Smith, (Bib. Diet.) with others, thinks there was no original division of the Pentateuch, but that it was written consecutively, and there are some good grounds for the supposition. But Bro. V. says it "can be clearly established" that Genesis was written after the other two books! If this is, with him, "clear" evidence, what must his inferences be? But this is *the kind of evidence* on which he grounds his *faith* that the sabbath was not sanctified at creation.

Having exhausted my allotted space, I am obliged to defer some of my arguments till the next number.

ELDER PETER VOGEL'S SECOND REPLY

A few items not immediately connected with the subject before us deserve a passing notice.

When I gave "Thou shalt not kill" as an example of an express command and said that by no possible construction could a Jew make it lawful to kill, I simply meant to emphasize the fact that the command is express, nothing more. It was wrong to kill from the beginning. Nevertheless, *as given on Sinai* the command concerned none but a Jew.

My brother quotes Rev. i., 10. as applying to the Sabbath. It has no such reference, as will be shown in due time.

I do not think it necessary to occupy more time in proving when Genesis was written, since my brother admits there is no proof that it was written before the transactions on Sinai. Eld W.'s reply, however, makes me say that it was not written till Exodus and Leviticus were written. He should have quoted me in full by adding, "From the exode till Exodus and Leviticus were written, *or at least the history therein contained had transpired*, we find Moses so busy as to have had no time for such a work." Even if the Pentateuch was consecutively written, as Dr. Smith and others think, my position need not be false. The reasons I gave were only intended to show that my hypothesis has something in its favor. I have an argument that carries conviction with it, but owing to its great length I prefer not to give it since there is no need of it, there being no practical difference between us.

It is perhaps not best for my brother to say of an incomplete argument, "but this is the kind of evidence on which he grounds his *faith* that the sabbath was not

sanctified at creation." He shall have all the proof he can reasonably ask, when I take the affirmative. All that I intend at present to do is to show that his proof-texts are thoroughly consistent with the hypothesis that the sabbath was not enjoined on man till after the exode.

The conclusion I draw from a comparison of Gen. xvii. with Ex. iv., 24-26 in favor of Genesis' being written after the latter event is not proved to be false by the fact that the Israelites did not practice circumcision during their forty years' sojourn in the wilderness. It was evidently with God's approval that they did not

practice it then since they were not reproved for it. For real or culpable neglects they were invariably reproved, but not for this. In the case referred to in Ex. iv., 24-26 the neglect was culpable, else the Lord would not have "sought to kill" Moses for it. We must distinguish between things that differ.

Eld. W. makes some distinctions with reference to the sabbath, which, even if just, are not necessary to an understanding of the subject before us. He speaks of the sabbath's being *constituted*, *instituted* and *appointed*. I fear that in this he bewilders his readers, and, judging from what he says, he himself is not clear in his distinctions. As these by him are meant to be turning or salient points, he should have clearly defined them with reference to the subject before him. I suppose he intends to express nearly, if not quite, the same idea by the first two and a different one by the third, yet constitute and appoint are practically synonyms. Webster defines each by the other, and Crabb gives them as synonyms with but a little shade difference. Something similar may be said of institute and appoint. Thus Gesenius, whom he quotes on *kadash*, says: "Also to *institute* any holy thing, to *appoint*," using them synonymously.

According to Eld. W., instituting the sabbath made it a sabbath, and appointing it enjoined it on man for observance. And he evidently regards the two acts as distinct in time; for he says: "In one text it says, 'he blessed the sabbath day;' and therefore it was already a sabbath day when he blessed it. In the other it says, 'he blessed the seventh day because that in it he had rested,' or sabbatized, which teaches the same."

Again he says, that it is God's resting *and blessing* which "entitled the day to a high regard" with those who properly respect and reverence "the mind and blessing of our great Creator," without and before "appointment;" and, "the evidence of its appointment is found in the word sanctified and hallowed."

I would like to ask (1) If the seventh day was already a sabbath in the sense of being a holy day, in virtue of God's resting on it, before He blessed it, what effect did the blessing have? (2) If God's resting *and blessing* made it holy, why then was it afterwards "hallowed?" and what effect had this hallowing on the day? (3) And if it is "in its *appointment* we must find the *duty* of observance," and "the evidence of its appointment is found in the words sanctified and hallowed," how was or is the day "holy in itself?" (4) Moreover, since "the sanctification of a day consists in a *precept* for its observance for a special or *sacred* purpose," how is the sabbath a moral and not a positive institution? (5) If "God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it, because that in it he *had* rested," how is it that man had a sabbath from the beginning? (6) Again, Eld. W. insists that the sabbath was "appointed" at creation for man's observance, and yet he tells us that "the sabbath was *directly enforced* after the exode!" Of course, then, *before* the exode it was *indirectly* enforced. What was "the measure of obligation" of this indirect enforcement? Was it akin to that high regard and reverence men should have for "the mind and blessing" of God before appointment?

I fear my brother is misled by the term *sabbath*. It often and literally means nothing more than *rest*, and at times it is used to denote *sacred or religious* rest. Sabbath day, then, often denotes only a rest day, and frequently also a sacred or religious rest day, "a rest holy to the Lord." We must not confound the two. It is at

least possible for God to rest without making it thereby a sacred rest; and while His resting on any day would constitute that one day a rest day (sabbath), i. e. a day in which he *had* rested, it would not constitute it a *sacred* rest day. For if the mere act of resting, because it is God's act, necessarily makes it a holy and to-be-repeated rest, then God's working on any day, because the act is God's, makes it a holy and to-be-repeated labor. Consequently, if God's resting on any day made that day "His property," laboring on any other day made it also "His property;" and it is as morally wrong not to labor on the day on which God labored

15

as not to rest on the day on which He rested. To what absurdities such reasoning would lead us! No, the Lord's resting did not make it a holy, sacred, and to-be-repeated rest, nor impart sacredness to the day on which He rested; and such expressions as, "the Lord's sabbath" or "My sabbath" are equivalent to "the Lord's rest," "My rest," and, *if* understood to refer to His resting at creation, do not declare ownership, but simply the fact of His having rested as a fact. And rest here must not be understood of having been "refreshed" (for such an expression is only an accommodation to man's capacity as God's "repenting" is), but as equivalent to having *ended* work or *ceased* to labor. The Lord never becomes weary to need rest, nor does His spiritual nature require a special day for its culture.

Before "sanctifying" or "hallowing" the day-and "the sanctification of a day," as Eld. W. truly says, "consists in a *precept* for its observance for a special or sacred purpose"-before "sanctifying" the day it was not the Lord's property any more than any other day, but afterwards it was, and that too in the same and special sense in which other requirements based on precepts were His property. "The Lord's sabbath" or "My sabbath" is of the same category so far as it expresses ownership as "Mine ordinances" (referring to tithes, sacrifices and such like. Mal. iii., 7.), and "Mine altar." Mal. i., 7. Tithes, sacrifices and altars the Lord calls His because He has enjoined them on, *and required them* of man; and so with the weekly sabbath. The *other* sense of "My sabbath," as already said, does not declare ownership, but simply an historical fact. *We must not deceive ourselves by a double use of possessives*, making them the same.

See again how Eld. W. is misled by the two-fold sense of "sabbath." He says, " 'He (God) blessed the sabbath day;' and therefore it was already the sabbath day when He blessed it." Before God blessed the seventh day it was indeed the sabbath day in the sense that He had rested in it, but not the sabbath in the sense of a sacred and to-be-observed institution, since it was not yet "hallowed." Here we read also, He "blessed the seventh day, because that in it He had *rested*." I have given these matters more attention than they deserve, but my opponent made it necessary, and I trust we will have no more of it.

Another point deserves a brief notice. Eld. W. says: "God's resting on the seventh day is *the basis, and the only basis of its* institution. * * * * If Deu. v. gives *the reason of the institution*, I would like to have it pointed out." Let me avoid the word "institution" lest we attach different senses to it. The chief reason why God gave the Jews *the sabbath*, (and I will show in due time that it never was given to

any other people) was because they had *labored in bondage*. "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 commandeth thee to keep *the sabbath day*." Deu. v., 15. Strictly speaking, *God's resting had but little to do with the sabbath as a sacred rest on the part of man to God*. God gave the Jews a sacred rest day because of and in memory of their deliverance from bondage, as the above passage clearly shows. But the question, *how often shall I observe this sacred rest? how many days shall I labor and then rest? and this mainly*, was determined by the facts of the creation week. Accordingly, when reference is made to creation in connection with the weekly sabbath, the number *seven* or *seventh* always plays a prominent part. "God blessed the *seventh* day, and sanctified it, because that in it He had rested from all His work." "Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work. But the *seventh* day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God. * * * * For in *six* days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested on the *seventh* day; wherefore the Lord blessed the sabbath day, and lowed it." "Six days may work be done, but in the *seventh* is the sabbath of rest, holy to the Lord. * * * * 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."-Gen. ii., 3; Ex. xx., 10-11; xxxi. 15-17.

I return now to the consideration of Gen. ii., 3., which I left unfinished in my first reply. "And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it, because that in it He had rested from all His work which God created and made." The blessing and sanctifying of the seventh day made it a sabbath for man's observance. *When*, then, was it blessed and sanctified? Eld. W. says at creation; I say the passage *can*, without violence any law of language,

16

be understood of a much later date, namely, of some time after the exodus out of Egypt. In other words, it furnishes no proof that the sabbath was not made for man's observance at so late a date as I assign. For the sake of testing this, I will assume that the sabbath was given for man's observance after the exode.

1. The passage itself excludes the idea of a Sabbath for man's observance from the beginning. The seventh day was sanctified after the first seventh day was past, after God "*had* rested."

2. While narrating facts in Genesis, Moses would at times make comments thereon, as in Gen. ii., 23-24: "And Adam said, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of man." Moses comments, "Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh." This is known to be Moses' comment by the fact that Adam then knew nothing of "father," "mother" and progeny. In like manner the blessing and sanctifying of the seventh day mention in Gen. ii., 3., may be regarded as Moses's comment, called forth by the historic mention of the seventh day; as if he had said, "By the way, this reminds me that God blessed and sanctified the seventh day for man's observance after he had brought us out of Egypt." I fail to see the "incongruity" of which my brother speaks.

3. Anticipation or prolepsis is common in works, both sacred and profane, written after the event. Since Moses wrote not only long after creation, but also after the sabbath was given, there is not the slightest impropriety in speaking of both events in connection, though widely separated in time. It is needless to give examples from profane writers; let a few from the Scriptures suffice.

John xi., 1-2. "Now a certain man was sick, named Lazarus, of Bethany, the town of Mary and her sister Martha. It was that Mary which anointed the Lord with ointment, and wiped his feet with her hair, whose brother Lazarus was sick." But this anointing took place some time *after* Lazarus was sick, (ch. xii., 3.) yet they are here joined because one suggests the other, as in the case of the seventh day. The language which my brother uses in reply to me; is just as much against John: It won't do, John, to join these events, it is "doing violence to the record and to reason. It does violence to the record, for it denies the order laid down by inspiration, wresting the third years from the second chapter of Genesis, [the second verse from the eleventh chapter of John] in its relation to recorded events, and placing it where inspiration never placed it."

Matt. x., 2-4. "Now the names of the twelve apostles are these: * * * Simon the Canaanite, and Judas Iscariot, *who also betrayed him.*" (For the time of betrayal see ch. xxvi.) Comments by Eld. W.: "Such a perversion of sacred Scripture is very rarely seen. For if the events there recorded did not then transpire according to the order laid down, the record is calculated to mislead the reader!"

Let us now hear from Moses in his Genesis, ch. x., 4-5. "And the sons of Javan (were) Elishah and Tarshish, Kittim and Dodanim. By these were the *isles of the Gentiles* divided in their lands; every one after his *tongue*, after their families, in their nations." But the confusion of tongues transpired after the events of this chapter, see ch. xi., 17., and the term "Gentiles" is of still later origin. Comments by Eld. W. again: "To thus mutilate the record, and take the facts of Gen. ii., 3., [Gen. x., 4-5.] from their evident and oft-declared connection is without any reason, or necessity-except that which is found in the theory which gives rise to the perversion!" Poor Moses, he seems to have fallen into severe hands.

In Gen. iii., 20., we have an evident anachronism, i. e., an event introduced before its time: "And Adam called his wife's name Eve; *because she was the mother of all living.*" Eve was not a mother till after the events recorded in this chapter, both before and after this verse, had transpired. See ch. iv. 1. An anachronism in Gen. ii., 3., is just as lawful in itself as one here; it does no more "violence to the record" there than here. And that there are facts stubbornly demanding some such disposition of that verse, shall be abundantly shown in due time.

4. If even in none of the ways suggested Gen. ii., 3. could be shown to be consistent with such an hypothesis as I make, here is another. Both sacred and profane writers often take up a line of thought and follow it to a certain point, then return and take up a second, carrying it forward to a desired point, then return

for a third, and fourth, or as many as they see fit. Even in prophecy this plan is pursued, see Revelation and Lange on Mat. xxiv., and xxv. This precisely is what Moses did in Genesis. He began a line of history with the creation of the heavens and the earth, traced it past the making of plants, of animals, and of man, up to the making of the sabbath for man's observance; which line ends with Gen. ii., 3. He then *returns* to the very beginning at v. 4, brings up another line which ends with the fourth chapter, in the days of Enos, when "men began to call upon the name of the Lord." And in the fifth chapter he returns a third time, not now to the beginning, but to the creation of man, and traces another line. Even in the book of Exodus the same course is to some extent pursued.-Since Gen. ii., 3., stands at the *end* of a line of history, it is with all ease and naturalness that it falls in with my hypothesis. While this is actually the case, yet, as compared with what it is recorded immediately before and after the third verse, it may be looked upon as comment, prolepsis, or anachronism, according to the stand-point from which we view it. And thus the impregnable Gibraltar of a creation sabbath is shown to be a fort of paper. What then shall we say of other passages, which by their friends are confessed to be weaker?

I knew not till copying it that this article is so long; I shall atone for it by brevity in my next.

ELDER J. H. WAGGONER'S THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

1. Your comment, "*as given on Sinai*," on the precept, "Thou shalt not kill," has no practical meaning, since it was "binding from the beginning," and of course binding on those who did not hear it at Sinai.

2. Rev. i., 10. refers to the Sabbath, and it only, if "the Bible and the Bible alone" is our standard. If we are left to be guided by inferences or tradition it is immaterial to what it refers.

3. Eld. V. now makes a wide difference between his reason given, and his reserved "argument" for saying that Genesis was written after certain events transpired. But when he gave those reasons he said it was shown "by such considerations as these." Doubtless that is so!

4. Bro. Vogel is a critic,-and he seems to be determined that we shall realize it. He criticizes my use of the word *constitute*, because I use it aside from the idea *appoint*. True, they may be used synonymous, and they may not. The distinction I made was this that the Seventh day was *constituted a rest day*, by the particular act of *resting*, before it was sanctified or appointed. This strictly correct, both in fact and in language, and I have no fears that my readers will "be bewildered" or have any difficulty in understanding me, even if am not always precise as Bro. V. But onward a little in his article I read: "While his resting on any day would constitute it a rest day (sabbath) i. e. a day in which he '*had rested*,' it would not constitute it a *sacred* rest day," or day to be observed. Here he makes exactly the same distinction that I made between constituting it a rest day *merely*, and appointing it for observance. Why is this? Is he bewildering his readers? is he "not clear in his distinctions?" or is this a piece of hypercriticism, taking time to no purpose?

5. Another point involves both criticism and logic, and is most remarkable. He says: "He (Eld. W.) tells us the sabbath was *directly enforced* after *the exode*." Of course, then, *before* the exode it was *indirectly* enforced." O, of course! That is to say that no precept can be directly enforced at two different times! Perhaps he will yet claim that the precept "Thou shalt not kill," is directly enforced in the New Testament, and "of course" it was not directly enforced at Sinai! and then what becomes of his statement at the head of his article? No one will deny that baptism was directly enforced at Cesarea on Cornelius. "Of course, then, it was *indirectly* enforced" on the day of Pentecost! Is Eld. V. also "bewildered?" or must our time be consumed on mere catches and plays upon

18

words? To quote his own language, "I trust we will have no more of it."

6. His questions relative to the seventh day being "a sabbath in the sense of its being a holy day, in virtue of God's resting on it, before he blessed it," may amuse the fancy of those who are satisfied to be amused; but he might have saved his time if he had more carefully read my argument wherein I distinctly assert the contrary. Again, he expresses fear that I am misled by the term sabbath; that I confound "a rest day," with "a sacred rest day," and he comments at length on the difference. But he has not stated-he cannot state-that difference more explicitly than I have. I have constantly made the *resting the ground and reason of the sanctification*; and God himself so declared it.

Eld. Vogel's line of argument marked 1 to 4 is inconclusive. The first point will be noticed if it shall be attempted to show that there is any point in it.

The second: There is no evidence in Gen. ii., 24. of any "comment" of Moses. When Adam named his wife Eve. (chap. iii. 20.) it was because *he knew* "she was the mother of all living;" that is, that a race was to spring from her. And he could as well know that "fathers" and "mothers" would, yes, *must* exist. To say he knew nothing of "progeny" is to directly contradict his reason for naming his wife Eve. Nor is there any "anticipation" of facts occurring, for it only states what "shalt" or ought to be-in the future.

The third; Not a single text quoted justifies his construction of Gen. ii., 3. The parenthetical remark in John xi., 2., "It was that Mary that," etc., directs the mind to another occasion and to a circumstance not then transpiring. In Matt. x., 4. the word of transition, "also," has the same effect. These texts are unlike Gen. ii., 3., and it is wrong to use them as he has, for, the reference in Gen. ii., 3., in regard to the sanctification of the seventh day, is only to facts in the immediately preceding connection. Gen. x., comes properly under the head marked "4." It is a line traced down, and chap. xi. returns to trace other events. Now in a record of "their generations," some length of time is necessarily involved, for several generations are given; whereas, the confusion of tongues occurred but a little more than one hundred years after the flood. Therefore there is no disarrangement of chronological order in verse 5. As to the claim on the word *Gentiles* the translation is altogether too questionable to warrant it. It simply means *nations*.

Gen. iii., 20. is the only text cited from that book which has a show of aid to his claim on the theory of anticipation. It contains the same cansal word that is in Gen. ii., 3. So far all right. Let us farther trace the parallel.

"And Adam called his wife's name Eve; *because* (future fact anticipated) she was the mother of all living."

"And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it: *because* (future fact anticipated) that in it *he had rested* from all his work which God created and made!"

Now if this *could* only be made to read, And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it: *because*-he brought the children of Israel out of Egypt, what a splendid proof text it would be for Bro. Vogel's theory! The truth is, the construction of Gen. ii., 3., as it refers to nothing but the immediately preceding context, excludes the idea of prolepsis, *and Eld. Vogel more than half confesses it*, notwithstanding his argument on that point. What, then, must be thought of his labored effort to put my remarks so "severely" against Moses, while he acknowledges what I claim, that there is really no prolepsis, and says that it falls under another head? It evidently was to affect the minds of the readers; a course generally pursued by those who are conscious of the weakness of their cause. I fear indeed that the record of Moses has fallen into bad hands-but they are not mine!

The fourth: It is true that the sacred writers often carry down a chain of events, and then return and take up another, even from the place of beginning. He needed not to say, "Even in prophecy," for it is very common in prophecy. How far did Moses come down in this line, from Gen. i., 1., to ch ii., 3? Though completed work creation, to the establishment of the week-which was known to, and recognized by the patriarchs-and to the appointment of the rest day; which appointment was based *entirely* upon the facts just recorded.

But there is quite too much assumed in regard to Moses bringing down one line of events and then returning to the beginning to take up another, as may be shown hereafter.

According to a promise, I now farther notice a point in his first article. He

19

seems to be aware of the strength of the argument for the *creation sabbath*, and attempts to turn away its force in a singular manner. Admitting that *the Lord rested* on the seventh day from the work of creation and that *the Lord's rest* is *the Lord's sabbath* (who will deny it?) he says: "There may have been a sabbath there for the Lord to *keep*, and for Him only." As keeping a weekly sabbath necessarily supposes alternations of labor and of rest, and as the Lord's work was that of creation, and that only, it follows that the Lord could only *keep* the sabbath by continuously creating on six days! Let him deny who can that *the Lord's sabbath* dates from the seventh day of creation week. There was its origin-there it was *made*. Did God make the sabbath for himself? Did the Savior say "The sabbath was made for God?" Why not "hear him?" It was "made for man." God could not *keep* the sabbath because he did not continue to work after the first six days. But man could rest from his own work and continue to keep God's sabbath in commemoration of God's resting from his work.

Again, Bro. V. admits my position, saying, "As man performed no work creation he could not rest, could have no sabbath then." That it was I claim; it was the Lord's sabbath because of the work of creation, and his only. *The sabbath was never based on man's work.* And here we discover the strength of the truth for which I contend. *It was the Lord's sabbath, and no other, which man was commanded to keep holy.* "The seventh day is *the sabbath of the Lord the God; in it thou shalt not do any work,*" "Verily *my sabbaths ye shall keep.*" The Lord's sabbath-the creation sabbath-and not their own was enjoined in the commandment. No person can point to a single reason for its being the Lord's sabbath except the facts of creation. Was the seventh day made the sabbath (rest day) of the Lord at any time but at creation? If so, let it be shown. And *the rest day of the Lord* is the only weekly sabbath enjoined in the Bible.

In view of the clear testimony concerning the making of the sabbath at creation, the words of our Savior, Mark ii., 27., are very significant. "The sabbath *was made for man.*" When was the sabbath *made for man*? Most assuredly *when it was made*, and not at some time. The Savior's words must have respect to *some relation* between man and the sabbath; and whatever superstitious gloss he intended to remove; whatever tradition he designed to correct, it yet remains true that that relation between man and the sabbath originated when the sabbath was made, namely, at creation. God made the world to be inhabited; Isa. xlv., 18.; and he made the sabbath for man-for earth's inhabitant. In every step-in the resting, the blessing and the sanctification-he had man in view, according to the Savior's words. But to say *the sabbath was made* at one time, and indicated *for man* 2,500 years afterward, is to contradict the words of Jesus.

An important sabbath testimony (often perverted) is that which presents the sabbath as "a sign." It has been claimed that it was a sign between the Jews and the Gentiles to keep a distinction between them. This is not true any farther than it is true that obedience to God always separates to him "a peculiar people." What is thus affirmed of the sabbath may with equal propriety be affirmed of any other moral duty. But the Scriptures never present the sabbath as "a sign" in any such light. In Ex.xxxi., 17. the Lord says. "It is *a sign between me and the children of Israel forever.*" It is *never* said in the Bible that it is a sign between the Jews and the Gentiles, but between the Lord and his people. To take the name of God out of this text and insert "the Gentiles" in its place is as presumptuous as it is name of the Lord out of the fourth commandment and make it read, "The seventh day is the sabbath sabbath of the Jews." But with some it has seemed to make no difference whether the name of Jew or Gentile be used as a substitute if the name authority of Jehovah can only be disconnected from the sabbath.

But of what is it a sign? what is its object? Read the text: "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.*" We notice here, as everywhere in the Scriptures, that sabbath truth and sabbath obligation center in the work of creation and the right of Creator. And it is true that the word "refreshed" does not indicated relief from fatigue; neither does "rest," when applied to the Lord. But *refreshed* is additional to *rested*, and indicates the delight he took in his rest day.

It can only be a perversion of this text and an outrage on just reasoning to say

20

the sabbath is a sign between Jews and Gentiles *because* Jehovah made the world in six days and rested the seventh day! See also Eze. xx., 20.; "And hallow my sabbaths; and they shall be a sign between me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord your God." The *creation sabbath* is the *Creator's sign* or memorial. In many scriptures the power to create and the work of creation are set forth as the distinguishing characteristics of the true God. And the sabbath is the sign of the exercise of that power. See Jer. x. wherein the idols and the worship of the heathen are decried. "The gods that have not made the heavens and the earth, they shall perish." "The portion of Jacob is not like them, for he is the former of all things." And the apostle Paul used the same fact to distinguish the true God from the multitude of false gods worshiped in Athens; Acts xvii. Whom they ignorantly worshiped as "The Unknown God," him Paul declared unto them in these words: "God that made the world and all things therein." See also Acts xiv., 15.; Rev. xiv., 6-8.

It is an undeniable truth that commemorative institutions are the very best means of imparting and perpetuating a knowledge of important events. No other event in the great struggle for American Independence is so well known by all the American people as the signing of the Declaration of Rights; and why? Because the fourth of July has been celebrated as a memorial day Books of history and monuments of stone are but feeble reminders compared with a memorial day. As long as the fourth of July is celebrated so long will the work of our fathers be distinctly remembered. Their patriotism their sufferings, and their triumphs can never be lost be the people while the day is observed. And so of the sabbath of the Lord. He declared it was a sign that it might be known that he was the Lord God; that he was the Creator of heaven and earth. Had it been uninterruptedly and universally observed, the knowledge of the true God-the Creator-could never have been lost to the nations of the earth. Truly, its importance cannot be overestimated.

According to the limitations which we have placed upon ourselves I must now dismiss this proposition. Many points necessarily remain unnoticed. But I hope the reader will not pass lightly over it. The subject is important. The text book is the word of the Most High. Reverence becomes us in all our examinations of its sacred pages. I pray that a sense of our responsibility and a view of the great tribunal to which we are hastening may ever be before us; that our lives may be framed in reference to these solemn things. To this end may we all heed the admonition of the divine words: "Fear God and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man. For God shall bring every work into judgment." Eccl. xii., 13-14.

ELDER PETER VOGEL'S THIRD REPLY

There are some points in Eld. W.'s last affirmative which I may safely pass by without further notice since they have already received sufficient attention.

Bro. W. comforts himself with his supposed discovery that I am guilty of the same confusion with regard to the use of "constitute" that I charge upon him. From this the reader will understand that Eld. W. regards my strictures as not without force. But he will also inquire whether Eld. W.'s source of comfort is real, or whether the word, when used by me in his senses, was not borrowed as quotation from him, either directly or in-directly, for the purpose of showing up the fallacy of his reasoning and to make his confusion appear. Possibly these "catches" have *caught* somebody.

Eld. W. now says that he does not now and never did regard the seventh day holy before it was blessed and sanctified. If this is the case, I have certainly misread him. But I cannot dismiss the conviction that his first article, which I have not now at hand, so represents him. However, I am most happy to be set right. He says, "I have constantly made the *resting* the *ground* and *reason* of the *sanctification* [i. e. making *holy*,] and God himself declared it." But the reader will also remember that in his second article he says, "The *sanctification* of a day consists in a *precept* for its observance for a

21

special or sacred purpose." Now if the day had to be *made* holy before it became so, how is it holy *in itself*? And if the making of it holy was by a *precept*, how is the sabbath a "moral" and not a positive institution?

The reader will judge from his own sense of the force of language whether to say "the sabbath was *directly* enforced *after* the exode" does not most naturally imply that before that event it was indirectly enforced. The transactions on the day of Pentecost and at the house of Cornelius with regard to baptism furnish no parallel to the above. Baptism was directly enforced once for all on Pentecost. The enforcement at the house of the Centurion had no direct reference to baptism, but Cornelius; and the fact that *he* was then required to be baptized shows that he had not been required to attend to it on Pentecost. But to clinch it all, Eld. W. says, "Perhaps he (I) will yet claim that the precept 'Thou shalt not kill' is directly enforced in the New Testament, and 'of course' it was not directly enforced at Sinai!" It is well that he says "perhaps," it may save his reputation as a prophet. He need not ask, "Is Eld. V. also 'bewildered?'" He will find him clear and pointed then.

My comments on Gen. ii., 3., Eld. W. treats rather cavalierly; but, if I mistake not, the reader will find more pith in them than Eld. W. sees. While I am satisfied that all of the four points there made will bear testing, yet, if but one of them would stand, he is defeated. Nay more, though all were worthless, and I should establish the affirmative of the next proposition it would suffice to refute his position on that passage. A few things, however, that he says regarding them, shall receive attention.

To prove that Gen. ii., 24. is not Moses's comment on v. 23, Eld. W. cites Gen. iii., 20. to show that Adam had the necessary knowledge to be himself the author of those words. I have, however, already shown that Gen. iii., 20. is an instance of anachronism, i. e., an event introduced before its time. This the very language of the text demands: "And Adam called his wife's name Eve; because she *was* (not *is to be*) the mother of all *living* (or *alive*, not who *are to live*)."

The instances I cited as cases of anticipation are undeniably such. The mere accident that the sentential or grammatical structure is not the same in Gen. ii., 3. as in some of them, does not affect the case in the least. In this respect the passages cited differ even among themselves, and yet are instances of prolepsis. It is the *facts* that are essential, not the *manner* in which the facts are stated.

Eld. W. places two passages in such a light as to pervert facts, and then makes merry over his caricatures. They are these:

"And Adam called his wife's name Eve; because (future fact anticipated) she was the mother of all living."

"And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it: *because* (future fact anticipated) that in it *he had rested* from all his work which he created and made."

If this were really my argument, I should dismiss it with shame because of its imbecility. But suppose, Bro. W., you place your parenthetic words, "future fact anticipated," immediately after the *and* at the beginning of each sentence, then read the sentences in their biblical connections, and see "what a splendid proof-text it would be for Bro. Vogel's theory."

Again: I am represented as "more than half confessing" that there is no prolepsis in Gen. ii., 3. Beg your pardon, sir, I meant no such thing. I claimed all the possible ways exhibited, "comment, *prolepsis* anachronism," and all, as applicable here, but expressed a preference for the various lines-of-history explanation. If my language seems to you to express more than this, rest assured I meant no more, and accept this explanation.

Eld. W. quotes from my first letter, concerning God's resting at creation: "There may have been a sabbath then for God to keep, and for Him only," and takes it as a concession on my part that there was then a sabbath. If he will take the trouble to turn to that letter, he will find that I had for my principal object to show that there was no sabbath then for *man* to keep on Eld. W.'s own basis, namely, that "a rest necessarily supposes some work performed." I did not admit that there was a sabbath then at all, but said, in effect, If there was a sabbath, or, to quote the language then employed, "There *may* have been," not there *was*, a sabbath. I roundly deny that there was any sabbath then, either for man or God, *in the appropriated or special sense of the word sabbath*. That God then *rested*, i. e. *ceased to create*, is true, but that this had any special significance, I deny. Strictly speaking, as intimated in my last, the Lord has *never* rested since the worlds

22

were made; and if Bro. W. means more than simply completed creation by "he did not continue to work after the first six days," he clearly mistakes the facts. "Behold, I go forward," says Job, "but he is not there; and backward, but I cannot perceive him; on the right hand where *he doth work*, but I cannot behold him." Job xxiii., 8-9. Even on the famous seventh day God worked, "*upholding* all things by the word of his power," the same word with which he created.

My brother repeats again and again the expression "*My sabbath*" as referring to the fact that God rested on that day and denoting possession on that account.

I showed in my last letter, and to this item he has not replied, that such is not the force of "My" as used in such Scriptures, but that it expresses possession only in the same sense and for the same reason that it does in the phrases "Mine altar," "Mine ordinances," etc. If "My sabbath" refers to the *day* on which God rested, then "My sabbaths" refers to *days* on which He rested, and there is more than one rest day of the Lord! Notwithstanding I have referred him to such facts, *and without attempting any disposition of them*, he repeats with all assurance, "No person can point to a single reason for its being the Lord's sabbath except the facts of creation!" Tell me, brother, how the Jewish altar came to be the Lord's, and the Jewish ordinances the Lord's ordinances, and you will have answered yourself, having found not only "another reason," but "the reason."

"Did God make the sabbath for himself?" No, sir, He made it for man. "When was the sabbath *made for man*?" "Most assuredly *when it was made*," Eld. W. correctly replies. But if by this he means that *the* sabbath was made for any one by God's resting, I deny it. God's resting on the seventh day did not make it "the sabbath," but His "appointing," i. e. His "blessing" and "hallowing" the seventh day made it "the sabbath." We must not deceive ourselves by a play on the two *different* senses of the term sabbath. Sabbath (rest simply) is not the sabbath. God's resting or ceasing to create may, *etymologically* be called sabbath (rest simply,) but it was not "the sabbath," the *sacred* rest which was required of *Fman*. This sabbath was made when God enjoined a day on man to be sacredly observed, which took place in the wilderness, as I shall soon have an opportunity to prove.

My brother asks, in effect, If the sabbath was made after the exode, when God legislated for the Jews only, how was it "made for man," i. e. all mankind? I answer, it never was made for all mankind. Mark ii, 27., refers only to the Jews. The universal term *anthropos* (man) is thus limited by the *known fact* that the Gentiles had no sabbath. This is a common use of general terms in every tongue. Thus, "There is one God, and one mediator between God and *men* (*anthropoi*)." 1. Tim. ii., 5. Here the term "men" is used universally, since there is no known limitation. "And the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful *men* (*anthropoi*,) who shall be able to teach others also." 11. Tim. ii., 2. Here we have the same universal term unlimited save as faithfulness and ability to teach limit it, and yet the known fact, not here mentioned, that *wives* are not to be public preachers of the Gospel (1. Tim. ii., 12.) restricts it in a manner similar to which "man" in Mark ii., 27., is restricted.

"The week was known to, and recognized by, the patriarchs," says my brother, and this he regards as proof of a creation sabbath. I wish he had been more explicit in this and had cited the passages on which he relies. I feel awkward in replying to so broad a statement, referring to many passages in general, but to none in particular. Nevertheless I shall try.

Gen. iv., 3-4 is one of the passages to which, I suppose, he alludes. "And in the process of time (*marginally* end of days) it came to pass that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the Lord." etc.

1. "End of days" is supposed to refer to the end of the week. If so, it was on Sunday that Cain and Abel sacrificed, and it proves Sunday-keeping rather than sabbath-keeping.

2. "End of days" is just as appropriate in itself to express the end of a year as the end of a week; and in this case more so, since after harvest most likely men would bring a thank offering "of the fruit of the ground."

3. "End of days" must denote the end or lapse of a year, or longer period, in 1. Kings xvii., 7., and Neh. xiii.. 6. "After a while (*marg.* at the end of days)" Elijah's brook dried up for lack of rain. Simply a week without rain would not have had such an effect.-

23

During the absence of Nehemiah from Jerusalem various disorders crept in among the Jews. "After certain days (*marg.* at the end of days)" he obtained leave to return and rectify them. A week would have been too short for all this.

Gen. xxix., 26-28. "Fulfill her *week*," that is, feast seven days for Leah according to custom (see Judges xiv., 10-12.) and I will give you Rachel, for whom you shall then "serve with me yet seven years."

1. Seven days of festivity no more prove that the seventh day was observed as a sabbath, than the *seven years* of service prove that the Patriarchs allowed the land to enjoy a sabbath during the seventh year, as the Jews did; or that the *seven years* of famine and of plenty (Gen. xli., 26-29-53.) prove the same.

2. In fact it proves the very opposite, namely, that there was then no sabbath observed; for they feasted and had a merry time for a *week*.

It is true that dividing time into periods of seven days was known to the Patriarchs. See Gen. vii., 4-10; viii.; 10-12; xxix., 26-28. But

1. This does not prove the observance of the seventh day any more than the division of time into periods of seven years proves a sabbatic year. On the contrary, as we have seen, neither Jacob nor the family of Laban observed such a day, and they were religious people. See Gen. xxviii., 1-4., *et seq.*

2. This division of time *may* have had its origin in the creation week. But it would not follow from this that the seventh day was necessarily kept as a sabbath.

3. It is by no means impossible that this division of time originated in in the quarters of the moon, or at least was kept in memory by them, which are about seven days in length. A synodical month is 29 d. 12 hr. 44 min. and 2. 8 sec. in length. A sidereal month contains 27 d. 7 hr. 43 min. and 11. 5 sec. The Peruvians counted their months by the moon; their half months by its increase and decrease; and their weeks by its *quarters*, *having no names for the days of the week*. They had also a cycle of *nine* days, the approximate *third* part of a lunation; as the week is the approximate *fourth* part. See *Kitto's Cyclopúdia*, Art. Day.

To conclude. Bro. W. has produced no *express command or statement*, no *example or precedent*, and *no necessary inference* of the sabbath's having had an existence before the exode. This is simply a fact. Whether he has been successful in establishing a *probable inference* is not for me to decide. Let the reader judge.

SECOND PROPOSITION:

"DO THE SCRIPTURES TEACH THAT THE SEVENTH DAY WAS MADE A SABBATH AFTER THE EXODUS OF THE ISRAELITES OUT OF EGYPT?"-Vogel affirms.

ELDER PETER VOGEL'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

Hitherto I have been on the negative, attempting to show that the passages of Scripture, relied on by Eld. Waggoner to prove that the sabbath was given at creation for man's observance, are thoroughly consistent with the giving of the sabbath at a much later date. It is with pleasure that I now take the affirmative and attempt to show *when the sabbath was given*. If I am successful in locating its origin this side of the exode, my former position will be unanswerably corroborated.

To the reader I would say that our space is limited and I have much to tell; I cannot, therefore, pause to elaborate or repeat, but shall concisely give solid facts and reasons. Were this an oral debate which could be heard but once, I would be at every pains to explain and elaborate, but being written it is not needed.

1. *When an institution is instituted or enacted, or mentioned for the first time, the definite article "the" is always wanting.*

Take, for example, the seven annual sabbaths which the Lord gave to the Israelites:

1 and 2. *The first and seventh days of unleavened bread.*-Ex. xii., 15-17: "Seven days shall ye eat unleavened bread; even the first day shall ye put away leaven out of your houses. * * * And in the first day there shall be a holy convocation, and in the seventh day there shall be a holy convocation to you: no manner of work shall be done in them, save that which every man must eat, that only may be done of you"

3. *Pentecost*-Lev. xxiii., 21.: "And ye shall proclaim on the self same day, that it is a holy convocation unto you; ye shall do no servile work therein; *it is a statute forever* in all your dwellings throughout all your generations."

4. *The first day of the seventh month.*-Lev. xxiii., 24-25.: "In the seventh month, in the first day of the month, ye shall have a sabbath, a memorial of blowing of trumpets, a holy convocation. Ye shall do no servile work therein: but ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord."

5. *The tenth day of the seventh month. The great day of atonement.*-Lev. xxiii., 27-32.: "Also on the tenth day of the seventh month there shall be a day of atonement; it shall be a holy convocation unto you. * * * It shall be a sabbath of rest unto you."

6 and 7. *The fifteenth and twenty-second days of the seventh month.*-Lev, xxiii. 39.: "Also in the fifteenth day of the seventh month, when ye have gathered in the fruit of the land, ye shall keep a feast unto the Lord seven days: on the first day shall be a sabbath, and on the seventh day shall be a sabbath."

It in precisely in this indefinite way that the weekly sabbath is first introduced to our notice and to the attention of the Israelites. For the sake of easy reference, as well as some criticisms, let me here transcribe so much of the sixteenth chapter of Exodus as we shall have use for.

(4) "Then said the Lord unto Moses, Behold, I will rain bread from heaven for you; and the people shall go out and gather a certain rate every day, *that I may prove them, whether they will walk in my law or not.* (5) And it shall come to pass, that on the sixth day they shall prepare that which they bring in; and it shall be twice as much

25

as they gather daily. * * * (22) And it came to pass, that on the sixth day they gathered twice as much bread, two omers for a man: *and all the rulers came and told Moses,* (23) And he said unto them, This is that which the Lord hath said, To-morrow is the rest of the holy sabbath [Heb. and Gr. *a rest, a rest of holiness*] unto the Lord; bake that which ye will bake to-day, and seethe that which ye will seethe; and that which remaineth over lay up for you to be kept until the morning. (24) And they laid it up till the morning, as Moses bade: and it did not stink, neither was there any worm therein, (25) And Moses said, Eat that to-day; for it is a sabbath [so also Heb. and Gr.] unto the Lord; to-day ye shall not find it in the field. (26) Six days ye shall gather it; but on the seventh day, which is the sabbath [Heb. and Gr. *a sabbath*], in it there shall be none. (27) And it came to pass, that there went out some of the people on the seventh day for to gather, and they found none. (28) And the Lord said unto Moses, How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws? (29) See, for that the Lord hath given you the sabbath [Gr. and Heb. *the sabbath*], therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread for two days; abide ye every man in his place, let no man go out of his place on the seventh day. (30) So the people rested on the seventh day."

From this it necessarily follows that *the idea of a sacred sabbath was a new thing*; for

1. This, its first mention, introduces and describes it as a new affair is introduced and described. Note the language, v. 23, "To-morrow is (not *the* sabbath, as it a well known institution, but) *a sabbathism*," i.e. a rest. They had often rested when weary and so readily comprehended this, but were surprised that, whether weary or not, the following day must be spent in rest. Then Moses adds another thought, that of sacredness,—"a rest of *holiness*." But how holy? holy for what? "Of holiness *unto the Lord*." Thus step by step, as one teaches a child a new thing, Moses taught the sabbath to the rulers. So also to the people, v. v. 25-26,—"a sabbath."

2. The definite article in the English version is supplied by the translators, who, no doubt, labored under the impression that the sabbath was an older institution; but there is nothing in the Hebrew or the Greek to warrant it; *the article is wanting*.

In Green's Hebrew Grammer, §245.3. we read, The definite article in Hebrew is prefixed when the thing referred to is "suggested by the circumstances, *or may be presumed to be well known*." §248: "Indefinite nouns are characterized as much by the *absence* of the article." There are, however, three cases in which a

noun is definite without the article: §246. 1. "Proper nouns, which are definite by signification. 2. Nouns with suffixes, which are rendered definite by the appended pronoun. 3. Nouns in the construct state before a definite noun, whether this has the article, is a proper noun, has a pronomial suffix, or is itself definite by construction." But the passage under consideration comes under none of these exceptional rules. We are, therefore, shut up to this conclusion, that, had the sabbath been a pre-existent and well known institution, the presence of the article would be here demanded, and its absence proves this the first mention of the sabbath.

The same rule obtains also in Greek. See Crosby's Greek Grammar, §469. "The article is prefixed to substantives, to mark them as *definite*." §472: "A substantive not employed in its full extent may be rendered definite, (§479:) by *previous mention, mutual understanding, general notoriety*, or emphatic distinction." Now the term sabbath (rest) is not employed in its full extent when describing the sabbatic institution, since it does not include all rest. Had it, therefore, been definite by "*previous mention, mutual understanding, (or) general notoriety*," the presence of the definite article would have been demanded in Ex. xvi., 23-25 and 26. If this is not proving my position, I know not how anything can ever be proved. But I will add proof to proof.

3. When the original sabbath law is elsewhere quoted the same facts stare us again stubbornly in the face. "These are the words which the Lord hath commanded, that ye should do them: Six days shall work done, but the seventh day there shall be to you a holy day, a sabbath of the rest to the Lord," Ex. xxxv., 1-2. Here the same rules apply as before. This version is faithful in spite of

26

the translators' prepossessions which made them turn commentators in the former case, though the construction is the same.

4. The *rulers* did not expect a sabbath-it took them by surprise. "And it came to pass, that on the sixth day they (some of the people) gathered twice as much bread, two omers for a man: and *all the rulers* of the congregation came and told Moses. And he said unto them, This is that which the Lord hath said (to me and Aaron,) To-morrow is a rest, a rest of holiness to the Lord." Ex. xvi., 22-23. Had the sabbath been a pre-existent institution, certainly "the *rulers* of the congregation" would have remembered it. The supposition that they had forgotten it is not sufficient to account for Moses' answer. In that case he would have said, Tomorrow is *the* sabbath, the day on which the Lord rested from creation and which He sanctified for man's observance. Anything short of mentioning the facts of the creation week would have been no explanation.

5 The *people* knew nothing of a sabbath. In the *beginning* of the seventh day after the first falling of the manna, Moses addressed the people thus: "Eat that (extra omer of yesterday's gathering) to-day; for to-day is a sabbath unto the Lord: to-day ye shall not find it in the field. Six days shall ye gather it; but on the seventh day, which is a sabbath, in it there shall be none." vv. 25-26. This we know to have been addressed to the people, since "all the rulers" were informed the day before. Had the people known the sabbath as an old institution, the laws of every language having a definite article would have required its use here. That

the people did not look for a sabbath appears also from the fact that some of them did not gather a double quantity of manna on the sixth day, expecting to *work on the seventh*. "And it came to pass, that there went out some of the people on the seventh day for to gather, and they found none." v. 27. Moreover, when the Lord reproveth them, (no doubt for all past disobedience, but) especially for disregard as to the quantity to be gathered on each day and for breaking the sabbath given them that day, He spoke of the sabbath as *definite* and *known*. "How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws? See, for that (because) the Lord hath given you *the* sabbath,¹¹ therefore, he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days: abide ye every man in his place on the seventh day. So the people rested on the seventh day." vv. 28-30. The fact of using the article "*the*" here, when we know the sabbath was known, as well as in Ex. xx., 8., "Remember *the* sabbath," confirms the conclusion I have drawn from the absence of the article in the previous mentions.

II. My second argument is founded on the fact that the sabbath was given as commemorative of two events, God's resting on the seventh day, Ex. xx., 8-11, and the deliverance of the Israelites from the bondage of Egypt. Deu. v., 12-15. Hence it was not till after such deliverance. He would be a foolish architect who would build a house before all the foundations were laid. I have already sufficiently dwelt on this while on the first proposition, and hence dismiss it with this additional remark: The circumstance that Deu. v., 15., names an item not found in Ex. xx., proves nothing against its having been given at the original proclamation of the decalogue from Sinai, any more than because all the conditions precedent to the remission of sins, under the New Economy, as, faith, repentance and baptism, are not found in any one record of the Commission, but must be sought by a combination of them all. Besides, Moses expressly declares that all he gives in Deu. v., as part of the decalogue was both proclaimed from Sinai and written on the two tables of stone. Deu. v., 22.

Moreover, the transactions of Ex. xvi., such as the commandments concerning the gathering of the manna, were of a *tentative* character, preparing the people for the giving of the law; for the Lord Himself said it was, "That I may prove them, whether they will walk in my law, or no." Hence it is that God gave His ordinances as arbitrarily as possible. He required the gathering of an omer of manna for every man, allowed the greedy

27

to have no more, and the indolent no less, even miraculously decreasing or enlarging the quantity when necessary. He required on the sixth day the gathering of a double portion without telling of a sabbath to follow, or that there would be no manna on that day to gather, and in the face of the fact that all previous attempts to save it from one day to another had failed. When at length the sabbath was introduced, it was as arbitrarily as possible—simply, and in keeping with the other requirements, as a rest sacred to God, without any reference to creation or to their deliverance from bondage. The *permanent* legislation on the sabbath, together with the assignation of proper reasons, was reserved to that grand and solemn day when Jehovah strode to His throne on Sinai, and Israel as "a holy nation" was born.

III. That the sabbath was first given in the wilderness is expressly stated by Nehemiah, ix., 13-14. "Thou camest 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 *commandest* them precepts, statutes and laws,

by the hand of Moses, thy servant: and gavest them bread from heaven for their hunger, and broughtest forth water for them out of the rock for their thirst."

How could it be possible to "make known" the sabbath to the Israelites if they knew it already? It is not possible to construe this as a *re-making* known of a forgotten sabbath, since

1. The parallelism shows that "madest known" is a kind of equivalent for "gavest" and "commandest."

2. The Israelites had not forgotten the Lord's past dealings so as to make it possible to use "made known" as expressive of *re-calling* their attention to them. Thus

[1.] They remembered the promises to their fathers. Gen. 1., 24; Ex. iii., 16.

[2.] The Hebrew midwives "feared God." Ex. i., 15-17.

[3.] Moses' parents had faith in God. Heb. xi., 23.

[4.] *The people worshiped God in Egypt.* Ex. ii., 23-25.

[5.] And they observed His ordinances, as circumcision; for this was necessary to eating the passover, and they were ready for it. Ex. xii.

Surely, then, the sabbath could not have been a forgotten ordinance or institution, but "madest known" expresses an original giving.

ELDER J. H. WAGGONER'S FIRST NEGATIVE

In a discussion of this kind I am opposed to everything that is calculated to merely affect the minds of the readers, and especially if it tends to mislead them. I wish to correct a remark made in the opening of Eld. Vogel's first article. He said, "With him (meaning me) the questions to be discussed are daily themes and daily studies, and have been for years, while with me this is not the case." Eld. V. cannot possibly know that this is so; it is very far from being correct. Frequently many weeks and even months pass without this subject being either a "theme" or a "study" with me. But how is it with him? He has but recently been engaged in a discussion in which he passed over the same ground he is now traversing; and therefore he is as well prepared to present his side of the question as any person can be. He accused me of "begging the question." What is this but begging for a favorable prejudgment?

He said in taking the negative he had only to show that all that I produced is "fully accounted for on the supposition that the sabbath was not enjoined on man" at creation. I consider it safe to say that in this he most signally failed. Not a reason was given-nothing that can properly be called a reason-for denying that God blessed and sanctified the seventh day according to the order of events laid down in the first two chapters of Genesis.

That the view of Gen. ii. that I advocate is the *obvious one* cannot be denied; and the obvious meaning of scripture is always to be accepted unless there is a

28

necessity for accepting another. No such necessity has been shown; and therefore, as yet, my affirmation stands. But he promised that when he took the affirmative he would make it all clear. We shall see how he will redeem that promise. And now, as I am on the negative, if I can show that his conclusions are not *absolutely necessary* then the *obvious meaning* of Gen. ii., 3. stands secure.

In his leading article on this second proposition he endeavors to sustain his affirmation in three particulars; (1.) On Ex. xvi. (2.) On Deut. v. (3.) On Neh. ix.

1. On Ex. xvi. he makes his argument two-fold; by a critical examination of the text, and by parallel scripture expressions.

To draw a safe and correct conclusion in regard to "mutual understanding" or the "general notoriety" of the sabbath in the wilderness he must have *positive knowledge* and *correct views* of the actual condition and circumstances of the people at that time. But that this is not the case with him is proven in that he makes several statements in regard to them for which he draws on his imagination, and which are not warranted by the record. A single assumption at this point vitiates his whole argument and renders his conclusions unnecessary. He quotes *general rules* in regard to the use of the article, *and tries to leave the impression on the mind of the reader that these rules are invariable in application*, which no scholar will claim. After giving the rules on the use of the article, Crosby says, §489:

"The insertion or omission of the article often depends, both in poetry and prose, upon euphony and rhythm, and upon those nice distinctions in the expression of our ideas, which, though they may be readily felt, are often transferred with difficulty from one language to another. In general the insertion of the article promotes the perspicuity, and its omission the vivacity of discourse. It is, consequently, more employed in philosophical than in rhetorical composition, and far more in prose than in poetry. It should be remarked, however, that even in prose there is none of the minutiæ of language in which manuscripts differ more, than in respect to its insertion or omission, especially with proper names."

Instances to almost any extent might be given to justify the above remark, but it is not necessary. Now *if a rule be given in order to show the necessity of a departure from the obvious meaning of a scripture, the rule itself must not admit of variation or diversity in practice*. But Eld. V. gives his rule to invalidate the obvious conclusion from Gen. ii., 3., and he gives a rule which authorities show is not fixed and invariable, and is widely departed from both in the Old and New Testament. He appears like one elated with the discovery of a mine of supposed value, before it has been sufficiently tested to determine its real worth.

It would be some support to his claim if his argument were cumulative; if his other points seemed to show that his application of the rule is just. But the reverse of this is the truth. He quotes several passages wherein are mentioned "a holy convocation," and attending sabbaths or memorials, to prove that *the first mention* of an institution is without the article; but these contain no proof, for they were never mentioned in any other manner. If they were it would not be decisive

in his favor, but as it is his pretended proof is an element of weakness in his argument.

His reasoning on Ex. xvi. is against both the facts and probabilities. He says, "The *rulers* did not expect a sabbath-it took them by surprise." There is still room for "surprise" here. How did he learn this? I appeal to the reader whether it is reasonable to suppose that the people gathered a double portion of manna on the sixth day according to the order of the Lord, see verse 5, and "*all* the rulers" were entirely ignorant of the reason of their so doing? Is it not rather reasonable that the rulers, as faithful overseers, reported to Moses that the will of the Lord had been done in the preparation for the holy sabbath?

In quoting v. 22, he inserts an explanatory clause, ("some of the people.") The word "some" has a significance in the text, but it does not belong where he places it. He intends to give the idea that the gathering a double portion on the sixth day was *an exceptional thing*; whereas, the text gives the idea that it was a *general thing*. "And *they* gathered it every morning, every man according to his eating; and when the sun waxed hot it melted. And it came to pass that on the sixth day *they* gathered twice as much bread, two omers for one man." The Lord had said they should do so;

29

verse 5; they did so, and the departures from the order were the exceptions. The facts are entirely against any surprise with anybody.

Again he says, "The people knew nothing of a sabbath." To make this appear he says that verse 25 was addressed to the people, as the rulers were informed of the sabbath the day before; which is to say that on that sabbath morning was their first knowledge of the sabbath. But he admits that the reproof of verses 28-29 was for breaking the sabbath. But if they knew nothing of the sabbath, and only "some of them," and that to the surprise of the rulers, gathered a double portion on the sixth day, what law had they broken? Indeed, if all he says is correct, they who gathered a double portion on the sixth day were the transgressors, while they who had no bread for the sabbath (if such were the case) had alone acted up to the usual requirement which had not been reversed or amended as yet; for we cannot believe that even *some* of the people knew that the Lord had commanded them to gather a double portion on the sixth day and that *all the rulers* were ignorant of that fact.

And again he thinks that if it had been an old institution Moses should have told them all the facts definitely, thus: "To-morrow is *the* sabbath, the day on which the Lord rested from creation, and which he sanctified for man's observance. Anything short of mentioning the facts of creation week would have been no explanation." So he seems to think an explanation was called for. And so I think, if it were at that time a new and unheard-of institution, but not necessarily required if it were an old one. But no explanation was given at that time. Yet when an explanation was given, when the facts and reasons of the sabbath were definitely set forth, the facts of creation only were referred to. On this chapter I further notice,

(1) The Lord had a *law* at that time, and the precept of that he chose by which to test their loyalty.

(2.) The people were ordered to gather a certain rate of manna every day. This shows that in things secular (or indifferent in a religious view, as Rom. xiv.) "every day" does not include the holy sabbath of the Lord.

(3.) Moses approved of their gathering a double portion of manna on the sixth day; saying, "*This is that which the Lord hath said, [at some past time] To morrow is the rest of the holy sabbath unto the Lord.*" As Prof. Rush well observed, *it was then the holy sabbath*, though no cessation of the manna had yet indicated it, and the individual day then referred to had not yet arrived. It was the sabbath by prior appointment.

(4.) That it was not a new thing is fairly concluded from the reproof, "*How long refuse ye to keep my commandments?*" This implies a *continued desecration of the sabbath*. But *how, why and when* the seventh day became the holy sabbath Ex. xvi. does not inform us. Everything essential to sustain the view of Eld. V. is wanting in this chapter. And, *when the origin, the blessing and the sanctification of the sabbath are recorded, no reference is made to anything that occurred at or after the exode*. It has a different basis.

The passover was given to Israel expressly to commemorate their deliverance from Egypt, while the sabbath is a memorial creation. Why go beyond the record and assert what is never revealed? In Deut. xii., 19., etc, spoken forty years after they left Egypt, Moses said, "Ye are not as yet come to *the rest*, and to the inheritance which the Lord your God giveth you." Was *that rest* to which the Lord promised to lead them when he brought them from bondage a weekly sabbath? No. They kept the sabbath 40 years in the wilderness before they received that rest. And they kept it forty years before Moses spoke the words which are now relied upon to prove that it was a memorial of the exode. If it was such a memorial they did not know it. They kept it for the reason given, to-wit: that God rested from the work of creation on the seventh day, and therefore blessed and sanctified that day.

2. On Deut. v. he is equally unfortunate. He tries to make it appear that the exact words of verses 7-21 were written by the Lord on the tables of stone. Every reader knows that Deut. v., 7-21; is not a verbatim copy of Ex. xx., 3 [original illegible] 17.; and, also that Moses spoke Deut. v. in a *rehearsal* forty years after the Lord spake from Mount Sinai. That Deut. v. is not the original copy as spoken by the Lord is shown by verse 12, "Keep the sabbath day to sanctify it, as the Lord thy God *hath commanded thee*." And that this refers back to Ex. xx. and not to Ex. xvi., (as he unwarrantably claims on Ex.

30

xxxv., 2.,) is positively proved by verse 16, "Honor thy father and thy mother as the Lord thy God *hath commanded thee*." No such commandment was given in the wilderness of sin, but it was on Mount Sinai.

He, with others, relies on the word "therefore" in Deut. v., 15., to prove that their deliverance from Egypt was one "stone" on which the sabbath was erected. But this must fail him. The Lord delivered Israel that they *might* serve him. Ex. viii., 1. The *obligation* to serve him already existed. The rigor of their servitude was such that they could not serve God: and that would interfere with the keeping of the sabbath more than with the observance of any other precept of

God's law. Therefore it is not strange that, when he delivered them he should prove them by this precept, and that he should remind them of their bond-service when he enforced this duty. But this does not prove that that event was the ground of the sabbatic institution or of sabbath obligation, for *every moral obligation* was enforced upon them by the same *special* reason-with the same "therefore;" which proves too much for his position. His argument in brief is this,

Premise: The Jews were commanded to keep the sabbath because they were brought out of Egypt.

1st conclusion: Therefore the sabbath was not binding on them before the exode.

2nd conclusion: And, therefore, it was not binding on any other people.

Let us test these conclusions by another scripture. Lev. xix., 35-37., "Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment, in meteyard, in weight or in measure. Just balances, just weights, a just ephah and a just hin, shall ye have; I am the Lord your God which brought you out of Egypt. *Therefore* shall ye observe *all my statutes*, and *all my judgments*, and do them." See also Deut. vi., 20-25; xxiv., 17-18. Upon this we may frame the same argument.

Premise: The Jews were forbidden to do any unrighteousness because the Lord brought them out of Egypt.

1st conclusion: Therefore to do no unrighteousness (or to do righteousness) was not binding on them before the exode.

2nd conclusion: And therefore to do righteousness was not binding on any other people. The same conclusions we must draw in regard to *all the commandments* he gave to them.

This is the great fault I find with that system of error to which Eld. Vogel is unfortunately committed. Its tendency is to leave everybody who lived before the exode, or who was not personally concerned in it, without the restraint of law, and without obligation to obey God. I am aware that in some respects he disclaims this conclusion. *But this disclaimer is in conflict with his reasoning.* Why insist, against the direct evidence of Gen. ii., that the sabbath was given to the Jews only, because they were brought out of Egypt, and disregard the truth that every other precept was enforced by the same reason? Blasphemy, or profaning the name of God, is not mentioned in the book of Genesis; and it was the subject of one of the statutes given to Israel because the Lord brought them out of Egypt. According to his argument this was not a *general* law, but was peculiar to the Jews! And yet he claims that his conclusions are necessary. I think they are very far from it.

3. On Neh. ix. he has fallen into a similar error by attaching an unwarranted meaning to the phrase "made known." This does not necessarily mean the first introduction of a thing, as he avers. In Eze. xxxix., 7., the Lord said: "So will I make my holy name known in the midst of my people Israel." This does not imply that it was not before known among them; but rather that it should be more deeply impressed on their minds, for it points to another declaration, "And I will not let them pollute my holy name any more." They had known it, but they had polluted it; he would now so make it known to them that they would no more

pollute it. And this will apply to the sabbath, and to all the statutes given to Israel after the exode.

And Neh. ix. says the Lord made known the sabbath when he came down on Mount Sinai, which is strictly correct according to the idea of that expression given in Eze. xxxix., 7.; but not according to the idea of Elder Vogel, for it was known to them before they came to Sinai.

But Eld. Vogel undermines his own theory in his comments on Neh. ix. He says, "The parallelism shows that 'madest known' is a kind of equivalent for 'gavest' and 'commandest.' Very good. But these terms are applied to *all the laws which God gave to Israel*; and

31

therefore by his showing, they were all unknown to Israel before the Exode, and none of them binding on any other people! "That which proves too much proves nothing." Every moral obligation to which they were amenable stands or falls with the holy sabbath.

And this shows that I am correct in regard to the *lawless tendency of that theory*. Indeed, it needs no confirmation beyond his own words, for he says I did well to say "perhaps" he will claim that the precept, Thou shalt not kill, is directly enforced in the New Testament! Whatever course may be pursued to avoid the natural conclusion from such a position, it will remain true that, to teach that such moral precepts are abolished, and not directly taught or renewed in the New Testament, is to lower the great fundamental principles of morality, and leave minds free from that needful restraint, which the authority of God's law can alone enforce, and which is so little felt in these days of laxity of morality, of wide spreading delusion, and of gross self-deception.

ELDER PETER VOGEL'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

I will proceed with my affirmative argument, leaving Eld. W.'s last paper to be reviewed in my next.

