

Discussion on the Sabbath Question [1863]

IN THE CITY OF MANCHESTER, N. H., BETWEEN ELD. M. E.
CORNELL, OF BATTLE CREEK, MICHIGAN, AND ELD. M. GRANT,
OF BOSTON, MASS.

STEAM PRESS
OF THE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION
BATTLE CREEK, MICH.:

1864.

[Editor's Note: This is coded under J. N. Loughborough's name because he is the one who reported this discussion. The date is inserted in the title to distinguish it from the title of the same name under J. H. Waggoner's collection, dated 1869.]

DISCUSSION AT MANCHESTER, NEW HAMPSHIRE

As it was known to many friends that I was present at this discussion between Elder M. E. Cornell and Elder Miles Grant, on the Sabbath question, and that I had taken quite copious notes of said discussion, I have been earnestly requested by these friends to give a report for publication.

If I had thought it would be necessary to publish this discussion, I should have given as near as possible a verbatim report. Elder Grant has given a one-sided report in the *World's Crisis*. This fact alone makes it duty to present before the public both sides, as far as it is in my power so to do. My object was to take the principal arguments advanced, and the scriptures used on both sides, and to state the propositions and arguments as far as I went, in the words of the speakers; and where authors were quoted, to state in the words of the authors the real point for which they were quoted. Many of the authors quoted by Elder Grant I have not access to in making the report, and could only give in the report of these authors such statements as were taken at the time he was speaking. But in each case I have taken the statements that were [original illegible] as having a direct bearing on the question. The authors quoted by Elder Cornell I have access to, and their statements are generally in full.

I have endeavored to avoid repetition as much as

possible, although there was, as is usual in discussions, much repetition. I have only repeated where the arguments were repeated for the sake of advancing some new ideas upon them. These facts, with the consideration that Elder Cornell is a more rapid speaker than Elder Grant, will explain why some of Elder Grant's speeches appear in the report much shorter than his opponent's. I have labored, however, to state all his arguments, scriptures, and proofs accurately.

I have seen some remarks by Elder Grant in the *World's Crisis*, to the effect that a "*bold* challenge had been made" for a discussion. I think there must be a misunderstanding by the Elder on this point. We did not make a challenge for a discussion, but when holding a tent-meeting at Manchester, N. H., last summer, requested any one that wished to oppose our views on the Sabbath question to come and preach on the subject in the tent. After this, Elder Bishop sent a challenge for a discussion. Several of the Adventbrethren in Manchester told me that they thought a discussion with him would not be satisfactory, as but few of them sympathized with him. We said to them, if they were anxious to have a discussion they had better get Elder Grant, a man in whom they all had confidence. Accordingly they held a correspondence with Elder Grant, which resulted in a discussion.

J. N. Loughborough.

Topsham, Maine, Feb., 1864.

Sabbath Discussion

The following discussion was held in the city of Manchester, N. H., on the evenings of the 14th, 15th, 16th and 17th of December 1863, between Elder M. E. Cornell of Michigan, and Elder Miles Grant, editor of the *World's Crisis*, Boston, Mass.

QUESTION

Resolved, That the Sabbath of the fourth commandment still exists, and is binding upon mankind.

Eld. Cornell *affirms*.

Eld. Grant *denies*.

ELDER CORNELL'S FIRST SPEECH

In entering upon the investigation of this question, it is important to have the question settled as to where the burden of proof lies. The following, from Whately's *Rhetoric*, is to the point:

"It is a point of great importance to decide in each case, at the outset of the discussion, in your own mind, and clearly to point out to the hearer, as occasion may serve, on which side the presumption lies, and to which belongs the burden of proof. For, though it may often be expedient to bring forward more proofs than can fairly be demanded of you, it is always desirable when this is the case that it should be known, and the strength of the case estimated accordingly."

In regard to the burden of proof, Prof. Tappan says: "Any ancient institution is presumed to be well founded until its principles can be shown to be false and mischievous; or it can be shown, by fraud or violence, to have supplanted a more ancient institution. In the latter case, the burden of proof falls upon the

6

more modern, and the presumption lies in favor of the more ancient institution. It happens, sometimes, that those are called innovators, who are in reality the advocates of what is truly *ancient* and *venerable*. If they prove this to be the fact, they of course transfer the burden of proof to where it justly belongs."

Again, he says:

"There is a presumption in favor of the old opinion and established usage, and he who attacks the question assumes the burden of proof; and unless he can bring proof to the contrary, the old opinion and institution must stand."- *Tappan's Logic*, pp. 482, 487.

Our question relates to the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. And who will deny that it is both ancient and venerable? Indeed, it is one of the most ancient institutions spoken of in the Bible. Its existence and observance are coeval with the history of mankind. If we apply the rules I have quoted, this ancient Sabbath must still exist, unless it can be shown to have been superseded or abolished. When a law is once enacted by the proper authority, it must remain in force until the same authority repeals it; and the repeal must be as plainly stated as the original enactment. It will therefore devolve upon the negative to prove that the Sabbath institution has been expressly repealed. He must show when, where, how, and by whom if it was done: for if it has been abolished, it still exists, and if it exists, of course it is binding upon mankind.

Every good institution must be based upon existing facts, and be enforced for just reasons. The facts stated for the Sabbath institution are, First, God rested on the seventh day. Second, He blessed and sanctified the day on which he rested. These facts and reasons are set forth in the Sabbath commandment as reasons for keeping the Sabbath day holy. These reasons were sufficient at the time the law was given to constitute the obligation, and, as they still remain, the obligation growing out of them must still exist.

We will now come to the authority of the New Testament for direct proof that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment still exists. The witnesses are Christ

7

and his inspired apostles. The first New Testament writer took up his pen about thirty years this side of the resurrection of Christ. It was all written in the Christian age, for the benefit of the men of the Christian dispensation. The terms they used are the inspired terms for the present time.

1. In Matt, xii, 1-12, the disciples and our Saviour were accused of breaking the Sabbath law. Christ vindicates the disciples by referring to the Scriptures (Hosea vi, 6) to show that they were guiltless, verse 7. "But if ye had known what this meaneth, I will have mercy and not sacrifice, ye would not have been condemned the guiltless." To eat on the Sabbath day when they "were an hungered," was an act "of mercy," and therefore it was lawful.

Again, when they charged Christ with Sabbath-breaking, for healing the sick on the Sabbath, he replied, "What man shall there be among you, that shall have one sheep, and if it fall into a pit on the Sabbath day, will he not lay hold on it and lift it out? How much, then, is a man better than a sheep? Wherefore, *it is lawful* to do well on the Sabbath days." Verses 11, 12.

The word "lawful" signifies "according to law." The fourth commandment was the great Sabbath law, hence Jesus declared that his acts were according to the fourth commandment. Thus, he recognised the Sabbath and the law of the Sabbath as still in existence. He does not even intimate that it was relaxed, or ever would be.

2. I will next show that the Sabbath existed and was binding this side of the crucifixion of Christ. If it was to expire at the cross, the disciples would have had some intimation of it, no doubt. Luke xxiii, 54-56. "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 his body was laid. And they returned and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath day, according to the commandment."

Luke recorded this by inspiration thirty-three years after it transpired. How careful he was to refer to

8

the commandment to show how the disciples rested thirty-three years before. This was written for us. He refers to the commandment familiarly, as actually existing and in force at the time of his writing.

3. It was the regular Custom of our Saviour to preach on the Sabbath days. Proof-Luke iv, 16. "And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up; and as his *custom was*, he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day and stood up for to read." Verse 31. "And came down to Capernaum, a city of Galilee, and taught them on the Sabbath days."

When we consider that this was recorded by inspiration, more than thirty years after this dispensation commenced, we must conclude that the Sabbath is recognized as an existing institution, well understood, and observed at the time the record was made.

ELDER GRANT'S FIRST SPEECH

I am glad to engage in this discussion with one who is so well posted on his side of the question before us. The Scriptures, of course, must settle the question, for when good men differ, one or both must be wrong. We do not claim to be very well posted. The question however, is one of great importance, for, admitting my friend's position correct, we are all Sabbath-breakers! and we know that a great penalty was attached to Sabbath-breaking, Tappan's Logic has been referred to about ancient institutions, etc. True, the Sabbath was ancient, but it was kept only by the Jews. I shall take the position that the Sabbath was only a positive institution, and shall prove that it was binding on the Jews, but never on the Gentiles, only when they lived in Jewish families; hence, we consider the statement that the Sabbath is binding upon all mankind, not correct.

My friend claims that the Sabbath still exists, because the reason assigned for its observance still exists. But I will show that the reason for keeping it does not apply to the human family-that it does not apply to the Gentiles. Deut. v, 15. "And remember that that wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and

9

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."

God took that day to commemorate their deliverance because it was the day on which he rested. It was binding only on Israel for they only were delivered from Egyptian bondage.

We now call on him to show that any Sabbath existed before they came to Mt. Sinai; or to give one passage in the New Testament to prove that the fourth commandment still exists. Matt. xii is quoted to prove it. "It is *lawful* to do well on the Sabbath days." But it is not lawful to do wrong on any day in the Christian age, surely! Luke iv, 16, and xxiii, 56, are quoted to prove that Christ and the disciples preached on the Sabbath days. True, and so should I, if I was among those who kept that day.

I will now advance argument to show that the Sabbath is done away. Heb. viii, 7. "For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second." This shows that the first covenant was faulty and can be improved. Gal. iv, 21-24. "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? For it is written that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a free woman. But he who was of the bond-woman was born after the flesh; but he of the free woman was by promise. Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants; the one from the mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar."

We learn what the covenant of Sinai was from 1 Kings viii, 9. "There was nothing in the ark save the two tables of stone, which Moses put there at Horeb, when the Lord made a covenant with the children of Israel, when they came out of the land of Egypt." Also, in Deut. 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." The ten commandments,

10

then, were the first covenant. It was not made before it was made with Israel at Sinai, and of course it was not binding before it was made.

ELDER CORNELL'S SECOND SPEECH

I propose to notice my friend's last argument first. He says the covenant in Heb. viii, 7, was the ten commandments. But if we examine the argument of Paul in Hebrews, we shall find that he is speaking of the covenant of the priesthood, which also was given at Sinai. Heb ix, 1. "Then verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service and a worldly sanctuary." "Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinance, imposed on them until the time of reformation," verse 10. This shows that the first covenant had carnal

ordinances, meats, drinks, etc. But there is not a word in the ten commandment covenant about a priesthood, meats or drinks, or *carnal* ordinances.

He quotes Gal. iv, 21-24 about the first, or Agar covenant, and applies it to the ten commandments. But verse 25 says, "For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and *answereth to Jerusalem*, which now is, and is in bondage with her children." This covenant answereth to Jerusalem; but the ten commandment covenant could be kept in any place, not a word in it that relates to old Jerusalem.

