

A Review of the Remarks of O.R.L. Crozier on the Institution, Design and Abolition of the Sabbath

By J. N. Andrews

"TAKE HEED THAT NO MAN DECEIVE YOU," is the solemn admonition of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is a singular, as well as painful fact, that men have ever preferred human institutions in the place of divine. The tradition of the Elders must be sustained, even at the expense of the commandments of God. In things pertaining to this life, how carefully men shun a counterfeit; with what interest do they seek for that which is true. But in things pertaining to godliness, and to life eternal, how sadly is the case reversed. With eagerness, men grasp the counterfeit, while at the same time they despise and trample under foot that which is sacred and true. Witness the Jews who rejected and crucified the *true* Messiah, and who still continue to reject him. See how many *false* Christs they have received! - Witness the mass of mankind preferring Mohammedism, and open idolatry, to even a nominal profession of faith in Christ. Witness those who are nominally called Christians. See the Papist preferring the Pope for the head of the Church, in the place of the Lord Jesus Christ; and the fire of purgatory, in the stead of the blood of Christ, to cleanse his soul from sin. Witness the Protestant choosing sprinkling, in the place of burial with Christ, as baptism; choosing death as "the gate to endless joy," in the place of resurrection, the promised "path of life;" and choosing a kingdom "beyond the bounds of time and space," instead of "the kingdom and dominion, and greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven." Witness also the mass of Adventists rejecting and trampling under foot the fourth commandment, that they may in its place observe a tradition of the Elders! Matt.15.3-9.

The reason of all this is plain. The worship of God, while the commandments of men are taught for doctrine, is vain. Satan therefore has no opposition to it. The institutions of men are congenial to the pride of our hearts, and we would fain persuade ourselves that they are quite as acceptable to God, as though they emanated from him. But the law of God cuts up the tradition of the Elders by the roots, makes manifest the carnal mind wherever it exists, [Rom.8:7; 3:20,] and stirs every energy of that wicked principle in deadly opposition. Hence, many are found in array against the fourth commandment, and not a few against the whole law of God. Some with the hope of sustaining their favorite tradition, others with no other object than to destroy the fourth commandment.

The subject of this review, is the report of a Bible class, written out by C., in the *Harbinger* for Dec. 6, 1851. In noticing it, we wish to trace out the effort made to show that the Sabbath of the Lord was a Jewish ordinance, instituted at, or near Sinai for them, (the Jews,) and nailed to the cross at the death of the Lord Jesus; also to notice the effort to erect, as far as the thing is possible, a first-day apostolic institution, on the ruins of Jehovah's ancient Sabbath. He writes thus:

"1. *When was the Sabbath instituted?* Gen.2:1-3 was read as evidence that the Sabbath was instituted at the creation. But it was replied, that this passage only tells what *God* did at that time, and says nothing about men being required to imitate God in resting on the seventh day."

It is very true that this text only tells us what God did on the seventh day, and to the seventh day. But that is the very thing we wish to learn. What did he do on the seventh day? "And he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made." Verse 2. This is the reason why the Bible calls the seventh day, "the Sabbath [Rest-day] of the Lord." This fact inseparably connects the Sabbath of the Lord with the first seventh day of time. What did he do to the seventh day? "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." Verse 3. This is the reason why the seventh day is claimed by Jehovah in the Scriptures as *his holy Sabbath*. If the word sanctify be used in its most obvious sense, then we may affirm that God blessed and hallowed the seventh day at Creation. If it be used in the sense of setting apart for sacred purposes, then no one can deny that God consecrated and set apart the seventh day in the beginning. The *sense* is the same either way. How, and when, then, did Jehovah make the Sabbath? Ans. By resting from his work of creation upon the seventh day, and sanctifying and hallowing it. Those who are able to show *any other act of making the Sabbath* are requested to do it. The sixteenth of Exodus treats the Sabbath as an existing institution, as we will presently notice. The decalogue points us back to Creation for the origin of the Sabbath. Ex.20:8-11. For whom, then, did Jehovah make the Sabbath? for himself? No. verily. He made it "for man." Mark 2:27.

In the absence of direct testimony either way, it is by no means certain that "holy men of old" did not regard the Sabbath. We read of their reckoning time by weeks and by sevens of days. Gen.29:27,28; 8:10,12. The reckoning of time by weeks is not derived from any thing in nature, and can be traced to but one source, viz., the six days work of creation, and the rest of the Sabbath. It is not very likely that the week of creation should be remembered and commemorated, and the rest and sanctification of the holy Sabbath should be forgotten.

But were it possible to show a violation of the Sabbatic institution in the patriarchal age, it would no more destroy the sacred character of that institution, than a plain violation of the institution of marriage on the part of some of the patriarchs, affects the sacredness of the marriage institution. Mal.2:14,15; Gen. 2:21-24; Matt.19:4-8; Mark 10:6-8, compared with Gen.16: 25:6; 29; 30. Both of these institutions were made for man before the fall. Mark 2:27;

Gen.2:1-3; 1Cor.11:1-12; Gen.2:18. Their sanctity is not derived from the decalogue; but the fourth commandment guards the sacredness of one, the seventh, the other. Ex.20:8-11,14. But he adds:

"As an explanation of this text, Heb.4:1-9 was read. All, I believe, conceded that this passage states the primary object of God's resting on the seventh day and sanctifying it; that it was to pre-figure the future 'rest' that 'remaineth to the people of God,' into which they will enter when the Lord comes."

Those who read carefully the text referred to, will observe that *it does not even mention God's act of sanctifying the seventh day!* Much less does it state his "primary object" in sanctifying the day. Paul asserts in verse 3, that the works of God "*were finished from the foundation of the world.*" He proves the point in verse 4 by quoting Gen.2:2. "*God did rest the seventh day from all his works.*" Whatever allusion this may be supposed to make to the future rest of God's people, it is certainly a mere inference to state from this text, that God's "primary object" in sanctifying the Sabbath, (before the fall of man.) was to typify the rest into which the redeemed should enter after the Second Advent!

With as much propriety at least, might it be said that God's primary object in the creation of Eve, and in the institution of marriage, was to typify the union between Christ and the church. For the same Apostle in Eph.5:22-33 speaks much more in favor of such a view than he does in favor of the view of C. in Heb. 4. Particularly notice verses 30-33 where the language of Gen.2, *is quoted and applied*; yet no one who reads Gen.2, with care, can believe that God's *primary* design in the institution of marriage was to typify the union of Christ and the church. Neither should they *on less* evidence, in reading the same chapter, conclude that God's primary object in sanctifying the day of his rest was to "sanctify it as a type." A type of future redemption instituted when man had not yet fallen!! How much more natural the reason assigned by the Lord Jesus for the sanctification of the Sabbath, than the reason inferred by C., which he declares is the only reason in the New Testament! "The Sabbath was made for man," says the Lord, "and not man for the Sabbath." Mark 2:27. The same expression that is used by Paul respecting the creation of Eve. 1Cor.11:9. "The primary objects" of both institutions are stated in these two texts, whatever they may be elsewhere used to illustrate. The language in each case carries the mind back to the beginning; and there we find the creation of Adam, of Eve, and of the Sabbath. Gen.2:1-3,7,18-24.

Col.2:16,17, was then adduced to prove still stronger that the Sabbath of the Lord is a shadow. Those who will take pains to read the two verses preceding the ones quoted, will notice the manifest impropriety of this application. "Blotting out," says Paul, "*the hand-writing of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us,*" etc. "Let no man, THEREFORE," (that is, for the reason he has named,) "judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of an holy-day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath *days.*" - ["sabbaths," says Macknight and Whiting, "sabbath days" says Wesley.] "The hand-writing of ordinances," which Paul affirms is abolished, is certainly distinct from "the royal law" which James teaches us is yet in force. Chap.2:8-12. That this law includes the

ten commandments, cannot be denied by those who will read James' testimony with care. (We shall notice the distinction again.) But some will object, and say that "the hand-writing of ordinances" embraced "sabbaths," and therefore "the *Sabbath of the Lord*," in the fourth commandment, was abolished by the death of Christ. - But do you not in this "greatly err, not knowing (or at least not heeding) the Scriptures?" If you will turn to Lev.23:24,32,39, you will find connected with the feasts, and meats, and drinks, and new moons of the Jews, four distinct "sabbaths," "besides the Sabbath of the Lord." See verse 38.

"The Sabbath of the Lord" was not one of the "carnal ordinances," [Heb.9:10; Col.2:14,] but it is one of the lively oracles of God. Rom.3:1,2; Acts 7:38; 1Pet. 4:11. Notice that the things abolished in Col.2, are things against us, contrary to us, etc. But the Sabbath of the Lord *was made for man*. So saith "the faithful and True Witness." Amen. The use of Col.2, noticed above, looks too much like the acts of those, who have, says God, "violated my law," and have "*put no difference between the holy and profane*." "and *have hid their eyes from my Sabbaths*." Eze.22:26. "*Take heed that no man deceive you*." Those who will reign in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem, gloriously with the Lord, are such as keep his commandments. Isa.24:23; Ps.132:13,14; Rev.22:14,15.

Ex.16, is next introduced by C. In order (apparently) to darken as far as possible, the testimony of this chapter, that the Sabbath existed before the Israelites came to Sinai, he asserts that the Testimony (the tables of stone) was spoken of in the wilderness of Sin, even more familiarly than the Sabbath. Verses 33,34. And yet "the Testimony was not given till more than a month after this; [See Ex.25:16,21; 31:18,] and it was not put into the ark, so that the pot of manna could be laid up before it, till the first day of the next first month, nine months and a half afterwards. Ex.41:1-3,17-21." This argument will probably deceive some; but I marvel how that C., as an honest man, could use it.

Moses said on the sixth day. [verse 23,] "To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord." Hence, there is no chance to deny that the Sabbath did then exist, and was distinctly rehearsed as such. But does he speak in that manner respecting the Testimony which did not then exist? C. asserts that it is "spoken of at the same time even more familiarly than the Sabbath," and the assertion will be received by many for "plain Bible testimony." - Moses did indeed say. "Take a pot and put an omer full of manna therein, and lay it up before the Lord, to be kept for your generations. As the Lord commanded Moses, so Aaron laid it up before the Testimony." Verses 33,34. But the next verse accounts for the mention of the Testimony. It says: "And the children of Israel did eat manna *forty years*, until they came to a land inhabited: they did eat manna, until they came unto the borders of the land of Canaan." Verse 35. Therefore the record of events in Exodus 16 could not have been written until about forty years after the departure from Egypt.- Now look at the record carefully. It does not say that the Testimony existed at the time of the fall of the manna. It does not say that Aaron *then* laid up the pot of manna before the Testimony. But it

is said by Moses, "This is the thing which the Lord commandeth, fill an omer of it to be kept for your generations." Verse 32. And the narrative being written forty

years afterwards, we have an account of what was done with it; it was placed in the ark of the Testimony. Verse 34; Heb.9:4. So that the fact that verse 34 tells us that the pot of manna gathered in that wilderness was laid up before the Testimony does not furnish the *slightest* proof that the Testimony (not then in existence) was even thought of in that wilderness. If C. has not handled the Word *deceitfully* in this part of his subject, then an instance of the act does not often occur. 2Cor.4:2.

The writer next asserts that the Sabbath was "something entirely new to the people." His reasons for this assumption, he offers in another place; they will be examined in their order. On the assumption just stated, he infers that they neither kept the Sabbath in Egypt, nor before their going thither. Of course this deduction amounts to nothing until the premise *assumed*, is made good. But we will notice the deduction in a brief manner. Please turn to Josh.5. It will there be seen that the ordinance of circumcision, though solemnly enforced by God, [Gen.17:9-14; Lev.12:3; John 7:23,] was neglected by the people while in the wilderness. See verses 5-7. Now if in a forty years sojourn in the wilderness, the ordinance of circumcision fell into total disuse, and was introduced the "*second time*" by Joshua, it is possible that a *century* of "cruel bondage" in the "iron furnace" of Egyptian servitude, [Ex.1:13,14; Deut.4:20; 1Kings 8:51; Jer.11:4,] might render it necessary that the holy Sabbath, (which is difficult, if not impossible, to observe in abject servitude.) should be solemnly set forth and enforced. But this is proceeding on the assertion of C., that the Israelites knew nothing of the Sabbath. We will now see if he be able to prove it.

In order to show the entire ignorance of the people relative to the Sabbath, it is necessary to explain away the fact, that, on the sixth day, they, without any direction from Moses, as he admits, "gathered twice as much bread" as the daily rate. Verse 22. To evade the testimony that this act bears to their regard for the Sabbath, he introduces miraculous interposition. Notice the first miracle described by him.

"Then they gathered, the stout ones more and the weak ones (who were probably crowded away by the stouter ones) less, but when they came to measure it, God wrought a miracle, so that each one had just an omer full and no more."

Such is the view entertained by C. respecting Ex.16:18. Now let us look at the view taken of it by the apostle Paul. See 2Cor.8:14,15. "But by an *equality* that now at this time *your abundance may be a supply for their want, that their abundance also may be a supply for your want, that there may be equality. As it is written, He that had gathered much had nothing over; and he that had gathered little had no lack.*" C. declares that God wrought a miracle to diminish the portion of some, and to increase the portion of others. (As well might he claim that God would make the paschal lamb to increase or diminish according to the number of persons; but that was not so. Ex.12:3,4.) But Paul shows us that there was an equality, the abundance of one supplying the lack of another. The first miracle, therefore, described by C., ceases to be a miracle.