IV. The sabbath was given by Moses in a sense that circumcision was not. But Moses gave circumcision as a pre-existent institution, incorporated into the law. Gen. xvii., 9-14.; Lev. xii., 1-3. If, therefore, the sabbath was given by him in a different sense, it was not pre-existent, but originated with him.

John vii., 22-23. "Moses therefore gave unto you circumcision; (not because it was of Moses, but of the fathers;) and ye on the sabbath day circumcised a man. If a man on the sabbath day receive circumcision, that the law of Moses should not be broken [marg. *without* breaking the law of Moses (i.e. the sabbath),] are ye angry at me, because I have made a man every whit whole on the sabbath day?"

1. The king's translators placed "with out breaking the law of Moses" in the margin, accompanied by parallels (||), to indicate that in their judgment it is equal to the rendition in the body of the work.

2. "The Students' Treasury Bible," published by J. B. Lippincott & Co., and prepared by "a late Regius Professor of Biblical Criticism and Biblical Antiquities," retains the marginal reading of the Common Version because the rendering of the body of the work is considered to be "defective."

3. Thulock, a commentator of no mean ability and repute, in his work on John, interprets this passage in accordance with the English marginal reading. And his testimony has more than ordinary weight since it is against the tenets of his school. What but stubborn necessity could have wrung from him the following paraphrase: "Ye transgress the law (the sabbath) to perform a sacred, beneficent work (circumcision,) on that one portion of man; will you be angry at *me*, when I perform a work with the same characteristics, on the entire man?" P. 202.

But I do not rest my cause on the authority of others. A good reason stands with me high above all human authority. I submit the following as conclusive proof that the marginal reading is substantially correct, and that the sabbath originated with Moses:

1. If the reading of the, body of the Bible be correct, and it be true, that the sabbath was given at creation, then there is no force in the Savior's calling attention to the fact that circumcision was not of Moses, but had an earlier existence, since this would be equally true of the sabbath.

2. There is evidently a contrast instituted between the sabbath and circumcision to the effect that one was of Moses in a sense that the other was not. But on the supposition that the sabbath had a prior existence as well as circumcision, such a contrast would be impossible.

3. On the supposition that the sabbath was the older law, the Jews could have replied to Christ effectually and without embarrassment, thus: The older law is

32

set aside by the later, so far as it comes in conflict with it, as when God commanded the Jews to march around Jericho and spoil the city on the sabbath. Josh. vi. 2-5, 21. So in the case of our circumcising a man on the sabbath day we obeyed the later law.

4. On the supposition that the sabbath was the later law, and so of Moses in a sense that circumcision was not, and on this only, is there any point in the Savior's attack upon the Jews. His argument may be stated thus:

a. The sabbath is the later law, since circumcision, though given to you by Moses, is not of Moses, i.e. did not originate with him. The latter law should, as a rule, obtain or have the precedence in case of conflict.

b. But ye on the sabbath day circumcised a man and yet claim not to have violated the law of Moses. You have made the later law yield to the older and think you have done no wrong!

c. How then can you charge upon me a violation of the sabbath, the later law, by following the older, the eternal principle of mercy, in healing a man on the sabbath? You are inconsistent.

d. Moreover, in your case it was a conflict of positive with positive law, in mine of moral with positive. And further, I have in this really followed a later law than the sabbath, a special command of my Father: "The works which my Father hath given me to finish." Jno. v., 36.

Thus we see the full force of Christ's charge: "Did not Moses give you the law? and yet none of you keepeth the law? John vii., 19.

V. *The sabbath was a type.* But a type in Eden and before the fall, where Eld. W. places the origin of the sabbath, would have been out of all character.

Therefore, it was not given in Eden, and is not based on what my brother calls "primary truth," since "*no typical institution or merely positive duty can grow out of original relations.*" And thus is he stripped of the last vestige of difference between the seventh-day and yearly sabbaths, which he so confidently insisted on in his opening article. And when the sabbath is once torn away from Eden where can we so naturally place this typical institution as in the typical dispensation of Moses? Where can we find authority to place it anywhere else?

But *was* the sabbath a type? So Paul says, Col. ii., 16-17, "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of *the sabbath days*: which are a *shadow* (type) of things to come; but the body (casting the shadow, the antitype) is of Christ (i.e. of the Gospel)." I am not now concerned respecting what the sabbath was a type of, but simply about the fact that it was a type.

The expression "sabbath days" I here understand to refer to the weekly sabbath exclusively. It may be possible, as Mc-knight understands it, that it refers to sabbaths of every description, but it does not seem so to me. Compare 1. Chron. xxiii., 31., with Col. ii., 16., where the same terms occur.

1. The plural form often refers only to the weekly sabbath.

a. See Ezek. xx., 12-13.; Lev. xix., 3-30.; xxvi., 1-2.

b. It is common in Greek to use the plural of sabbath for the singular. See e.g., Ex. xvi., 23, 25, 26, 29.; xx., 8[original illegible]9.; Matt, xii., 1., where the Greek is plural, but rendered by the singular in English.

These references show that the plural form in Col. ii., 16., is not against me.

2. The "sabbaths" of Col. ii., 16. refer exclusively to the weekly sabbaths, since the seven annual sabbaths are included in and described by the term "holy days" (Gr. *heortee*.) For

a. What other office can we assign to *heortee* in Col. ii., 16.?

b. This term is used in Acts xviii., 21. to describe Pentecost, one of the annual sabbaths; and in Lev. xxiii., it is used to designate every one of the seven yearly sabbaths, being the only term rendered "feast" in that chapter. See v. v. 2, 4, 6, 39.

VI. *The sabbath was pre-eminently Jewish*, given to them only, and observed by them alone.

1. This follows from the fact already noticed, that it was given in memory of *their* deliverance from Egyptian bondage. Deu. v., 15.

2. It was commanded to *their* fathers, but it is nowhere said to have been commanded to any other people.

Jer. xvii., 21 [original illegible] 22. "Thus saith the Lord, Take heed to yourselves and bear no burden on the sabbath day, nor bring it in by the gates of Jerusalem; neither carry forth a burden out of your houses on the sabbath day, neither do ye any work, but *hallow ye* the sabbath day, as I commanded *your* fathers."

3. It was a "sign" between God and the Hebrews only.

Ezek. xx., 12., "Moreover also I gave *them* (the Israelites) my sabbaths, to be a *sign between me and them*, that they might know that I am Jehovah that sanctify them."

Ex. xxxi., 13-18. Verily my sabbaths shall ye keep: *for it is a sign between me and you* throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am Jehovah that doth sanctify you. Ye shall keep my sabbaths *therefore*; for it is holy unto *you*. * * * * Six days may work be done: but in the seventh is the sabbath of rest, holy to the Lord. * * * Wherefore (all the world? No, but) the *children of Israel* shall keep the sabbath. * * * * It is a sign *between me and the children of Israel: for* in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested and was refreshed."

Eld. W. labored to show that the sabbath is not a sign between the Jews and the Gentiles. This man of straw he killed completely; but it is only a man of straw. These passages, however, prove what he does not want them to prove, namely, that *the Gentiles had not the sabbath*; and hence also that *the sabbath was not made at creation*, for then they would have had it. Had the sabbath been observed also by the Gentiles, had it been a *general* thing, it could not have been a *special sign*. The Masons and the Odd Fellows have signs. A is at the head of both and issues their pass-words. Let the pass-word of the Masons be used also by the Odd Fellows, and it ceases to be a sign by which A distinguishes the Masons. To be a Masonic sign it must be their *exclusive* property. So *let the sabbath be generally observed and it is no longer a "sign" between God and the children of Israel*. Eld. W. appealed to the wrong passage to sustain his cause.

VII. *The sabbath was not given to the Gentiles*; hence not at creation, and not even to the Jews till to them as a people.

Ex. xx., 10. "But the seventh day is the sabbath of Jehovah thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor *thy stranger* that is *within thy gates*." From this it follows

1st. That "strangers" generally did not keep the sabbath, but only such as were slaves to the Hebrews-"*thy stranger*."

2nd. When that slave was not "within" the gates of his master, that is, did not work *for* him, he was not required to keep the sabbath. The reason of this prohibition obviously is that no Jew might work by *proxy*, just as his "cattle" were not allowed to work for him on that day.

Again, Is. lvi., 1-8. "Keep ye my judgments, and do justice: *for my salvation is near to come, and my righteousness to be revealed*. (2) Blessed is the man that doeth this, and the son of man that layeth hold on it; that keepeth the sabbath from polluting it, and keepeth his hand from doing any evil. (3) *Neither let the son of the stranger*, that hath joined himself to the Lord, speak, saying, *The Lord hath utterly separated me from his people; neither let the eunuch say, Behold, I am a dry tree*. (4) For thus saith the Lord unto *the eunuchs* that *keep my eabbaths*, and choose the things that please me, and take hold of my covenant; (5) *Even unto them will I give in mine house and within my walls a place* and a name better than of sons and of daughters: I will give them an everlasting name, that shall not be cut off. (6) *Also the sons of the stranger*, that join themselves to the

Lord, to serve him, and to love the name of the Lord, to be his servants, *every one that keepeth the sabbath from polluting it*, and taketh hold of my covenant; (7) Even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in mine house of prayer: their burnt-offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted upon mine altar; for mine house shall be called a house of prayer *for all people*. [8] The Lord God which gathereth the outcasts of Israel [the eunuchs] saith, Yet will I gather others to him, besides those that are gathered to him."

Is. liv.-lvi., 8. is a prediction concerning the Gospel Dispensation. [1] Compare Is. liv., 1, and lvi., 1. with Gal. iv., 27.; also lvi., 7. with Matt, xxi., 13. [2] The "stranger" [Gentile] is to have a share in the favors spoken of as well as the Jew. Is. lvi., 3., 6 comp. Acts x.; Eph. i. and ii. [3] The eunuch is to be also admitted with the Jew. Is. lvi., 3-5., 8 comp. Acts viii., 26-40. But among the Jews they had no part. Deu. xxiii., 1.

This prepares us to consider the following facts: In enumerating the glorious promises that shall be realized in the New Dispensation, Isaiah calls attention to this: that the "stranger" or Gentile shall be admitted to the keeping of a day

34

here predicted and described by the name of sabbath; hence it follows that under the Old Dispensation the Gentile or stranger had no such right or privilege, that the sabbath was not given to such, nor observed by them. Is. lvi., 3, 6, 7. Had, however, the sabbath been given at creation, or for all mankind, then the Gentile would have been under obligations to keep it during the Old Dispensation as well as the Jew. This seems to me as final. What think you reader?

So far I sum up the argument on this and the former proposition as follows:

I. I have undoubtedly *approved precedent or example* of keeping the Sabbath since the Exodus, while Eld. W. has not shown and cannot show one before that event.

II. Argument No. iii. gives an *express statement* that the sabbath was given since the Exode, while there is none in favor of an earlier date, and in the nature of things cannot be, since God cannot lie or contradict Himself.

III. All my other arguments, six in number, *necessarily imply* the giving of the sabbath since the Exode; and Eld. W. has failed to produce a single *necessary implication* of the giving of the sabbath at creation.

IV. No argument attempted by Eld W. in favor of the first proposition, even if successful, rises above a *probable inference*, which we have seen in the very outset "can never outweigh or stand against an approved precedent, a necessary inference, or an express command."

V. The strength of my position is further seen in this: Suppose now that all my arguments are overthrown but one, then the field is still mine, since, whichever argument stands, it is above the probable, and so beyond the reach of his.

From this also follows this conclusion, namely, that Eld. W. has not established a single probability in favor of the first proposition, since the Bible does not furnish a fair probability against itself.

ELDER J. H. WAGGONER'S SECOND NEGATIVE

Eld. Vogel's second affirmative is before me. In this he makes four points, marked IV to VII, which I notice in order.

"IV. The sabbath was given by Moses in a sense that circumcision was not." In the sense that he intends, this is not proved. Indeed, I think I never saw an argument of the same length containing so many *non sequiturs*-so many large conclusions from small premises-as his article under consideration. But the sabbath was given in a sense that circumcision was not. *It was given by the voice of Jehovah* when he spake his "ten words" in the hearing of all his people. It was twice written by the finger of God on the tables of stone, as one of the immutable precepts of the Most High. No mere type or shadow ever had such honor.

Eld. V.'s argument on this point is based on the marginal reading of John vii., 23. He says, "The king's translators placed 'without breaking the law of Moses' in the margin, accompanied by parallels (||), to indicate that in their judgment it is equal to the rendition in the body of the work." This sentence, "accompanied by parallels (||)," stands in the above as giving weight to the marginal reading. The parallel (||) has no significance whatever, being only a mark of reference, and answers the same purpose as the asterisk (*), or the figure (2) in this text in my Bible, which is London print. Eld. V. shows a peculiar aptness to throw in such coloring sentences, which may well raise a suspicion of his argument. Truth does not need them.

1. There is no contrast raised by the Savior between the sabbath and circumcision. Nor is there evidence nor reasonable inference that Jericho was taken on the sabbath. The "first day" and the "seventh day" are mentioned in the cases of the feasts, as in Lev. xxiii., 4-8; but they are the first and seventh days of the feast; not of the week. So Jericho was to be compassed seven days, and the record refers to *the days of the compassing*, and not to the days of the week.

2. Tholuck's paraphrase is of no weight

35

at all, because he makes the Savior say that to circumcise a man (child) on the sabbath was a violation of the sabbath, which he does not say. He vindicated his acts of healing on the sabbath because they were "lawful." Matt, xii., 10-13. Even admitting the marginal reading-"*without breaking the law*"-this paraphrase contradicts it. It is evidently used for effect-not for its relevancy.

3. It is often the case that the marginal is the better reading, but not in this. It is here inadmissible. On this text I quote:

Am. Bible Union.-"That the law of Moses may not be broken."

Wakefield.-The same.

Alexander Campbell's "Living Oracles".-That the law of Moses may not be violated.

Murdock's translation of the Syriac.-The same.

Campbell and Macknight.-The same.

Anderson's translation, (Disciple), Same as Bible Union.

Diaglott.-"So that the law of Moses may not be violated."

Do. interlineal rendering.-"*Hina* that *mee* not *luthee* may not be loosed *ho* the *nomos* law *Moseos* of Moses."

And so Olshausen.-"*Hina mee luthec ho nomos Moseos*, is to be understood thus, in order that the law should not be broken."

Clarke, (*comment.*)-"That the law might not be broken which had enjoined the circumcision to take place at that time. Lev. xii., 3."

Parkhurst, Robinson, Liddell & Scott, Greenfield, Groves, Donuegan, etc, give as the definition of *hina*, that; so that; to that end; in order that. And of *hina mee*, that not; lest; lest that. No authority gives any "various reading" to the Greek. Several of the authors cited above were "no sabbath" in theory. Every one can see that the common version is strictly correct, fixing the "law of Moses" to circumcision.

4. Another point is settled by this text. Eld. V. said that " 'madest known' is a kind of equivalent for 'gavest,' " and then said that that which was known could not be made known. But Eze xxxviii., 7. disproves that assertion. Here the Savior says Moses *gave them* circumcision, and says also it was "of the fathers,"-they had it from Abraham. If it came down to them from Abraham, and was observed by them before the Exode, how could Moses give it to them? But the Savior says he did. Here is a settler for Eld. Vogel's misconception of Neh. ix. It was not the *original giving*.

"V. The sabbath was a type." This he confidently affirms, and I as confidently deny it. His remark, "I am not now concerned respecting what the sabbath was a type," shows commendable discretion! To endeavor to find the antitype of the weekly sabbath is a hopeless task. On this point he rests his case on Col. ii.; that he misconstrues the text is easily shown.

He says that "sabbath days" here refer exclusively to the weekly sabbath, since the annual sabbaths are described by "holy day," and asks, "What other office can we assign to *heortee* in Col. ii., 16.?"

Heortee occurs 27 times in the N. T., rendered *feast* 26 times; *holy day* once, (this text.) *Heortazo* once, "Keep the feast." There were (annual) sabbaths connected with their feasts; but a feast day was not necessarily a sabbath day; there were more feast days than there were sabbath days. Hence the distinction in this passage. (Acts xviii., 21., Clarke says, "most likely the passover." But the whole clause is either rejected or marked doubtful by Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Sinaitic MS., it is entirely wanting in many MSS.) *Heortee* refers to the feast days; "sabbath days" to the annual sabbaths. They were alike in their origin. But Eld. V. exclaims exultingly, "Thus is he stripped of the last vestige of difference between the seventh day and yearly sabbaths."

Not so fast, dear sir. It happens that not a point of difference that I have claimed has yet been set aside.

a. It was based on the facts of creation. No annual sabbath was referable to creation.

b. It was the rest day of the Almighty. He did not rest from his work on any of the annual sabbaths.

c. God spake it with his own voice from Sinai. He did not name any of the annual sabbaths.

d. It was twice written by the finger of God on the tables of stone. No annual sabbath was placed there, nor written by him.

e. It was put in the ark as a part of that moral code over which the priest sprinkled blood to make atonement. But the annual sabbaths were a part of

36

that system which contained the priestly service.

f. Its sanctification (setting apart, appointing,) rested solely on the work and acts of God. The other sabbaths were of the typical system, (restitutionary,) made necessary by the wrong doing of man. Not one of these points of difference can be moved.

Eld. Vogel has said and re-iterated that he has "shown" that there is no difference. If his *assertion* is a *showing* then he is right; otherwise not. He has found fault with me because I say the work of, and rest from, creation is *the reason* of the appointment of the sabbath. He may renew his complaint; I will a little farther elucidate this grand truth. Notice the terms used in the fourth commandment. *Wherefore*-for this reason; the Lord *blessed*-spoke well of, *put honor upon; the sabbath day*-the day of his rest from the work of creation; and *hallowed it*-set it apart, appointed it for observance. With these definitions in view I will contrast his words with the words of Jehovah.

"Strictly speaking God's resting had but little to do with the sabbath as a sacred rest." *Elder Vogel's second reply.*

The seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work: for [*because*] in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is and rested the seventh day; for this reason the Lord *put honor upon the rest day* and *set it apart to a sacred use*. This is exactly the signification of the terms used in the commandment. It is God's *own reason and his only reason* for the appointment of the seventh day. Why not let the word of Jehovah settle this controversy? I confidently appeal to the reader as to whether I hazard anything in saying that God *appointed* the seventh day for this reason-that he rested thereon when he made heaven and earth. He expressly says so.

Now for Col. ii., 16-17. Paul speaks of meats, drinks, new moons, feasts, and sabbaths, which are a shadow of things to come. We can point definitely forward to the work of Christ in the annual sabbaths; but when we take the word of Jehovah for the sanctification of the weekly sabbath it points only back to creation. Paul's qualifying sentence in Col. ii., 17. absolutely shuts out the sabbath from his list of types.

"VI. The sabbath was pre-eminently Jewish." And wherefore?

"1. It was given in memory of their deliverance from Egypt." No scripture says so. Its sanctification is never referred to anything of the kind. His inference from Deut. v., 15. has been shown to be unwarranted.

"2. It was commanded to their fathers." And so were all moral duties without exception. He can no more prove that it was given to them only than he can prove that the precept to honor father and mother, or that forbidding profanity, was given to them only. No mention is made of blasphemy before the exode. Then the precept was "given to the Jews"-*"commanded to their fathers."* Dare he undertake to show that it was given to any others? They were to honor their parents that their days might be long upon the land which he gave them-Canaan. Was this precept given to the Gentiles, or to any who did not inherit that land? Is

it not Jewish also? And thus it is that whatever subverts the sabbath subverts all morality. On this declaration I take my stand, prepared to defend it.

"3. It was a sign between God and the Hebrews only." He says I completely killed the "man of straw," that the sabbath was a sign between the Jews and Gentiles. [I said, "to keep a distinction between them."] It is a man of straw that I have had to demolish every time I have met a man of Bro. Vogel's views. When he said I had completely killed it, I thought perhaps he might let it rest. But, no; he has to use it to evade the force of my reasoning. In his illustration the Masons and Odd Fellows are made to represent the Jews and Gentiles. He says, "Let the pass-word of the Masons be used also by the Odd Fellows and it ceases to be a sign to distinguish the Masons." There is your straw man again! it is the very point at which I struck. Where does the Bible say it is a sign to distinguish the Jews from the Gentiles? It is a sign to distinguish the true God. It is a sign because he made the world in six days and rested the seventh day; Ex. xxxi. It is a sign that they might know he is God. Eze. xx., 20. He thinks I have appealed to this text in vain, because he entirely misapprehends it. After confessing that I had killed the man of straw, he sets it up and adopts it as his own!

He says the sabbath was not general,

37

for if it had been given to and observed by the Gentiles it would not have been a special sign. What does he mean by special? The sabbath was God's sign of creation. Israel had covenanted to keep God's commandments-the sabbath being one of them. Had they kept them they would have been to him "a peculiar treasure above all people." Ex. xix., 5-8. Why? Because "all people" had turned away from God. But had all people served and obeyed God this peculiarity would not have existed. If the Jews would know that he was God-the Creator-by keeping creation's memorial, so would the Gentiles. In the N. T. Christians are designated "a peculiar people." What would the reader think if I should argue that the gospel cannot be general in its design for if everybody should embrace it there would be no peculiar people? That is just what his argument amounts to.

Again he says, "Thy stranger within thy gates" was to keep the sabbath; therefore strangers generally were not to keep it! Most singular conclusion! This does not indicate to whom the obligation extends, but, how far the individual responsibility of the householder extends.

Isa. lvi., 1-8. doubtless refers to the calling of the Gentiles, but that it teaches the introduction of a new sabbath is quite another thing. A careful reading of Isaiah will show that chapters liii. to lix. are consecutive prophecy. Briefly I notice. Chapter liii. describes the passion of the Savior; liv. the New Jerusalem; lv. the call to the gospel feast; lvi., 1-8. some blessings and duties concerning specified classes; lvi., 9.-and lvii. the great apostasy; lviii. the reformation, from first to last, ending with a sabbath reform, now, under God's providence, in progress; lix. the end of the priesthood of Christ, the time of trouble, and the judgment. Now it will take more than Eld. V.'s assertion to make it appear that when the Lord says "my sabbaths" in chap. lvi., he means something different from his sabbath-his holy day-in chap. lviii.; or that in either text he refers to a new, and unknown, and unexplained institution. Eld. Vogel says because the Gentile "may join himself to

the Lord and keep his sabbaths" in the New Dispensation "hence it follows that under the old Dispensation the Gentile or stranger had no such right or privilege." Most of his "hences," "it follows," and "therefores" are about of this kind. See Num. xv., 14-16., "And if a stranger sojourn with you, or whosoever be among you in your generations, and will offer an offering made by fire, of a sweet savor unto the Lord, as ye do, so shall he do. One ordinance shall be both for you of the congregation, and also for the stranger that sojourneth with you, an ordinance forever in your generations; as ye are so shall the stranger be before the Lord. One law and one manner shall be for you, and for the stranger that sojourneth with you." Thus is his conclusion disproved. That the Gentiles had the privilege of sojourning with them and enjoying religious privileges is also shown by Deut. xxiii., 15-16.; Ex. xii., 48-49.

The Lord said by Jeremiah, [xii, 14-17,] concerning his "evil neighbors" who spoiled the inheritance of Israel, that he would pluck them out of the land; yet "if they will diligently learn the ways of my people, to swear by my name, The Lord liveth, as they taught my people to swear by Baal; then shall they be built in the midst of my people. But if they will not obey I will utterly pluck up and destroy that nation, saith the Lord." Character was always more than birth in the sight of God.

When the Lord promised the kingdom to David and his seed, he said he would visit their transgressions with the rod if they kept not his commandments. Ps. 89, 20-32. Their enjoyment of the kingdom depended upon their obedience to the law of God, sabbath included; Jev. xvii. But they did not obey; they were "a disobedient and gainsaying people." And Jesus said to them, "The kingdom of God shall be taken from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." Matt, xxi., 43. James says the kingdom is promised to them that love God; chap. ii., 5.; and John says, "This is the love of God that we keep his commandments;" chap. v., 3. And Jesus again in Matt. v., 17-21., refers the consequences of keeping or breaking the commandments to the kingdom of heaven. The conditions of the kingdom were never changed. The change of dispensation in respect to its object and effect will yet come up for investigation and this subject will be further considered.

ELDER PETER VOGEL'S THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

That my charge of Bro. W.'s "begging the question" is just, is simply a matter of fact which every reader has the means to verify. And Eld. W.'s verdict, "he (I) most signally failed," does not in the least disturb me. I write for the masses; yet I am not without hope, faint though it be, that, when the heat of the battle is over and he takes a calm survey of the field, he may conclude differently. It is easy to say "he draws on his imagination" for facts, but the proof of this would be in better taste, and perhaps not so cheap. Understand, however, gentle reader, Eld. W. does not write for effect! But Bro. V., who is but a young man, knows no better than to do just so naughty a thing. His untamed blood makes him accept a system of such "lawless tendency" as to make killing no crime; and in his crudity he does things that "no scholar will claim!"

1. Exodus xvi.-[1.] The section which Eld. W. quotes from Crosby, with reference to the article, that author printed in small type to show that it figures but little in the case. [2.] Ex xvi. does not come under that section since it is neither poetry nor impassioned prose, but legal information, which demands "perspicuity." [3.] The fact that the last mention of the sabbath in this chapter, the only instance of "renewed mention" in it, has the article, shows that the rules I quoted apply and are strictly followed. [4.] The Hebrew, concerning which Eld. W. maintains a respectful silence, has no such exceptions as he would force on the Greek text, and this places my position beyond all dispute. I rather think this "mine" is still [a] mine.

That I have not drawn upon my imagination for facts as to "mutual understanding" or "general notoriety" is clear from the facts adduced at the close of my first affirmative. I know not how to account for Eld. W.'s charge of manufacturing facts.

So also his assertion that the yearly sabbaths "were never mentioned in any other manner" than indefinitely was made without sufficient attention to facts. [1.] Nearly every mention of them by Moses was either a first mention or a remention for the purpose of additional legislation, which is nearly an equivalent. [2.] If this were even not the case the absence of the article would be adequately accounted for by the weekly sabbath's taking it by "emphatic distinction." [3.] But in this matter of fact Gesenius, whose ability Eld. W. has pronounced as "beyond dispute," testifies against his universal negation and in my favor. "The sabbath is a name for the great day of atonement in the seventh month, Lev. xxiii., 32." Lex. under sab. [4] See also Is. i., 13. What "an element of weakness" my statement is!

Eld. W. "appeals to the reader whether it is reasonable to suppose that the people gathered a double portion of manna on the sixth day according to the order of the Lord, see v. 5, and 'all the rulers' were entirely ignorant of the reason of their so doing." This appeal will be in order whenever I say that the rulers knew nothing of the command in v. 5. I simply said that they were ignorant of a sabbath to follow, as is clear from the manner in which Moses introduced it to their notice. "Is it not rather reasonable," continues W., "that the rulers, as faithful overseers, reported to Moses that the will of the Lord had been done?" That is to say, every time the people turned round in obedience to a command "all the rulers" put off post haste to inform Moses! How reasonable! But what is conjecture as compared with facts?

To say that "the rulers were informed the day before" the seventh and the people on the seventh is not equivalent to saying that the people were not informed till "sabbath morning." The day began with the evening among the Jews [Lev. xxiii., 32,] and orders for the day are usually issued when the day begins. There is no limit to absurd conclusions that can be drawn for an opponent by manufacturing premises for him.

"How long refuse ye to keep my commandments" by no means necessarily "implies a continued desecration of the sabbath." Is the sabbath commandments? That it is one of many, I grant; and this new and test commandment was no better kept than others had "long" been. That's all. 2. Eld.

W. thinks that "the passover was given to Israel expressly to commemorate their deliverance from Egypt," and that therefore

39

the sabbath can not be commemorative of that event. But strictly speaking the passover commemorated only one item of their deliverance, the passing over of the death-angel, while the sabbath covered their deliverance in general. So baptism commemorates the death, burial and resurrection of Christ in general [Ro. vi.], and the Lord's Supper His death in particular.

Notwithstanding Bro. W.'s labored efforts to show that Deu. v, 15. was not written on the two tables of stone, Moses still insists [v. 22] that it was, and I am inclined to believe him.. "Forgive me this wrong." Nor is Ex. xx., 3-17 the original copy, Eld. W.'s assertion to the contrary notwithstanding, since Deu. v. testifies that it is defective. The original was written on tables of stone.

The rest of Deu. xii., 9. was a promise and is the rest of Caanan; it has nothing to do with the rest of Deu. v., 11-15, which is a command and refers to the seventh day. "It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks."

Now let us see how my "therefore" "must fail" me. "Every moral obligation," says Eld. W., "was enforced upon them [the Israelites] by the same special reason-with the same 'therefore,'" as the sabbath in Deu. v., 15; and this he thinks proves to much for me. Compare Lev. xix., 35-37.

God deals with the human race somewhat as parents have to deal with their children. A son old enough to grasp it needs only to be told that it is morally wrong to steal and it suffices, but it is a waste of words to endeavor to impress the immorality of such a deed upon a five-year-old. He obeys either simply because it is forbidden by the authority of the parent, or because he fears the penalty. A moral basis is too abstract for him; he needs to have it given in a concrete or tangible form, *i. e.*, as a positive command. Now before the fall man's ability to grasp moral relations was all that God made it; after the fall it was somewhat blunted, but not yet so degraded by a course of sin as to be incapable of receiving moral relations on their proper basis; hence God annexed no temporal penalties, not even to murder. I know well what use some make of Gen. iv., 14. and 53-24., but know also that a proper construction of those passages establishes no temporal penalty for murder.

After the race had shown itself unfit to be governed in this way, God swept it from the earths, and gave to the survivors some moral relations, as the unlawfulness to kill, Gen. ix., 5-6., in a kind of positive form.

Finding this still insufficient, or rather, mankind in general failing to regard much as sin which stood merely on a moral basis, God took Israel and placed for them moral obligations generally on a positive basis [see Deu. xxviii. *et al.*] that in this school they might be prepared for the Gospel [Gal. iii., 24] which governs by general principles [Phil. iv., 8.,] restoring all moral obligations to their moral basis simply. [Here is my prohibition of killing without "direct enforcement."] Hence Paul says, The law "was added [to the promises made the fathers] because of transgression, till the Seed should come," [Gal. iii., 19.]; and [Ro. v., 20.] "The law entered that the offence might abound;" not that mankind might sin more, but that they might see sin where before they did not; nor that the law disclosed new

moral principles, but that it put old ones on a legal basis, *i. e.*, gave them in a concrete or positive form, as to children. Hence we find moral obligations enforced under Moses as if they were new, because they were new in that form, "the law entered," "was added;" and in this form other nations did not have these principles. Where, then, is the absurdity of Eld. W.'s 1st and 2nd conclusions from my premises, when fairly understood? And how does my "therefore" fail me?

If the sabbath were a moral institution it would always have existed, and then Deu. v., 15. would only have placed it upon a new or legal basis "till the Seed should come." But it is, as has been shown, a commemorative and therefore positive institution; hence the word "therefore" points to its origin. Here I feel the ground so solid under me that I would be willing to risk both the first and second propositions on this single text, Deu. v., 15.

The "therefore" of Lev. xix., 37. does not make commemorative institutions of moral precepts, but only places them upon a positive basis, since no moral principle can ever be commemorative; but the "therefore" of Deu. v., 15. makes the sabbath commemorative of deliverance from Egypt, because it is a positive institution, just as the paschal feast is made commemorative by the "therefore"

40

of Ex. xii., 17., according to my brother's own reasoning.

3. Neh. ix., 13-15.-[1.] I did not say that "made known" is a full equivalent for "gavest" or "commandest," but that it is "a kind of equivalent;" *i. e.*, it means all that they do with the additional thought of giving or commanding for the first time. Let the reader remember this also when Eld. W.'s strictures on John vii. are read. [2.] But, says my brother, the Lord "came down on Mt. Sinai, etc," and I have the sabbath made known in the wilderness. Are you sure, brother, that the text says He made known the sabbath on Sinai? By the same course you prove this I engage to prove that He then and there gave them manna in "the wilderness of Sin," and water from the rock "in Rephidim!" Do you see how "Eld. Vogel undermines his own theory?" [3.] Ezekiel xxxix., 7. [and he might have added xx., 5 9.,] "So will I make my holy name known in the midst of my people Israel," does not in the least disturb me. [a.] Grant, for argument's sake, that "make known" here denotes a *re*-calling of attention to things formerly known. Have I not admitted that it sometimes has this force? And did I not prove that in Neh. ix. it cannot have this meaning? But suppose I had not, is the first meaning of a word to be set aside for a secondary one without an imperative necessity? [b.] But even in these instances "made known" is used in its primary sense. "The Lord is known by the judgments which He executeth," Ps. ix., 16. And did He not, as I have shown, make pre-existent moral principles [His judgments] known in a legal or new form? Consider also the import of Ex. vi., 3-7. "I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God Almighty; but by my new name Jehovah [*i. e.*, in my new character] was I not known to them. . . . I will take you to me for a people, and I will be to you a God: and ye shall know that I am the Lord your God."

4. Let us now look after those "colored sentences" respecting John vii., 22-23. I have somewhere seen a quotation from the king's translators to the effect that

parallels [||] denote parallel marginal readings, and a dagger [Ü] an equivalent reading, *i. e.*, a reading in different words but the same sense. If it becomes necessary I will seek and produce their own language. That my statement is true any reader can satisfy himself by examining a common reference Bible. The substance of my statement is found in the following quotation from the preface of Dr. Geo. Campbell to his Gospels, as an apology for a new translation: "Has the margin in the English Bible, which in a very great number of passages gives the reader his choice of different translations, ever been found to endanger the faith of his people?"

Eld. W. quotes from various translators in favor of the reading in the body of the Bible; but they all held the sabbath to be a moral institution, and so, when there was a choice of rendering so far as the mere words were concerned, they translated in harmony with their convictions, and left it for commentators to harmonize the context. Many commentators come to this passage with the same prepossession and labor to explain; but such explanations!

I do not deny that *hina mee* ordinarily signifies that not, but it is also true that *hina* is often used for other particles, and by no N. T. writer more freely than by John, and at times it is even redundant or so nearly so that its force cannot be readily indicated in English. If its use were simple and uniform why should the best N. T. lexicographers devote a page or more to its discussion? The marginal reading cannot, therefore be condemned, if the connection demand it. And that it does this I attempted to show in my last paper. I invite Eld. W.'s attention to my argument.

That there is a contrast between circumcision and the sabbath cannot be evaded in view of the expression "not because it is of Moses, but of the fathers." It implies that one is of Moses and the other not. True, they are *both* of God, He spoke both into existence-in the same sense there is no contrast. But one originated before the time of Moses, and the other-when? Here is a contrast, and one fatal to my brother's theory.

It makes no practical difference on what day Jericho was spoiled; there was marching or work for a whole week, and of course on the sabbath. But did Eld. W. ever consider that by adopting his reasoning I could show that he cannot tell what day of true time the Jews observed as a sabbath? It was the seventh day after the first falling of the manna, but on what day did the manna first fall? Here the record is silent, just as silent as

41

on what day the march about Jericho began.

Tholuck's paraphrase, Eld. W. says, "was evidently used for effect-not for its relevancy." This is equivalent to saying that I designedly deal dishonestly. Did you see my heart, Bro. W.? I regret that so unchristian an expression should stain your piece. I recommend to your perusal Matt. vii., 1 [original illegible] 2. But so far as the paraphrase is concerned, you will, upon repentance, allow me to think it in accordance with the marginal reading. "Ye transgress the law," in Tholuck's view, means that they transgressed in the same sense that Jesus did, which is simply no transgression, *i. e.*, "without breaking the law of Moses." But Eld. W. will hear from this passage again.

5. The sabbath a type. That *heortee* ["holy day"] may refer to a feast which has no sabbaths connected with it is true; but does it refer exclusively, or even mainly to such feasts in Col. ii., 16.? As certainly as it there refers to those feasts which had sabbaths connected with them, so certainly does it include the yearly sabbaths. And as often as the 27 N. T. occurrences of *heortee* refer to such feasts as had yearly sabbaths connected with them, just so often is it an instance confirmatory of my position. Suppose, then, that Acts xviii., 21. refers to the Passover feast rather than to Pentecost, how does this help Bro. W.? Or suppose that the passage is spurious, does it not show the *use* of *heortee*? In this connection I also said something concerning Lev. xxiii.; let Eld. W. remember it, for it stands sadly in his way.

When I said that the sabbath's being a type stripped Eld. W. of the last vestige of difference between the weekly and annual sabbaths, I, of course, did not mean that I had proved the weekly sabbaths to be annual, or the annual sabbaths to be weekly; these are mere accidents. But that it destroys every vestige of moral basis for the sabbath, and places it in the category of positive institutions, I meant and still insist upon. Moral institutions are not typical, nor typical institutions moral.

But, says Eld. W., the sabbath points back and therefore cannot point forward! The passover also pointed back and yet was a type. 1 Cor. v., 7.

6. The sabbath pre-eminently Jewish. Much under this head needing a reply has been considered while speaking of Deu. v., 15.

That the sabbath is a sign "between God and the children of Israel" is expressly asserted. Nor is it a sign of creation. Ex. xxxi., 17., when fairly construed, simply refers to the facts of creation for the frequency of the sabbath. The sabbath is a sign of God's having singled out the Israelites as His special people: "It is a sign between me and you throughout your generations, that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you., v. 13; see also Ezek, xx., 12-20. This fixes the matter and forbids W.'s construction of v. 17.

And here I must notice a wrong use made of "peculiar." In Scripture this word is not used in the sense now popular, but as Webster defines it, "Belonging solely or especially to an individual." This did not prevent other people as individuals from becoming Jews, but it demanded of them a renouncement of their nationality and naturalization as Israelites.

7. The sabbath not given to the Gentiles. That Is. lvi. predicts a new day under the name of sabbath will be shown in its proper place. Until then I have not a word of reply to what Eld. W. says on this head. But his attempt to annihilate the distinction I showed to exist between the Jews and Gentiles, as such, respecting the keeping of the sabbath fails in this that it does not distinguish between a naturalized stranger, *i. e.*, one made and treated as if by nature a Jew, and an unnaturalized one. The former was under every obligation which rested upon a Jew, but not the latter. The former, *e. g.*, kept the passover [Ex. xii., 48-49.,] but not the latter. The one might not eat that which died of itself [Lev. xvii., 15.,] while the other might [Deu. xiv., 21.,] whether he was "within" or without the gates of Israel. This last reference will also show that I was right in my construction of "within" in Ex. xx., 10., and Eld. W. slightly in the dark.

The stranger who was not so naturalized "as one that is born in the land" was not distinguished from others by being an idolater, for many of them kept up the Patriarchal worship, as Jethro, the Ninevites, Cornelius and Justus. They were those "other sheep" of whom the Savior spoke, who were "not of this (the Jewish) fold." John x., 16.

ELDER J. H. WAGGONER'S THIRD NEGATIVE

The reader will bear in mind that a discussion is different from an essay or an independent argument; it is not to be expected that every point involved in the subject should be noticed, but those contested. The *identity of days* and the bearing of the word *sanctify* are often matters of earnest dispute; but they are not with us. Eld. Vogel and myself agree on these. Also where time is so limited it is impossible to notice everything which might in strict justice demand attention.

1. Eld. Vogel says the section I quoted from Crosby was put "in small type to indicate that it figures but little in the case." It is explanatory, and necessary to an understanding of the subject. Its being put in small type does not indicate that it is not truth! Nor does he speak of "impassioned prose"-"even in prose" are his words; and they will stand.

I did not maintain silence concerning the Hebrew. I said the exceptions were numerous in *both Testaments*. Gesenius says of the article, its use is. "nearly the same as in Greek and German." He also makes the same exception that Crosby does in regard to poetry, though Green does not; *and this shows that Green's not noticing the exceptions is not evidence that exceptions do not exist*. Let us notice a few of them.

a. Eld. V. says the sabbath was so well known on that morning when the manna was first withheld that the article was demanded. Yet when they had kept the sabbath about five months longer; having witnessed the constantly recurring miracles which pointed it out, and made its observance a necessity; having heard the voice of Jehovah, in his terrible majesty, defining and enforcing it on Mt. Sinai; and Moses had received two copies written by the finger of God; after this lapse of time with all this evidence of its being well known, the same form is used in Ex. xxxv., 2. that is used in Ex xvi., 23.; the article is wanting. And this is "legal information" also; not poetry nor "impassioned prose."

b. Lev. xxiii., 3. was spoken a number of months later, yet the article is omitted. It was not then lacking in "notoriety," "emphatic distinction," nor in anything that would insure its use if no exceptions to the rule were allowed.

c. A striking instance is found in Ex. xx., 10. "Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work; but the seventh day is a sabbath of the Lord thy God." It can not be said that this is indefinite, for the article is inserted in verses 8 and 11, on either side of this. Did the translators turn commentators on this text? No; nor did they on Ex. xvi., 23; facts of history and the usage of the language justify their course.

d. Gen. i., 1. "In a beginning"-*Heb*. Who can find fault with the translators for here inserting the article? It is a faithful translation, *i. e.* gives the true idea of the text.

e. Prov. xxi., 1. "A king shall joy in thy strength," etc. Read the connection and see if the translators have not done justice to the text by inserting the article. I am at a loss to comprehend Eld. Vogel's remark, "The Hebrew. . . has no such exceptions as he would force on the Greek text." If he means that the Grammar which he uses does not notice exceptions, it does not meet the case, for others do; and his expression is unfortunate; liable to mislead. But if he means that the Hebrew of the old Testament has no such exceptions, then his "mine" is easily exploded. I did not use the words "no scholar" in an individual sense, as his italicising the last word implies; but I *now* think *perhaps* he was right in his emphasis.

f. I repeat that his reference to the expression "a holy convocation" is "an element of weakness in his argument." It is *invariably* without the article. It is as if he should attempt to show that a certain man might be distinguished from certain others because his name is John, when John is the name of every one of them. Compare on the passover Ex. xii., 16. with Lev. xxiii., 7., though a year intervened between their mentions.

But Bro. Vogel is confessedly ingenious and fruitful of expedients. When the fallacy of his argument on this point is shown, he answers: "Nearly every mention by Moses was either a first mention or a re-mention for the purpose of additional legislation which is nearly an equivalent." "A kind of equivalent" and "nearly an equivalent" are "a kind of" cushion which he prepares on which

43

to fall easily when compelled to fall from his assumed position; and in case of necessity, as on Neh. ix., he can hide behind their ambiguity. The prefix "re" signifies "again" A re-mention is simply a mentioning again. Does he mean that these re-mentions are additional instances of the *first mention*? And may there be a second, third or fourth occurrence, at long intervals, of the first mention? If not, what does he mean? I would like to know how many months or years must intervene to distinguish between a first and second mention, or between the second mention and merely a "re-mention." Or if it is only "*nearly* equivalent," what proportion belongs to the first mention, and how much of it shall we pass over to the second? If this is not language to help a failing theory I never knew an instance.

Yet again, he says the yearly sabbaths might be mentioned indefinitely because the weekly sabbath had taken the article by "emphatic distinction." If so, why is it that the weekly sabbath wants the article so long after its mention in Ex. xvi.? And how can it take the article by "emphatic *distinction*" if there is not a "vestige of difference" between it and the others, and if it belongs to "the same category," as he has said?

Gesenius, as quoted by Eld. Vogel, was evidently referring to the term *sabbath* without regard to its being definite or indefinite, for, in the next article he lends the text cited, "a sabbath of sabbathism." But, inasmuch as Eld. V. offers it in proof, he indorses the giving of the article to *sabbath* in Lev. xxiii., 32. And thus he furnishes another exception to the rule which he says has no exceptions!

2. At first he said the rulers were "surprised," yet now he says they knew of the order for gathering a double rate of manna. But they came and told Moses

before he spoke to them of the sabbath as in verse 23. Yet again he says it is "absurd" to suppose they went to let Moses know the order was obeyed. Well, why did they go? can he give another reason? One thing is beyond conjecture—Eld. V. is befogged over Ex. xvi.

3. He says the Passover commemorated only "one thing" namely, the passing over of the death-angle in Egypt. *Why* did he make this assertion, contrary to the express reading of Ex. xii., 15-17? I leave it to the reader if some of his assumed "facts" are not "imaginary." All that I said in regard to the Passover and the sabbath is fully confirmed by the scriptures.

4. He does not notice the proof I gave that Deut. v. has not the original copy of the Decalogue. "*These words*," in Deut. v., 23. is the equivalent of *these commandments*. Compare Ex. xxxiv., 28., where Moses says the Lord wrote "the ten words"—(Heb.,) on the tables of stone. Eld. V. might with equal propriety assert that there were *only ten words* on the tables of stone. "Words" in these texts has a technical or special signification. His remark concerning the *rest* of Deut. xii., 9., etc. is without point. I did not disregard the distinction between the command and the promise. I distinguished also between the *rest* of Deut. xii., and the sabbath of Deut. v. His words convey an erroneous impression. I said, and I repeat, that the *rest* promised to them in contrast with their bondage in Egypt was not the sabbath, but the inheritance of Canaan. The Lord's words to Paul will far more aptly refer to himself.

5. His remarks on "make known" do not better his case; his quotations are irrelevant. To quote Psa. ix., 16. to show that "make known" is used in its "primary sense" is truly strange, for the words are not there! "Make known" and "is known" are not synonymous. Nor does Eze. xxxix., 7. speak of making known his "*new name*" as Ex. vi., 3-7., quoted by Eld. Vogel. I shall not try to account for his passing off such random statements for argument on the case; I have given him credit for sufficient discrimination to perceive their irrelevancy.

6. On John vii. (1.) He says the authors I quoted "all held the sabbath to be a *moral* institution," and translated according to their prepossessions. I do not wish to arouse his "righteous indignation" a second time over this passage, but I am compelled in justice to his statement is not correct. (2.) Who are those "best N. T. lexicographers" who devote a page or more to the discussion of the Greek word *hina*? It is true they give a variety of combinations in which it is used, but what lexicographer gives a different rendering of *hina mee* from that I gave from Parkhurst, Robinson, Liddell & Scott, Greenfield, Groves and Donnegan? That is confirmed by the renderings I quoted from the *Diaglott* and from Olshausen; and I notice also by the grammars of McClintock &

Crooks, and Crosby. (3.) I must repeat, and every reader can see, that "Tholuck's paraphrase" of John vii., 23. does not agree with the marginal reading, notwithstanding the effort of Bro. V. to harmonize them. If, "*Ye transgress the law,*" and "*Without breaking the law,*" are synonymous in his vocabulary, I have but to say they are not in mine. There is plausibility in Bro. Vogel's softening of the terms, to-wit: it was "no transgression at all;" *but Tholuck does not say that!* but the very opposite. Why, then, did he quote Tholuck, seeing there is a

contradiction between them? After accusing me at the very outset of the discussion, and without any reason, of "begging the question," and afterward of "perverting facts," he is now very indignant because I can assign no other reason for his use of Tholuck than "for effect." He asks if I saw his heart, and refers to Matt. vii., 1-2. I answer, no; but I saw what proceeded from it, and refer him to verse 20 of the same chapter. Had he acted up to Matt. vii., 12. from the first his complainings would come with better grace. But the evidences are before the readers, and they can judge between us. (4.) His quotation from Dr. Campbell's preface does *not* favor his view. It simply says the reader has a "*choice* of different translations," but not on which side that choice should fall. I never saw a man catch at smaller straws than does Eld. V. The marginal reading in this case is inadmissible, and his argument on it a *non sequitur*.

7. My view of the record of the spoiling of Jericho he thinks would enable him to show that I cannot prove what day of true time the Jews observed as a sabbath. Let him try it and see. He cannot show by Ex. xvi. That it was not the seventh day after six days' falling of the manna; nor can him prove that it was the day of their deliverance from Egypt. But I can abundantly show that it was the day on which God rested when he made heaven and earth; the seventh day from "the beginning," and of course the true seventh day of the week. This truth cannot be hid by any means.

8. "Ex. xxxi., 17., when fairly constructed," says Eld. V., "simply refers to the facts of creation *for the frequency* of the sabbath." This is certainly assuming much, considering that the idea is so foreign to every statement concerning the blessing and sanctification of the day. Let the reader turn to my last article and see my paraphrase of the fourth commandment. The definitions of terms there given cannot be disputed and they sustain all that I claim or have claimed for the seventh day as *the creation sabbath*. Creation is referred to, not merely to point out relation or frequency, which could be done without it, but, to show that it is the Lord's rest day; a day of holiness; a sign that Jehovah is the true God-the Creator of all things.

9. All that he says about a "naturalized stranger" has no force. According to his view he cannot prove that the Gentiles, *as such*, had any law at all. So evidently is this the outgrowth of his theory that I have known prominent men of his denomination to openly take the position that they had none. The blessings of the Gospel are also only for "naturalized strangers," for Gentiles as such are not partakers of the promises to Israel in the New Covenant. Compare Rom. ii., 28-29; ix., 1-5; Heb. viii., 6-10; Eph. ii., 11-19. His theory of *abstract* law, and "moral law on a positive basis," is fanciful and dangerous, as will be fully shown in due time. According to his explanations there is no difference between the "*concrete* or *tangible* form, *i. e.* as a positive command," and *revealed* law. Outside of this *positive moral* law! or tangible, there could be no *express* or "tangible" rules of obligation! Of course man's only rule of action was his own "institutions," as the Spiritualists now have it. And when the "concrete," the "tangible" or the "direct enforcement" was abolished the whole world was turned back to the blessedness of heathenism: restored to those "general principles" which had so completely failed as a guide in the past, leaving each one to supply

the "tangible" or the "direct" according to his prepossessions, feelings, intuitions, or what not; but no more to be guided by the direct, the specific, the tangible, or in other words, *the revealed!* If this does not open the door for "liberty" large enough to suit the "carnal mind," (see Rom. viii., 7.,) I cannot imagine how that might be done. May the Lord save us from the legitimate results of such a theory.

I will briefly notice a few points, passed hitherto for want of space. I am willing to leave it with the reader if a duty cannot be "directly enforced" at different times. To deny it is preposterous. A contrast may exist between the direct and indirect, but it was not implied in

45

my language, and *he knew* I did not have any such contrast in view. To my reference to Cornelius he replies: "The *enforcement* at the house of Cornelius had no direct reference to baptism, but to Cornelius." What was enforced there? Baptism, and nothing else. Therefore the enforcement of baptism had no direct reference to baptism! The angel told Cornelius to send for Peter that he might tell him what he ought *to do*. To this his mission had "direct reference;" and he "*commanded* them to be baptized! Was this a "direct" or indirect, "tangible" or intangible, enforcement of baptism? He drew a contrast between the direct and indirect enforcement of the sabbath. Well, if to Cornelius there was but an indirect enforcement of baptism, we are satisfied with *just such* an indirect enforcement of the sabbath! But what, then, does he gain by his hypercriticism?

I deny that I perverted facts in my remarks on Genesis. Not a text that he quoted in the O. Testament presents an instance of anachronism. His position as I now understand it is as absurd as the one I examined, to-wit: that Adam did not name his wife until long after he received her-until after her children were born! Very many names in the Old Testament were given by prophetic foresight, as every reader knows, and the naming of Eve is one of the most evident instances of this kind. The *tense* emphasized by him, argues nothing in the case. The Lord said to Abraham, "A father of many nations have I made thee," while the son of promise was not yet born.

Eld. Vogel said the reader would inquire whether the word "constitute" as used by him was not borrowed as a quotation from me, either directly or indirect for the purpose of showing up the fallacy of my reasoning. I can answer the inquiry; it was not in quotation, either directly or indirectly, but in his own *direct argument* that he used it. These are his words: "It is at least possible for God to rest without making it thereby a *sacred* rest; and while his resting on any day would constitute that day a rest day (sabbath,) *i. e.* day in which he '*had* rested,' it would not constitute it a sacred rest day." If, as he claimed, "constitute" can be *only* properly used in the sense of "appoint," what is the force of his argument? His pretended explanation is not fair; it does not present the matter in its true light. And his assertion that I confess that there is force in his strictures by my saying that he has made the same distinction, is only frivolous.

His remarks and quotations to show that *God is still working in upholding*, etc. are irrelevant, and being so would require no notice were they not calculated to mislead. The sabbath institution has no reference whatever to the work of upholding or preserving, but *only* to the work of *creating*. This has been so often

placed before the reader that it might seem unnecessary to repeat it. But it is a truth that in a discussion the prejudices of many are easily excited and it is justifiable to meet whatever tends to divert the reader from the truth at issue. Were their minds always directed to those truths of revelation directly at issue, and never diverted *from* them, discussions might be more pleasant and profitable than is generally the case.

Having now passed through the first two propositions, I submit the subject to the reader, confident that it has been established that

1. The sabbath is a memorial of creation; it was blessed and set apart by Jehovah at the conclusion of his work; the Lord himself gave the facts of creation as its basis, and the only reason of its being blessed and sanctified. When its sanctification is spoken of it is never connected with any other events.

2. A great and manifest difference is shown between the seventh day or weekly sabbath and the yearly sabbaths, in that it was based on the facts of creation; it was the rest day of the Almighty; God spoke it with his own voice; he wrote it on the tables of stone; it was deposited in the ark with *only moral precepts*, over which atonement was made before God. Not one of these facts can be applied to the yearly sabbaths, which were parts of a system growing, not out of the acts of the Creator, but out of the necessities of man arising from his own rebellion.

3. There is neither express statement nor necessary inference to invalidate any of these truths.

And again I pray that God may, by his Spirit, guide us into all truth; that through faith in his Son who died "to put away sin," we may so "keep his commandments, which is the whole duty of *man*," that we may be able to stand in that day when "God shall bring every work into judgment."

THIRD PROPOSITION:

"DO THE SCRIPTURES TEACH THAT THE SEVENTH DAY SABBATH IS TO BE OBSERVED BY CHRISTIANS THROUGHOUT THE GOSPEL DISPENSATION?"-Waggoner affirms.

ELDER J. H. WAGGONER'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

Much of the controversy in the world has arisen from misapprehension of terms. To secure the reader in this respect I remark that when I use the words "the Scriptures," I mean the Old and New Testaments. And I speak of this because it has become a custom with some in this "evil generation" to confine "the Scriptures," so far as *authority* is concerned, to the New Testament. This is very wrong, and leads to grievous errors. The word "Scriptures" in the Bible, without any limiting word, refers mostly to the Old Testament exclusively, but *never* to the New exclusive of the Old. While the custom to which I refer gives precedence to the New Testament, in the Bible itself precedence is always given to the Old.

The reader will notice that all of our propositions are concerning what "the Scriptures" teach. And as the first two rested almost entirely on the testimony of the Old Testament, they shut out that invidious distinction, and regard the two Testaments as of equal authority as witnesses in the case.

In the ministry of our Lord and of his apostles "the Scriptures," referring in almost every instance to the Old Testament, were *the standard of all authority* to which they always appealed. The idea which now somewhat prevails that they *superceded*: "the Scriptures;" that they set aside the authority of the Old Testament by the introduction of the New, finds no sanction in the words of Christ and his apostles. Thus Paul wrote to Timothy: "*From a child thou hast known the holy Scriptures*"-the Old Testament of course, for none of the New Testament was written when Timothy was a child; "*which are able to make thee wise unto salvation*"-because they thoroughly furnish the man of God "*unto all good works.*" The law of God, which "is perfect," (Psa. 19:7,) is written therein. The commandments of God which contain "the whole duty of man (Eccl. 12:13) are there made known. That law "the doers" of which "*shall be justified,*" and by which men shall be judged, (Rom. ii: 12, 13, 16; see Eccl. 12:13, 14), is in those Scriptures. This is high endorsement. But, though the law of God is perfect, man as not perfected himself in obedience; he has not done his whole duty; there are no "doers of the law;" and *therefore* a remedy is needed, a system of restitution, of recovery, or of bringing back to God. And this is introduced by Paul in connection with "the Scriptures" thus: "through faith which is in Christ Jesus." Here is set forth a close relation, a complete harmony between the Old and New Testaments; between *the law* and *the gospel*; "the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus."-Rev. 14:12. But this remedial system, as I before said, is nor elementary; it does not grow out of the will or action of God *as does the law*; but it grows out of the rebellion of man. They who reject the law and take the gospel as its successor, as some do, and then boast of "first principles," use language without any just regard to its relations. The truths here set down will be appreciated when we come to examine Eld. Vogel's theory of "general principles" as opposed to "direct enforcement."

One text in the N. T. has been briefly noticed, and as it looks both to the past and future of our discussion, I will further notice it here. It is Mark ii: 27. On this I affirmed that "the sabbath was

47

made" at creation; which is proved by the truth that it was the rest day of God from the work of creation, and that "*for this reason*" he blessed and sanctified it. And this is decisive that it was "*made for man*" for the race; that it is a primary institution. But Eld. Vogel replied: "The universal term *anthropos* (man) is thus limited by the *known fact* that the Gentiles had not the sabbath." On this assertion his conclusion is based! But a statement to be the logical basis of a conclusion must be either self-evident, expressly stated, clearly and indisputably proved, or admitted. If it is claimed with neither of these it is a clear case of "begging the question." But (1) his statement is not of the nature of self-evident truth. (2) It is not expressly stated; the text itself gives no countenance to such a view. (3) It is not clearly proved; his main line of argument is philologically

defective, as witness the following: "The Hebrew, concerning which Eld. W. maintains a respectful silence, has no such exceptions as he wants to force on the Greek text, and this places my position beyond all dispute." But I have shown that the Hebrew has such exceptions, and hold myself ready to show it further if it becomes necessary; and this not only throws his position back on disputed ground, but robs it of all its force. For, as I remarked, a rule given to set aside the obvious meaning of a scripture must not admit of exceptions. My view of Gen. ii: 3, is clearly the obvious one, sustained, too, by the word of the Lord in the fourth commandment; while his rebutting argument furnishes no ground for a *necessary* dissent, being itself so defective. (Of his unjust and unscholarly accusation that I would *force* such exceptions on the Greek text, I shall have occasion to speak hereafter.) (4) It is not admitted; in sincerity I deny it. And I confidently say it is not known to me nor to any one else by any scripture statement to that effect, nor by any just conclusion from any such statement. A clearer case of "begging the question," of assuming as true what remains to be proved, is not often seen.

He refers to 2 Tim., ii: 2, but it is inappropriate. There are limitations in that passage, (though the limitation he claims is much disputed), and to give this as a parallel instance of the use of "the universal term," surrounded as it is by limitations which forbid its use in a universal sense, is a great trespass on the limits of just reasoning. I might in like manner say that the twelve, in Acts v, also used "the universal term men," limited only by the number seven, etc, etc.! but if I quoted it thus to meet the evidence of a passage *without any limitation*, all must consider it an abuse rather than a proper use of language. There is no limitation in Mark ii: 27, either expressed or implied. The truth that the sanctification (appointment) of the sabbath was *always* referred to the facts of creation, is sufficient to make it certain that "the sabbath was made *for man*"-for the race. And the title which the Savior appropriates to himself in this passage-"the son of *man*"-is proof beyond possibility of contradiction that this view is correct. Related as are his words in two verses it is impossible to place a limitation on the word *man* in one sentence and not carry that limitation over to the other. I ask the reader to note this.

Or, if Eld. Vogel is as tenacious for *the article* as his words indicate he can retain it in this passage as it is in the Greek, "The sabbath was made for *the man*." This would direct our minds at once to *the man* who was present when the Sabbath was made; for, as shown by the History in Genesis, only *one man* existed at that time. But this makes its bearing equally comprehensive, for *that man* was the parent and representative of the race. The duties and the welfare of the race were committed to him. Any institution made *for him* and *at that time* was for his posterity without any limitation. The translation is unobjectionable as it stands; but if the article should be translated it cannot be referred to any man but Adam, the parent of the race. In either case is proved the Edenic origin of the Sabbath.

As related to this I will here notice the objection that man had not a sabbath to observe "from the beginning." The objection itself is ambiguous; "from the beginning" marks no definite point of time. It cannot refer to the "beginning" as in Gen. i: 1, for that would be but a foolish cavil. But I affirm that the sabbath is an

institution of *original obligation*, dating from the original enforcement of moral obligation on man. I use the term "original obligation" as embracing that, and that only, which grows out of *original relations*, that is, relations growing out of the independent action of the Creator, and not at all arising from the

48

action or rebellion of the creature. (See my first article). In reply to the objection I say that *Adam, being himself a part of the original creation, existed before all of the relations existed on which moral obligation is based*. If this is true it covers the whole ground of the objection and effectually removes it. Now for the proof.