I will now show that there were two covenants made at Sinai, and I will present them in contrast:

1. God's covenant is commanded *to* man. Proof: "And he declared unto you his covenant which he *commanded you to perform*, even ten commandments; and he wrote them on two tables of stone." Deut. iv, 13.

But the Horeb covenant was an *agreement* between God and Israel Proof: "Now, therefore, if ye will obey my voice, indeed, and keep *my* covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people; for all the earth is mine; and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel.

11

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. And Moses returned the words of the people unto the Lord." Ex. xix, 5-8.

2. God's covenant was written by his own hand on the tables of stone. Proof: "And he gave unto Moses, when he had made an end of communing with him upon mount Sinai, two tables of testimony, tables of stone, *written with the finger of God*." Ex xxxi, 18.

But the Horeb covenant was written by the hand of Moses in a book. Proof: "And *Moses wrote all the words of the Lord*, and rose up early in the morning and builded an altar under the hill, and twelve pillars, according to the twelve tribes of Israel." Ex. xxiv, 4. "And it came to pass, when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a *book*, until they were finished." Deut. xxxi, 24.

3. God's covenant was put in the ark. Proof: "And I turned myself and came down from the mount, and put the tables in the ark which I had made; and there they be, as the Lord commanded me." Deut. x, 5. "There was nothing in the ark save the two tables of stone, which Moses put there at Horeb," etc. 1 Kings viii, 9.

But the Book of the Covenant was kept in the *side* of the ark. Proof: "Take this book of the law, and put it in the side ('by the side,' Bernard's trans.) of the ark of the covenant of the Lord, that it may be there for a witness against thee."

4. No blood was ever sprinkled on the tables of the ten commandments.

But the old Book of the Covenant was dedicated with blood. "Whereupon, neither this first testament was dedicated without blood. For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both *the* [original illegible] all the people. Saying, This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you." Heb. ix, 18-20.

The first covenant was atonement in figure; the new covenant is atonement in fact. But there is not a hint about an atonement or a priesthood in the ten commandments.

In regard to the assertion that the Sabbath was not for the Gentiles, we enquire. For whom was the Sabbath made? Jesus says, "The Sabbath was made *for man*." Mark ii, 27. The term man, in this text, like many others, is generic, and is used in the broadest sense, meaning the entire race. "A noun without an adjective is to be taken in its broadest sense as "man is accountable," Kirkham's Grammar. "It is appointed unto man once to die." Gentiles die, therefore the term "man" means Gentiles as well as Jews. "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground." Gentiles are made of dust. *For man* made of the dust, the Sabbath was made. There was another institution made for man at the same time and place, namely, The marriage relation. 1 Cor. xi, 9. "Neither was the man created for the woman; but the *woman for the man*." Now if the expression, "The Sabbath was made for man," can be construed to mean only the *Jew* man, then, by the same rule, the woman created for man is confined to the Jews, and Gentile have no right to marry.

My friend says, The reason for the Sabbath was that God brought Israel out of Egypt. "*Therefore*, he commanded you to keep the Sabbath day," shows that the Sabbath is a memorial of their deliverance, and was not obligatory before. On this we remark that this was only a specific reason. The fourth commandment contains the general reason, which points back to creation. They had been slaves in Egypt, where they could not keep the Sabbath, but now they were brought out where they could, they must serve God in all things.

But the argument on the word "therefore" proves too much. Deut. xxiv, 17, 18. "Thou shalt not pervert the judgment of the stranger, nor of the fatherless; nor take a widows raiment to pledge: but thou shalt remember that thou wast a bondman in Egypt,

and the Lord thy God redeemed thee thence: *therefore*, I command thee to do this thing.

Is this precept a memorial of their coming out of Egypt?! The same rule will apply to the whole law. Lev. xix, 36, 37. "Just balances, just weights, a just ephah, and a just bin, shall ye have: I am the Lord your God, which brought you out of the land of Egypt. *Therefore* shall ye observe *all my statutes*, and all my judgments, and do them: I am the Lord."

My friend argues that the Sabbath is not now binding, because it is not commanded over again in the New Testament. This argument assumes that whatever is not given over again upon a new account, is not binding. But I deny that Christ commanded anything over again upon a new account. Christ and the apostles quote some of the commandments, and refer to others, as well established principles and laws. They quote the law to enforce their teaching. Matt. vii, 12. "Therefore, all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: *for* this is the law and the prophets."

He believes the first three commandments of the decalogue are now binding. I now call on him to show where these are commanded over again, or to give up his position in regard to the Sabbath. When he will show that the first three are given over again, I will show that the Sabbath is given over again just as plainly. Why call for a reenactment of the Sabbath when it never was done away?

I can find where the Sabbath was definitely and plainly commanded, and the reason why; now let him show where it is as definitely abolished. What! the weekly Sabbath, made *for* man soon as the world began, abolished! As well talk of the abolition of marring, which was instituted at the same time and place. These two ancient, honorable institutions are as old as our world, and they both have the same divine sanction, the same origin.

ELDER GRANT'S SECOND SPEECH

We are glad our friend is pressing up to the point. He says there are many covenants: that is true, but

14

we ask him to attend to the one we are talking about. We want something to show how we are to keep the Sabbath, and perhaps we shall show that he does not keep it. If we are to keep the Sabbath, we must do it according to the rule in Ex. xxxv, 2, 3. "Six days shall work be done, but on the seventh day there shall be to you a holy day, a Sabbath of rest to the Lord; whosoever doeth work therein shall be put to death. Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitations upon the Sabbath day."

I want to enquire. Does he believe the stoning penalty is binding? We cannot keep the Sabbath here. We must have fires in our dwellings. In the New Testament we learn that Christ broke the Sabbath, and justified himself in it. He commanded the man to carry his bed on the Sabbath. This was a violation of the fourth commandment, which said "They should bear no burdens on the Sabbath day."

My friend says, The ten commandments were binding on the Patriarchs. Let him prove it. If they were binding before Sinai, why command them over again?

The Sabbath was made for man, true, it was not made for beasts; it was a day of rest to commemorate the deliverance from Egyptian bondage.

At the close of our last speech we were endeavoring to show that the first covenant was the ten commandments. I will now give further proof: Deut. ix, 9. "When I was gone up into the mount to receive the tables of stone, even the tables of the covenant which the Lord made with you, then I abode in the mount forty days and forty nights; I neither did eat bread nor drink water.

We will now show that this covenant is done away. 2 Cor. iii, 7, 13. "But if the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance: which glory was to be done away." "And not as Moses, which put a vail over his face, that the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished."

15

This testimony shows that the law written on stones was "abolished," "done away." The ten commands referred only to outward acts, but the new covenant takes hold of the heart.

ELDER CORNELL'S THIRD SPEECH

My friend thinks we cannot keep the Sabbath here because we need fires. But we are talking of the fourth commandment Sabbath. The command says not a word about kindling fires. This was a mere arrangement for Israel while they were in the warm climate of Arabia, where no fires were needed, unless to cook manna, or for burnt offerings. They were to cook their manna on the sixth day. They should not kindle fires to cook manna. But they were commanded to offer burnt offerings on the Sabbath day, and of course had to kindle fires for that purpose. Num. xxviii, 9, 10. "And on the Sabbath day two lambs of the first year without spot, and two tenth deals of flour for a meat offering, mingled with oil, and the drink offering thereof: this is the *burnt offering of every Sabbath*, beside the continual burnt offering and his drink offering." When they came to Palestine they kindled fires to keep from freezing, as it was very cold there in the winter. Did God ever require man to suffer on the Sabbath for want of fire to make him comfortable?!

He enquires whether the stoning penalty is still in force? I answer it is not. The old death ministration is done away. But this does not affect the obligation of the Sabbath any more than it does the other nine commandments. The death penalty was attached to most of the other command, which he admits are still binding. The penalty may be changed, and not affect the binding obligation of the law in the least. In several of the States they have changed the penalty for murder from hanging till dead to imprisonment for life, but the law against killing has been in force every moment since it was first enacted.

I now come to the charge against my Saviour, that he broke the Sabbath, and justified himself in it. "He violated the fourth command, which forbids bearing

16

burdens!" Wonder if my friend has ever read the fourth commandment? There is not a word about "bearing burdens" in it. But I repel the charge that my Lord was a Sabbath-breaker. This charge was first made by the wicked Pharisees. My friend is found in bad company on this point. None will deny that the Sabbath was binding up to the cross. If, then, Christ did not keep it, he must have sinned against God, but the Scripture saith that "In him is no sin," and he was "without sin." He, himself, declared that what he did on the Sabbath was "lawful;" and before he left the world he said, "I have kept my Father's commandments." John xv, 10.

The Elder thinks that if the ten commandments existed before Sinai, there was no need of commanding them over again. He has forgotten his argument that none of them are now binding unless they are commanded over again. If they existed before Christ, why command them over again? Israel had been in slavery and had lost the knowledge of God to a great extent. When they were brought out of Egypt, Nehemiah says, "Thou madest known unto them thy holy

Sabbath, etc." Neh. ix, 14. If this proves that the Sabbath did not exist before, then Ezek. xx, 5. "And made myself known unto them in the land of Egypt," would prove that God himself did not exist before! That which proves too much proves nothing.

He will have it that the Sabbath is a memorial of the deliverance from Egypt. But in this he greatly errs, for memorials must have in them a fitness to the thing commemorated. There is a fitness in baptism to the Lord's resurrection; also, of the bread and wine to the crucifixion. Now, we enquire, how did they come out of Egypt? The first-born of the Egyptians were slain, and there was great excitement; the king of Egypt arose up in the night told the people to be gone. Ex. xii, 33 "And the Egyptians were urgent upon the people, that they might send them out of the land *in haste*: for they said, we be all dead men." Thus they came out of Egypt with their cattle and their luggage, at midnight, with one great rush. Now

17

does the rest and quiet of the Sabbath fitly represent it. A *rest* to commemorate a *rush!!!*

2 Cor iii, 7, is brought forward to prove the ten commandments abolished. But when closely examined, we find it only shows that the glory of the old ministration of the law is done away. If it proves the Sabbath abolished, it equally proves the abolition of the other nine commands. Did Christ abolish "Thou shalt not kill," and "Thou shalt not steal"? "O, no! these are needed still." Yes! and so is the Sabbath. Man's physical, mental and moral nature demands a day for rest and worship. Jesus says, "The Sabbath was made *for man*." Why abolish that which, was made for man?

My friend says the ten commandments referred only to outward acts. Does "Thou shalt not covet," refer to outward acts?!