Having introduced, as we have noticed, miraculous intervention to make the daily receipts of manna alike, C. is now prepared to account for the double quantity of manna obtained on the sixth day. - Hear him again:

"The rulers did not know why, on measuring the manna the sixth day, each person should have twice as much as on other days: for Moses had not told them any thing about the Sabbath: therefore neither they nor the people knew any thing about it. But now he makes that known to them. Verse 23-26.

It will be noticed that C. (in order to reconcile this act of the people, with the idea of their entire ignorance of the Sabbath) proceeds on the assumption that there was still another miracle wrought by God; the miracle this time being to double the manna found in the vessels of the people! We think, however, that this miracle, if examined, will turn out very much like the first; for neither instance presents any necessity for a miracle. It would seem that when God had provided food from heaven by a direct miracle, that the people who had "not one feeble person among their tribes," [Ps.105.37,40,] might gather it without miraculous aid. But we inquire, Was it the act of the people, or a miracle from God, that a double quantity was obtained on the sixth day? "To the law and to the testimony." "On the sixth day *they gathered twice as much bread, two omers for one man;* and all the rulers of the congregation came and told Moses." Verse 22. There is no higher testimony than this; we believe it and rest upon it. *It was the act of the people in gathering, n o t the act of God in doubling what they had gathered,* that accounts for the double portion of manna on the sixth day. And this *plain testimony* refutes the *assertion* of C. that "the rulers did not know why" the people had a double quantity on that day.

But it will be asked, Why then did the rulers come and mention this matter to Moses? Verses 19,20 present a *reasonable* answer, and one that involves no absurdity. They had been directed to leave none of the manna till another day, and how could their act of preparation for the morrow (the seventh day) be reconciled with that direction? Moses, in his answer to the rulers, sanctions the act of the people. "This," says he, "is that which the Lord hath said, Tomorrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord: bake that which ye will bake to-day and seethe that ye will seethe; and that which remaineth over, lay up for you, to be kept until the morning." Verse 23. They laid it up, and it did not corrupt as on the preceding days, but was preserved. Take notice. The preparation on the sixth day named by God to Moses in verse 5, was not rehearsed by him to the people until *after* they had gathered the manna on the sixth day. Verse 23. This fact shows that the gathering of a double portion, was the voluntary act of the people, facilitated, doubtless, by a more plentiful supply on that day. Verse 29. This act of the people, therefore directly refutes the assertion of C. that they were "perfectly ignorant" of the Sabbath. Whether the two miracles which he introduces to sustain his assertion are entitled to any weight, others must judge.

C. having denied the institution of the holy Sabbath at the time when God rested upon, sanctified and blessed the seventh day, we look with no little interest for what he will show to be the act of instituting the Sabbath. After quoting verses 23-26, he remarks that,

"This is the first time the Sabbath is mentioned in the Bible, and Moses speaks of it as though he had just received it from God, and of which the people were perfectly ignorant." Had C. stated that this is the first place in the Bible where *the term Sabbath* occurs, he would not have made a false statement. Those who will read the fourth commandment, will notice that the seventh day is called the Sabbath even before God blessed and sanctified it. It reads thus: "The Lord blessed *the Sabbath-day*, and hallowed it." And this act of blessing the Sabbath-day and sanctifying it, is recorded in Gen.2:2,3. As well might he affirm that Jehovah was not spoken of before the days of Moses; for in making himself known to Moses, he says, [Ex.6:3,] "By my name Jehovah was I not known unto them." [the patriarchs.] For the word Jehovah refers to a personage, not merely to a name; and the word Sabbath refers to an institution, not merely to a term.

We have shown from the narrative that the people could not have been "perfectly ignorant" of the Sabbath, (how could any people be, that know as much of God as this, that he created heaven and earth in six days and rested on the seventh?) but as C. asserts that the holy Sabbath dates from Ex.16, and that the people were entirely ignorant of the institution, we are anxious to read God's act of instituting the Sabbath, and also the instruction and explanation given to the people.

What account, then, does the record contain of any act of instituting the Sabbath in the wilderness? The first sentence reads thus: "And he (Moses) said unto them, This is that which the Lord hath said, To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord;" then follows directions respecting the disposal of the manna. We ask then in candor, Did this statement of Moses constitute the seventh day "the holy Sabbath unto the Lord?" Was it not by that language confessed to be such already? If the latter question be answered in the negative, then we will look at the matter further. To constitute it his Sabbath (Rest-day) did God rest upon the seventh day in the wilderness of Sin? No. He did this at Creation. Did he sanctify and hallow the day in the wilderness? Nothing of the kind is claimed. He did that at Creation, even the enemies of the Sabbath "being judges." How then was it instituted? Was it by Moses giving express direction that it should be observed? The record is searched in vain for even that, until after at least one Sabbath had been in part observed in the wilderness. Perhaps it can be proved by what some would call "plain Bible testimony," that the Sabbath was instituted in the wilderness of Sin, but we would be glad to have *the testimony presented*. Or shall we conclude that the children of Israel observed the Sabbath without having it instituted? (!!)

As the memorials of the Bible begin with the events commemorated by them, (witness the Passover, Ex.12:11-14; the Feast of Tabernacles, Lev.23:39-43; Baptism, Rom.6:3-5; the Lord's Supper 1Cor.11:25,26; see also Ex.17:8-14; Num.16:39,40; Josh.4:7-9; Matt.26:13,) it is not a little remarkable, that the Sabbath, commemorating the events of Creation, [see Ex.20:8-11,] and not the events of the Exodus from Egypt, should be instituted, not at Creation, but in the wilderness of Sin. (We greatly fear that those who teach this doctrine, are in that wilderness themselves.

1John 3:4.) But if it be true that "the Sabbath was *made*" in the wilderness of Sin, it is still more remarkable that *no account of the act* should have been recorded!

The writer argues that because it is said "the Lord hath given you the Sabbath, therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days," that the Sabbath must then for the first time have been communicated to Israel. For surely he did not "give them what they already had!" - A text in the New Testament may help the mind of C. Please to read John 7:22, and then answer me, How could Moses give them circumcision when they already had that ordinance, even from the days of Abraham? Gen.17:9-14; Josh.5:5. If you answer, that the subject was still further set forth and impressed upon them, then we say, just so was it with the holy Sabbath.

He proceeds to quote Neh.9:13-15, which testifies that, Thou [God] "madest known unto them thy holy Sabbath." "Certainly God did not make known to them what they already knew!" - We answer how could God *make himself known* unto Israel in the land of Egypt, [Eze.20:5,] when he chose them, and lifted up his hand unto them, saying, "I am the Lord your God;" when they already knew the true God? (For they were the only church of God on the earth at that time.) Ex. 2:23-25; 3:7; 4:31.

If you answer he revealed Himself to them more fully, and made known their duty to him more clearly, we add, even so was it with his holy Sabbath. And we request the reader's attention to the point a moment longer. The testimony of Nehemiah is directly against C. God did not make his Sabbath for the Jews. No! No! It was already in existence, as well as himself, and he made it known to them. Amen.

We have rested nothing upon "the use of the past tense in verses 23 and 29," and therefore do not stop to argue the point.

He next proceeds to explain the text. "How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws." Verses 28,29. As the text now stands, it clearly indicates a *continuance* in the neglect of the Sabbath. He proceeds to enumerate what he terms "several commandments and laws." Look at this list.

"1. That they should gather a certain quantity every day; 2. That they should leave none of it till the morning; 3. That they should gather twice as much on the sixth day as on any other; 4. That they should lay up that which remained on the sixth day to eat on the seventh, and 5. That they should not go out on the seventh day to get any."

This catalogue is worthy of attention. Whether it was made out for the purpose of "making out a case," or not, is not our province to decide, though it looks strongly that way. - The third "law" or "commandment" here enumerated had never, so far as we can read, been given to the people! But if it had been given, then it directly contradicts the view of C. that the double portion of manna on the sixth day, had been miraculously provided for them. It also contradicts the statement made by him, that the elders did not understand how the people came by a double portion of manna on the sixth day! For if any beside Moses and Aaron would know of the existence of such a precept, surely *they* would. What is quite as remarkable, the fifth "law" enumerated by C. was not given further than by implication until *after* God had uttered the rebuke. -

See verses 28,29. Of the three remaining laws not one was directly violated by the recorded trespass of the people on the Sabbath!

But it is manifest that it was the violation of the Sabbath of Jehovah, that called forth from him this cutting reproof, and led him to give *in the next verse*, what C. enumerates as the fifth law of his series! - By turning to verses 4 and 5, it will be seen that God's reason for giving the manna in the manner that he did, was that he might "prove them whether they will walk in *my law or no.*" - (Then he had something that he called his "law" before any of the precepts enumerated by C. existed.) Notice therefore, that every thing was so adjusted with reference to the Sabbath, in the giving of the manna, that it could be observed without being in the smallest degree burdensome. When, therefore, some of the people persisted in disobedience and in violation of God's Rest-day, he utters this solemn reproof, and by express statute forbids the repetition of the act.

One fact that seems to have been generally overlooked, deserves, at least, a passing notice. God gave the manna to the people, to prove them, *whether they would walk in his law or no.* Hence, they were left without any direction to provide for the seventh day. But this they proceeded to do *voluntarily* on the sixth day. Thus their regard for his law was made manifest. But when some of them went out to gather the manna on the seventh day, the pointed rebuke of Jehovah was uttered, though they had not by express precept been forbidden so to do. Thus God, by placing them where they could act freely, *proved them*, and let each manifest what was in his heart.

The expressions of this chapter respecting the Sabbath should not be forgotten: "To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord." "To-day is a Sabbath unto the Lord." "The seventh day which is the Sabbath." Verses 23-26. With a single question to the candid reader, we submit the chapter: Is there *any act of instituting* the Sabbath recorded in Ex.16, or does it treat the Sabbath as *an institution already in existence?*

"We then passed to the Decalogue. Ex.20:8-11. Some thought this passage proved the Sabbath to be a primary institution, established at the creation. But it was replied, that it does not say any thing of the kind; hence that conclusion is only an *inference*, which is not sufficient to establish a truth or a religious duty, Because God commanded the Hebrews to rest on the seventh day, *'for'* he had rested on that day in creation, does not prove that men began immediately after that to rest on that day, any more than the text in the New Testament which says, 'We love God because he first loved us,' proves that we began to love God just as soon as he loved us."

Those who will look at the fourth commandment for themselves, can judge of the truth of C.'s assertion that the Sabbath is not a primary institution, or that the proof of it, at least, rests upon mere inference. Where does this text place the origin of the holy Sabbath? For this is the grand question before us. At the giving of the manna in the wilderness of Sin? It is silent about that wilderness. Did God say then, (at Sinai,) "I now institute the Sabbath?" Verily, he does not! And it is very evident that he could not thus say. For C. is obliged to admit that some how or other it was in existence at least thirty days before the Hebrews came to Sinai.

What does God say, then, as to the origin of his Sabbath, or Rest-day? - He states the reasons on which the fourth commandment rests in

10

these words: "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day and hallowed it." Verse 11. Then the seventh day was the Sabbath of the Lord, prior to his act of sanctifying and hallowing it. And this act of blessing and sanctifying the day, immediately followed his act of resting upon it. Gen. 2:2,3. If these facts do not prove the origin of the Sabbath prior to man's fall, then they mean much less than they express. What act made it Jehovah's Rest-day? His act of resting upon it - not at Sinai, not in the wilderness of Sin, but at Creation. What made it "holy unto the Lord" - his "holy day," etc? His own act of blessing and hallowing it in Eden. Since then it has been the holy Sabbath unto the Lord. It does not derive its sanctity from Sinai, no, no. But because of the sanctity it already possessed, it was placed in Jehovah's royal law. Let the fourth commandment speak for itself.

We thank C. for his New Testament illustration. We could not have found so good a one in a long search. It is to the point. Our love to God is *because* he first loved us. This does not prove that we have loved God ever since he loved us; but it does prove that we ought to have so done. The fourth commandment requires the observance of the Sabbath *because* of what God did at Creation; this does not prove that the Sabbath has been observed ever since that time; *it only proves that it ought to have been so observed.* He continues:

"Special attention was called to the closing part of the passage quoted: God 'rested the seventh-day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day, and hallowed it.' Why did God bless and hallow the seventh day? Not because he designed it to be a weekly rest for man, but because he himself had rested from the work of creation on that day: hence he sanctified it as a type. Heb.4."

It is not a little remarkable that "special attention was called to the closing part of the passage," and yet they did not *read* the fact that the Sabbath existed at the beginning. God blessed the Sabbath-day (a thing in existence) and hallowed it at Creation! Notice the care with which in the next sentence, he changes the expression *Sabbath-day* to *seventh day*. It would prove the existence of the Sabbath *too early!* Was Matt.13:15, true in this case? We now appeal to the reader. Is it not the expression, God "rested the seventh day, wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day, and hallowed it," proof that he then constituted it a *memorial* of his rest from creation on that day? Especially when the fourth commandment reads, "*remember* the Sabbath-day [Rest-day] to keep it holy." Is it not sublime nonsense, to say that the Sabbath was made as a memorial of the departure of Israel from Egypt, or as a type of man's redemption and rest after the Second Advent, when as yet he had not fallen!! C. is willing to have the Sabbath instituted in Paradise as a type. But if it was "sanctified as a type" then, and never was any thing *but a type afterwards*, why did it need to be instituted a second time in the wilderness of Sin, and (as we infer from C.'s words) a third time at Mount Sinai? Surely if he is correct in all this, there must be something very sacred about such a type as that! We are glad that he now (though

inadvertently) confesses the truth that the Sabbath originated in Eden, before the fall. This is his position: God then "sanctified it as a type," and 2500 years afterward made

11

it again a type for the Jews. Does the reader - does C. himself "believe all this?" We suggest that obedience to the commandments of God is much more blessed, than, at least, a *poor excuse* for breaking them! Ps.19:7-11.