I affirm (who will deny?) that marriage is an *original* and *moral* institution. But there was no such institution "from the beginning" for Adam to regard; for, when he was created no woman yet existed. We have the following order of events: 1st, Adam was created-but there was no marriage. 2nd. Eve was made-but yet there was no marriage institution. 3rd, She was given to Adam to be his wife-and then marriage obligation first existed. And so of the sabbath. 1st, God created the heavens and the earth-but there was no sabbath. 2nd, God rested the seventh day-but yet there was no institution of the sabbath. 3rd, God blessed and sanctified (set apart to a sacred use) the rest day-and then sabbath obligation existed. Marriage rested as much on the ordinance of God as did the sabbath. To be consistent Eld. Vogel must deny what I have stated in regard to marriage, or yield his objection to the sabbath as an original institution. And here again I say, what I expect to show again and again, *that any argument which would overthrow the sabbath would destroy the foundation of all morality*. Let the reader ponder this. The points I have herein examined have an important bearing on the argument which I shall now put forth.

The evidence required on this proposition is quite different from that required on the first two. The proof on those was in regard to the origin of an institution and its appointment for observance. The present proposition does not call for evidence of that nature. In this consists the difference of proof concerning an old and a new institution. An old institution is only *recognized*; its recognition is all that is required to establish its existence. But a new institution must be proved by the act of instituting it, by its consecration or appointment, or by an express precept for its observance. If these be not produced there is no evidence of an institution. And without these an allusion or recognition is entirely out of the question.

We have never contended for the *origin* of any sabbath institution or Sabbath obligation in the New Testament. Indeed, it is not admissible under the circumstances. We plead directly against it; we plead for a sabbath as old as the heavens and the earth; a sabbath made *for man* when man was first made acquainted with his relations and duties to God: a sabbath blessed and set apart as Jehovah's rest from the work of creation. If there were any act of instituting it found in the New Testament that would be an argument against its antiquity. Right here our opponents run into a grave error. They affect to think we should produce as explicit an act of institution as they ought to produce for a *new one*. More than that; they generally refuse to accept the plain recognition of an institution well known to exist for ages, while they contend that we ought to

acknowledge a few unnecessary inferences as authority sufficient to establish an institution which is never once named in the Scriptures, of which no act of appointment can be produced, and which was never enforced by any precept. On no other subject in the whole range of theology is shown such an utter disregard of all the principles of just reasoning as is shown in the opposition to the sabbath of the Lord our God.

I propose to examine this question under three heads, namely:

I. Show that the Lord claims *a day* in this dispensation, as he did in past ages.

II. Show that the sabbath is recognized and familiarly spoken of in the New Testament without such explanations as would be necessary to guard against misapprehension if it were abolished.

III. Show that the law of which the sabbath commandment is a part was not abolished, but is now binding on all man kind.

And, I. To show that the Lord claims *a day* in this dispensation I quote Rev. i: 10. "I was in the spirit on the Lord's day." In quoting this text I wish to have distinctly understood what I claim, and what I do not claim, that it teaches. Knowing that unwarranted inferences are often drawn from the passage I shall avoid such an error.

(1) I claim that this text *proves* that one day is "the Lord's day" in this dispensation; that his claim and right to that certain day is as clearly established by this scripture as was his right to *a day* established by Ex. xx: 10, or by Isa, lviii: 13. And I insist that this text is decisive on this point.

49

(2) But I do not claim that this text furnishes any proof as to what day of the week is "the Lord's day." In that respect it defines nothing. That must be settled by other scriptures. But the settlement of this point will not be difficult if we allow the Lord to establish his own claim by his own accord. The reader will remember that all our propositions concern that which "the Scriptures teach;" not that which we would be pleased to have them teach, or which we would unnecessarily infer from their teachings.

(3) While I do not claim that Rev i: 10 gives any information as to which day of the week is there referred to, I do claim that it refers to the sabbath, the seventh day, because *it is the only day that the Lord ever Claimed as his, either in the Old or New Testament*; and I unhesitatingly challenge the disproof of this proposition by reference to a single text in all "the Scriptures," which proves, either directly or indirectly, that the Lord ever claimed any day as his own But the seventh day. While "the Scriptures," our acknowledged standard, declare *positively* which day is "the Lord's day." We have square work before us. Mere inferences have no place in his question.

II. The inspired writers of the gospels and the book of Acts speak familiarly of the sabbath as of a *known* and *observed* institution, without any of those explanations which would be necessary to guard against misapprehension if it were abolished.

Matt, xxviii: 1. "In the end of the sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene, and the other Mary to see the sepulchre."

Greenfield says of *opse*, "after or at the end of." So this text may be properly rendered "after the sabbath," which is in harmony with Mark xvi: 1. This text contains all that Matthew says about these two days, at the time of the resurrection, the sabbath and the first day of the week; the rest and the first working day.

Mark xvi: 1, 2. "And when the sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, had bought sweet spices that they might come and anoint him. And very early in the morning, of the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun."

This is exactly parallel with Matt., xxviii: 1.

Verses 9-11. "Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven demons. And she went and told them that had been with him, as they mourned and wept. And they, when they had heard that he was alive, and had been seen of her, believed not."

This is all that Mark says of that sabbath and first day at the time of the resurrection of the Lord.

Luke xxiii: 54-56:24:1. "And that day was the preparation, and the sabbath drew on. And the women also, which came with him from Galilee, followed after, and beheld the sepulchre, and how the body was laid. And they returned and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the sabbath day according to the commandment."

"Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulchre, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them."

This is Luke's testimony concerning that interesting period of the crucifixion and resurrection. While it is silent, as is that of the others, in regard to any abrogation, it gives important evidence in regard to those holy women of whom it has been said they were "last at the cross and first at the tomb." Their devotion to the Savior was no more unworthy than was their faithful obedience to God's commandment. They waited until "the first day in the week"-a working day-to do that which they would not do on the sabbath out of respect for the authority of the laws of God. If sabbath obligation had ceased it will ever remain a marvel that this text is so particular to notice obedience to it, and so silent in regard to its cessation.

John xx: 1, 19. "The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early, when it was yet dark, unto the sepulchre, and seeth the stone taken away from the sepulchre."

"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."

I have quoted John also, though he does not mention the sabbath, because I wish to get all the evidence at once before the reader concerning that time

when it is claimed that obligation to God's commandment ceased, and some new *obligation* was to be introduced.

Having passed through the gospels I reserve the examination of the Acts of the Apostles for the next number.

ELDER PETER YOGEL'S FIRST NEGATIVE

The proposition now before us is of great importance. The first two were mere outposts, this is the enemy's main army; there we did mere skirmishing, here we shall have a pitched battle, fighting for existence. I could afford to yield the first two propositions, but here I can give no quarters.

Circumcision existed before the law of Moses (Gen. xvii: 9-14), was incorporated in it (Lev. xii: 1-3), and was abolished with it. So if the sabbath had existed before the law and was incorporated in it, it fell with it; provided, of course, that the latter like the former was a positive institution.

If any of our readers have never before heard or read a religious discussion they might as well learn at once.

1st. That no passage of Scripture is so fortified but that an ingenious opponent can say something contrary to its most obvious sense, and even make his position seem plausible. Such men were not wanting even in the days of the Apostles, and Peter complained that they "wrested all the Scriptures" (2 Pet. iii: 16). God made no attempt to coerce the wilfully perverse, but so spoke that the honest heart need not fail of His sense.

2nd. I expect to present no argument to which no reply will be attempted, and to adduce no passage of Scripture for which my opponent has no interpretation. Hence, the manifest duty of the reader is to judge, with honesty of purpose, which argument has the greater weight, and whose interpretation is the better, and in harmony with God's word.

I have no wish to dissent from my brother's definition of the term "Scriptures;" for it is manifestly true that the term includes both the Old and the New Testament, and is as comprehensive as the word "Bible."

That "*all* Scripture . . . is *profitable* for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, and for instruction in righteousness," and "is able to make us wise unto salvation through faith which is in Jesus," I believe on the testimony of Paul; but on the same testimony I also believe that "*there is verily a disannulling* of the commandment going before for the weakness and *unprofitableness* thereof" (Heb. vii: 18). It is not my purpose just now to explain this paradox, but one thing is clear, that at least much, if not all, of the Old Testament Scriptures does not stand related to us as it did to the Jews. No doubt "the law (*marginally* doctrine) of the Lord was perfect" (Ps. xix: 7) in its adaptation to the times and circumstances of the Jews, and "holy, and just, and good" (Ro. vii: 12) in its designs; and yet "the law made nothing perfect" (Heb. vii: 19), so that "the ministration of death" had to be "abolished" (2 Cor. iii.). But how it is that "whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning" (Ro. xv: 4) shall appear as we proceed, so far as it has a bearing on the investigation before us.

Bro. W.'s sly hint as to the use of the expression "first principles" is wholly lost on me. I hide behind Paul who uses its equivalent (Heb. vi: 1, 2,) in such a way

as to relieve me from all embarrassment. I would suggest an interview with him; it might save a needless burning of powder.

And here I must pause to answer a question asked me by Eld. W. in his closing article on the second proposition. He is "at a loss to comprehend," and asks me to explain, what I mean by "The Hebrew has no such exceptions as he tries to force on the Greek text." I simply mean what I say. I had quoted a general rule governing the Greek use of the article, and it was clear that it bore me out in my position on Ex. xvi. He adduced a special rule, declaring there were certain exceptions to the general rule. *And without showing* (for that was his business) *that it applied to the particular case in hand* he assumed it (which he had no right to do, since it was not a general rule), and argued from the assumption. This I call *forcing* exceptions on the Greek (my brother will please pardon the obtuseness which fails to see anything

51

either "unjust" or "unscholarly" in this); and in connection with this I said that the Hebrew has no exceptions which will enable him to gain his point. I know, indeed, that there are exceptions even in Hebrew, but in prose not so many as in Greek. It was logically no part of my business to disprove his illicit assumption, but as usual I did the gratuitous task, and he thereupon proceeded upon another illogical assumption, namely, that if he could dispoe of my gratuity he would make good his first assumption!

Bro. Waggoner falls so frequently into this error that I cannot refrain from calling the reader's attention to another instance. In my opening article on the second proposition I announced this general rule: "When an institution is instituted or enacted, or mentioned for the first time, the definite article 'the' is always wanting." Instead of adducing a single exception, which by the rule he was challenged to do, he simply insisted that the examples which I had cited as illustrative of the rule were of such a class that they were not adapted to its illustration, since the article may be absent for another reason than that named in the rule! Suppose he had been successful in this, what possible bearing against the rule could this have had? As a gratuity it may be well enough, and I shall not complain if he sees fit thus to waste paper and ink, only I was anxious to have my main position tested. I might help him to another fact and say that Lev. xxiii is an example of enumeration, and that this may at least in part account for the absence of the article; but of what avail would this be to him? If the article is absent for *two* reasons, how does that disprove the rule which finds there a condition in accordance with its requirements?

Elder W. insists that he has shown "that the *Hebrew has such exceptions*" as his position on Ex. xvi requires. In this he evidently alludes to the cases adduced in his last negative, which I have had no previous opportunity to notice, and will for this two-fold reason at once examine them with all possible brevity.

(a). Ps. xxi: 1, is sufficiently accounted for by Bro. W. himself. It is Hebrew poetry; and Green says (Gram. β 247): "The article is frequently omitted in the brief and emphatic language of *poetry*, where it would be required in prose."

(b). Gen. i: 1. "In (the) beginning," is not to the point, since the article is not needed in an English translation any more than in Hebrew. "At first" answers every purpose.

(c). Ex. xxxv: 2, I have already accounted for, and is altogether in my favor. It is professedly a quotation of the original language used in giving the sabbath to man, and, of course, indefinite. "*These are the words* which the Lord hath commanded," etc.

Here, by the way, I am reminded of my brother's comment on the term "words," in Deu. v: 22. If he insists in using it there in the sense of "commandments" he must grant me the same privilege here. And if you look in Ex. xxxv for the "commandments" of the Lord you will find things which are not written on the two tables of stone. And thus has he sharpened for me a knife which will eviscerate his comment yet to be made on "*The commandments of God and the faith of Jesus.*" Beware of tools with two edges.

(d). Ex. xx: 10 is *not* indefinite. True, the article is wanting, but it is one of those cases where it is not needed, being definite by construction. See Green's Heb. Gram., §§ 246. 3, 255 and 257.

(e). Lev. xxiii: 3 comes under the rule of *enumeration* in which the article may or may not be used, according to the writer's option, and has therefore no bearing on Ex. xvi. Compare, for example, 1 Chron. xxiii: 31, where the article is used, with Col. ii: 16, where the article is not used, though the items enumerated are the same.

Thus every example relied on by Bro. W. most signally fails him. And to save him all further trouble over the absence of the article in certain cases from the term sabbath, I would say that I know of passages, and knew it before I wrote a line on Ex. xvi, where the article is wanting, but always for adequate reasons in no wise affecting my position on that chapter.

I wish, moreover, to take occasion here to remark, that in so far as my arguments hinge on Greek and Hebrew criticisms they are mainly designed for those who can know that they are just. The common reader will find enough not thus contingent to answer every purpose. I have often also another reason aside from the thoroughness of discussion in going to the original. For example, those who hold my brother's views often lay such stress on a clearly mistranslated passage,

52

as the presence of the article in the English version of Ex. xvi: 23-26, that the force of their reasoning cannot well be broken without showing that it has only the false basis of an untenable translation. And I am thankful to God that He has given me the ability to reach such cases.

Elder W. has a peculiar fondness for discussing over again propositions already disposed of. The first note we heard from him, when on the second proposition, was on the beginning of the first, and in his closing article on the second he was still there; and both the first and the second pass again under review in his opening out on the third! An occasional going back could be borne without nausea, but so much of it-well, it shows that *he is not satisfied with the work he has done, else why should he return?* If the surgeon repairs to the

field when the battle is over it is because he knows there are wounded ones there, and also dead ones who need embalming. "Peace to their ashes."

As it is now my business to follow Eld. W., he shall find in me "a friend that sticketh closer than a brother." And I will at once proceed to give a decent burial to his argument from Mark ii: 27.

1. While I am fond of the article in its proper place I cannot endure it in English before the word "man" in this passage. If "man" were here translated from *aneer*, as in 1 Cor. xi: 9, I could have no objections, but since it is from *anthropos*, a generic term, owing to a difference in idiom the article is necessary in Greek but has no business in English; and therefore Adam cannot be here referred to. See *Crosby*, § 470, 1.

2. That a generic term can be and often is limited by a known fact not expressed in connection with it, I have undeniably shown in my last article on the first proposition, and can be further proved by a thousand examples. But it is not necessary since my brother admits it. The only question between him and myself is, Is there such a limiting fact? I affirm it, he denies it; let the reader judge between us. I shall make no attempt to prove over again what I have already established, but am content to refer to my work on the second proposition at length, particularly to the arguments marked vi and vii, as stated and defended in my second and third affirmative. Dare Bro. W. content himself with this reference and abide the reader's verdict? or must he debate those points over again, and so confess defeat? We will see. He may even repeat the accusation of "begging the question," if he likes; I can afford to bear it all-my appeal is made.

3. "Related," says Elder W., "as are Christ's words in the two verses [Mk. ii: 27, 28], it is impossible to place a limitation on the word *man* in one sentence and not carry the limitation over to the other. I ask the reader who wrote this." Let him note it say I, and, whether true or false, when he has found anything in it I am ready to hear his report.

4. What my brother says of Acts v, (Acts vi he means), about "men" being limited by the number "seven" (see vv. 3 and 5), as bearing against my use of 2 Tim. ii: 2, is so wholly irrelevant that I cannot see how he so sadly blundered. For example, in his passage the original is *aneer*, in mine it is *anthropos*; his form is specific, mine is genuine!

So far as the difference between my brother and myself is concerned it may or may not be true that "marriage is an *original* and *moral* institution," I am not now concerned about that. He may also emphasize the alleged fact that Adam was himself "a part of the original creation," and "existed before all of the relations existed on which moral obligation is based;" it is still true that man had no sabbath from the beginning. That is, if the days of the creation week, as Elder W. *assumes*, were twenty-four hour days, the *second* day of Adam and Eve's existence should have been a sabbath in order to have a sabbath "from the beginning." But he says that the sabbath came *because* God had rested, and therefore *after* His rest. Now, if man's sabbath came *after* God's rest it did not begin *with* His rest, and therefore not with the first seventh day. That's all.

The confident and oft repeated assertion "that any argument which would overthrow the sabbath would destroy the foundation of all morality," thus making the sabbath a *moral* institution, I wish now to put severely to the test. I affirm that

The Sabbath is a Positive Institution

1. In Mat. xii: 1-5, Christ compares it with a positive law which David broke in eating the show-bread. Now, had the sabbath been a moral law his argument would have been fallacious, or what logicians call a *non sequiter*; for, in that case it runs thus: David, your model saint,

53

when hungry broke a *positive* law, and you hold him guiltless; my disciples, when hungry, broke a *moral* law, and you hold them guiltless! Where is the parity of reason? Have the moral and the positive the same predicates?

2. In Mat. xii: 7, the Savior evidently classes satisfying hunger with "mercy," a moral principle, and keeping the sabbath he puts in the category of "sacrifice," a positive requirement, insisting that the moral takes the precedence, and so declares the sabbath to be a positive institution. "If ye had known what this meaneth, I will have mercy and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless."

3. In Mark ii: 27, 28, the same principle is involved. Jesus declares man to be lord of the sabbath; but man is not and cannot be lord of a moral principle, for moral principles are either eternal, or founded in the nature of things and the constitution of man. When the Savior says, "The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath," he asserts nothing as to *when* the sabbath was made—that thought is wholly foreign to his purpose—but for what *purpose* it was made; he simply says that man has control of the sabbath, and not the sabbath of man. And since man is lord of the sabbath, and Jesus is also a man, being the *son of man*, he argues that he is *also* lord of the sabbath; that is, has a right to use or set aside the day to any extent that the higher law of mercy dictates, as in feeding the hungry, healing the sick, leading an ass to water, or drawing a sheep out of the pit. Or, in the language of the great Alford, "Since the sabbath was an ordinance instituted for the use and benefit of man,—the Son of Man, who has taken upon Him full and complete Manhood, the great representative and Head of humanity, has this institution under his power." See *Lange* on Mat. xii: 8.

The Pharisees did not admit that Jesus was the Son of God and so had control of the sabbath, yet somehow he silenced them. If Jesus did not establish his lordship over the sabbath from the fact that man is lord of it, how was it that he silenced them? Can my brother tell? I repeat, therefore, again, that man is lord of the sabbath and challenge my brother to produce an instance where man is said to be lord of a moral principle. Till then let him stand in silent awe before this enunciation, and own the sabbath a positive institution.

4. But there is still more in the above passage. It declares that "the Sabbath was *made*" (*egeneto*); a moral principle is not made, but *is* (*esti*).

5. The sabbath was a *commemorative*. institution, this my brother admits; but a moral or eternal principle is *never* commemorative. This has stood in italics and challenged a refutation ever since our discussion began.

6. The sabbath was a type; a moral principle is not and cannot be one.

That the sabbath was a type I am willing to leave to the reader's decision upon the evidence presented in argument v of the second proposition. Dare my brother place as much confidence in his reply then made? If not, let him try again, and he will find that the half has not been told.

7. If the sabbath had been a moral institution it would have been of universal obligation, and the Gentile would have had it as well as the Jews. For proof that the former did not have it I appeal again to arguments vi and vii of the second proposition.

8. The sabbath was a periodic institution *i. e.*, of periodic obligation, and is therefore positive in its nature since no moral obligation is ever periodic, but unintermittently binding.

9. There is no moral, *i. e. necessary* connection between God's resting on the seventh day and man's resting, but the connection is only through *positive* commandment to that effect, and therefore the sabbath is a positive institution. Or, to use my brother's own language, it is "in its *appointment* (that) we find the *duty* of observance;" "the evidence of its appointment is found in the words *sanctified* and *hallowed*;" "the sanctification of a day consists in a *precept* for its observance for a special or sacred purpose." I submit, as I have from the beginning, that that which is born of a precept inherits its nature and is positive.

I could easily swell the preceding list but think it will answer every purpose as it is. If there is a weak point in it I do not know it, and hope my brother will point it out. Of this I am very confident, *that so long as one of these points stands unimpaired the field is mine. And on his ability to overthrow these depends his ability to hold the present proposition.* What more he says in his last paper as yet unnoticed shall receive due attention in my next.

ELDER J. H. WAGGONER'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

No one doubts that there have always existed persons ready to "wrest the Scriptures," but common courtesy, to say nothing of Christian courtesy, demands that such an application to an opponent be omitted in a discussion of this kind. Elder Vogel might bear in mind that he was not solicited by me to engage in this debate, and the unprejudiced reader can best judge which, if either, of us falls under this strong condemnation.

He seems to lay it to heart that I refer back to former propositions, as if the past scene of conflict brought sad memories to him. These questions are closely related, and there are truths underlying all which I intend shall not be lost sight of. No doubt if he could control both sides it would result much more to his satisfaction. If he has been accustomed to have an opponent conduct his affirmative according to his direction he may now have the benefit of a new experience. He has made strong complaints that, in a previous discussion, he had to lead out though in the negative. In all my observation I have never seen a stronger effort made to lead an affirmant than in his last article. In this I predict his failure.

But one question of the past demands further attention; it is his position on the Hebrew. And I will now explain to the reader, and should have done so

before, that there is no indefinite article in the Hebrew. As, "In a beginning," "The seventh day is a sabbath," etc., the "a" or its equivalent is not in the original; of course the translators must determine when to supply it.

The reader will remember that I quoted a section from Crosby in which he stated that in poetry the article is not so much used as in prose; and that in prose, manuscripts greatly differed in the use of the article. This I referred to the Hebrew as well as to the Greek, to prove that exceptions existed to the rules quoted by Elder Vogel. And my claim of exceptions went no further than Crosby's statement. On this Elder V. replied, "The Hebrew, concerning which Eld.W. maintains a respectful silence, *has no such exceptions* as he would force on the Greek text."

And here I must withdraw the admission I made that Green does not notice exceptions to those rules. That was according to my impression when I wrote; that impression being strengthened by the circumstance that Eld. Vogel quoted directly from Green, and yet denied that the Hebrew had *any such exceptions* as I claimed on Crosby's statement. But having since examined Green's Grammar I find that he opens full as wide a field of exceptions in the Hebrew as Crosby does in the Greek; and this takes from Eld. Vogel even the slight excuse I was willing to make for him in regard to his sweeping assertion.

Green says, "The article is frequently omitted in the brief and emphatic language of poetry, where it would be required in prose." § 247, pg. 274. He instances as follows: Psa. ii: 2, kings of earth, for kings of *the* earth; lxxii:17, in the presence of sun, for *the* sun; Isa. xxi:

12. Watchman says morning comes, for *the* watchman and *the* morning; Dan.viii: 13, to give both-sanctuary and-host," etc. And he further gives instances of its omission in prose, as Ex. xxvii 21, in-tabernacle of-congregation; 1 Kin. xvi: 16-captain of-host." and others.

In his "*Chrestomathy*," of Gen. ii:4, where it is literally, "in day the Lord God made earth and heavens," he says, "This inversion of the accustomed order imparts to the expression a sort of poetic character, whence the omission of the article." Pg. 88.

Here we have, 1st a section stating the *frequent* poetic omission of the article. Isa. lvi, on which Eld. Vogel lays so great stress in his speculations, comes under this head. Also Isa. lviii:13; first clause.

2nd. A claim for "*asort of poetic character*" for a sentence in Gen. ii:4, to bring it under the rule for poetic omission, showing that the line between poetic omission and prose omission is not clearly marked.

3rd. Instances (which may be greatly multiplied) where it is omitted also in prose. *These are exceptions to all the rules.*

These points give as large scope for exceptions in the Hebrew as I claimed from Crosby in the Greek, and show that I was fully justified in applying Crosby's

remarks as a regulation of Eld. Vogel's assumption.

In addition to this Gesenius makes a statement of great importance in this question. He says, "*The predicate of a sentence does not take the article.*" Lex.,

pg. 240. This shows further how wide the range of exceptions is, and stamps Eld. V.'s theory as speculative.

In his last he makes another effort, as futile as previous ones, to bolster up his argument. Of Lev. xxiii, he says, "it comes under the rule of *enumeration*" but he gives no authority to explain his rule or justify his assertion. Is not this "a kind of equivalent" to a "re-mention?"

On my showing the fallacy of his quoting texts on "a holy convocation." to sustain his position he asks. "What possible bearing against the rule could it have?" But he adduced them to sustain the rule; and if their disproof has no bearing against the rule, it is only because *as proof* they had no bearing in favor of the rule! "That's all." But why, then, did he offer them?

Of Ex. xx:10, he says, it "is not indefinite;" which is true, *but it has not the article*. But further he says it is definite by construction; *and refers to three sections of Green's grammar, quoting neither*. This will be instructive to his readers, not one-hundredth of whom ever saw Green's grammar, and if they had it, could not possibly determine to what statement of the three sections he refers; for there are many statements in those sections which do not apply to it. The section first cited, 246, 3, says that nouns may be definite without the article by construction, but it gives no explanation applicable to this text. The last cited, §257, says, "The preposition (lamed) *to, belonging to*, with or without a preceding relative pronoun, may be substituted for the construct relation in its possessive sense." If to this he refers it will apply to Ex. xvi:23, as fully as to chap. xx:10. The true reason why it is definite is that it comes under the law of predicates, *and so does Ex. xvi:23, which therefore does not require the article*. Eld. V. says he uses his argument on the Hebrew for those who know that his remarks are just. If there is anyone who knows that, I would be glad to be introduced to him.

Now a few words in regard to this controversy over the Hebrew, which I only regret on account of its having introduced into our discussion some expressions not easily appreciated by the mass of our readers. Eld. Vogel unqualifiedly denied that *such exceptions* existed as I claimed on the Greek; and everyone can see that the very life of his argument depended on his assertion in this respect being true. But I have shown that exceptions do exist in the Hebrew *to the full extent* of my claim on the Greek. It is certainly true that Eld. Vogel knew that these exceptions existed, or he did not. If he did not, it is evidence that his knowledge of Hebrew is too superficial to entitle his criticisms and opinions to confidence. But if he did know of their existence, why did he so positively declare that they did not exist? *As I did not see his heart* I will not offer any solution of this mystery but shall charitably hope that his comment on 2nd Peter, iii: 16, which he applied to me may not be found to apply to himself at last.

I shall now proceed in my affirmative; having passed through the Gospels, I quote from the book of Acts, the *inspired Church History* of this dispensation.

Acts xiii:14, 27, 42, 44. "But when they [Paul and Barnabas] departed from Perga, they came to Antioch in Pisidia, and went into the synagogue *on the sabbath day*, and sat down." "For they that dwell at Jerusalem, and their rulers, because they knew him not, nor yet the voices of the prophets, *which are read every sabbath day*, they have fulfilled them in condemning him." "And when the

Jews were gone out of the synagogue, the Gentiles besought that these words might be preached to them the next sabbath." *"And the next Sabbath day came almost the whole city to hear the word of God."*

Inspiration here set down what took place *on certain sabbath days*. These occurrences were nearly fifteen years after the crucifixion, and this was penned still later; and (as circumstances show and it cannot be denied) as that was the seventh day, these texts prove that the seventh day was called the sabbath day, at that time, by the apostles, by the Gentiles, and by the Evangelist. And again, as they said the prophets were read in the synagogue *every sabbath day*; and the seventh day was, *and the first day was not*, the day in which the prophets were read in the synagogue, it is proved positively that the seventh day then was, and the first day was not, the sabbath day. Behold the harmony of the Old and New Testaments. The O. T. says the seventh

56

day is the sabbath of the Lord-his holy day. The N. T. recognizes both titles, the sabbath and the Lord's day, and points *unmistakably* and *only* to the seventh day. The prophet predicts that the Gentiles shall be called, and they shall take hold of the sabbath. And the N. T. says at one time they gladly received the word and requested that it might be preached to them *the next sabbath*. While the prophet look Forward into this dispensation and speak of the *sabbath to be kept*, not a word in either Testament-in all "the scriptures"-recognizes any day of the week as a sabbath but the seventh; and both Testaments do recognize that day as the sabbath in the plainest terms. Eld. V. said that Isaiah prophesied that *a day called sabbath* would be kept in this dispensation; but as "every sabbath" in the language of the N. Testament includes every seventh day, *and excludes the first day*, it follows that that prophecy is fulfilled in the seventh day, or it has failed,-for it is not fulfilled in the first day, as that is never called the sabbath day.

Acts xv:21. "For Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, *being read in the synagogues every Sabbath day.*"

This is most important testimony. (1) As the preceding it proves that "every sabbath" includes *only* the seventh day. (2) It was the words of the Apostle James; they were inspired of God. (3) It was spoken full twenty years after the resurrection of Christ, when that *new "day called sabbath"* should have been taking that title by some inspired authority, it such a thing was known to the servants of God. (4) It was spoken in full council of "the apostles and elders; and his words are virtually the words of the whole council. The bearing of such facts as these is not to be mistaken.

Acts xvi:13. "And on the sabbath day we went out of the city by a river side, where prayer was wont to be made; and we sat down and spoke unto the women which resorted thither."

This took place in Philippi in Macedonia; and so it appears that the sabbath was kept outside of Judea and its synagogues. And inspiration continues to give it that honored title.

Acti xvii:1, 2. "Now when they had passed through Amphipolis and Appollonia, they came to Thessalonica, where was a synagogue of the Jews. And Paul, as

his manner was, went in unto them, and three sabbath days reasoned with them out of the scriptures."

These were the identical "scriptures" where in they learned what day was the sabbath and the Lord's day.

Acts xviii:4. "And he reasoned in the synagogue *every sabbath*, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks."

This was at Corinth, nearly twenty-five years after the resurrection of the Lord. And still, by the authority of the Holy Spirit, the honored title of *the sabbath* was given to the seventh day. In the absence of all proof *that any body knew* that the first day of the week was the sabbath or the Lord's day, and in the absence of any explanation to the effect that the sabbath was either changed or abolished, the unbiased reader must conclude that inspiration recognized and sanctioned the rest day of the Lord-the sabbath day-as an institution perpetuated under the gospel.

A new and unknown institution cannot take the name of the known institution without full explanations being given. This is a truth which admits of no exceptions. *It must be admitted* as a rule; to violate it is to practice deception. Were a man to give important testimony concerning what transpired *in the City of New York*, it being also well known that he was well acquainted with that city, no query could arise as to its locality, that city being so well known. But should it afterward be found that a place was, or was to be, laid out in the copper regions of Northern Michigan, to which it was designed to give the name of New York City, and that the man in his testimony referred to *that new and unknown City*, giving it the title of a city well known to everybody, without any explanation, all would pronounce him guilty of gross deception. And so of Rev. i:10. He who says that *John meant* another day than that which was well known as the Lord's day, is *bound to give certain proof that that other day was*, at that time, *well known by that title*, or he makes the apostle guilty of just such deception as I have supposed. *All to whom John wrote knew* that the Lord had, in the most terribly majestic manner, and by many plain statements, reserved the seventh day to himself as *his holy day*: his rest day from the work of creation; upon which he had placed the divine benediction, and sanctified it as a day for sacred use. Wherever "the scriptures" had extended their influence, the seventh day was known to be *the*

57

Lord's day. And that title cannot be transferred to another by inferences and suppositions. We may allow people to parley over inferences where there is no direct testimony, and even then it is unprofitable. But where there is direct testimony inferences can have no governing influence.

III. The law of which the sabbath commandment was a part, was not abolished, but is now binding.

The scriptures show that two different laws, or systems of law, were given to the Jews. One, a law of moral precepts, which pointed out sin. The other, a remedy for sin. Not *an original necessity*, as I have before shown, but growing out of the necessities of man as a transgressor. Neither of these laws was original to Israel. "The fall" involved all mankind, and the promise of "the seed" to

bruise the serpent's head was given not to a nation, but to the race. Sacrifices were before Moses or Abraham. If others did not have the same Knowledge of God that Abraham had, it was not for want of opportunity, but (as Paul says) because "they did not like to retain God in their knowledge" Noah was righteous, but the world was filled with violence and wickedness. Lot was righteous, but the men of Sodom were sinners. Abraham was chosen, because he was faithful, to fulfil in him the promises which God had made to the race; and when the fear of God had almost departed from the earth, and men had lost sight of their responsibility, as Pharaoh who asked, "who is the Lord that I should obey him?" God separated the descendants of Abraham and revived amongst them the knowledge of his law, "the light of which had almost ceased to shine on mankind. And God's long suffering as well as his justice will be appreciated when it is borne in mind that he gave as a reason for putting off the fulfillment of a promise to Abraham's descendants, that "the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full." Gen. xv:16. God will not infringe on perfect justice to fulfill any of his gracious purposes. Rom. iii:23-26. Had the world at large maintained respect for God and his authority Abraham need not have been separated from his kindred. And had not all the nations "changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshiped and served the creature more than the Creator," there would have been no occasion for God to renew the knowledge of his law. But under the circumstances there was need of that awful manifestation of divine power and glory to impress deeply on their hearts that which mankind had shown themselves so prone to neglect and forget.

The question of law is one of fundamentals; it embraces within itself all other questions. Without law there can be no government. Both *duty* and *pardon* recognize the existence of law; but duty is before pardon, as obedience is better than sacrifice, and prayer is abomination if made in disrespect of the law; (Prov, xxviii:9); and to say, Lord, Lord, to the Son of God will not admit into the kingdom of Heaven without *doing the will* of his father.

The difference between these two laws is not only evident from their natures, but is recognized in the scriptures. Thus the Lord said to Moses, "Come up to me into the mount, and be there; and I will give the tables of stone, and the law, and commandments, which I have written." Ex. xxiv:12. By comparing the scriptures we learn that this law comprised the ten commandments-neither more nor less which God had spoken with his own voice. It was distinguished from all others by being spoken by the voice of God and written by himself; and separated by being put into the ark, over which atonement for sin was made; and it was also distinguished by express recognition. Said the Lord by Jeremiah, vi:19, 20. "Behold I will bring evil upon this people, even the fruit of their thoughts, because they have not hearkened unto my words, nor to my law, but rejected to it. To what purpose cometh there to, me incense from Sheba, and the sweet cane from a far country? Your burnt offering are not acceptable, nor your sacrifice sweet unto me" Thus they could offer their offerings and sacrifices and not keep *the law*, showing that they were not parts of the same law.

And again, chap. vii:22, 23. "For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt offerings nor sacrifices. But this thing commanded I them,

saying, obey my voice." When they heard *his voice* he spake *his law*, the ten commandments. Deut. iv:12, 13. Thus plainly does the Lord separate his law from all secondary matters.

ELDER PETER VOGEL'S SECOND NEGATIVE

I did not accuse Bro. Waggoner of wresting the Scriptures; I simply stated the fact that they could be wrested, with the inference that one of us does this, and left it entirely with the reader to decide who that one is. Nor would I be understood that the wresting is intentional; I am conscious of the strictest integrity, and cheerfully accord the same to Elder W. On no other ground could I call him brother.

I have no wish to dictate a course for my brother, nor have I made an attempt to do so; I have only insisted on the observance of universally recognized rules of honorable discussion, which he has violated, and assures us that he will continue to do so. The reader will not be at a loss to know what this means; it shows that Elder W. is not satisfied with the work he has done. Men usually let well enough alone. We must, however, not be too hard on him. For while I could afford to lose both of the former propositions without injury to my cause, he cannot; it makes the sabbath of Jewish origin, and consequently it passed away with that dispensation. It is this that hurts.

Nor need he say, "the past scenes of conflict bring sad memories to me;" on the contrary, they are pleasing memories, as the confidence and satisfaction with which I repeatedly appeal to my work just as it is, fully attests.

A large share of my brother's last article is taken up in Hebrew criticisms on a former proposition, which are incorrect in almost every essential feature. My first impulse was to notice them in detail; in fact, I wrote a reply to every item, but have concluded not to trouble the reader with them for reasons which will presently appear.

I wish to say kindly what I am about to say, but nevertheless as clearly as truth and justice demand. My firm conviction is that Elder W. is incapable of making a safe criticism based on the original. Take, for example, the following: With Green's Hebrew Grammar before him, and open at section 246.3, he pronounces sabbath in Ex. xvi: 23 definite by construction! Now this is one of the simplest rules in Hebrew, and yet he blunders in applying it. It is a useless task to follow such a critic, and I have concluded not to do it. I do not ask those readers who have been accustomed to place confidence in Bro. W.'s criticisms to take my word for what I say respecting his criticisms; let them consult a Hebrew scholar about his statement with reference to Ex. xvi: 23 and satisfy themselves.

There is, however, one statement which I must briefly notice because it has apparent weight, and where better scholars than he have blundered. I refer to the following quotation from Gesenius: "The predicate of a sentence does not take the article." The old Grammarians and Lexicographers, both Hebrew and Greek, have generally laid down this rule, but facts are against them. Winer proves the rule to be false by a long array of examples and then adds: "Hence it follows that

the oft-repeated rule: 'the subject of a proposition may be known by its having the article,' is incorrect."-Gram. p. 115 (seventh edition, improved.)

Let us now turn to Bro. Waggoner's direct argument. I begin where I left off in my first negative. He lays his work out in three divisions, the first of which is to show,

1. "That the Lord claims a *day* in this dispensation, as he did in past ages."

That the Lord now claims a day, I cheerfully grant; and that Rev. i 10 proves it is beyond doubt. So far we are agreed. We differ only as to what day is meant by "Lord's day" in Rev. i: 10. When I take the affirmative of the next proposition, I pledge myself to show that this is said of the first day of the week. The mere fact that the sabbath was called the sabbath of the *Lord* (not the Lord's day, however), and that Rev. i: 10 speaks of the *Lord's* day, does not identify them as the same. Under the Former Dispensation the Father was meant by the term Lord, under This Dispensation the term refers exclusively to Christ (1 Cor. viii: 6). (1). I deny that Jesus was ever called the Lord of the sabbath, and call for the proof. (2). If the proof could even be furnished, and it were found that he was called the Lord of the sabbath under the Old Dispensation, it would still

59

remain to be proved that he is the Lord of it in the New.

2. "The sabbath," says Elder W., "is recognized and familiarly spoken of in the New Testament without such explanations as would be necessary to guard against misapprehension if it were abolished." Or, as he afterwards puts it, "The inspired writers of the gospel, and the book of Acts speak familiarly of the sabbath as of a *known* and *observed* institution, without any of these explanations which would be necessary to guard against misapprehension if it were abolished."

That non-christianized Jews observed it, we both agree to. That Judaized Christians also observed it is a matter of course. But that Christians intelligently observed it *as obligatory* in the New Dispensation remains to be proved. The mere fact that Christians for a long time observed the day proves nothing; for,

(1). They also observed the annual sabbaths. Are they therefore binding?

(2). They observed circumcision. Is it binding?

(3). They offered animal sacrifice. Are we to offer them?

To all these things my brother says, No. Yet, if the mere observance of the sabbath proves its present obligation then are these also obligatory, for they were observed. See my first article on "approved precedent."

Will my brother say that these things were types and so met their fulfillment in Christianity? The same is true of the weekly sabbaths. Read Col. ii: 16, 17, and my comments thereon in argument v, under the second proposition. Is this observing the sabbath "without any of those explanations necessary to guard against misapprehension?"

Let us look at the matter from another standpoint. My brother quotes in full all the passages of the four gospels, which speaks of the crucifixion, the keeping of the sabbath then, and of the resumption of work on the first day of the week, and then adds: "If sabbath obligation had ceased it will ever remain a marvel that this text [Lu. xxiii: 54-xxiv: 1] is so particular to notice obedience to it, and so silent in

regard to its cessation." But he claims that ceremonial observances were abolished at this time. Will it "ever remain a marvel" that there is nothing said about the disciples ceasing in its very midst the observance of the feast of unleavened bread which they were then keeping? And why should all the disciples gather "according to the commandment" on the day of Pentecost, fifty days after the crucifixion, to observe that feast? Is not this also a "marvel?"

The fact is that the disciples then knew nothing about the abolition of anything by the crucifixion, hence they acted accordingly; and the writers of the gospels and Acts, as faithful historians, recorded events as they transpired. If they chose then to withhold comments furnished by the light given on and after Pentecost, it was their privilege to do so. The bearings of the potential act, the crucifixion, to abolish everything of a positive nature in the preceding dispensation, were not yet made known to the people. To illustrate: A number of men are imprisoned for an indefinite period and loaded with chains. The governor writes out a pardon, seals it, and gives it to some of the prisoners to be opened and read fifty days afterwards to their fellows for the benefit of all. Let the chains represent the sabbath, and the prison the Jewish feasts and whatever else is of a positive nature in the old law. You see that the instrument which procures the liberation of the prisoners is in existence before it takes effect for fifty days. Would it be sound logic for my brother to argue that the governor's pardon did not free the prisoners from their chains (the sabbath) simply because they were for fifty days after it was written ignorant of its nature and still bore their chains? Yet this is the way he reasons about the women's keeping the sabbath "according to the commandment," i. e., as it prescribes.

Or, suppose that the prisoners so misinterpreted the governor's pardon as to still cling to both prison and chains, or at least to the chains, for many years after, would this prove that there is no pardon in the governor's writing? This, precisely, is my brother's argument from Acts!

Suppose again that some of the prisoners interpreted the pardon aright but found that some of the rest not only misinterpreted it but had actually so fallen in love with the chains that they did not desire to be released, while still others believed the pardon to be entirely spurious and would look upon such as should throw off their chains as rebels against the government. Would it not be well for those who would undertake to reason with them, in order to avoid arousing excessive

60

prejudice and to find readier access to them, to wear their chains for the sake of gaining such? This is what Paul and others actually did; and so he explains: "Unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might gain them under the law" (1 Cor. ix: 20). And so, precisely, James reasoned with reference to similar matters, not only for the sake of unconverted Jews, but also for the sake of such converted ones as did not fully understand the nature of Christianity. Hence he said to Paul when the latter came to Jerusalem, "Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of the Jews there are which believe; and they are all zealous of the law; and they are informed of thee, that thou teachest all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to

forsake Moses, saying that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs. What is it therefore? the multitude must needs come together, for they will hear that thou art come. Do therefore this that we say to thee." And then follow the directions and Paul's compliance with them. See Acts xxi: 20-26.

It is a fallacy to reason from the fact that "all" of the "many thousands" who believed kept this or that belonging to the law, and because Paul, James and other enlightened teachers conformed to their prejudices, feeding them with milk until they could endure strong meat, that therefore these are binding upon us. *It requires as express legislation to carry a positive institution from one dispensation to another as it did to establish it at first.* But there is no such legislation with reference to the sabbath, and this ends the matter.

Paul had also another reason for preaching on the sabbath; he could then get an audience of such as he could not reach on other days. It was the day when the Jews, to whom he wished to preach, were assembled; and when they were in the habit of giving opportunity to read and explain the Scriptures (Lu. iv: 16 17). To this also Acts xv: 21 refers-"Muses of old time," *i. e.*, since many generations, Moses "hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every sabbath." Nor is it at all strange that pious Gentiles should not only build them synagogues, as the centurion mentioned in Lu. vii: 2-5, but also habitually meet and worship with them, though there was no law requiring either.

And the very expression, "Paul, *as his manner was*, went in unto them, and three sabbath-days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures," is proof that the writer of Acts knew the sabbath not to be binding; for were it binding, it would be a matter of course that Paul would preach on that day, but since it is not binding it was necessary to tell that such was Paul's manner, else we should not have known it.

The explanation that the sabbath, circumcision, and indeed all such "customs" were no longer binding was long withheld, because the people could not bear it. This may seem strange to some, but such is nevertheless the fact. On the same principle God did not insist on monogamy for thousands of years, though such was His design from the very first; and for a similar reason also He suffered divorce on slight pretexts for many ages. Mat. xix: 8. Even Peter, an inspired apostle, after preaching eight or ten years had to be convinced by miracle that the Gentiles are also to be partakers of gospel blessings. And this is especially strange since his commission read, "Go ye into *all* the world and preach the gospel to *every* creature" (Mark xvi: 15). Besides, he had, in his very first sermon, preached salvation for "all" (Acts ii: 39) without understanding for ten years what that meant which the Spirit caused him then to say. In many things, for a long time, even the apostles saw "through a glass darkly." Gradually, but yet as fast as they could bear it, light came. And so the Savior had ordained: "First the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear."

I do not claim that the first day of the week was ever called "Sabbath" by inspiration, except in prophecy. Hence the first day ought not to be called sabbath now save in poetry and figurative language. By what right the first day was called sabbath in prophecy, I must reserve for my next proposition, where it

properly belongs. But to find a fulfillment of Is. lvi: 6 in as yet unconverted Gentiles coming out to hear Paul preach on the sabbath to see what he had to say is so strangely wild that it is difficult to believe that a man ever wrote it in sober earnest. I fear my brother was nodding just then.

Is. lvi: 6 and all similar prophecies no more predict the continuance of the Jewish sabbath than the 7th verse-"their burnt-offerings and their sacrifices shall

61

be accepted upon mine altar"-gives to us animal sacrifices and a literal altar, or than Is. lxvi: 23 insists upon the continuance of Jewish "new moons." Such literalism would construe Zech. xiv: 20 into a present duty to literally write "holiness unto the Lord" upon "the bells of the horses" rather than to insist upon righteous dealing!

3. Elder W.'s third division is not yet sufficiently developed to need a reply. While awaiting the result I will begin a negative argument.

I. The law is abolished; and since the sabbath was a part of the law it went with it, no matter when it was given.

The expression "the law," when referring to the Old Dispensation, and not qualified to the contrary either expressly or by obvious implication, always refers to the entire body of the law as a whole, or to single commandments as part of the whole. In other words, there is no such Scriptural distinction as "the moral law" and "the ceremonial law." Under the Jewish Dispensation the moral, the ceremonial, and the Judicial were part and parcel of one law. It was in the days of the Schoolmen, when men, preparatory to entering the ministry, spent sixteen years in hairsplitting and called it "theology," that the three-law distinction arose. But "what God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." What in one sentence is called "the law of Moses" (Lu. ii: 22) is in another called "the Law of the Lord" (v. 24); and what in one passage is called simply "the law" is in another called "the law of Moses;" compare Lu. xvi: 16, "The law and the prophets were until John," with Lu. xxiv: 44, "All things must be fulfilled which are written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms." Both of these passages refer to the whole of the Old Testament with this difference in details, that what is divided in the second into "prophets and Psalms" is embraced in "prophets" in the first, since the Psalms are largely prophecy. I know of no instance where the ten commandments alone are called "the law," simply.

1. When I say that the law is abolished I have reference only to so much of the law as was positive; and this includes the sabbath which I have shown to be positive. Moral relations cannot be and were not abolished. This was foretold by Haggai, ch. ii: 6, as quoted by Paul in Hebrews xii: 27. "Yet once more I shake not the earth only, but also heaven." This implies a former "shaking," which took place at the giving of the law to the Jews; see Hag. ii: 5, Heb. xii: 25, 26. And the second shaking was to take place when Christ should come for the first time or while the second temple was still standing (Hag. ii: 7, Heb. xii: 28). As to the things shaken or removed Paul's comment is, "And this expression, yet once more (etc.), signifieth the *removing* of those things that may be shaken (*marg.*), as of things that are *made* [and the sabbath was "made," Mark ii: 27], that those

things which cannot be shaken [namely, things not "made," *i. e.*, moral principles] may remain."-Heb. xii: 27.

2. "Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgression, *till* the seed (Christ) should come." Gal. iii: 19. But Christ has come; therefore the law has served out its time and is discharged.

3. "The law *was* (not is) our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, *we are no longer under the schoolmaster.*"-Gal. iii: 24, 25.

ELDER J. H. WAGGONER'S THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

Having introduced the third point in my argument, the perpetuity of the law, I shall notice a reference made by Elder Vogel, which will show how a person may be led astray by his theory and prepossessions. He says, "I also believe that 'there is verily a disannulling of the commandment going before, for the weakness and the unprofitableness thereof.' Heb. vii: 18. Here I may justly quote the language which he unjustly used. "This is a convenient way he has of begging the question by assuming that "the commandment there referred to was that of the Sabbath," and "That my charge of Bro. V.'s begging the question is *just is*

62

simply a matter of fact which any reader has the means to verify," by reading Num. iii: 10 and parallel passages, wherein the service of priesthood was given *exclusively* to Aaron and his sons; and observing that Paul, in Heb. vii, is arguing the *change of priesthood* from Aaron to Christ. Of course, in making this change of priesthood there must be, "of necessity a change also of the law." Heb. vii: 12. For disregarding *that law* a King of Israel was smitten with leprosy; and Paul argued (what every one can see) that if that law remained, Christ, who was of the tribe of Judah, could not be recognized as a priest. This testimony of "our beloved brother, Paul," has often been "wrested," by applying it to that to which his words could have no possible reference.

The *relations* of the two laws to which I have before referred, are not always kept in view, and this oversight gives rise to serious and fatal errors. *Law is primary, but redemption is secondary.* Law springs from the will and attributes of God; redemption is occasioned by the willfulness of man. Law must have existed, from the fact that the relation of Creator and creatures, of Governor and governed, existed. But redemption would not have been, had not sin come into the world. And we cannot have right ideas of secondary principles if we have no just ideas of their primaries. No man can so appreciate a pardon as to receive it in a right spirit and be benefited by it who has not just regard for the law which condemned him. Thus the gospel is often perverted to be a mere minister to selfishness because the law-the revelation of the divine will and the necessary basis of the gospel-is rejected.

Laws grow out of *principles*; but principles are not laws. We can have no idea of the principles of any government, human or divine, except through its laws. There can be no difference between the attributes of God and the principles of

his government. As God is just, justice must be a principle of his government; and it must unite with and have an influence over every other principle. So of love, of immutability, and of every divine attribute and perfection. We cannot conceive of his possessing an attribute which does not shine forth in his government. But as law is the revelation of principles and the basis of government, whatever applies to the government of God, applies, of course, to his law. Law is but the expression of his will, and his revealed will must be in harmony with his attributes. Considering that there is so close a relation *between the divine law and the divine perfections*, it is not strange that David prayed thus; "Open thou mine eyes that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law." Psa. cxix: 18.

1. All that can be said in favor of *law* in the abstract can be applied to that law which God spake to Israel.

As law is the foundation of government and the rule of action, it follows that character under the government is only determined by the law; and, of course, character is the counterpart of the law obeyed. A man's character being known, it is known by what kind of a law he has walked. Or, conversely, knowing the nature of a law, it is easy to determine the character that will be developed by obeying it. Let us apply these truths to the law in question.

(1.) Jehovah said to Israel if they would *obey his voice* they would be "a holy nation." Ex. xix; 6. It is impossible to become holy by obeying a law which is less than holy itself. A defect in the law would leave a defect in the character.

(2.) "The law of God is perfect." Psa. xix: 7. Perfection in a law which is the outgrowth of the divine attributes is of that nature that it cannot be improved. Nor can it be duplicated by another law equally perfect, unless there are two distinct wills of God, emanating from distinct classes of attributes.

(3.) "Fear God and keep his commandments, this is the whole duty of man." Eccl. xii; 13. The word "man" is here used generically-it means the race. This testimony is of great importance. The whole duty of the race of man is comprehended in those commandments which God gave to Israel. And as that law contains man's whole duty, man would not have come under condemnation if he had kept it. Of course he would have been justified by it. And again, *it is the only law of its kind*, for it is impossible to have two different laws, each containing the whole duty of moral agents; each containing the elements of justification before God.

(4.) "The doers of the law shall be justified." Rom. ii: 13. This certainly refers to the same law that is referred to in the scriptures quoted above; for a law which is perfect, which contains the whole duty of man, which will form a

63

holy character, will certainly justify the doer; and no other would. These are a few of the high testimonials we gather from the scriptures in favor of that law which God gave to Israel. And the points which follow confirm this.

2. As the will or law of God is the outgrowth of his attributes, it is the revelation of his own character, and is called *his righteousness*.

(1.) We are commanded to be holy because God is holy; but he said to Israel that they would be holy if they obeyed his voice, or kept that law which he

proclaimed to them. This is the nearest that a creature can possibly approach to God; to be perfectly conformed to his will, and to form a character in harmony with the revelation of his attributes.

(2.) "All thy commandments *are righteousness.*" Psa. cxix: 172. This is but a fair conclusion from the evident truths here presented. This psalm, which in every verse contains a tribute to the law of God, says in verse 142, "Thy righteousness is an everlasting righteousness, and thy law is the truth." And verse 144, "The righteousness of thy testimonies is everlasting." Also, verse 123, "The word of thy righteousness."

(3.) It is referred to in like manner in Isa. li: 7: "Harken unto me, ye that know righteousness; the people in whose heart is my law." His law is "the word of his righteousness." In harmony with this are the words of Paul.

(4.) "But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, *being witnessed by the law.*" Rom. iii: 21. Passing for the present the *contingent relation* brought to view in the first part of this verse and the context, we notice that *the law witnesses to the righteousness of God.* As a law which can justify the doer must contain *the elements or principles of justification*, that is, to be a complete, holy law; so a law, to be a witness to righteousness must itself be the exponent of righteousness; for a law cannot testify concerning principles which it does not embrace. A [original illegible] not forbid, nor justify that which it does not require. That the law is both a rule of righteousness, and an exposition of the righteousness of God, could not be more clearly and strongly stated than is here stated by the apostle.

3. On the perpetuity of this law as a rule of righteousness, (the righteousness of God,) see Isa. li: 6, "My righteousness shall not be abolished." This can refer to but one of two things: *a.* To Jehovah's own attributes, which, as a revelation, would be equivalent to saying that he would not commit suicide! *b.* To the law, which is the revealing of his character to man, and which is called his righteousness. This must be its meaning, and contains a timely rebuke to those who teach that it has been abolished, See Psa. cxix: 126, "It is time for thee, Lord, to work, for they have made void thy law."

4. On the law as *the will of God.*

[1.] Psa. xl: 8: "I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea, thy law is within ray heart." As Jesus was here presented in prophecy, so was he in its fulfillment. He said he came not to destroy the law, Matt. v: 17. But he who teaches that he did destroy it [or abolish it, which is the same thing; for when a law is abolished nothing can be done to destroy it], makes the Savior's actions contradict his words. As this is Elder V.'s position, I entreat him to pause in his work of presumption, and no longer cast such indignity upon the blessed Son of God. Jesus says it is of no avail to cry, "Lord, Lord," to him, if *ye do not the will* of his Father; and that he will say to the rejected, "Depart from me, ye that work iniquity"-literally, workers of lawlessness, or law-breakers. Matt. vii: 21-23.

[2.] "My doctrine is not mine but his that sent me; if any man will *do his will* he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God or whether I speak of myself." Jno. vii: 16-17. I have said that the law springs directly from the will of God, but redemption was made necessary by the willfulness of man. One is primary; the

other is secondary. Here Jesus confirms this view by giving *the will of the Father as a test of the doctrines of the Son*. The Gospel must be in harmony with the law of God or it is not from Heaven-not from God. The harmony between the Law and the Gospel is based on the unity of the Father and the Son. By these words of the Saviour the Jews would have been warranted in rejecting his doctrines, if they had conflicted with the revealed will of God; and so now should we reject every [so-called] gospel that does not harmonize with the laws of God. Such a "gospel" puts the Son in antagonism with the Father-it is not from above. But the decisive testimony on *the will of God* is that of Paul.

[3.] "Behold thou art called a Jew, and *retest in the law*, and makest thy boast of

64

God, and *knowest his will*, and approvest the things that are more excellent, *being instructed out of the law*." Rom. ii: 17-18. This clearly confirms what I have said, that the law reveals the *will of God*. Now note: a. It is the law in which the Jew rested, and therefore it was the law that was given to Israel. b. It is the law of truth [see Psa. cxix: 142], for the Jew had "the form of knowledge and truth in the law." *Had he kept it* he would have had the essence and power of the truth as well as the form, as we must judge from what has been said concerning the nature of this law, and as we shall see farther. c. It is a law which forbids stealing, adultery, and the worship of idols: verses 21-22. It is therefore a "tangible" law of "direct enforcement." d. The breaking of this law dishonors God, verse 23. Yet some now so far depart from "the apostle's doctrine" as to contend that that they dishonor God in the keeping of it! e. The breaking of this law neutralized the circumcision of the Jew, and destroyed its efficacy as *a sign of righteousness*, verse 25, chap. iv: 11. f. If the Gentile keeps this law he will be preferred before the Jew; verse 27. g. There is *righteousness in this law* which could make the Gentile a "Jew inwardly," and count his uncircumcision for circumcision; verses 26-29; that is, to secure to the gentile a covenant interest in the promises to Abraham, which are the blessings of the gospel; Gen. xvii. Of course the law is the *basis of the Abrahamic covenant*, as will be more fully shown hereafter. h. It is a law which will justify the doer; verse 13. i. And all these words the Apostle applies in this dispensation. Here is a mass of evidence too plain to be controverted.

5. That this law is the rule of the judgment is farther proved in Rom. iii, where it is said the Jews received "the oracles of God." Stephen said in Acts vii: 38, that Moses received "the lively oracles to *give unto us*." These are the "living oracles." Paul says that the chief benefits of the calling and separation of the Jews was that the oracles of God were intrusted to them; and from them we are to receive them. And he proceeds to show that if the unbelief of the Jews made the faith of God [faithfulness, truth] of no effect, God could not *judge the world*; Rom. iii: 1-6. Solomon also said the commandments of God should be kept *because* "God will bring every work into judgment."

6. The Gentiles were and are amenable to this law. Paul says of both Jews and Gentiles that "they are all under sin;" Rom. iii: 9; and to prove it he quotes from the Old Testament. It needs but little if any argument to show that quotations

from the scriptures given to Israel would not prove the Gentiles sinners unless they were amenable to the law contained therein. Any amount of quotations from the statutes of England would not prove me guilty of wrong in the United States, because their jurisdiction does not extend here. This is a question of jurisdiction. When the apostle declares that "all the world" are proved guilty by the law, Rom. iii; 19, we know there can be no limitation to the term "world," because this is a conclusion drawn from the previous evidence that Jews and Gentiles are on a level and are all proved sinners by the same testimony. His quotations were entirely without point, and his conclusions erroneous if, as many now affirm, "the law" did not reach the Gentiles. And this is in harmony with the evidence of Rom. ii, and other yet to be given.

7. Men are proved sinners by the law. This is both the statement of a truth, and the necessary conclusion from the proofs given. "By the law is the knowledge of sin." Rom. iii: 20. But this could not be true if the law is abolished, as Eld. Vogel teaches. I have shown that there was a distinction between *the law* and the sacrifices and offerings. Had no sin existed no sacrifices would have been required. But "where no law is there is no transgression." They exist in the following order; 1st. The law. 2ndly. Transgression. 3rdly. Sacrifice for sin. But the types of the past dispensation represent the relation we sustain to the offering of Christ in this; and the difference between the law which makes known sin, and the system of remedy for sin, is as clear and distinct in this dispensation as it was in that. In a word, the law, by which is the knowledge of sin, and the gospel, which is the remedy for sin, are as distinct as two systems can be. And *the perpetuity of the law* is fully and sufficiently proved by this declaration that it is the instrument which points out sin. While that is a revealed truth, they who argue for the abolition of the law strike at the foundation of truth-at the very life of the gospel itself. For the gospel-good news of salvation, redemption, pardon-is a nullity

65

if it has not the pre-existing law as its basis.

Every evidence and reason here produced, and that shall hereafter be produced, shows the unsoundness of Eld. Vogel's theory of law, and the basis of my premises and conclusions based on his view of Deut. v: 15. If the law which was given to Israel had no previous existence, if it did not reach the Gentiles, then it cannot be proved that the Gentiles were under legal obligation; that they were the subjects of the government or of the judgment. And this conclusion which I deduced from the Old Testament [and which Eld. V. virtually endorsed], is plainly stated in the New Testament.

But few points in Eld. Vogel's second negative require notice; they will be attended to in due time.

ELDER PETER VOGEL'S THIRD NEGATIVE

Eld. Waggoner completely misapprehends me on Heb. vii., 18, hence his nice talk about "begging the question" and "wresting" the Scriptures is without point as against me. He argued from 2 Tim. iii., 16-"All Scripture . . . is profitable" etc.-in

such a way as to leave the impression that all Scripture, because it is profitable, is now binding on us in the same sense that it was on the Jews. I showed that such a conclusion is erroneous from the fact that the law of the priesthood is part of "all Scripture," is therefore profitable," and yet is expressly said to be abolished. In other words, while we may be profited by it we are not profited in the same sense and way that the Jew was. Hence for aught that appears from 2 Tim. iii., 16, and all similar passages, the entire law *may* be equally abolished and yet be "profitable" and "for our instruction."

The third division of my brother's argument, begun in his second affirmative and continued throughout the third, is still unfinished. Courtesy requires me to notice it; nevertheless I do it with reluctance now, since it is difficult to divine what sort of an end so curious a beginning may have. His chief aim seems to be to prove that whatever is expressive of an attribute of God (*i. e.* whatever is moral) cannot be abolished, but must extend through all time and eternity. But have I not already admitted this? Why then spend so much time in its proof? Let him show that the sabbath is moral in every feature of it-(1) in the idea of sacred *rest*, and (2) in the idea of rest on the *seventh* day of the *week*-and I will surrender unconditionally. I deny that the sabbatic institution is moral in any essential feature of it. Here is something "tangible," and I invite my brother to the issue.