In our first speech we made an argument on the acts and reasons on which the Sabbath institution is based. That the seventh day became the Sabbath by the net of God in resting upon it; that he sanctified it because that in it he had rested, and that he required man to keep it, because he made it holy. My friend has passed this by. Is he afraid to grapple with it?

I will now show that the ten commandments, Sabbath not excepted, were in existence before the Sinaitic covenant was made, and if I prove that the Sabbath existed, and was binding by law, five minutes before the Sinaitic covenant was made, the doing away of that covenant will not affect the Sabbath in the least. If the Sabbath did not originate with the old covenant, there is no necessity that it should end with it. I will refer to the commands in their order. 1. Jacob required his household to "Put away their strange gods." Gen. xxxv, 2, 3. 2. "Images" were understood to be "gods." Gen. xxxi, 19, 30. 3. Israel was forbidden to "Profane the name of their God," for the land had been defiled on account of such abominations and the Lord abhorred the nations because of their sins Lev. xviii, 3, 21, 23, 27. "Sin is not imputed when there is no law." Rom. v, 13. This

18

shows that the law existed before Israel received it at Sinai. 4. "And he said unto them, this is that which the Lord hath said, To-morrow is the rest of the holy

Sabbath unto the Lord," etc. Ex. xvi, 23. By comparing Ex. xvi, 1, with Ex. xix, 1, we learn that this was spoken at least thirty days before they came to Mt. Sinai. 5. The son of Noah was "cursed" for dishonoring his father. Gen. ix, 24, 25. 6. When the king of Egypt commanded the midwives to kill all the male children, they refused because they "feared God," Ex. i, 16, 17. 7. Joseph refused the request of his mistress, and said, "How then can I do this great wickedness and sin against God?" Gen. xxxix, 9. 8. The sons of Jacob said, "How, then, should we *steal* out of thy lord's house silver or gold?" Gen. xlv, 8. 9. When Joseph was wickedly imprisoned by false witness, the Lord greatly blessed him. Gen. xxxix, 7-20. 10. They understood stealing to be a sin, and covetousness is included in the breaking of the eighth command.

I will show that there was a law for the Sabbath before the people came to Mt. Sinai: "And the Lord said unto Moses, How long refuse ye to keep *my commandments* and my laws? See, for that the Lord *hath* given you the *Sabbath*, etc." This proves that the keeping of God's commandments included the Sabbath, in the patriarchal age. Gen. xxvi. "Because that Abraham obeyed my voice and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes and my laws." The Sabbath being a part of God's commandments and laws, we see that Abraham must have kept it.

I will next offer proof that the law of the ten commandments, as a whole, is brought over into this dispensation. In Rom. ii, 7-23, Paul is reproofing the Jew for violating the law. He quotes three of the ten commandments to prove that they had not kept the law. In chap. iii, 1, he refers to the "oracles of God" committed to the Jews at Mt. Sinai. This shows that us he is talking of the old code of ten commandments. In verse 9, Paul says that he has "Proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin," which shows that the law was blinding on Gentiles as well as Jews

19

In verse 19, the apostle comes to an important conclusion: "Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them mouth them who are under the law: that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God." We now enquire: 1. If the law died at the cross, how could it prove the world guilty in a. d. 60, the date of Paul's letter to the Romans? 2. If it was binding only on the Jews, how could Paul use it to prove "all the world guilty?"

ELDER GRANT'S THIRD SPEECH

My friend says, The Sabbath existed before Sinai. If so, it must have existed without a penalty, which is not possible. He has not given us any proof that the Sabbath was ever given to the Gentiles. He quotes one of the commands that does not refer to outward acts. But what I say, is, The law did not take hold of a man till the act was committed. Let him show that the law of ten commands is brought over *as a whole*, and he has gained his point. I don't see any light in his position that 2 Cor. iii, refers to the glory of Moses' face being done away. I will now notice his argument on Rom. iii, 19. Let Paul explain himself. Rom. vii, 1-6. "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? For the woman which hath a husband, is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband. So then, if while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man. Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead that we should bring forth fruit unto God. For when we were in the flesh, the motions of sins, which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death. But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were

20

held; that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter."

Now, we have as good a right to say that "law" here means the ten commandments as in the case he refers to in Rom. iii, 19. Paul says we are "dead to the law," have got through with it, and are married to Christ. "That being dead wherein we were held," then the law is dead. We are dead, and the law is dead. We have nothing more to do with the law.

My friend charges me with having no Sabbath. I shall show that the first day of the week is the Christian's day of rest in honor of Christ's resurrection. Every man who refuses to keep the first day of the week virtually denies the resurrection of Christ. Christ has given a new covenant, and put into it all of the ten commands except the fourth. Wood says, The Sabbath was given to the Jews, but not to any other nation. Selden says, He found no evidence that the Sabbath was kept among the ancient Gentiles.

ELDER CORNELL'S FOURTH SPEECH

First, I will notice my friend's denial that there was any penalty to the ten commands before Sinai. I can just as well deny that there is a penalty to "Thou shalt not kill," in this dispensation. I have already shown that sin was imputed to those who broke the ten commands before Sinai. But "Sin is not imputed when there is no law." Temporal death never was the full penalty of the law. The real penalty was and still is eternal death.

The Elder has admitted that if we show that the law as a whole is brought over into the New Testament, we have gained the question. I will now proceed to do that very thing. And 1. The ten commandments alone were a "whole law." Proof: Ex. xxiv, 12. "And the Lord said unto Moses, Come up to me into the mount and be there and I will give thee *tables of stone* and a *law*, and commandments *which I have written*, that thou mayest teach them.

2. This whole law is enforced in the New Testament. James ii, 10, 11. "For whosoever shall keep the *whole*

21

law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. For he that said, Do not commit adultery, said, also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law."

The "whole law" referred to in this text is the one that says, Thou shalt not kill, and, Thou shalt not commit adultery, and the same law said. Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.

To show that a law given at Sinai is brought over, we refer to the sermon of Stephen, the martyr preached this side of the day of Pentecost, when the New Testament was fully in force. Acts vii, 38. "This is he that was in the church in the wilderness with the angel, which spake to him in the mount Sins, and with our fathers: who received the lively oracles to give unto us."

This shows that the "lively oracles" received on mount Sinai were to be "*given unto us*," Christians. Stephen takes this law to show men their sins in this dispensation: hence, it must be in force. Proof: "Who have received the law by the disposition of angels and have not kept it."

Further proof that the law is still in force is found in Luke xvi, 17. "And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail." Also, Rom. iii, 31. "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law."

If the law is not "made void," but "established," by faith, and it is "easier for heaven and earth to pass, than for one tittle of the law to fail," we must conclude that the law, *as a whole*, is brought over into the New Testament.

My friend reads several verses in Rom. vii, and says thin means the ten commandments. Here we agree exactly. But Paul says, We are dead to the law, and Bro. Grant says, We have got through with it, have nothing more to do with it, etc. Now I will commence and read from where he left off, and show that Paul concludes that the law is still in force. Verses 7-12. "What shall we say, then? Is the law sin? God forbid, [original illegible]. I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said,

22

Thou shalt not covet. But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence. For without the law sin was dead. For I was alive without the law once; but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died. And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death. For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me. Wherefore, the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good."

This law must have been in force, else how could it convince Paul of sin, and slay him? Did Paul refuse to have anything more to do with that which was "holy, just and good?" In verse 22, he says, "I *delight* in the law." Did Paul delight in that which was dead?! So we see Paul had not got through with the law; it was binding then, and it is binding still.

My friend next tries to get out of his no-Sabbath dilemma by asserting (without a particle of proof) that the first day is to be kept in honor of Christ's resurrection. But neither Christ nor the apostles have anywhere commanded any man to keep the first day; and Bro. Grant's rule is that what they have not

commanded in the New Testament is not binding. Now he knows there is no command for the first day, and yet he says if we don't keep it we "virtually deny the resurrection of Christ." He will keep the first day of the week without its ever being *once* commanded, but at the same time refuses to keep the seventh day because it has not been commanded the second time. Would he have God speak louder than he did before?

It is now strangely asserted that the ten commandments were abolished, and all re-enacted but the fourth. Did the Infinite Lawgiver ever enact a law, then abolish it, then re-enact it? Did the All-wise God make a mistake, and put the Sabbath [original illegible] mere ceremonial ordinance in the midst of the nine moral precepts, and then abolish all of them to get rid of the troublesome Sabbath?!

Let me illustrate the absurdity of such a position. Suppose a man has an incurable sore on his fourth finger. This finger has served him well in the past, but it is of no more use to him. He calls a surgeon, who

23

advises him to have it amputated. He consents to it, and the doctor cuts off all ten of his fingers and thumbs, throws away the diseased finger, and then goes to work to splice on the nice good ones for his future use! Would not my friend cry, O, foolish doctor! And shall we charge God foolishly?

He has once in this discussion applied the old covenant of Hagar, Gal. iv, 24, 25, to the ten commandments, but he now has the old "bond-woman" abolished, and nine-tenths of her re-enacted. He has nine-tenths of the old Hagar of bondage in his own system!

He has quoted authors to prove that the Sabbath did not exist among the ancients, but we have shown that the Sabbath was sanctified at creation, and of course it existed from that time. Let God be true, though all men should be proved liars.

We now propose to let the Scriptures testify as to what was abolished. Eph. ii, 14-16. "For He is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; having abolished in his flesh the *enmity*, even the *law of commandments* contained in *ordinances*: for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace; and that he might reconcile both unto God in one by the cross, having *slain* the *enmity thereby*." Col. ii, 14-17. "Blotting out the handwriting of *ordinances that was against us*, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross; and having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them in it. Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holy day, or the new moon, or of the sabbath days: which are a *shadow of things to come*; but the body is of Christ." Heb. ix, 10. "Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and *carnal ordinances*, imposed on them until the time of reformation."

The apostle carefully points out the law that is abolished. To the Ephesians, he says it is "The law of commandments [original illegible] in ordinances," which was [original illegible] But there is no enmity in the ten commandments. To the Colossians, he describes that

which was blotted out as the "hand-writing of ordinances that was against us," which was a "shadow of things to come." But the ten commandments were never against men, neither were they shadows of things to come. To the Hebrews, Paul says, the law which was only imposed until the time of reformation, consisted "only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances. Not one of these can possibly refer to the decalogue.

ELDER GRANT'S FOURTH SPEECH

My friend is getting quite earnest. I admit that the reason for the Sabbath still exists, and that reason is found in Deut. v, 15. They had been in hard bondage in Egypt, needed rest, therefore the Lord gave them the Sabbath. Dr. Gill and others say that Gen. ii, 3, probably refers to what was done in the days of Moses, and that it was probably recorded parenthetically.

I admit that the nine commandments existed in principle before Sinai, and I will now show that they are brought over into the New Testament.