We digress for a moment from the point before the mind of the reader, in order to answer an objection. "Sabbath-breaking was not forbidden by express precept until after the Exodus." Very good. Neither was idolatry, blasphemy, disobedience to parents, adultery, theft, false witness, or covetousness. Yet it is certain they were heinous sins in the sight of Him who changeth not. Mal.3:5,6. If we mistake not, no one of "the ten words" of Jehovah existed in the form of express precept in the patriarchal age, save the sixth. Gen.9:6. But a moment's reflection upon the decalogue will show that each of the principles therein embodied is as old as creation, and as broad as the family of man! The Hebrews indeed had the lively oracles committed to them, and thus had a great "advantage" over those nations not thus favored. Yet it is certain, that the whole family of man were amenable to them. Acts 7:38; Rom.3:1,2,9-31. God only embodied the moral precepts of his own government at Sinai; he did not create them there. The fourth commandment does not originate the duty contained therein, but gives the reasons for its observance, as old as creation, and alike applicable to all men. The wholesome restraint contained in the law of God, would never have been deemed "a yoke of bondage," were it not for the carnal mind which *dislikes the restraint*.

"As a direct and positive answer to the question, When was the Sabbath instituted? Deut.5:12-15 was read. [The reader will turn to it; he continues] This is as plain as any thing can be. The Lord thy God brought thee out thence [from Egypt] through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm: *therefore* the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath-day. Now as an effect does not precede its cause, so the Sabbath commandment did not exist before the departure from Egypt; because that event is distinctly stated as the cause of that commandment being given."

I can hardly suppress a smile when I witness the eagerness with which C. grasps this text, which says not one word about the *origin* of the Sabbath, to prove that it was instituted after Israel left Egypt. The decalogue, as uttered by the voice of the King Eternal, gives us the reasons on which the Sabbatic institution is based. Ex.20:8-11. These, as it has been already shown, are all against C. Deut.5, does not give one of these reasons. And we submit this point to him. Can you tell from Deut.5, why the seventh day should have been preferred to the first, the second, or the fifth days as the Sabbath of the Lord? And further, can you tell from the same chapter how it happened that any day was called the Sabbath [*Rest-day*] of the Lord? And if you cannot answer, as most assuredly, you will not be able to do from Deut.5, then you must confess that we must look to Ex.20, which explains the whole matter. For it is a rule (I think) to interpret that which is less particular, by that which is full and definite.

Deut.5, is not the decalogue as uttered by Jehovah. It is a rehearsal of it by Moses forty years afterward. Some things are added, and some things are omitted. Now look at its mention of the Sabbath. It begins [verse 12] as follows: "Keep the Sabbath-day to sanctify it as the Lord thy God commanded thee." Now where had he commanded this act? In Ex.20, where "God

12

commanded the Hebrews to rest on the seventh day, *for* he had rested on that day at Creation." Then Deuteronomy itself, cites us to Exodus for the Sabbatic law, and Ex.20, gives it, with reasons that base the institution on what was done at Creation. Nay it even calls the seventh day the Sabbath, as we have before shown, prior to the fall of man.

Does Deut.5, contradict the testimony of Ex.20, and tell us that the Sabbath was made after the departure from Egypt? Not an intimation of the kind is given. Does it tell us that the Sabbath commemorated the departure from Egypt? Not a word of that. Let the *original* commandment speak. "Remember (the day of the Exodus? No! but remember) the Sabbath-day." What day is the Sabbath-day? Some day connected with their flight from Egypt? No! No! It is the day on which Jehovah rested from his work of creation!

But does not Moses say, "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?" Truth. But is there a word in all this, that tells us how there came to be a Sabbath-day? Not one. It does not give one word respecting its origin. But it does give the reason why God enforced it upon the children of Israel.

He had brought them out of "the house of bondage" where they could not keep the Sabbath, [Ex.1:13,14; 3:7; 5:4-19; 6:9.] and placed them in a situation where every thing was adjusted with reference to the Sabbath, that he might "prove them whether they would walk in his law or no." But lest C. should say the fourth commandment originated the Sabbath, we find the Sabbath in existence *before any* express command to keep it had been given. Ex.16:23. The reader will notice that it is not, When was the fourth commandment given? that has been the question before us, but, "When was the Sabbath *itself* instituted?" As C. speaks of cause and effect, we will try to state them distinctly:

1. THE CAUSE: "*God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it*, because that in it he had rested from all his work."

2. THE EFFECT: "The Sabbath *was made* for man."

It will be noticed that C. rests his whole argument upon the language, "*Therefore* the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath-day," as direct and positive testimony that the Sabbath was instituted after the departure from Egypt. Let us test the character of this inference. Turn to Deut.24:17,18, and you will read thus, "Thou shalt not pervert the judgment of the stranger, nor of the fatherless, nor take a widow's raiment to pledge; but thou shall remember that thou wast a bond-man in Egypt, and the Lord thy God redeemed thee thence; *therefore* I command thee to do this thing." If the expression in Deut.5:15 proves that before the departure from Egypt men had not been under obligation to keep the Sabbath which God sanctified and hallowed at Creation, *then the same*

expression in Deut.24:17,18 proves that men had not been under obligation, prior to the departure from Egypt to treat with *justice* and *mercy* the stranger, the fatherless and the widow!! "This monstrous absurdity is a legitimate conclusion from the premises of C. Hence his vaunted argument is a baseless inference.

13

Deut.5, which says not one word about the *origin of the Sabbath*, is presented as a "direct and positive answer to the question," and in the estimation of C. makes *it as plain as any thing can be!*

We sum up the question discussed as follows:

1. God sanctified the Sabbath at Creation. Ex.20:11.
2. He made it known to the Hebrews in the most solemn manner. Neh. 9:13,14.
3. The fourth commandment of the royal law, embodies the sacred institution, and renders it as immutable as that law. Rom.3:31; Luke 16:17.

The first question is now submitted.

"2. For whom was the Sabbath instituted? In this question Deut.5:1-3 was read. The Sabbath was a part of that covenant which Moses said God made with the people in Horeb, and not with their fathers: hence it was made with, and for the Hebrews only, as also the commandment as it stands in the Decalogue clearly shows."

To show the wicked perversion of this text so often made, we say to C., "Come now let us reason together."

1. "The Lord made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day."
2. "The Sabbath was a part of that covenant which Moses said God made with the people in Horeb, and not with their fathers."
3. Hence the duty enjoined in the fourth commandment was not binding on the patriarchs.

Really, this disposes of the Sabbath in an admirable manner; but let us try it again:

1. "The Lord made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day."
2. The precepts, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me, Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain, Honor thy father and thy mother, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet," were a "part of the covenant which Moses said, God made with the people in Horeb and not with their fathers."
3. Hence the duties enjoined in these nine commandments were not binding upon the patriarchs!

Such a freedom as that, is really the freedom for which the carnal mind has ever plead. Rom.8:7; 2Pet.2:18-22. C's syllogism proves that the Sabbath was not binding on the patriarchs; mine, (constructed on the same foundation,) proves that none of the duties enjoined in the decalogue were! But "that which proves too much, proves nothing to the point." Hence, there is a defect somewhere.

But let us try it again:

1. "The Lord made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day."

2. But the sixth commandment embodied in this covenant, was expressly given to Noah and to his posterity. Gen.9:6.

3. Therefore the moral duties embodied in the holy law of God (which was the condition, or terms of agreement of the covenant, Ex.19; 20,) *may* have been binding before they were given in this most solemn manner.

The covenant made (if you wish me so to speak) "for the Hebrews"

14

in Horeb, either did, or did not, institute the duties of the moral law. 1. If it did institute them, then it enables C. to prove that the Sabbath, with all the rest of the moral precepts in the law of God, was made for "the Hebrews only." But this would prove that idolatry, blasphemy, murder, adultery, theft, false witness and covetousness, as well as Sabbath-breaking, had not been wrong prior to this, and were not then wrong for "any other people than the Hebrews." This is every way as absurd as it would be to obey the fourth commandment. 2. But if the covenant made at Horeb, *only embodied* those moral duties *without* creating them, then C. has not in this text, *one fraction* of proof that the Sabbath was made in Horeb for the Jews. The reader will notice that the idea of C. is a *mere inference* drawn from the fact that God then made a covenant with Israel. But that covenant did not create the Sabbath, for it was in existence *before* the covenant was made. See Ex.16. And with the established fact before us, that the Sabbath was instituted at Creation, how absurd and ridiculous is the idea that it was made at Sinai "for the Hebrews!"

Because God saw fit to make a distinct revelation of his moral law to Israel, and to make a covenant with them, on condition that they would keep it, [Ex.19; 20,] the law of God is in no wise affected by the question, whether they kept that covenant or not. Nor does the fact, that when the new covenant based on better promises is made, when God shall put his law in the heart of his people, prove, that it shall then be abolished. It proves that it shall then be in existence. Amen.

The question whether the fourth commandment pertained merely to the Jews, or alike to all men, really grows out of another, viz: Did the law of God pertain merely to the Jews, or did it actually pertain to all men? For the fourth commandment is as broad as the others.

If the law of God was confined to the Jews, then the Gentiles were not amenable to it. But "where there is no law, there is no transgression." And the Gentiles around them must be considered as moral beings, but not accountable to any higher authority than that of their kings! But what then should we make of that statement of Paul, that those who had not the written law had "the work of the law written in their hearts?" Rom.2. Or of his testimony, that, though the Jews had the advantage in that "the oracles of God" were committed to them, yet by the law the whole world was condemned and shown to be guilty before God. Rom.3. But if C. should admit that the Gentiles were amenable to the law of God, then we add, the fourth commandment is an important part of that law.

Having noticed the inferential testimony presented by C. we now proceed to examine that which is "direct and positive," "plain Bible testimony." It is, however, of the same nature as that which the Sadducees presented to our Lord to disprove the resurrection, and which Prof. Bush has used to show the impossibility of such an event. The argument of the Sadducees is familiar to all. Matt.22:23-25. Those who have read Bush's Anastasis, will recollect that he presents "unanswerable" objections to a literal resurrection of the body! He proceeds to demonstrate from a great number of ingeniously

15

devised "considerations," that such an event is absolutely impossible! (For he knows not the Scriptures nor the power of God.) While obedient faith has ever said, "Speak Lord, thy servant heareth," and has ever regarded a divine requirement as quite too sacred to be trifled with, or explained away, it has ever been the part of unbelief to cavil at, and, by some means, evade what God has said.

We will present a summary of the "considerations" by which he proves that the Sabbath of the Lord "was not adapted to all climates and latitudes, therefore could not have been designed for universal man," but was instituted for the Hebrews in the land of Palestine. - Fires were forbidden, without which it would be impossible to live in some climates; near the poles the sun rises and sets but once a year, so that the sun (the only guide in the Sabbath law) would give them but one Sabbath in seven years - day and night comprising a whole year there, and it would be impossible to regulate the time by clocks to correspond to Palestine - and finally, a day may be gained or lost by circumnavigating the globe to the East or to the West!

We cannot forbear to repeat the old adage that "Necessity is the mother of invention." What could not be found in the word of God to show that the Sabbath was made merely for the Jews, to be kept in Palestine only, is abundantly proved by "these considerations!"

1. "Fire was not to be kindled on the Sabbath." Was that a part of Jehovah's "royal law," or was it a part of the "hand-writing of ordinances" containing directions "for a particular people" to observe in a "particular country?" It is given in connection with the penalty of temporal death for a violation of God's Sabbath, and also in connection with directions respecting the Tabernacle, and evidently pertains to none but the Hebrews. (The distinction between "the hand-writing of ordinances," and "the royal law," and the fact that the real penalty of the law was the second death, will be noticed in their place.) This direction was not burdensome to them in that land. As well might it be said, because they were directed to make extra offerings on that day, and as these offerings were not to be observed by other people, that the Sabbath was not designed for the Gentiles. But had C. "rightly divided the word of truth," he would have put some difference between the holy and the profane, and not have hid his eyes from God's Sabbath. One of the great ideas of the grand Sabbath law, the fourth commandment, is *mercy*; and it is as much the act of mercy to kindle a fire in this climate as it was for the Pharisees to pull an ox from a pit, and it is less labor.

2. Relative to the people that have but "one Sabbath in seven years," we ask whether this statement made by C. was in sober earnest, or thrown in for effect. Look at the Sabbatic law. We are to work six days because God made heaven and earth in six days - not in six thousand years- nor yet in six years; and we are to rest the seventh day - not a thousand years - nor yet one year, but one day, just as God did. That is the guide, "given in the Sabbath law." - The first three days of the Creation week were reckoned without any sun. When the plagues were poured out on Egypt there were three days of total darkness. These according to the view of C. made but one long night! And there is yet to be in the fearful scene before us, a

16

period when the vials of unmixed wrath from Jehovah's temple, shall be poured out on the worshipers of the Beast, and of his Image, and on those who have his Mark, when the kingdom of the Beast shall be *full of darkness*, and they shall gnaw their tongues for pain. But we ask, May not time be reckoned even then, by those to whom "the plagues shall not come near?" Could it not be reckoned in Egypt? Was it not reckoned in the week of Creation? And finally, cannot *Sunday* be reckoned in the polar regions, or do men who have spent a year there, reckon it but one day?