He seems indeed to be aiming at this, but in so roundabout a way that I fear his readers fail as yet to see the drift of his argument. His third sub-proposition reads thus: "The law of which the sabbath commandment was a part, was not abolished, but is now binding." Granting as he must and does that at least part of the Mosaic code, as the law concerning the priesthood together with all ceremonial observances are abolished, he manifestly regards these as no part of the law. But of this he should give clear proof, since it is vital to his argument, but is by no means self-evident, and is moreover squarely denied.

If I have been at all successful in gathering his position it is this:

1st. Before sin entered this world man as creature and subject was under rules and regulations; had he never sinned he would always have been under these obligations; and the fact of his sinning does by no means release him from these laws, but they are constantly and always binding since they are for man as man.

2nd. Since the fall God has introduced means and expedients suited to man's salvation from sin, and only necessary because man has sinned, and destined to pass away with the complete eradication of sin from the race. These expedients may change with a change of dispensations, as the sacrifices of the law have given place to the better means of the gospel; but the gospel itself, being only

66

an expedient for man's salvation, must eventually share a like fate with the sacrifices of the law.

3rd. The first class above named is designated by such expressions as duty, the law, the commandments of God, the voice of God, the will of God, etc., and may be called primary law.

4th. The second class is designated by such expressions as pardon, gospel, remedial system, etc., and may be called secondary law.

5th. The first class or primary law is based on the will and attributes of God, hence is wholly moral. To this class the ten commandments belong since they are expressive of duty and are called the law, the voice of God, the will of God, etc. Consequently the ten commandments are all moral, the sabbath is moral and cannot pass away.

6th. From the fact that Bro. W. refers the expressions, the law, the commandments, the voice of God, etc., to the ten commandments, and especially since he so refers Ecc. xii., 13, "Fear God and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man," it is evident that he regards the decalogue as a complete compend of moral and "primary law."

Having now stated Eld. W.'s argument in such a way that the reader can see his aim (and I think I have done him full justice), let us examine its correctness.

In the first place, Not everything which is "duty" now originated before the fall: "A *new* commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also (so) love one another." John xiii., 34. "This is *my* commandment," says Jesus, Ch. xv., 12. This grew out of redemption and yet is "duty," and "redemption is secondary." Hence also the text "My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me," has been taken in an unwarranted sense by my brother.

Secondly; All divine law does *not* "spring from the will and attributes of God." Moral law may be expressive of the will and attributes of God, but positive law is only expressive of will. It is the absence of any moral reason for it that makes it positive.

Thirdly: The commandment prohibiting Adam to eat of a certain tree was positive, since it rested exclusively on the will of God; and yet, having been given before the fall, it was a "primary law." But if one "primary law" is positive so may another be. Hence if it could even be successfully shown that *all* of the ten commandments belong to "primary law," it would not thence follow that the sabbath is moral. Indeed, I have already proved it to be positive.

Fourthly; A positive requirement, resting as it does simply on the will of God, may be changed at any time God sees fit and man's growth or need requires. Hence all "primary law" is not unabolishable; and to prove the sabbath to be a "primary law" has nothing to do with proving its present obligation.

Fifthly; The ten commandments are not a complete compend of moral or "primary law." They do not, for example, contain the "primary law" forbidding poligamy, nor that moral law contained in the Savior's "*new* commandment." Hence also they do not contain man's "whole duty," and cannot be called "the law" in my brother's especial sense. They are not even all moral; the sabbath certainly is not, to say nothing of the prohibition to "make" images.

Sixthly: Even the form which at least some of the moral commandments of the decalogue take, is furnished by the facts of the fall. "Thou shalt have no other gods before me" is an example.

Seventhly; Compliance with a positive command growing out of the work of redemption is also "duty" (Mai. iii., 7-8; Lu. vii., 30) and a measure of "righteousness" (Mat. iii., 15), and non-compliance is sinful disobedience (1 Chr. xiii., 10), needing expiation or atonement if forgiven. And there are "fruits of

righteousness" which are not by the law, but "by Jesus Christ," Phil. i., 11. The fact, therefore, that it was "duty" to observe the sabbath, and keeping it a measure of righteousness, and that atonement was made over it, does neither prove it to be "primary law" nor moral. Thus every distinction which Eld. W. seeks to establish by which to prove the sabbath "primary law," moral, or perpetual fails, and with it his third division.

Let us, however, examine his exegesis of and comments on certain passages. "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven." Mat. vii., 21. True; but is the sabbath still His will? The passover was once His will, is it therefore, now?

That was a fine homily, Bro. W., which you delivered from the text, "It is time for thee, Lord, to work; for they have

67

made void thy law," and no doubt might have had a good effect on some hardened sinner of David's time. But it strikes me that if you were in position to preach to your brethren from Gal. iv., 10-11, "Ye observe *days*, etc. I am afraid of you lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain," or from v. 21, "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do you hear the law?" your sermon might be in keeping with the dispensation under which we live. You could show how the covenant from Mt. Sinai "gendereth to bondage," and how like Hager, God, not man, hath "cast it out." Then also, "Stand fast, therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage," would make a most happy peroration.

Attempting to prove that the Mosaic code contained two laws and that the ten commandments are one of these two, my brother quotes Ex. xxiv., 12: Come up to me into the mount, and be there; and I will give to thee the tables of stone, and the law and the commandments which I have written." Here the words "law" and "commandments" are qualified by "which I have written." This is not only obvious from a glance at the original, but also over the word "law" is found the conjunction accent *kadhma*, showing that the Hebrews so understood it. But when "law" is made definite by the adjunct "which I have written" it may take the article on that account, and not because this law stands apart from the rest of the Mosaic code as *sui generis* or distinctive and alone of its kind; hence also the king's translators have felt it no unwarrantable procedure to omit the article.

Jer. vi., 19-20 does not prove the law one thing and "incense," "burnt offering," and "sacrifices" another. It only shows that in the case in hand they were offered in such a state of heart as to be no offerings. The spirit in which an act is done gives character to it; it may or may not be obedience to law according as a proper spirit is present or absent; and the presence or absence of a proper spirit in any particular act may often be undiscernible to the human observer save as it crops out in other acts; hence these, as in the case before us, must be brought up to show the character of that.

"And again," says Eld. W., "chap. vii., 22-23, 'For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings nor sacrifices. But this thing commanded I

them, saying, Obey my voice! When they heard *his voice he spake his law*, the ten commandments. Deut. iv., 12-13. Thus plainly does the Lord separate his law from all secondary matters." This is ingenious But I must remind my brother of Prov. xviii., 17: "He that is first in his own cause seemeth just; but his neighbor cometh "and searcheth him." "My voice" may apply to anything which God has commanded, whether directly or through an agent (see 1 Sam. xv., 1-20-22); hence to restrict it here to the ten commandments is unwarranted unless circumstances compel us to it. But there are no such compelling circumstances. "Obey my voice" here refers and is equivalent to "keep my covenant" in Ex. xix., 5. This covenant is contained in Ex. xx-xxiii. It was not all spoken directly to the people by God because they could not endure to hear him to the end (Ex. xx., 18-19), and they begged Moses to act as spokesman. He did so and wrote it in a book and the people accepted it, ch. xxiv., 3-8. And this covenant or "voice of God" does contain commandments concerning sacrifices. The words of Jeremiah contain nothing to the contrary: "I spake not...nor commanded...concerning sacrifices...but, Obey my voice?" The idea is this: Mere sacrifice without the spirit of obedience is not what the Lord wants, but sacrifice in its proper spirit is obedience to God's voice, and this the Lord requires. Obedience is the emphatic word, and the contrast is between it and disobedience in whatever seeming obedience it may inhere. There is therefore no contrast between two different laws, and the attempt to find authority here to so divide the Mosaic code fails. If however the contrast were between "sacrifice" and "the voice of God," then, according to the use of negatives to be explained when I come to Mat. v., 17, the sense would be this: Sacrifice is indeed part of the voice of God, but so small a part that compared with all that it is as nothing, and to rely on it exclusively or chiefly is as it were no obedience.

I am the more certain of this since I have in a previous number shown the unity of the law. And here I wish to add a few more indispensable proofs:

68

1. Paul speaks of the entire Mosaic code as "the whole law," Gal. v., 3. Now that which constitutes one "whole law" cannot be two.

2. In John vii., 23 the sabbath is included in "the law of Moses."

3. In Mal. iv., 4 the commandments are included in "the law of Moses." "Remember ye the law of Moses my servant, which I commanded him in Horeb for all Israel, with the statutes and judgments." "With the statutes and judgments" no more makes them no part of "the law of Moses" than "with the bishops and deacons" In Phil, i., I declares these not to be "saints." But the "with" is a supplement, the Hebrew simply reads "statutes and judgments," as the Douay version correctly renders it, and the Greek "as to statutes and judgments." Take whichever version you will the sense is substantially the same-the Mosaic code is but one "whole law." On this Gibraltar I plant myself.

But granting, for argument's sake, that there are two laws, and that the ten commandments form one of these and that one, namely, which my brother is so anxious to show not be abolished. Then I want no better proof that it is abolished than some of the very texts on which he most relies to prove the contrary. Take, for example, Mat. v., 17: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the

prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill." While I think that this refers to the entire Mosaic code, and can prove it from the context, I will for the present treat it as if it referred only to the ten commandments, since my brother will have it so. Let us first notice a peculiar use of negatives. "I receive not testimony from man," says the Savior, John v., 34. The circumstances show that he does receive it, but that he has "*greater* testimony than that of John" [v. 36] and so much greater that in comparison with the reliance he places on this his reliance on John's testimony sinks into nothingness. Again; "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel," 1 Cor. i., 17. If we construe this as my brother does Mat. v., 17, it would mean that Paul was forbidden to baptize. But Paul did baptize; hence such a construction is unwarranted, and it simply means this: Baptizing is indeed a part of my work, being included in preaching the gospel, but compared with the grand scope and magnitude of the latter the mere act of baptizing is as nothing. So in Mat. v., the Savior says in effect, the abolition of the law is indeed a part of my mission, and is implied in fulfilling it, but compared with the grand work of fulfilling it, of bringing in the verity set forth in type and prophecy, it is as nothing. "The law was given by Moses, but the grace and the truth [the verity, the antitype] came by Jesus Christ," John i., 17. Sabbath, for example, means *rest*, and the sabbath is a type of rest; and, says the Savior, Mat. xi., 28, "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden and I will give you rest." "And his rest shall be glorious," says the prophet [Is. xi., 10]; "for if that which is done away is glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious" [2 Cor. iii., 11]. "We who have believed *do* enter into rest" [Heb. iv., 3], for "the body [the antitype] is of Christ," Col. ii., 17. But during the Savior's personal ministry the antitype had not yet come; hence he said to those "pressing into the kingdom" that the law must stand firm as the heavens till all the types and prophecies should ripen into the gospel. And when that time came, when the day of Pentecost arrived, the law ended and the gospel began. *Sic transit gloria leg's.*

ELDER J. H. WAGGONER'S FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE

By reason of a mistake in the direction, I did not receive Eld. Vogel's second negative for a long time. To obviate delay I mostly prepared my third affirmative before receiving it. A few points deserve notice.

Eld. V. and myself have kept up a friendly correspondence during our discussion. In one of these private notes I expressed regret for some things he said in his closing reply on the first proposition. He answered that it was not a final summing up, and I had a chance to set right what appeared to me to be wrong. I needed no intimation from him to assure me that this was my right and privilege; and justice required that I should do so. Yet now, because I exposed his sophistry and hypercriticism, he publicly accuses me of pursuing a

69

dishonorable course in discussion! This convinces me of that which I before feared, that there is a certain peculiarity in him which prevents his doing justice to an opponent.

His assertion that I am not capable of giving a correct criticism on the Hebrew, is a small matter, while I have *proved* that he has not made a reliable statement in regard to it. He is astonished that I should so "blunder" with Green's Grammar before me, and refers to "section 246, 3." As that section and number does not contain the whole scope of the use and omission of the article it cannot prove that I blundered in claiming a definite construction on Ex. xvi., 23. But, if it does not cover the entire field then he has blundered in claiming a definite construction on Ex. xx., 10. There is nothing in that section to disprove my quotation from Gesenius. But he acknowledges that I am not alone in this "blunder"-that "better scholars than he [I] have blundered" thus before. But in what company does he place me in this? In that of Gesenius and "the old grammarians and lexicographers, Hebrew and Greek." Verily, I am content. It is truth that the whole extent of my blunder is that I quoted and correctly applied a statement of the lexicon of Gesenius. But Eld. V. says Winer gives a list of examples to the contrary. What of that? Cannot an array of examples be given to show that definite nouns do not always have the article? The complexion of a fact is wondrously changed according as it is for or against him! Gesenius does not claim that this is invariable in usage. Eld. Vogel did positively deny that there were exceptions to the rule he quoted; but I have proved that there are. Has this any bearing on his reliability as a critic of the Hebrew?

Green gives the names of thirteen grammarians whom he consulted in preparing his grammar, adding, "besides others of less note." If Winer was consulted at all he belongs to this class. Green also says that his "work is mainly based upon the three leading grammars of Gesenius, Ewald and Nordheimer;" and while he gives precedence to Ewald only over Gesenius as a grammarian, he says, "Gesenius is unquestionably the prince of Hebrew lexicographers."

The reader will bear me witness that I have never thrust any profession of scholarship before him. I confess my entire dependence on the accredited authorities. Even in English I pay my respects to Dr. Webster! If the "young and untamed blood" of Eld. V. is able to carry him as by intuition, through the mazes of Hebrew criticism, leaving Gesenius and his compeers behind as mere "blunderers," we will only congratulate him, and trust to aid and experience to teach him to bear his honors with more meekness than he can at present command.

On the term "Lord's day," Eld. Vogel says: "Under the former dispensation the Father was meant by the term Lord, under this dispensation the term refers exclusively to Christ," and refers for proof to 1 Cor. viii., 6, which says that to us there is "one Lord Jesus Christ." Certainly there is only one "Lord *Jesus Christ*," but it is strange that any man with an open Testament before him should make the above assertion. In a partial examination of the N.T. I noticed over three-score places where the term is applied to the Father; a few I quote. Jesus said "I thank thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth." Matt. xi., 25. "Times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord; and he shall send Jesus Christ." Acts iii., 19-20. "Against the Lord and against his Christ." Acts iv., 16. "The kingdoms of *our Lord* and of *his Christ*." Rev. xi., 15. Can I not with good reason quote, "My firm conviction is that Eld. V. is incapable of making a safe criticism based on"-a

plain reading of the New Testament? Does he ever "blunder?" By such reckless statements he tries to set aside the proofs I gave on "the Lord's day."

There is yet another important scripture fact bearing on this point. Of Jesus Christ as "the Word" John says: "All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made that was made." Jno. i., 1-3. See also Col. i, and Heb. i., 1-15. "By whom (the Son) he (the Father) made the worlds," and verse 10, "And thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thy hand." Now as the Son of God was actively present in the making of the world in six days, so was he also in resting, and blessing and sanctifying the seventh day. The work being equally that of the Father and the Son, so of necessity was the rest day. This separating between the son and the Father, and putting one in conflict with the other is a necessity of that theory. Jesus is Lord of the sabbath by the work of creation, and according

70

to his own declaration. Mark ii., 28. And it is the only day concerning which either the Father or Son ever put forth such a claim. Eld. V. may use all the sophistry he pleases, but he will never point to one text of scripture which contradicts this statement.

On 2 Tim. iii., 16-17, he plays on the words, saying that "all scripture" is not now binding on us as it was on the Jews. But he entirely ignores the point I made which is that the scriptures which Timothy knew from a child-the Old Testament-thoroughly furnish the man of God "unto all good works," containing as they do the immutable law of Jehovah. This truth may be covered up, but it cannot be destroyed, and it is a sure indication of the law of God.

His position on the law, if he can be said to have any position, is a curiosity.

(1.) He says the moral, ceremonial, and judicial were parts of the same law; hence "part" of that law is moral.

(2.) He admits that what is moral cannot be abolished; hence "part" of that law to Israel cannot be abolished.

(3.) He then quotes scripture to prove that "the law," "the whole law," was abolished; thus perverting the scriptures, and contradicting himself.

(4.) He denies the distinction between *moral* and *ceremonial* law, saying the scriptures make no such distinction. The scriptures do not use the terms, but they clearly prove the existence of the two laws, which we correctly express by those terms. The scriptures do not speak of "probation," nor of "moral character;" do these therefore not exist? But query, Do the scriptures speak of the "moral part," and the "positive part" of the law? Does Eld. Vogel find these expressions in the scriptures? Is not this another specimen of his hypercriticism?

Having asserted that all the law is abolished, does he not in this deny that *any part* of the law is moral? Did I not say truly that *whatever abolishes the sabbath abolishes all moral law*? If the law against idolatry, blasphemy, murder, adultery, theft, etc, is not moral, where shall we find moral law? Eld. Vogel, in asserting that these are abolished directly asserts that they are not moral. Reader, are you prepared to follow him in this?

Once more; to prove (what he has now virtually admitted) that his position strikes a death blow at all morality, I instituted a comparison between *marriage*

and the *sabbath*, in their *origin* and *appointment*. His answer was that he was not concerned whether or not marriage is moral! I think not! He has thus far shown a marvelous unconcern about all that exposes his theory, and about the fate of all morality when it stands in his way.

He must presume largely on the blindness of our readers if he thinks to make them believe that I argued that all that is "duty" now originated before the fall. My distinctions between original and secondary obligations were clearly made. Nor did I intimate that all "divine law" grew directly out of the will and attributes of God. Baptism is a "divine law," but my argument excludes it from the list of original duties. The Saviour explains his "new commandment." "This is my commandment that ye love one another as *I have loved you*. Greater love hath no man than this, *that a man lay down his live for his friends*." John xv., 12-13. See 1 John iii., 16. The moral duty of "love" did not originate in the New Testament; but to *lay down life* for a friend cannot be an "original obligation."

He admits that moral law grows out of the attributes of God. Yes, so manifestly so that whatsoever grows exclusively out of these attributes, not referable to the action or will of man, is moral. But the *distinguishing attribute* upon which *the knowledge of the true God* is often, in the scriptures, made to depend, is that of *creative power*. The reader well knows, on the authority of Jehovah himself, that the sabbath institution, *the seventh day sabbath*, grew *solely* out of this attribute; and is *a memorial of the exercise of this power*.

He thinks I could make a better sermon if I stood where I could preach to my brethren from Gal. iv., 10, "Ye observe *days*, and months, and *times*, and years." Let us look at that in its connection.

[1.] It is spoken to them of whose former practices Paul said they "did service unto them which by nature are no gods." This could not refer to keeping the sabbath nor to anything which the true God ever required, but to the practices of heathenism.

[2.] It includes observing "times," which is expressly forbidden in Deut,

71

xviii., and other places, and is designated as a heathen practice.

[3.] Myself and brethren observe but one day in each week, the seventh, which the true God, the Creator, set apart at creation, and in the most solemn manner commended its observance.

[4.] Eld. Vogel says the first day of the week should be "sacredly kept," and therein he and his brethren keep just as many "days" in a year as we do-fifty-two. Did he know this?

[5.] Alexander Campbell said the first "public authority" for keeping Sunday was of Constantine; and he enforced its observance in the towns and cities only, under the title of "venerable day of the Sun." *Sunday*, not the Lord's day.

[6.] The Am. S. S. Union Bib. Dict. says the first day derived its name Sunday, from the heathen, who dedicated it to the sun, to which they held it sacred. And this was the only *dedication* and *sacredness* it ever had.

[7.] And therefore Eld. Vogel and his brethren are subjects of the apostle's comment in this text, as they observe a heathen "time;" a "day" instituted by, and

only sacred to, "them which by nature are no gods." And he is no nearer to the truth on any other text in Galatians than on this.

Eld. Vogel said he knew of no text which calls the ten commandments *the law*. I quoted literally Ex. xxiv., 12, which has the article in the original. And how does he endeavor to set aside the evidence of this text? He says the word *law* is qualified by the words "which I have written," and it may take the article on that account! These words could as easily qualify "a law" or "a part of the law," as "the law" if that were the idea. But he asserts that the Hebrews so understood it because "over the word 'law' is found the conjunctive accent *kadhma*." Here again his pedantry crops out to as little purpose as before; for, 1, the accent is not *kadhma*, but *pashta*, which is a disjunctive accent; and, 2, the influence of the accents in that respect is imaginary rather than real. Jehovah wrote only the ten commandments on the tables of stone and he called them "the law." Will Eld. V. next try to account for the fact that no more than this law was written on the tables of stone? Is his ingenuity equal to the task he has undertaken? He caught at a straw on Ex. xxiv., 12, but even that eluded his grasp.

On Jer. vii., 22-23, he says, "*My voice* may apply to anything which God has commanded whether directly or through an agent;" and then argues around until he gets to the point of affirming that sacrifices and offerings were a part of *the voice* of God. But against his vain reasoning two facts stand sure; when God spake with *his voice* in the hearing of Israel he spake only the ten commandments; and, the Lord himself says *he did not speak concerning sacrifices*, etc., but he said, Obey my voice. Eld. Vogel here places himself in direct conflict with the word of Jehovah, rather than yield to a plain truth. I do not envy him in his position.

I will collate some of the evidences of the Scriptures on the two laws.

They could offer sacrifices, etc., and not keep *the law*, Jer. vi., 19-20. And when God spake the law which he wrote on the tables of stone he said nothing concerning sacrifices. Jer. vii., 22-23.

There is one law to which the carnal mind is not subject because the carnal mind is *enmity*; Rom. viii., 7. The other law was called *the enmity*, Eph. ii., 15. These laws are in contrast.

One law is spiritual; Rom. vii., 14. The other was carnal; Heb. vii., 16.

One law was magnified and made honorable by the Saviour; Isa. xlii., 21. The other he blotted out; Col. ii., 14.

One he came not to destroy; Matt. v. 17. Of the other there was of necessity a change; Heb. vii., 18.

One law is holy, just, and good; Rom. vii., 12. The other was not good; Eze. xx., 25.

One by which a man should live in keeping; Lev. xvii. 5, etc. The other by which he should not live; Eze. xx., 25.

One law in which the godly delight; Rom. vii., 22; Psa. cxix., 24-92-97; Isa. lviii., 13. The other a yoke which they could not bear; Acts xv., 10; see verse 5.

One law which is established by faith and not made void; (*Katargoumen*-Gr.); Rom. iii., 31. The other which is abolished; [*Katargesas*-Gr.]; Eph. ii., 15.

On the abolition of the law of types we have no dispute; but I must deny the abolition of the moral law. Nor can I admit that "the law ended and the gospel began" on the day of Pentecost, as Eld. V. asserts. "The beginning of the gospel" may be found in Mark 1. See

72

also the fulfillment of the prophecy of Isaiah lxi., in Luke iv., 18-21. And Paul says of the *positive law* of the O. T. that Christ "took it out of the way, nailing it to the cross." Col. ii., 14; see also Eph. ii., 14-16. But query; did Christ nail it to the cross on the day of pentecost? Was the crucifixion on the day of pentecost? Eld. Vogel's system will be complete when he can show that the resurrection was also on the day of Pentecost. Then he will surely have sufficient honor upon that Jewish yearly festival to warrant its perpetual observance, on every first day of the week.

I have said that the law was the basis of the Abrahamic covenant, and is a rule of righteousness to the Gentiles; Rom. ii., 17-29. Paul also says in Gal. iii., 13-14, "Christ hast redeemed us from the curse of the law . . . that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ." By this we learn that,

[1.] The curse of the law rests on all, Jews and Gentiles, which proves that they are all amenable to the law; for the law cannot curse those who are not amenable to it. See my remarks on Rom. iii., 9-19.

[2.] The curse of the law must be removed before we can inherit the blessing of Abraham, which proves that they who are not in harmony with the law, or are its transgressors, cannot inherit the blessing of Abraham; and of course the Abrahamic promises have *the law* for their basis. Comp. Gen. xxvi., 1-5. I have before shown that the gospel is a nullity without the law for its basis; and the Abrahamic covenant is identical with the gospel. So Gal. iii., 13-14, is a confirmation of my position on Rom. ii.

ELDER PETER VOGEL'S FOURTH NEGATIVE

For want of space some passages in Eld. W.'s third affirmative remain unnoticed. These shall first receive attention.

Ps. xix. 7. "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul." Is it the office of "primary law" to *convert* the soul? David is here, then, speaking of the Mosaic code as a whole, whose perfection or completeness is manifest in this that it contains a remedial system, "converting the soul," as captives are *caused to return* (Jer. xxxii. 44-xxxiii. 11) and ruined cities *restored* [Dan. ix. 25]; for in these passages the same original word is used. That "the law of the Lord" embraces the whole Mosaic code I have already shown from Lu. ii. 22-24, where it is interchanged with "the law of Moses." Hence it includes the law of the priesthood, and is thus again shown to be in part "remedial." Hence also its "perfection" is only *relative*, suited to that age; but in an absolute sense "the law made nothing perfect," Heb. vii. 18; there was therefore need of a "change." "For if the first covenant had been *faultless*, then should no place have been sought for the second," Heb. viii. 7. Paul is rather severe on those who now look to "the law" for

justification: "Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace." Gal. v. 4.

Ecc. xii. 13. "Fear God and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man." To say nothing against "duty" as a supplement here, and how "happiness" would be at least as good if not better, I call attention to the fact that the Lord has "commanded" many things not found in the decalogue. Each man, whether Jew, Gentile, or Christian, is under obligation to attend to the things commanded to *him*. Many "commandments," as keeping the passover, concerned only the Jew; so of the sabbath.

Is. li. 6. "My righteousness shall not be abolished," has no reference to the ten commandments. It is equivalent to the "salvation" of the same verse. It is a prophecy concerning the gospel and the "eternal salvation" of which Christ is the "author." Heb. v. 9.

Ro. iii. 21. "But now the righteousness without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets. This passage also my brother completely mistakes. When a person complies with every requirement of a law he is righteous, since that law does not condemn him, and this is the righteousness of the law [Ro. x. 5.]; he is also "perfect" and

73

"holy" as measured by that law, whether the law itself is perfect or imperfect. Hence to argue the absolute perfection of a law from the fact that the one obeying it is perfect as measured by that law, is a sophism. "The righteousness without the law," *i. e.*, without perfect obedience to the law, "is *now* [*i. e.* in the gospel] manifested." How? By forgiveness upon *faith* in Christ. This is "witnessed by the law." Where? Gen. xv. 6, Abraham "*believed* in the Lord; and he counted it to him for *righteousness*." Compare Ro. iv. 3. Thus we see that Paul had not brother W.'s narrow view of the law, but he included even Genesis in it. 'Witnessed by the prophets.' Where? Hab. ii. 4, 'The *just by faith* shall live.' Compare Ps, xxxii. 1-2 and Ro. iv, 6-8.

Romans ii. 17-18, is also misapplied when confined to the ten commandments. It is the same law which we have just seen includes even Genesis. While still speaking of this law Paul quotes in Ro. iii. 9-18, from the Psalms, Proverbs, and Isaih, and says in the next verse (19) that these are quotations from the law. This, to borrow two words from Paul, ought to 'stop' my brother's 'mouth.'

Ro. iii. 1-6. To find proof in this that the ten commandments are to be *the rule*, in the future judgment is to interpret into the passage what cannot be interpreted out of it. Paul simply says that God is not unrighteous in punishing transgressors, else He could not judge the world, since judgment implies punishment. But not one word does he say about the law by which men will be judged. If the law of the context is to be *assumed* as the rule then the whole Mosaic code is that rule, which is absurd since all men are not under it.

Ro. iii. 9-19 does not prove the Gentiles amenable to the ten commandments. I have already shown that in this place Paul quotes from the Mosaic law as a whole. But as a whole it was only given to the Jews, and 'we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith *to them that are under the law*.' Therefore, 'all

the world' here refers only to the whole Jewish world and to 'every mouth' therein. For similar uses of this expression see Luke ii. 1; Acts xi. 28.

Verse 9, 'We have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin,' does not prove that the ten commandments were given to the Gentiles. The Jews were proved sinners by the Mosaic law (ch. ii. 21-24), and the Gentiles by moral principles so far as they had by them been discovered and set forth in their civil laws [ch. ii. 1]. 'For as many as have sinned without [revealed] law shall also perish without [revealed] law... For when the Gentiles which have not the law [by revelation], do by nature [by their native ability to discover moral relations and obligations] the [moral] things contained in the law, [given to them], are a law unto themselves: which show the [moral] work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another.' Ro. ii. 12-15. It is not to be supposed that they could discover every moral item of the Mosaic code, but many of them they could and did. So Paul says; and by these they are proved guilty, not having lived up to them. See ch. i. 18-32. But no positive institution can be thus discovered, since it has no moral element, but rests simply on the will of God. Hence they know nothing about the passover or the sabbath, and will not be judged with respect to these.

Ro. iii. 20. 'By the law is the knowledge of sin,' does not prove the ten commandments still binding. For, [1] as already shown the ten commandments as such and exclusively, are not here referred to. [2] This simply declares that the *existing* law convicts of guilt; and this is true whether that law is perpetual or *temporary*; moral, positive, or both.

That this is a general proposition, referring to no law in particular, but to all law in general, is further evident from the Bible Union version, which reads thus: 'By works of law shall no flesh be justified in his sight; for *by law is the knowledge of sin.*' The article is wanting in the original before *law*, and while it may sometimes be supplied without material injury to the sense, here undoubtedly it should not be. But for the sake of shortening the controversy I will not press this point.

From the preceding there follow these conclusions:

1st. That my brother has wholly misinterpreted these passages, restricting them to the ten commandments, whereas their true sense requires a broader application.

2nd. That a theory which cannot be maintained without such a perversion

74

of the Scripture is radically false, unscriptural and anti-scriptural.

3rd. That the Mosaic code is a unit, one *whole law*, of which the ten commandments are but a part.

4th. In further confirmation of this conclusion, and in addition to all I have before said on this point, I beg leave to cite two more passages of Scripture:

[1.] 'He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses,' Heb. x. 28. Here Paul alludes to Deu. xvii. 2-6, where this language is found and the ten commandments are spoken of. Thus Paul declares the decalogue a part of Moses' law.

[2.] In 1 Kings ii. 3, David urges Solomon to '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 it is written in the law of Moses.' He who will not be convinced by such testimonies as these is beyond the reach of argument.

Elder Waggoner's fourth affirmative having not yet arrived, I will begin a second negative argument.

II. *The ten commandments are abolished.*

Be it distinctly understood that I do not argue for the striking out of a single moral principle contained in the decalogue. Moral principles are eternal as Jehovah. Hence Paul says in effect that whenever the abrogation of a divine law is spoken of it must not be taken to the extent of obliterating moral principles. Heb. xii. 27. Hence the ten commandments are only abolished in so far as they were *statutory, i. e., positive*. Hence that which is wholly positive as the sabbath, is entirely abolished; and that which is in part positive and in part moral, is only abolished in part.

Is there, then, a positive element in all the ten commandments? Yes, the use made of them at Sinai is positive; and I give the following as proof:

1. In my last affirmative on the second proposition I have shown them all to be to some extent positive. I shall not here reproduce that argument, but simply refer the reader to it.

2. The arguments which I shall produce to prove their abolition are undeniable proof that they are positive; for it is out of all character to speak of abolishing that which is wholly moral. But the Scriptures do speak of the abolition of the decalogue; therefore it is positive.

3. In still another way do the Scriptures declare the ten commandments positive. They call them 'statutes,' time and again, but a statute is positive. '*Statute*. An act of the legislature of a state or country, declaring, commanding or prohibiting something; a *positive law*.'-*Webster*. Mark well, however, that a statute may have a moral basis; *i. e.*, aside from its statutory value it may also have a moral value. Thus, it is a moral duty that we give of our means to carry out God's purposes among men. The statutes of the law required a tenth; this was positive, resting solely on the will of God, the Legislator; and because it was positive it was abrogated with the rest of the law. The moral principle of giving alone remains now. Nor has this principle been again expressed in a statutory way, specifying a definite amount, but it stands solely on its moral basis, leaving it to the promptings of love to say how much to give [Acts v, 4; 2 Cor. viii. 8; ix. 7]. Nevertheless, the abolished 'statute' of tithes is still profitable; not that it speaks with *authority* now, but as a counselor it *suggests* and *admonishes* us as to what was once God's will, so that we may suspect ourselves as not under the control of love, or a willing mind, but under selfish covetousness when we fall below a tenth.

4. That the ten commandments sustained a relation to the Jews which they did not to the Patriarchs and Gentiles is unmistakably implied, yea, asserted in Deu. v. 2-3. 'The Lord our God made a covenant with us in Horeb. The Lord made *not* this covenant with *our fathers*, but with *us* even *us*, who are all of us here alive this day.' But as moral principles, so far as they contained them, they

were known to the fathers or patriarchs, as can be abundantly shown. What then is this *new* value they received? Not moral, certainly, but a *positive* or *statutory* value.

We are now ready to proceed with the arguments for the abolition of the ten commandments.

1. I have already stated, and here challenge its refutation, that it requires just as express legislation to transfer from one dispensation to another a positive enactment, law, or institution, as it did to first establish it. It is therefore simply a matter of course that the ten commandments were abolished to the extent that

75

they are positive or statutory. And since the sabbath was purely a statute, it is wholly gone.

2. Since the law is a unit and is politico-ecclesiastic, the ten commandments as used in the law are also of a political character; and in this character they are of course positive or statutory. But the New Dispensation is purely ecclesiastic, hence it cannot receive the political laws of the Old; they were therefore necessarily abolished in their statutory aspect. Hence the sabbath is entirely abolished since it was purely statutory.

Or, to state it differently, the word covenant in Deu. v. 2-3 is used in the sense of *constitution*. It was the only word which the Hebrews had to express the idea. The decalogue is the constitution of the Mosaic laws; *i. e.*, it sustains the same relation to the law that the constitution of the United States sustains to our laws. Some of their laws, as Ex. xxxi.-xxxiii, are an elaboration of that constitution, are laws based directly on it; others were merely in harmony with it. Whatever, therefore, is the nature of the law as a whole, is the nature of the ten commandments; *i. e.*, if the law as a whole was manifestly political so was the decalogue, the constitution. And if this was mainly political it had to be abolished to the extent that it was such, since the New Dispensation is purely religious and ecclesiastic.

Was, then, the law political? I answer, yes. And if this answer is demonstrable the abrogation of the decalogue is established. Now for the proof.

[1.] Paul expressly calls the Jewish compact or confederation 'the commonwealth of Israel' [Eph. ii. 12]. But the law was the only bond of union in this 'commonwealth;' therefore it was political.

[2.] There is not a single reference in all the law to the future life, but all its rewards and punishments look to this life. See Deu. xxviii. This precisely is the nature of a secular compact, but not of a purely religious institution.

[3.] This is further evident from the fact that God stood to the Hebrews in the relation of a political ruler, law giver and king. For when they said to Samuel, 'Make us a king to judge us like all the nations,' Jehovah replied: 'They have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them.' 1 Sam. viii.

[4.] That the law was chiefly political in its bearings, and religious only in a limited and restricted sense, is further apparent from the fact that many of the transgressions thereof were purely of a civil or secular character, or, in the style of Paul, affected only 'the flesh;' and the rights and sacrifices in atonement for

these were of a like character, being adequate to their remission without borrowing efficiency from the blood of Christ, so that Paul was warranted in saying, 'The blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean sanctifieth to the purifying [purging] of the flesh' [Heb. ix. 13]. This, however, is not to be confounded with transgressions of such laws as had the religious mingled with the civil, the guilt of which, to the extent that it invaded the domain of the religious, affected 'the conscience,' and whose sacrifices for expiation had to this extent to borrow efficiency from the blood of Christ [Heb. ix. 9.; x. 4].

[5.] It was because all the laws of the Mosaic code were political or civil, some wholly and others only in part, yet mainly, that such enlightened teachers as Paul could offer animal sacrifices for the remission of guilt without inconsistency [Acts xxi.] even after Christ was recognized as the true and only sacrifice for 'the purging of the conscience' or for atonement of sins which looked in their consequences to a future existence and judgment. They were offered on political grounds and for political offences, as we could still celebrate the fourth of July, after our government were changed to a monarchy. On any other ground such conduct as that of Acts xxi. 26, defies explanation.

III, My third argument for the abrogation of the ten commandments is as follows:

[1.] They are called 'the covenant,' Ex. xxiv. 28; Deu. iv. 3; ix. 9-11.

[2.] They are further described as 'the covenant of the Lord which he made with our fathers when he brought them out of the land of Egypt.' 1 Kings viii. 9 and 21.

[3.] God said, '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 that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt.' Jer. xxxi. 31 34.

[4.] Paul says that this '*new* covenant' has been made, and that the old has 'vanished away.' Heb. viii. 6-13. He who presumes

76

sumes to say that it still stands must give God the lie.

IV. Christ 'abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of the commandments in [their] ordinances.' Eph. ii. 15. And since the sabbath was nothing but an ordinance, a positive command, it is wholly gone. In bold contrast with this is my brothers position, that on which the life of his theory depends: 'The law of which the sabbath commandment was a part, was not abolished, but is now binding!' Reader, whom will you believe, Bro. Paul or Bro. Waggoner?

ELDER J. H. WAGGONER'S FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE

8. That men are proved sinners by the law, and are of course under condemnation as long as they disregard it, is farther shown by Paul in Rom. vii. 7, "I had not known sin but *by the law*; for I had not known lust except *the law had said*, Thou shalt not covet." By this it will be seen that "primary law" does have its part in the work of conversion; it convinces of sin, without which there

can be no genuine repentance, and of course, no genuine conversion. Hence Paul taught "repentance toward God"-whose law has been transgressed-"and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ," who takes away the carnal mind which "is not subject to the law of God," and brings back the straying into harmony with the will and government of heaven. If Eld. V. has any other means than *the law* to prove men guilty in the sight of God, *let him produce the text*, or cease his vain speculations. Psa. xix. 7, cannot be referred to the law of types of the O. T. without contradicting the New; for that law by which animal sacrifices were offered was "unprofitable and made nothing perfect." His error is that he makes no distinction between types and shadows, and the law defining moral obligation, forbidding theft, adultery, etc. His illustration by the duty of *giving* is entirely defective. To show a distinction between *precept* and *morality* he says *the statutory duty of giving a tenth* is abolished, leaving the duty of giving on a moral basis. But the requirements *to give a tenth* is no more explicitly stated in the O.T. than is *the precept to give* in the New. And he can only prove the existence of the duty to give by express statements to that effect. The distinction he claims is a fallacy.

We read in the Scriptures that men cannot be justified by the law *because* they are sinners-they have all transgressed the law-and of course are condemned by it. His insinuation that we seek justification by the law is as unworthy as it is unjust, for he knows better. *Condemnation* and *justification* each have their place in the experience of a sinner redeemed, and *condemnation must precede pardon*. And here I will notice another fallacy which underlies his whole system. He says *the law* was abolished, but the *principles* were not. This is the rankest antinomianism, and leaves every one to follow his own inclinations; for if men are left to judge of the application of *principles without precepts* a revelation is a nullity. I repeat, he opens the door for just such *liberty* as the *carnal* mind will greatly enjoy. Rom. viii. 7. And his position will not bear the test of Scripture. "*By the law* is the knowledge of sin." Will Eld. Vogel show that the knowledge of sin is by *principles* and not *by the law*? Again, "Sin is not imputed when there is no law." Will he *prove* his position by showing that sin is imputed on principles without the law? Every reader of the Bible knows that he cannot. Paul was not convinced of sin by abstract principles, but by what "*the law said*." Will Eld. Vogel confess to an experience like that of Paul? If not, whose "mouth" should be "stopped"-mine or his?

9. The purity and perfection of *the law* is as clearly stated in the New Testament as in the Old. "The law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good." Rom. vii. 12. There is no necessity for mutilating Psa. xix. 7, as Eld. V. does to make it read, "The law of the Lord *was* perfect," for Paul confirms it just as it stands. All that has been said of the necessary relation of *law* and *character* will here apply. If the law is holy it is designed to form a holy character, and would therefore justify the doer; and this is also the reason why it witnesses to the righteousness of

God; Rom. iii. 21. And its perfection is shown by all those Scriptures which declare that it will not justify sin, or the sinner. It condemns sin as a good law must; for if it justified the sinner in his sin it would be a bad law.

On this subject I may notice a most singular position taken by Eld. Vogel. He pronounces my argument a "sophism," and says a man may be "perfect and holy as measured by that law, whether the law itself be perfect or imperfect." I am not surprised at his making this declaration; it is according to his crude notions of law and morality. A man would not be blamed or condemned by an imperfect law if he kept it; but he would not therefore be perfect. If we have any means of determining that a law is imperfect the same means will determine that a character must be imperfect that is conformed to that law. His assertion is equivalent to saying that a certain thing is straight because it is so like a crooked stick, or that a given angle may be properly called a right angle because it bears comparison with an obtuse angle! The crudity of his notions of law and perfection of character would appear only humorous were not the subject one of solemn importance, and did not errors in regard to it lead to fatal results.

10. "For we know that *the law* is spiritual." Rom. vii. 14. Of course obedience to it is pure spiritual worship of God. And this fully justifies that other statement of Paul, "The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to *the law* of God, neither indeed can be." Spirituality and carnality cannot coalesce; there must be antagonism between them. Hence, wherever there is opposition or insubordination to *the law*, there is carnality. As before stated, in such cases, there can be no genuine conversion-no true repentance. They may cry "Lord, Lord" to Jesus, but as they *do not the will* of his Father, they are workers of iniquity-law-breakers. The reader will remember that Eld. Vogel very conveniently passed over the evidence I gave on Rom. ii., that *the will of God is the law*, and that he is dishonored by the breaking of *the law*, and that the Gentile is accepted of God if he *keeps the law*. Rom. ii. 17-29.

Now if *the law* is spiritual *it is moral*. And this text opens the way to expose another instance of false reasoning on the part of Eld. Vogel. To say that I am surprised at the use he makes of Webster's definition of *statute* does not half express my feelings, because he knows as well as I do that in that definition Webster has no reference to the theological distinction of *positive* and *moral*. Webster's third definition of *positive* is, that which is *explicitly stated*, as opposed to implied. The fifth definition has regard to the theological distinction. Now according to the third definition the Decalogue is positive, that is, explicitly stated; but not according to the fifth definition, that is, in distinction from moral. For Webster says, "The *moral law* is summarily contained in the Decalogue, written by the finger of God on two tables of stone." Had not Webster *expressly contradicted* his use of the word *positive* there might be some excuse for his course; now there is none. I repeat, his position subverts *all morality by subverting the moral law*.

11. Heb. ix. 15. This text says that Christ "is the mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance."

(1.) As Jesus mediates in behalf of transgressors under the first testament, his mediation takes hold of that law which they transgressed; for their transgressions were real-not of a typical system, but-violations of God's *moral law, written on the tables of stone*. Of course that law is not abolished, but stands to appear against them in the judgment, if Jesus does not blot out their sins.

(2.) The transgressions of that law stand between them and the eternal inheritance, which they could not do if, as Eld. Vogel asserts, it looked only to temporal benefits. If it was given to them as a *civil law* only they could have broken every precept of the decalogue without incurring moral guilt, or being therefore subject to a future judgment. But every Scripture which speaks of its holiness, perfection, spirituality, as a rule of life, of justification, etc. is a direct contradiction of that assertion. Was any moral law binding on the Jews except that which God *revealed* to them? If there was, by what Scriptures do we learn that fact? A little consideration of these queries will convince any one of the groundlessness of Eld. V.'s assertion.

12. "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea we establish

78

the law." Rom. iii. 31. This is the necessary conclusion from the apostle's argument in this and the preceding chapter. And this confirms the view I have presented on the two laws-the *moral* and the *ceremonial* or positive. The moral law is established by faith, because condemnation must precede justification of a sinner; and *pardon* supposes the justice of the condemnation; that is, it recognizes the claims of the violated law. Pardon in the absence of law is a nullity. And the idea of abolishing the law and pardoning the transgressor also is absurd. But we know that the types or positive laws of the O. T. are not established by faith; they are made void. The moral law-the Decalogue (Webster) is confirmed and established (magnified, extolled, honored, Isa. xiii. 21) by the gospel. The ceremonial law was blotted out, abolished or made void, nailed to the cross. This text settles absolutely the controversy relative to the abolition of the law.

I re-affirm my position on this chapter: that it refers to the moral law of the O. T., and it condemns both Jew and Gentile. It needs but a few words to expose the fallacy of Eld. V.'s view. He affirms that the law in this chapter includes the Mosaic ritual of types, and that it cannot refer to the Gentiles. Notice: once in this chapter the apostle refers to *the Judgment of the world* in arguing the perpetuity of "the oracles of God" which were given to Israel. Twice he speaks of both Jew and Gentile. Twice says that all have sinned or gone as tray, which he applies to both Jew and Gentile. Once He says that all the world are guilty before God. Now if nothing more definite could be produced this would prove Eld. Vogel's assertion illogical and unjust. But notice the connection and relation upon which the apostle makes his application. "We have before proved both Jew and Gentiles that *they are all under sin*, as it is written, there is none righteous, no not one," and thus he proceeds to sustain his charge against Jews and Gentiles by quotations from Psalms, Proverbs, and Isaiah. If this is not proving the Gentiles sinners *by the Old Testament* I know not what would be proving them such. Reader, what think

you? Verses 19; 20 contain the logical conclusion from this statement; all the world are guilty before God, and *no flesh* is exempt from this condemnation. And the inference of Eld. V. that Psalms, Proverbs and Isaiah are "the law" referred to is groundless. These quotations are *the evidence* that Jews and Gentiles are all sinners; but these quotations are not the law nor any part of the law which they violated in sinning. I Not a position that he has taken in his last negative will stand the test of examination.

And therefore, again, *the law* here referred to does not include the "Mosaic ritual," for the Gentiles were not so related to that law, nor was that law to point out sin; it was remedial in its nature, based in its operation on the existence of sin. But *the moral law*, which is spiritual, perfect, and holy, reaches all the world; and "all the world" must be used in this extended sense, when both Jews and Gentiles were so distinctly specified.

I have quoted literally the Authorized Version of Rom. iii. Eld. Vogel says the article should be omitted in verse 20. He has before hinted at the difference of "law" and "the law" in the N. T. If that difference exists let him show it. If he wishes to make the issue on the Greek article the way is open. I deny his claim and promise to meet it whenever he offers anything to sustain it.

13. "For sin shall not have dominion over you, for you are not under the law but under grace." Rom. vi. 14. Our position on this text is no novelty. We hold that "under the law" expresses the condition of one *under condemnation*-not merely under *obligation*; for our redemption is *from the curse* (Gal. iii. 13-14), *not from the duty*. And this expression-under the law-describes the condition of *all who are not justified*. The contrast is plain between "under the law" and "under grace;" it is exactly the contrast between condemnation and justification. But the Scriptures never present a contrast between *obedience or obligation*, and justification. On the contrary Paul says "*the doers of the law* shall be justified." Here justification is joined to doing the law, but *justification is never joined to breaking the law* under any circumstances. *Selah*. All are by nature under the law; or otherwise, if the law is abolished, then none are under the law, *but all are under grace*, and no condemnation exists. This is the inevitable result of abolishing the law, and is very comforting to Universalists. Are "the children of wrath" under grace? No. Where, then, are they? Under the law-under

79

condemnation; in sin. Shall we sin, or transgress the law, that grace may abound? "God forbid." He that sins is the servant of sin, not the servant of God. There was a time when each one who is now a Christian was not under grace, but under condemnation. This relation was only changed by being "redeemed from the curse of the law;" but the curse comes by transgression-not otherwise. Therefore the curse continues as long as the transgression continues, for "by the law is the knowledge of sin." Christ came "to put away sin;" not his own, for he had none, but ours, which is not done if we continue in sin. It is easy to be seen that the apostle's argument is based upon the existence of *the law*, and that Eld. Vogel, in quoting Scriptures which may and do prove the abolition of the typical law is "beating the air," and subverting morality by applying them to moral law.

14. But Eld, V, hit upon one important truth, and I will adopt it as a point in my argument. I wish that his intention had been such that we could give him credit for it. He says, "The decalogue is the Constitution of the Mosaic laws, *i. e.*, it sustains the same relation to the laws that the constitution of the United States sustains to our laws." Exactly so; and those laws, as our laws, could be abolished without abolishing the Constitution or destroying the government. But that was the Constitution of a moral government, being a moral law, and it must remain as long as moral obligation remains, without regard to the abolition of laws of a different nature, not fundamental. When the Constitution is abolished all is overthrown. But Jesus never professed the intention to destroy the government of his Father and to erect another in its stead. He came *to reconcile rebels to his Father*. His position as "mediator" also attests this. The theory which abolishes God's Constitution, has Jesus Christ coming to earth and finding a rebellion against his Father; and on which side does he array himself? On the side of the rebellion, and against his Father's government, totally subverting it by abolishing its Constitution I Verily, if that be so, he was the worst rebel of the whole. They had the *disposition* to overthrow the government of God, and he carried it but for them! Lord those who thus make "Christ the minister of sin."

But farther: Eld. V. says, "The law was the only bond of union in the commonwealth of Israel," and he thinks therefore it was only political. But in this he jumps from the truth to his conclusion. Of course the Constitution only is the bond of union, even as our laws might be abolished without destroying the union if the Constitution remained. His reference is Eph. ii., which we will examine. Paul is therein speaking to the Gentile converts to Christianity. He says that before their conversion they were "*aliens from the common-wealth of Israel*, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world." A bad condition, truly. Does Paul farther say as Eld. V. argues, that the 'commonwealth of Israel' is destroyed, its 'Constitution' abolished, and their 'hope' built upon its ruins? No; he says 'the middle wall of partition' is broken down, those shadowy laws which were peculiar to a natural seed, and now, through the gospel, the great plan of *naturalization*, those Gentiles by nature 'are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints and of the household of God,' And so in Rom. xi.; 'the root' is not dug up and destroyed, but the natural branches were broken off and unnatural branches, Gentiles, 'grafted in.' The Gentiles may be saved if they embrace *the covenant made with Judah and Israel*, Heb. viii., and are 'grafted in,' so as to be of 'the Israel of God;' Gal. vi. 16; and are no more strangers and foreigners from the commonwealth of Israel. But if Israel was but a political body and that commonwealth only a 'civil compact,' as Eld. V. teaches, why is it that the New Jerusalem, the heavenly city, has its gates named after 'the twelve tribes of Israel?' Rev. xxi. 12. Perhaps Eld, Vogel has not yet learned that 'salvation is of the Jews;' his system of theology may need remodeling to embrace "The fullness of Scripture truth. None but 'Israelites indeed' will enter those gates; therefore a blessing pronounced upon them 'that *do his commandments*, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in *through the gates* into the city.' Rev. xxii. 14. *The commandments* are the 'Constitution' of 'the commonwealth of Israel,' and it is not necessary to argue

that when Gentiles are no more strangers and foreigners from the commonwealth of Israel they are in duty bound to obey the 'Constitution' of that commonwealth. And

80

this they will do *if they are good citizens*. But if they will not do this, they disfranchise themselves. See Rom. vi. 14-16. If Eld. Vogel acknowledges that he and his brethren are a part of 'the Israel of God' they must come to this. But of this I will speak farther when I examine the subject of the covenants.

ELDER PETER VOGEL'S FIFTH NEGATIVE

5. That the ten commandments were abolished is further evident from Col. ii. 14, where we read expressly about God's 'blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us.' and that He 'took it out of the way, nailing it to the cross.'

(1.) The ten commandments are the only 'handwriting' God ever had (Ex. xxxi. 18; xxiv. 12; xxxii. 16); therefore they are here specifically referred to and are declared to be 'blotted out' and taken out of the way' in so far as they were 'ordinances.'

(2.) 'Ordinance' (Gr. *dogma*, from *dokeo*, to think) signifies a *decree*, a *statute*, a *positive ordinance*; Luke ii. 1, 'There went out a decree from C^Esar; Acts xvi. 4, 'They delivered the decrees.' See also Dr. Webster.

(3.) 'Blotted out'-Gr. *Exaleipho*-Lat. *obliterare*, to obliterate, to cancel; opposed to *anagrapho*, to record.-Liddell & Scott.

(4.) The ten commandments as '*ordinances*' were 'against us' and 'contrary to us,' since [a] They were largely political and the New Dispensation is not; [b] The New Dispensation has the Messiahship of Jesus as its basis or constitution (Mat. xvi. 16-18); hence the ten commandments could not be received in their constitutional aspect, [c] As a political constitution they had a temporal death penalty [thus *treason* is punished in political governments] and so were contrary to a dispensation of grace.

(5.) When this handwriting was blotted out the whole law fell with it as the whole house must fall when the foundation is taken away. Hence Paul says, 'Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of *sabbath-days*; which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ.'

6. "God also made us sufficient ministers of a *new covenant*; not of the letter, but of the spirit; for the letter kills, but the spirit gives life. But if *the ministratration of death*, in the letter, *engraven in stones*, was *glorious*, so that the children of Israel could not look steadfastly on the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance, which glory was to be done away, how shall not the ministratration of the spirit be more glorious? * *

* * * For if *that which is done away was glorious*, much more that which abides is glorious."-*Bible Union*.

There are two things here spoken of as 'done away,' (1) 'glory was done away,' and (2) another something is done away which had glory or 'was glorious.'

That which 'was glorious' is 'the ministration of death in the letter,' as contained in the ten commandments 'engraven in stones.' In other words, the ten commandments were done away (a) In their death penalties attached or as 'the ministration of death,' and (b) 'In the letter,' *i. e.*, as 'ordinances,' 'statutes,' or positive enactments. Hence there remains nothing of the ten commandments but their moral basis, the principles that underlay them. The sabbath having no moral basis, but being purely, positive is wholly gone.

I turn now to Eld. W.'s fourth affirmative.

That of which he complained in a private note was, as I supposed (for he made no definite charge), to the effect that I had added new matter in my last negative on the first proposition. I expressed myself as unaware of having done so, and said that to such matters he had yet an opportunity to reply and a right to rebuke me publicly for it. This differs the width of the heavens from a re-discussion of a closed question.

Just as in the Greek with reference to Ex. xvi. 23, Bro. W. evaded the issue by talk about 'manuscripts' differing in the use of the article (Crosby § 489) when we had nothing to do with differing 'manuscripts,' but with a settled text, so has he done with reference to the Hebrew. He claimed a definite construction for Ex. xvi. 23, which is impossible

81

since *lamed* is not there used 'in its possessive sense' [Green § 257], and hence not in a construct way as in Ex. xvi. 10. Here he shifts the issue by saying that I place him in this blunder with Gesenius and the old grammarians generally. No. He has the honor of being alone in this blunder; he cannot escape it. It was with reference to the assertion that the predicate does not take the article that I said he blundered with the old grammarians. Winer is not quoted by Green for the simple reason that his grammar is Greek, though on the point on which I quoted him he takes in other languages. Green lays down the same rule-"A noun in the predicate may receive the same adjuncts as in the subject," § 259. Hence while he considers Gesenius 'the prime of lexicographers,' as a grammarian he condemns him on this point.

Elder W. has 'never thrust' his profession of scholarship before the reader. No, no, he was only the first to enter into a disquisition on the Hebrew, telling us the equivalent for 'rest!' And how wonderfully he hangs on! It is equal to the turtle which is said not to let go its bite till it thunders, though its head be cut off. In Eld. Vogel this would be 'pedantry,' but the case is altered by the ox which is gored!

Respecting the Lordship of Jesus Christ I shall speak more fully in its proper place, the next proposition. Meanwhile I would say that I do not mean that the Father has ceased to be in His nature Lord, *i. e.*, Jehovah, the Self-existent One, but that in the official sense of 'head over all to the church (Eph. i: 22)'-hence also head over the 'Lord's day'-Jesus is the only head, the 'one Lord (Eph. iv: 5),' without a rival, with 'all authority (Mat. xxviii: 18).'

In his Word-state Christ was indeed present at creation, but only as *agent*, not as proprietor: *By him the Father made the worlds*, Heb. i: 2. Hence if the sabbath had even originated "there Jesus would no more be the Lord of it than a

carpenter is the owner of the house he builds for another. Nor does Jesus set up such a claim in Mark ii: 28, as I have abundantly shown without reply.

But what means this trying to prove that Jesus is the Lord of the Sabbath? Is it not a latent conviction that 'Lord's day' in Rev. i: 10 refers to him as the Lord?

The Old Testament Scriptures furnish us 'unto all good works,' or make us 'wise unto salvation,' *only 'through faith which is in Christ Jesus,' i. e., through the Gospel.* 2 Tim. iii: 15. The ten commandments-'the law'-which my brother would extol beyond measure, could neither furnish 'unto *all* good works' nor make one 'perfect' even in the day when they stood as given from Sinai. 'All these have I observed from my youth,' said a young man. 'One thing thou lackest yet (Mark x: 21),' replied the Savior, 'If thou wilt be perfect,' etc. Mat. xix: 21. Therefore, *the ten commandments are not perfect.*

If my brother would distinguish between a principle and its application he would experience no difficulty in seeing that a moral law can be abolished and yet the underlying principle remain intact. Then also my position would cease to seem to him contradictory.

I would not object to the terms 'the moral law,' 'the ceremonial law,' etc, if there were separate laws corresponding to these terms. But since the law is one, and portions of it are 'moral,' it is obviously proper to speak of moral 'parts.'

'The beginning of the gospel (good news) of (concerning) Jesus Christ,' that is, the beginning of a history of Jesus, is the introduction of Mark's biography of Jesus. At most it can only refer to the gradual exhibition of the principles of the reign of Christ; for long after this Jesus still said 'I *will* build my church (Mat. xvi: 18).' The gospel in fact could only begin after the death, burial and resurrection of Christ, since these are essential items in it. 1 Cor. xv: 1-4.

It is simply not true that I said that I am not concerned whether marriage is moral or not. Eld. W. must have described himself when he said, "There is a certain peculiarity in him which prevents his doing justice to an opponent." I spoke only with reference to this discussion.

If I have done my brother injustice in saying that he regards all 'duty' as having originated before the fall, it is with pleasure that I stand corrected. But he certainly argued that the ten commandments are 'primary law' and that all 'primary law' is moral, intending thus to prove the sabbath moral. I showed the defect in his reasoning by pointing to the command not to eat of a certain tree in Eden as 'primary' and yet positive.

Galatians was indeed written to Gentiles but not with reference to their paganism. The law, the law, the law, was their cry, and Paul addressed them as

82

those who 'desired to be under the law.' Hence the 'times' of Gal. iv: 10 are not identical with those of Deu. xviii: 10, and the 'days' are clearly Jewish days. Nor is it a question as to the number of days observed, but as to the kind; if mine are gospel days and my brother's Jewish, then he is condemned and I approved. Neither must he be too hasty in calling Christian Sunday-keeping a 'heathen time.'" on mere human authority; we will soon hear the Scriptures on this point.

I said that I knew of no text which calls the ten commandments the law *simply* (Please note this little word when you quote me again, Bro. W.); certainly Ex.

xxiv: 12 does not do it, but qualifies it by 'which I have written,' so making 'law' definite and sufficiently accounting for the presence of the article. Says Kerl, Comp. Eng. Gram., p. 180, a noun may be 'definite, as being made so by some accompanying descriptive words,' and so take the article; as, 'The man who is upright.'-Having so often had occasion to chide my brother, I must here give him credit for a clever thing. The Hebrew accent over 'law' in Ex. xxiv: 12 is indeed *pashta* and not *kadhma*; they are just alike in character, and often nearly and sometimes wholly in position, so that they may be easily mistaken for each other, as I inadvertently did. But the practical result remains unchanged-'law' is less disjoined from 'commandments' than this from 'which I have written.' The latter is so separated by *zakeph katon* that it must qualify 'law' as well as 'commandments.' This is not 'fanciful,' as bro. W. says, but as Green says, β 28, "The punctuators have attempted * * * to represent to the eye the precise position held by each word in the structure of the sentence."

I can easily account for God's writing only the ten commandments. They were the Jewish constitution, and constitutions are usually better cared for than other laws.

On Jer. vii: 22-23 Eld. W. has not even tried to grapple with my explanations. The surface meaning of words is not always their intended import. 'If thy hand offend thee, cut it off'-who would take the surface meaning here?

Bro. W. seems unfortunate in his collation of evidence in favor of two laws. If there are two laws, and Eph. ii: 15 refers to one exclusively, it is to the ten commandments-'the law of *the commandments*'-and 'blots' them 'out.' Moreover the same law maybe 'spiritual' or 'carnal,' according to the stand-point from which it is viewed or the standard with which it is compared. In different conditions of a patient the same dose may be poison or medicine; and any one's love as compared with that of his fellows may be warm, but as compared with God's, cold.