1st commandment. "Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment," Matt. xxii, 37, 38.

2nd. Neither be ye idolators, as were some of them: as it is written, The people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play." 1 Cor. x, 7.

3rd. "But I say unto you, Swear not at all." Matt. v, 34.

5th. "Honor thy father and mother: which is the first commandment with promise: that it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth." Eph. vi, 2, 3.

6th, 7th, 8th, 9th and 10th. "For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not hear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying namely. Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," Rom. xiii, 9.

If our charge that Christ broke the Sabbath offends

25

the brother, we will take it back and let it stand that the Jews *accused* him of breaking it.

I admit that the Sabbath was binding on the Jews, and the old covenant was made with the Jews. But we are not Jews, and it was not made for us, surely.

My friend asks, Did God make a mistake when he put the Sabbath into the decalogue? I answer, No. He did not make a mistake, but he did make a new covenant, and left the Sabbath out of it.

I will look at Rom. vii again. I do not deny that this law made known sin and was good. I find no fault with it; it answered its design, and now we may be married to Christ.

ELDER CORNELL'S FIFTH SPEECH

My friend goes back to Rom. vii, and admits that it refers to the ten commandments. This is all we claim. Paul declares that this law made known his

sin: that it slew him, etc. Could an old dead law slay Paul? Bro. Grant makes the first husband in Paul's illustration, the law. I will read it again. "For the woman which hath a husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband. So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulterer, though she be married to another man."

Here are three parties—the *woman*, the *husband*, and the *law*. The husband dies, and the woman and the law are left. The law don't bind the woman to the old dead husband. She is it liberty to be married to another man. But the same law that bound her to the first husband now binds her to the second. We can not possibly by any rule of language make the law the first husband. The woman is bound by the law the her husband "so long as *he* liveth," not so long as the *law* lives. Paul's application of this illustration is pimplly this. The first husband was the "old man" of sin [original illegible] the "carnal mind," which Paul says is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. Rom.

26

viii, 7. The *death* of the first husband is "Our old man *crucified* with him, that the *body of sin* might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin." Rom. vi. When we are married to Christ, the second husband, we are "free from *sin*," instead of being free from obedience to the law. Christ does not give those who are married to him license to break his Father's law.

Dr. Gill and others are quoted, against the perpetuity of the law. If this question is to be settled by the testimony of men, I can give two to his one.

I will quote only a few. Dr. Chalmer, speaking of the Sabbath, says, "It stands enshrined among the moralities of a rectitude that is immutable and everlasting." John Wesley, speaking of the ten commandment law, says, "Every part of it remains in force upon all men in all ages. Neither time, place, nor circumstances make it liable to change" Dr. Albert Barnes, speaking of the same, says, "True piety has respect to all the commands of God, and keeps them." Bishop Hopkins is very earnest against the "Corrupt and rotten notion of the law's abrogation." Alexander Campbell, on the precepts of the decalogue, says, "Which not only in the Old Testament, but in *all revelation*, are the most emphatically regarded as the synopsis of all religion and morality." H. H. Dobney (Baptist minister), of England, speaks of "The moral law, presented to us in the shape of distinct commandments, ten in number, prescribing to each one of us concerning God in the first place, and then concerning our deportment to fill our fellow creatures." Dr. Cumming of England, says, "The law of ten commandments is in its nature unchangeable and permanent. It was ordained by the Supreme Lawgiver, as the infallible rule of life, to all men, in every age of the world, in all places, under all circumstances, in every nation and generation of men on the earth. Not one jot or tittle of it was ever abolished, nor diminished nor altered in the least degree, by the change of dispensation [original illegible] to Christian." The Encyclopedia of [original illegible] Literature, on the fourth commandments says: "Its position in the midst of the moral law distinctly

27

points to its perpetual and universal obligation." The Religious Encyclopedia says, "It is wholly a mistake that the Sabbath, because not re-enacted with the formality of the decalogue, is not explicitly enjoined upon Christians." Dr. Thomas Dick, on the fourth command says, "This is a command which never was abrogated, and which never can be abrogated, in relation to any intelligent beings, so long as the creation exists." Dr. Clarke says this law is the "rule of life," even for Christians. Dr. Thomas Scott says, "To imagine that any redeemed sinner should be allowed to disobey it, is absurdity, impossibility, blasphemy."

My friend repeats his denial that the Sabbath originated at creation. If the Sabbath was not known from creation, what was it that suggested to the patriarchs the reckoning of time by weeks. There was nothing in nature to suggest such a division of time. They must have received it from God's original appointment of the week and Sabbath. Josephus remarks: Moses says that in just six days the world and all that is therein was made, and that the seventh day was a rest and a release from the labor of such operations: *whence* it is that we celebrate a rest from our labor on that day, and call it Sabbath; which word denotes rest in the Hebrew tongue, -*Antiq.*, *Book I, chap. 1.*

At last my friend has brought forward his code of re-enacted commandments. Let us examine it. For the third commandment he quotes Matt. v, 34, "Swear not at all," but this was spoken about three years before the crucifixion. So that he has the third command re-enacted before he has the ten abolished! He has found where the nine commandments are quoted or referred to in the New Testament, but in no place are they given over upon new authority. They are simply quoted, the name as the prophecies are quoted, upon original authority. Christ enforced his teachings by quotations from both law and prophets. Matt. vii, 12. "Therefore, all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for *this* is the law and the prophets."

I will now show that the Sabbath is plainly recognized as an existing institution in the New Testament.

28

Proof: 1. Christ honored it as his regular preaching day. Luke iv, 16, 31. "And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up: and, as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and stood up for to read. And came down to Capernaum, a city of Galilee, and taught them on the Sabbath days." Luke xiii, 10. "And he was teaching in one of the synagogues on the Sabbath."

2. He recognized the existence of the Sabbath law by declaring his acts on the Sabbath to be "lawful," i. e., according to the Sabbath law. Matt. xii, 12.

3. When he was speaking to the disciples concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, which took place in a. d. 70, he recognized the Sabbath as an institution that would actually exist at that time. Matt. xxiv, 20. "But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath day." No hint that the Sabbath would be abolished any more than the seasons of the year.

4. Those who had been favored with most of Christ's personal instructions, kept the Sabbath after Christ's crucifixion, "according to the commandment." Luke xxiii, 56.

5. Jesus says, "The Sabbath was made for man." Mark ii, 27. If it was made "for" man, it is not abolished. This is the very best evidence that the Sabbath is not for any particular age or class of people, but for the entire race.

ELDER GRANT'S FIFTH SPEECH

It seems we have come around together on Rom. vii, I do not deny that the law was alive, and that it slew Paul. If the Sabbath is binding, no one can be a Christian without keeping it. How is it that I receive such great blessings from God, if it is sin to break the Sabbath?

My friend has quoted several authors, but I would ask him whether any one of them believed in keeping the Sabbath?

I do not claim that the ten commands were abolished, and then nine of them re-enacted. "Thou shalt not

29

kill" never was abolished. The nine commands were brought over into the new covenant without change, but the fourth command was left out. The Sabbath is not commanded in the new covenant.

There was nothing in the old covenant to forbid a man's being at variance with his neighbor. The Sabbath was classed with feast days in Lev. xxiii. They had feasts and holy convocations, and the first one was the seventh day Sabbath. Those feasts were all abolished together.

I will now proceed to show from the Scriptures that no man can be justified by the law. Gal. v, 4. "Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace." Gal. ii, 16-19. "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified. But if, while we seek to be justified by Christ, we ourselves, also, are found sinners, is therefore Christ the minister of sin? God forbid. For if I build again the things which I destroyed, I make myself a transgressor. For I through the law am dead to the law, that I might live unto God." Gal. iii, 19, 24, 25. "Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator. Wherefore the law was 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 a schoolmaster."

This law was not added in Abraham's time. There is no evidence that Abraham kept the law. It was four hundred and thirty years after the promise to Abraham.

ELDER CORNELL'S SIXTH SPEECH

It seems that we are progressing. Bro. Grant has admitted [original illegible] in Rom. vii means the ten commands, and now he admits that this law was alive when Paul

was converted. If the ten commands were alive, of course the fourth was alive. This is all we claim. Paul says, "I had not known sin but by the law." An abolished law could not have made known sin, hence it is certain that the law was in full force when Paul was converted.

My friend thinks the Sabbath cannot be binding, because he has been so blessed while disregarding it. This is evidently for want of better argument. Does God bless men only when they are right on every point? This argument would prove the soul immortal, consciousness of the dead, and endless misery. Let us try this rule. Bro. Grant goes to a certain place to preach that the soul is not immortal. One of his hearers rejects his testimony, because he has been so blessed while believing the opposite. The Elder replies that his reasoning is not good, for God blesses men because they are honest, and not always because they have all the truth. They are blessed because they are living out what light they have.

I have not intimated that a man could not be an honest Christian unless he believed in the Sabbath. A man is not condemned until he is enlightened on the truth, and he *chooses* darkness rather than light.

My friend objects that my authors did not keep the seventh day. So much the better witnesses. They were all keeping my friend's first-day Sabbath, and yet they dare not deny so evident a truth as the perpetuity of the fourth commandment. President Mahan says, "Testimony in favor of truth from the ranks of its enemies constitutes the highest kind of evidence."

I am astonished at my friend's denial that he has argued in this discussion that the ten commands were abolished. He now says the nine commands never were abolished. I regard this as backing square out. He has argued that the ten commands were the old covenant, which was done away. He has quoted 2 Cor. iii, 7, to show that the law written on stone was done away. He also quoted Rom. vii. and remarked "The law is dead."

But now that he has taken back that position, or

rather denied it, he has destroyed his own application of many of his best proof texts.

He says the old covenant did not forbid a man to be at variance with his neighbor. That this is a mistake see Lev. xix. 18. "Thou shalt not avenge, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people, but thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself: I am the Lord." The last six commandments of the decalogue are all to prevent any injustice to neighbor.

He says the Sabbath was classed with the feast days, etc. Lev. xxiii. It is true, the seventh day Sabbath is mentioned in the same chapter with the feasts, but in verses 37 and 38 we find they were to keep all those feasts "Besides the Sabbaths of the Lord." Here is a clear distinction made between those days.

Scriptures are quoted to show that no man can be justified by the law. But is the law abolished because it will not justify those who have broken it? The apostle gives the reason why it will not justify. Rom. iii, 20. "Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the

knowledge of sin" When sinners are justified by faith for their past sins, then it becomes true that "the doers of the law shall be justified." Rom. ii, 13.

In reply to the [original illegible] that Abraham did not keep the law, I will load Gen. xxvi, 5. "Because that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge my commandments, my statutes, and my laws."