We notice two methods of reckoning time:

(1.) By the sun. This would lead us to keep the seventh day as it comes to us.
(2.) To regulate our time by Palestine. This would lead us to keep the Sabbath in part *before* the seventh day should come to us. The first is doubtless the scripture method; let either be correct, it can be followed. (See articles in *Review and Herald*, Vol.I. Nos.9 and 12, "The time of the Sabbath.")

3. Relative to circumnavigating the globe, we ask C. a question: Suppose that men were able to encompass the globe with the speed of a telegraphic despatch; suppose they could, for instance, be able to encompass it twenty-four times in one day, and thus gain *twenty-three days*, we ask how much weight such a circumstance would have in deranging dates? How much weight would it have in deranging his or your reckoning of Sunday? Verily, none. It is doubtless very difficult to keep God's Sabbath in the polar regions, (*it is here*,) but it is not difficult to keep the day of apostolic "preference" either there or in circumnavigating the globe! When you are called to circumnavigate the globe, or to visit the polar regions, we will try to aid you further; till then we earnestly suggest the propriety of your obeying God.

We turn from the "oppositions of science falsely so called," and listen to the "Scriptures of truth."

Isaiah 56 is worthy of notice. The promise of gathering to God's holy mountain the outcasts of Israel, and the sons of the stranger, is here distinctly stated on the condition that they would keep the holy Sabbath. If you choose to do so, call this prophecy Jewish, these outcasts literal Jews, and this holy mountain, the land of their inheritance. Now where are these outcasts? Just where the Leader of Israel predicted: scattered among all people from the one end of the earth even unto the other. Deut.28:64. See also Luke 21:24. What is the condition of gathering these outcasts together? The observance of the holy Sabbath! Isa.58:13,14. And

if they can do it in every land under heaven, the sons of the stranger, [Gentiles,] who have the promise of being gathered on the same condition, can do it also. Isa.66:22,23. "For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I will make, shall remain before me, saith the Lord, so shall your seed and your name remain. And it shall come to pass, that from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord." - Then if the Holy One of Israel be credited, we may consider one point established. When the dominion of Christ is from sea to sea, and from the river to the end of the earth, and the kingdom, and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom *under the whole heaven*, shall have been given to the people of the saints of the Most High,

17

all flesh shall come to worship before Jehovah from Sabbath to Sabbath, and from new moon to new moon. Then it is possible for the human family to observe the Sabbath over the whole globe! We appeal to C, if it be not so! All flesh will have the Sabbath, and the Tree of Life, as first designed, both of which were made before the fall. The Tree of Life shall yield its fruit every month, and thus shall its fruit be ready for those who shall come up from one new moon to another. Greatly indeed, must that heart be changed that fights God's Sabbath now, before it can be admitted to enter where the whole family of the redeemed shall observe it, and have free access to the Tree of Life. Fully do we coincide with the words of Jesus, the "Alpha and Omega:" "Blessed are they that do his [the Father's] commandments, that they may have right to the Tree of Life, and may enter in through the gates into the City." Rev.22:13-16.

C. having presented a groundless inference, and an amount of "philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and *not after Christ*," we inquire, Does not the word of God contain some better answer than all this? Yea, verily. The beloved Son of God has told us for whom the Sabbath was made, and his testimony would not have been disregarded, and an *inference* from the words of Moses chosen in its stead, were it not for the vain hope of making the Servant contradict the Son. Jesus was with the Father at Creation, [John 1:1-3,] he is competent to testify. The Father says of him, "This is my beloved Son, *hear him*." We respond, Amen. He testifies in so many words; (his testimony is ultimate truth;) "The Sabbath was made for man." Mark 2:27; 1Cor.11:9. Now look at one or two Bible instances of such expressions. "Man lieth down and riseth not: till the heavens be no more." Job.14:12. "There hath no temptation taken you but such as is common to man." 1Cor.10:13. "It is appointed unto men once to die." Heb.9:27. We offer the following grammatical rule from Barrett's Principles of English Grammar, p. 29. "A noun without an adjective is invariably taken in its broadest extension, as: Man is accountable." With the following points we submit the second question:

1. All flesh shall yet come to worship before Jehovah on the Sabbath. - God the Father.

2. The Sabbath was made for man. - Son of God.

"3. Does the New Testament require us, as Christians, to keep the Sabbath day?"

The artful manner in which this question is stated, is worthy the admiration of all Sophists. We have seen that the Sabbath was sanctified at Creation - made for man - embodied in Jehovah's royal law. The question before us therefore is not, Does the New Testament re-enact the fourth, or any other of the commandments? But it is this, Does the New Testament abolish the law of God, and give us another in its place? The burden of proof therefore belongs to the opponents of the fourth commandment. For God having enacted his holy law and proclaimed it in person, it is the part of its opponents to show that it is abolished; not the part of its friends to show its re-enactment. We believe in its perpetuity and immutability, not in the re-enactment of any part of it. For it is not like God to abolish

18

a law and then re-enact it! That is something that he never yet did. The laboring oar, then, is in the hand of C.

Witness the effort which he makes to escape from the fourth commandment. He shows how lightly God the Father had ever regarded his Sabbath; he shows that the Lord Jesus Christ, the disciples, the holy women, who "rested the Sabbath-day according to the commandment," and the apostles, Paul and Barnabas, all disregarded the Sabbath! And all of the above named, Paul and his company excepted, disregarded it before it was abolished! Apostolic preference for the first day of the week is then proved from Acts 20:7; 1Cor.16:1,2. He then proves from 2Cor.3 that the ten commandments were all abolished, and then all but the Sabbath commandment are introduced into the new covenant! Then Rom.14 is brought forward to prove that there is *no difference* in days, each being at liberty to keep, or to refrain from keeping, any day he pleases. The distinction between the royal law and the hand-writing of ordinances is next disproved! He sums up his argument and concludes with a chapter of Sabbath-keepers' absurdities? It is not without a serious effort that he excuses himself from keeping the fourth commandment. The attention of the reader is called to his excuses, while we weigh them in the scales of truth. Will they screen him from wrath in the day when "the penalty of the law" shall be inflicted on "every soul of man that doeth evil?" Please notice, he passes over Matt.5:17-19 where our Lord in his first sermon speaks out in distinct terms on the *real point at issue*, and begins with the accusation of Sabbath-breaking, presented by the Pharisees, and refuted by Jesus Christ. He speaks as follows:

"On this question of Matt.12:1-8 was first read. The Pharisees accused the disciples to the Saviour of breaking the Sabbath-day; and he excused them by referring to David's eating the show-bread when he had need, and to the Priest's customary profanation of the Sabbath by doing more labor on that day than on any other (Num.28:5,10.) and tells the Pharisees that if they had understood the great doctrine of 'mercy' which he came to establish, they would not have condemned the 'guiltless.' - He pronounced his disciples guiltless in doing what they did, and does not say but they would have been equally guiltless in doing any amount of labor."

In order to aid the mind of the reader, and also to make C. speak out plain, we offer him one of three positions:

1. Christ excused his disciples by referring to others who had done wrong. (A poor excuse truly.)

2. Or the law always had been relaxed, changed, superseded, or abolished. (Then it was not relaxed by Christ.)

3. Or the acts of the priests, the act of David, and the acts of the disciples, were not, *under the circumstances in which they were placed*, contrary to the law of God.

The first two positions being too absurd to need refutation, all must agree upon the third. Now look at the facts in the case. What said the law of God respecting the Sabbath? "Six days shalt thou labor, and do all *thy* work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: *in it* thou shalt not do any work." Were the priests in their act of offering up sacrifices upon the Sabbath, at work for themselves, or for God? Not for themselves, but to *obey* God. Num.28:9,10. They were not doing what could be called "*thy work*." But had they been engaged in slaughtering animals for their

19

own use on that day, would they have been guiltless then? Verily not. Look at the case of David. 1Sam.21. He was fleeing for his life from Saul, the king of Israel. "He had need," and as an act of mercy, "*for there was no bread there but the shew-bread*," the priest gave him of it to eat. This, as an act of *mercy* was *according to the law*. "The *weightier matters* of the law" were "judgment, *mercy* and faith." Matt.23:23. Under other circumstances, though not expressly forbidden, it would have been wrong. Christ appealed to these circumstances to show that the disciples, in satisfying their hunger from the heads of wheat, were guiltless. Was there any chance "to answer him again?" Not any. But how "unreasonable it is for C. to insinuate from this chapter that any amount of labor would have been "guiltless" on the part of the disciples. If David and the priests would under other circumstances have been blameless in acting as they did, then might C. offer this chapter as proof, not merely that the law was slacked up in the days of Jesus, but that it always had been! It is not "hard for thee to kick against the pricks?"

"Mercy and not sacrifice" was *not* a new doctrine. Hos.6:6. - It was one of the *weightier matters of the law*. Matt.23:23.

"Instead of affirming, even by implication, the Sabbath law, all he says goes to receive them from its obligation. He says he is greater than the temple, hence, has a right to change or supercede its ceremonies; and that he is Lord even of the Sabbath-day, hence, has a right to dispose of it as he pleases - even to abrogate it: - he and his disciples are not subject to it. It is not recorded that either he or his disciples refrained from doing any thing on the seventh day because it was the Sabbath, except the women who delayed going to anoint his body till the Sabbath was over: but they probably did this more from fear of the Jews than for reverence for that day: for Jesus and his disciples often did more than that on that day. He healed on the Sabbath-day and commanded the healed to carry their beds and justified his conduct by saying, 'my Father worketh hitherto and I work;' as if he had said, my Father is not subject to the Sabbath law neither am I; and as he is so is his disciples."

We have already shown that there was no act of relaxing or destroying "the Sabbath of the Lord," on the part of Jesus. He justified the disciples on the same ground that he justified the priests in the temple, and David's act of eating the shew-bread; so that the law was no more relaxed or slacked up then, than it always had been!

Though Christ was greater than the temple, he was not greater than him who dwelt therein. John 14:28; Matt.23:21. He was not greater than the law contained in its ark, [Ps.138:2,] for he submitted to its curse and died "the just for the unjust." - Gal.3:13; 1Pet.3:18.

The fourth commandment was no more a temple ceremony that were the other nine! But even with the temple ceremonies Jesus did not meddle; he was not a priest upon earth; his priesthood, which was to "supersede" the Levitical, did not commence till his ascension. Heb.8.

The Son of man is the Lord of the Sabbath, even as the husband is the lord of his wife. See Mark 2:27,28; 1Cor.11:9; 1Pet.3:6; Gen.18:12. Not to abrogate, abolish, put away, or destroy, but to cherish, protect, and defend. He is the Lord of his people - he is *our* Lord Jesus Christ. Not to abolish - not to abrogate - not to destroy us - but to lay down his own life for us, and to "come again"

20

and take us to himself. Rom.14:9; John 14:1-3. "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." Matt.22:32. Jesus Christ is not the Lord of dead types and shadows, but of "the lively oracles!" Amen.

In taking leave of Matt.12, we ask, Whether an act shown by our Lord Jesus Christ to be in accordance with that *weightier matter of the law, mercy*, and therefore no violation of the law, will justify C. in *open, willful* violation of the fourth commandment? If he be "weighed in the balances" of Matt.12, his own chosen scales, will he not be "found wanting?"

"It is not recorded that either he, or his disciples, refrained from doing any thing on the seventh day because it was the Sabbath." (Witness the art used here; why did he not show where they ever violated the fourth commandment?) But we ask, Where is it recorded that they refrained from theft out of respect to the eighth commandment? Nay, is it not written that one of the twelve was a thief? John 12:6. How far would that fact go to show that he relaxed the eighth commandment? He repeated it, indeed, as he did all the commandments on the second table, but we inquire respecting his *acts*. Why not prove from John 8:11; Matt.21:31, that Jesus relaxed the seventh commandment? Or from Luke 14:26, that he relaxed the fifth?

We regret that the Sabbath is so far from being a "delight" to C., [Isa.55:13,] that he even calls in question the motives of those who observe it! - The holy women did not keep the commandment, because they wished to obey God. O, no. - It was "from fear of the Jews." We have read, indeed, that the disciples were once assembled *on the first day of the week* with closed doors "*for fear of the Jews*," [John 20:19,] but of the women who were *fearless enough* to follow their Lord at an hour when his disciples forsook him and fled, it is recorded that they "rested the Sabbath-day, according to the commandment." Whether an outward act "for fear of the Jews" would be "according to the commandment," may be

judged from reading the commandment itself: "Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it *holy*." The holy women kept the fourth commandment - the Holy One and the Just had done no less. John 8:29,46.

Jesus "healed on the Sabbath-day!" True, he did. Was it not lawful to heal on the Sabbath-day? Luke 14:1-6. Nay, was it not in an eminent degree *proper*, that the day which was hallowed for man, should be honored with the most of his merciful acts? We can hardly refrain from expressing the opinion, that, had the first day of the week been thus honored, C. would have urged that consideration in its behalf!

Jesus directed a man to carry his bed on the Sabbath. Very good. This, like the work of the priests on the Sabbath, was not an act of his own pleasure or profit. The carrying of the bed, considered as a burden, was a mere trifle. That it was not such a burden as God had forbidden may be seen by comparing Jer. 17:21-27; Neh.13:15-20.