Ro. iii: 31-'Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law'-requires a few words. If we accept the Common Version here the allusion is to the entire Mosaic code, *with special reference to its moral or basic principles*. So Conybeare, who retains the article before *law*, construes it. If the reference were even exclusively to the ten commandments it would recognize only the binding force of the moral principles therein contained, and would in no wise prove the perpetuity of the sabbath, which is purely positive. This is not simply a possible explanation, but a necessary one, since the sabbath, together with every positive enactment of the law, is elsewhere declared abolished.

But as Paul wrote it the case is still stronger. McKnight renders him literally thus: 'Do we then make law useless through the faith? By no means, for we establish law.' While the word law without the article may and often does refer to the Mosaic law (though the conception is necessarily different from that in which the article is used), it is also the only way we can use that word when we wish to speak of law in general. And who shall say that this last is not Paul's thought? It is the very expression best calculated to set it forth, and the Jewish law would have been better referred to in the use of the article. See, too, how it suits the

connection. Paul is proclaiming a universal system of pardon upon faith in Christ (v. 30). A Jew objects that a system of pardon so accessible would render law useless, since there is no sense in condemning a man and pardoning him in one breath; it would make condemnation a mere farce and law a sham; it would be better to have no law. On the contrary, replies Paul, we establish law; that is, (1) A system of pardon recognizes the existence of law, for pardon without law (transgressed) is impossible, and (2) The presence of a system of pardon in the economy of God declares it a necessity, and by implication

83

law, with reference to which it is made, a necessity. And so far is a system of pardon from being an evil that even the Jews' own scriptures speak well of it: David pronounced it a 'blessed' thing (Ro. iv: 6-8) and even father Abraham was pardoned upon faith (v. 3; Gen. xv: 6).

We come now to passages that are such excellent proof-texts in favor of the abolition of the law that I shall not be content with simply rescuing them from a wrong service into which they are pressed, but shall duly marshal them for aggressive warfare. When I turned aside from my first argument I had made three counts.

4. 'Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law,' Gal. iii: 13. This implies redemption from the law itself. In fact just as 'the gift of the Holy Spirit' denotes the Holy spirit as a gift (Acts ii: 38), so to be redeemed from 'the curse of the law' is to be redeemed from the law as a curse, as 'a yoke upon the necks of the disciples which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear.'

Am I asked how Christ redeemed the Gentiles from the curse of a law under which they never were? The answer is twofold: (1) The curse of the law as applied to the Gentiles need not denote identity with that of the Jews, but simply similarity, just as 'the reproach of Christ' (Heb. xi: 26) as predicated of Moses denotes not identity but similarity. (2) In one sense the Jewish law was a curse even to the Gentiles. The Gospel could not come to them till it came first to the Jews (Jer. xxxi: 31)-for 'salvation is of the Jews'-and to these it could not come till the law was removed.

The law, so far from being the basis of the Abrahamic covenant, was a mere appendage, 'four hundred and thirty years after,' and 'was added because of transgression till the Seed (Christ) should come,' Gal. iii. 'For the promise (or covenant), that he should be heir of the world *was not* to Abraham, or to his seed, *through the law.*' Ro. iv: 13.

5. 'And unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; 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.' 1 Cor. ix: 20. The parenthesis is not in the Common Version, but in improved versions. If we accept it, Paul says expressly that he is not under the law; if we reject it, he says no less-he 'became as under the law' for special purposes. And if Paul, who was a Jew by nature, was not under the law, who will presume to put this yoke upon the necks of the disciples?

But, says Eld. W., 'under the law' means under condemnation. So then Paul became as 'under condemnation!' and the Galatians '*desired* to be under

condemnation!' (Ch. iv: 21). 'O foolish Galatians!' No; Paul himself puts 'under the law' in antithesis with 'without law' (1 Cor. ix: 21).

ELDER J. H. WAGGONER'S SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE

Elder Vogel's fifth negative contains some things which do me great injustice, and I have questioned whether it is not duty to notice them now, but decide to continue my argument.

14. *The law is God's covenant commanded.* The word covenant is extensive in signification. Says Greenfield, "*Diatheekee*, any disposition, arrangement, institution, or dispensation; hence, a testament, will; a covenant, *i. e.*, mutual promises on mutual conditions, or promises with conditions annexed;" by metonymy a body of laws and precepts, that is, to which certain promises are annexed. I quote at this length to show to how many things the word covenant *may* be applied. Care is, of course, necessary to make a proper application of any text to its subject where the word is used; as the word itself designates no one particular thing, the connections alone will determine its use in any instance.

There are many covenants spoken of in the Bible, but only one as *God's covenant commanded*; that is, the ten commandments. It is the condition of other covenants, as see Greenfield above, both of the *old* and *new*. Some points I will notice.

(1.) It was not the *old covenant* or *first covenant* made with Israel, but the *condition* of that covenant. To show how one covenant (agreement) may stand related to another covenant (law), I quote 2.

84

Kin. xxiii; 3: The neglected book of the law was found in the house of the Lord, "And the king stood by a pillar and *made a covenant* before the Lord, to walk after the Lord, and to keep his commandments and his testimonies, and his statutes, with all their heart and all their soul, *to perform the words of this covenant that were written in the book.* And all the people stood to the covenant." They made a covenant (agreement) to perform the words of the covenant (law) written in the book. And thus it was with the covenant which the Lord made with Israel, which is found in Ex. xix: 5-8. The Lord told Moses to convey to Israel the following words: "If ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people; for all the earth is mine; and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and an holy nation. These are the words *which thou shalt speak* unto the children of Israel. And Moses came and called for the Elders of the people, and laid before their faces all these words which the Lord commanded him. And all the people answered together and said, All that the Lord hath spoken we will do."

Here was a plain *covenant* or *agreement* which the Lord made with the children of Israel; it was *concerning his covenant*, or the words of his voice which they had not yet heard. Three days hereafter the Lord spake in the hearing of all Israel, from Sinai. Of this Moses said to them, "And the *Lord spake unto you* out of the midst of the fire; *ye heard the voice* of the words, but saw no similitude; only ye heard a voice. And he declared unto you *his covenant* which he

commanded you to perform, even the ten commandments; and he wrote them upon two tables of stone." Deut. iv: 12-13. After the people had heard the voice of God declaring *his covenant*, so that, they fully understood *the condition* of the covenant made with them, they ratified or renewed *their covenant* saying to Moses, "All that the Lord hath said will we do and be obedient." And Moses sprinkled the blood of the offering upon the people in token of the ratification of the covenant, saying, "Behold the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you, *concerning all these words*." Ex. xxiv: 7-8.

That Eld. Vogel entirely misapprehends the words of Moses in Deut. v: 2-5 is easily seen in the light of these facts. Moses said, "The Lord our God made a covenant with us in Horeb. The Lord made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day." This covenant I have quoted from Ex. xix. He adds, "The Lord talked with you face to face on the mount, out of the midst of the fire." The Lord talked with them when he declared *his covenant* which he commanded them to perform; but *not* when he made the covenant with them; to this the parenthesis, v. 5 refers. ("I stood between the Lord and you at that time to show you the word of God.") This is true of what is recorded in Ex. xix, but not true of Ex. xx, for then the Lord spoke to them *directly*; they "heard his voice." Thus, there are two things brought to view in Deut. v, and the parenthetical words of v. 5 refer to verses 2, 3, the *covenant made with Israel*, but not to verse 4 and onward, for the covenant commanded was given by God himself, without the agency of Moses. Eld. V. confounds these, though they are so distinct in the Scriptures.

Note again the case of Josiah, "The covenant written in the book" was binding upon them before Josiah *made a covenant* to keep it; and also, the written covenant would remain of force if they failed to regard the covenant they had made. The covenant written in the book did not at all depend on the covenant made by the king and the people. And so of that in Ex. xix. *God's covenant* of moral obligation, forbidding idolatry, profanity, murder, etc, and guarding the two sacred institutions erected in Eden, the sabbath and marriage, was binding whether or not Israel agreed to keep it. Their covenanting to keep it did not add to its force; their failure to keep it did not detract from its morality, its authority, or its perpetuity.

(2.) God's covenant was also the condition of the promises to Abraham. The covenant God made with Israel was one of mutual promises on conditions, according to the primary significations given by Greenfield. But *the law* of God as *the condition* of that covenant is also by metonymy called a covenant. And it has always this metonymical use when connected with promises or agreements, as in 1. Chron. xvi; 15-18. "Be ye mindful always of *his covenant*, the word *which he commanded to a thousand generations*; which he made with Abraham, and of his oath to Isaac; and *hath confirmed the same to Jacob for a law, and to Israel for*

an everlasting covenant, saying, Unto thee will I give the land of Canaan." Here the relation of *the law* and the *promise* is distinctly stated; the law of course being the basis or *condition of the promise*. In Gen. xxvi: 1-5 we find the very things here referred to. Said the Lord to Isaac, "Sojourn in this land and I will be with

thee, and will bless thee; for unto thee and unto thy seed will I give all these countries, and I will perform the oath which I sware unto Abraham thy father, . . . *Because* that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws." Here is the same relation recognized; the promise has the law for its condition. And we are left in no doubt as to what law or commandments are here referred to, as the Lord said in 1. Chron. xvi, as quoted, that this promise of the land to Abraham and to Isaac was conditioned on *the word which he commanded to a thousand generations*, and that he confirmed the same to *Jacob for a law*, and to Israel *for an everlasting covenant*. Every candid reader must see that this fully justifies the conclusion I drew from Paul's words, that the curse of the law must be removed from us that we may inherit the blessing of Abraham. As the *law* is *the condition* of those blessings, they who are its transgressors, and therefore under its curse, cannot inherit those blessings. But "the blessing of Abraham" is identical with the blessing of the gospel, and we stand related to *God's covenant commanded to a thousand generations* just as did Abraham.

This expression-commanded to a thousand generations-denotes perpetuity. As the Lord said in the law, "showing mercy to thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments." Not that it will be confined to any number; it would be just as true if millions were inserted.

(3.) The first covenant was useless and void, because the people did not fulfill it; and this will apply to *an agreement*, but will not apply to a *law*. An agreement (covenant) is nullified by a failure on *either part* to fulfill it: but a law is not weakened, nor changed in character, by failure on the part of subjects to obey it. Neither the nature, the authority, nor the perpetuity of a law is affected by disobedience; the effect is solely on the transgressor. That the "agreement" was the *first covenant*, is shown by the words of the Lord in the promise of the *new covenant*. "Finding fault with them" (not with *the law*) he said he would make a new covenant with them, not according to the one he made with their fathers when he brought them out of Egypt, "which my covenant they brake, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord."

(a.) They agreed to obey his voice and keep his covenant.

(b.) For which he promised to regard them as a peculiar treasure to himself.

The failure of this covenant is directly recognized in the promise of the new.

(a.) "They continued not in my covenant"-they did not fulfill their agreement

(b.) "And I regarded them not, saith the Lord"-he therefore refused to fulfill his promise. Indeed, it was *impossible* for him to regard them according to the covenant of Ex. xix; for he he promised to regard them as a "holy nation," "a peculiar treasure above all people." But if they would not regard his *moral law*-the rule of holiness-they would not be holy; they would be *sinners as all the nations*, and if God should continue to regard them *as holy*, contrary to their real characters, he would deny himself. It is evident from this contrast of the two covenants that the *first covenant* is found in Ex. xix.

(4.) The new covenant "was established upon better promises." There can be no richer blessing than to be counted 'holy' in the sight of God; to be 'a peculiar treasure above all people' to the Lord, and so far there could be no better

promises. But these promises related only *to obedience*; in the first covenant made with Israel there was no provision for non-fulfillment, and the 'ministration' under that covenant, the priestly service with the blood of bulls and goats, could not take away sin; therefore no promise of forgiveness was included in that covenant. But as our Priest has blood that will cleanse from moral guilt, forgiveness is offered in the covenant of which he is mediator; and the promises to be 'merciful to their unrighteousness,' and to 'remember their sins no more,' are the 'better promises' of the new covenant.

(5.) But I have shown that forgiveness of sin or justification is never connected with transgression of the law or continuance in sin; and therefore with forgiveness is associated the promise, 'I will put *my law* in their hearts and write it in their minds.' And if *the law* is in their heart it will insure future obedience,

86

The Savior delighted to do the will of God because the law was in his heart. Psa. xl. And so Paul called *the law* of God 'the law of my mind,' and said he delighted in it. *He was fully converted*, and the promise of the new covenant was fulfilled in him. Eld. Vogel says, "In one condition the law would be a 'delight;' in the other 'a yoke of bondage.'" This expression, 'a yoke of bondage,' is never in the Scriptures referred to the moral law, but to those ceremonies which did not reach the conscience. But I accept his general idea, and will let Paul testify as to *the conditions* of the parties. It was *after his conversion* that he delighted in the law, Rom. vii; while the enmity and insubordination to the law is found in the 'carnally minded,' Rom. viii. And my most solemn conviction is that Eld. V. would be doing better service to his readers to call upon them to examine their own hearts to see whether they are with Paul in his experience, or *in the other condition*.

Here I am reminded of Eld. Vogel's holding up to ridicule my saying that 'under the law' describes the condition of those *under condemnation*. Yet all must confess that all who are 'under the law' are under condemnation, and will so remain till redeemed from its curse. Now as the law condemns all sinners, and all have sinned, it is easy to see that they who trust in their own works for salvation, choose their own condemnation. As well might he ridicule the idea of certain ones' *loving death*; Prov. viii: 36. or that Israel should *choose to die*; Eze. xxxiii: 11. Death is not in their desire or affection, but they choose the course which leads to it. Eld. Vogel's own course is an illustration of the same principle. Paul says the *carnal mind is not subject to the law*; and while Eld. V. denies the evident conclusion, he is making most strenuous efforts to prove that he is of that class.

All the direct proofs that I have brought from the N. T. on the perpetuity of the law, and its being the condition of the Abrahamic covenant, are proofs that *the law* must be written in the hearts of those in the new covenant—all the children of Abraham. And as 'the law is spiritual,' it must be in the hearts of all who worship God 'in spirit and *in truth*.' The error of the opposition is in perverting Paul's words as if he said the new covenant 'was established upon a better law.' But that could not be; for a law cannot be better than holy, perfect, just, spiritual, etc. If the objection be raised that it will not justify the sinner, I answer that *moral rules cannot do that* in any dispensation. But for the violation of moral law a system of

pardon-an *amnesty* of special or positive enactments-must be provided. But *pardon is conditioned on future obedience of moral law*; the gospel provides for 'remission of sins that are past;' Rom. iii: 23-26. Indulgence of sins future belongs to 'another gospel' emanating from Rome.

(6.) As *God's covenant commanded*, the ten commandments stand alone, separated from all other laws. Jehovah spoke *only* the ten commandments in the hearing of all the people *with his own voice*. He wrote *only* the ten commandments on the tables of stone. Eld. Vogel's reply to the question why God wrote *no more* on the stone is: "constitutions are usually better cared for than other laws." This answer meets my mind exactly, and thus by the light of truth is he compelled to yield his oft-repeated assertion that it was all one law; which is, in effect, to yield the whole issue. And on Rom. iii: 31, he says: "If we accept the common version here the allusion is to the entire Mosaic code with especial reference to its moral or basic principles." Which is to say that the entire Mosaic code is not made void, but especially its basic principles are not made void! Does anybody call this reasoning? But what are its 'basic principles' if not its 'constitution?' And twice he has said the ten commandments were the constitution of that system. But he wants a contrast, and where does he find it? Listen; "The New Dispensation has the Messiahship of Jesus for its basis or constitution." If anything were wanting to prove that Eld. Vogel has never reached to even the faintest conceptions of the principles of government, we have it here. Christ is mediator of the new covenant, and this is *the constitution of the new covenant!* Just as much as the priesthood of Aaron was the constitution of the former. Or, accepting all of his theory of the church [which we cannot], we should then say that the priesthood of Aaron, and the kingship of David, were the constitution of the past dispensation! Both the priesthood and the kingship were parts of *the administration of government*, the whole being based upon a *constitution*; and so in this: Christ is 'mediator between God and man.' and

87

Eld. Vogel has no better idea of governmental relations than to call this the constitution! And all his theory and all his arguments are based upon such crude notions as this.

Again, *only* the ten commandments were placed in the ark, over which the priest sprinkled blood to make atonement. The work of the priest was [not the constitution itself! but] in reference to the constitution, for by this were the people condemned. Had there been no constitution the work of the priest would have been an idle, senseless ceremony. And if the priests of that dispensation had had blood to offer which could have taken away sin, there would have been no occasion for Christ to minister 'for the redemption of the transgressions under the first covenant.' Heb. ix: 15. Their transgressions were a fact-they violated a moral law; but the 'ministration' was only 'a figure;' it took away no sin, and of course their sins stand against them and will meet them in the judgment if Christ does not blot them out. But as 'sin is not imputed when there is no law,' of course, again, the law is of force and will meet them in the judgment. Eccl. xii: 13-14.

Those priests 'served unto the example and shadow of heavenly things,' Heb. viii: 1-5; and when we are permitted by faith to have a view of the heavenly

things, there is 'seen in his temple the ark of his testament.' Rev. xi: 19. Our High Priest must also have a 'constitution' over which to officiate.

I regret that my limits do not permit me to finish this argument in the present number.

ELDER PETER VOGEL'S SIXTH NEGATIVE

6. "Ye are not under the law, but under grace," wrote Paul to the Romans (ch. vi: 14). I know not how language could be more explicit than this. The gospel is here called 'grace,' as in John i: 17, "The law was given by Moses, but *grace* and truth came by Jesus Christ." The antithesis in either case is between the law and the gospel. To be 'not under the law' does not mean not to be under condemnation, as we have already seen, but freedom from the law. This sense the context requires. The exhortation is (v. 12) not to let sin encroach upon us. In verse 14 the consolation is given that even if we should inadvertently sin, it need not have a permanent or protracted sway over us; 'for ye are not under the law' which could not make 'perfect as pertaining to the conscience' (Heb. ix: 9), and where there was 'a remembrance of sins every year' (Heb. x: 1-4), but we are under the gospel, a system of such 'grace' that God says: 'Before they call I will answer, and while they are yet speaking I will hear,' and again, 'I will forgive their iniquity, and I will *remember* their sin *no more*.'" Jer. xxi: 34.

Here Paul anticipates an objection: "What then? shall we sin because we are not under the law but under grace?" If "under the law" meant "under condemnation," this would be a strange question. It would presuppose condemnation so desirable as to be courted! But take it that the law with its death-penalties in this life is removed, and no question is more natural. Paul replies to this question that to sin (intentionally, hence habitually) would make us the slaves of sin (v. 16), and that this would ultimate in death hereafter (v. 23). I am asked, "Are the children of wrath' under grace?" Since grace here means the gospel dispensation I answer, Yes; but the benefits of this grace are conditioned upon repentance and faithful obedience, hence not 'very comforting to Universalists' or to unrepentant children of wrath.

It appears further that Paul considered it quite possible to sin though the law be abolished. He evidently understood the abolition of the law to be consistent with the retention of the moral principles which underlay it. These he called 'the law of God' in ch. viii: 7, because God is their author, and with reference to these do we read of 'repentance towards God.' Hence, also, 'the Gentiles which have not the law,' but had to some extent these principles-'a *law* unto themselves'-could sin. Though 'sin is not imputed where there is no law,' it may be imputed (and in the case of the Gentiles was, Ro. ii: 12-15) without '*the* law.' That sin may be 'imputed on principles without the law' Paul avers when he speaks of 'as many as have sinned without (revealed) law.' The same principle is involved

in finding a man guilty of covetousness with such certainty as to be able to exclude him from the church (1. Cor. v: 11), though no percentage is named. This is the fatal point which my brother evades. Nor do 'principles without precepts'

make 'revelation a nullity;' there needs to be a 'revelation' of principles, since but few of them are so near the surface as to be apprehended without such aid. It is here where the O. T. Scriptures are largely 'profitable.' We have, moreover, under the gospel specific revelation or legislation covering cases which general principles could not reach. Liberty and license, however, are essentially different. It is liberty to be free from the multitudinous specific enactments of the legalistic dispensation of Moses and to be governed by general principles in all possible cases. But this liberty is not to be turned into license, and Paul warns us against doing so: 'Brethren, ye have been called into liberty; only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by (the principle of) love serve one another.' With an air of triumph my brother says, 'If Eld. Vogel has any other means than *the law* to prove men guilty in the sight of God, *let him produce the text*, or cease his vain speculations.' I would answer that the terrors of Sinai are weak to condemn sin compared with the matchless love of the cross. 'What *the law could not do*, in that it was weak through the flesh, *God sending His own Son* in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, *condemned sin in the flesh.*' Ro. viii: 3.

7. The law spoken of in Ro. vii,-which in my view is the entire law, but in my brother's only the ten commandments-is the same law mentioned in ch. vi: 14. There Paul said, 'Sin shall not have dominion over you; for *ye are not under the law*, but under grace,' and here he takes up this thought again, having turned aside to consider an objection. 'Or', he continues-and this *or* is suppressed in the common version-'Or know ye not, brethren, (for I speak to them that know the law,) how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth?' Paul proceeds to prove what he before had only asserted, namely, the abolition of the law. He draws an illustration from the marital state (vv. 2, 3) where the wife is under obligations to her husband while he lives and cannot marry another without adultery till he is dead. So with the Jews-the 'brethren who know the law'-they were once married to the law, but are now joined to Christ. If the law is not dead this is an adulterous union. But that their former relation to the law is destroyed, Paul surely asserts: 'Wherefore, my brethren, ye are become dead to the law by the (coming or crucifixion of) the body of Christ, that ye should be married to another' (v. 4). 'Now we are delivered from the law' (v. 6). To be 'dead to the law,' then, does not mean to be in a state of forgiveness or union with Christ, but that the Jews' relation to the law, as given by Moses, was first destroyed 'by the body of Christ' that there might be saving union with him.

In verse 5, Paul calls the state of the Jew under the law being 'in the flesh,' because the law was chiefly a fleshly or political institution, and says that the passions which were by the law made men commit sins punishable by death. For two reasons then-(1) because it was thought best to free those under it from the law, and (2) because the passions by the law brought forth sin punishable by death-he proceeds to consider an objection naturally raised, namely, whether the law, as the Jew had it, is 'sin' or sinful (v. 7), and concludes that it is 'Holy, just and good.' 'Holy, just and good' is therefore the negative of 'sin' or sinful, and as such may be predicated of the entire law-of that which is purely positive and ceremonial as well as of that which has a moral basis. If, therefore, Eld. W.'s argument from this predicate in favor of the decalogue is worth anything, it

equally proves the binding force of every ceremonial precept! Will he abide by his logic? So also the predicate 'spiritual' of v. 14 stands apart from 'carnal' only when 'carnal' is used in the sense of 'sold under sin,' but not as used in Heb. ix: 10 and vii: 16; for God never enjoined a 'sinful' ordinance. 'Spiritual,' in the sense of Ro. vii: 14 is, therefore, not equivalent to 'moral,' as Eld. W. erroneously concludes, but is affirmable of even ceremonial law. Moreover, the 'carnal' (*sarkos*) of Heb. ix: 10 and vii: 16 is predicable of the law mentioned in Ro. vii, for it is called, in v. 5, *sarks*, 'flesh' or 'carnal;' and this is further proof that the law is mostly political.

I ought, perhaps, to say here that Ro. vii: 7-25 describes an actual experience, but not a constant Christian experience. No Christian can say of his life as a habit, that 'that I would, I do not, but the

89

evil which I would not, that I do Nor does it refer to Paul's conversion. The scene is laid in Judaism, when the law was in full force, and describes the conflict of the moment when Paul committed his *first* sin. 'I was alive (sinless) without the law once', namely, before I came to the years of responsibility; 'but when the command came [when it came to my understanding, when I became responsible] sin revived [sprang up to life] and I died.' This locates the event. The conflict is, for the sake of vividness, described in the use of the 'historical present,' of which we have brief examples in John iii: 4; iv: 7. Hence all comfort drawn from the use of the present tense here is hollow.

My brother's talk about the fact that the ten commandments are the will of God, was not 'conveniently' evaded. All law which God has ever given was an expression of His will, but that does not prove its permanency, since it may have been His will that it should be changed. As for Christ's coming to do his Father's will, it simply means that he came to obey instructions; and part of this will was that he should abolish the law.

With reference to my use of Webster's definition of statute I stand corrected. I indeed knew better, yet' for the moment I was strangely misled by the term 'positive,' having my mind pre-occupied with its theological sense.

As to Paul's meaning by 'as it is written,' (Ro. iii: 10) that he had proved both Jews and Gentiles sinners by the Old Testament, Eld. W. is clearly wrong. (1) All of the passages quoted, when examined in their O. T. connections, are written only of the Jews. (2) If we regard the last member of v. 9 as a parenthesis, connecting the 'as it is written,' with 'No, in no-wise,' we obtain a sense in harmony with the Old Testament, also with Paul in v. 19, and in my favor.

Heb. ix: 15, does indeed speak of Christ's atoning for some of the sins committed under the former dispensation (I say 'some,' because others were then and there sufficiently atoned for, v. 14), but this does not argue against the abolition of the law. For example, a few years ago some parties in Reading, Pa., produced a will made by a lady and claimed that it was worthless because not in accordance with the law, and so claimed exemption from dividing property as it directed. The will, however, was in accordance with a law then abolished, but in force when the will was made. A course of litigation showed that the abolished law was in force as to that will. Thus pardon and abolition go together.

I know not why my brother should put into my mouth the words, the law is '*only* political,' and the Jews '*but* a political body.' He wrongs me in this, for I distinctly said, 'politico-ecclesiastic,'-'mainly political', etc, That there is a religious element in the law, I never denied, but that it is of the high order found in the New Testament is quite another question. Not only Jacob before the law had such poor religious ideas as to think, when he had wandered a few miles away from home, that he was out of the jurisdiction of God, but even the inspired Jonah thought to escape Him by a journey across the Mediterranean. No wonder that the law for such an age and people was mainly political and had even its moral precepts given as though they were positive.

If in the gospel dispensation the Gentiles were made 'no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God,' it is because of the two is made 'one new man,' Eph. ii: 15; and the covenant made with Judah and Israel, of which the Gentiles partake, is a '*new* covenant,' Heb. viii: 8. Of similar import is Ro. xi. Paul says that he is laboring to convert the Gentiles (v. 13) that he might stir up emulation among the unbelieving Jews (v. 14) to their salvation. And that the unbelieving Jews are fit to be saved he teaches by two illustrations—a lump of dough and an olive tree; and the converted Jews are the 'first-fruit' and 'the root.' If a part of the dough has been offered to the Lord (Num. xv: 18-20) the rest may also be used, and if the root of a tree is not poisonous, the branches cannot be obnoxious for use. But the converted Jews were 'the first-fruit' of the '*new* covenant,' and to this the Gentiles stood related as a wild olive tree only in the sense that it was promised to be made with the Jews and then the Gentiles were to be 'grafted in' (Acts iii: 26.)

To show that I am not alone in holding the law to be largely political, I wish to quote from Jews themselves, who certainly would make the most favorable showing of their side the case will admit. 'The Hebrew commonwealth was neither a plain religious institution, nor an administration purely civil, but partook of both at once. As in your forms

90

of government the church and the state are distinct, so, on the contrary, in ours they formed but one thing. . . . In this government, Jehovah was not only the object of religious worship as the only true God; he was, besides, the first civil magistrate, and head of the body politic. . . . The worship of Jehovah only, and an inviolable attachment to it, were the first condition and basis of his alliance with his people: 'Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve' To worship strange gods was, therefore, a breach of this alliance, a rebellion against the sovereign; in a word, the highest act of treason.'—*Jews' Letters to Voltaire*, pp. 192-3. Thus we see that even the Jews look upon the ten commandments as largely a political document. And in substantial accord with this are our best commentators and most learned theologians.

That the 'first' or 'old' covenant has been abolished is so undeniably plain that Eld. W. is constrained to admit it. But he tries to save his cause by calling the *preliminary* conference of Ex. xix *the* covenant, instead of the ten commandments! The word covenant, in its Bible use, is indeed of such width that this may be called a covenant, yet, it is so clearly a preliminary interview to see

whether a covenant would be kept, if made (v. 5) with a statement of some of the benefits to be enjoyed in the event it is lived up to, that I am surprised to see my brother calling it the 'old' covenant.

But grant, for the argument, that Eld. W. is right, and that the ten commandments are the condition of the 'old' covenant, what then? Clearly, with the abolition of a covenant its conditions cease. Thus the very issue Bro. W. would avoid, is unavoidable. The case of Josiah (2. K. xxiii: 3) is no parallel to this; it was only a *vow* to keep a covenant already made, but long neglected; for, properly speaking, man alone can make no covenant with God. If it be urged that the ten commandments were in force before the 'covenant' of Ex. xix, I answer, yes, but *not as given on Sinai*. It is only as then given that I maintain their abrogation.

Let us now examine Ex. xxiv; 8. 'And Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it on the people, and said. Behold the blood of the covenant, which the Lord made with you concerning all these words.' I would place a comma after 'you,' and render the last clause '*on* all these words,' construing *on* in amenity with 'blood,' or sprinkled understood. The same word, *al*, is rendered on in the fore part of this verse and also in v. 6, which is its primary meaning. 'Concerning' is only a remote meaning, not to be thought of when the primary one will make sense. This furnishes us the fact that Moses 'sprinkled both *the book* and all the people' (Heb. ix: 19), from which Paul reasons. And so long as I have Paul with me, I am fearless. The covenant, then, of Ex. xxiv: 3-8 is that of 'all these words'-the ten commandments together with their amplification in the three following chapters-and they are the 'old' covenant which was done away. I must repeat my conviction that Deut. v is in full accord with this. Indeed, I am utterly unable to see how it can possibly be otherwise construed. The parenthesis of v. 5-'I stood between the Lord and you'-cannot refer to Ex. xix, but must to Ex. xx: 19 and xxiv: 3-8, for the 'standing between' is in connection with being 'afraid by reason of the fire.'

That the ten commandments as given in covenant at Sinai were 'the condition of the promise to Abraham,' I cannot admit. 'The law,' as such, was 'four hundred and thirty years after' the days of Abraham [Gal. iii: 17] and 'was given by Moses' [John i: 17]. That Abraham had and obeyed 'commandments,' 'statutes,' and 'laws,' and was on that account favored, I believe on the testimony of Gen. xxvi: 5; but that these were in every respect the same as the law from Sinai, I beg to be excused from believing. To construe the poetic expressions of 1. Chron. xvi: 15-17, so prosaically severe as to contradict both Paul and John, as quoted above, is too absurd for refutation. There were, however, some common elements in the laws which Abraham kept and that one which was 'four hundred and thirty years after,' and this is the basis of David's poetic outburst. In all this I say nothing of the fact that Abraham never saw the Sabbath.

ELDER J. H. WAGGONER'S SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE

Another point or two I will now consider on the covenants.

(7.) The minister or priest of the new covenant has also a sanctuary in which to officiate. The first covenant had "a worldly sanctuary" of two departments-the holy and the most holy. In that the priests 'served unto the example and shadow of heavenly things,' as the sanctuary was made according to a pattern shown to Moses; Heb. viii: 5; ix: 1. But our Priest serves in 'the sanctuary and true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man,'-in the heavens; Heb. viii: 1-2. The earthly are called the pattern of the heavenly. 'For Christ is not entered into the *holy places* made with hands, *which are the figures* [resemblance, copy corresponding to an original-Greenfield] of the true, [literally, true ones], but into heaven itself.' There are, therefore, *holy places* in the heavenly sanctuary. When Moses made the first sanctuary the Lord promised to manifest his glory at 'the door of the tabernacle of the congregation'-the holy; Ex. xxix: 42, 43; just inside of which door were the seven golden candlesticks, (properly, lamp-stands), and the table of show bread. And when St. John had a view of the majesty of God in Heaven, where our High Priest was when the revelation was given, he saw 'seven lamps of fire burning before the throne.' Rev. iv: 1-6. But when 'the seventh angel sounded,' ushering in the third woe, coming down even to 'the time of the dead that they should be judged,' and to the giving of reward to the prophets and to all that fear the Lord, small and great, then 'there was seen in his temple, *the ark of his testament*,' or covenant. Rev. xi: 14-18; comp. Chap. xxii: 12; Luke xiv: 14.

As the time of giving reward here brought to view is at the coming of Christ, we look to Rev. xiv: 14, where the Savior is seen coming to reap the harvest of the earth, and just preceding his coming a call is made to 'keep the commandments of God [the 'one law-giver,' 'the judge of all'] and the faith of Jesus,' the 'mediator between God and man,' in the heavenly sanctuary. Thus it appears that under the seventh trumpet our High Priest fulfills the type of 'the day of atonement,' or of 'cleansing the sanctuary,' Lev. xvi: 1-19; Dan. viii: 14, by entering into the *most holy of the heavenly places*, wherein is seen the ark of God's testament, or covenant.

We readily admit that everything made by Moses was a figure or representation of the things in the heavens; but that which was in the ark-the law of God-was not made by Moses. It took hold on moral relations, and came directly from God himself. Paul says 'the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets;' and we see this illustrated in the writings of inspired men. Though all were inspired by 'one spirit' and 'spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost,' they presented in their writings each the peculiarity of his own mind. What a difference is seen in the styles of Peter, John, Paul, Isaiah, Daniel, etc. Each book bears the visible impress of the mind of its writer even under inspiration. But look at the ten commandments. 'Whose image and superscription is this?' Here is an instrument which bears honors above all the revelation which God committed to the race-'And God spake all these words.' Jehovah himself wrote them. They bear the impress of Deity alone. With what reverence and sacred awe should all men stand before the ten commandments of Jehovah!

When the gospel age closes-when probation ends, and 'the seven last plagues' are to be poured out upon the earth, the angels receive these plagues

from 'the temple of the tabernacle of testimony in heaven'-the most holy place, Rev. xv. In those plagues 'is filled up the wrath of God,' because it is then and there that the work of our High Priest is finished; the atonement is made, and the sins of 'all the Israel of God' are blotted out. This is an extensive theme, but my limits will not permit me to enlarge upon it.

(8.) The *new covenant* was made with Judah and Israel. It was decidedly 'Jewish,' to use the language of our opponents, made with the Jews, and one born a Jew is its mediator! Paul says that to them pertains 'the adoption, and the glory, and *the covenants*, and the giving of *the law*, and the service of God, and the promises.' These are privileges not to be despised; but the *chief advantage*

92

of the Jews was that 'unto them were committed the oracles of God,' Rom. iii. Will the reader consider again the testimony of Stephen, Acts vii: 38, that Moses 'received the lively oracles [living oracles] *to give unto us.*' Happy for 'us' if we obey those 'living oracles'-God's holy covenant, 'the word which he *commanded to a thousand generations.*'

But Eld. Vogel says 'the commonwealth of Israel' was 'a civil compact,' and that nothing given to them remains. This assertion is disproved by the Scriptures, for the new covenant was made with them; and 'the oracles of God' which Moses received, were 'living oracles' in the time of Stephen. Such evidence cannot be evaded. And it strikes me there is unusual irreverence manifested in Eld. Vogel's statements on this subject. Of that 'civil compact' he says:-

'(3.) This is further evident from the fact that God stood to the Hebrews in the relation of political ruler, law-giver and King. For when they said to Samuel, Make us a king to judge us like all the nations, Jehovah replied, They have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them.'

This has no point at all except this, that Jehovah was a ruler in every respect just like the one they chase in his stead! Will Eld. V. squarely avow that conclusion, or renounce his position? Saul was only a civil ruler, and could not administer government on moral grounds; 'hence it follows' that Jehovah was a political-not a moral governor! Question: Did the priests minister between Saul and the people, after he began to reign? Or was there another important relation back of Saul's rule? Were the ten commandments the law of Saul, or was the glory of Saul manifested over the ark of the testament in the sanctuary? Does it not appear that Eld. V. is a Very superficial reasoner on Bible relations? If we are to judge of the character and position of the one rejected by that of the one chosen in his stead, to what conclusion must we arrive from the Jews' rejecting Christ and choosing a murderer in his stead? Some say that such things are not so much the fault of the reasoner as of the theory which he is advocating; but I cannot accept such a distinction. Any person of ordinary ability is responsible for advocating a theory built on such premises and leading to such conclusions. When the truth and honor of God, and the eternal welfare of our fellow beings are at stake, our teachings involve a responsibility calling for especial carefulness and reverence.

Another point of importance, relating also to Eld. Vogel's errors on the term 'Lord,' I must waive to attend to that which I cannot longer postpone.

The reader may be assured that I regret the necessity of again referring to the Hebrew, but justice compels me to do so. I shall use 'great plainness of speech' as the occasion requires. I have already pointed out errors of statement and deduction in Eld. Vogel which ought to have settled the question, but he persisted in his course. In this I shall convict him of such inaccuracies, or 'blunders,' to adopt his own courteous style, as will, I trust, put it to a final rest.

1. The reader will please notice the following cases where *sabbath* is in predicate; Ex. xvi: 23, 25, 26; ch. xx: 10; ch. xxxi: 15 first time; ch. xxxv: 2; Lev xxiii: 3 twice; Deut. v: 14; and the article is omitted in each case. It is not inpredicate in the following instances: Ex. xvi: 29; ch. xxxi: 14, 15 second time, 16 twice; ch. xxxv: 3; Lev. xxiii: 11, 15, 16; Deut. v: 12; and in each case the article is used. This is not accidental; and I leave the reader to judge whether a first mention will account for its omission in Ex, xx, and xxxi, and xxxv, Lev. xxiii, and Deut. v. Eld. Vogel's invention of a 're-mention nearly equivalent to a first mention,' is positively puerile, got up to meet the necessities of his case. If the statement of Gesenius is a 'blunder,' how is it that from first to last, in the same chapter and in the same verse, the article is omitted when the noun is in predicate, and inserted when it is not in predicate? This use fully justifies the words of Gesenius: 'The precept is also correctly given by grammarians, that *the predicate* of a sentence does not take the article.' Exceptions do not destroy this precept more than they do that quoted by Eld. V., and exceptions to that are abundant, though he did positively deny it. He misconstrues Green if he thinks he 'condemns' Gesenius in this. The absence of the article is fully accounted for on other ground than that by Eld, Vogel; hence his inference is unwarranted and his argument a nullity.

2. He does me great injustice in accusing me of blundering: in regard to the construction of Ex. xvi: 23. He said I once blundered with Gesenius in claiming the above as rule, and once again

93

in claiming a definite construction for this text. But the reader will remember that I claimed it definite *under this rule*, and if the rule holds good I made no blunder at all, and this he knows. For, supposing that Gesenius did blunder in his statement, that does not show that I made any blunder in applying the rule to this text, nor did Eld. V. claim that. He 'evaded the issue' by referring to a rule which has no bearing on the case.

3. I could show the inconclusiveness is statement on the use of the preposition, and of the unfairness of his method of reference to Green; but as I instituted no claim on the preposition, I will pass it for brevity's sake, only referring to the following 'blunder' of his: He claimed in his argument Ex. xvi: 25 as an instance of the indefinite use of *sabbath*; but it is just like Ex. xx: 10 in construction, and he now claims the latter text as definite by construction! In a man who is 'capable,' never liable to 'blunder,' and never writes for 'effect,' this course is hard to explain.

4. His accusation that I blundered, accompanied with his reference to Green, §246. 3, was unjust and presented the matter in a false light. For [1.] He knew that I did not claim it definite by construction under that section. [2.] He knew that

that section did not cover the whole field of the omission of the article, and therefore it would not settle a question raised under other rules. [3.] He knew that that section and number referred only to the construct state, and therefore would cut off his claim on Ex. xx: 10, if it would mine on Ex. xvi: 23; for Ex. xx: 10 is not in the construct. His course in this was unfair, tending only to mislead, and was as unjust to the reader as to me. I have little reason to expect that he will yield to proof, but I insist that in simple matters of fact he shall have some regard for justice.

5. He treats with raillery my saying that *sabbath* means *rest*, as if it were parallel to his own pedantry. But this is so well known that I assume nothing in the statement; the English reader has learned the same from Webster. His ridicule about my holding on to it would be in better place if I had said anything that admitted of denial.

6. Perhaps it is because I have not recently graduated at a theological school that I am not able to appreciate his very chaste and genteel remarks about 'the turtle.' But if I am any judge of their force they aptly represent his course on Ex. xxiv: 12. Had he simply confessed his 'blunder' without trying to cover his retreat in such a questionable manner, he also would have done a 'clever thing,' and a thing more creditable to himself. But that would not be in keeping with his general course. As usual, when his proof is shown to be deficient, it makes no practical difference. Take away all his evidence, or turn it against him, and it never weakens his argument at all! To *excuse* his first blunder, which was too glaring to admit of *denial*, he runs into others equally apparent. Take the following in reference to the accents named:

'They are just alike in character, and often nearly and sometimes wholly in position, so that they may be easily mistaken for each other, as I inadvertently did.'

They are just alike in shape, which is all the truth that the above statement contains, unless he dodges behind the word *nearly*, which is a poor refuge. They may occupy the same location on a given word, but not in consecution, that is, in their relation to other accents; so they may be easily and readily distinguished in any position. But in this case even that excuse is not admissible, for in this text *pashta* occupies a position in location as well as in consecution which *Kadhma* never occupies, and therefore it may not be easily mistaken for the latter *except by a person who is entirely ignorant of both these plain and unvarying points of difference!* And this, if we may trust his own showing, was the case with Eld. Vogel.

7. His farther remarks on that blunder betray a like ignorance of the laws of consecution. To destroy the force of *the article* he first said the accent on 'the law' was conjunctive, connecting these words with, 'which I have written.' Being corrected in that he now says 'the practical result remains unchanged' because there is a still stronger disjunctive over 'the commandments' than that over 'the law!' This is surely a novelty in consecution; if he wishes to get a patent on it, nobody will dispute his claim to the invention. Invariably the nearer you approach the end of a section, the stronger is the disjunctive; and that over 'the commandments' is a 'kingly accent,' and disjoins these and the preceding words

from the 'train' following, leaving the words '*which I have written,*' immediately connected by consecution with,

94

'*that thou mayest teach them.*' All that I have said in this and the preceding paragraph may be known from a single glance at the original by any person who has a knowledge of Hebrew accents.

At first I thought Eld. Vogel had at least a fair knowledge of Hebrew, but I have been forced to change my mind in regard to his attainments. Though his egotism was prominent all along, I inclined to overlook that, as it is so often manifested by young men not long from school who have not grace to restrain it. When I *proved* beyond denial the error of his statement in regard to the omission of the article, he coolly accused me of 'blundering,' and of being 'incapable,' with a haughtiness and air of scorn that might almost have made Goliath die of envy. As he says, he did 'chide' me often, and in an unseemly and arrogant manner, but I shall care but little for all that until I have some evidence that his knowledge nearly equals his assurance.

I have let forbearance rule as long as justice and a proper regard for the cause of truth will permit. As I write mainly for the benefit of English readers, I have had no desire to carry this discussion into the Hebrew; so far as I am personally concerned, I do not care how far he carries it in that direction, being confident that he can gain nothing by the controversy, because the truth is not with him.

His criticism on the English of Ex. xxiv: 12, is as defective as that on the Hebrew, but of this hereafter.

ELDER PETER VOGEL'S SEVENTH NEGATIVE

There still remain some points to be noticed in Eld. W.'s sixth affirmative. In trying to prove that Ex. xix rather than xx contains 'the first covenant,' he says, that 'the first covenant was useless and void because the people did not fulfill it; and this will apply to *an agreement*, but will not apply to *a law*.' (1) The facts, however, are that the first covenant expired *by limitation* [Gal. iii: 19]; and this puts a wholly different phase upon the matter. If non-fulfillment on the part of the people were to have been the cause of its termination, then there were frequent and much stronger reasons for its annulment long before Christ's crucifixion than at that time. (2) We may call the first covenant an agreement, if we will, yet it was also a law-covenant, for it was 'enacted' or 'legislated.' This is by accommodation asserted of the 'new covenant,' and so by implication of the 'old:' Christ 'is the mediator of the better covenant, which *was established* upon better promises.' 'Was established' [Gr. *nenomotheteetai*, rendered 'received the law,' in ch. vii: 11] is translated by Conybeare 'is enacted,' and by Rotherham 'has been legislated.' Heb. viii: 6. In this view of the first covenant I have with me also the mature judgment of Conybeare in his note on v. 9-'the covenant which I gave unto their fathers.' 'It must be remembered,' says he, 'that the Greek word does not [like the English *covenant*] imply reciprocity. It properly means *a legal disposition*, and would perhaps be better translated *dispensation* here. A covenant between two

parties is expressed by a different term.' And thus are we irresistibly led to the decalogue as the first covenant. (3) It was owing to the 'faultiness' of the first covenant that it was abolished; though it was well adapted to the Jewish age, it was 'faulty' for the Christian age. We have already seen that it failed of perfection when fully kept [Matt, xix: 21]; and Paul says, 'If the first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second.' Heb. viii: 7. The 'finding fault with them' of the next verse is altogether too slender a basis for so sweeping a conclusion as Bro. W. makes. He is certainly aware that the Greek construction is just as naturally expressed thus: 'But finding fault, he saith to them;' and this is McKnight's version. Conybeare fully agrees with McKnight, and translates thus: 'Whereas, He findeth fault, and saith unto them.' He adds, in a note, " 'findeth fault' refers to the preceding 'faultless.' The pronoun should be joined with 'saith.' " The expression, 'Because [McKnight, *when*] they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not,' is a brief allusion to the many defections of the Hebrews and to the punishment from God which followed each estrangement, showing the necessity of having laws written upon the heart and the 'faultiness'

95

of having them written on tables of stone and statute books.

What Eld. W. says concerning 'the better promises' of the new covenant has no practical bearing on the subject before us.

What God, through Jeremiah, calls 'my law' He calls 'my laws' through Paul [Jer. xxxi: 33; Heb. viii: 10]. To hold that this refers to the ten commandments-no more and no less-is a bare assumption. We will not thus allow Eld. W. to transfer the Sabbath from the tables of stone into the hearts of Christians. I have no wish to deface the least iota of morality taught by the ten commandments; but I wish also to recognize the fact that God has a 'law' which went 'forth out of Zion' [Is. ii: 3], which is 'His' as well as that from Sinai. If the two are identical-standing because ordained of old-why was there a new 'legislation?' Be it remembered, however, that the new law is one of 'liberty.' And this law of liberty, when viewed as of God, may be called 'the law of God.'

My remarks on Ro. iii: 31 concerning the establishment of the entire Mosaic law in its 'moral or basic principles' has been ridiculed because it was misunderstood. I used 'basic principles,' not as equivalent to 'constitution,' but as referring to every moral principle of the Mosaic code, whether in the ten commandments or in other portions of the law.

This attempt at ridicule reminds me of another which I passed by as unworthy of notice, but for the sake of some ought perhaps to consider. I can see nothing 'crude' in asserting that a man may be perfect and holy as measured by a given law, whether the law itself be perfect or not. If the law is absolutely perfect, so will be the one obeying it; but if the law be defective, he is nevertheless perfect *as to that law*, though imperfect as measured by another and perfect law. But, says Bro. W., 'if we have any means of determining that a law is imperfect, the same means will determine that a character must be imperfect that is conformed to that law.' True; but this is declaring a character imperfect by *another* law. And before

God gave us the perfect standard of the gospel men had no means of declaring either the Jews or their law imperfect or 'faulty.'

Eld. W. must pardon me for reiterating the 'crude' statement that the Messiahship of Jesus is the constitution of the Christian church. Against the conclusion of all his reasonings and analogies between the priesthood and kingship of Christ and those of Aaron and David, I place the single declaration, "Upon this rock will I build ray church.' That upon which we build is fundamental, organic, constitutional.

To argue the present obligation of the ten commandments as given on Sinai, and hence of the sabbath from such passages as Rev. xi: 19 and xv: 5-8, surprises me. 'And the temple of God was opened in heaven' would by the same logic prove the transfer of the Jewish temple from earth to heaven, to say nothing of the fact that 'the ark of his testament' contained the whole Mosaic code [Deut. xxxi: 26], and so would prove nothing abolished! Then think of 'lightnings,' 'thunderings,' great hail,' and 'earthquakes' in heaven! Shall we next have a philosophy of the cause of these earthquakes?

Respecting the antitype of the tabernacle, I must regard Eld W. as in error by construing 'heavenly' in Heb. viii: 5 as referring to a place rather than as descriptive of condition; or, if it must refer to a place, of taking it in too narrow a sense. For

1. The most holy place of both the tabernacle and the temple was, in the narrower sense of the word, a type of heaven [Heb. vi: 19-20; ix: 8, 24] into which our High Priest *has* entered, not is to enter at some future time.

2. The holy place was a type of the Christian Church. Acts xv: 16-17; 1. Cor. iii: 16; 1. Tim. iii: 15. As the High Priest officiates 'within the veil' so the priests officiate in the holy place [Heb. ix: 6-7]. Christians are priests [1. Pet. ii: 5-9], hence the Church is the holy place. This might be still further shown from the antitype of the furniture in the holy place, but I forbear with the remark that if the 'candlestick' or seven-armed lamp-stand typifies the Holy Spirit rather than the word of God, He is found in the Church. 1. Cor. iii: 16.

The stress Eld. W. lays on the plural of Heb. ix: 24-'holy places'-with the purpose of proving both holy places to be in heaven, results from insufficient attention to the subject. The Greeks often used the plural where in English only the singular is admissible. Thus the same word, and in the plural too, is rendered *sanctuary* in Heb. viii: 2; ix: 3; xiii: 11; and *holy place* in ch. ix: 12, 25. Just as the word 'tabernacle' denotes sometimes

96

both holy places, and at others either one or the other of them [ch. ix: 2-3], so also does *ta hagia* ['the sanctuary' or the holies.]

3. The cleansing of 'the sanctuary' [Dan. viii: 14] has reference to affairs to transpire on *earth* at the destruction of Mahometanism. For as the little horn of Dan. vii is a symbol of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy, so that of ch. viii. is of Mahometanism; this their respective places of origin and spheres of influence prove.

Everything in the tabernacle was a type, not excepting the ark and its contents; for as such or as given on Sinai the ten commandments were positive.

Therefore we conclude again that to argue from the passages adduced by Eld. W. from Revelations, that by the ark and its contents these things are literally meant, is not only to proceed most arbitrarily, but is also wholly out of character without taking 'the temple,' 'the smoke,' 'the hail,' 'the lightning,' 'the thunder,' 'the earthquake,' etc., etc., as equally literal. This will suffice to show the absurdity of my brother's interpretation of those passages in Revelations without taking time to give the true exposition. Besides, it is too near the close of this proposition to enter on such foreign matters.

'The covenants *and* the giving of the law' of Ro. ix: 4 refer to the two or three covenants made with Abraham, 'pertaining' to Israel, and to the 'giving' to them of the law-covenant.

The 'us' to whom the lively oracles [Acts vii: 38] were given, were Jews, among whom the circumcised Stephen classifies himself. The oracles were 'living' when given; and if they now [in this dispensation] live, it is in their moral aspect and as '*all* Scripture is profitable.'

The words commanded to a 'thousand generations' are no stronger than 'perpetual' or 'everlasting' predicated of the Aaronic priesthood [Ex. xl: 12-15], the passover and its feast [Ex. xii], circumcision [Gen. xvii], the shew-bread [Lev. xxiv: 5-9], and a number of other things; and it is just as credible that the former, period has expired as that the latter have.

If by 'the commandments of God' [in Rev. xiv: 12] one chooses to understand *all* the morality God has *commanded*, I shall not oppose him; but if he means to intimate that the ten commandments are the only commandments of God, or are here referred to as given on Sinai, I shall accuse him of begging the essential point. Christ gave commandments of his own; John xiv: 21; Xv: 10-14. Christ's commandments are often called the commandments of God; John xii: 49-50; xiv: 31; 1. Tim. i: 1; hence there are commandments of God which are not of the law; see also 1 John iii: 21-24; Ro. xvi: 26; Tit. i: 3, and other places.

Had I maintained that God was *only* a political ruler to the Jews, then the question, 'Did the priests minister between Saul and the people, after he began to reign?' would have been in order. But the fact is that the Jews did neither accept Saul as their religious sovereign nor reject God as to that relation, and yet they 'rejected' Him. In what relation, if not political?

Nearly one-half of Eld. W.'s last article is devoted to Hebrew criticisms. Much of what he has to say relates only to one argument of the second proposition, and could be yielded without detriment to the main point at issue between us. Were his 'great plainness of speech' to be taken as argument, I should yield the point at once. For the sake of the common reader I wish to point out such misstatements as he can be judge of, and by these he may know what value to place upon the rest.

1. I said nothing about 're-mention' in connection with the weekly sabbath.

2. I did not 'treat with raillery' his saying that sabbath means rest, but used the word myself in that sense.

3. My statement about his 'holding on' had not reference to his definition of sabbath, but to his persistency in Hebrew criticisms, dragging the second proposition into the third, in the face of his profession of not thrusting his

scholarship before the reader. And I might have added, in the face of his *challenge* to discuss the use of the Greek article before the word 'law.'

4. He pronounces it egotism in me to accuse him of not understanding the Hebrew, when the fact is that I only paid him back in his own coin, as any one can see by reading his second affirmative. I wonder whether his style would have anything to do with making 'Goliath die of envy.'

With a few remarks bearing more directly on his criticisms, I submit the case.

1. We need no array of instances

97

where *sabbath* is used without the article. I have before said that I was aware of such occurrences. His statement that the predicate does not take the article I disproved by good authority; and I might have added such examples as Ex. ix: 27, '*the* righteous [party],' and xvi: 16, '*the* thing. It matters not how often sabbath occurs in the predicate without the article; the essential point is this: Why is the article absent in Ex. xvi: 23? Had the sabbath been a forgotten institution, and there again insisted on, the article would be necessary; and its absence agrees with the universal custom of introducing a new institution in an indefinite way. 'In the language of living intercourse it is *utterly impossible* that the article should be omitted where it is decidedly necessary.'-Winer, Gram. p. 115.

I will further add, that if the sabbath had been an existing institution during the Egyptian bondage, when the majority of the Hebrews served the Lord, the silence of the Scriptures would be wholly inexplicable, since with nothing else would their task-service have so much interfered, and complaint on this point would have been severe and specific.

2. Seeing the necessity, on his supposition, of having the sabbatic institution definitely named in Ex. xvi: 23, Eld. W. says: 'The reader will remember that I claimed it definite *under this rule*,' namely, that the predicate does not take the article. This is another instance of drawing the very opposite conclusion yielded by the facts in the case. 'A substantive with an article may be the predicate as well as the subject of a proposition, *since even the predicate may be conceived of as a definite individual*.-Winer, p. 114. That is, if the predicate has not the article it is not definite.

3. Having signally failed in showing Ex. xvi: 23 parallel with Ex. xx: 10 in the use of *lamed*, Eld. W. tries to draw ch. xvi: 25 into service. Unfortunately for him, however, that construction is often resorted to in place of the regular construct when 'the first noun is indefinite and the second definite' [Green, §257, 2]. Should he reply that this may be the case in Ex. xx: 10, I answer, yes; but taken in its contextual connection the case is altered. This, no doubt, determined the king's translators to render the first passage indefinitely and the second definitely. But if Eld. W. should insist on treating both alike, making each indefinite, be it so; my point stands sure.

4. All that Eld. W. says in his paragraph marked 4, is made pointless by the fact that when *lamed* is used 'in its possessive sense' it 'may be substituted for the construct relation.'-Green, §257.

5. The criticisms on Ex. xxiv: 12 I dispose of briefly by simply re-asserting my position, and an appeal to the learned reader for its justness.

THE SABBATH ABOLISHED

I. Turning again to negative arguments, I insist upon it that the sabbath is a positive institution. (1) It is described by the same term, sabbath, which describes other positive institutions. (2) It is moreover admitted that sabbath often takes the article, when denoting the weekly institution, by way of preeminence over or emphatic distinction from the annual sabbaths. A moral and a positive institution are never distinguished in this way. And being positive, the sabbath passed away with the other positive institutions of the old economy.

II. The sabbath is specially named as abrogated, in Col. ii: 16-17.

III. The sabbath is here also declared to be a type, finding its antitype in the Christian dispensation. And, as Paul says, when the substance comes the shadow ceases.

IV. Gentile Christians were not to keep the sabbath.

1. It was nowhere enjoined upon them.

2. They were specially exempted from keeping the positive institutions of the law. Acts xv: 23-29; xxi: 20-25.

3. They were particularly forbidden to observe Jewish days: 'Ye observe days [weekly sabbaths], and months [new moons], and times [the Jewish festivals which included the annual sabbaths, Lev. xxiii.], and years [sabbatic years]. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain.' Gal. iv: 10-11.

V. The sabbath was 'against us' and 'contrary to us.' This we have seen to be true of the entire decalogue, in that positive aspect in which it was given to the Jews, but it is particularly true of the sabbath.

1. The sabbath had a relentless death-penalty attached to it (Ex. xxxi: 14-15; xxxv: 2), and in this it was 'contrary' to the genius of a dispensation of grace.

2. No fire was to be kindled on the sabbath. Ex. xxxv: 1-3. This marks the sabbath as not intended for universal

98

observance, owing to the coldness of some of the countries in which Christians often live. It is 'against us.'

3. The sabbath was a sign between God and the Jews (Ezek. xx; 12; Ex. xxxi: 12-18) and so was part of 'the middle wall of partition' which is 'broken down.' Eph. ii: 14.

ELDER J. H. WAGGONER'S EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE

Eld. Vogel said, "That no passage of Scripture is so fortified but that an ingenious opponent can say something contrary to its most obvious sense, and even make his position seem plausible." Had he been only intent on illustrating this in all his course, he could have hardly succeeded better than he has, except that he has not by any means always made 'his position seem plausible.' I have aimed more to get the truth before the readers than to notice all his efforts to cover it up, exposing the more prominent as occasion seemed to require. I will briefly notice the objections remaining.

He says 'under grace' means 'under the gospel,' and answers that 'the children of wrath' are under the gospel, and so under grace. But every reader knows that Paul, in Rom. vi. and vii., addressed only those who had died to sin, and were baptized into the death of Christ. Have the children of wrath 'been delivered from the law' by '*having become dead to the law*' by the body of Christ? Have they 'obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine delivered' unto them? Are they under grace because they are dead to sin, and sin has no dominion over them? A more manifest perversion of scripture I never saw than Eld. V.'s comments on Rom. vi. and vii. He applied chap. vii. to the Jews, who, he said, were 'joined to Christ,' by his crucifixion! and yet says 'under grace' does not prove 'union with Christ.' He also said chap. vii. does not describe 'a constant Christian experience.' But I ask, Does it describe the experience of one convicted of sin, who is looking to Christ for salvation? Not a single verse in these chapters will apply to 'the children of wrath,' or to the Jews who are not in 'union with Christ.' There is no hint of the death (or abolition) of the law, but of *individuals* who, dying to sin, are 'redeemed from the curse of the law' that they may be united to Christ.

He made a just distinction between 'carnal' as applied to sinful man, in Romans, and as applied to a positive law, in Hebrews, and then logically proceeded to apply the sense of the 'carnal commandment' of Hebrews to Romans! 'Carnal,' in Rom. vii. and viii., is a state of sin, of enmity against God and opposition to his law. There can be no higher or stronger sense of *carnal* than that of enmity to God-sold under sin; but this is placed in opposition to the *spiritual law* of Rom. vii. And *spiritual* can be used in no higher sense than as the opposite of sin, or of enmity against God. Eld. Vogel persistently confounds things essentially distinct. I will speak of this subject again.

He affirms that Rom. iii. 10-19 refers only to the Jews, and cites to the O. T. quotations as proof. We will look at one of them: 'God looked down from heaven upon the children of man, to see if there were any that did understand, that did seek God. Every one of them is gone back; they are altogether become filthy; there is none that doeth good, no, not one.' If Eld. V. cannot see that this applies to 'all the world' he might yet submit to Paul who so makes the application. In chap. ii. Paul has been speaking directly of Jews and Gentiles, and then asks, 'What advantage then hath the Jew?' over the Gentile, of course. He has still both classes before his mind. 'What then? are we [Jews] better than they [Gentiles]? No, in no wise, for we have before proved *both Jews and Gentiles* that they are all under sin, as it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one,' etc. I rest this with the reader. It is most remarkable with what ease Eld. V. can find proof, in his favor, in the merest inference, but none at all in a plain declaration against him.

He cites the case of a will, to prove that an abolished law may be in force as regards that will,-which is not, however, the correct way of stating it-and then says that that proves that pardon

and abolition of law go together! Can he be so obtuse as to think that is so? Let him show a case of prosecution and conviction under an abolished law, and he

will then have approached the point. If his eyes shall ever be opened to see the difference between *moral* and *circumstantial* duties, he will understand the difference between *crime* and the distribution of property!