The law that was added because of transgression, was the remedial law of types and ceremonies. It was the typical law that was the schoolmaster to bring us to Christ. But there is not a word in the decalogue that to Christ. The Sabbath pointed back to creation.

My friend has repeated several times that if we show that the Sabbath is brought into this dispensation, he will yield the question. Very well. I will again refer to Matt. xxiv, 20. Christ taught his disciples to pray that their flight from Jerusalem should not happen on the Sabbath. This was to take place about forty years this side of the crucifixion. They must regard [original illegible] Sabbath at that time. It is of no use to try

32

to evade this by saying that Christ taught them to pray that their flight might not happen on the Sabbath, because he foresaw that the Jews would have the gates locked, and would not let them out on that day. If the gates were locked so that they *could not* flee on the Sabbath, what need was there of praying that their flight should not happen on that day?

ELDER GRANT'S SIXTH SPEECH

My friend says it was the "ceremonial" law that was added because of transgression. The Bible does not say one word about a ceremonial law.

Eph. ii has been quoted to show what law was abolished. He says this cannot refer to the ten commands because there is no "enmity" in that law. If that fourth precept is now binding, every man must put out his fires and suffer. This would be enmity enough, surely.

He quotes Col. ii, 16, for his ceremonial Sabbaths, but we find Paul also speaks of "holy days." Was not the weekly Sabbath a holy day? No scholar will deny that Col. ii, 16, includes the seventh day Sabbath.

We are referred to Matt. xxiv, 20, for proof that Christ taught the obligation of the Sabbath in the year a. d. 70. It was the custom of the Jews to keep their gates shut on the Sabbath. Christ knew they would be keeping it, and they keep it yet.

I will proceed to give some evidence for the observance of the first day, Barnabas says, "We observe the eighth day with gladness, in which Jesus arose from the dead, and having manifested himself to his disciples, ascended into heaven." Ignatius says, "Wherefore, if they who were brought up in these ancient laws came nevertheless to the newness of hope no longer observing Sabbaths, but keeping the Lord's day," etc.

It has not yet been shown where Christ commands us to keep the Sabbath. If Christ commands it, I will keep it, if I have to freeze in the act.

The commandments of Christ in the New Testament are called God's commandments. 1 Jno. iii, 22, 23.

33

"And whatsoever we ask, we receive of him, because we keep his commandments, and do those things that are pleasing in his sight. And this to his commandment, That we should believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ, and love one another, as he gave us commandment." Acts xvii, 30. "And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men every where to repent."

The expression, "commandments of God," don't always mean the ten commandments. James ii, 8, "The Royal law," don't apply to the ten commands, but to "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

I repeat, there is no love to God or neighbor in the ten commandments. A man may keep all of them and yet not be saved.

ELDER CORNELL'S SEVENTH SPEECH

The investigation thus far has brought us to the turning point in the discussion. We are interested.

My friend thinks the "enmity" in Eph. ii, 15, is the prohibition of fires on the Sabbath day. But if we examine closely we shall find that the not kindling fires had reference only to the cooking of manna while they were in the wilderness of Arabia, a warm climate. It was a mere by-law for that time and place. They were commanded to offer burnt offerings on the Sabbath. See Num. xxviii, 9, 10. Of course, then, the "kindling of fires" is limited to certain objects and purposes. There is not a word in the fourth commandment about kindling fires. I will now show that in Judea, where the Sabbath was kept many years, they could not live without fires in the coldest winters. And surely, God never required men to freeze in a cold climate, in order to keep the Sabbath.

When Christ was crucified in the spring of the year, it was so cold that they needed fires to warm by. Jno. xviii. "And the servants and officers stood there, who had *made a fire of coals*, for it was *cold*: and they *warmed themselves*; and Peter stood with them, and *warmed himself*." In the former part of the winter they needed fires also. See Jer. xxxvi, 22. "Now

34

the king sat in the *winter house*, in the ninth month: and there *was a fire* on the hearth burning before him."

The psalmist David, in his address to Jerusalem, says: "He giveth *snow* like wool; he scattereth the hoar frost like ashes. He casteth forth his *we* like morsels: who can stand before his cold?" Ps. cxlvii, 16, 17.

Dr. Clarke has the following note on this text: "At particular times the cold in the East is so very intense as to kill man and beast. Jacobus de Vitriaco, one of the writers in the *Gesta Dei per Francos*, says that in an expedition in which he was engaged *against* mount Tabor, on the 24th of December, the cold was so intense that many of the poor people, and the beasts of burthen, died by it."

My friend repeats the assertion that there is no love to God in the law. We still wonder whether he ever read the ten commandments. Let us read a few words of the second commandment: "Shewing mercy unto thousand of them that L-o-v-e me and keep my commandment."

When Jesus was interrogated as to what was the great commandment (or principle) "*in the law*," he replied, "Thou shalt *love the Lord thy God* with all thy heart," etc. Matt. xxii, 36, 37.

I will now show that my friend is mistaken when he says that no scholar will deny that Col. ii, 16, embraces the weekly Sabbath. I will select witnesses, celebrated for learning, and those, too, who kept his first day Sabbath.

Dr. Adam Clarke, on this text says, "There is no intimation here that the *Sabbath* was done away, or that its moral use was suspended by the introduction of Christianity. I have shown elsewhere that Remember

35

the Sabbath day to keep it holy, is a commandment of *perpetual obligation*, and can never be suspended but by the final termination of time." See Commentary.

Dr. Justin Edwards says, "The days referred to are those required to be observed in the ceremonial law; days associated by God with meats, drinks, and new moons. The passage does not refer to the Sabbath of the moral law, associated with the commands, forbidding theft, murder, and adultery. This weekly Sabbath was never against men, or contrary to them, but was always for them and promotion of their highest good." Notes on the New Testament.

Barnabas and Ignatius are quoted for the first day. Barnabas speaks of the eighth day, but an eighth-day Sabbath must be outside of the week. This witness does not say whether it is the eighth day of the month or of the year. My friend ought to know that both these are spurious testimonies. I affirm that they are both miserable frauds.

Of the epistle of Barnabas, Mosheim says: "As to what is suggested by some, of its having been written by that Barnabas who was the friend and companion of St. Paul, the futility of such a notion is easily to be made apparent from the letter itself."

Neander says: "It is impossible that we should acknowledge this epistle to belong to that Barnabas who was worthy to be the companion of the apostolic labors of St. Paul." Kitto says "The so-called epistle of Barnabas, probably a forgery of the second century." Eusebius declares it to be spurious. The Religious Encyclopedia, Milner Domville, Coleman, Killen, Stuart, and many others, give substantially the same opinion of this epistle.

36

Of the Ignatian epistles, Prof. C. F. Hudson says: "Of the eight epistles ascribed to him, three are genuine, viz., those addressed to Polycarp, the Ephesians, and the Romans." The quotation of Bro. Grant was from the epistle to the Magnesians, which is universally admitted to be spurious.

Dr. Killen thus states the opinion of Calvin: "It is no mean proof of the sagacity of the great Calvin, that upwards of three hundred years ago he passed a sweeping sentence of condemnation on these Ignatian epistles."

My friend promises to keep the Sabbath if I will show that it is taught in the New Testament. Now, I ask what kind of proof he will require to satisfy him. He has given a rule to work by, and I will use it. He says the nine commands are taught in the New Testament. Now, if I have shown or can show that the Sabbath is as plainly taught as several of his nine commands, he is bound to keep the Sabbath. Let us see. For his second commandment he quotes "Neither be ye idolaters," etc. 1 Cor. x, 7. But this does not define idolatry in the New Testament. It only refers back to the old dispensation. "Neither be ye idolaters, *as were some of them*," i. e., Don't you break God's law, as they did. Go back to thy second commandment and we learn what idolatry is. Now the Sabbath is brought over in the same manner, i. e., by recognizing it as an existing institution, and referring back to its origin to show why it exists. Mark ii, 27. "The Sabbath *was made for man*." We go back to find when it was made. We read the fourth commandment, and find it points back to creation for its origin, as well as for the reason for keeping it. The great Teacher says, The Sabbath was made *for* man. We are men hence

37

it is for us. Shall we reject it? The Sabbath is brought over in the most unqualified manner.

My friend has tried to destroy the force of the argument we made on James ii, 8, by saying that the royal law in Christ's precept. "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Let us look at that again. "If ye fulfill the royal law *according to the Scripture*, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," etc. The scripture [Lev. xix, 18] is one thing, and the royal law, which is to be fulfilled according to it, is quite another. We shall find what law is referred to by the connection, verses 10 and 11. "For whosoever shall keep the *whole law*, and yet offend in one *point*, he is guilty of all. For he that said, Do not commit adultery, said, also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law."

These commandments stand as a representation of the "whole law" from which they are taken, and unmistakably show that law to be the ten commandments.

I will now advance another proof that the law of God as a whole is brought into the New Testament. Matt. v, 17-19. "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am *not come to destroy*, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled. Whosoever, therefore, shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of Heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of Heaven.

[original illegible] enforces every jot and tittle of the law, as obligatory

38

till heaven and earth pass away. No man may violate one of the least of its precept.

Thus Christ has magnified the law and made it honorable. Why should Bro. Grant, why should any man feel opposed to such a law? Nine of the

commandments are admitted good for all mankind, and the Sabbath was made for man, for all mankind. Paul regarded the law as "holy, just and good." James calls it the "royal law." Now, we ask, Why have such a law, or any part of it, done away? If a man thought the decalogue had some very obnoxious precepts, that were revolting to his nature, then we could see some reason in opposing it. There is one instance of a man's feeling opposed to the decalogue when he was ignorant of its meaning. The London Advertiser has the following:

"A candidate for Parliament, at the recent election, in the course of an electioneering speech was asked, What do you think of the decalogue? Confounded with the inquiry, he turned to a friend and asked, in a whisper. What does that mean? The friend, whose acquaintance with divinity was on par with his own, replied by suggesting that it probably meant flogging in the army.' Whereupon, the candidate replied, I entirely disapprove of the Decalogue, and will never rest until I see it abolished.'

I do not wonder that a man should feel opposed to the decalogue, when he thought it meant flogging in the army," but that any one should oppose it knowing that it means God's great moral law, is perfectly unaccountable.

ELDER GRANT'S SEVENTH SPEECH

My friend does not advocate that the penalty of the Sabbath is still binding. Let him show how the penalty can be abolished and the law still remain in force.

He quotes authors to show that it is very cold in Judea, on Mt. Tabor. Of course the Jews did not live up there.

He quotes Prof. Hudson. Does Prof. Hudson keep the seventh day? He does not.

I will repeat again that if he will show that the fourth commandment has been brought into the new covenant, I will give up at once. I should think he might bring a text from the New Testament to prove it, if it is now binding. If he will prove it to be binding now, I will keep it, though it would be hard.