But God the Father lightly esteemed the Sabbath-day. "*My Father worketh hitherto and I work.*" How had God the Father worked hitherto? By his acts of Providence, and by the acts of his mercy continued to the human family, as well on the Sabbath as on

21

other days. The earth continues its revolution on its axis, and in its orbit; the moon also, and the planets continue their usual course, impelled by the power of God; the rain falls, vegetation continues its growth as usual, and God watches over, and preserves the lives of men. Those acts may in the estimation of C. show Jehovah's total disregard for his Sabbath, but we ask, if so, did they not also on the first seventh day of time, albeit it is said he rested? Jehovah's own language, however, may be read in "the Scripture of the prophets." Isa.56; 58; Jer.17.

Jesus, who upholdeth "all things by the word of his power," [Heb.1,] broke the Sabbath in the same manner that his Father had. For he performed many good works on the Sabbath, and declared (this is something that the Pharisees and our opponents have always denied) that "it is *lawful* to do well on the Sabbath-day."

But he declares that he had kept his Father's commandments. - John 15:10. Shall it be said of him, as it may too often be said of men who make a like declaration, that his acts directly contradict his profession? Or will it be said that the fourth is not one of his Father's commandments? But it will be noticed in the text quoted that we are required to keep his commandments, *even as he had kept his Father's commandments*. If he kept only a part of them, and abode in his Father's love, we may pursue a similar course with the commandments of Jesus, and abide in his love. But who does not know better than that? "This is the love of God, [the Father.] that we keep his commandments." 1John 5:3. "If ye love me, [Jesus,] keep my commandments." John 14:15. And we add, those that retain that which they "have heard from the beginning" [John 1:1; Gen.1:1; 2:1-3] will "continue in the Son *and* in the Father." 1John 2:24. They will "keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ." Rev.12:17.

Christ was made subject to the fourth commandment, in the same sense that he was to the whole law. Hear the apostle Paul: "God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, *made under the law*," Gal.4:4. The disciples were not greater than their Lord.

We take leave of the position of C. relative to the Gospels, with these remarks:

1. Christ came to "magnify the law, and make it honorable," [Isa.42:21,] but he relaxed its obligation, even *before* God had abolished it!

2. He "came to fulfill" the law, yet justified the violation of its fourth precept!!

3. He did more against the law than its worst enemy could have done; for while it was yet in existence, (as all must admit,) he justified its violation, and then relaxed its claims so that it could not take hold on its transgressor.

4. James says that "whosoever shall fail with respect to one precept hath become guilty of all." [Macknight.] Jesus himself failed with respect to the fourth commandment and became guilty of all!!!

5. "Sin is the transgression of the law." According to C., [note also John 9:24.] Jesus was a sinner. But according to the beloved disciple, "In him is no sin." 1John 3:4,5.

But as it was a mistaken notion with the Pharisees in regarding the "mint, anise, and cummin" of the law, as above its "weightier matter,"

22

"*mercy*," that led them to make these charges against him who had kept his "Father's commandments," and had ever done "those things that please him," we ask if C. may not be laboring under a similar mistake? Whether or not, that which C. has presented from the Gospels, will cause Jehovah to "have him excused" from obeying the fourth commandment, is now submitted to the reader.

The patient attention of the candid is asked, while we now attempt to follow C. through the book of Acts. We will present as concise and definite a statement of his views as possible.

1. The meetings attended by the apostles on the Sabbath were generally under the control of the Jews. This accounts for them, 2. The historical mention of the Sabbath, proves no more for it than a similar mention of the Passover, Pentecost etc. proves for them. The same argument from the New Testament that would prove the perpetuity of the Sabbath, would prove the perpetuity of the Jewish feasts also. This proves too much therefore proves nothing to the point. 3. Paul traveled on the Sabbath, (Acts 13:13,14,) and "chose a time to start from Philippi to Troas (a sail of five days) that would cause them to sail on the Sabbath-day!" Acts 20:6,7. 4. They then waited at Troas six days till the time for the disciples' meeting came, which was the first day of the week. "No mention is made of their having a meeting there on the Sabbath. This shows that the apostles and disciples did not respect the Sabbath, as such, either as to traveling, or as a day of worship, but chose to meet on the first day of the week in preference."

We have often heard it remarked that drowning men will catch at straws, but we are sorry to see it so clearly proved in the case before us. We have traced the windings of C. through the Gospels, and shown (as we trust) the falsity of the

view that charges Christ and his apostles with the sin of breaking the fourth commandment. He now tries from the Acts of the apostles to show that *they* had no regard for the Sabbath, but preferred the first day of the week in its stead. He has not told us what had become of the fourth commandment; perhaps he is preparing the way to do so.

1. That many of the meetings attended by the apostles were under the control of the Jews is very true. But it is quite remarkable that while we read of Paul's sojourn at Corinth (the very place where C. will show hereafter, that they were "*accustomed* to meet on the first day for worship") we read that he *wrought at his trade*, and preached in the synagogue *every Sabbath*. And this he did for a year and six months, persuading both Jews and Greeks, thus spending seventy-eight Sabbaths. Acts 18:1-11; 17:1-3. As this was Paul's manner respecting the Sabbath, we ask, what was his manner respecting Sunday? Not one word is uttered respecting stated, or indeed any worship on that day, and it is not improbable that it was one of the days on which *he wrought at his trade*. This may not prove that the fourth commandment is binding on us, but it does indicate that Paul's preference for Sunday was not very strong. But let us look a little further. Paul tells the Ephesians that he had "*kept back nothing that was profitable*" unto them. Acts 20:20. But did he ever intimate to them that Sunday had taken the place of the Sabbath of Jehovah? But let us find a place where the apostles preached to the Gentiles. We pass over the account in Acts 16:13, and notice the account given in Acts 13:42-44. We there learn that Paul, after preaching on the Sabbath in the synagogue, was requested by the *Gentiles* to preach to them the next Sabbath, which he accordingly did. Is it not remarkable that he should not have

23

said. You need not wait the space of a week, *to-morrow* is the day of apostolic preference, on that day therefore come and hear? What would C. have said had a like request been made to him? Have we found any thing as yet to excuse C. in willful disobedience to the fourth commandment?

2. The book of Acts, indeed, contains the record of institutions which are done away, as well as of those still in force. The institution of the Sabbath, made for *man* at Creation; the ordinance of circumcision, made in the days of Abraham, for his literal seed; the ordinances of the Jewish Church, made for it at the Exodus; the ordinances of the Christian Church made for it by our Lord, are nearly all mentioned. Shall we conclude then that all are abolished, or that all are in force? We will do neither. The Apostle to the Gentiles speaks; hear him: "Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, *the law of commandments contained in ordinances.*" Eph.2:14-16. The ordinances of the Jewish Church were abolished; the ordinances of the Christian Church have taken their place. The Sabbath is not a Church ordinance, but, like the rest of the moral law, pertains to men as *men*, not as members of any Church, but as moral beings accountable to God's government. Hence, it is not relaxed, amended or abolished, by any change of dispensation! The feasts of the Jews, the Passover and unleavened bread, the Pentecost etc., were embodied in the hand-writing of *ordinances*. The Sabbath is embodied in the fourth commandment of the royal law. The hand-writing of

ordinances is abolished. Col.2. The royal law is in full force. James 2. It is submitted, therefore, whether the same argument that establishes the ancient Sabbath of Jehovah, establishes the Jewish feasts also. We have been looking for something against the fourth commandment. C. has discovered that Paul did not keep the Sabbath. We will now examine his proof.

3. As proof that Paul did not regard the fourth commandment, C. presents Acts 13:13,14, to show that Paul arrived at Antioch in Pisidia on the Sabbath, and thus broke the rest of the Lord's Sabbath. Is this *inference* sufficient to prove that Paul violated the law of God? - Rom.7:25; 8:1-7. Is it stronger than that by which infant baptism is proved? Acts 16:15,33. Or the one by which purgatory is proved? Matt.12:32. Or the doctrine of probation for the dead? 1Pet.3:19,20. Or the doctrine of the transmigration of souls? John 9:1-3. Would the rulers of the synagogue have been very likely to extend to Paul a courteous invitation to speak, if he had just broken the Sabbath?

The account of Paul's voyage from Philippi to Troas next claims attention. We inquire then, did Paul by this act break the fourth commandment and teach men so? That he journeyed on the Sabbath from *choice*, is all *assertion!* Before it can be proved that there was any act of breaking the fourth commandment on the part of Paul, it ought to be shown that the distance was such that he could not expect to reach the port of Troas before the Sabbath; [Acts 16:11,12;] as it now stands they might have been driven of adverse winds, as he was on his voyage to Rome, so that a sail of two or three days might have been more than doubled. And even then, there is no evidence that they might not have kept the fourth commandment on

24

the water, by resting on the Lord's day, and by solemnly dedicating themselves to him.

The moral character of Paul ought not to be impeached without better testimony! Why did not C. discover that the children of Israel, while carrying the Ark of God around Jericho, were violating the fourth commandment contained in that Ark? For one of the seven consecutive days on which they carried it, must have been the Sabbath. Josh.6. But as Paul, a long time after this, speaks directly on the point, he shall have liberty to defend himself. Hear him: "I have committed *nothing* against the people, or *customs of our fathers.*" Acts 28:17. And if even the Jews neither spake nor showed any harm of him, [verse 21,] we think the fact ought to "shut the mouths of gainsayers," and convince them that they had laid a "grievous complaint against Paul, which they cannot prove!" Acts 25:7. Perhaps, however, *false witnesses* might be set up, as in the case of Stephen, [Acts 6,] to testify that he had not ceased to speak blasphemous words against the law. Rom.7:12. Shall this kind of proof that Paul violated the Sabbath be called "plain Bible testimony?" We assure all, that if it cannot stand *now*, assuredly it will not, when "the hail shall sweep away *the refuge of lies*, and the water shall *overflow the hiding place.*" Isa.28:15-17; Rev.16:17-21. Would it not be better to make the truth your refuge against that fearful scene? Ps.91; 119:141,151; 111:7,8; Isa.24:5,6. Having endeavored to vindicate the character of *him* who has ever "*magnified his word above all his name,*" also that of the

Messiah, the disciples, the holy women, and the apostles, Paul and Barnabas, from the serious aspersions thrown upon them, we take leave of this part of the subject, requesting the candid reader to decide whether they are on the side of the fourth commandment, or on the side of those who trample it under foot. Ps. 1,21,22.

4. We now inquire into the evidences on which it is asserted that Paul preferred the first day of the week, to the day that Jehovah hallowed for man. As C. has nowhere shown what has become of Jehovah's Sabbath, except that Christ relaxed it, and that his followers did not keep it "according to the commandment," we feel interested to see what he will make out for its apostolic rival, the first day of the week.

The silence of Scripture respecting the manner in which Paul spent the six days at Troas cannot be taken as evidence that they had no meetings during this time. For consider that Paul was on his journey, hasting if it might be possible "to be at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost." Acts 20:16. That that numerous company of brethren should be waiting there six days in order to have Sunday come, (a day which God had never set apart,) in order to get the disciples together, would indicate that the disciples were much more attentive to worldly business, than to the company of the great Apostle. - But the same silence is preserved respecting his abode in Greece three months, his abode at Tyre seven days, his sojourn at Cesarea many days. Verse 3; 21:1-10; 9:43.

As there is no precept for Sunday-keeping, those who wish to observe it, have but one way to obtain directions. How did Paul, in this the only instance that can be hunted up, keep the Sunday? - For it is not to be presumed that Paul's example can be improved

25

upon, otherwise it is an imperfect example, and should not be followed.

We inquire then respecting their coming together to break bread. As we are to follow this pattern, we ask, When did Paul break bread? If our method of reckoning time (from midnight) was followed, which is not very probable, then this act of breaking bread was upon the second day of the week, as it took place *after* midnight. The question would then be fairly before the mind, Shall we be governed by apostolic preference for Monday, or by *our* preference for Sunday?

But if the Bible method of reckoning time (from six o'clock P.M.) was followed, which is much more probable, it would then appear that they came together at the close of the holy Sabbath, for an evening meeting. (Does it not read like one?) Paul preached to them, broke bread early Sunday morning, and then started off on his long journey to Jerusalem!! Then it would be clear that he waited till "the Sabbath was past," had a farewell meeting all night with the disciples, and started "early in the morning, the first day of the week," for the city of his fathers.

Suppose, however, that the example on which C. rests, could be well sustained. How much does it prove, when we consider that "the breaking of bread" was instituted on Thursday eve [Matt.26:26-30,] and at one period celebrated daily, not *merely* by the Church at Troas, but by the apostolic Church at Jerusalem? Acts 2:41-47.

We hope to be pardoned for the following quotation; it is the best summing up of the evidence from this text, that we have ever seen. It was not written by a Sabbath-keeper.

"You who infer, because St. Paul and the disciples at Troas, spent the whole night of the first day of the week in praying, preaching, and heavenly conference, in regard he was to leave them and depart on the morrow; *therefore*, St. Paul and the disciples at Troas met *that* night to keep holy *the day past*; *therefore*, the disciples at Troas met *every first day of the week*, to keep that day holy; *therefore* the Church at *Philippi*, the Church of Cilicia, and *all* Christian Churches, did then keep holy the first day of the week; *therefore all the apostles* did constantly keep holy that day; *therefore* Christ and his apostles *appointed the first day of the week* to be for ever celebrated, instead of the Sabbath. Is not this pitiful logic? Do you not *be fool and mislead the people?*" - Edward Fisher. 1653.