There is not the least evidence that either Jacob or Jonah thought of getting 'beyond the jurisdiction of God.' But look at his position in that light. Jacob was one of the very few on earth who had preserved the knowledge of the true God; and the world did not improve in piety from his time to that of Moses. Eld. V. said the law was given in 'a tangible form' 'that they might see sin where before they did not.' And this was essential to be done, in the condition of the race. But the gospel swept away all that means of instruction in moral obligation, and restored men to their former 'liberty,' without a 'direct enforcement' of even the law against murder! leaving men under 'principles' by which they had never yet known God or their duty to him. What a gospel!

The letter of the Jews to Voltaire says their 'government' was both civil and religious, and Eld. V. says this proves that they considered the ten commandments a political instrument. It proves no such thing. He complains that I make him say the law was *only* political, whereas, he said it was *mainly* political. He said 'it was political,' 'a secular compact,' and argued on these statements without qualification. If he is not always consistent with himself, it is not my fault. I took the basis of his argument as the ground of my assertion, and he has no right to complain.

He says, 'Eld. W. is constrained to admit that the old covenant is abolished.' Well, that is cool! Will not Eld. Vogel next say that the power of his logic has driven me to acknowledge that we are in the Christian dispensation, and claim it as a victory? I charge directly that such things can only be said 'for effect.'

He denies the relation of covenants as presented by me, that is, that the first covenant (agreement) of Ex. xix. was based on the covenant (law) given in Ex. xx. I gave 2. Kin. xxiii: 3 as an illustration. This he denies, and says the people alone could not make a covenant with God—they only made 'a vow' to keep the covenant. I gave the verse in full—the king '*made a covenant* before the Lord,' 'to perform the words of the covenant that were written in this book.' It is easy to see *his object* in thus directly contradicting this text, but how he *dares* to do it is not so easy understood. It proves his saying that 'an ingenious [?] opponent can say *something* contrary to its obvious sense.'

He says Deut. v: 5 cannot refer to Ex. xix. It reads, '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.' But it is true that in Ex. xix. Moses took the word of God down to the people, and returned the word of the people to the Lord; verses 5-8. And it is true that by reason of the manifestation of God's glory on the mount 'all the people that were in the camp trembled.' Ex. xix: 16, etc. These are the very things to which Deut. v: 5 does refer.

Eld. V. would do well to inform his readers how much of the word of inspiration may be safely thrown aside as a 'poetic outburst.' That which David said was commanded to a thousand generations (and to Abraham) was confirmed to Jacob and to Israel *for a law*, and an everlasting covenant. Christ and the apostles recognized the inspiration of David's 'poetic outbursts.' Is Eld. V.

greater than they? There is no parallel between 'a thousand generations' and 'your generations.' *Everlasting* and *forever*, may be so limited as to be less than one generation. See Ex. xxi: 6.

Matt, xix: 21 does not prove that the first covenant failed of its object 'when fully kept,' for it never was fully kept. It was designed to develop a *holy* people (Ex. xix: 5-8), but it failed, for they did not keep it. The Savior quoted a *part* of the decalogue to the young man, that which *hangs on* the duty of love to our neighbor, Matt, xxii: 34-40, and thus *proved* that the young man was selfish and covetous. His testimony in his own favor is not decisive, for it is not unusual to see 'a young man' vain-glorious and self-conceited.

James' 'law of liberty' says 'thou shalt not kill,' But Eld. Vogel says this law is not 'directly' or 'tangibly enforced' in the N. T.! Therefore James' law is not that of Eld. V. James tells us some of the things that his 'law of liberty' says; but Eld. V. cannot tell what his law says because

100

it is 'intangible.' Nay, such a law cannot say anything.

His remark on Rom. iii: 31 was not misunderstood. He did refer it to 'the whole Mosaic code with especial reference,' etc.

To make plausible his absurd statement that the constitution of the new dispensation is the messiahship of Jesus, he quotes the *figurative expression*, 'On this rock will I build my church.' This may be good proof to one who teaches things 'intangible.'

I did not ridicule his crude notions of law and character, only as they appear ridiculous in a fair presentation. My illustrations hold good, and his *emphasis* does not change the nature of his expression. It amounts to this: A certain thing tested by a stick is straight *as to that stick*, though the stick itself be crooked! What kind of straightness has it? Or, a certain angle, because it agrees with an obtuse angle, is a right angle *as to that obtuse angle*! But what is the form of such a right angle? Perhaps he *cannot* see anything *crude* in such a position as this-it is not for me to measure his capacity.

His comment on my view of Rev. xi: 19 is certainly unworthy of any man professing the least degree of candor, I said, and proved by Heb. viii: 1-5, etc., that the temple of the tabernacle of testimony in heaven is the antitype of the Jewish sanctuary; and he says my argument would *transfer* the Jewish temple to heaven! He might as well assert that my saying that Christ is a priest in heaven would *transfer* the Levitical priesthood to heaven. I made a clear distinction between the type and antitype; why does he try to cover it up? There is just as clear a distinction between the church and the sanctuary, as there was between the children of Israel and the sanctuary. His reference to 'the veil' within which Christ 'is entered' does not show that there is but one of 'the holies' in heaven, for Heb. ix: 3 speaks of 'the second veil.' The *second* proves a *first*; therefore there are *two*. In Rev. xvi: 17-21, the 'great voice out of the temple of heaven from the throne,' is followed by thunders, lightnings, earthquake, and hail-storm *on the earth*; and so in chap. xi: 19. He has better shown ability to caricature the Revelations than to expound it. He also says I err in applying the 'heavenly things' of Heb. viii: 5 to a *place* rather than to a *condition*. But verse 5 is the

complement of verses 1, 2, which, corrected to suit his theory would read, 'We have such an High Priest who is set on the right hand of the throne of the majesty in' *the condition!* It is not *in that condition* but *in that place* that he is 'a minister of the *sanctuary*, and the *true tabernacle* which the Lord pitched and not man,' and of which (sanctuary) that pitched by man was a type.

Ex. xxiv: 12 is an important proof text, and I know not how to characterize his course on this except to call it an evasion. When I quoted it literally, according to the original-'the law'-he said:

'I said that I knew of no text which calls the ten commandments the law *simply*. (Please note this little word when you quote me again, Bro. W.)'

Did he require that the word simply should be in the text which calls the ten commandments *the* law? That would be a miserable cavil. Or, did he use the word in the sense of *solely*, as calling them, and them only, the law? If so, Ex. xxiv: 12 does exactly that thing, *and he cannot deny it*. Or, was this word simply thrown in to help to evade the conclusion when the text was produced? In either case it was a very *simple* thing. Beside his learned [!] reference to the Hebrew on this text he tries to evade its force by reference to the English grammar. Behold his parallel-'The man who is upright.' I trust our readers are not so easily deceived as to take this as an illustration in point. Eld. Vogel knows there is no classification in Ex. xxiv: 12. Were the ten commandments one of a class of laws written on tables of stone? No. A qualifying sentence which can refer to only one individual, as is the case in this text, does not weaken the specifying power of the article. The ten commandments are *the only law* that ever had the honor of being spoken and written by Jehovah, and he who detracts from the holiness, the justice, and the authority of that sacred law cannot fail to bring confusion upon his own head.

All readers of the Bible know that Moses was required to make a copy in a book of all the laws given through him. All the ceremonial laws and types of Christ were therein written. But the argument of Eld. V. was this: The ten commandments were the only law that God ever wrote; therefore they alone are the 'hand-writing' and to them Paul refers when he says that the hand writing

101

was 'blotted out.' That being so, the ten commandments *only* were nailed to the cross! The laws written by Moses in a book were typical, and being so, must be nailed to the cross of Christ-the antitype. (Not, however, nailed to the day of pentecost, as Eld. V. would have it!)

And I will leave it to the reader if 'blotting out' is not a figure more suitably applied to that which Moses wrote in a book, than to that which God wrote on tables of stone. And whether 'nailing to his cross,' and 'taking out of the way,' are not more fitly referred to types of the cross and to positive institutions, than to such precepts as these, 'Thou shalt not kill-Thou shalt not commit adultery-Thou shalt not steal.' For whose benefit or in what interest were these 'taken out of the way?' In whose way did these precepts stand? or what class of men would rejoice to be assured that these were 'blotted out,' and left on no 'tangible' footing of 'direct enforcement? Eld. V. re-iterates this position in his last article, saying that not the sabbath alone 'was against us and contrary to us. This we

have seen to be true of the entire decalogue.' Is it possible that the 'entire decalogue' if 'directly enforced' even in the most 'positive manner,' would be 'against' Eld. Vogel, and 'contrary to' him? Is he willing to admit that the precepts 'Thou shalt not kill-Thou shalt not commit adultery,' would be *in his way* if they were yet of 'direct enforcement?' Are they 'contrary' to him, and to the 'liberty' which he desires? Or if he would not admit the conclusion of his argument as applied to himself, I ask again, out of *whose way* were they taken? In what interest were they abolished? This antinomian heresy is nothing new. It has been deprecated by the thoughtfully pious of all ages. And happy will it be for the world if the advocates of such a theory never fall altogether to the level of their own teachings.

He plays upon the words 'as given to Israel,' and 'positive enactment,' as if they changed the nature of the precepts of Jehovah. He knows that he cannot justly apply these words to the ten commandments in the sense of *mere positive laws*, but only in the sense of *expressly revealed laws*. They do not effect the question of *their morality* at all. It is no credit either to himself or to his position that he persistently harps on *the conclusion* when he has been once compelled to renounce *the premise*.

After a long delay the closing part of Eld. Vogel's article reached me as I had written this. I care to notice only a few points on the Hebrew; barely sufficient to submit the question.

(1.) I have not denied that the predicate *may* take the article, and sometimes does, as exceptions exist to the best accredited rules; but that it *necessarily* or *usually* does I deny, and point to the uniformity of use in the instances given, to sustain me. As to whether Winer is comparable to Gesenius I say nothing, as it is not a question of argument. But of the facts presented I know.

(2.) I yield nothing on Ex. xvi: 23. I laid no claim on the use of the preposition only because I knew it was no sufficient ground; and he has now conceded that point. He admits that the preposition is used in its possessive sense when the first noun is indefinite. Then, of course, that use does not prove the first noun to be definite, as he claimed; that must be determined by other means. My wonder was that he so confidently made such a claim in the face of this fact. Yet he seems determined to show his inconsistency by again quoting that it 'may be substituted for the construct relation,' not seeming to understand that it is *only in its possessive sense*, not affecting the question of its definiteness. He cannot possibly avoid the dilemma in which I placed him by comparing Ex. xvi: 25 and xx: 10. But he says 'the contextual connection' alters the case! And so after all it is *the context* and not the use of the preposition that makes it definite, is it? This is the first of my knowing that a noun may be proved to be 'definite by construction,' *by the context*, when it cannot be done by the construction of the sentence! He has given no just reason why Ex. xx: 10 is definite-the true reason he denies.

(3.) My criticism on Ex. xxiv: 12 he sets aside by simply reasserting his position, and appealing to the learned for its justness. This is perhaps next to the best thing he could do in the case. The best would be to frankly confess his errors. If he really thinks his position is just, then I 'reassert my position,' that it is

because he knows nothing of Hebrew accents. And yet I query thus: it seems that he must know enough of Hebrew to be aware of the error of his statement when the facts are pointed out, even if he knew nothing of those facts before. I *feared* from the first that he was not so ignorant

102

as his position would indicate, but I was willing to put the mildest possible construction on his case. There are those who will have an interest to put it into the hands of 'the learned' for decision, and if Eld. Vogel is willing to risk a reassertion of his position before them I am satisfied. I cheerfully submit it, I might point out other errors in his last, but I take leave of the Hebrew unless he opens it himself.

When I consented to hold this discussion I stipulated for the privilege of ten articles on this proposition, promising, however, to confine it to eight, if possible. I have matter prepared for others; but I could not present all my proofs even with many more, and I let other considerations prevail, and thus abruptly close. The unusual length of Eld. Vogel's last suggested this method of closing, by lengthening this, reserving a summary till the final close. I think I may safely say that proofs beyond controversy have been presented, that *the moral law* is yet of force-yet the means of condemning sin. I pray that all of our readers may weigh the evidences with that candor and reverence that is due to such an important subject.

ELDER PETER VOGEL'S EIGHTH NEGATIVE

We have now seen all that Eld. W. has opportunity to offer on this proposition. Though I still have much negative matter on hands, the rules of discussion preclude my presenting anything further. I proceed, therefore, to review the last affirmative, and to present a brief summary.

And first I wish to protest against Eld. W.'s summing up this proposition at the close of the next. The final words on this question belong to me. The first two propositions were so related that his being on the negative of the second gave him opportunity to really close both; and he will also rightfully have the last word on the next proposition. I claim the privilege of at least closing this one; nor shall he deprive me of this right. It usually requires more space to answer an argument than to make it, and yet I have occupied less space than he. On the first two propositions we are about even, he having 40 lines more than I. His first six affirmatives of this proposition contain between 75 and 80 lines more than my replies, and the prints will show that my seventh article is but little longer than his, while his last contains about one-fifth more matter than it should. I do not say this complainingly; I only wish to show that he, rather than I, has the advantage in point of length. I shall not drag this proposition into the next, but shall claim the right to review his summary, in the event that he carries out his expressed intention.

In Ro. vii. and the last half of ch. vi., Paul has special reference to Jews and their relation to the law. This 'every reader knows' who attends to such expressions as, 'Ye are not under the law, but under grace'-'ye are become dead

to the law'-'delivered from the law'-'married to another.' I did not say that anyone was 'joined to Christ by his crucifixion,' but that by this all who were 'under the law'-all Jews, whether converted to Christianity or still 'children of wrath'-were 'delivered from the law.' This removes every difficulty presented. My analysis of Ro. vii., showing that it does not describe *conversion*, but Paul's *perversion* or the struggle in committing his *first* sin, is unassailed and unassailable.

A careful examination of my argument will show that my 'just distinction' with reference to the use of 'carnal' was also justly used.

A reference to Ps. xiv. and liii. will show that the quotation of Ro. iii: 10-19 refers only to the Jews, or, as Paul says, 'to them that are under the law.' 'What advantage then (*oun*, therefore, in view of the *preceding* considerations) hath the Jew' over the Gentile (Ro. iii: 1)? explains itself, and does not give Eld. W. any aid on what *follows*.

A distinction 'between moral and circumstantial duties' will not set aside the principle illustrated by the Reading will case, since I have proved (3rd Aff., 2nd Prop.) from Lev. xix: 35-37; Deut. xxviii; Gal. iii: 19, and Ro. v: 20, that moral principles were given, in the law, to the Jews as if they were not moral,

103

but positive, or, if my brother prefers the word, as 'circumstantial duties.'

I fail to see that Eld. W. has extricated Jacob and Jonah from the condition in which I showed them to be. Nor have his notes of exclamation any potency to prove that a given kind of government is unsuited to the present manhood of our race simply because it was not adapted to the Patriarchal infancy and to the Jewish childhood, when 'the Holy Spirit was not yet given' (John vii: 39) to guide and teach men (1 John ii: 27). As well say because a man from a dark mine cannot at once bear the full light of the sun, or a lame man walk without crutches, that therefore they never can.

For his special benefit I must recommend to my brother's re-perusal the quotation from Jews' Letters to Voltaire, and request him also to re-consider whether I was not always consistent with myself. I might add, in his own courteous style, 'He knew it,' but I will spare him the pain, and simply ask, What has he done with my arguments on this point? Where is his reply?

Behold, too, how he strains my statement that he 'is constrained to admit that the old covenant is abolished!' Could I have referred to my 'logic,' when I had not yet written a line on the topic? Or, has he forgotten the position which at least some of his brethren used to occupy? Verily, somebody is talking 'for effect.'

As proof that the ten commandments are not the first or old covenant, the word *concerning*, in Ex. xxiv: 8, was caused to be printed in italics; but now, having so completely turned it against him that he has not a word in reply, his position is still the same! I gave *reasons* why the word 'covenant' in 2 Kings xxiii: 3 is used in the sense of 'vow,' but to this we have no reply, save a re-quotation of the passage. Wonderful proof!

When I said that Deut. v: 5 cannot refer to Ex. xix., I of course referred to verses 2 and 3, in reply to his statement that 'the parenthetical words of verse 5 refer to verses 2, 3, the *covenant made with Israel*, but *not* to verse 4 and onward, for the *covenant commanded* was given by God himself without the

agency of Moses.' He now abandons this and quotes from Ex. xix., 16, etc., saying, 'These are the very things to which Deut. v., 5 does refer!' This not only amounts to the same as my reference to Ex. xx., 19, but is a *turning over to my position*, since 'verse 4 and onward' pertains, he says, to 'the covenant commanded.' We are making fine progress. 'He which persecuted us in times past now preacheth the faith which he once destroyed.'

I recognize the Bible as inspired; but to construe a figurative expression literally, or interpret statements of prose so as to swell them up to the fervor of poetic diction severely rendered, is neither Scripture nor inspiration. 1 Chron. xvi. is poetry in Hebrew: ver. 8-22 contain the first 15 verses of Ps. cv.; and ver. 22-33, the whole of the 96th Psalm, with some slight variations. Let the reader also examine the use of 'thousand' in the following passages: Job xxxiii., 23; Ps. xci., 7; Is. xxx., 17. I question whether 'everlasting, and forever, may be so limited as to be less than one generation.' At least Ex. xxi., 6 is very doubtful; it enslaves not only a man for a life time, but also all the generations which issue from him. But did my brother think of what he now says, when he quoted Ps. cxix., 142 as applying to the ten commandments, and argued that 'everlasting' excludes all 'limitation?' In his own style, 'What a difference it makes when a fact is for or against him!'

Matt. xix., 21 does prove the ten commandments imperfect. When the young man said, 'All these things have I kept from my youth up,' the Savior, 'who knew what was in man,' 'beholding him, loved him.' It was not 'covetousness,' according to the law, to have and desire to retain 'large possessions.'

James does *not* call the ten commandments 'the law of liberty,' for the latter is 'perfect' (ch. i., 25), whereas, the former, as we have seen, is not. Nor does he assert anything contrary to this in ch. ii.; verse 12 is a continuation of the theme discussed up to verse 10, the intervening verse being but an illustration, which might have been drawn from any source, sacred or secular.

Figures of speech intelligently used have *real* meanings. And 'build,' in the declaration, 'On this rock will I build my church,' cannot be deprived of the sense of resting or depending on, as on a foundation. Hence we do here find the constitution of the Christian Church.

Any position can be made to appear absurd by a licentious use of illustrations. The 'crooked stick,' and 'obtuse angle,' as applied to my 'notions of law and character,' are wholly inappropriate. Compare the law to a Flemish ell (27 inches)

104

and the gospel to a French ell (54 inches) and my position is fairly represented. Suppose seven ells to be perfection under either dispensation; is Jewish perfection then equal to that of the gospel?

Eld. W. failed to grasp my point respecting those passages in Revelations. He argued that the ten commandments are literally meant, in Rev. xi., 19, by 'the ark of his *testament*;' I replied, no more literally than 'the temple of God' denotes the Jewish temple.

It is true that there were two veils in the tabernacle or temple, but one of these (the second) was pre-eminently '*the veil*;' comp. Matt. xxvii., 51, and parallel

passages; and within this veil Jesus entered (Heb. vi., 19). This follows, further, from the fact developed that the first of the holies has its antitype *on earth*, in the Church of Christ. Nor is there anything militating against this in Heb. viii. 'The heavens' of verse 1, and 'heavenly,' of verse 5, are not equivalents; they are from different words in the original; the first is designative of place, the other not; the latter word occurs in such passages as Eph. i., 3; ii., 6, '-*hath* made us [the members of the *Church*] sit together in *heavenly places*.' Even the same word has often different meanings in the same sentence.

Ex. xxiv., 12, that 'important proof-text,' is up again. How simply my brother acts over 'simply.' I said, "I know of no instance where the ten commandments alone are called 'the law,' simply." Can there be any doubt as to my meaning? Did I not say in the same paragraph that "the expression 'the law,' when referring to the old dispensation, *and not qualified to the contrary*, * * * always refers to the entire body of the law as a whole, or to single commandments as part of the whole?" Is not 'law' qualified, in Ex. xxiv., 12, by 'what I have written?' This qualification makes it definite, and it may and does take the article on that account. I quote Kerl again; "Definite, as being made so by some accompanying descriptive words; (as) 'the *blue-eyed* damsel;' 'the winds *of Autumn*;' 'the man *who is upright*.' " Are not 'which I have written' 'descriptive words?' There is a contrast (implied) between that written by God and that not written by Him, as there is one between an upright man and one not upright, and between Autumnal winds and winds not Autumnal. With a rule so directly to the point I covet the reader's verdict.

The 'handwriting' of Col. ii., 14 can only mean the ten commandments, for (1) nowhere in all the Bible is the rest of the law ever called a handwriting, whereas, the hand which wrote it is a common descriptive of the decalogue. (2) Let the reader consult the connection, observing that 'his cross' reads 'the cross' in the Greek, and he will find himself unable to make any fair disposition of it other than I have made. (3) So far from retaining the rest of the law this is the grandest stroke for its abolition, since with the removing of the foundation the house must fall. I have also shown that the Greek for 'blotting out' is opposed to 'recording,' and may apply with the fullest appropriateness as I have applied it.

I am asked for whose benefit were such precepts as forbid killing, stealing, and adultery, taken away? in whose way were they? accompanied with some unworthy insinuations concerning myself. To me such proceeding seems highly culpable; for no one knows better than my opponent that I claim no abolition in the sense he attributes to me. Have I not repeated again and again that I cling to every iota of morality contained in the law? Did I not prove that the ten commandments were given to the Jews as if merely positive commandments, and that *only to this extent were they abolished*? That they were given to them in large measure as a political constitution, and that as such they were abrogated? It may be true that in after ages the Jews saw that a moral basis underlay nearly all of them-and some of their leaders may even have so spoken of them-yet this neither alters the fact of their having been given as if only positive, nor that to this extent their abolition was a necessity; it only increases the need of abrogation. Is

not such a view of the case more than implied in my third affirmative of the second proposition?

I do not, then, wish to change 'the *nature* of the precepts of Jehovah,' but only to remove them from the unnatural position in which God was compelled, for a time, to place them by reason of man's incapacity. Nor have I 'renounced the premise,' but merely admitted that one supposed way of showing its existence has no bearing on the question. Had I even renounced the premise my good brother would have given it to me again in his change of base respecting the reference of Deut. v., 5 to Ex. xix. How kind!

105

I will requite this good deed by allowing him the coveted last word on the Hebrew, knowing that what I have already said on the matters involved is all-sufficient, and hasten to the more necessary work of

A BRIEF SUMMARY

I. Elder W. sought to maintain his affirmation under the three following divisions:

1. "That the Lord claims *a day* in this dispensation." Rev. i., 10.

Here we are happily agreed. But insofar as he tried to identify this day with the sabbath by making Jesus Lord of it in a higher sense than man is, I so fully met him that he had no reply (1st Neg). I also pledged myself to identify this day with the first day of the week, on the next proposition.

2. "That the sabbath is recognized and familiarly spoken of in the New Testament, without such explanations as would be necessary to guard against misapprehension if it were abolished."

To this I replied [1] That all the mentioned instances of observing the sabbath would be expected on the supposition of its abolition; and [2] That the explanation is given that these things were done to conciliate Jewish prejudice. See Acts xxi., 20-25; 1 Cor. ix., 20. [3] Circumcision, animal sacrifices, the annual sabbaths, etc., all of which are confessedly abolished, were attended to by Christians as well as the weekly sabbaths. [4] The sabbath is expressly said to be abolished (Col. ii., 16-17); and [5] The Gentiles are in particular forbidden to observe all Jewish days [Gal. iv., 10-11].

3. "That the law of which the Sabbath commandment is a part, was not abolished, but is now binding on all mankind."

To this I opposed its exact counterpart, viz., that Christ 'abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of *the* commandments, in [their] ordinances.' Eph. ii., 15.-Here the discussion virtually ended. Nevertheless every step in the development of his argument was patiently met, and refuted to my entire satisfaction, and I trust also to that of all unprejudiced readers. And here I must add

THE VERDICT OF ELD. W.'S OWN BRETHERN

These articles appear simultaneously in the *Gospel Echo and Christian*, my paper, and the *Advent Review*, Eld. W.'s paper, and of which he is one of the editors. Concerning the conduct of these papers he wrote to me in a letter, dated June 5, 1872, as follows: "I would ask that the editors and correspondents of both papers shall not interfere, but leave the points broached by us entirely to us during the discussion." The *Christian* has strictly observed this just request, referring all querists to the discussion, while the *Review* has not only seldom issued a number without at least one article touching the propositions between us, and sometimes two or three, but has, in violation of the agreement, even taken hold of the very points in hand. The issue of April 8, 1873, for example, has an article on "The Vail of the Sanctuary," by the resident editor, and one on 2 Cor. iii., by one of its most prominent correspondents-both being "points broached by us." And in this week's issue, April 15, 1873, the same correspondent takes up my various references to Galatians, with a promise to consider also Heb. viii. I have a right to speak of these matters here because these articles appeared since my 7th Negative was sent to the printers. What does this mean? Were Eld. W.'s brethren satisfied with his effort, and conscious of victory, would they act thus? Not only this procedure, but also the fact that different views from Eld. W.'s are taken on a number of passages, declare unmistakably what this means. It is a verdict in my favor.

II. The ten commandments together with the rest of the Mosaic laws form but one law, and this law is abolished.

1. The same names are indifferently applied to either portion, both being called 'the law of the Lord' and 'the law of Moses.' See 2nd Neg. To this there was no reply.

2. The unity of the law was shown to be either implied or asserted in Gal. v., 3; John vii., 23; Mal. iv., 4; [see 3rd Neg.] and Heb. x., 28; 1 Kings ii., 3 [4th Neg.].

3. That the law was so abolished as to leave only its moral principles, I showed in my 2nd Neg. from Heb. xii., 27-28; Gal. iii., 19; iii., 24-25; in the 5th Neg. from Gal. iii., 13; 1 Cor. ix., 20; and in the 6th Neg. from Ro. vi., 14; and ch. vii.

The sabbath being wholly a positive institution, whether originated at the giving of the law or pre-existent, was on that account abolished with such other positive institutions as pre-existent circumcision

106

and the co-etaneous annual sabbaths.

III. I next made my argument more specific by singling out the ten commandments. I showed that they stood to the Jews in such a special relation as is inconsistent with the genius of the present dispensation; that they were abolished as to this particular relation, and that this abolition involved the total destruction of the sabbath. See end of 4th and beginning of the 5th Neg.

Let me name four points:

1. The ten commandments as given to the Jews are pronounced imperfect by the Savior in Matt. xix., 21 and Mark x., 21 [see 5th Neg.]. When they are called perfect the term is used only in an inferior sense; see 4th Neg.

2. The 'first' or 'old' covenant is conceded to be abolished; and that the ten commandments are this covenant I showed from Ex. xxiv., 8 [6th Neg.] and Heb. viii. [7th Neg.]; to which I might add my brother's concession on the reference of Deut. v., 5.

3. I showed that the ten commandments are expressly called the covenant which the Lord made with the children of Israel when He took them by the hand and led them out of Egypt [1 Kings viii. 9, 21], and that the covenant so described is done away [Jer. xxxi., 31-34; Heb. viii., 6-13]. [See 4th Neg.] To this no reply was attempted.

4. According to Eld. W. Matt, v., 17 refers exclusively to the decalogue. To his argument thence derived I replied by showing that it teaches abolition in the strongest terms [3rd Neg.]. And so complete was my success that he attempted no rejoinder.

IV. At the close of my first Negative I made *nine* arguments in proof of the sabbath's being a *positive* institution, and I added *two more* in the paragraph marked I. at the end of the 7th Neg. To none of these has a reply been made, though Eld. W. is aware that this is fatal to his position. For 1. The abolition of the law consists in abolishing only that and all that which is positive; and 2. It requires express legislation to transfer a positive institution from one dispensation to another, and there is no such legislation respecting the sabbath under this dispensation.

V. Narrowing the compass of the discussion still more, I produced arguments wherein the sabbath is expressly named as abolished, three of which will suffice for this summary:

1. In Col. ii., 16-17 the sabbath is expressly named as abolished: "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holy day [*heortee*, the Jewish festivals, including the yearly *sabbaths*, Lev. xxiii.], or of the new moon, or of the sabbaths; which are a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ."

2. I argued from the fact that building fire in their dwellings on ordinary occasions was prohibited, that the Sabbath bears the unmistakable impress of a local and temporary institution. Here I was somewhat disappointed by Eld. W.'s silence; for I was anxious to expose the only answer ever made.

3. Mark testifies that the sabbath belongs to the class of things that were 'made' [ch. ii., 27], and Paul declares, in Heb. xii., 27, that the 'things that are *made*' are '*removed*.' To this also we have had no reply, and, no doubt, for the obvious reason that none is possible.

FOURTH PROPOSITION:

"DO THE SCRIPTURES TEACH THAT THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK IS TO BE SACREDLY OBSERVED BY CHRISTIANS?"-Vogel affirms.

ELDER PETER VOGEL'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

The former propositions related to the sabbath, the seventh day of the week, this concerns the first. I have shown, at least to my own satisfaction, that the

sabbath is abolished; and I am now to prove that the first day of the week has claims upon us, in a religious way, different from and high above that of other days. And this simple matter of fact is to be determined by Biblical evidence.

I do not claim that the first day is to be sacredly kept in virtue of the fourth commandment of the decalogue, nor that there is a 'change' of the seventh into the first, but that we have a new day and for a new reason.

Nor am I to occupy myself with inquiries whether the first day of the week is binding upon worldlings, but simply whether Christians-those who accept Christ in a practical way, as by faith and obedience-are to keep this day.

Here I wish to adopt my brother's language: "It will be well to consider what is the nature of the evidence required to sustain the proposition. For as all have, to some extent, already formed opinions on the subject, some may be satisfied with less proof than ought by right to be given, while others *may ask more and of a different kind*, than the circumstances justly demand."

In my first paper on this discussion I gave 'five different ways of ascertaining Bible teaching, and have shown that any one of these, excepting an 'inference less than probable' is of sufficient force to form a basis for faith and action. If, therefore, I could only produce a 'probable inference,' the present proposition would be affirmatively answered. And if I should rise higher in the scale of proof-as I confidently expect to do-my position will be overwhelmingly strong.

The weight of proof to be given will be greatly enhanced when we consider what the circumstances 'justly demand'. No dispensations could differ more widely than do the Mosaic and the Christian. They are contradistinguished by such terms as 'law' and 'grace' [Ro. vi., 14], 'letter' and 'spirit' [Ro. vii., 6; 2 Cor. iii., 6], 'bondage' and 'liberty' [Gal. v., 1]. The Old Dispensation is called 'letter' because every requirement and prohibition was written out in letters, i e. fully expressed; the New is called 'spirit' because the spirit or principles which might be framed into express laws are as much as possible given to us without an encasing letter. In other words, God has disclosed to us certain general principles to which we are to refer our actions to know whether they will be approved or disapproved. I should like to develop this subject at length, but, on account of limited space, will content myself with the brief unfoldings already made under former propositions. I must, however, assure my brother that this is not 'innerlightism, which he rightfully abhors, but heaven-ordained New Testamentism.

This being the nature of the Christian Dispensation, we rightfully expect that even such cases as cannot be reached by general principles, but where more specific legislation is needed-as in positive institutions-there is as little of the legalistic style as possible. Take, for example, the Lord's Supper. So far as the *existence* of the institution is concerned we have express statements; but so far as the *frequency* of its observance is concerned we are wholly left to inference-to approved precedent. Yet, not only has the church for centuries confidently interpreted these precedents to be of *weekly* obligation, but I hazard nothing in

saying that nearly all of the most eminent Bible students area unit on this question. Let me quote some of them:

"At least every Lord's day."-Wm. King, Archbishop of Dublin.

"Constantly administered every Lord's day."-Dr. Scott.

"The Lord's Supper was observed by the first Christians every Lord's day, *nor will this be denied by any man who has candidly investigated the subject.* * * * * Weekly communion did not die with the apostles and their contemporaries."-Dr. Mason.

"It is well known that the primitive Christians administered the Eucharist every Lord's day."-Doddridge.

"In the primitive times it was the custom of many churches to receive the Lord's Supper every Lord's day."-Matthew Henry.

"It is well known [that the Lord's Supper] was observed by the primitive churches every Lord's day."-Dr. J. M. Cramp, Pres. Arcadia College.

"Every first day of the week."-Alexander Carson.

I might swell this list by such names as Adam Clark, John Wesley and John Calvin. The interested reader may see the subject fully discussed, and the foregoing quotations at length, in *The Christian System*, by A. Campbell, published by Bosworth, Chase & Hall, of Cincinnati, Ohio.

As with the Lord's Supper, so with the Lord's day. As an institution it has express recognition, but as to the frequency of observing it-whether annually, monthly, or weekly, and on what day of the week-we have inference and approved precedent.

There is another reason besides that of the genius of the Christian Dispensation for finding the frequency of observing these institutions left to precedent and inference rather than precept. That portion of the New Testament-Acts and the Epistles-which appertains more especially to the New Dispensation is of such a cast as to make this course normal. Acts is rather a history of what people did, under apostolic guidance, than a digest of what they were to do, and the Epistles more a correction of errors and abuses than books of precept.

With these preliminaries I proceed more directly to the work before me. I shall attempt to prove

I. That prophecy predicts a sacred day for this Dispensation.

II. That the New Testament Scriptures speak of and recognize such a day as actually existing.

III. That this day is a new institution, peculiar to the Christian Dispensation.

IV. That this day recurs weekly, and upon the first day of the week.

V. That the first day of the week is peculiarly appropriate and the fittest of the seven for this purpose.

I will at once proceed to show.

I. That prophecy predicts a sacred day in this Dispensation.

Under the second proposition I have shown Is. lvi., 1-8 to be applicable to and spoken of the New Dispensation. It speaks of a 'sabbath' in this Dispensation for the keeping of which there shall be a blessing upon the people. "For thus saith the Lord unto the eunuchs that keep my *sabbaths*, and choose the things that please me, and take hold of my covenant; even unto them will I give in mine house and within my walls a place and a name better than that of sons and of daughters; I will give them an everlasting name, that shall not be cut off. Also the

sons of the stranger, that join themselves to the Lord, to be his servants, every one that *keepeth the sabbath* from polluting it, and taketh hold of my covenant; even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in mine house of prayer: their burnt-offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted upon mine altar: for mine house shall be called an house of prayer for all people." Verses 4-7.

We have seen that the sabbath is abolished, hence we know that this prophecy is not to be construed in its most literal sense, and yet, of course, as nearly literal as possible. Were it not for the fact that we know from other Scriptures that there are now no more 'burnt-offerings' 'sacrifices' and 'altars,' we would confidently expect them from this prediction. Clearly, then, by 'burnt-offerings,' 'sacrifices' and 'altar' the prophet meant to describe that in the New Dispensation which sustains to it a similar relation that these things did to the Old. The resemblance between the thing named and the thing signified is somewhat like the likeness in our Savior's parables. It is an illustrative use of words-the unknown being introduced and described by means of the known. In many instances this is a necessary license; for if this course were

109

not admissible, many things concerning the New Dispensation the prophets could not have foretold without giving a full exposition of it. So vivid and impressive is such a figure of speech that we use it in the language of common intercourse. On visiting a foreign nation, for example, and seeing them celebrate their national anniversary, it would be quite within the bounds of propriety to write to our friends at home, saying, 'To-day is this people's Fourth of July,' though that day fell on the bleakest end of December. Their anniversary and ours may differ in as many respects as the first day and the sabbath, yet this would not forbid the use of the figure which clothes the one in the drapery of the other. Indeed, without a difference a figure would be impossible. So in prose it is a pregnant metaphor to call the 'Lord's day' sabbath, as when Christ called Herod a fox; and in poetry it is the beautiful language of passion.

II. The New Testament Scriptures recognize the existence of a sacred day in this Dispensation.

1. That there is a day set apart for religious exercises seems at least a probable inference from Heb. x., 25, where Paul insists on 'not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is.' This recognizes a set day for gathering together in order to worship; for without such a day one member could not know when the others meet; nor could he be accused of neglect for not meeting with them. But whether this day is Divinely appointed, or only of human selection, is not so clear; yet the probability seems to me greatly to preponderate in favor of Divine appointment, since without such instruction on this point man's proneness to neglect stated public worship would often work to his spiritual detriment; especially would this be the case with 'babes' in Christ. Nor would neglect be deserving of such severe rebuke were the appointment merely human.

2. The two following passages are more decisive:

(1.) "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." Acts xx., 7.

(2.) "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him." 1 Cor. xvi., 2.

Under another head I shall look more narrowly into the teachings of these passages. For the present I only call attention to the fact that here are two stated acts of worship performed on a given day, making the day sacred to these acts.

3. The fact that there is a sacred day in this Dispensation is placed beyond all reasonable controversy by the apostle John. He says, 'I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day.' Rev. i., 10. Clear as this passage is in asserting that a day in this Dispensation belongs to the Lord in an especial sense, there are those who would force another construction upon it; namely, that the Lord's day denotes (1) The Gospel Dispensation, or (2) The Day of Judgment. But neither of these positions can be true. The first would make John seriously tell his cotemporaries that the vision which he had on Patmos took place in the Christian Dispensation, when everyone knew that it could not possibly have been at any other time! Equally incongruous would be the second, for it would date the Seven Epistles in the Day of Judgment and on the isle of Patmos! Besides, the particular expression here used in the Greek (*tee kuriakee heemera*, the Lordic Day) is not only never applied to the Judgment day, but is also wholly inappropriate for such a use. This the reader will see when we come to look more narrowly into the expression. Moreover, the expression 'in the Spirit' [*en Pneumati*] denotes being inspired or under the Spirit as to His influence. Compare Matt. xxii., 43. John says, in effect, 'I was inspired, or under the influence of the Spirit, on the Lord's day,' making 'on the Lord's day' designative of time *when*, fixed and mutually known. Unquestionably, then, the word 'day' is here used literally; and John declares that there is a day in this Dispensation pre-eminently the Lord's. Or, more strictly speaking, he dates his Epistles to the Seven Churches on a day recognized by all Christians as especially the Lord's. Over this fact Eld. W. and I will have no dispute, for he has already admitted all that I here claim. I have written for the benefit of another class to whom I also wish to carry conviction.

The fact that this day is declared to be the Lord's, proclaims also its nature with reference to man's relation to his Divine Head. In other words, it does not mean that the Lord does not possess the other days from which this one stands apart-for all days are the Lord's in that sense-but that man is to regard the day as

110

holy to the Lord. It is a sacred institution.

III. The 'Lord's day' is a new institution, peculiar to the present Dispensation.

1. It cannot be otherwise, for we have seen that the sabbath, together with all other Jewish days, is abolished.

2. This will further appear from the fact, to be hereafter proved, that the Lord's day falls on the first day of the week. It was an essential part of the sabbath that it be kept on the seventh day of the week, and from evening to evening. Ex. xx., 10; Lev. xxiii., 32. Had it been even transferred from the seventh to the first day

that very transfer would have made it a new institution; it would have been eliminating an old element and substituting a new one.

3. The Greek expression rendered 'Lord's day' is not composed of two nouns but of an adjective and a noun, and would be more accurately expressed by *Lordean* or *Lordic* day. The adjective *kuriakee* [Lordic or Lordean] was 'formed by the apostles themselves' *Winer*, N. T. Gram. p. 236. To the same effect testify Liddell & Scott. Of the mode of dealing with words in their Lexicon they say "We have always sought to give the earliest authority for its use first. Then, if no change was introduced by later writers, we have left it with that early authority alone." Pref. p. xx. When we turn to the word *kuriakos* they give as their 'first' citation, and therefore as its 'earliest authority,' the New Testament. The question now arises, Why form a new word to express a sacred institution, if the institution itself be not new? *Winer* says, "Entirely new words and phrases were constructed, mainly by composition and for the most part to meet *some sensible want*." Gram. p. 25. What conceivable 'sensible want' respecting the sabbath did the Old Testament leave unexpressed? Clearly, this *new* 'want' arose with a new institution. This position receives additional strength from the fact that the only other New Testament use of *kuriakos* is found in 1 Cor. xi., 20, designating 'the Lord's Supper, which is certainly a new institution.

4. The *meaning* of *kuriakos*, whether the word itself be new or old, leads to the same conclusion, provided it refers to Jesus as the Lord. And that Jesus is referred to I shall presently show.

Crosby says, Gram. §315, note b., that the meaning of adjectives terminating in *kos* is '*relating to*' that which is denoted by the stem, which in the case in hand is *Kurios*, Lord. If *Kurios* refers to the personal appellation bestowed upon Jesus [Acts ii., 36], then *kuriakos* signifies *pertaining to Jesus as Lord*, hence to his Lordship as having originated in it. With this agree the Lexicons:

"*Kuriakos*, of or pertaining to the Lord, i. e., the Messiah, the Lord's, 1 Cor. xi., 20; Rev. i., 10."-Greenfield.

"*Kuriakos*, *pertaining to the Lord*, to the Lord Jesus Christ; e. g. *kuriakon deipnon*, the Lord's Supper, 1 Cor. xi., 20; *kuriakee heemera*, the Lord's day, Rev. i., 10.-Act. Thom. §31. Clem. Alex. Strom. 7:10."-Robinson.

"*Kuriakos*, of, belonging to, concerning a lord or master; esp. belonging to the Lord [christ]: hence *hee kuriakee*, sub. *heemera*, the Lord's day, dies dominica, N. T.: *to kuriakon*, the Lord's house, Eccl., whence our *kyrke*, *church*."-Liddell & Scott.

These authors are quoted in full; and such testimony might be easily multiplied. There is, however, no higher authority than Liddell and Scott. They declare the Lord's Day to be a day 'concerning' or having respect to the Lord,' belonging to' Him, and being 'of' Him. They leave us, then, in no doubt as to the origin of the day. It is not a day transferred from one Lord to another, but, as Greenfield and Liddell & Scott unite in testifying, 'of' the Lord referred to in the passages where it occurs.

ELDER J. H. WAGGONER'S FIRST NEGATIVE

Eld. Vogel's closing of the last propositions calls for a notice. I would suggest that his 'untamed blood' be subjected to some cooling process; he may discover that I will do no very 'naughty thing.'

I deny his charge that my brethren have interfered with this discussion. Not a sentence has been written or published with any reference to it. I have the best of reasons for believing that my brethren are as fully satisfied with it as his are. I may refer to this again. And his ninth paragraph calls for explanation.

111

Although it is too obscure to be understood it contains an insinuation, which I insist on having cleared up. I have noticed in many cases his tendency to cover up with words, professing to answer points when no answer was given. I demand as a right that he shall tell what he means by my forgetting the 'position which at least some of my brethren used to occupy.' If he wishes the 'last word' he must not crowd such things into a closing article. A man who clamors so much about 'honor' ought to set a good example. Now to our proposition.

This question is, in one sense, a limited one, and in another sense very extensive. In one view it concerns only the supposed existence of a certain positive institution; in another it involves a consideration of the objects of the new covenant and the relation or position of its mediator, the Son of God. Thus a negative argument may embrace these points:-

I. Sunday observance is no part of the spiritual (moral) law which is written in the heart in the new covenant.

II. The Sunday does not bear even a single mark of a positive institution.

III. Sunday keeping stands opposed to one of the precepts of God's moral law, and is false worship, by which its institutor is honored above the true and living God.

The first point will not be contested. If it shall appear that the second is truth, that the Sunday has no just claim as a positive institution, then the truth of the third point will follow as a necessary conclusion; no obligation then exists for Sunday: it is 'will worship.'

Here I take decided exceptions to his proposed use of his *five methods of proof*, as not being applicable to this question. But it was well understood that they were framed for the benefit of this proposition.

1. Express command; no such exists for Sunday.

2, 3 and 4. Inference and implication, either probable or less than probable. These are not admissible as evidence to establish a positive institution.

5. Approved precedent or example. Nothing of the kind can be shown for the Sunday. Moreover to prove a positive institution by example, there must not only be a declaration of *continuous action*, but a *specific declaration* that the action related to the institution. Otherwise the very existence of the institution depends upon mere influence, which is *never* sufficient to establish a positive institution.

He quotes approvingly my remarks on the 'evidence required,' but falls almost infinitely short of what I volunteered to (and did) give for the sabbath. I repeat my words:-

I inquire, what is sufficient proof of the obligation of an institution? Two things are necessary.

'1. The act of instituting.'

'2. The record of appointment.'

If neither of these exists we have no right to *infer* the existence of the institution. Why does he not follow my example with such proof for the Sunday? Because it does not exist. He cannot produce the act of institution, or any reference to such an act, or any law of institution, or any example of obedience to such a law. When I compare the proof offered for the sabbath and Sunday (which is the 'summary' to which I referred), these facts will be fully appreciated.

Eld. Vogel (and others for him) claims that he has 'something new' and very important on this subject; but, as he has laid out his argument, this is not true.

(1.) His position on the 'genius of this dispensation,' that positive duties may rest on *principles* rather than on *specific declarations*, has been often argued by those who plead that infant baptism may be inferentially established. Thus an old work from the Pres. Bd. of Pub. says of Sunday keeping that doubts "arose chiefly among the same people who denied, because there is no command in the N. T. enjoining it, the propriety of infant baptism." In the same work it was declared that the glory and power of Christ were most strikingly manifest in that he could bring into use ordinances without precept! I commend this idea to Eld. Vogel for his adoption. He has reproduced the old Pedo-Baptist argument, but he has not improved it.

(2.) His argument on 'a Lordic day' is nothing new, only the writer who first employed it gave more euphonic title-'a lordly day!' But what is effected by it? There is no practical difference between 'the Lord's day' and 'of' or 'pertaining to' the Lord; the common translation stands undisputed. But his position is one of great difficulties, resting on an unnecessary inference, viz., that the term 'Lord' belongs exclusively to the Son; which I might admit without detriment to my position. I prepared a rejoinder

112

to his previous contradictory assertions on this point, but he removed it to the present proposition, saying that he would 'show in the proper place,' etc., and I therefore waived it till he shall develop further. When he does that I shall show the nature and bearing of his inference, and also expose his other inference that it is a new institution.

There is a marked uniformity of faith as to what is necessary to establish a positive institution. The principles governing this question are so plain that almost all men agree in their statement, however much they may differ in practice; each applies the principles without hesitation when arguing on the *nature* of positive obligation. On this subject I can confidently appeal to Eld. V. and to all his brethren, in the words of the apostle: 'For I write none other things unto you than what ye read or acknowledge;' for every sentence which I shall write or quote on positive institutions will be acknowledged and endorsed by him and them when *baptism* is the subject; but when the Sunday is to be sustained they ignore these same principles, well knowing that they literally cut up their Sunday argument by the roots. All who are conversant with theological literature have as plausible inferences for infant baptism as can be furnished for Sunday. Eld. Vogel's list of

learned authorities, without which his inferences would have been too bald to be presentable, may be rivalled by authorities for infant baptism.

His illustration of his position by the want of 'direct legislation' in regard to the Lord's Supper is peculiarly defective, and contains the very root of all error on positive institutions. (1) The Lord's Supper was plainly instituted. (2) It is plainly commanded. (3) It is plainly revealed in what it consists; that is, the action is described. But, (4) the *frequency* of its observance, as he admits, is not revealed; of that nothing is said, and of course that is no part of the law of the institution, and there is no obligation in respect to it. Only two instances are given: its appointment by the Savior, and its observance at Troas; and *these were on different evenings*, without a word connecting it with either. No matter if a thousand great names are given in its favor; it yet rests solely on *human and uninspired testimony*, and is therefore of no authority. In advocating stated periods for its observance Eld. Vogel makes *faith* come without the word of God, (Rom. x., 17,) and imposes duty where nothing is revealed. In this he has not stopped on Pede-Baptist ground—he occupies the ground of the Roman Catholic.

In his argument I, Isa. lvi. is used in a manner which may be made to subvert the prophecies. He rests *altogether* on the hypothesis that if one text of a prophecy is used in an accommodated sense the whole prophecy or context must be; or, if one part is literal, the whole must be. A prophecy may apply partly to that which is immediately before the reader, and partly to that which is remote. His rigid method applied to Psa. lxxix would either prove Christ a sinner or deny its literal application to him, contrary to the express statements of the N. T. I have before shown that the sabbath is, by the prophecy, thrown forward into the gospel dispensation; I also proved that it is 'recognized' in the New Testament. And his point II, is that a 'sacred day' is recognized in the gospel. But notice, it is *recognized, not instituted*. We meet on the common ground of its 'recognition,' but he cannot show any act of *instituting*. And therefore his III, is not an argument, not susceptible of proof, but only an inference. There is no new institution. It has been abundantly proved that the moral law of God is the rule of right and action in this dispensation, and the sabbath of the Creator is a part of that law. To this the prophet refers, and this the New Testament 'recognizes.'

And no man ever assumed a more inconsistent position than he takes right here. He affirmed that it must take as plain and direct testimony to transfer an existing institution to this dispensation as it took to institute it, but now insists that an entirely new institution may be erected without any direct testimony! Let him prove the existence of a new institution, and I will allow all that he claims of allusion or recognition. But I deny the right to claim its existence by allusion or recognition, when there is another *well known* institution to which the allusion refers. The very allusion is proof of the continued existence of the old institution, unless the existence of the new is proved *outside of the allusion*. But every one knows that an *inference from the allusion is his only proof of his institution!*

Again, he admits that, so far as the direct testimony of 'the Scripture' is concerned,

it is not revealed whether his new institution is *the first day* or some other day; or the first day of the week, the month or the year. That is to be settled by inference and human authority! Let the reader note the proposition, 'Do the Scriptures teach,' etc., and then consider how much of his argument would be left if he should strike out his quotations from uninspired writers. His quotations from 'The Christian System by A. Campbell,' serve him a much better purpose than any he could make from 'the Scriptures' by the inspired servants of God.

His quotations of 1 Cor. xvi., 2 as of a day of meeting or stated day of worship is worthy of the purpose for which it is used! Even Dr. Justin Edwards, the chief of all Sunday-tradition theorists, is constrained to admit that this laying 'by him' is 'at home' and not in the meeting house. And this is so clearly the sense of the original that he could but admit it.

Eld. V. also admits, what I before showed, that 'the Lord's day' must refer to some 'mutually-known time,' but *infers* that it was Sunday! Let him show that *anybody knew* that Sunday was the Lord's day; that *anybody knew* that John alluded to that day. If *supposition* must settle the terms of positive institutions, the Disciples may disband and unite with the Pedo-Baptists.

On such a course as he pursues in this argument we will hear A. Campbell:—"Be it then emphatically stated that their method is not to produce either a precept or a precedent for infant baptism; but to infer it from sundry passages of Scripture, *never presuming to find in any one passage premises of the whole rite*, but for a part of it. Then, by putting these parts together, supposed to be logically inferred from sundry sayings, they construct positive authority for a positive rite. This is, most certainly, as unprecedented among men as it is illogical in point of propriety. Who ever heard, in any other case, of inferring one part of an ordinance from one sentence in another passage, referring to something else, and *by converting these two inferences into one*, make it a positive and explicit authority for a Christian institution?"-*Chris. Baptism*, pp. 384, 5.

These words apply with most cutting force to the course of Eld. Vogel; for even his inferences depend for plausibility on the thick glossing they receive from uninspired testimony. I shall quote much further on this subject. For the present let the reader weigh well the following words:-

"All commemorative institutions are *positive, and dependent as to obligation on the will of the institutor*, and hence not binding on man till formally proclaimed."-*P. Vogel*, in his first article in this discussion. 'Of course' he will now proceed to give us the *formal proclamation of the institution of the Sunday!* or cease to teach it as of obligation. Eld. V. is not an ignorant man; he well enough understands the laws of evidence to know that his affirmation calls upon him (1) to give proof of the *formal proclamation* of the Sunday; or (2) to deny that it is a positive institution and give it a moral basis; or (3) to renounce his affirmation and yield the question. This is so reasonable that I have a right to insist in his taking *well-defined* ground on these points.

As his affirmation says nothing of the *reason or ground* of Sunday obligation I requested him to define his position, to which he replied:-

"The first day is with me a sacred day in a similar sense that the sabbath was a *sacred day*."

He should, then, give similar evidence of its sacredness. Let us compare the two:

1. The divine blessing was placed on the sabbath. *Did God bless the first day? Give the proof.*

2. God sanctified the sabbath day. *Did he sanctify the Sunday? Chapter and verse asked for.*

3. He claimed the seventh as his own-the holy of *the Lord*-the Lord's day. *Did he ever claim the Sunday as his? Where is it found?*

4. He explicitly gave a *reason* for the sacredness of the sabbath. *Did He ever give any reason for Sunday sacredness and observance? Where, and what is it?* Mc-Garvey [a Disciple Pros., Eld. Vogel's own denomination], in his *Commentary on Acts* says; "The day of the week on which the Holy Spirit descended has been celebrated from that time till this; *though no formal reason is given* in the N. T. for its observance." The reason is all of man's devising; it is will-worship.

5. God expressly commanded the seventh day to be kept as a holy time. *Did He command to keep the Sunday? When, and where?*

6. God uttered severe threatenings against those who refused or neglected

114

to keep the seventh day. *Did He threaten those who do not keep Sunday? Why, and when?*

7. God gave promises of rich blessings to those who keep the seventh day. *Did He ever promise anything for keeping Sunday? What, and where found?*

If the first day is to be *sacredly kept* it is sin not to keep it; but

a. 'By the law is the knowledge of sin.'

b. 'Where no law is there is no transgression.'

c. 'Sin is not imputed when there is no law.'

I do not keep Sunday. Will Elder Vogel please to show what law I transgress; by what I am proved a sinner therefore?

Every positive institution must have its limits well defined; otherwise there is confusion. Eld. Vogel dodges this by saying that he is not to inquire if the worldling is under obligation to keep Sunday. True; the terms of the proposition do not *compel* him to do so; but the inference is unavoidable that if it is a *positive institution of the gospel*, they who reject Christ have *no more right to keep Sunday* than they have to be baptized or to partake of the Lord's Supper! It is legitimate to the subject, however much he may avoid it; and I may show "the position that at least some of his brethren have occupied" in regard to it.

ELDER PETER VOGEL'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

I wish to confine myself strictly to this proposition, and hence will say as little as possible concerning matters belonging to the past. Whether Eld. W.'s brethren have discussed points 'broached by us' the reader can decide for himself by sending for the *Review* of the dates given. And as to the position formerly occupied by at least some of Eld. W.'s brethren, I simply mean what I said, namely, that they have argued that the first covenant was not abolished. I am

quite willing to believe on his mere word that he never so held. Nor have I charged him with this.

I must emphatically deny Bro. W.'s positions marked I., II., and III., contending as to the first that the observance of the First Day is 'written on the heart in the new covenant' in the same sense that the sabbath would have been had it been extended to this dispensation.

My brother speaks lightly concerning 'inference,' yet he must be aware that circumstantial evidence, which is nothing but inference, has hung many a man. Are we, in religious affairs, to lay aside all the laws of evidence save such as he may dictate? Did ever a pope ask more?

Whenever as good proof can be given for sprinkling or infant baptism as I give for the Lordic Day, I shall preach it with all my might. Bro. Campbell is misconstrued whenever he is represented as inveighing against *legitimate* inference, or, in his own words, things '*logically* inferred.'

I grant that faith comes by the word of God; but is legitimate inference no part of His word? Should I so speak as to imply that my brother is a liar and a thief, would he not consider it slander? Or is it only in religious affairs that we are to be denied our common sense? No, no; even inferences reached with such difficulty that the babe in Christ is not able to draw them are 'faith' to him having made the deduction, and therefore 'the word of God.' Only in such cases Paul says: 'Hast thou *faith*? Have it to thyself before God,' Ro. xiv., 22. For '*strong* meat belongeth to them that are of full age, even those who, by reason of use, have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil,' Heb. v., 14.

But with reference to the binding force of a sacred day in this dispensation I have something clearer than inference. Of Rev. i., 10 even Bro. W. says, in his first affirmative on the the third proposition: "(1) I claim that this text proves that one day is 'the Lord's day' in this dispensation; that his claim and right to that certain day is *as clearly established as was his right to a day established by Ex. xx., 10, or by Isa. lviii., 13.* And I insist that *this text is decisive* on this point. (2) But I do *not* claim that this text furnishes any proof *as to what day of the week* is 'the Lord's day.' In this respect it

115

defines nothing. That must be settled by other scripture."

Having left so 'decisive' a text, it was not necessary that the apostles should record 'the act of instituting' and give 'the record of appointment;' these are necessarily implied, and known to have a real existence, for without them such a text would have been an impossibility. Henceforth let there be no more call for a 'formal proclamation.'

And that this day is a new institution is as clearly asserted by *Kuriakee, Lordic*, as the action in baptism is by *baptidzoo*. 'And I insist that this text is decisive on this point.' Having read my Bible rather than human treatises, I was unaware that any one had ever, in modern times, written 'a Lordly day.' This may be more euphonic, but 'Lordic' is truer to the facts in the case.

With respect to the time of observing the Lordic Supper there is no conflict between Acts xx., 7 and the time of its institution; for at that time the disciples did not 'commune', but merely ate bread and drank wine. The death of Jesus had not

yet transpired, nor did they believe that it would, and hence there neither was nor could be a 'commemoration' or a 'communion.' Nor has the time of instituting anything to do with the time of observing an institution, else all the commemorative institutions of the O. T. (see Lev. xxiii.) would have fallen on different days than they did, and nearly all on the same day!

My argument from Is. lvi. I leave with the reader, as I consider it untouched. I gave my reasons for the use made of that passage, and would have cited many similar prophecies, did I not aim at brevity. Ps. lxi. is not a prediction, but a simple record of David's experience. It applies no more to Jesus than to any one else of the present day who happens to be 'hated without a case,' etc., etc., and so has a history tangent to David's in certain points. I now turn to the

CONTINUATION OF THE AFFIRMATIVE

My first affirmative closed with the citation of lexical authority, proving that *kuriakos*, as an adjective, describes things having originated with or 'of' the lord referred to. And so indelible is this meaning that even the few instances where it is turned to secular uses still reflect its native sense. Thus Cremer, in his N. T. Lexicon, gives as its *extra* N. T. use, "that which belongs to the *ruler-herrscher*-as e. g. to *kuriakon*, state or fiscal property-synonymous with *to basilikon*-but seldom so occurring."

Shall we inquire of the commentators? The answer is the same. In his comments on Rev. i., 10, Barnes says *kuriakos*: "It properly means *pertaining to the Lord*; and, so far as the *word* is concerned, it might mean a day pertaining to the Lord in any sense, or for any reason-either because he claimed it as his own and had set it apart for his service, or because it was designed to commemorate some important event pertaining to him; or because it was observed in honor of him."

If we turn to the English adjective formed after the analogy of *kuriakos*, namely, *Lordic*, the result is the same.

Let us now inquire as to *who* is meant by Lord in Rev. i., 10, whether the Christ or the Father. Barnes says, "This was a day particularly devoted to the Lord Jesus, for (a) that is the *natural* meaning of the word *Lord* as used in the New Testament, and, (b) if the Jewish Sabbath were intended to be designated, the word *Sabbath* would have been used." Hackett, in his comments on Acts i., 24, says: "*Kuriakos*, when taken absolutely in the N. T., refers generally to Christ." The point aimed at by both of these writers is about the same as my former statement that 'under this dispensation the term Lord refers exclusively to Christ.' Mark well, however, that I do not say that this is the case in the entire N. T. Scriptures. Jesus was not yet 'made Lord' (Acts ii., 36) during the period covered by the four Gospels; hence such passages as Matt. xi., 25 come not within the bounds of my statement; nor do most of such passages as are quotations from the O. T. Acts iv., 26, for example, is a quotation of Ps. ii., 2, and refers to God, while Heb. i., 10, though a quotation, refers to the Christ. Lord (Jehovah, the Self-Existent One) refers in these quotations to the nature, or to one of the attributes, of God and of the Word. But in the official sense we have

now but 'one Lord' [Eph. iv., 5], namely, Jesus, who was 'made Lord' at the beginning of and for this dispensation [Acts ii., 36], and is hence 'Lord of all' [Acts x., 36] and 'Lord over all' [Ro. x., 12], being 'the head over all things to the Church' [Eph. i., 22; for 'all authority is given into his hands' [Matt. xxviii., 18]. In 1 Cor. viii., 6 this matter is most explicitly stated, 'Lord' and 'Jesus Christ' are here two distinct appellatives, and in apposition,

116

as 'God' and 'the Father' are appositives. To this not only the context disposes us, but also the answering of one member of the sentence to the other requires it. The heathens, says Paul, have 'gods many' and 'lords many' but to us there is only

"One God-the Father-of whom, etc.

One Lord-Jesus Christ-by whom, etc. It is not a decision between two or more rival 'Lord Jesus Christ,' as any other construction would make it, but between several alledged 'Lords,' in which 'Jesus Christ,' as an appositive, is definitive of the 'one only Lord' in whose favor the decision falls, as 'the Father' is definitive of the 'one only God.'