My friend quotes Matt. v, 17, That Christ came not to destroy the law. True, he came not to destroy it, but to fulfill it. He finished it in its old form, and remodeled it. The ceremonial part is now left out. I do not say that the ten were abolished and the nine re-enacted. It was like the remodeling of an old constitution. They examine it item by item, and say, This is to be brought into the new one, and that is not. Nine of the commands have been brought over; the fourth was not.

We refer again to Deut. 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." If it was not made before it was not binding before. This covenant was the ten commands. Paul calls the old covenant "Carnal ordinance imposed on them till the time of [original illegible]." That which was in force till the

reformation, is now no longer in force. Paul in 2 Cor. iii, has shown us what was abolished. It was the law written on stone. If it is done away, it is not binding now, surely.

ELDER CORNELL'S EIGHTH SPEECH

I am called upon to show how a penalty can be abolished and the law remain in force. That is easy. Bro. Grant has given us a rule for it. He admits the nine commands are brought over without change. But several of those commands had the stoning penalty. Now, if he will think how he brought over the nine without the penalty, his difficulty in regard to the fourth will be solved.

He thinks I had no right to quote Prof. Hudson, because he does not keep the seventh day. But that is the very reason I did quote. All the better for us if his own men testify against him.

My argument on Matt. v, 17, is answered by asserting that Christ fulfilled it, i. e., he finished up the old form and remodeled it; that it has become Christ's now; for he has given us new constitution. I will now test his new constitution by his own definition of the word "fulfill." Gal. vi, 2. "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so *fulfill* the law of Christ.

The Galatian brethren did fulfill the law of Christ, i. e., says Bro. Grant's rule, They finished it up and remodeled it!!

The word fulfill signifies to keep, to perform, to obey. "Thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness." Matt. iii, 15.

My friend now finds that his position that all ten of the commands were abolished will not hold, so he takes it back and says the nine commands never were

41

abolished; that these existed before the covenant was made on Sinai, and hence they are still binding. Now if I can show that the Sabbath existed before the Sinaitic covenant, he has lost the question again.

When the people were in the wilderness of sin, between Elam and Sinai, about thirty days before the law was given on Sinai, they were reprov'd for breaking the Sabbath. Ex. xvi, 28, 29. "And the Lord said unto Moses, How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws? See, for that the Lord *hath* given you the Sabbath, therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days: abide ye every man in his place, let no man go out of his place on the seventh day."

Now, if Bro. Grant's argument is good, that the nine precepts are binding now because they existed before Sinai, then the Sabbath is now binding for the same reason.

But he has overthrown his position that the nine commands existed before given to Israel, by his quotation in Deut. v, 2, 3. "The Lord made not this covenant with our fathers," etc., and remarks, If it was not made before, it was not binding before. But he admits the nine were binding before, therefore his argument on Deut. v, 2, is null and void.

My friend in his last speech, says that 2 Cor. iii, 7, shows what was abolished, even the law written on stone. So he now has all ten abolished again! They are abolished and they are not abolished, just as occasion requires. How difficult it is to get rid of that troublesome Sabbath.

"O, fourth command, what trouble hast thou been,
Source of vexation to the sons of men!

42

How have they tugged and toiled, with various plans,
To break thy power, and shirk thy just demands!"

Our argument on the reason for the Sabbath is yet unanswered. Why keep the seventh day? Because God rested upon it and hallowed it. If this was a sufficient reason at Sinai, it was from creation, and it is sufficient still. I will now show that a commandment, or that which was equivalent, was given at creation for keeping the Sabbath. Gen. ii, 3. "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 Lord "sanctified it." What is the meaning of the word sanctify? Webster says, to sanctify is "to separate, set apart, or appoint to a holy, sacred or religious use." "Sanctify a fast." i. e., appoint a fast, call the people to observe a fast. God set apart the Sabbath by proclamation, that it should be kept holy.

ELDER GRANT'S EIGHTH SPEECH

My friend admits the fourth command makes trouble, and that's just what we have been Baying.

He has one text that seems to weigh heavily in his own mind. "The Sabbath was made for man." Now the fact that it was made *for man*, goes to show to my mind that it was ceremonial, or positive, and hence was done away with the rest of such laws.

French says, "Col. ii, 16 cannot be confined to the Sabbath alone. It must apply to the whole circle of outward ordinances." We view the Sabbath as a positive institution and its observance being limited to the old covenant has ceased.

This is the testimony of Bishop Whateley, Irenæus, Tertullian, and Ignatius. "The Fathers," says Calvin,

43

"frequently called the Sabbath a shadow." We find it classed among positive institutions and feasts, "made for man."

Baxter says, Col. ii, 16 means the weekly Sabbath.

My friend says, The Sabbath existed from creation because the reason for its observance existed from that time.

But we find that was only the reason why God chose that day for Israel. Let us see whether the Sabbath existed from creation all the way down.

Bangor says, "It was given to Israel and to Israel alone." He was also warranted in the expression "The Sabbath was done away." Again he says, "We find nothing of the imposing of the seventh day before the wilderness of sin." Dr Giles says, "In the wilderness of sin was the time it was instituted." If it was made at creation why was it not mentioned before the exode.

Calvin says, "The fourth commandment was abolished at the resurrection of Christ." Erasmus says, "With Moses law we have nothing to do." Chalmer says,

"The former husband is taken away. The death of the law took effect at the death of Christ." Selden says, "The Talmudists (Jews) consider the Sabbath their own." Jonathan Edwards says, "The Jews were commanded to keep the Sabbath in commemoration of their deliverance from Egypt;" Masbein says "The first Christians held meetings on different days Justin Martyr says, "We meet on the day that Christ arose." Barnabas says, "We keep the eighth day."

ELDER CORNELL'S NINTH SPEECH

If the testimony of men is reliable proof the question must be settled. The fathers are quoted to prove the Sabbath abolished; and many of these same fathers declare that the Soul is immortal, the dead conscious, etc. If their say-so is to be taken on one point why not on another. Bro. Grant himself rejects their testimony on other points. Concerning such testimony Martin Luther says, "When God's word is by the father expounded, construed, and glossed, then, in my judgment, it is even like unto one that straineth milk through a coal-sack; which must needs spoil the milk and make it black." Dr. Clarke says, "We should take heed how we quote the fathers in proof of the doctrine of the gospel; because he who knows them best, knows that on many of those subjects, they blow hot and cold."

My friend says, The expression "made for man" shown the Sabbath to be ceremonial and hence it is done away. He has once in this discussion discarded the term "ceremonial" but he has come now to use it as glibly as if he never even thought of its being objectionable.

But if the Sabbath was only a ceremonial ordinance why was it placed in the midst of nine perpetual and moral precepts? Was it not because the all-wise Lawgiver saw that it was worthy of their company. It has been said that a man is known by the company he keeps. So with the Sabbath. Its neighbors on both sides were very moral and respectable citizens. There is not a community in the world that can compare with it in morality. The Sabbath is like the commandments with which in was associated on the

45

tables of stone. If one is abolished they all are. If nine are in force they all are.

There are two institutions "for man" from the very beginning, the Sabbath and marriage. Paul says, 1 Cor. xi, 9, "Neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man." Both these institutions originated at creation before the fall of man. Both of them are holy and sacred. The fourth commandment guards the sacredness of the Sabbath, and the seventh commandment the sacredness of the marriage relation. Now if as Elder Grant says, the expression. "The Sabbath was made for man," proves it only ceremonial and therefore abolished, then by the same rule the declaration. The woman was created for man, proves that she is only a positive institution, and that marriage is only a ceremonial ordinance, and hence is done away. That which proven too much proves nothing.

My friend inquires why there is no mention of the Sabbath during the first 2500 years, if it was binding. I answer. The history of that period is very brief.

How short the account of so good a man as Enoch! He walked with God three hundred years, and was not, for God took him. There is no definite mention of the doctrine of the resurrection during the same period. Shall we therefore infer that the patriarchs did not believe in the resurrection? Future punishment, and Christ's second advent in flaming fire, and the Judgment of the great day are not definitely mentioned in the book of Genesis. But there is a period of over five hundred years this side of Mt. Sinai, and the Sabbath is not mentioned in the history of it, and that, too, while the Sabbath was enforced by the death penalty.

46

Shall we conclude that it was not binding during that time?

My friend goes back to the fathers again to prove that Col. ii, 16, embraces the weekly Sabbath. The fathers can be quoted to prove almost anything. They neither agree with themselves, nor the Bible. I appeal from the fathers up to the *grand-fathers*, Paul, Peter, James, John, and others. If Paul designed to embrace all Sabbaths in Col. ii, 16, why does he qualify it with "which are shadows of things to come?" The weekly Sabbath being instituted at creation before the fall, could not be a shadow of anything in redemption. The Sabbaths mentioned in Col. ii, were those "contrary to man and against him," but Jesus says of the weekly Sabbath, it "was made *for* man." Could it be "for man," and yet "against him?" Does Paul contradict Christ? If not, then he cannot refer to the weekly Sabbath.

I will now show that there were two distinct laws: that the word "law" does not always refer to the same thing.

David speaks of the moral law when he says, "The law of the Lord perfect, converting the soul." Ps. xix, 7. In verse 11 he says that in keeping it there is great reward."

Paul in Heb, vii, 18, speaks of the disannulling of the law "for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof." In chap. x, 1, he declares that [original illegible] never could "make the comers there unto perfect."

Paul speaking of the ten commandments in Rom. vii, says, "We know the law is [original illegible] But in Heb. vii, [original illegible] he mentions "the law of [original illegible] commandments."

Christ speaks of the law, that [original illegible]

47

should pass from, till heaven and earth should pass away. Matt. v, 18.

Paul speaks of another law and says, "The priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law." Heb. vii, 12.

Paul declares that Christ abolished "the law of commandments contained in ordinances." Eph. ii, 15. But of another law Christ says. "Think not that I am come to destroy the law." Matt. v, 17.

Nehemiah says that God gave on mount Sinai "right judgments, true laws, *good* statutes and commandments." Neh. ix, 13: but in Eze. xx, 24, 25, God says. "I gave them *also* statutes that *were not good*, and judgments whereby they should not live."

Peter calls "the law of Moses" a yoke "which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear." Acts xv, 10. But Paul on the ten commandments in Rom. vii,

says, "I *delight in the law of God* after the inward man;" and, "with the mind I serve the law of God." Verses 22, 25.