There would be a pyramid of evidence in the above, could we begin with the last conclusion, and reason back to the first statement. But as it now stands, the pyramid rests upon its *apex*, not upon its base, and those who stand upon it, are on "slippery places," and in imminent danger of being cast "down into destruction." Ps.73:18. Can it be said that C. has proved his point by "plain Bible testimony?" If it be so, then, verily, (as a Universalist once told me,) "It takes but little to prove the truth." Whether the straws that C. has gathered from the book of Acts will save him from the abyss of the Roman decretals, the reader must judge. But he has further testimony to offer for this apostolic institution. Hear him:

"Paul's instruction to the Churches in Galatia and Corinth, is in keeping with this. 1Cor.16:1,2. The collection for the saints, was to be taken on the first day of the week. This clearly implies that they were accustomed to meet on that day of the week, not to keep the Sabbath, but worship God and attend to the services and duties of the Christian Church."

26

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

"The Apostle simply orders, that each one of the Corinthian brethren should lay up *at home* some portion of his weekly gains on the first day of the week. The whole question turns upon the meaning of the expression, 'by him;' and I marvel greatly how you can imagine that it means 'in the collection box of the congregation.' - Greenfield, in his Lexicon, translates the Greek term, '*by one's self*, i.e. *at home*.' Two Latin versions, the Vulgate and that of Castellio, render it, '*apud se*,' with one's self, at home. Three French translations, those of Martin, Osterwald, and De Sacy, '*chez soi*,' at his own house, at home. The German of Luther, '*bei sich selbst*,' by himself, at home. The Dutch, '*by hemselven*,' same as the German. The Italian of Diodati. '*appresso di se*,' in his own presence, at home. The Spanish of Felipe Scio, '*en su casa*,' in his own house. The Portuguese of Ferreira, '*para isso*,' with himself. The Swedish, '*naer sig sielf*,' near himself. I know not how much this list of authorities might be swelled, for I have not examined one translation that differs from those quoted above."

The text [1Cor.15:2] does not, to be sure, prove that the people might not have gone to meeting *after* every one had lain by him in store, though it does not even intimate any thing of the kind, but it does prove that at the time when this

injunction, "every one of you *lay by him* in store, as God hath prospered him," should be obeyed, each must be at his own home!! Having done this, they could, when Paul should come, each take to him what they had gathered, as easily as we can take our Bibles with us to meeting. There would be nothing ostentatious about this manner of acting. Public contributions were forbidden by our Lord. Matt.6:3,4. "But when thou doest alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth: that thine alms may be in secret; and thy Father, which seeth in secret, himself shall reward thee openly." Paul did not contradict this injunction of our Lord, nor does he *even seem so to do*. - (We would commend the direction of Paul to the conscientious observer of the fourth commandment.) "Thus easily," as J. B. Cook remarks, "is *all* the wind taken from the sails of those who sail, perhaps unwittingly under the Pope's Sabbatic flag."

This uses up all the inferences presented by C. with which to construct a first-day institution out of *apostolic* "preference." If C. be still bent on doing this, we *now* suggest that "the *successor* to the chief Apostle" can furnish any amount of evidence desired. ("The Catholic church commands *all her children* to keep Sunday, and the festivals of the saints.") The Sabbath of the Elders rests upon a rolling pebble: the Sabbath of Jehovah *rests upon a solid rock*. They are now submitted for choice. 1Kings 18:21.

"2Cor.3 was next examined. Those who believe in the Sabbath find it very difficult to make any use of this chapter. That which was 'written and engraven on stones' was 'done away,' 'abolished.' What was written and engraven on stones? Ex.32:15,16, will tell. It was the ten commandments. Those who contend for the perpetuity of the Sabbath have no evidence or arguments to present against these plain statements of God's word; yet they express great surprise that the ten commandments should be abolished, and admitting that, they cannot see how men can be any longer under any moral restraint. But this consequence by no means follows, and they very well know that we do not

27

believe that God ever has or ever will absolve men from the obligations of his law; yet he has seen fit to change the verbiage and appendages of his law to suit the unfoldings of his progressive plan. Now this chapter is easy to be understood, if we only allow ourselves to look at the subject impartially. The ten commandments were the constitution of God's religious system, from the departure from Egypt to Christ; but when he came he remodeled the religious system: to do which he set aside - 'did away,' 'abolished' - the old constitution and established a new one, naming and enforcing in the new all the precepts of the old, except that of the Sabbath, which is not once named as belonging to the new system."

The above being the *only* attempt to meet the *real* question at issue, (viz: Is the royal law abolished?) we present it entire. We have been taken down the steps gradually, thus; (1.) Christ relaxed the Sabbath; (2.) the disciples were not subject to it; (3.) the holy women kept it from fear of the Jews; (4.) Jesus and his disciples, and those healed by him, did more on the Sabbath than was lawful; (5.) the Father lightly esteemed it; (6.) Paul and Barnabas broke it, preferring in its place the first day of the week. There is *another* step, and the reader has

reached the bottom of the stairs. We have been all the while descending, yet have remained in darkness respecting the fate of God's law and of his Sabbath. The seventh step fitly closes this fearful descent, and shows their fate. God has "abolished," "done away" *his "constitution,"* and thus, having abrogated the *first principles* of his own government, (that is what is meant by his "constitution,") we are at least set free from one of them, the fourth commandment - the holy Sabbath.

The *first principles* of his moral government embodied *the Sabbath*, (how erroneous, then, the idea that it was a Jewish shadow!) and God abolished these first principles, and then established a new constitution, with all of them in it except the Sabbath! As though the Infinite Jehovah had no settled principles in his moral government, but was like man, "given to change!" Prov.24:21; Ps.1,21. The great truth that the Sabbath was once one of the first principles of God's moral government, is thus distinctly confessed, but it is an astonishing doctrine that God has abolished all these first principles of his government, and then chosen a part in their stead. The standard of moral principles was defective, and another has been chosen in its place!

We will state the points in the view presented by C. with which we agree, and also those from which we dissent. We agree with his statement in the following particulars:

1. The ten commandments were engraven in the tables of stone. Ex.32:15,16. Note, Job 19:24.

2. We do confess ourselves surprised that the law of God should be abolished, and do not see how men can, in that case, be under moral restraint. Luke 16:17; Rom.4:15.

3. God has changed the appendages of his law. Heb.10:14,17. - (The ordinances of the Jewish Church, appended to the "constitution," have given place to the ordinances of the Christian Church. - Heb.9:1; Eph.2:15; 1Cor. 11:2,23,26. But this is a very different thing from abolishing his "constitution.")

4. That this chapter is easy to be understood, if examined impartially. Prov. 8:8,9; 1Sam.3:10; Ps.119:72,126,128.

5. That the ten commandments were once (at least) the constitution

28

of God's religious system. Ex.20:3,17; Deut.5:22; Eccl.12:13,14.

We dissent from the following assertions:

1. "Those who believe in the Sabbath find it very difficult to make any use of this chapter."

2. That which was written on stones was abolished.

3. They have no evidence or arguments to present against these plain statements of God's word.

4. Men are under as much moral restraint, as before God's constitution was abolished.

5. God, through his Son, abolished or did away his constitution in the days of the First Advent.

6. He has established a new one, embracing nine of the ten commandments.

We offer the following reasons for dissenting from each point:

1. We do not find it difficult to believe all that is written in 2Cor.3. But we have never thought of drawing an *inference* from it that would make Paul *contradict his own direct and positive statements*. We have left this for those to do, who having made "void the law through (pretended) faith," would justify themselves in breaking the commandments and teaching men so. The attempt to press it into that service, shows the absolute necessity of wresting and mangling it, before it can be made to say, "that which was engraven on stones was done away." As direct proof on this point, we present the following from another column of the same *Harbinger*:

"But if the ministration of death, WRITTEN and ENGRAVEN on STONES * * * was to be DONE AWAY * * * is ABOLISHED * * * is DONE AWAY. What can be plainer than this?"

Had an observer of Jehovah's Sabbath been driven to thus wrest and mangle this, or any portion of the divine testimony, in order to sustain himself, I would hide my face and remain dumb with shame. There is no heresy, however, "damnable," but what may thus be proved! (?) 2Pet.2:-1-3. The plain reading of the chapter not being enough to the point, the words which explained what was abolished, (viz: the appendages of the law,) are left out. It is by quoting Scripture thus, that it is made to prove that "the royal law" is abolished. We have read in Peter's second epistle that some would wrest the words of *Paul to their own destruction*. We had supposed that this remark of Peter belonged to some other period; we now think he rightly placed it in his account of the last days.

2. "That which was written and engraven on stones was done away, abolished." This extraordinary assertion is uttered with the utmost positiveness. But we think that the mangled verses in which Paul has spoken, should be written out in full, and suffered to speak for themselves. Look at them as they stand in the Book of God:

Verse 7. "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;"

Verse 11. "For if that which is done away was glorious, much more that which remaineth *is* glorious."

Verse 13. "And not as Moses, which put a vail over his face, that the

29

children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished."

Verse 14. "But their minds were blinded; for until this day, remaineth the same vail untaken away in the reading of the Old Testament; which vail is done away in Christ."

We ask, then, is this direct testimony that Jehovah has abolished his "constitution," or is it only inferential? Not one of these verses can be presented as direct testimony, until that part of it which explains what was abolished, is left out. For the question in verse seven is this, Was it the temporary glory that enshrouded Moses in his ministration, as he brought down the holy law of God from the hands of Jehovah, or is it that holy law itself, that has "been done away?" By leaving out the words between "written and engraven in stones," and "is done away" it makes direct and positive, "plain Bible testimony" that the law of

God is all abolished. If, however, the words remain as Paul wrote them, the other idea is taught. We pass to the next verse:

Verse 11. "For if that which is done away was glorious, much more that which *remaineth is glorious.*" Now as no one will deny that that which is done away in verse 11, is the same as that which is done away in verse 7, we ask, what is that which *remaineth* in distinction from "that which is done away?" For there is direct testimony here, that something *remains*, and that everything was not done away, or abolished. Were we to answer in the words of inspiration, we would say "the royal law" "*remaineth*;" the hand-writing of ordinances is abolished. James 2; Col. 2. - Were we to answer in the terms used by C. we would say the "*constitution remaineth*;" "the appendages of the law" (the Levitical ministration) are done away by the glory of Christ's more excellent ministry, before the *Ark of God* in the heavenly tabernacle. Rev.11:19; Heb.8:1-5. The eleventh verse, therefore, directly contradicts the view that everything is abolished and that *nothing remains*. But could we believe C., the ten commandments with all their appendages, were abolished - *nothing remains* - and nine of the abolished precepts have been gathered up in their stead.

Verse 13 tells us that Moses "put a vail over his face, that the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished." This verse being explanatory of verse 7, we have here a good opportunity to determine what was abolished. *When* the vail was upon the face of Moses, "the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished." What then did that vail hide? Were the tables of stone hidden by the vail? - Nay, verily. But the temporary glory of Moses' face, which in the estimation of the Jews still abides. The vail hid that which is abolished. That which he held in his hand was not hidden - it is that which *remains*?

Verse 14. The vail with which Moses hid the glory of his face still remains upon literal Israel. They still connect in an inseparable manner, the great constitution with the glory that enshrouded Moses and that attended the Levitical ministration, not seeing that Christ's "more excellent ministry" in the true tabernacle has taken its place. Israel can not see that the hidden glory is gone, but as they can still see the holy law, they believe that that glory must abide as well as

30

that law. Others at the present day fall into the opposite extreme; they can see that that glory is gone, and hence, conclude that that holy law has gone also. They do not see that in the heavenly tabernacle, where our Great High Priest is accomplishing his most glorious ministration, the *Ark of God* abides as well as in the earthly tabernacle. They think highly indeed of the mercy-seat, [Ex.25:17-22,] but the law of God contained in the Ark beneath that mercy-seat, is despised and counted a thing of nought. Heb.9:4. The dream, that the blood of Christ blotted out the moral law, (the very thing that caused it to be shed,) will be found vain and delusive in the day of God!

The proof from this chapter, therefore, that God's law is abolished, being only inferential, we now inquire into the character of an inference on which rests the most remarkable doctrine that ever was taught. That it is not a necessary

inference we have already seen. And we now inquire whether it agrees with the plain statements of this same Apostle. The doctrine is this: The Infinite Jehovah abolished the first principles of his own government, and then formed the most of them into a revised constitution! To believe this, requires strong faith on the part of any one who has any just conception of the Infinite Jehovah. Isa.55:8,9. Rather, I should say, it requires strong testimony to establish such a view.

The Apostle Paul has elsewhere stated in distinct terms what was abolished, and what is yet in force. He is consistent with himself, he is to be believed.

Eph.2:15. "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."

Col.2:14. "Blotting out the hand-writing of ordinances" that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross."

Paul distinctly teaches that the "hand-writing of ordinances" was abolished. Now hear Paul speak of the "royal law."

He shows in Rom.3:19, that the law of God condemns the whole world, and thence onward through the chapter, shows how men are delivered from its fearful condemnation, and how they are justified in the sight of God, viz: by faith in the death of our Lord Jesus Christ, "the just for the unjust." He then informs us whether the salvation and pardon of the Gospel, offered to men through faith in him who has been slain, destroyed the law of Jehovah or not.

Rom.3:31. "Do we then make void the law through faith? *God forbid: yea, we establish the law.*"

The Apostle was converted *after* the ascension of the Lord, consequently after the time when it is said the law was abolished. His conversion is the most remarkable one upon record. But mark what it was that shew him that he was a sinner, and that he was lost without a Saviour.

Rom.7:7. "What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." (Tenth commandment.) Verse 12. "Wherefore the law is holy; and the commandment holy, and just, and good." - An abolished law never

31

yet convicted a man of sin. And on his own testimony, he had not known sin had the law been abolished.