It is only official 'authority' and 'Lordship' which, in the case before us, is, or can be conceived to be, 'given' or 'made.' Hence it is in an official sense, respecting this dispensation, that Jesus has 'all authority' and is 'Lord of all' and 'overall.' Under this official jurisdiction come, of course, all the institutions now binding on us, Hence 'Lord's Day,' 'Lord's Supper,' 'Lord's Table,' and such like, can only refer to Jesus as the Lord.

If anything were yet wanting to complete the proof, even the word *kuriakos* would cry out. So distinctly and decisively is its voice heard in 1 Cor. xi., 20-the *kuriakon* (Lordic) Supper-that no one in even his wildest fancy can fail to hear Jesus named. And if *kuriakos* came first and purposely into being to hail Him as Lord, then, when it speaks again, and by inspiration finally-'the *kuriakee* (Lordic) Day'-what puny mortal shall dare to misunderstand it? Reader, did you note how the Lexicons quoted have interpreted this voice? The facts before us declare them wise in this.

IV. The day which is to be sacredly kept this Dispensation, 'the Lord's Day,' recurs weekly, and upon the First Day of the week.

Having seen that one day in this dispensation is the Lord's and that this day is a new institution, we can easily determine which day it is by observing *what day the first Christians gave to Him*, for under apostolic oversight and instruction they certainly acted right in this matter. And this practice on their part answers to us every purpose of a direct command, since it is the fruit of one. Let us then inquire into what day they were in the habit of devoting to religious purposes. However, one source of error is here to be carefully guarded against. If even instances could be found of their meeting on the seventh day of the week for their own religious purposes, this *of itself* would not determine it to be the day sought, unless there be no other day on which they met, since they might do this from the same motive and for the same reason that led them to observe other Jewish days and feasts. Should even precedents determine in favor of the seventh day, it would nevertheless not be on account of the same reasons for which God's

ancient people met on this day, for the day now binding is a *new* institution. But if the first Christians gave a day to the Lord which was not devoted to religious purposes under the former dispensation, then this will determine it to be the sacred day, since there is but one such day, as the phrase '*the Lord's Day*' unmistakably declares. And here a single hint speaks volumes. For even the faintest shadow of a reason might induce a people to honor a day revered by their fathers for ages in the worship of the true God; but to devote a new day, never before so honored, this has a potent meaning in it. Was there then such a day so given? This I answer in the affirmative, and proceed to the proof.

1. "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." 1 Cor. xvi., 1-2. So writes Paul to the Corinthians. Or, as McKnight renders the second verse, 'On the first day of every week let each of you lay something by itself, according as he may have been prospered, putting it into the treasury, that when I come there may be no collections.' So in substance also that recent and most critical translator, J. B. Rotherham.

a. Whether we should render 'by him' or 'by itself' cannot be dogmatically decided, since the Greek *par' heautoo*, is indefinite and may express either equally well. Those who render 'by him' decide in favor of the use to which these words are more frequently put; while those who translate 'by itself' are governed by the context, 'that there be no gatherings when I come.' If we adopt McKnight's version it is plain that there was a meeting on every First Day, when the money was put into a common treasury 'that there be no gatherings' when Paul might come. If we render 'by him,' i. e., 'at

117

home,' then it is clear that Paul expected that as a rule Christians would be 'at home' on that day, i. e., not absent on business. In either view it marks the day as not their own.

b. Giving, when properly done, is a religious work, an act of worship in the broader sense of the term. Hence this contribution is elsewhere called a 'grace' (2 Cor. viii., 6-7). And this religious act—an act in every way fitted for such a day, and all the more impressive when done on such a day—was directed to be performed on the First Day of the week.

c. Nor was the First Day thus observed in Corinth only, but the command extended to all the churches of Galatia (1 Cor. xvi., 1), and, perhaps, also to 'all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord' (1 Cor. i., 1), for to all such was this epistle addressed. *Why* name the *First Day* of the week in all Galatia as well as in Achaia?

d. Nor was it simply once thus done, but, as McKnight well expresses the force of the original, 'On the First Day of every week.' For, he adds, "as *kata polin* signifies every city; and *kata meena*, every month; and, Acts xiv., 23, *kat' ekklesian*, in every church: so *kata mian sabbatoon* signifies the first day of every week." So also says Winer, N. T. Gram. p. 401, this passage should be construed. We find, then, Sunday after Sunday, in regular succession, and by a

large number of churches, both in Europe and Asia, devoted to 'this grace.'
'*Continuous action.*'

2. From Acts xx., 7 it appears that another act of worship-partaking of the Lordic Supper-was performed on the First Day. '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.' Instead of 'when the disciples came together to break bread,' the better texts and versions read, 'we gathered together to break bread.' This 'we' who gathered includes Paul's companions together with the disciples of Troas, the 'them' to whom he preached.

Let us not be too eager to finish our lesson here; we may be amply repaid for our leisure. There are three different ways of reckoning the day recognized in the Scriptures, viz.: From evening to evening, from morning to morning, and from midnight to midnight.

a. The first named, from evening to evening, originated with the Jewish sabbaths and was peculiar to their sacred days. 'From even unto even shall ye celebrate your sabbaths' (Lev. xxiii., 32) would not have been a necessary law if the Jews had been in the habit of so beginning their days. And this law passed away with the sabbaths.

b. The other style, from morning to morning, is as old as creation, and belonged to the so-called 'civil' reckoning of the Jews. I can here perhaps do no better than to quote from Conant's Genesis He translates the 5th verse of ch. i. thus: 'And God called the light Day; and the darkness he called Night. And there was evening, and there was morning, one day.' On this he comments as follows: "*And there was evening*; namely, the close of a period of light by the coming on of darkness; *and there was morning*, the close of a period of darkness by the return of light; the two periods making a day. This is the true idea of morning. By evening is meant, in Hebrew as well as in English, the coming on of darkness after a period of light; in other words, the close of day by the coming on of night. There could be no evening without a previous period of light. Day began, therefore, with light and not with darkness; and one day continued, till the returning light marked the commencement of another. The later custom of the Hebrews (Lev. xxiii., 32), of reckoning the day from evening to evening, was made necessary by the use of the lunar calendar, in the observance of their feasts and other commemorative seasons, which depended on the return of the new moon. Where the natural day is meant, as in Lev. vii., 15, it closes with the morning of the following day." And so that old nation, the Babylonians, also reckoned their days. Here I must add a word from J. P. Lange, the famous German commentator. He renders Matt. xxviii., 1: 'About the end of the sabbath,' and says: "The peculiar expression is explained by the context. It was the time of the dawn, or of breaking day (heemera to be supplied in connection with *epiphoskousee*), on the first day of the week, Sunday. Similar are the statements of Luke and John; while Mark says, about sunrise. * * * It is not the accurate Jewish division of time, according to which the Sabbath ended at six on Saturday evening, but *the ordinary reckoning* of the day, which extends *from sunrise* to sunrise, and adds the night to the preceding day. * * * Matthew makes the

day of the week begin here with sunrise." Meyer, Alford, Conant, and many others equally learned, treat this passage in a similar way. Others, as P. Schaff, Lange's translator, while favoring a different rendering, not only admit this to be the more natural translation, but, what is just to my purpose, concede that 'the natural division of the day' was 'from sunrise to sunrise.'

The discussion of the third style, and the application of the whole to Acts xx., I must reserve for my next affirmative.

ELDER J. H. WAGGONER'S SECOND NEGATIVE

Eld. Vogel has turned his insinuation into a direct statement that some of my brethren have argued that the first covenant was not abolished. *This I deny*, and call upon him to point to a single accredited writer or speaker among us who has so taught. Were his statement true, it would have no bearing against my argument, but he knows the 'effect' it will have on some minds. To add that he will believe on my 'mere word' that I never held that view, may not have been designed to insult, but could never emanate, in such a connection, from a regard to the courtesies due an opponent. I have not yet considered it due to anybody to offer even my 'mere word' on that point.

A man more reckless of his statements on the Bible, I have never met. He says Ps. 69 is 'not a prediction'-does not apply to Jesus more than to 'any one else of the present day.' (1) See verses 9, 21: 'For the zeal of thine house hath eaten me up; and the reproaches of them that reproached thee are fallen upon me.' 'They gave me also gall for my meat, and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink.' Comp. John ii., 17, and Rom. xv., 3, etc. And so unreliable are his statements on Isa. lvi.

He says when the Lord's Supper was instituted they 'did not commune, but merely ate bread and drank wine!' And that is all they do now, according to the true faith. I was aware that Eld. V. was raised in the 'mother church,' but supposed that he had got farther from her than he has. Jesus then said, 'This is my body-this is my blood,' *i. e.*, they *represented* his body and blood, and so they do now. His reference to Lev. xxiii, for the times of instituting and of observing their feasts, do not serve him, for there was a *specific statement* of the time of their observance-but not so of the Lord's Supper.

It is amusing to see how strenuously he pleads for inferences in behalf of positive institutions. Campbell is not misconstrued by me. He does inveigh against that which (to use his own words) '*is supposed to be logically inferred*' in favor of a positive institution. I ask the reader to look again at my quotation from Campbell. He describes and condemns the very course Eld. V. pursues, to-wit: taking a part here and a part there and connecting inferences, without direct statement or precept. The only real service Mr. Campbell did for theology, was to strip the vail of tradition and inference from positive institutions. Eld. V. complains that I said, 'he knows better.' I used the words justly. But if he *does not* yet know A. Campbell's position, I will try to enlighten him. We will read again:-

"A positive institution requires positive precept-a positive and express authority. No positive institution has ever been established upon mere inference. To attempt to found a positive Christian ordinance upon an inference, or upon a series of inferences, is, in effect, to stultify and make void its pretensions. * * * We have called upon its advocates times without number for such a precept-for such a positive injunction, but hitherto we have asked in vain."-Baptism, p.218.

A man hung on circumstantial evidence is unjustly hung, if the evidence is not based on a series of undisputed facts. But Eld. Vogel not only violates every just principle, by trying to build up a positive institution by mere deduction, but even his supposed facts from which his deductions are drawn, are fallacies!

1. Rev. i., 10 does not hint of a new institution, nor point out the first day of the week.

2. Acts xx., 7, does not speak of the Lord's day, nor of the observance of any day, nor of any duty in that respect.

119

3. 1 Cor. xvi., 2, does not speak of the Lord's day, nor of the observance of a day, nor of any assembling for any purpose on any day. Inference is all that he presents.

On Rev. i., 10, he has done a needless work. No one denies that it is a day 'of,' or 'pertaining to,' the Lord; 'the Lord's day' expresses all that. He quotes Barnes; I accept it, and will quote it again: "So far as the *word* is concerned, it might mean a day pertaining to the Lord, in any sense, or for any reason-either because he claimed it as his own, and set it apart for his service, or because it was assigned to commemorate some important event." Now all these particulars apply to the seventh day as the Lord's day. (1.) He claimed it as his own. (2.) He set it apart for his service. (3.) He designated it to commemorate an important event, even the creation of the heavens and the earth. But neither of them applies to the first day. (1.) He never claimed it as his own. (2.) He never set it apart for his service. (3.) He never designated it to commemorate any event. If this is disputed we call for the precept-the 'positive injunction!' They who love the pure word of God more than traditional fallacies, will be at no loss to determine which is the Lord's day.

He revives the question, and re-affirms his position that 'Lord,' in the text, refers only to Christ. I should have exposed this before, only that he declared its 'proper place' was in this proposition. We will examine the ground.

(1.) He said, "Under this dispensation the term *Lord*, refers exclusively to Christ." I proved the falsity of that by quoting such texts as Rev. xi., 15, '*Our Lord* and *his Christ*. To this he replied:

(2.) "I do not mean that the Father has ceased in his nature to be Lord; i. e., Jehovah, the self-existent One, but in the official sense of head over all things to the church, Jesus is the only head, the *one* Lord, without a rival, with all authority."

He has reiterated this, but I quote this, in preference to his later statements, because it is more brief and explicit. The second (marked 2) is an evasion of the most marked kind. The question is not as to whether the Father has changed in his nature, which would indeed be a rare question for discussion! but whether his

assertion is true that 'the term, Lord, belongs exclusively to Christ in this dispensation.' This is too plain a point to dodge, and his first inference in his present argument is based on this assumption. What a ground for positive duty! When he undertakes to *prove* that the term *Lord* is used in Rev: i., 10, in a sense in which it is not used in Rev. xi., 15, we shall note how it is done.

But, were his first assumption conceded, it would not serve his purpose, unless he could establish the other, which is based on the nature of the authority of Christ in this dispensation. The relevancy of the following quotation will be seen as I progress. Thus he said:-

"Christ, in his word-state, was indeed present at the creation, but only as *agent*, not as proprietor. * * * Hence, if the Sabbath had even originated there, Jesus would no more be the Lord of it, than a carpenter is owner of the house which he builds for another."

Now I affirm that both Father and Son are 'proprietor' of the Sabbath by virtue of creation; it, and it only, is 'the Lord's day,' whether the term refers to Father or Son, or to both. And such an indignity as Eld. Vogel casts upon the glorious Son of God, I dislike to repeat, even to expose it. Let the reader turn to those scriptures which speak of the work of creation, and see if the above is not an insult to the Maker. See Col. i., 16-17. 'For by him were all things created, that are in Heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him, and for him.' No; not 'for him,' says Eld. Vogel; he was only like the carpenter who builds a house 'for another!' And such a monstrous perversion of Scripture as this is to show that Jesus is *not* the Lord of the Sabbath day-that it is not the Lord's day.

He continues to assert that Jesus is the only 'Lord' in this dispensation, but evades the full result of his statement by adding-'in an official sense.' Did he carry this limitation through his argument, there would be no dispute between us. But he does not; he makes him not agent, but proprietor, in the New Testament, in a sense that he was not in the work of creation. Thus he quotes that he is 'head over all things to the church,' but only that part of the text which does not say that the Father gave him to be that head. He is Lord and Christ; but the Father 'made him' such. Has he more independence or proprietorship in this than in creation? When he shows that his present 'authority' was not

120

conferred by the Father, and is not of a special kind for a special purpose, and that he is not yet 'expecting till his foes be made his footstool,' which will be done by the Father (Ps. 110., 1); that God was not in Christ reconciling the world unto himself; that eternal life is not the gift of God through Christ; that Christ is not 'mediator between God and man;' that he does not act as 'advocate,' and that the Father did not send the Spirit in answer to the prayer of Christ; that his doctrines were his own, and not his Fathers; and that Christ came to do his own will, and not the will of his Father; when such and a score of other Scripture truths are reversed, then will be shown that Jesus has an independent proprietorship in the gospel, which he had not in creation!

I said (first negative) that 'the Sunday is no part of the spiritual (moral) law written in the heart in the new covenant.' This he denies; and as it is closely

related to the question of 'propriatorship,' I notice it here. And first, I raise the question, Who made the new covenant? Who is the covenant maker 'with Judah and Israel?' Is it the Father or the Son? I say it is the Father-the same that made the first covenant. Hear his words: 'Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers.' But if Eld. Vogel is right-if the 'propriatorship' of the new covenant is in Jesus, then, I ask, Who is the mediator? The Catholics would answer, the virgin, or the pope; but what should we say?

And this forever settles the question as to *whose law* is put in the hearts of the 'Israel of God' in the new covenant. Jehovah, the covenant maker, says, 'I will put *my laws* in their hearts.' 'The commandments of God' are distinguished from 'the faith of Jesus;' and all the positive institutions of the gospel are a part of the faith of Jesus, not of the moral law of the Father. And as the Son does the will, or law, of the Father, nothing in the faith of Jesus can conflict with the law of God. But the Sunday tradition 'makes void the commandment of God,' and is, therefore, inadmissible. Christ never proclaimed it, and the law of the Father does not permit it. Thus much for the ground of his first inference.

But he says, 'With reference to the binding force of a sacred day in this dispensation I have something clearer than inference.' That is not a point of dispute between us. I have argued the same thing for the Sabbatic institution. But that this sacred day is a new institution, or is the first day, he has only inference in his favor. Thus on all the ground of difference between us he stands on inference only.

1 Cor xvi., 2, does not speak of the Lord's day, nor refer to it, nor to any observance of any day. Remember that an inference, when admissible, must rest upon facts beyond dispute; otherwise, it is utterly worthless. Fortunately for my argument, the ground of his inference is denied by his own partizans. The testimony of an opponent, in my favor, is the strongest evidence; therefore, I first give the testimony of authors who were strongly traditionized to Sunday-keeping:-

"Let him lay up at home, treasuring; as he has been prospered. The Greek phrase, 'by himself,' means, probably, the same as at home. Let him set it apart; let him designate a certain portion; let him do this by himself when he is at home, when he can calmly look at the evidence of his prosperity."-Barnes.

"Some are of the opinion that the sums thus set apart were brought to the treasury of the church at the time; but the words do not seem to admit of that interpretation; and if each separately laid by the sum which he proposed to give, the whole would be brought together at once when necessary, without any trouble in soliciting contributions."-Comp. Com.

"Every one was to lay by in store, have a treasury or fund with himself for this purpose. * * * Some of the Greek fathers rightly observe here that this advice was given for the sake of the poorer among them. They were to lay by, from week to week, and not bring into the common treasury, that by this means their contributions might be easy to themselves, and yet grow into a fund for the relief of their brethren."-Matthew Henry, Com.

"The apostle only meant that there should be no private and petty gatherings, then first to be made, when he came, but only one *suneisphora* [joint contribution] formed, containing all the sums which had been gradually laid up in private."-Bloomfield, Notes on Greek Text. And of the 'gathering' he says: "The word *logia* is nowhere else found in

121

the scriptural, and very rarely in the classical writers; and seems to have been confined to the language of common life. It properly signifies a gleanings, and then, as here, a slight gathering."

"Certainly it may not be inferred from this passage that collections took place among the congregations on the Sabbath, for it was Paul's intention that each should make a suitable contribution at home."-Olshausen, Com.

"Lay by him in store; at home."-Justin Edwards' Notes.

"*Par' heauto*, by or with oneself; in one's house; at home, Fr. *chez soi*. 1 Cor. xvi., 2. So Xen. *Mem.* 1. 13. 3."-Robinson's Lexicon.

"*Par' heauto*, at one's home or house. Lat. *apud se*, Hdt. 1.105, cf. 1,86."-Liddell & Scott's Lexicon.

These were Sunday men; some of them of the most rabid kind. What but the most evident facts could lead them thus to remove the foundation for a popular Sunday inference? I copy also a few translations:-

"Let every one off you put asyde at home, and laye vppe whatever he thinketh mete."-Tyndale.

"Let each one of you lay by himself in store."-Sawyer's.

"Let each of you lay by him and treasure up."-Anderson (Disciple).

"Let every one of you lay aside and preserve at home."-Syriac.

To the above I add a summary given by J. W. Morton, in his address to the Synod of the Ref. Pres. church:-

"I marvel greatly how you can imagine that it means in the collection box of the congregation! Greenfield, in his Lexicon, translates the Greek term, *par heauto*, 'by on's self, *i. e.*, at home.' Two Latin versions, the Vulgate and that of Castellio, render it '*apud se*,' with one's self, at home. Three French translators, those of Martin, Osterwald and De Sacy, '*chez soi*,' at his house, at home. The German of Luther, '*bei sich selbst*,' by himself, at home. The Dutch, '*by hemselven*,' same as the German. The Italian of Diodati, '*appresso di se*' in his own presence, at home. The Spanish of Felipe Scio, '*en su casa*,' in his own house. The Portuguese of Ferreira, '*para isso*,' with himself. The Swedish, '*naer sig sielf*,' near himself. I know not how much this list of authorities might be swelled, for I have not examined one translation that differs from those quoted above. Now if your premise is false, your inference is not only *unnecessary*, but wholly inadmissible."

Had not so much stress been laid upon this inference I would ask pardon for spending so much time in exposing it. If inferences were admissible on this subject, what could the inference be worth based on a supposition so extensively denied by the most able of Sunday-keepers? And such is the whole foundation of the Sunday argument; the basis of a proposed positive institution of the gospel!

Eld. Vogel further infers that Sunday was a sacred day because they were to give on that day, and giving is an act of worship! Good, perhaps, for those whose worship is necessarily confined to Sunday-Sunday Christians! But my brethren all follow this injunction of 1 Cor. xvi., 2, yet not one of them regards it as the Lord's day. This shows to what a strait he is reduced to make inferences for Sunday.

His position on Acts xx. is not fully developed, but I will offer a few proofs to show that here, also, he has no foundation for his inference. Prof. Bush, an eminent scholar, said:-

"The evening is probably mentioned first because the darkness preceded the light. On the ground of this recorded order of things in the sacred narrative, the Jews commenced their day of twenty-four hours from evening."-Notes on Gen. i., 5.

Lange, on the same text, says:-

"Evening and morning denote rather the interval of a creative day, and this is evidently after the Hebrew mode of reckoning; the day is from sunset, the morning that follows stands for the second half of the day proper. In the same manner was the day reckoned among the Athenians, the Germans and the Gauls. It is against the text for Delitzsch to put as the ground here the Babylonish reckoning of the day, namely, from the dawning of the morning."

And so Kitto, Cyclopaedia, Art. Day:-

"The earliest measure of time on record is the day. 'The evening and the morning were the first day' (Gen. i., 5). Here the word '*day*' denotes the civil or calendar day of twenty-four hours, including the 'evening,' or natural night, and the 'morning,' or natural day."

The reader will bear in mind that in exposing these inferences, I do not admit that an inference is any just reason for a positive institution. I protest against the whole course of Eld. Vogel,

122

and am glad to put myself on the record as fully committed against inference and tradition. With Alexander Campbell, I demand 'positive precept'-'express authority' for a positive institution. Eld. Vogel said a 'formal proclamation' was necessary to make a positive institution binding. But that was only meant to apply against the Sabbath: with Sunday the case is immensely different.

His remark that I wish to dictate as to the kind of evidence to be received, and that a pope could do no more, is deserving only of contempt. He did not think it popery in him to ask for the 'formal proclamation' of the Sabbath; nor did he ever think it was popery for A. Campbell to demand a 'precept' or 'positive injunction' for positive institutions. I will yet show him that I stand upon the ground clearly marked out by the great body of writers, of all denominations, on the nature of and evidences for positive institutions.

ELDER PETER VOGEL'S THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

c. The third style of reckoning time, namely, from midnight to midnight, is used by John in his Gospel, the last written book in the New Testament, unless Revelation be later. Here we have Scriptural authority as to the last usage among

Christians. Mark xv., 25 informs us that, according to the notation which begins the day with the morning, Jesus was crucified at the *third* hour—our nine o'clock in the morning. But John, who evidently begins the day at midnight, says that at the *sixth* hour He was on trial, John xix., 14. This is also the only reckoning, as we shall hereafter see, which accounts for all the Scriptural statements bearing on the length of time that Jesus was in the grave. "The Egyptians, the Ausonians, and others," says Kitto, adopted this reckoning. It was also used by the Romans, and hence was the prevailing method when Christianity was cradled and nurtured. Not only was this style used in Ephesus, where John wrote his Gospel, but also in the Roman town of Troas, about 130 miles to the north, of which Acts xx., 7 speaks.

Thus do we not only justify the present usage of beginning our days at midnight, but this also decides that that breaking of bread (v. 11) which took place after midnight (v. 7) was not the breaking of bread for which the disciples assembled, but was such an ordinary eating of food as is mentioned in Acts xxvii. 35 in the use of similar terms. Conybeare well says: "St. Paul now took some refreshment after the protracted labor of the evening." He translates verse 11, "When he had eaten," and adds, "This is distinguished in the Greek from *the breaking of bread*." Hence the breaking of bread for which they assembled—the partaking of the Lordic Supper—was attended to before Paul began his long speech. Indeed, the change of pronouns—"We having assembled to break bread, Paul was discoursing with *them*"—indicates a withdrawal of Paul's companions after the Communion, and before the discourse. And this serves to strengthen the preceding conclusion as to the point whence the day is reckoned. At least the reckoning which begins the day with sunset is not to be thought of; for that applied only to *Jewish* sacred seasons. The time of its abolition was, moreover, so far in the past, that it had fallen into desuetude, especially among Gentile Christians.

From the fact that Paul and his companions 'tarried *seven days*' at Troas before this gathering to break bread took place, it appears that in this Gentile city the Christians did not observe the sabbath, as was still the custom in Jewish countries; reports of which troubled converts from among the Jews. Acts xxi. 19-25.

We have here, beyond all controversy, one First Day given to the Lord, in the Communion and the ministry of the word, and I raise the question whether we may affirm more from these premises. It seems to me that we can, and I will here set down a few reasons.

a. Eminent Bible scholars of various denominations have been compelled, chiefly by this passage, to decide against their practice, and that of their people, in favor of weekly communion. (See quotations in my first affirmative.) Now, whatever force this passage has in this

123

direction, it has with equal clearness in favor of the weekly observance of the First Day. The two are inseparable.

b. It seems, as Conybeare says, that Paul 'lingered at Troas after his companions.' This conclusion is, no doubt, reached from the expression, 'And we

went *before*' (*proelthontes*, to go in advance or first), as Paul's companions (*proelthontes*) had preceded him in their journey to Troas, v. 5. The precise point when they left is, by the change of pronouns, indicated to have been immediately after Communion and before preaching: 'We having come together to break bread, Paul discoursed to *them*.' (Bible Union.) It was Paul that was 'about to depart on the *morrow*,' while his companions went in advance, by ship. The bearing this has on the question before us is obvious. The ship was expected to weigh anchor on Sunday, yet the communion service is postponed to that day! Though Paul and his companions were with the brethren at Troas a whole week, and no doubt 'labored from house to house,' yet the Lordic Supper is not attended to on any previous day, not even on the Sabbath, but is reserved for Sunday. Evidently this was *the* day for its observance. Aware, however, that the ship would sail about the time of meeting, Paul had 'appointed' or planned that his companions should go with it, and that he, in order to gain a few hours for his brethren and to give them opportunity to attend preaching on that day, would 'on the *morrow*' go to the trouble of footing it accross to Assos, while the ship is rounding Cape Lectum or doing business at the next landing. These facts can have but one meaning, namely, that the First Day of the week is the Lordic Day—the day on which the Lordic Supper is to be partaken of. And if such is the nature of the First Day, it is of every First Day.

I can, however, easily picture to myself the avidity with which my brother will seize upon the fact that Paul's companions traveled on this day, to turn it against me. Let him, however, remember that we are not now talking about the sabbath, hence no fanciful interpretation of the rules regulating it will apply here. The journey was *necessary*, and the ship not under their control. Whether they were able or unable to endure the fatiguing march across the country, or were needed to guard the baggage upon the ship's arrival at Assos, it is not necessary to conjecture; they could as quietly and profitably enjoy a sacred feast on shipboard as in the upper room at Troas. Paul and Luke arrived at Troas on Monday, having been the preceding Sabbath and Sunday on their way from Europe to Asia, v. 6. If, therefore, the traveling of Paul's companions argues against the First Day, his own traveling argues much more against the sabbath. Having once failed to make railroad connections, I was compelled to finish the last twenty miles of my journey afoot and on the Lord's Day, on a hot September morning, in order to fill an appointment of long standing; in this I felt that I was doing acceptable service to the Lord. On the supposition that I am right in the day, dare even my legalistic brother say that I did wrong?

We have, then, in several acts of worship, and in many churches, indeed in every church, both of Europe and of Asia, whose history is given in such detail as to name the time of observing these acts, invariably the First Day given to the Lord; and this not once, simply, but 'every First Day of the week.' Beyond all controversy, therefore, this is 'the Lord's Day.'

V. The First Day of the week is peculiarly appropriate and the fittest of the seven to be the Christian's sacred day.

The Lord's Day being a new institution, we naturally expect a new reason to underlie it. Being a positive institution, the Lord could make any day His that He

saw fit to choose. But positive institutions, as a rule, are commemorative and fall more appropriately on memorable days, if there be any, and if, in the nature of the case, they can be permanently located. The entire 23rd chapter of Leviticus is proof of this statement. Baptism, though commemorative (See Ro. vi.), is of such a nature as to find a fit place at the burying of 'the old man' and the resurrection into a new life. The Lordic Supper is a symbol, not of dying, but of death: the bread and wine are apart, as were the body and the blood of Jesus, from the time the Roman spear had entered His side till the moment of the resurrection on the First Day. While, then, any point between these two events is, in itself, suitable for the location of this commemorative institution, yet the First Day is the more appropriate, having the additional advantage of being the more notable. There is no day of the week in this dispensation

124

about which so many memorable facts cluster as about the First Day. Indeed it is remarkable how barren of such events are the other six. Let the reader pause to call them up, interrogating them one by one, and he will be astonished at the meagerness of the result. But turn to the First Day and behold what we have! What stimulus to holy thought!

1. Jesus rose from the dead on the First Day of the week.

This is an admitted fact on the part of Eld. Waggoner and his brethren, but denied by Seventh-Day Baptists. I will, therefore, pause a little to gather Scripture facts in support of my statement. And for this the reader will have the more patience when I assure him that these facts will bear on several points hereafter to be made.

a. The paschal lamb was by the law required to be slain on the 14th day of the first month, between the two evenings-3 p. m. and sunset. Ex. xii., 6, margin. But as 'born under the law' (Gal. iv., 4) and 'a minister of the circumcision' (Ro. xv., 8), Jesus 'learned obedience' (Heb. v., 9), 'knew no sin' (2 Cor. v., 21), was 'without sin' (Heb. iv., 15; 1 Pet. ii., 22; 1 John iii., 5), and 'fulfilled all righteousness' (Matt. iii., 15); He, therefore, slew the paschal lamb at its appointed season. See also Matt. xxvi., 17-21; Mark xiv., 12-18; Luke xxii., 7-14; and compare Ex. xii., 18.

b. On the fifteenth day, which of course began after the two evenings had passed, was the first paschal sabbath, Num. xxviii., 16-18. And so also testifies Smith, Bib. Dict., Art. Pass.: "The lambs were selected, *on the fourteenth they were slain*, and the blood sprinkled, and *in the following evening, after the fifteenth day of the month had commenced, the first paschal meal was eaten*. At midnight the first-born of the Egyptians were smitten." Again: "As the sun was setting, the lambs were slain, and the fat and blood given to the priests (2 Chron. xxxv., 5-6). The lamb was then roasted whole, and eaten with unleavened bread and bitter herbs, no portion of it was to be left until the morning. *The same night*, after the 15th of Nisan had commenced, the fat was burned by the priests and the blood sprinkled on the altar (2 Chr. xxx., 16; xxxv., 11). *On the fifteenth*, the night being passed, *there was a holy convocation*, and during that day no work might be done, except the preparation of necessary food (Ex. xii., 16)." So, in substance, Kitto also.

It was on this day, the 15th, a yearly sabbath, that Jesus was crucified. The same unscrupulousness which had once led the Jews to send officers to arrest Jesus on 'the great day of the feast' of Tabernacles (John vii., 32-45) and afterwards to seize Peter during the Passover (Acts xii., 3-4), led them, in disregard of the day, to crucify Jesus on the first yearly sabbath. Against the conclusion to which the foregoing facts undeniably lead, namely, that the Passover had actually begun, John xviii., 28 weighs nothing, since (1) the word passover may there denote the feast in general, as in Luke xxii., 1, or (2) the same perverseness which could crucify the innocent One, could just as readily postpone the keeping of the Passover beyond the legal time, or (3) the priests may have been afraid of becoming defiled because it would render them unfit to attend to the sacrifices which were to be offered on the 15th. Nu. xxviii., 17-24.

c. Jesus was crucified on 'the preparation' day before the sabbath, Lu. xxiii., 54. As this preparation day was itself a (yearly) sabbath, and the second yearly sabbath is wholly out of question, the sabbath which followed was one of the weekly sabbaths, and Jesus was crucified and buried on Friday. And this helps us to understand the somewhat indefinite expression of John xix., 14-'It was the preparation of the Passover;' it is to be understood of the preparation for the weekly sabbath, which fell in the passover week. Before the yearly sabbaths no particular preparation was needed, for necessary food might be prepared on those days (Ex. xii., 16). But this sabbath 'was a high day' (John xix., 31), since it not only fell within the passover week, but also because from it the following Pentecost was dated, as we shall hereafter see.

d. On the first day of the week the grave was found empty, and Jesus had risen. Mark xvi., 1-6; Luke xxiv, 1-7. His resurrection could not have taken place on Saturday; for in that case it would be impossible to make out 'three days' even by counting the beginning and ending fraction of a day as a whole, no matter at what point we begin to reckon the day. Nor is there any passage of Scripture which teaches His resurrection on the Sabbath. The only one relied on by the advocates of this theory

125

is Matt. xxviii., 1-6, "In the end of the sabbath, as it began to dawn towards the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulcher." And the angel said, Jesus 'is not here; he is risen.' Should we adopt this version, and understand with Lange, in the quotation already made from him on this point, that the more accurate Jewish division of the sabbath is here referred to, we have these women leaving their homes at the dawning of the day and arriving at the sepulcher, as Mark says, 'at the rising of the sun,' or more strictly, 'the sun having risen.' Or, if we adopt the more unusual rendering of Dr. Geo. Campbell and others, 'After the Sabbath,' etc., this difficulty vanishes equally well. Campbell says, "Opse before a genitive often means 'after.'" There is, however, a more excellent way. Let the word 'opse' have its more usual meaning, 'late' or 'in the end of,' and render *sabbatoon* in each of its occurrences by the same word in English (and no man can give a substantial reason why this should not be done) then we have the version of Rotherham, and of many others,—"And late in the week, when it was on the point of dawning into the first

[day] of the week," etc. The Jews for whom Matthew wrote his Gospel, knew well that, though the sabbath ended at sundown, the week, according to their own reckoning, did not end till sunrise the next day. It follows from the foregoing that Mark xvi., 9 is punctuated correctly in the common version: "Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene."

e. Jesus, then, was in the grave a part of Friday, all of Saturday, and a part of Sunday. He said that he would be in the heart of the earth 'three days and three nights,' Matt. xii., 40. If we reckon the day from sunset, and count the beginning and ending fraction as if a whole, we can make out three days, but only two nights; though this reckoning is not permissible, since it belongs only to sacred days; if, on the other hand, we reckon from sunrise, adding the night to the preceding day, we still have but two nights. The night must be broken into fractions before we can count 'three nights.' This brings us again to the Christian reckoning, which begins the day at midnight. From before sundown to Friday midnight, counting fractions, we have one day and one night; from thence to Saturday midnight, another day and two half or one whole night; thence till sunup Sunday, another day and night.

That it is Bible custom to reckon the beginning and the ending fractions of a series as if they were whole numbers, is so well known and so generally admitted that proof seems unnecessary. I will only ask that doubters, if there be any, begin at such passages as 1 Kings xv., 25-28, and try to harmonize the reigns of the kings of Judah and Israel.

By way of preparing for objections on another score, I call attention to the fact that Jesus said He would rise 'in three days' (John ii., 19), 'after three days' (Mark viii., 31; Matt. xxvii., 63), and 'on the third day' (Matt. xvi., 21; xvii., 23; xx., 19; Mark x., 34; Luke ix., 22). It must be frankly confessed that according to our idiom this is an irreconcilable contradiction. But the difficulty vanishes when we remember that the Jews in all ages habitually used the cardinal numbers inaccurately, and the ordinals accurately. Let us look at a few examples. Joseph imprisoned his brethren 'three days' and yet released them on the third day (Gen. xlii., 17-20). This, by the way, also serves to show that a fraction is counted as a whole. Reheboam said, 'Depart ye *for three days*, then come again.' 'So all the people came to Reheboam the third day as he had appointed;' 1 Kin. xii., 5-12. The Pharisees and priests asked for a guard, alleging that Jesus had said, '*After three days* I will rise again.' 'Command, therefore, that the sepulcher be made sure *till the third day*' (Matt. xxvii., 62-64). Matthew reports Jesus as having said, 'the third day' (xvi., 21), and Mark, in a parallel passage, says, 'after three days' (viii., 31). 'Cornelius said (to Peter, Acts x., 30), *Four days* ago I was fasting until this hour;' but according to our count it was only *three* days. In Esther iv., 16-v., 1, we have a passage parallel to Matt. xii., 40: 'Fast ye for me, and neither eat nor drink *three days, night and day*;' yet 'on the third day,' she went before the king.

2. The First Day is memorable by reason of Christ's appearance to His disciples on that day, after His resurrection.

There were, no doubt, other days on which Jesus appeared to his disciples, but none of them stand out with such prominence as these. The appearances on

other days are not dated, unless it be the ascension day, that mournful event when

126

the disciples were left 'orphans' and 'comfortless' for a season; and yet it is difficult to say whether this was on Thursday or Friday. But for some reason the Holy Spirit has seen fit to carefully date the appearances on the First Day.

[1.] On this day Jesus appeared to proclaim His resurrection [a] to Mary Magdalene, Mark xvi., 9-11; [b] to the other women [Matt. xxviii., 8-10]; [c] to Peter, Luke xxiv., 34; 1 Cor. xv., 5; [d] to two others of the disciples, Mark xvi., 12-13; and [e] to the Apostles generally, Mark xvi., 14-18; Luke xxiv., 36-49; John xx., 19-23. To the sad hearts who mournfully said, 'We trusted that it had been he which should have redeemed Israel,' this was equal to the reception of a new life; they were 'begotten again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead!' But all this meant no more to them than it means to us. Most memorable day!

[2.] "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." John xx., 26. 'After eight days' is the inaccurate use of the cardinals, which we have examined above, denoting the eighth day, as 'after three days' denotes the third.

J. N. Andrews, Seventh-Day Sabbatarian, in his History of the Sabbath, says, "'After six days' instead of being the sixth day was about eight days after. Matt. xvii., 1; Mark ix., 2; Luke ix., 28." But Luke's '*about* eight days' is too indefinite to form an exception to the rule established. Webster says that *about* signifies 'not far from,' and the sixth day is certainly 'not far from' the eighth. Luke did not mean to be accurate. Mr. Andrews says again, "Those who were to come before God from Sabbath to Sabbath to minister in His temple, were said to come 'after seven days.' 1 Chr. ix., 25; 2 K. xi., 5." This is no exception; if after seven days denotes on the seventh then after eight days signifies on the eighth. Moreover, the Hebrew of 1 Chr. ix., 25 is peculiar; it literally reads, '*for* or *against* the seven of days.' Where we have after in the Common Version, the Hebrew has *lamed*, *for* or *against*; the Greek, *kata*, *on*; the Douay Version, *upon*; and Luther, the genitive, *i. e.*, *on*;—thus making it different from John xx., 26, where the Greek has *meta*. There is, then, no getting away from the fact that the only visits of Jesus to His disciples which the Holy Spirit saw fit to date carefully were those taking place on Sunday.

ELDER J. H. WAGGONER'S THIRD NEGATIVE

Eld. Vogel's *rule of faith* is worthy of notice. In exalting inference, he applies Heb. v. 13-14, to this effect: they who rely upon the plain word of God are only babes, while they who accept inferences which the babes could not even draw, are the ones who use strong meat, having their senses exercised to discern both good and evil! Paul was not speaking of inferences, but of truths which they were not prepared to hear. If the exegesis of Eld. V. is correct, then the Disciples are only babes on the subject of baptism, for they demand a 'precept'—a positive

injunction;' while the pedo-baptists have the strong meat of inference which the weaker Disciples are not strong enough to see, not having their senses so well exercised! For myself, 'the sincere milk of the word' is acceptable; but I despair of getting it in favor of Sunday.

When I stated the evident truth that 'precedent' was no ground for an institution, unless the action was proved to be both continuous and to relate to the institution, he cited the order to lay by themselves their donations on the first day of the week and added, 'Continuous action!' But that action had no relation whatever to the sacred observance of Sunday, *and he knows it!* This little artifice to give the appearance of such action is worthy of the cause it is made to serve-worthy to be placed among the 'pious frauds' by which Sunday and other traditional dogmas have been elevated into 'Christian duties.'

And he said, 'We have in several acts of worship, and in many churches, . . . the first day given to the Lord.' This is a bold misrepresentation of the Scriptures, such as I would not wish to meet

127

in the great day. I have abundantly proved that no act of worship which could have any bearing on the 'sacred observance' of the first day, is found in 1 Cor. xvi. 2; and Acts xx. gives but a single act of a single church, without an intimation that any other church ever did the same, or that that church did so a second time! And what was then done is sufficiently accounted for on other ground than that by him assumed. With Dr. Carson, I say, 'An unnecessary inference is without authority.'

So clearly is my statement true, that Prof. McGarvey (Disciple), in his 'Commentary on the Acts,' says: "It. must, in candor, be admitted that there is no express statement in the N. T. that the disciples broke the loaf every Lord's day; neither is it stated that they *met* every Lord's day." True, and if *a second instance* could be given, it would afford *some ground* to claim *a custom*; but a single one does not. And it will be noticed that, in the last quotation from Eld. Vogel, he says the first day was '*given* to the Lord.' Who required the gift? Let the requisition be shown. It cannot be.

His last affirmative is a labored effort to show that Acts xx. proves that the Sunday was a day of observance; also, that Paul did not travel on Sunday. But never was there a failure more complete in every respect. In order to prove the latter point, he assumes that the day *did not* commence and end at sunset. He is quite willing to follow Babylonian or Roman time, or any time except that which God has plainly marked out in his word. And it is fitting that he should try to attach a reckoning of *heathen time* to his Sunday institution, because it is confessedly of *heathen origin!* Does he deny it? Here is the proof:-

"Sunday was a name given by the heathen to the first day of the week, because it was the day on which they worshiped the sun."-S. S. *Union Bible Dict.*

"The heathen nations in the north of Europe dedicated this day to the sun, and hence their Christian descendants continue to call the day Sunday."-*Webster.*

"The ancient Saxons called it by this name, because upon it they worshiped the sun."-*Rel. Encyclopedia.*

"It is also called Sunday from the old Roman denomination of *dies solis*, the day of the sun, *to which it was sacred*."-*Douay Catechism*.

If the *sacredness* of the seventh-day Sabbath had such an origin as that, I would blush to advocate it. If the first day ever had any higher dedication or sacredness, let my opponent give proof of it. 'What is the chaff to the wheat? saith the Lord.' But to his points.

First, he quotes John xix. 14, 'It was about the sixth hour,' to prove that John did not reckon the day from sunset, but rather from midnight. Against this, I say (1), as he said of Luke-'about eight days'-it is not designed to be definite; 'about' (he quotes) means 'not far from.' And (2) the common reading (third) in John xix. 14, is repudiated by all the beat scholars and commentators. And here I will remark that Eld. Vogel's theory stands self-condemned, in that it rests entirely on inference; and his inferences are all drawn from assumptions which are contradicted by his own partisans, and representative men in his own denomination. Surely it would seem that a *positive institution*, for which A. Campbell says *positive precept* or *express injunction* should be given, should have at least as much as *one ground of inference* which is beyond general dispute. A few authorities will settle this point.

"*There can be no doubt* that an error of number has crept in (*gamma* being confounded with *epsimon*) and that the true reading is T, *i. e.*, *tritee*. Indeed this reading is found in seven of the best MSS., some fathers, as Eusebius (who says it was so written in the autograph), Jerome, Severus, Ammonius, Theophylus, and some scholiasts, with Nonnus. In this opinion, the best commentators acquiesce."-*Bloomfield on Greek Text*.

Clarke refers to MSS. and authorities also, and adds:-

"As in ancient times, all the numbers were written in the manuscripts, not at large, but in numeral letters, it was easy for *gamma*, *three*, to be mistaken for *epsimon*, *six*. The *Codex Beza* has generally numeral letters, instead of words. *Bengel* observes that he has found *gamma*, *three*, exceedingly like *epsimon*, *six*, in some MSS. The major part of the critics think that *third*, *the third*, is the genuine reading."

We cannot fully illustrate the force of these remarks, as the characters in ancient Greek, before printing was discovered, were more uncouth than those given above, and might much more readily be confounded.

And so evident are the reasons that *the third* is the true reading, that Prof. Anderson,

128

a Disciple, author of a very good translation of the N. T., ignores *the sixth* entirely, and renders it, *the third*. Other authors might be quoted, but it is not necessary. So much for his first dependence!

Secondly, on Matt. xxviii. 1, he says:-

"The Jews, for whom Matthew wrote his gospel, knew well that, though the Sabbath ended at sundown, the week, according to their own reckoning, did not end till sunrise the next day."

Were this true, it would not give the strength to the argument that he so much needs; but the question first arises, Did the Jews reckon the week as ending at sunrise? I call for the proof. When that is given, I will notice his inference further.

Once more, he dates the crucifixion on the fifteenth day of the month, the yearly sabbath. But the Jews would not go into the judgment hall lest they should be defiled, 'but that they might eat the passover.' This text, Eld. V. says, may denote the passover in general! He surely ought to know that 'eating the passover' applied only to eating the paschal lamb with bitter herbs, etc. He made an unnecessary argument to prove that it was eaten the night before, *i. e.*, the night succeeding the fourteenth. Hence, if the Savior was crucified the fifteenth, they had already eaten the passover. The probability is against him, for that day was called 'the preparation' as regards the weekly Sabbath (Luke xxiii. 54-56), and 'the preparation of the passover' (John xix. 14), which likely refers to the preparation which had to be made for eating the paschal lamb. See Ex. xii. And this would show that 'that Sabbath was a high day,' because the yearly and weekly Sabbath came in conjunctions. So loosely does he throw assertions together, and make them the basis of *inferring a positive institution!* But his whole argument on this point is of no interest to me, having no relation to the observance of any day, nor can it carry conviction to Seventh-day Baptists, being marred with such serious defects.

On Acts xx. he says the ship was not under their control. Where did he learn this? The probabilities are clearly against him, for verses 15-16 say, 'And the next day we came to Miletus. For Paul had determined to sail by Ephesus, because he would not spend the time in Asia.' The fact that he chose the route, indicates the contrary of Eld. V.'s statement; and this is the view of Olshausen, and others.

Prof. McGarvey, of the Disciple denomination, in his 'Com. on the Acts,' says:-

"I conclude, therefore, that the brethren met on the night after the Jewish Sabbath, which was still observed as a day of rest by all of them who were Jews, or Jewish proselytes, and considering this the beginning of the first day of the week, spent it in the manner above described. On Sunday morning, Paul and his companions resumed their journey, being constrained, no doubt, by the movements of the ship, which had already been in the harbor of Troas seven days."

Thus do the oracles of Eld. Vogel's own denomination sweep away the ground of his inferences, because 'the logic of facts' is too strong to be resisted. It will be seen when he closes his argument that he has not even one ground for his inferences which is not strongly disputed by his own partisans.

But McGarvey thinks that Paul's traveling on Sunday is no warrant for us to make it a secular day! And Eld. Vogel has a suspicion that his inference will not meet with a hearty reception, so he, too, excuses Paul for traveling on Sunday; and how? By reference to his own action! He gives two reasons for his doing so. 1. He missed the railroad connection. 2. He had a long-standing appointment to fill. Would Eld. V. be willing to admit that he secularized Sunday without giving these explanatory reasons? He would not. But no such reasons were given in Paul's case.

Now look at the whole compass of the subject. Both Eld. Vogel (by citing his own case as parallel) and Prof. McGarvey offer excuses, or reasons, to justify Paul's traveling on Sunday; and thus we find that in the only instance where it is claimed that an apostle ever kept Sunday, they consider it necessary to devise reasons for his not keeping it! What a strength of *precedent!* and this is in the entire absence of testimony in its favor.

And I will answer his appeal to me in regard to his traveling on Sunday. He asks if I, a 'legalist,' dare to say he did wrong. No, sir, no. I confess myself too much of a legalist to condemn a man for working on Sunday when he is unable to show even the shadow of a legal prohibition! A 'legalist' of old said, 'By the law is the knowledge of sin.' Will Eld. V. take his position with

129

Paul on this assertion, and still teach that it is a sin to work Sunday? Produce the precept.

An interesting point, I have now to notice. On Paul's non-observance of Sunday, he says:-

"Let him remember that we are not now talking about the Sabbath, hence no fanciful interpretations of the rules regulating it will apply here."

It is just so-Sunday is not the Sabbath. It had not the characteristics of the Sabbath, and hence *no rest from labor* was required upon it. And it never was called the Sabbath, which is proof positive that Isa. lvi. does not speak of Sunday; *for Isaiah speaks of the Sabbath*. Neither the 'regulations' nor *name* of Sabbath belong to Sunday. No 'fanciful' interpretations of rules can regulate it. Assuredly not: if it is a positive institution, *only positive rules regulating it* are admissible! Now, kind sir, tell us, oh, do tell us where they may be found. I would like to see that part of Eld. Vogel's theory which is anything but 'fanciful.'

He says the first day is the fittest and most appropriate to observe. Does the word of God say so? No. Does it designate any event to be celebrated on that day? No. Let us hear again from the standard authors of Eld. Vogel's denomination. McGarvey, on Acts ii., says:-

"The day of the week on which the Holy Spirit descended has been celebrated from that time till this, though *no formal reason is given in the N. T.* for its observance. *The absence of inspired explanations*, however, has not left the world in doubt upon the latter subject; for the two grand events which occurred on that day-the resurrection of Jesus and the descent of the Holy Spirit-are of such transcendent importance that all minds agree at once in attributing to them, and especially to the former, the celebration of the day."

That it 'has been celebrated from that time' is a groundless assumption. But, aside from that, let A. Campbell give his opinion of establishing positive institutions in 'the absence of inspired explanations.' He says:-

"All will-worship is a disparagement of the worship appointed of God; it is, consequently, a reflection upon his wisdom, and obnoxious to his displeasure. It is as contrary to his revealed will as the presenting of 'strange fire' upon his altar was in the days of Nadab and Abihu. And, indeed, *every religious practice which was not founded upon an explicit revelation of the will of heaven, is will-worship*. The language of it is this: '*Thou shouldest have appointed this, and we are*

supplying a defect in thy wisdom or goodness.' Such is the spirit of every innovation in divine worship."-*Campbell on Baptism*, pp. 405, 6.

If Eld. Vogel dares to accuse me again of misconstruing Campbell, let him tell our readers what Campbell meant by these plain words. And more anon.

The resurrection has its *divinely appointment memorial*; it is baptism. And if the 'Man of Sin' had not laid his hand on this ordinance, and destroyed it, so far as its significance as a memorial is concerned, by turning it into sprinkling, which has no semblance of a resurrection, the Sunday could never have taken its place. So surely does one error prepare the way for another. Man's ideas of the fitness of things have nothing to do with divine revelation. What does the word of God require? By this, let everything be tested.

On the reckoning of time, I will remark that Sunday does indeed begin at midnight, but the first day of the week never did! *Sunday* is of heathen origin-a heathen period of reckoning-beginning at midnight. But *first-day* is God's time, beginning at the evening, when the sun sets. *The meeting at Troas did not convene on Sunday*, but on the evening of the first day of the week. It continued over unto Sunday, *i. e.*, till after midnight, and Sunday morning Paul took his journey. That the Lord's supper was celebrated in the early part of the evening is purely an assumption. Indeed, it is useless to expect anything but assumption from Eld. Vogel, while he advocates a theory for which there is no Bible proof.

Mr. Campbell's words set a strong seal of condemnation upon this whole Sunday system, most clearly showing it to be will-worship; and, as 'all will-worship is a disparagement of the worship appointed of God,' Sunday, of heathen origin, never commanded in the Scriptures, disparages the worship of God appointed in the sanctifying of the memorial of His rest.

To show the difference in the argument for the two institutions, and the impossibility of admitting the Sunday innovation, I notice:-

1. It has been shown that the seventh-day

130

Sabbath was sanctified at the end of creation week, *because* God rested from his work on that day. Jehovah himself said, '*therefore*'-for this reason-'the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.'

2. It was distinct from all yearly sabbaths, being based on the facts of creation. It was an institution as old as the heavens and the earth; coming to us from Eden; as old as the marriage institution, which was not the case with the ceremonial sabbaths.

3. It was *the rest day of the Almighty*. He did not rest from his work on any of the yearly sabbaths. While they were peculiar to the Jewish system, it was emphatically 'the Sabbath of the Lord.'

4. God spake it with his own voice. The other sabbaths were revealed through Moses.

5. God himself wrote the Sabbath precept on tables of stone. The Other sabbaths were not so written.

6. It was put into the ark, a part of that moral law over which the priests ministered in the temple of God.

7. Eld. Vogel has twice said that the seventh-day Sabbath might take the article 'by emphatic distinction,' which is true only because it was *emphatically distinguished* from the yearly sabbaths. Though in his argument he denied that there was any distinction, the 'logic of facts' compelled him to acknowledge the distinction, and an 'emphatic' one, too.

8. It has been abundantly proved that 'the law' which God gave to Israel, which is always taught in 'the Scriptures,' is the rule of right in this dispensation; that it is not 'made void;' that it proves all, both Jews and Gentiles, sinners; and it will be the rule of judgment in the great day.

9. The New Testament recognizes-not only the obligation of the law, as a whole, but-the perpetuity of the Sabbath, by many direct statements of what was done on 'the Sabbath day.'

10. When referring to these events, the book of Acts speaks of 'every Sabbath day,' referring to every seventh day only; which proves that the term Sabbath *does not apply* to the first day of the week; which proves again that Isaiah did not refer to the first day when he spoke of *the Sabbath*.

11. Jesus said, The Son of man is Lord of the Sabbath day; and it is referred to in Rev. i. 10, as the Lord's day.

12. Nothing has been presented to offset this array of important Bible truths, but *inferences drawn from assumptions*, the assumptions themselves being disproved by the most eminent and able of Sunday adherents! A weaker cause than that of Sunday, no man ever undertook to advocate. A more evident case of will-worship was never traditionized into a professed Christian duty.

ELDER PETER VOGEL'S FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE

3. Another most memorable occasion was the Pentecost following the resurrection of Jesus. Pentecost signifies *fiftieth*, and was so named because it always fell on the fiftieth day, counting from the morrow of the Paschal Sabbath, and so came invariably on the First Day of the week. I am well aware that some contend that 'the morrow after the Sabbath' was the morrow after the first yearly sabbath of the Paschal week, but to me there is nothing plainer than that the weekly Sabbath is meant.

a. 'The morrow after the sabbath' (Lev. xxiii. 11) is rendered, in the Greek, *tee epaurion tees prootees*, the morrow of the *First Day*, *i. e.*, Sunday.

b. As if for the greater clearness, the yearly sabbaths of the Paschal week are, in this connection, called 'holy convocations,' simply (vv. 7, 8), while the word sabbath is used to designate the day from whose morrow the Hebrews were to date Pentecost.

c. Not only do we have the word sabbath used to designate the day, but, in the Hebrew, the definite article is prefixed to show it to be *the Sabbath*, by way of pre-eminence. (See ver. 11, 15, 16.) This is all the more significant when the fact is regarded that none of the yearly sabbaths have the article in this chapter; no, not even the weekly Sabbaths, aside from these verses. The significant weight of the article seems specially reserved to place this matter beyond cavil.

d. And, as if to make sureness doubly sure, the day which ends the series is declared to be the First Day of the week:

131

'Even unto the morrow after the seventh sabbath shall ye number fifty days,' v. 16. Inasmuch as 'the yearly sabbaths were movable as to the day of the week,' had the counting been from the morrow after the first yearly sabbath, it would have been impossible to always end the series of fifty days with a sabbath before the fiftieth day; for the only possible sabbath before the Pentecost was a weekly Sabbath. Hence the 'morrow' which came after it, the Pentecost, was the First Day of the week.

With this matter indisputably settled, we are ready to note the memorable events of the day.

(1.) On this day the promised baptism of the Spirit took place. "And behold," said Jesus to His disciples, "I send the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye at Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high," Luke xxiv. 49. This promise of the Father was the baptism in the Holy Spirit (Act3 i. 4-5), and was fulfilled on the Pentecost: "Therefore, being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear" (Acts ii. 33). Never before was the Spirit so given (John vii. 38-39), This was 'the *first-fruits* of the Spirit' (Ro. viii. 23). Henceforth He was both 'along side of' and 'in' the disciples (John xiv.16-17), shedding abroad the love of God in their hearts to a degree past all understanding (Ro. v. 5; Eph. iii. 19). Before this, "eye had not seen, nor ear heard, neither had entered into the heart of man, the things which God had prepared for them that love Him; but God hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit" (1 Cor. ii. 9-10). Christian reader, as your heart burns with that love, and is cheered by these things, can you think of a day more memorable? How it wafts its blessed sacredness across the ages! Glorious day!

(2.) This day marks the beginning, in fact, of the New Dispensation. "Out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem," said the prophet [Is. ii. 4], and 'beginning at Jerusalem' was the Savior's instruction [Luke xxiv. 47]. "Who hath heard such a thing! Who hath seen such things! Shall the earth be made to bring forth in one day! or shall a nation be born at once! for as soon as Zion travailed, she brought forth her children!" Is. lxvi. 8. At the giving of the old law three thousand perished by the sword of justice; but at the ushering of the new, 'the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls.' What a gathering of 'first-fruits' for the Lord!

4. And of what is the Pentecost itself typical, but of the sacred observance of the First Day, upon which it so uniformly fell. Pentecost was one of the 'holy days,' *heortee*, of which 'the body is of Christ' [Col. ii. 16-17]. The antitype always enters with the recession of the type. I do not say that there is no double fulfillment of prophecy in types, as there is in other prophecies, but I insist that the shadow gives place only to the substance. And as a shadow Paul declares the Pentecost gone and its substance here. I maintain that the First Day, the Lordic Day, is that substance. Of all the sacred days appointed by Moses, only two were not movable as to the day of the week, the Sabbath, and the Pentecost.

The Sabbath was not movable for retrospective reasons, but the Pentecost-what retrospection has it, binding it to the First Day?-the reason can be only prospective. And this is virtually admitted in Eld. W.'s first article in this discussion, when he says of all the yearly sabbaths, and so of Pentecost, 'They were typical of future events.' In *that* First-Day sacredness lay, in embryo, the Christic holy day of this dispensation. As the '*sheaf* of the *first-fruits* of the harvest' [Lev. xxiii. 10-11], presented to Jehovah on the memorable First Day in the Paschal week-a resurrection of new grain from the old-was a type of the resurrection of Christ, 'the first-fruits of them that slept' [1 Cor xv. 20]; and as the two Pentecostal wave-loaves, the *prepared* 'first-fruits unto the Lord' [Lev. xxiii. 15-17], were a type of the 'first-fruits' of Christians [Jas. i. 18] offered to Christ on the Pentecostal First Day [Acts ii.], and also of Christians generally as they are presented in heaven [Rev. xiv. 4]; so the Pentecost itself, and of course in its First-day character, has its antitype. 'The body, is of Christ.' And this type is of itself sufficient to end this controversy.

5. Analogy furnishes material for the conclusion that there should be a sacred day in this dispensation, and that the First Day of every week should be the time.

1st. The occasion of deliverance from Egyptian bondage was deemed worthy of weekly sabbatic commemoration [Deut.

132

v. 5]. The deliverance from the task-service of the devil, which was virtually accomplished at the resurrection of Jesus, surpasses the former by the value of the spirit above that of body, and by the preciousness of immortality above mortality; and hence, for a stronger reason, deserves commemoration.

2nd. We have seen that not until the First Day were the bars of the tomb broken; and hence not till on this day did the Lord Jesus *rest* from His work of redemption, and from His conflict with the Satanic power which had entombed Him. If the Father honored the day on which He ended the old creation, much more is it fit that the Son should honor that on which He ended the new creation, inasmuch as the new surpasses the old. "Behold, I create new heavens and a new earth," finds its *first* fulfillment here; and so far do these excel the old that the prophet adds, "And the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind." Is. lxv. 17.

REVIEW OF THE SECOND NEGATIVE

I said not a word about 'accredited writers' when I referred to the fact that 'at least some of Eld. W.'s brethren' once held to a non-abolition of the old covenant. I had read but little of Advent literature at the time I met those 'brethren.' Had they even been 'writers' it would be easy to say 'not accredited.' If names are desired, they can be had for the asking. And as for insult or discourtesies, I believe every word from my pen on this proposition will bear the closest scrutiny. My brother may continue his insinuations, if he will, and may persist in characterizing those with me as 'partisans', his shall still be 'brethren.'

Suppose I were wrong in my application of Ps. lxi., would that prove me in error on Is. lvi? But even on this Psalm I have nothing to yield. 'The zeal of the

Lord's house' may 'eat up' many a Christian, and 'the reproaches of them that reproach the Lord' such a one may take upon himself as well as did David. There is a difference between *appropriated* quotations, when individual histories run parallel, and fulfillment of predictions; both may be said to be fulfillment of scriptures, but not in the same sense.