God has carefully distinguished between the moral and the ceremonial laws: 1. He spoke the moral law in the hearing of all the people: but the ceremonial law he gave privately to Moses. 2. He wrote the moral law with his own finger on stone: but the ceremonial law was only written by the hand of Moses in a book. 3. The tables of the moral law were placed in the golden ark made for the express purpose: but the book of the ceremonial law was placed by the side of the ark. The moral law was the rule of life, and showed what sin was; but the ceremonial law was given to point the mind of the sinner to the atonement for sin. It was added because of the transgressions of the [original illegible] law. God had made a distinction. What

48

God does is significant. In the light of these facts I protest against jumbling all the laws of the Bible together, and then sweeping them all away together at the cross. The moral law cannot change with the change of dispensation. It is as immutable as God himself, and can no more be abolished or changed than God's eternal throne.

ELDER GRANT'S NINTH SPEECH

My friend argues that there are two laws. We seem to be coming together. I have not denied that there are two laws. The first law was the old covenant of bondage, but the second law is the new law of liberty. Gal. v, 1. "Stand fast therefore in the liberty where-with Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage." Those who have kept the Sabbath have felt that they were in bondage. If we adopt one of the feast-days we should adopt them all. We think we are at liberty from that law of ordinances. We can now come to Christ without going around with a meat offering.

I will now refer to some learned authors to show that the patriarchs did not keep the Sabbath. Peter Heylen, in the preface to his work, says. "When you give it out as a matter of fact that before Moses time the Sabbath was observed, I will let you see that it was not so. It is all your [original illegible] to show it was moral." In his work he says, "There was no Sabbath kept till the time of Moses, as I will show from the fathers. None were circumcised till the time of Moses, when the Sabbath was instituted [original illegible] and Eusebius declare that "the religion of the patriarchs was quite different from that of the Christians. Justin Martyr says, "There was no use for the Sabbath until

49

Abraham's time, and Moses was the first lawgiver among the Jews." St. Augustine says, "The Sabbath is no part, of the moral law." Athanasius says, "It was abolished at the resurrection of Christ. Clement of Alexandria says, "We keep the Lord's day, if we would glorify the Lord in his resurrection."

The Lord's day we now keep is kept in commemoration of the resurrection of Christ. If the Jew does not keep the first day he virtually denies the resurrection.

The bondage of the old covenant was in the Sabbath. Were they not stoned to death for breaking the Sabbath?

ELDER CORNELL'S TENTH SPEECH

This evening will close up the investigation of the question before us, I am glad to see the interest that is manifested. Some of the friends seem to think we use too much sharpness in our manner. Sometimes persons mistake hard arguments for abuse. If we have erred it has been of the head and not of the heart. Our aim has been to avoid everything unkind; however, I had much rather take back indiscretion in manner, if it has occurred, than to be under the necessity of taking back, or denying, my principal arguments.

My friend says, The Old Testament was bondage, but the New is liberty. This may be true, but it cannot apply to the law of God. Those who kept the moral law under the old covenant talk much like those who keep the law under the new covenant.

Ps. cxix, 165. "Great peace have they that love thy law, and nothing shall offend them." Rom. vii, 12, 22. "Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good."

Ps. cxix, 15. "I will walk at liberty, for I seek

50

thy precepts." Rom. viii, 6, 7. "For to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace. Because the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be."

My friend says, Those who have kept the Sabbath say they were in bondage. I have heard thousands say the Sabbath was their delight and joy. There is no bondage in the weekly Sabbath. It was made for man, to be one of his greatest blessings. That the Sabbath is not to be regarded as a bondage, is evident from Isa. lviii, 13. "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable; and shalt honor him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words," etc.

The Lord directed men to call the Sabbath a *delight*, but Bro. Grant calls it a yoke of bondage. Who knows best? He says he is acquainted with some who kept it awhile, then gave it up, and they testify that it was bondage to them. I do not wonder that such ones gave it up. If I felt that it was bondage I would give it up too. But I know of more than [original illegible] *thousand* who have not given it up, and who regard the Sabbath as a precious gift from God. I have [original illegible] the Sabbath about eleven years and man speak [original illegible] personal experience. For several years I tried my best friend's position of [original illegible] but I never knew what freedom was will I, like the Psalmist, [original illegible] law.

The fathers are [original illegible] prove that the [original illegible] did not keep the Sabbath [original illegible] the *Bible* say the patriarchs [original illegible] keep the Sabbath [original illegible] the fathers [original illegible]

51

it in the Bible we can get it there. If they did not get it in the Bible, it is good for nothing.

We have shown that the reckoning of time by weeks in that age came from the well-known institution of the Sabbath. He has failed to account for this in any other other way. Neither has he met the argument that the Sabbath was instituted at creation. That sanctifying it was the setting it apart by proclamation to a holy or religious use for man.

My friend has several, times repeated the declaration that what is not commanded in the new covenant is not binding and still asserts that we must keep the first day or deny the resurrection of Christ. Why don't he show where the first day is commanded?

My friend has finally condescended to tell us what was the bondage of the ten commandments. It was in the Sabbath on account of the stoning penalty. But he has overlooked one important fact. The other nine commands also had the stoning penalty. Proof. For the first and second commandments see Deut. xiii, 6-10; third commandments. Lev. xxiv, 11-14; fifth commandment, Deut. xxi, 18-21; sixth commandment, Ex. xxi, 12; seventh commandment, Deut. xxii, 24; eighth ninth and tenth commandments, Josh. vi, 19, 25.

If the fourth commandment contained bondage because had the stoning penalty, the other nine were bondage for the same reason. But he has the nine brought over without change, hence he has nine-tenths of the old yoke of bondage in his new constitution.

I will [original illegible] advance, Ps. xix, 7. "The law of the Lord perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple." David

52

must have referred to the decalogue, for that was the only perfect moral code ever given to man. There were *ten* precepts in that perfect law; now if one of them is left out it becomes so far imperfect. A perfect law will not admit of the slightest change.

Isa. lvi, 1, 2. "Thus saith the Lord, Keep ye judgment, and do justice; for my salvation is near to come, and my righteousness to be revealed. Blessed is the man that doeth this, and the son of man that layeth hold on it; that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and keepeth his band from doing any evil."

This prophecy locates itself when "salvation is near to come." In Heb. ix, 28, we learn that salvation comes at the second advent of Christ, and in 1 Pet. i, 5, that salvation is ready to be revealed in the *last time*. If a blessing is pronounced on the man who keeps the Sabbath in the Christian age, of course it exists and is binding.

Paul's manner was to preach on the Sabbath. Acts xiii, 42, 44. "And when the Jews were gone out of the synagogue, the Gentiles besought that these words might be preached to them the next Sabbath. And the next Sabbath-day came almost the whole city together to hear the word of God." Acts xvi, 13. "And on the Sabbath we went out of the city by a river side, where prayer was wont to be made: and we sat down, and spake unto the women which resorted thither." Acts xvii, 2. "And Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three Sabbath-

days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures." Acts xviii, 4, 11. "And he reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks. And he continued there a year and six months, teaching the word of God among them."

53

We learn from these scriptures that Paul, "if his manner was," preached every Sabbath-day, to the Jews in the synagogue, out by the river side, to the Gentiles, and when he was a located minister a year and six months at Corinth; in all eighty-four Sabbaths. We have no record of his ever preaching only on one first day of the week, and that was the all-night farewell meeting; with the disciples at Troas. The whole strength of apostolic example is in favor of the Sabbath.

ELDER GRANT'S TENTH SPEECH

My friend quotes David and Paul that the law was a delight, etc. True, the old law was a delight, but it is no more a delight since the new covenant, surely. He says the Sabbath penalty is done away. Now I call on him to show one instance where the penalty of a law has been done away and the law remain in force. He says Paul preached on the Sabbath. True, but he did not keep it. He says, "Let no man judge you in relation to it." If I was among Sabbath-keepers I should preach on the Sabbath as Paul did.

For further testimony on the new law I will read Rom. xiii, 9, 10. "For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet: and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbor: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law." Acts xv, 28, 29. "For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things: that ye abstain from [original illegible] offered to idols, and from blood, and from

54

things strangled, and from fornication; from which if ye keep yourselves, ye shall do well. Fare ye well."

Why not enjoin the Sabbath here if it is so important? It may be asked why several other commands were not mentioned. I answer, because they were observing them. If the Sabbath was binding, why not *bind* it upon the disciples in that council. Grotius says, "These three points were the only ones between Jews and Gentiles that admitted of dispute."

In regard to keeping; the seventh day, it is a fact that a definite day cannot be kept. If two men sail around the world, one will gain while the other will lose a day. When they come together they would find themselves keeping different days.

I will now give a few facts for the brother's consideration:

1. It is a fact that Adam's first day corresponded with God's seventh day.
2. It was a fact that the Sabbath was made only for the Jews.
3. It is a fact that Gen. ii, 3, does not prove the Sabbath from creation: for it was not written till after the exode.

ELDER CORNELL'S ELEVENTH SPEECH

My friend calls for one instance where a penalty has been done away and the law still remain in force. He has furnished it himself. He admits the nine commands still in force without change. They had the stoning penalty. He calls on me to show one case, when he has furnished nine instances in his own argument.

He quotes Rom. xiii, 9, 10 for his new law.

55

Paul refers to some of the commands which relate to our duty to neighbor and then adds "If there be any other commandment it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Wakefield has it "Every other *such* commandment." Neither of the first four commands relating to our duty to God are quoted there. If the text proves that the Sabbath is left out in the New Testament, because not quoted, it equally proves that the other three are left out. That which proves too much proves nothing in the case.

My friend next resorts to Acts xv, 28 and asks why the Sabbath was not enjoined if it was binding?

I answer because their question did not relate to the moral law, but to matters in the ceremonial law. He says, the reason why the other commandments were not quoted was because they kept them. Good! Let me apply the same rule to the Sabbath. The Sabbath was not mentioned because there was no dispute in regard to it. They had never changed the day, all were agreed, and hence no need of taking it up in council. He quotes Grotius, that the three points mentioned were the only ones in dispute between Jews and Gentiles. Better still. Then the Gentile Christians must have been unanimous in keeping the seventh day. If they had not there would have been trouble enough. The Jews took occasion to find all the fault possible with the Christians.

I am astonished that my friend should bring up that old objection to the Sabbath, that the world is round. Is it not just as round when his first day comes?

He makes many assertions and says "It is a fact," that this and the other is so, or is not so. Now I ask what all such assertions, without proof amount to,

56

they are simply thrown in for effect, or to take up my time I deny every one of his assertions. Now let him prove them. Until then, we are even go far as they are concerned.

I will now advance another direct proof that the Sabbath exists in this dispensation. Rev. i, 10 "I was in the spirit on the Lord's day." John undertakes to tell us on what day he had his vision. It was the "Lord's day." What day did John understand to be the Lord's day? John wrote his gospel two years at least after the wrote Revelation, and there he simply calls the resurrection day. "The first day of the week." John xx, 19. If the first day had become the Sabbath or Lord's day, John would have said so. But he still called the seventh day the Sabbath. We now inquire what day is the Lord's day in the Bible. I challenge him to show where the first day is ever once called the Lord's day.