But hear him again. He wishes to enforce obedience to parents, and he takes the fifth commandment to do it: [Eph.6:2,3:] "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." Mark, it is not Paul that establishes the commandment (as some would have us think) but the commandment that establishes what Paul has said. These statements of Paul show unequivocally that he did believe the hand-writing of ordinances to be abolished, and *did not believe* that the ten commandments, God's great constitution of holy principles, were. But in order to examine this *same point* still further, we will introduce C's next assertion:

3. "Those who believe in the perpetuity of the Sabbath have no evidence or argument to present against these plain statements (?)of God's word." Had C.

refuted the plain testimonies of Holy Writ, bearing as he well knows directly against him, instead of passing them in silence, and then said that Sabbath-keepers have nothing to present against these *inferences*, he might have been somewhat entitled to confidence. Wholesale, sweeping assertions like the one just quoted may weigh with some as argument, but they are most frequent where argument is wanting. We offer the following direct testimony relative to the perpetuity of God's constitution, asking that C. will either refute it, or else withdraw his assertions.

1. THE TESTIMONY OF THE LORD JESUS: "Think not that I am come to subvert, the law or the prophets. I am come not to subvert, but to ratify. For verily I say unto you, heaven and earth shall sooner perish, than one iota, or one title of the law shall perish without attaining its end. Whosoever, therefore, shall violate, or teach others to violate were it the least of these commandments, shall be in no esteem in the reign of heaven; but whatsoever shall practice and teach them, shall be highly esteemed in the reign of heaven." Matt.5:17-19. [Campbell's Translation.] Matt.19:16,17. Luke 16:17; Matt.22:35-40.

2. THE TESTIMONY OF PAUL, already given: (1.) He testifies to what is abolished. Eph.2:14-17; Col.2:14-17. Heb.9:10. (2.) He testifies to that which is not abolished. Rom.7:7-25; 8:1-7. Eph.6:2,3; Rom.3:31.

3. THE TESTIMONY OF JAMES: "If ye fulfill the royal law, according to the Scripture, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, ye do well: But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors. For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. For he that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law. So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty." James 2:8-12.

4. THE TESTIMONY OF JOHN: "And every man that hath this hope in him, purifieth himself, even as he is pure. Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law. And ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins

32

and in him is no sin." 1John 3:3-5; Rev.12:17; 14:12; 22:14.

4. Men are as much under moral restraint, as before God's constitution was abolished. In explaining the point, he says that God "has seen fit to change the verbiage and appendages of his law to suit the unfoldings of the progressive plan." Had he said nothing more, we had altogether remained silent, for the constitution might be still supposed to abide, to hold men in check. But when we are told that the first principles of God's holy law are abolished, we inquire where the moral restraint is found. Had C. considered it worth his while to show any act of God in re-enacting his law, and thus establishing another constitution, he might then assert that men are under moral restraint, even as before the holy law was abolished. - But when the law of God is cut up by the roots and scattered to the four winds, we cannot restrain a feeling of deep anxiety for the Ark of God.

No man has yet explained how, or by what means the law of God was re-enacted. Most have taken it for granted, because the last six commandments are

several times quoted in the New Testament, that they are certainly re-enacted. But notice these points: (1.) The first four are not quoted in the New Testament. Then they are not re-enacted. (2.) The last six are several times quoted. Then they are several times re-enacted. (3.) When Christ quoted from the law of God, it was not in the form of a re-enactment, but as a quotation from the law of Jehovah. (4.) But since Christ quoted a part of the law, the whole law has been abolished. (5.) When the apostles quoted the law of God, they quoted from the original law and not from a revised edition of Jehovah's constitution. And their quotations are proof, not of the re-enactment of God's law, but of its perpetuity. - Rom.7:7,12; Eph.6:2; James 2:8-12. - (6.) There is no re-enactment of God's law recorded in the Bible. Hence, if the law of Jehovah has been abrogated, there is no moral law! We now request C. to explain how men are as much under moral restraint as before the royal law of the King Eternal was annulled.

5. God, through his Son, "abolished," "did away" his constitution in the days of the First Advent. No further proof is presented, than the inference already noticed. Why God did this, we are told but in part, and nothing of the kind being written in the Book of God, we shall be indebted to C. for all the light we have. Will he explain the subject further. We can however suggest one reason, and but one. - It is this: Jehovah's Sabbath, a shadow, had entered into his constitution, and in order to get it out, God abolished his constitution, and then named nine of its precepts, (it is not shown when, nor where,) and made another. But as it may be possible that Jehovah places a higher estimate upon the Sabbath which he made for man, than its opponents do, and as the language of Job 23, "he is of one mind, and who can turn him," may still be true, it is at least, possible that this is "a cunningly devised fable" that God has never sanctioned. - Did the Infinite Law-giver in any instance that can be produced, ever enact a law, then abolish it, then re-enact it? Such variableness and contradiction might perhaps be found in men, but should never be charged upon God. How well can the Old and New Testaments agree, when one was formed on one constitution, and the other was

33

formed on another? Is God "altogether such an one as thyself?" Can God deny himself?

6. He has established a new constitution. For this idea, also, we are indebted to C., as it is not contained in the Holy Scriptures. God has indeed promised that he would make a new covenant, but when he did this, he would put his *law* into the heart and write it in the mind. No abolition or re-enactment named, and none has ever existed except in the theories of men. We are also indebted to C. for a knowledge of what the new constitution contains. It was made by naming and enforcing nine of the ten commandments. The facts in the case are, that while the New Testament distinctly teaches the perpetuity of Gods constitution, it has never repeated but six of the ten, those written on the second table. The constitution once consisted of the ten commandments. These, God abolished at the death of his Son. He takes nine of these abolished precepts and makes a new constitution! A strange constitution, truly, made up of precepts that God had abolished! Nine abolished precepts, are established without showing how. It is

said that the creed of the skeptic involves the most unaccountable absurdities. But they can hardly equal such absurdities as these.

We invite attention again to 2Cor.3. The subject before the mind of the Apostle, is the surpassing glory and excellency of the Gospel ministry. See verses 1-6. He then argues that "if the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away; how shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious?" The word ministration signifies the act of performing service, or service itself. Macknight renders it ministry. It is thrice used in the New Testament. Luke 1:23. Zechariah accomplished the days of his ministration, (service.) Acts 6:1. The Grecians "were neglected in the daily ministration," (service.) 2Cor.9:13. Paul's service for the poor saints at Jerusalem is called a ministration. The face of Moses when he came down from the Mount, shone with glory. Yet what he brought down was only condemnation and death, written and engraven by the finger of Jehovah. His ministry or service, was only the ministration of condemnation and of death. The holy law was written in those tables of stone, and it could only show them to be sinners, and condemn them to death. - Rom.3:19,20; 7:7-10; Gal.3:21. The Gospel of Jesus Christ recognizes all men thus condemned and sentenced to death, [2Cor.5:14,15; Rom.3.] and brings them the joyful tidings of pardon through the blood of the Son of God, in whom justice and mercy meet together. If the face of Moses shone with glory, though he only ministered condemnation and death, how much more glorious then is that ministry that offers life, pardon and salvation!

Glorious as was that ministration, it was not to abide. The glory was hidden, "the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which he abolished." But we all with open face, behold Jesus, a merciful and faithful High Priest, standing before the ark containing God's holy law, and sprinkling his blood upon the top of that ark, the mercy seat. The ministration of condemnation has given place to the ministration of righteousness, not because the law

34

that condemned the world has been done away, but because the blood that brings pardon has been offered for guilty man.

The remarks of C. occasion the following suggestions:

1. The ten commandments embodied the Holy Sabbath and formed the constitution of God's government; yet, according to C., the same argument that would establish the Sabbath embodied in this constitution, would also establish the Jewish feasts, which were *only* embodied in the hand-writing of ordinances!!

2. Christ relaxed a part of the constitution of God's religious system, the disciples violated it, the holy women did not keep it, God the Father lightly esteemed it, and to get rid of it, the whole constitution was abolished!

3. The whole foundation of God's religious system, his constitution, has been torn up and scattered to the winds, in order to get the Sabbath out of it. This, it is very true, would be necessary, in order to get rid of the Sabbath - but it cannot be done until a stronger than the Most High shall be found!

We have descended the flight of steps presented by C. and now stand upon the last one for a moment's reflection. The step we perceive is marked, "Law of God Abolished." We have noticed the deceptive and dangerous character of each step as we have descended. We have also seen that there is nothing real in the step on which we stand. We look into the gulf before us; it is a pit, the depth of which has never yet been fathomed.

In strong contrast with this, let us mark the steps which lead to the "holy hill of Zion." (1.) "By the law is the knowledge of sin." Rom.3:20; 7:7. (2.) "Repentance toward God." Acts 20:21. (3.) "Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ." Acts 16:31. (4.) "Faith worketh by love." Gal.5:6. (5.) "This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments." 1John5:3; Rom.13:10. (6.) "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." Rev.22:14.

Reader, I set before thee life and death, [Matt.19:17; Rom.6:23,] which dost thou choose? Prov.9:12.

"Finally, Rom.14 was examined." The whole matter may be stated in a few words without doing injustice to C. This chapter proves that there is no difference in days - not merely feast days, but between the first, third, seventh, or any other day; each is at liberty to esteem one day above another, or to esteem every day alike. And finally Col.2:16, was brought to prove that no one has a right to judge us in any such matter.

To expose the deceptive character of the broad field which C. thus endeavors to open at the foot of his flight of stairs, we call attention to the following admirable remarks of Dr. Justin Edwards, in his (first day) Sabbath Manual:

"Some, after they embraced the Gospel, thought that the ceremonial as well as the moral laws were binding. Others, more enlightened, thought that they were not. This led to contention among them. Paul, in the fourteenth chapter of Romans, presented such considerations as were adapted to lead them, in this matter, to a right decision.

'One man,' he says, 'esteemeth one day above another. Another

35

esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it.' Both mean to honor God, and he will accept them. But what day does he speak of? The Sabbath of the fourth commandment, associated by God inseparably with the *moral laws*? Read the connection. What is it? Is it, one man believeth he must worship Jehovah; another who is weak, worshipeth idols? One believeth that he must not commit murder, adultery or theft, and another thinks he may? Were those the laws about which they were contending, and with which were connected the days that he speaks of? No: about those laws there was no dispute.

But, 'one believeth that he may *eat* all things,' (which are nourishing, whether allowed in the ceremonial law, which regulated such things, or not.) 'another who is weak, eateth herbs. Let not him that *eateth*, despise him that eateth not; and let not him that eateth not, judge him that eateth, for God hath received him.' Those were the laws about which they were contending, and with regard to which

the Apostle was giving them instructions. It was not the *moral*, but the *ceremonial* laws; and the days spoken of, were those which were connected, not with the former, but with the latter.

So, in the second chapter of Colossians, 'Let no man judge thou in *meat* or in *drink*, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbaths.' The sabbaths spoken of, are not the Sabbath associated with, Thou shalt not commit murder, or adultery, or theft; but which the sabbaths associated with meats and drinks, and new moons, were, indeed, shadows of things to come. But to take what he said about these sabbaths which were associated by God with ceremonial laws, and which the Apostle himself in this very discourse, associates with them, and apply it as some have done to '*the Sabbath*,' which God associated with moral laws, *is wrong*." Pages 134-136.

Now we add, that in the beginning, Jehovah sanctified and hallowed his Sabbath for man, and thence throughout the Bible, it is called the "Holy Sabbath unto the Lord," the "holy of the Lord, honorable," "my holy day," "the Lord's day," etc. But you will say, I do not believe that the day is *now* sanctified and hallowed, on account of Jehovah's act at Creation. Will you please listen a moment. Why do you see in every thing around you, the most visible marks that mortality, decay and corruption, are stamped upon them? If you reply, because the earth is under the curse of God, we answer, Truth, but when did God put his curse there? All must answer, It was done at the fall of man. But why is it there now? Has he ever cursed it again? Never. Gen.8:21,22. But the original curse abides, and will abide, until it shall have devoured the earth, [Isa.24:1-6,] when the curse shall be removed, and the family of the redeemed inherit the new earth for ever. Rev. 22:1-3. We call attention again to God's hallowed day. His blessing was placed upon the Sabbath, prior to his curse being placed upon the earth; - he hallowed the day - he has never removed his blessing from it - it abides there still - it will abide there, 'mid the glories of Paradise restored. Isa.66:22,23. And in the language of Balak to Balaam, though in a far higher sense, we say, I know that what he blessed is blessed, and what he curseth is cursed. Num.22:6.

36

But did not Paul say "another esteemeth every day alike?" And does not the term "every day," include God's Sabbath? We answer, if you will turn to Ex.16:4, again, you will read, "The people shall go out and gather a certain rate *every day*," and in the account of their acts we read, "they gathered it every morning." Verse 21. But when they went out on the Sabbath to gather, the frown and the rebuke of Jehovah was upon them. Verses 27-29. It is manifest, therefore, that when Jehovah saith "every day," that day is excepted which he hath reserved unto himself. Ex.20:8-11. - See the point exactly illustrated by the language of 1Cor.15:27. - But we do say on the authority of the Bible, that the first day of the week, for which C. puts forth all the plea that he is able, is one of "the six working days," [Eze.46:1,] and is one of the "every days" that are alike, an Apostle being judge. We should understand that God addresses us as reasonable beings, and "not as the horse, or as the mule, which have no understanding; whose mouth must be held in with bit and bridle, lest they come near unto thee." Ps.32:9; Prov. 21:16. But as a direct and positive testimony that when he saith "every day alike,"

Jehovah's Rest-day is excepted, we introduce Rev.1:10, "I was in the Spirit on *the Lord's day*." This is a direct testimony to the fact that in the *Gospel Dispensation*, one day is still claimed by God. As we do not read in any place(except in the "*fathers*" who prepared the way for the great apostasy by adding tradition to the word of God) that Jehovah has "put away" his holy day and chosen another, we submit the following testimony as to what is the Lord's day. Gen.2:3. "God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it." Ex.16:23. "The rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord." Ex.20:8. "Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy." Isa.58:13. "My holy day," "the holy of the Lord, honorable." Mark 2:28. "The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." Rev.1:10. "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day."