I am sorry to learn that my brother only eats bread and drinks wine, when he sits at the Lord's table. With Paul, I claim to 'commune' [1 Cor. x. 16], *Deipnon* [supper] denotes a 'full meal,' and is not exhausted by the deglutition of a morsel of bread and of a sup of wine: the spirit feasts to the full. This is least akin to the cannibalistic devouring of literal flesh and blood by the 'mother church.' Neither this spiritual repast, nor even a simple commemoration of a crucified Savior, was possible to the apostles at the institution of the Lord's Supper, both on account of ignorance and of unbelief respecting the essential basis.

Campbell says of Pedobaptists, "Their method is not to produce either a precept or *precedent*." He admits, then, a precedent as sufficient; and precedents I have given. My brother admits that a man may be justly hung upon circumstantial evidence [*i. e.* inference], if 'based on a series of undisputed facts.' This, precisely, I have given. Is that fact or fiction which Paul and Luke record in 1 Cor. xvi. and Acts xx., and that in those other scriptures cited? Ah! but ray deductions are disputed. Yes, so does the criminal's lawyer dispute, but for all that the man is hung.

Let me grant that express precept or formal proclamation is needed. We have it. Rev. i. 10 would be an impossible scripture without such a basis. I see a house yonder: it is massive in its proportions, but I am not in position to see its foundation; it is out of sight: has it, therefore, none? Must we see the foundation before we have a right to assert that it has one? How preposterous! Well, I'll grant it, says my brother; but then it is an old house, long since built. In reply, I prove [1] that the old house has been torn down, [2] that this is built by a different architect, and [3] that it stands in a different place.

I am requested to prove that the term Lord in Rev. i. 10 is used differently from Rev. xi. 15. And here is the proof: 1. Though the words are the same in the English, they are not in the original Greek. 2. That used in Rev. xi. 15 refers there undoubtedly to the Father, whereas the other is never used with reference to Him, but only of the Christ. 3. 'Lord,' in Rev. i. 10, is used in an official sense, and so refers to Christ, since He only is now Lord, officially, as I have abundantly shown. True, the Father 'gave him to be head;' but that which is given to me is *mine*. And when 'all authority' is given, what is lacking to complete Lordship? In other words, the Father was sole Lord, officially, in the

133

former dispensation, but He resigned or 'gave' this position to Christ during this dispensation, so that Jesus is now 'Lord of all.'

The reason why Jesus did not do His own will during His earthly ministry is simply this: He was 'born under the law' [Gal. iv. 4] and was obedient to Him who was then Lord; but Himself being Lord now, He is 'the *author* and *finisher* of the faith' *i. e.*, of the gospel with all its appurtenances [Heb. xii. 2]. And mediation, on the part of Christ, must not be so much conceived of as having the Father now

above Christ and over the gospel, but rather as having Him before the gospel. Not only is Christ the author of the gospel, but the whole race is His by the purchase of His blood, so that now all are amenable to Him, and 'the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son' [John v. 22]. It is only when the Son will resign this Lordship that the Father will judge again, and those, namely, who shall not have profited by having been under the Son [Heb. x. 31]. The Father was speaking level to the Jewish mind when He said, 'I will make a new covenant;' for, strictly speaking, Jesus is the 'testator' or covenanter [Heb. ix. 16]; and hence the 'my laws' are Christ's laws, of which He is 'the author and finisher.'

This leads us again to the conclusion that the Lordic Day, of Rev. i. 10, is a Christic day. He is 'the author' of it; and everything predicated by Barnes of *kuriakee* is, as he meant it, predicable of the Sunday.

The attempt to prove Jesus proprietor of creation, and so of the Sabbath, is weak indeed. All things were created '*for Him*' [Col. i. 16] is to prove Him owner and proprietor! Let us test it. The Sabbath was made '*for man*,' therefore he is owner and proprietor of it! If I, then, see fit to set the Sabbath aside, what right has my brother to complain? "Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own?"

I am represented as saying that the Lord's Day is a 'moral law.' I said nothing of the kind, but was careful to tell to what extent I denied his proposition marked I. in his first negative, and have both before and since called the Lord's Day positive. While knocking down his man of straw, he makes a statement too good to be lost; namely, "All positive institutions of the gospel are a part of the faith of Jesus." Now since all sacred days are positive institutions, that of Rev. i. 10 is also positive, and of the faith of Jesus. And since Jesus is 'the *author* of the faith,' he is also of the day named in Rev. i. 10. It is, therefore, a *new* institution. Do I still 'stand on inference only on all the ground of difference?' It strikes me that we have concession here.

And what is there so despicable about inferences? Is not the conclusion of every argument an inference from its premises? To inveigh against inference is to ask me to argue without reasoning, to discuss without discussing, and to prove my proposition with my mouth shut!

Much space is devoted to 1 Cor. xvi. 2, to prove the collection to have been at home, as though that were fatal to my position. But my conclusion follows equally well from either construction. I will, however, say again, that *heautoo*, being in the dative case, may be either masculine or neuter; if masculine, then by *himself* (at home) is the proper version; if neuter, then we must render it *by itself*. I would like to know how my brother has found out that it cannot be neuter. As for the term *logia* (collection), it is from the verb *legoo*, and *legoo* means *to gather in any quantity*, as fuel, words for a discourse, etc., etc. See Liddell & Scott.

On Acts xx. I was sufficiently full in my third affirmative. I will only add, that to argue from the sentential order of the words in Gen. i. 5 to the point of beginning the day, is lame. Who, for example, would argue from Acts v. 30 and x. 39, 'whom ye slew and hanged on a tree,' that Jesus was first slain and then nailed to the cross? Yet this sentence is connected by *and* in a way that the other is not. See

Conant's literal version, already given. It is a well known fact that great liberty is used in the sentential collocation of words when the real order is indicated by the meaning of the words, as in Gen. i, 5, or by a knowledge of the facts in the case, as in the other passages cited.

I have space here only to consider two items in the *third negative*. If the First Day was *given* to the Lord, 'who required the gift?' The Lord Jesus. For Rev. i. 10 shows that He requires a day, and no day can be shown to have been given, if it is not the First Day. To the statement that 'Acts xx. gives but a single act of a single church,' I have, in addition to what I previously said, this reply: From 1 Cor xi. we learn that there were

134

two kinds of gatherings among the first Christians. [1] The more private or social meetings for prayer and prophecy, which seem to have been 'free-will offerings,' presented by a few gathered here and a few there, according to convenience; and [2] there was the 'coming together *in the church*,' when all came together 'into one place' [ver. 18, 20]. And this gathering had always in view, as a chief purpose, 'to eat the Lord's Supper' [ver. 20]; the Corinthians failing of this only in so far as they perverted the institution.

1. Such being the custom of the primitive Christians, it is known that the meeting of Acts xx. 7, being for the purpose of observing this Supper, was not a casual affair; and, hence, the First Day is the day for the 'coming together in the Church.'

2. Moreover, the type of the shewbread demands a stated weekly meeting for the observance of the Lord's Supper. We have already seen that the holy place in the tabernacle represents the church. The table of shewbread had all the appearance of the Lord's table. There were twelve loaves; one for each tribe, as we have one loaf, being but one body; there were also vessels of wine, as on the Lord's table, which was poured out as an offering to God, as Christ poured out His soul to be an offering; and incense, typifying the thanks we render before participation. That bread was only for the priests, as the Lord's Supper is exclusively for those who are now of the 'royal priesthood.' "*Every Sabbath* he [the priest] shall set it in order before the Lord *continually*, being taken from the children of Israel by an *everlasting* covenant" [Lev. xxiv. 8]. 'Everlasting', 'continual,' and 'perpetual' are terms that have no such limit as to confine their force to the Mosaic dispensation. As the priesthood, the Sabbath, circumcision, and other institutions, whose duration is described by the same terms, exist today in antitype, so does this institution also. The Lord's Supper must, then, be weekly observed, but, by express example, upon the First Day. This, therefore, is the Lord's Day.

ELDER J. H. WAGGONER'S FOURTH NEGATIVE

The reader will remember that Eld. Vogel asked, "Has he forgotten the position that, at least, some of his brethren used to occupy?" In this he insinuated that that position was so strongly or prominently taken by some of my brethren that I knew it, for how else could I forget it? I have been intimately acquainted

with both the writers and speakers of the Seventh-day Adventist faith for more than twenty years, and know that their faith on our relation to the covenants has been as well defined as has been that of the Disciples on baptism. I know that no one, ever recognized among us, ever taught as he said. Though Eld. V. has placed himself in a questionable light by many of his assumed positions, I did hope that he would not so far lose sight of honorable dealing as to forfeit that respect which it is pleasant to entertain for an opponent in theological controversy.

A few points in his last article I will notice.

1. On Sunday, Christ 'rested from the work of redemption'! What an absurdity. Paul says we are yet 'groaning for redemption.' If Christ then rested (ceased) from that work, where is our hope?

2. He well says that to deny inference is to ask him to discuss with his 'mouth shut.' If he had kept his mouth shut till he had something besides inference for Sunday, it would be closed yet.

3. He acknowledges that he is 'not in a position to see the foundation' of Sunday! But I am in a very good position to see the foundation of the Sabbath-the Lord's day. It is laid broad and deep in the word of God; the corner stone in Eden; and reaches to the earth made new. There is no obscurity there. But he says he sees the building, and there fore there must be a foundation. Did he never hear of a house built upon the sand? His own argument is conclusive proof that the sand-bank of inference is its foundation, and its superstructure the fog of tradition. And what are the 'proportions' of the building of which he speaks? He has constantly evaded the subject of the extent or limitations of the

135

obligations of Sunday-keeping. I heard Eld. Treat, a very prominent man among the Disciples in Indiana, publicly say, "I am ready to stump the country from Maine to California in favor of a general Sunday law." Would he 'stump the country' in favor of general law to enforce baptism-a law to compel everybody to be baptized? And if not, why not? Are they not both positive institutions of the gospel? (!) Why not treat them alike? In a discussion on baptism I think Eld. Vogel would claim a clearly defined limitation. Why this inconsistency? Such a course is a virtual acknowledgment that there is no such institution.

4. It is immaterial as to what is the meaning of *legoo*. I gave an undisputed authority for the definition of *logia*. But the definition which he *italicised* as professedly from Liddell & Scott, *is not given by them*.

5. He thinks, at last, that he has got something more than inference, namely, my concession! Suppose I had conceded his assumptions, would that give them authority in the absence of Scripture proof? But his 'triumphing is short;'-I made no such concession. I said, 'All the institutions of the gospel are positive.' Is marriage a gospel institution? Is it confined to the church of Christ? No. Why not? Because it comes down from Eden-it antedates sin and the gospel. And so of the Sabbath. Has Eld. V. forgotten the whole tenor of my argument, that the Sabbath is 'an original institution?' The Sabbath is not peculiar to the gospel, more than is marriage. And so the only relief he finds from his mass of inference is a fancied

concession, which can only be made out by a per version of words. I forbear to blame him for the perversion only because his position so strongly calls for pity.

6. Heb. xii. 2, does not say that Christ is the author and finisher of *the* faith, *i. e.*, of the gospel system. He distinctly affirmed that his doctrines were not his own, but he spake the words given him of his Father. These words of Paul are in the conclusion of a discourse on *personal faith*, and are correctly rendered-'author and finisher of *our* faith.' This correction sets aside much of his fourth article. Eld. V. shows a wondrous tendency to misstate words of Scripture, and then build upon the foundation he has made. The reader will see, by turning to 1 Cor. ii. 9, 10, that he has garbled that text to make it harmonize with his position. I see no reason why he should take such a course except his anxiety to make a case, the necessities of which require it.

7. On the proprietorship of the Sabbath I refer to my remarks on Mark ii. 27, 28, in the early part of this discussion. The Sabbath was made for man, for him to use in the worship of God; but it is the Lord's Day. These two declarations are in the Bible. But see another text, 1 Cor. xi. 9, which says the woman was created for the man. His wife is *his*, is she not? May he therefore abuse her, in violation of the law of the institution which governs the relation? And his comparison would make man proprietor of the Sabbath in the same sense that Christ is; but, did man create all things in the beginning, and rest the seventh day and bless and hallow it, as Christ, the Maker, did? His position casts indignity upon Christ and His word, and is that of a caviler, not that of a reasoner.

8. The new heavens and new earth were not created on that Sunday! for they are not yet. Peter says (2 Pet. iii.) they will succeed the passing away of the 'heavens and earth which now are,' which will take place in 'the day of Judgment and perdition of ungodly men.' And Rev. xxi. says in the new earth there will be no sorrow, no tears, no sickness, no death. Is that now the case? Such an expositor of Scripture is Eld. Vogel! And Isaiah says that, in the new-earth state, 'from one Sabbath to another,' all flesh will worship the Lord. If Eld. Vogel gets there, he will have to be converted from his present position.

He said, under the third proposition, "Each man, whether Jew, Gentile, or Christian, is under the obligation to attend to *the thing commanded to him*." Now if he will show *that Sunday was commanded to Jew, Gentile, or Christian*, the controversy will be ended. But he tries to make *equally binding, things not commanded!* What is it but will-worship?

A. Campbell said, "Do we transgress any divine command in neglecting to have our children baptized? No; I never read of any one being accused of this sin in the Bible, nor of any commandment that was thereby transgressed."-*Baptism*, 427. Let Eld. V. put 'neglecting to keep Sunday,' in this, and it is just as forcible and true.

Dr. Sherlock, against the Romanist's rule of faith, wrote:-

136

"What is matter of institution depends wholly upon the divine will and pleasure; and though all men will grant that God and Christ have great reasons for their institutions, *yet it is not the reason, but the authority, which makes the institution*. Though we do not understand the reason of the institution, if we see

the command, we must obey; and though we could fancy a great many reasons why there should be such institution, if no such institution appear, we are free, and ought not to believe there is such an institution because we think are reasons assigned why it should be. . . . I would not be thought wholly to reject a plain and evident consequence from Scripture; yet I will *never admit* of a mere consequence to prove *an institution* which must be delivered in plain terms, as all laws ought to be; and when I have no other proof but Scripture consequences, I shall not think it equivalent to a Scripture proof."

This is sound doctrine; and had it been written for the present occasion, it could not more directly have condemned Eld. Vogel's course.

Bishop Taylor wrote:-

"All positive precepts, that depend on the mere will of the law-giver, admit no degrees, nor suppletory and commutation, because in such laws we see nothing beyond the words of the law and the first meaning. He will not be disputed with, nor inquired of *why* or *how*, but just according to the measure there set down. So, *and no more*, and no less, and no otherwise. For when *the will of the lawgiver be all the reason*, the first instance of *the law is all the measures*, and there can be *no product but what is just set down.*"

And so far as institution or obligation for Sunday is concerned, there is nothing just set down!

Dr. Goodman wrote:-

"Now it is very evident that all things of this nature ought to be appointed *very plainly or expressly*, or else they can carry no obligation with them; for, seeing *the whole reason* of their becoming law or duty lies in the will of the legislator, if that be not plainly discovered, they cannot be said to be instituted, and so there can be no obligation; because, where no law is, there is no transgression; and *a law is no law in effect which is not sufficiently promulgated.*"

Bishop Burnet said:-

"*All reasoning upon this head is an arguing against the institution.* . . . He who instituted it knew best what was most fitting and most reasonable; and we must choose rather to acquiesce *in his commands* than in our own reasonings."

Dr. Owen said:-

"Divine revelation is the only foundation, the only rule, and the only law of all religious worship, that is pleasing to God or accepted by him; *when once a person maintains it allowable to pass the limits of a divine command, there is nothing to hinder him from running the most extravagant lengths.*"

We have seen this well illustrated by Eld. Vogel in this discussion.

Bishop Hopkins said:-

"We ought not to worship God with any other external worship than *what himself has commanded*, and appointed in his holy word. The Scripture has set us our bounds for worship; *to which we must not add*, and from which we ought not to diminish; for whosoever does either the one or the other must needs accuse the rule, either in defect of things necessary, or of superfluity of things unnecessary; which is a high affront to the wisdom of God, who, as he is the object, so is he the prescriber of all that worship which he will accept and reward."

And Richard Baxter said:-

"Who knows what will please God but himself? and has he not *told us* what he expects from us? *Can that be obedience which has no command for it?* Is not this to supererogate, and to be righteous overmuch? Is not this also to accuse God's ordinances of insufficiency, as well as his word; as if they were not sufficient to please him or help our own graces? Oh, the pride of man's heart, that, instead of being a law-obeyer, will be a law-maker! For my part I will not fear that God will be angry with me *for doing no more than he has commanded me*, and for sticking close to the rule of his word in matters of worship; but I should tremble to add or diminish."

From these quotations it will be seen that there was nothing new nor novel in the stand taken by Alexander Campbell on positive institutions—he did not originate his views. But he did faithfully and nobly press them, on the subject of baptism. All Protestants claim these positions against the Romanists; and all Baptists claim them against Pedo-baptists. It needs but little reflection to see that Catholicism could not live if they prevailed. And it is equally evident that if these truths were universally acknowledged,

137

there could not be a Pedo-baptist nor a Sunday-keeper in the Christian churches!

Prof. Clark Braden, in a notice of a discussion which Eld. Vogel had on this subject," said that Eld. V. maintained 'the Christian Sabbath' to the entire satisfaction of those 'of all churches' who hearer heard him. By the way, Eld. Vogel said he had not made the subject a specialty, and was not so well prepared to debate it as I was. But his friends and admirers contradict this. Mr. Braden said that he was able 'to enlighten the best read scribe among' them, and called upon the 'brotherhood' to take steps to have a written discussion between Eld. V. and some seventh-day man, that they might thus be prepared 'to meet this disorganizing system when it attempts to work inroads on our congregations.' And so, the steps were taken and the challenge given. And thus Eld. Vogel stands as the chosen representative of the 'Disciple' body. His acknowledgment that inference is his only dependence, is their acknowledgment. His failure to find proof of Sunday, is their failure. But they will find—they cannot fail to see—that he has done them an irreparable injury in regard to the truth they hold. For, while his positions are too fallacious to meet the approval of candid men, their enemies will take *his declarations in favor of inference and deduction for positive institutions*, and successfully meet them on the question of infant baptism. They must yet see the necessity of yielding Mr. Campbell's positions on infant baptism, or of repudiating Eld. Vogel's argument on positive institutions.

The truth is, and Messrs. Braden and Vogel know it, that many in 'the churches,' as well as among themselves, are not only easily satisfied with anything that seems to favor Sunday, but *they are determined to be satisfied with it!* however contradictory it may be. Knowing that they have no evidence, they catch at every plausible *substitute for evidence* that is presented.

As Eld. Vogel's work is so gratifying to 'the churches,' it is worth while to bring together some of the positions of the churches who sit so lovingly together on the Sunday theory.

1. The seventh-day Sabbath was made and sanctified at creation, and changed to the first day of the week at the resurrection of Christ.

2. The original Sabbath of creation was changed to the sixth day (improperly called the seventh in Exodus!) at the passage of the Red Sea, and again changed to the seventh day (improperly called the first in the New Testament!) at the resurrection.

3. Indorses the above, except that the change was made before they left Egypt.

4. The original Sabbath of Eden was the first day of the week (improperly called the seventh day in Genesis!) and was changed to the seventh at the falling of the manna, and back again to the first day at the resurrection.

5. The Sabbath of the Old Testament was Jewish; the Christian Sabbath is the first day, enforced, however, by the same commandment.

6. The Sabbath commandment enforces only the seventh part of time, which comes on Sunday.

7. The Sabbath was entirely Jewish, and was abolished; and a new institution erected of Sunday.

8. The Sabbath is entirely abolished, and in this dispensation there is no sacred time, but it is necessary to keep some day, and that day should be Sunday.

9. The Sabbath was an original institution, unchanged in the New Testament, but 'the church,' by the power given to her and of the successorship of Peter, changed it into Sunday.

Can any other dogma, professedly Christian, claim such an array of contradictions? Can a doubt exist that only error and darkness is the cause of this Babel of confusion? By this, Sunday stands self-condemned, for if there were any *evidence* they would seize upon it, and unite in presenting it to the world. But they all agree in the result! The result is what they are after, regardless of the process by which they reach it. Reader, what would you think of arithmeticians who should declare they had to a certainty found the product of certain numbers, because they had added them, subtracted them, multiplied them, and divided them, and brought the same result every time! The very claim would stamp the result as error and the fruit of error.

Of the erection of the festival of this 'memorable day,' Dr. Kitto says:-

"The commencement of the Christian church on the day of Pentecost, preceded as it was by our Lord's ascension, attached a peculiar interest to this season, and eventually led to its being set apart for the commemoration of these great

138

events. It was not, however, established as one of the great festivals until the fourth century."-Kitto's Cyclopaedia.

"It must be confessed that there is no law in the New Testament concerning first-day."-Buck's Theol. Dict. A confession easy to make because the fact is universally known.

"The change from the seventh to the first day appears to have been gradually and silently introduced."-Dr. Scott. And in that manner have all the errors crept into the church, while the 'law and the testimony' are the measure of duty.

"Was the first day set apart by public authority in the apostolic age? No. By whom was it set apart, and when? By Constantine, who lived about the beginning of the fourth century."-A. Campbell, Lecture in Bethany College in 1848.

Dr. Heylyn, author of a large History of the Sabbath, says of early Sunday-keeping:-

"For three hundred years there was neither law to bind them to it, nor any rest from worldly business required upon it. . . . Tertullian tells us they did devote the Sunday partly unto mirth and recreation, not to devotion altogether; when, in a hundred years after Tertullian's time, there was no law or constitution to restrain men from labor on this day, in the Christian churches."

Bishop Jeremy Taylor said:-

"It was not introduced by virtue of the fourth commandment, because they for almost three hundred years together kept that day which was in that commandment."

All these authorities (Sunday-keepers) point to 'about the beginning of the fourth century,' for the first Sunday law. Campbell says directly that Constantine was the author of it. Constantine's decree was in a. d. 321. Heylyn puts it 'a hundred years after Tertullian's time,' who died a. d. 216. Every testimony points to Constantine's law as the first public authority for Sunday. His decree reads as follows:-

"Let all the judges and townspeople, and the occupation of all trades, rest on the venerable day of the sun; but let those who are situated in the country, freely and at full liberty, attend to the business of agriculture; because it often happens that no other day is so fit for sowing corn and planting vines; lest the critical moment being let slip, men should lose the commodities granted by Heaven."

Prof. Stuart, on the Sabbath, and many other writers, makes mention of the fact that the council of Laodicea published an anathema against those Christians who kept the seventh day. This was in a. d. 364.

This shows that 'the day of the sun' was first made popular by a heathen edict, and then taken up and adopted by the Romish church, and the observance of the seventh day, the holy Sabbath of the Lord our God, was strangled by the anathemas of their councils.

ELDER PETER VOGEL'S FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE

Having both the third and fourth negatives to review, and wishing to present a brief summary, I shall use the utmost brevity, intending to close with this number, unless Bro. W. violates the rules of debate in his rejoinder.

I did not say that "they who rely upon the word of God are only babes," but that babes, because 'unskilled,' can do little else. And while Paul speaks of 'higher truths,' in Heb. v. 13, 14, they are truths gathered by inference, 'mere deductions,' from various Old and New Testament facts, as Paul had just been gathering, and upbraided the people, not only for insufficient attainments to

gather and 'teach' them themselves, but also for inability to 'hear them.' What 'pious frauds' Paul was guilty of!

We are abundantly told what Campbell, McGarvey and others teach, but in my simplicity I supposed the question was, "Do the *Scriptures* teach?" Had I only understood this matter sooner, what quotations might I have not made from Eld. W.'s brethren! Nay; as Beecher said of Calvin, so say I of others: "My first desire is to know what is true; and then I am very glad if Calvin agrees with me, but if he don't, so much the worse for him."

'Sunday' is a term of heathen origin (and, no doubt, the heathens created the day itself!); therefore, it cannot be put

139

to a sacred, scriptural use! Bread and wine were offered by heathens to their gods; therefore, the Lord's Supper is a heathen institution! Well, logic is logic!

The Babylonians and the Romans reckoned their days from midnight to midnight (they were heathens, you know); therefore, the Lord can't. Naughty heathens, these, to estop the Lord!

John xix. 14, "It was about the sixth hour." True, 'about' is indefinite, but not sufficiently so as to convert the sixth into the third hour. Nor is it at all admissible to change sixth into third. Anderson's translation was from a text that read *third*, but at the time of his death he was at work upon a better text. The quotations from Bloomfield and Clarke amount to nothing; for (1) But few manuscripts use characters instead of words to express numbers. (2) Even when characters are employed the chances for mistakes are overrated. The Greek letter for 3 has three different forms, and that for 6 has four; only one of the first three and one of the last four can be at all mistaken for each other, and even these are less alike than our numerals 8 and 3. A more likely presumption is, that some copyist supposed, from his knowledge of the other Gospels, and on the assumption that all used the same reckoning, that his predecessor had made a mistake which he felt it duty to correct. (3) But the most decisive fact, and that which places this matter beyond dispute, is this: The three oldest and best manuscripts, the Alexandrian, the Vatican, and the Sinaitic (the united testimony of which neither Bloomfield nor Clarke had) agree in reading 'the *sixth* hour.' "These three manuscripts," says Tischendorf, "stand at the head of all ancient copies of the N. T., and it is by their standard that both the early editions of the Greek text and the modern versions are to be compared and corrected." Again; in John i. 39 we read, "They came and saw where he dwelt, and abode with him *that day*. It was about the *tenth* hour." The conjunction 'for,' in the Common Version, is rejected by the three manuscripts above named. Had John used the Jewish mode of reckoning, the tenth hour would have been four o'clock, and the expression, 'abode with him *that day*,' would be out of place. There is no mistaking the reckoning John followed. And this fixes the reckoning of Acts xx. 7, in spite of all the learned authorities which my brother may accumulate.

Others may apologize for Paul's traveling on the First Day of Acts xx. 7, I know he did not travel. He traveled, however, both the preceding Lord's Day and the *Sabbath* before that; hence I do not hesitate to do likewise when necessity

requires. By 'the logic of facts' I set aside McGarvey's comment. He is no 'oracle.' As a people we acknowledge none but 'the living oracles.'

Because 'Paul had determined to sail by Ephesus,' my brother thinks the ship was under his control. This by no means follows. The vessel had its course marked out, and Paul could only have reached Ephesus by boarding another vessel, as he did on other occasions. The delay would have been small could he have controlled the vessel and gone to Ephesus; but to change once, perhaps twice, this would have caused much delay.

All the rules regulating Sunday observance are called for. This demand would be just were we under the law. Under the gospel we are 'sons' and are not governed after the manner of 'servants.' It is sufficient for a son to know that the day is 'the Lord's.'

The call for proof that the Jews ended their weeks with sunrising on Sunday, will be unheeded. The proof has been given, and he has seen fit to ignore it; so it must go to the reader without a reply.

The assertion that the 'eating of the passover' of John xviii. 28, and the statement that Jesus ate it before the appointed time, thus sinning! and also the assertion that the weekly and yearly sabbaths came in conjunction that year, need no reply, having been forestalled in my third affirmative.

The quotation from Campbell on will-worship is perfectly gratuitous. I can show, and have shown, 'an explicit revelation of the will of heaven,' as my summary will show.

Eld. W. closes his third negative with an attempted exhibit of the difference between the argument for the Sabbath and Sunday. Every item, save one, has been considered before. No. 11, for example, "The Son of man is Lord of the Sabbath," was shown to be untrue in the sense he takes it. On the contrary, I proved that every Jew is lord of the Sabbath in the same sense and to the same extent claimed by Jesus in Mark ii. 27. See 1st neg., 3rd prop., par. marked 3,

140

near the end. The facts in No. 7 were shown to prove the Sabbath a positive institution. Indeed, I gave eleven different proofs of its being positive, without reply.

No. 6 contains a new statement to this effect: The Sabbath commandment was put into the midst of moral commandments; therefore, it is moral! That is, if a negro were among nine white men, and engaged in every respect as they are, it would prove him white! No; the Sabbath commandment, which is wholly positive-commemorative and typical-was, no doubt, put into the very midst of other constitutional precepts, in their nature moral, though then given as if positive, *to rebuke those who would divide into two laws what God has joined into one.*

REVIEW OF FOURTH NEGATIVE

For some reason my brother has found it more convenient to accuse me of dishonest dealing, and to declare how he has lost respect for me, than to test my statement by calling for the proffered names. No doubt, this is honorable and worthy of all respect.

1. Paul indeed says that we are yet 'groaning for redemption,' but it is 'for the redemption of our *body*;' *i. e.*, for the consummation in ourselves of what Christ has long since consummated for us. When Jesus "was delivered for our offences, and was raised for our justification" (Ro. iv. 25) He had *completed* the *remedy* for our sins: God could "be just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." Jesus *rested* from the preparation of the remedy; it is ours now to take it and experience its salutary effects-'the redemption of our body,' etc, etc. "This man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till [as a result] his enemies be made his footstool. For by one offering he hath *perfected* forever them that are sanctified." Heb. x. 12-14.

2. Were it even true that I have nothing but inference, how would this dispose of my argument in favor of the legitimacy of inference? 'Is this reasoning?'

3. If the house of Rev. i. 10 is built on sand, 'this is the *Lord's* doing.' He, not I, must bear the blame.

4. The meaning of *legoo* is material. *Logia* is the fruit of the tree *legoo*. "Can the fig tree, my brethren, bear olive berries? either a vine, figs?" My brief, definition, on the basis of Liddell and Scott, is the substance of their longer one, and was given as such.

5. We are now informed that in the sentence, 'All the institutions of the gospel are positive,' *of* denotes *origin*. Glad to hear it. Perhaps Eld. W. can now see that when the Lexicons say that *kuriakos* (Lordic), in Rev.i.10, denotes *of* the Lord Jesus, as well as 'respecting' Him, they mean that the day originated with Him. It is, hence, 'of the gospel,' and so 'positive.' After all, then, the 'concession' is a concession. What 'perversion !' yea, what 'call for pity !'

6. "Jesus, the author and finisher of *the* faith" is a literal version of Heb. xii.

2. The article here is not the result of renewed mention, renewed from chap, xi.; for that would make Jesus 'the author and finisher' of the Mosaic dispensation! The article can here denote only that which is '*the* faith' 'by pre-eminence,' namely, the gospel. As for 1 Cor. ii. 9, 10, I did it no violence; Paul himself makes a present application of that quotation. To refer it to the future, this is 'garbling,' ay, 'wresting.'

7. I did not reason, says my brother, in my reply to his deduction of proprietorship from the statement that all things were made 'for' Christ. Very true; absurdities are not to be reasoned with any more than air-castles are to be bombarded. They need but to be unmasked to die of their own ridiculousness.

8. The prophecy respecting new heavens and earth (Is. lxxv.) finds indeed a (second) fulfillment when applied as in 2 Pet. iii. and Rev. xxi. This new heaven and earth know neither sin (Rev. xxii. 15) nor death (Rev. xxi. 4), whereas Isaiah speaks of both (ver. 20); in the one they do not marry (Matt. xxii. 30), in the other they bear children (Is. lxxv. 23). In the primary application of Isaiah's new heavens and earth the Jews reject the Savior and the Gentiles accept the gospel (Is. lxxvi. 5, etc.); also the Jews, finally converted, will be successful missionaries among the Gentiles (ver. 18-21). This marks it as primarily applying to the gospel dispensation. Nor can verse 23 be construed into a recognition of the existence of the Sabbath any more than into that of the Jewish new moon festival.

"If Eld. Vogel gets there he will have to be converted from his present position!" Here we get a glimpse of Eld. W.'s uncharitable creed. A mistake of the head, however true the heart and devoted

141

the life, will consign one to perdition! This may smack of 'law,' but not of 'grace.' See, too, how presumptuously he impugns the motives of all those not with him on the Sabbath question: "They are *determined* to be satisfied with it [the testimony for the First Day], however contradictory it may be!" When a man forsakes the faith of his kin at the risk of his life, and for no other gain than the truth can yield, is *he* 'determined' to be wrong? Shame on the pen that can write it!

Having neither Jews nor Gentiles, as such, in Christ Jesus (Gal. iii. 28), it is only necessary that I prove the Lord's Day 'commanded' upon Christians.

My brother quotes from Campbell, Sherlock, Taylor, Goodman, Burnet, Owen, Hopkins and Baxter, to the effect that only that which is commanded or required by the Lord is acceptable, as a positive institution; and that all positive institutions, of human origin, are will-worship and damnable. To this I have all along given assent. His quotations are a waste of space. It must strike every reader that his space could have been better used by attention to numerous points against him, which he has now no more opportunity to notice.

Regarding me as the representative of the 'Christian' brotherhood, Eld. W. says: "His [my] acknowledgment that inference is his [my] only dependence, is their acknowledgment." I have made no such acknowledgment, but have insisted that approved precedent or legitimate inference is a satisfactory source of proof. As Bro. Waggoner represents his brethren by special choice, his prevarication is their falsity.

The quotations from Kitto, Campbell and others, are not to the point. If he means anything to the purpose, he means that these men testify that there was no observance of the Lord's Day for several hundred years after Christ, whereas they mean that there was no *human* legislation under Christian auspices then. These quotations, then, are wholly foreign to the present proposition, which has only to do with what 'the *Scriptures* teach.' I notice them only because introduced, and so lengthen this article beyond my first intention. Take an example or two. Buck not only says, in the same article quoted from, that "the first day of the week has *always* been observed by the Christian church," but gives five New Testament reasons for its observance. And Mr. A. Campbell wrote in 1830: "The Jews were under a government of precepts—we are under a government of principles. Hence all was laid down to them in broad and plain commandments . . . duties, accurately defined to the utmost conceivable minutia; insomuch that nothing was left to discretion—nothing to principle. There is nothing like this in the New Institution. We have no ritual, liturgy, nor manual. The New Constitution and Law of Love does no more than *institute* the converting act, the Lord's Supper, and *the Lord's Day*. . . . The Lord's Supper . . . and the Lord's Day, . . . though positive institutions, are not presented to Christians accompanied with directions for the mode of celebration, as were the former institutions under the Jewish Age. There were more directions about the

celebration of the Passover and the observance of the Sabbath, than are to be found in the whole New Institution. Nay, indeed, there is nothing of the sort in the Christian Economy. No mode of eating the Supper, no mode of observing the Lord's Day is suggested in the apostolic writings. In this Christians are left to the discretion of full-grown men to the government of principle."-*Chris. Baptist*, p. 657. These views Mr. Campbell maintained throughout his studious life. In the very year referred to by Eld. W., though I do not know where he got his quotation, Mr. Campbell wrote against Christmas because it is an 'unauthorized *tradition*;' for, said he, tradition, in the department of religious life, "ought, above every other, to be most scrupulously avoided."-*Mill. Harb.* for 1848, p. 17. On page 280 he declares how he adopted the principle, in 1809, a principle held all his life, that "nothing ought to be received into the faith or worship of the Church, or to be made a test of communion among Christians, *that is not as old as the New Testament*. Nor ought anything to be admitted as of Divine obligation, in the church constitution and management, but what is *expressly enjoined* by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ and his Apostles upon the New Testament church; *either in express terms or by approved precedent*." Continuing this subject, he informs us, pp. 344-5, how this led him to canvass every subject anew, resulting in the rejection of infant baptism and affusion (he was a Presbyterian then) and in the retention of the Lord's Day. On but a

142

single point I will give a fragment of his reasoning, written more expressly in favor of weekly communion, but equally applicable to the Lord's Day, and so regarded by himself: "If he [Luke, Acts xx. 7] had said that on a first day the disciples assembled to break the loaf, then I would admit that both the Sabbatarians, and the semi-annual or septennial communicants, might find some way of explaining this evidence away. The definite article is, in the Greek and in the English tongue, prefixed to stated times, and its appearance here is not merely definitive of one day, but expressive of a stated or fixed day."-*Chris. System*, p. 313.

SUMMARY

I take space only to notice a few points; the reader will remember the rest.

I. Rev. i. 10 asserts *in express terms* that there is now a sacred day. Eld. W. has not only admitted this, but has further owned that this passage does not fix upon any day as that day, much less does it name the Sabbath.

II. This day is a new *institution*. The term *kuriakos* (Lordic or 'Lord's') asserts this in the most explicit manner, being just as decisive and express on this point as *baptidzo* is on the action of baptism.

1. It is a *new* term, coined by the apostles, and so expresses a *new* idea. *To this there is no reply*. I called in vain for a new feature in the sabbatic institution, unexpressed in the Old Testament.

2. While the term Lord has been applied to both the Father and the Son, *kuriakos* is *never* applied to the Father, or to any institution belonging or having belonged to Him; hence the *Lordic* day is not the Sabbath day, but a Christic institution.

III. Having the most explicit Divine assurance of the existence of a new sacred day-not inference, but express statement-whatever may be necessary to the existence of such an institution, as express command or formal proclamation, though not recorded, is just as certainly known to have a real existence as a house is known to have a foundation. It is so necessary an inference that no express command could be stronger. "Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed."

IV. When the *existence of a new institution* is not left to inference, there can be no reasonable objection to proving the time of its observance by good precedent and good inference. And this we have in all sufficiency.

1. Since no one has ever claimed or can claim any other day for this institution than either the seventh or the first day of the week, every argument offered in favor of a present binding force of the *old* sabbatic institution, which monopolizes the seventh day, is an argument just as strong in favor of the first day as the time for this *new* institution. And this argument, so far as the first day is concerned, is intensified by every precedent and inference favoring the first day, *so that it must always be stronger than that for the Sabbath can possibly be.*

2. On the other hand, every argument for the abolition of the Sabbath is not only just so much proof for the Lordic Day as a *new* institution, but the continued observance by Jewish converts, for a time (if there be any such observance), of the Sabbath *under the name of Sabbath*, decides in favor of the first day for the new institution; and this decision is intensified by the precedents and inferences respecting the first day.

3. The first day is pointed out as a sacred day by the typical meaning of the Pentecost.

4. The first day is fraught with many stirring memories and most noted events, pertaining to this dispensation, and so is pre-eminently suited for a commemorative institution. While fitness alone cannot prove the existence of a positive institution, yet, when that existence is known, fitness apprehended is a most beautiful drapery.

5. Analogy points to the fact that the rest which Christ's death and resurrection bring us is memorialized by the Lordic Day. If under the Law the Pentecost could silently point back to the giving of that law, who may deny a similar right to this institution, in its nature a thousand times more vocal?

And now, indulgent reader, farewell. The Lord direct us into all truth, and bring us at last to His glorious presence. *Amen.*

ELDER J. H. WAGGONER'S FIFTH NEGATIVE

1. I much regret that the publishers in Quincy, Ill., omitted the Greek characters from my quotations from Clarke and Bloomfield on John xix. 14. This not only obscures them, but entirely destroys the sense of my paragraph referring to them. On this point, Eld. Vogel's *conjecture* as to how a change *might have been made*, amounts to nothing; and it is a poor relief that he can quote some authorities in his favor; for the reader will agree with me that a position denied by such scholars as Bloomfield, Clarke, Anderson, and 'the best

commentators,' as Bloomfield says, is hardly safe to rest upon as ground of inference for positive duty!

2. He seems to fear I will pursue an unwarranted course in closing, and plainly shows what he considers would be such, in saying he has made arguments which I have no more opportunity to notice! In this we have another measure of the man. As if he could present arguments at any time which I cannot answer, even to the close. It may gratify the curiosity of the reader to turn back and examine Eld. Vogel's closing negative on the first proposition; but he will hardly realize the disagreeableness of the task of meeting a man who is so egotistical and arbitrary that he cannot endure to have another enjoy equal rights with himself.

3. His explanation of his position on Heb. v. 13, 14, leaves him worse than before. He compares his inferences with Paul's 'gathering' of 'deductions,' when Paul was writing by direct inspiration! This shows the weakness and folly of his transferring to Paul the charge of 'pious frauds.' It rests only on himself.

4. He objects to my quoting from Campbell and McGarvey, because the proposition relates to what 'the Scriptures teach,' and hints of what he could have done had he understood the matter. But the reader will remember that in his very first affirmative he quoted twelve authorities and referred to four others, and especially recommended the writings of Campbell, and advertised them! I might properly have objected to his quoting mere human authorities to prove what 'the Scriptures teach,' but when he fails to give an of iota of Scripture proof for Sunday, I have a right to show its origin by any testimony I please. His 'simplicity' is indeed great if he cannot see that his course is anything but creditable to himself, and betrays a consciousness of the weakness of his position. (Not to be excelled, I will do the favor to the reader, of saying of a book which Eld V. mentioned, that the *History of the Sabbath*, by J. N. Andrews, is a thorough vindication of Bible truth, and exposure of the falsities of the Sunday theory, published at the *Review and Herald* office, Battle Creek, Mich. *Send for a catalogue.*)

5. Without any just reason, for it was irrelevant, he referred to what *somebody*, unknown to us as either a speaker or writer, believed. But when I disprove his position by Campbell and McGarvey, lo! *they* acknowledge no human authority! But 'McGarvey on Acts' is a recognized denominational work amongst them. And again I say, omit his quotations from human authority, and his inferences would be too bald to be presentable.

6. Being 'sons,' no 'rules' for keeping Sunday are required! All that he has said on this subject may be adopted by the Catholic for every dogma of that church. As well might we say, that the 'principle' of baptism being established, no rules are required to govern its observance, but we are left to our 'deductions' for that. Let us see. 1. *Sprinkling* is spoken of by the prophet when referring to this dispensation-even sprinkling with water. 2 Peter based the reception of a promise upon baptism, and said, the promise is to you and to *your children*. 3. Following this, we find that whole households were baptized. From these, and others, I can frame a better inferential argument than Eld. V. has for Sunday, and sustain it by as many 'great men.' Let him show some established *facts* before he

apostrophises the 'memorable day.' Let him show that God blessed or sanctified it before he talks about 'a blessed sacredness.' This is begging what he needs to prove; all 'pretty talk,' but in an argument it is no higher than *pious cant*, and is fittingly rebuked by the words of the Savior: "In vain do ye worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."

144

Campbell's remarks, which he quotes about the Lord's supper and the Lord's day, are exceedingly faulty, and show that Campbell was inconsistent with himself. Because no prescribed form is given for eating the supper, therefore, no rule is required for keeping Sunday! But of the supper we have *the express act and law the institution*; for the Sunday we have neither. A 'babe' can see this difference.

Again, there is no question as to whether the Lord *could* adopt the heathen traditions as Christian ordinances: but, is there proof that *he has* done it? That the heathen consecrated Sunday might not 'estop the Lord,' but where is the proof that the Lord consecrated it? It does not exist, '*and he knows it.*' As to the use of bread and wine in the supper, the Lord *expressly enjoined* it; but not so of Sunday. In *name, dedication and observance*, it is *only* of heathen origin.

7. He says the work of Jesus in redemption is finished '*for us,*' and 'it is now ours to take it.' But can we 'take' the redemption of the body, without a further direct work of Christ? See 1 Thess. iv. His quotations on the sufficiency of Christ's sacrifice do not touch the point, and if he does not know it, it is but another evidence of his boasted 'simplicity.' Can we resurrect ourselves by virtue of what Christ has done for us? And can we be saved without his present mediation? Reader, this is a fair sample of the evasions which I have had constantly to meet throughout the discussion.

8. He referred to my disproof of the grounds of his inference, and said the opposing lawyer might deny, but still the man was hanged on circumstantial evidence. But if the colleagues of the leading prosecutor should rise up and deny that the 'circumstances' existed, as claimed, the *opposing lawyer* would not have much to meet! And this is exactly the case here. His inferences, which are his only dependence, I disprove by Sunday-keeping authors-man of, at least, as much candor as Eld. Vogel, and far greater study and critical knowledge. The reader can readily see the weight of this point.

9. To affect indignation is more convenient than to explain the fact, or to disprove, that some 'are determined to be pleased' with anything that favors Sunday. And if he is satisfied with his own argument, he presents a remarkable instance in himself. If I am wrong, why do such contradictions combine? Why are they 'of the churches' so well pleased with his effort, when they deny the very foundation of his argument? Who will answer? And I would say to him, that a man may do many things at great hazard, which are good in themselves, and yet have an impure motive for other actions. I do not measure the truth by men, however good they may claim to be. God knows the heart, and he will judge all by 'his commandments.' Eccl. xii. 13, 14. Perhaps he has forgotten that Israel, at the hazard of their lives, braving the wrath of the king, confessed the Lord and

left Egypt at his command, yet fell in the desert. This is for 'our admonition.' "Let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall."

10. My "call for proof that the Jews ended their weeks at sunrising on Sunday will be unheeded." I expected it, for what could he do where no proof exists? To say that he has given proof of it is simply an untruth. Having never seen any intimation of such a thing before, I referred it to some who, like Paul, have 'profited in the Jew's religion,' and are thoroughly acquainted with Hebrew literature, who unhesitatingly assert that the Jews had no such reckoning. He is deserving of something besides 'pity' in this. The candid and God-fearing will look with suspicion upon a theory which is supported by such means. I cannot do this justice by any comment, and I leave it with all other 'pious frauds' (minus the pious!) for which an account must be rendered to him who requires faithfulness in speaking his word, and who will crown only those who 'strive lawfully.' Jer. xxiii; 28; 2 Tim. ii. 5.

11. There are no *first* and *second* fulfillments of the prophecy of the new creation, for there are not *two new earths*. Nor does Isaiah speak of births in that prophecy, as Eld. V. asserts. My proofs on this point stand untouched, and are a complete refutation of his professed argument for Sunday as a memorial.

12. He says Buck gives 'five N. T. reasons' for Sunday keeping. But Buck acknowledges they do not amount to a 'law,' and they are only of human devising. '*The Scriptures*' never give any reason for it, 'and he knows it.' Learned men find more 'reasons' than that for infant baptism, for the invocation of saints, for papal supremacy, etc., *but they are not proof*. 'Do the Scriptures' give proof of

145

the institution? That is what is demanded.

I will now examine his several points of argument as follows:-

I. On the Lord's day. He *infers* that the term refers to Christ only. it is but an inference, for it no more mentions Christ than it mentions the day of the week. But he laid the foundation for this inference in the wild statement that 'the term Lord belongs exclusively to Christ in this dispensation.' To this I replied that it referred to the Father in more than three-score places in the N. T. Next, he said it referred to Christ in an 'official sense;' that the Father "resigned, or gave his position to Christ during this dispensation, so that he is now 'Lord of all.' " This is the climax of all his absurdities. The Father never 'resigned' any position. He never held, 'officially,' any position now occupied by Christ-he never was 'mediator,' as Christ now is. Christ is not now 'Lord of all' to the exclusion of the Father, but is 'by the right hand of God exalted,' that 'men should honor the Son even as they honor the Father.'

He said; "If *Kurios* refers to the personal appellation of Jesus (Acts ii. 36), then *Kuriakos* signifies pertaining to Jesus as Lord"

If his assertion were true, that it refers *exclusively* to Christ, then the statement would be at least plausible; but it is not. Taking the Revelation alone, *Kurios* refers to the Father thirteen times; to the Son, five times; it is three times used where it may refer to either; once where it refers to neither. So far as facts are concerned, the testimony is entirely against him. Now I say-if *Kurios* refers to the appellation of the Father, as we know it does, then *Kuriakos* signifies

pertaining to the Father. Having taken the text out of his hands, I will say that I could admit all his claim without detriment to my position, for if it did refer only to Christ, I have already proved that Christ is Lord of the Sabbath, by his own words, and the work of creation. But the disproof of his assertion here is *fatal to his Sunday theory*, for he does not pretend that sufficient evidence is found elsewhere for the 'foundation' of his institution. With him, everything depends upon the correctness of his assertion that "the term Lord refers exclusively to Christ." That being lost, his cause is lost beyond the possibility of recovery; for his assumed proof is only a 'deduction,' and the life of his deduction rests upon an assertion which has not even a shadow of truth in it. I might safely rest the case here; but I will follow him further.

II. Having *assumed* that the first day is the Lord's day, without offering any Scripture proof, he next draws from 1 Cor. xvi. 2 that it was the day of Christian assemblies. But I have most conclusively proved, by Sunday-keeping authorities (in this sense I used 'partisans'), that nothing of the kind is found in this text; that the inference is forbidden by the construction of the scripture. And, again, while his proposition depends upon the correctness of his inference, which I have disproved, I might admit his statement without detriment to my position; for the text does not speak of the Lord's day, nor of the sacredness of any day, nor of anything peculiar to a sacred day, even if they had to assemble to perform the duty indicated.

III. He *infers* that Acts xx, 7, shows the first day to be a day of observance, whereas it does not speak of the Lord's day; it does not speak of a sacred day; nor of the observance of any day. Not a fact is stated in this chapter inconsistent with my position on the Sabbath, or true Lord's day. Not a fact is stated to sustain his inferences. On the contrary, it is clear that it was not observed by Paul and his companions as a day of rest, or 'sacredly observed;' having kept the Sabbath with the church at Troas, and being about to continue on his journey on the morning of first-day, he has a parting meeting with them on the evening of that day. To evade these facts, Eld. V. claims a change in the reckoning of the day, based on two points: (1) On John xix. 14, which is proved untenable by the best authorities; and (2) That the Jews ended the week at sunrise on Sunday morning; a statement which ought to cause his face to mantle with shame.

That Paul traveled on that Sunday is admitted by McGarvey, a Disciple Commentator. On this I might multiply authorities, but it is not necessary. I will mention only that Conybeare, so often referred to approvingly by Eld. V., also admits it. And, in regard to Eld. Vogel's last assertion, that Paul traveled on both Sabbath and first-day previous to his arrival at Troas, I answer: it was a voyage which he had once sailed over in two days. See Acts xvi. 11; Conybeare

146

and Howson, chap, xx., p. 591. As it was but a two days' sail, there is no evidence that they were sailing on the Sabbath; or, otherwise, they were delayed by unpropitious weather; for, had they made the journey direct, in the ordinary time, without hindrance, they would have arrived at Troas at least a full day before the Sabbath. But how different his journey from Troas, which was commenced by deliberate determination on the first day of the week!

IV. He claims a *recognition*-mark, not even a mention-of the first day by the Holy Spirit descending on that day. Were this true it would not prove a recognition of the sacredness of the day, nor of the duty to observe the day, for no mention is made of either. And, the Spirit descended on other days besides that. But, the truth is, *that Pentecost was not on first-day*. This appears by the concession of the best authorities, and also by the fallacy of Eld. Vogel's argument on Leviticus. Briefly I will notice his exposition of Lev, xxiii.:-

a. He says it was not 'the morrow of the paschal Sabbath,' but, as he gathers from the Greek, 'the morrow of the first day.' But, then, of course, it would be second day; for 'the morrow of the first day,' could no more be first day, than 'the morrow of the Sabbath' could be the Sabbath.

b. But the *first day* is not there, either in Hebrew or Greek. That is another fiction of his romantic brain.

c. The article is used only in that verse, because *Sabbath is in predicate in every other instance in that chapter*, and therefore the article is understood 'by construction.'

d. Every day is a 'holy convocation' on which a solemn assembly is convened. See verses 1-3.

e. Analogy is all against the Sunday in Acts ii., even granting the day, for the Holy Spirit did not mention it, but the *Pentecost*, which means the *fiftieth*. Therefore if a day was to be honored and perpetuated it was that fiftieth day, which surely does not come weekly! It needs a *reason* for continuing a fulfilled yearly type by a weekly observance!

f. Were it admitted that it was Sunday, it would disprove his reckoning, for he says it was the day succeeding the Sabbath, which ended at sunset. But he says the Sunday begins at sunrise: if that were true, there was an entire night of about twelve hours between the close of the seventh day and the beginning of the first day! which is only equaled in absurdity by his cutting one night in two at midnight, and calling it *two different nights*! See his argument on the Passover.

g. If it was the weekly Sabbath, as he avers, then we have inspiration recognizing the Sabbatic character of the seventh day, seven weeks after the resurrection, which is a direct proof such as he would be glad to find for the first day. For,

h. If the seventh-day Sabbath were abolished at the cross, as he averred, there could be no morrow after the Sabbath, seven weeks thereafter. The morrow after a day that did not exist would be only a myth.

But again, the best authors admit that Pentecost was not Sunday, but the Sabbath; this admission is made even by eminent Sunday advocates, which they would not make did not the facts compel them to do so.

Dr. Clarke says not a word upon the subject, which is an argument of itself; for he never failed to note when an inference could be drawn for Sunday.

Prof. Hackett says: "It is *generally supposed* that this Pentecost, signalized by the outpouring of the Spirit, fell on the Jewish Sabbath, our Saturday."-*Com. on Original Text*.

Barnes says: "If the views of the Pharisees were followed, and the Lord Jesus had with them kept the Passover on Thursday, as many have supposed, then the

day of Pentecost would have occurred on the Jewish Sabbath, our Saturday. *Kuinoel Lightfoot*. It is impossible to determine the truth on this subject, nor is it of much importance."

Jennings, in *Jewish Antiquities*, says: "Since Christ eat his last passover on the same day with the rest of the Jews, as we have already proved, namely on the, fourteenth of Nisan, which was Thursday; the next day, on which he was crucified, must be the feast of unleavened bread; therefore the sixteenth day, the Saturday, was the first day of the seven weeks betwixt that and the Pentecost; consequently the fiftieth day, or the morrow after the seventh sabbath or week, which was the day of Pentecost, must fall on the Saturday, or the Jewish Sabbath."

Olshausen says: "Now, since, according to the accounts given regarding the time of the feast, the passover, in the

147

year of our Lord's death, fell so that the first day of the feast fell from Thursday evening at six o'clock till Friday evening at the same hour, it follows of course that it was from Friday evening at six o'clock that the fifty days began to be counted. The fiftieth day fell, therefore, it appears, upon Saturday."

Ripley, in his *Notes*, says it "cannot be satisfactorily decided."

Smith, *Bib. Dict.*, says it is a point disputed, but favors the view that it was the Sabbath.

All these, as well as many others from whom I might quote, are strenuous Sunday men, and, knowing the use that is made of it, would have placed it upon Sunday would the facts allow. And to assert confidently, *and make it the basis of duty*, as does Eld. Vogel, that it was Sunday, is an unwarranted and bold proceeding, calculated to lead away from *the revealed will of God*.

It may be asked, if we believe that it was the Sabbath, why we do not use it as an argument for that day. I answer, *We do not need it*. We have the commandment of God, and his own express reason, for keeping it, and there is no requirement to keep it because the Spirit descended upon it. Such *conjectures* we leave for those who delight to deal in them, or find them necessary to their cause. In 'the law and the testimony' we are 'thoroughly furnished unto *all good works*.'

And now, dear readers, I appeal at once to your reason and to your consciences: Are you willing to risk your acceptance with God on such a doubtful foundation as has been laid for the Sunday? I leave to your judgment the evidences of the Edenic origin of the Sabbath, of the perpetuity of the moral law, and of the recognition of the Sabbath by inspiration in the New Testament; while *not a single fact* has been given, not a *precedent* established, nor a *necessary inference* produced to prove that Sunday is to be 'sacredly observed.' In the entire absence of testimony in its favor, every scripture is reasonably and justly interpreted, without the *forced construction* of making them *allude to* something which cannot be proved to have an existence.

Consenting to engage in this discussion in the midst of other pressing labor, traveling most of the time, so that but few of the articles reached me at any one post-office, away from my library and books of reference, I have regretted my

unfavorable circumstances for such a work. The opposition has been presented as forcibly as it can be. But this investigation, under these conditions, has strongly confirmed my faith in the ten commandments as the moral law, and the perpetual obligation of the Sabbath of the Lord our God, and of the utter futility of the attempt to establish, by "the Scriptures," the Sunday as a day of observance. Eld. Vogel assured me that he had "something new and better" than the old Sunday arguments; but in that respect I have been disappointed. The same old round of inferences has been traversed, showing conclusively that the opposition to the holy Sabbath has exhausted its resources without finding any proof that the Sunday is a gospel institution.

As you make your decision on the question, remember that another decision is yet to be made. When "God shall bring every work into judgment," your decision will be passed upon. If you decide in harmony with the revealed will of God, that day will confirm and establish your choice. But if you decide contrary to "the statutes of Heaven," that day will reverse your decision, without leaving it possible for you to correct your errors.

May God, by the aid of his Holy Spirit, enable you so to judge, so to act and to live, that of you the angel may proclaim: "Here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." Rev. xiv. 12.

APPENDIX

The preceding discussion was printed from a transfer of the columns of type used in the *Christian*. Owing to an insufficient quantity of marks of parenthesis for a form of sixteen pages, the printers often used square brackets instead. Numerous errors were also found in the discussion as it appeared in the *Christian*; corrections of these I sent to the office that they might be attended to before the book-forms were struck off. Some were faithfully attended to, while others were neglected, even in the same article. Of the *errata* found below there are only two which I did not point out before. Such errors as are no practical detriment, as p. 7, 2nd col., line 14 from below, Acts xv: 37-37 for Acts xv: 37-39, and line 10 from below, Acts xxi: 23-36 for Acts xxi: 23-26, as also such mistakes as *shoald* for *should*, *which* for *which*, *preposesion* for *prepossession*, *non sequiter* for *non sequitur*, though formerly pointed out, I have overlooked in the list below, together with other errors of less importance. The reader should also remember that in many instances of Scripture reference there is a dash between two numbers where there should be a comma. P. V.

ERRATA

- P. 18, 2nd col., line 8, *for cansal read causal*.
- P. 25, 2nd col., line 11, *for much read such*.
- P. 29, 2nd col., line 28, *for Deut. xii: 19 read Deut. xii: 9*.
- P. 42, 2nd col., line 17, *for Prov. xxi: 1 read Psa. xxi: 1*.
- Same col., line 32, *for individual read invidious*.
- P. 43, 1st col., line 20, *insert bending before language*.

- P. 44, 1st col., line 26, *for* Mat. vii: 12 *read* Mat. vii: 1. 2.
- P. 44, 2nd col., line 36, *for* institutions *read* intuitions.
- P. 49, 1st col., line 8, *for* accord *read* word.
- P. 52, 2nd col., line 12, *for* who wrote *read* to note.
- P. 52, 2nd col., line 23, *for* form *read* term.
- P. 52, 2nd col., line 24, *for* genuine *read* generic.
- P. 57, 2nd col., line 25, *for* the *read* thee *after* give.
- P. 67, 1st col., line 33, *for* conjunction *read* conjunctive.
- P. 67, 2nd col., last line, *for* indispensable *read* indisputable.
- P. 68, 2nd col., last line of 3rd Aff., *for* leg's *read* legis.
- P. 69, 1st col., line 18, *omit* not.
- P. 69, 2nd col., line 31, *for* Acts iv: 16 *read* Acts iv: 26.
- Same col., line 16 from below, *for* Heb. i: 1-15 *read* Heb. i: 1-5.
- P. 71, 2nd col., line 16 from below, *for* Lev. xvii: 5 *read* Lev. xviii: 5.
- P. 73, 2nd col., line 12 *for* given to them *read* given to the Jews.
- P. 74, 1st col., line 15, *for* paul *read* Paul.
- P. 81, 1st col., line 10, *for* prime *read* prince.
- P. 81, 2nd col., line 2, *for* s *read* is.
- P. 83, 1st col., par. marked 4, line 5, *for* Holy spirit *read* Holy Spirit.
- P. 84, 1st col., par. marked 14, the quotation marks *after* annexed *in line 5 from below, should be after* annexed *in line 3 from below.*
- P. 87, 1st col. of 6th Neg., line 7 from below, *for* Jer. xxi: 34 *read* Jer. xxxi: 34.
- P. 89, 1st col., line 15 from below, *for* v. 19 *read* v. 19.
- P. 90, 1st col., lines 14 and 15, *for* alliace *read* alliance.
- Same col., line 23 from below, *place a comma after* if made (v. 5).
- P. 91, 1st col., line 32, *for* the revelation *read* the Revelation.
- P. 92, 2nd col., line 27, *after* Ex. xvi: 29 *add* ch. xx: 8, 11.
- P. 97, 2nd col., line 17 from below, *for* incluped *read* included.
- P. 98, 2nd col. of 8th Aff., line 4, *for* logically *read* illogically.
- P. 103, 1st col, line 12, *for* yot *read* yet.
- P. 111, 2nd col., line 11 from below, *insert a between* gave *and* more.
- P. 112, 2nd col., line 24, *for* recogniezd *read* recognized.
- P. 113, 2nd col., line 14 from below, *for* Pros. *read* Prof.
- P. 114, 1st col., line 18, *for* therefore *read* therefor.
- P. 115, 2nd col., line 29, *for* Kuriakos *read* kurios.
- P. 132, 1st col., line 1, *for* Deut. v: 5 *read* Deut. v: 15.
- P. 132, 1st col., line 5, *insert* the *before* body.

¹ The article is here present in the original Hebrew. In the Greek translation, however, it is wanting before the word *sabbath*, yet the construction is such as to make it just as definite, giving the article *logically* to "sabbath:" "Therefore the Lord hath given you (as) sabbath, *the*. present day (*sabbata teen heemeran tauteen*)." "Sabbath" and "day" being *appositives*, it is only necessary to make one (the latter) definite to render the other so.