Mark ii, 28 "Therefore the Son of man is Lord *a/so* of the Sabbath." His father was Lord of it, and he "also" was Lord of it. His being Lord of it signifies that it was his day. The man is Lord of his wife, signifies that she belongs to him. So with the Sabbath. The day that Christ is Lord of is "The Lord's day." No other day was ever called the Lord's day in the Bible. The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord," etc. And "If thou turn away the foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day, etc.," shows conclusively what day is the Lord's.

ELDER GRANT'S ELEVENTH SPEECH

My friend accuses me of saying things for effect. Of course we do. That what we talk for. He quotes, "The law was [original illegible] We do not deny

57

that the law *was* holy. But God has abolished some things that were holy. They are not all binding now, surely.

I admit, that the penalty for the nine commandments is the second death, and if the Sabbath is brought over it is the same.

He denies that the Lord's day is the first day of the week, but if he will carefully read church history he will find that the first day is called Lord's day.

He admits that the ceremonial law is done away; hence the Sabbath must be done away; it was that law that regulated the keeping of the Sabbath.

Paul says he kept back nothing that was profitable, but he did not mention the keeping of the Sabbath. He declared the whole counsel of God, and yet not a word about keeping the seventh day for the Sabbath.

We will now look at what we have said by way of recapitulation. 1. What we said on Rom. vii. "For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband. So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress."

The same thing is presented just before the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. We read on, "But if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man. Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that ye should bring forth fruit [original illegible] God." This we regard as conclusive. We are [original illegible], when the law is dead.

ELDER CORNELL'S TWELFTH SPEECH

My friend says he has not denied that the law *was* holy, but Paul writes to the Romans twenty years this side of where he says the law was abolished, and says The law *is* holy. Bro. Grant's "was holy" is not there.

He now admits that if the Sabbath is binding it has the same penalty as the other nine commands. Thus he has now given up all he has said about the Sabbath having no penalty if it is now in existence.

If I will read church history I will find that the first day is the Lord's day. Indeed! Has it come to this that we must leave the Bible and take history for our guide. Take the Bible as far as it goes on our side, and history for the rest. This is the Catholic rule in full.

He says Paul kept back nothing profitable, but never said a word about keeping the Sabbath. This argument assumes that what Paul did not teach is not now binding. Let us apply this rule. Paul never said one word about keeping the first day in honor of the resurrection of Christ, therefore it is not profitable. Here again, my friend has run full till against his own position.

I will now refer to some of our arguments:

1. We have shown that Christ recognized the Sabbath in his teaching as an existing institution. He said it was "made for man," and taught that it would be in existence in a. d. 70, when Jerusalem was destroyed.

2. The disciples rested on the Sabbath, according to the commandment, after Christ was crucified. He has not even attempted to answer this. It is too late for

59

him now. He cannot leave my main proofs until his last speech, so that I can have no chance to notice his reply. He saw no way to answer it, and therefore concluded not to grapple with it.

3. We have shown that the Sabbath was instituted for man at creation; that God sanctified it there; and the word sanctify means "to set apart for a holy use," which could not be done without a proclamation to that effect.

4. That the Sabbath existed before the covenant of Sinai, and independent of it: hence the passing away of that covenant could not affect the Sabbath.

5. We have given the most positive proof that the moral law, as a whole, is endorsed and enforced by Christ and the apostles. Paul proves all the world sinners by the law, twenty-nine years this side of the cross. Rom. iii, 19. If the law was abolished, it could not prove that any were guilty before God.

6. That the Sabbath or Lord's day is recognized by John in a. d, 96, on the isle of Patmos.

7. We have seen in numerous instances that the negative has overthrown his own positions. All ten of the commands were abolished, then only one. The trouble some Sabbath is not binding now because it is not commanded over again. But the first day binding without ever being once commanded. If the Sabbath is still binding, the stoning penalty is also, but the nine commands can be brought over without that penalty.

We have seen that the reasons and facts on which the Sabbath institution was based still exist, hence the institution must exist. This argument has not been met. Before the Sabbath can be abolished, he must destroy the facts and reasons on which it is based. 1. God rested on the seventh day. 2. He sanctified the day

60

on which he rested. 3. Conclusion: therefore we must "Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy." This was our argument on the institution of the Sabbath. We are now ready to submit the question, and we do so with the kindest of feelings to all, hoping that the investigation may result in much good.

ELDER GRANT'S TWELFTH SPEECH

I have not intimated that Christ *commands* us to keep the first day. I have shown that the Sabbath was abolished with the feast days.

My friend refers to the women resting, "according to the commandment." But this took place before the resurrection, and of course is no proof for us.

He has quoted Matt. v, 17: Christ did not come to destroy the law, etc. I believe that I have not denied it. But there was something abolished. If we are dead to the law, and the law is dead, as we have seen in Rom. vii, then of course the Sabbath is dead also.

I have shown that the Sabbath in positive, and hence not binding now-that the Sabbath penalty was stoning, and if that is done away the Sabbath must go with it.

The claim that the law of ten commands, as a whole, is brought into the New Testament, has not been sustained.

We have given good historical testimony that no Sabbath was binding on the patriarchs. We brought several testimonies and nothing was brought to rebut them.

We are willing to submit the question right here. We think the negative of this question has been well sustained. We shall part as friends. I will join with my friend in the hope that good will result from this investigation.

PERIODICALS

The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald is Published weekly at \$2,00 a year, in advance.

The Youth's Instructor is Published monthly at 25 cts. a year, in advance.

PUBLICATIONS

The law requires the pre-payment of postage on Bound Books, four cents for the first four ounces, or fractional part thereof, and an additional four cents for the next four ounces, or fractional part thereof, and so on. On pamphlets and tracts, two cents for each four ounces, or fractional part thereof, orders, to secure attention, must be accompanied with the cash. Address Elder James White, Battle Creek, Michigan.

	Price.	Weight.
	cts.	oz.
History of the Sabbath , (in paper covers),	40	10
The Bible from Heaven ,	25	5
The Three Angles of Rev. xiv, 6 12, particularly the Third Angel's Message, and the Two-horned Beast,	15	4
Sabbath Tracts , numbers one, two, three, and four,	15	4
Hope of the Gospel , or immortality the gift of God,	15	4
Which? Mortal or Immortal? or an inquiry into		

the present constitution and future condition of man,	15	4
Modern Spiritualism ; its Nature and Tendency,	15	4
The Kingdom of God ; a Refutation of the doctrine called, Ages to Come,	15	4
Miraculous Powers ,	15	4
Pauline Theology , or the Christian Doctrine of Future Punishment as taught in the epistles of Paul,	15	4
Review of Seymour . His Fifty Questions Answered,	10	3
Prophecy of Daniel : The Four Universal Kingdoms the Sanctuary and Twenty-three Hundred Days,	10	3
The Saints' Inheritance . The Immortal Kingdom located on the New Earth,	10	3
Signs of the Times , showing that the Second Coming of Christ is at the door,	10	3
Law of God . The testimony of both Testaments, showing its origin and perpetuity,	10	3
Vindication of the true Sabbath, by J. W. Morton, [original illegible]		

62

Missionary to Hayti,	10	3
Review of Springer on the Sabbath, Law of God, and first day of the week,	10	3
Facts for the Times . Extracts from the writings of [original illegible] authors, Ancient and Modern,	10	3
Miscellany . Seven Tracts in one book on the Second Advent and the Sabbath,	10	3
Christian Baptism . Its Nature, Subjects, and Design,	10	3
The Seven Trumpets . The Sounding of the seven Trumpets of Revelation viii and ix.	10	2
The Sanctuary and 2300 Days of Dan. viii, 14,	10	2
The fates of the Transgressor , or a short argument on the First and Second Deaths,	5	2
Matthew xxiv . A Brief Exposition of the Chapter.	5	2
Mark of the Beast , and Soul of the Living God,	5	1
Assistant . The Bible Student's Assistant, or a Compend of Scripture references,	5	1
Truth Found . A short argument for the Sabbath, with an Appendix, "The Sabbath not a Type."	5	1
The Two Laws and Two Covenants ,	5	1
An Appeal for the restoration of the Bible Sabbath in an address to the Baptists,	5	1
Review of Crozier on the Institution, Design, and Abolition of the Seventh day Sabbath,	5	1
Review of [original illegible]. A reply to a series of discourses delivered by him in Battle Creek on the Sabbath question.	5	1
Milton on the State of the Dead,	5	1

Brown's Experience. Consecration---Second Advent, Report of General Conference held in Battle Creek, June, 1859, Address on Systematic Benevolence, etc.	5	1
Sabbath Poem. False Theories Exposed,	5	1
Illustrated Review. A Double Number of the Review and Herald Illustrated,	5	1
Nature and Obligation of the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment. Apostasy and perils of the last days, In German,	10	2
In Holland,	5	1
French. A Pamphist on the Sabbath,	5	1
" " " " Dan. ii, and vii,	5	1
ONE CENT TRACTS. The Seven Seals-The Two Laws-Reasons		

63

for Sunday-keeping [original illegible] of [original illegible] on the Law-Judson on [original illegible].

TWO CENT TRACTS. Institution of the Sabbath-[original illegible] by [original illegible] Infidelity and Spiritualism-War and [original illegible]-Who [original illegible] the Sabbath-Preach the Word-Death and [original illegible] Little-Truth.

THREE CENT TRACTS. Dobney on the Law-Milton on the State of the Dead-Scripture References-The Mark of the Beast, and Seal of the Living God-Spiritual Gifts.

Bound Books

The figures set to the following Bound Books include both the price of the Book and the postage,

The Hymn Book , 464 pages, and 122 pieces of music,	80	"
" " " with Sabbath Lute,	\$1,00	
" " " Calf Binding,	1,00	
" " " " " with Lute,	1,20	
History of the Sabbath , in one volume, bound		
Part I, Bible History Part II, Secular History,	50	"
Spiritual Gifts Vol. I , or the Great Controversy between Christ and his angels, and Satan and his angels,	50	"
Spiritual Gifts Vol. II. Experience Views and Indents in connection with the Third Message,	50	"
Scripture Doctrine of Future Punishment. By H. H. Dobney, Baptist Minister of England,	75	"
Home Here and Home in Heaven , with other [original illegible]. This work embraces all those sweet and Scriptural [original illegible] written by Annie R. Smith, from the time she embrace the third message [original illegible] till she fell asleep in Jesus. Price 25 cents.		

The Chart. A Pictorial Illustration of the Visions of Daniel and John, 20 by 25 inches. Price 15 cents. On rollers, post-paid, 75 cts.