We will not say of Sunday-keeping, as C. affirms respecting God's Sabbath, that it is a type, unless perhaps it be *a type of the day that follows God's great week of time, when the wicked shall be raised and punished*; (Rev.20:5,7-9;) but we do say that it is a shadow - there is no substance to it - nothing real - nothing divine about it. Rom.14:5,6.

We now examine his remarks relative to the two laws. He states the view to be this: The ten commandments constituted the law of God; and the last four books of Moses, the ten commandments excepted, constituted the ceremonial law, the abolition of which is taught in 2Cor.3. He then disposes of the whole question, by stating that the two great commandments named by Christ, [Matt. 22:35-40,] are not found in the decalogue, but in the ceremonial law. Deut.6:4,5; Lev.19:18. He adds, their theory would abolish the two pronounced greatest by Jesus Christ, and would retain the ten which Paul says are abolished. "They ought to feel the force of this fact."

To this we answer, that we have already noticed the inference by which Paul is made to say that the divine constitution is abolished, and have shown that it is not only an unnecessary inference, but that it positively contradicts his own direct statement, also those of Jesus, of James and of John. We now respectfully represent that our "theory" does *not* teach that the two great commandments on which

37

the others hang have been abolished. The force of his misrepresentation, we do feel. "The hand of Joab is in all this."

That there may be no mistaking of the view, let me state it in distinct terms. We have believed and taught that "the ten words" written upon the tables of stone, *were a summing up of all the principles of God's holy law*, and that they were unmixed with Jewish ordinances; and that those things which were against us, which were taken out of the way, were found in the book *only*; *not* that every thing that was written in the book was abolished, (for the ten commandments after being given by themselves, are interspersed through the ceremonial law,) and that *nothing that was in the tables of stone, was abolished*.

Relative to the distinction mentioned, may I not appeal even to C. Despite his hostility to the view, he confesses in distinct terms that the "ten commandments were the *constitution* of God's religious system;" while that connected with it seems to be entitled to no higher designation than "the verbiage and appendages

of his Law!" Is there no distinction between a *constitution*, and the laws that may be appended to it?

We do not believe that the two great principles out of which our duty to God, and our fellow men, springs, viz: Supreme love to him, and the love of our neighbor as ourselves, are abolished; nor do we believe that our "whole duty" (commandments of God that grow out of these two principles) is abolished. Eccl.12:13,14.

We now present two New Testament expositions respecting these two laws; the one from the pen of the apostle Paul, as an exposition of that law which "is abolished;" the other from the pen of James, as an exposition of that law which is "established." We trust that even C. will be satisfied respecting the distinction. We introduce, then, the apostle Paul to show the character of the law abolished, and to give an inspired commentary on it. Listen then to the words of the Apostle to the Gentiles:

"Blotting out the hand-writing of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross; and having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it. Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new-moon, or of the sabbath-days; which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ." Col.2:14,17.

Every word of this we believe. No part of the moral duty of men is contained in the above - no one of the ten precepts of Jehovah's "royal law" is abolished by it!

Now we call attention to the apostle James. He is rebuking his brethren for the sin of partiality to the rich, and (what a marvel!) he takes the law of God to do it with; not an amended copy, or revised edition, but the original which was perfect! Hear him:

"If ye *fulfill* the royal law, *according to the Scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself*, ye do well: But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and *are convinced of the law as transgressors*. For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one *point*, he is guilty of all. For he that said, do not commit adultery, said also, do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law. So speak

38

ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty." - James 2:8-12.

We believe every word of this also. And it does show that there is a "royal law" that is *not abolished*, as well as a "hand-writing of ordinances" that is abolished. And that the two *great principles*, are inseparably connected with the ten great duties. Matt.22:35-40. We appeal to C. - we appeal to all who may read. "Are not these things so?"

James quotes but one of the two great principles, (as he was speaking of our duty to our neighbor only,) and consequently names precepts that grow out of *that*, found on the last table. But this no more proves that the first table (our duty to God) is abolished, than it proves that the first of the two great principles (supreme love to God) is abolished also!

Besides, the Apostle does distinctly say, in speaking of the ten commandments, that "whosoever shall keep the whole law, but shall fail with respect to one precept, hath become *guilty of all*." [Macknight.] This also be believe. And in the last of the verses quoted above, he directs us to speak and act as those "that shall be judged by the law of liberty."

Christ in Matt.5:18, in speaking of this same law of liberty, cites us forward to the time when heaven and earth shall pass away, as the first point (at least) to look for the passing of the law of God. - And it is a fact of surpassing interest, that at that point John says: "And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face *the earth and the heaven fled away*; and there was found no place for them. And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is *the book of life*: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works." Rev.20:11,12.

Mercy which now offers pardon, obtained by the death of God's only Son, to guilty man condemned by the holy law. [Rom.3,] shall then have stepped out, and stern justice will vindicate the broken law, and the insulted blood of the Lord Jesus Christ. The commandment-keepers will then enter into life, [Matt.19:16,17; Rev.22:14,] and those who have continued in sin ("transgression of the law") will receive the wages of sin - *the second death!* Rom.6:23; Rev.20:15; 22:15.

"Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." Gal.6:7. I dare no more suppress these solemn and fearful truths, than I dare to deny the existence of the Most High God. And I would solemnly charge, nay, I would entreat with tears, those who are determined to break the fourth commandment and to teach men so, that they do it on their own responsibility, and that they do not charge the sin of Antinomianism upon Christ and his chosen apostles!

The statement of C. respecting the two laws being false, the force of the matter is against him, and ought to be felt by *him!* Let him show from the divine testimony that "the royal law," and "the hand-writing of ordinances" are the same, and we promise not to be "slow of heart to believe all that is written!" - We have taught the perpetuity of the two, and also of the ten commandments. Is such a theory

39

any worse than that which, seems at least, to teach the abolition of both?

The ten commandments (duties) grow out of the two great commandments, (principles,) as naturally as the fingers proceed from the two arms, and neither the two nor the ten, can be spared better than a man can part with his arms or his fingers. (We suggest that the directions given to Wisdom's Son, [Prov.7:3,] to bind the commandments upon his fingers, could be obeyed much better before one of the ten was abolished than since that time.) We believe in the perpetuity of the two and of the ten - both of the arms and of the fingers; but C. teaches, (I ask pardon for the figure,) that the fingers have all been cut off, and then nine of them have been joined on again, though the manner in which this latter process was accomplished, is not very fully stated by him. If it took Jehovah in person to

enact his law, we ask whether it will not require quite as exalted a being to re-enact it, after it shall have been abolished by him?

The ten commandments hang on the two; they have ever hung there; they must continue to hang there till the principles of God's own holiness can change - until the love of God and of our neighbor, can consist of something else beside keeping those commandments that embody our whole duty to them!

The ten commandments grow out of the relation that man sustained before the fall, and embody those moral principles that are as immutable as God's character. Paul shows us that it is by the law (something just right itself) that the knowledge of sin exists. He shows that all men are condemned by it, and shown to be guilty in the sight of God, and that it is by the blood of Christ, and not by any typical sacrifice, that men are redeemed.

He shows that faith in that blood that was shed for our transgressions of the law, justifies us in the sight of him whose holy law has been broken. And that faith in him does not make void the law, but establishes it. He shows that faith works by love, and the love of God is manifested by keeping his commandments.

Then by the great work of redemption, supreme love to God and the love of our neighbor as ourselves (represented in the figure by the arms) is restored to us, and flows out through the ten commandments, (the fingers in the figure) in rendering, not by mere outward act, but from a heart of pure love, those duties that we owe to our God and to our fellow men. The two are the principles; the ten are the principles carried out into acts.

The only way that these precepts can be kept, is by being filled with perfect love to God, which is the only fulfilling of the law that God will accept. As the work of salvation is all of grace through faith, there is no room left for Phariseeism, (self-righteous trusting in the law, as though the obedience of a proud spirit would be acceptable to God. Luke 18:9-14,) nor yet for Antinomianism, (the making "void the law through faith,") forgetting that it is necessary that faith should cause us to fulfill the righteousness of the law. - Rom.8:1-7. The one is solemnly rebuked by Paul, the other in no less measured terms by James. Rom.10; James 2.

The great evangelical doctrine of the New Testament may be summed up in a few words which the Holy Ghost useth:

40

1. *We are saved by grace through faith.* 2. *Faith works by love, which is the fulfilling of the law.*

Those who are thus striving for salvation, have not fallen from grace!! They are not justified by the law, nor do they sacrilegiously make it void through pretended faith. Those thus redeemed by the blood of Christ, constitute the Church of the New Testament. - The ordinances of Christ belong to these alone, and in no sense to the world. It is *the law of God* that leads men to repent - it is the gospel that offers them pardon through Jesus Christ. Their relation to each other as members of the Church of Christ, and to Christ as their Lord, is defined by that which Christ and his apostles have said. - Their relation to God the Father and to their fellow men, as such, is defined by the law of God. We desire both

"the Son and the Father," - the commandments of God, *and* the testimony of Jesus Christ. Amen.

As "the hand-writing of ordinances" or "law of commandments contained in ordinances" is abolished, some may be ready to assert that the ten commandments were ordinances of the Jewish Church. Let us test the matter. If the commandments were Church ordinances, then those who were not members of that Church were not amenable to them. For all Church ordinances grow out of the relation that men sustain as members of the Church.

But we ask whether the precept, "Thou shalt not steal," was in the days of the Hebrew Church, or is now in the days of the Christian, a Church ordinance? Were there no people but the Hebrews amenable to it then? Is there none but Christians amenable to it now? Test the commandments, "Thou shalt not kill," "Thou shalt not commit adultery," or indeed any of the ten in the same manner, and then answer me, Were they Church ordinances, or were they moral laws? Do they grow out of the relation that men sustain as Church members, or as moral beings accountable to the government of God? True it is that the Jews had this advantage, that unto them were committed the oracles of God; [Rom.3:1,2; Acts 7:38;] but the Apostle proceeds to show how "exceeding broad" they were, by stating in verse 19, that every mouth is stopped by them, and the whole world shown to be guilty before God! But says one, As you deny that *the Sabbath* was Jewish, do you call it Christian? No by no means. It is like the other precepts of the moral law, *divine*! It was made by Jehovah for man, embodied in the royal law of God, and is as immutable as that law itself! Matt.5:17-19.

"But it was a sign between God and the children of Israel, throughout their generations, and what do you do with that fact?" We do with that as with other portions of the divine testimony, - We *believe* it. It was a sign between God and the Hebrews for a certain period, for it designated them as worshipers of the *true God in distinction* from the nations around them, who worshiped "the gods that *have not made the heavens and the earth.*" Jer.10:10-12; Eze.20:20. But this no more proves that it is *now abolished*, than the fact that Jesus is now a sign that is spoken against, [Luke 2:34,] proves that he will be abolished, when he shall cease to be such a sign! We "delight" in the Sabbath, we adore the Lord of the Sabbath! C. sums up the Bible class report thus"

41

"In reference to the position of the New Testament on the Sabbath question, two points were made: 1. Neither the Saviour nor any of his apostles ever enforced the Sabbath precept. 2. In all the catalogues of sins contained in the New Testament, Sabbath breaking is not once named, - In view of these facts, it was claimed that no Christian could be required to keep the Sabbath day,"

(1.) The above reflects much greater credit upon the shrewdness of the writer than it does upon his candor in summing up so important a question. The fourth commandment is a part of the royal law, and it is his part to get it out, *not* ours to insert it a second time. The idea that the moral law of God *needed* to be enforced by the Son of God, or by any of his apostles, is a singular, and in the highest degree absurd, idea! Christ often took the law of God *to enforce what he said himself, and so did the apostles!*

But as marvels will never cease, we are given to understand that what Christ and his apostles did not enforce, is not binding on us as Christians. And the Sabbath precept having never been quoted directly by Christ or his apostles, we are not as Christians under obligation to keep it. Those who make this assertion seem not to have weighed it very well. The first four are not quoted; and we as Christians are not "required to keep them!" But to show how little weight it would have, had our Lord quoted the fourth commandment several times, we add that the last six, a part of which he quoted *several* times, are all abolished, together with the first four which he did not quote, all of which they attempt to prove from 2Cor.3. So that since that time we have a *new* law of God. That God who gave his holy law in person and *himself* wrote it, has abolished it, to re-enact it either through Christ or his apostles. *Not approving* the expression, we do not say that Christ and his apostles *enforced* the law, for how could the Son who says "My Father is greater than I," much more how could the apostles who were not so great as he who sent them, *enforce* the law of Jehovah? But on the strength of their testimony, we do declare that they teach its perpetuity and immutability, and most solemnly enjoin obedience to it. Matt.5:17-19; 19:16,17; 22:35-40; Luke 16:17; Rom.3:31; 7:7-25; 8:1-7; 1Cor.9:21; James 2:8-12; 1John 3:4,5.

(2.) The catalogues of sins named in the New Testament, contain nothing that the law of God does not show to be sinful. But they may be used to justify other sins as well as the sin of Sabbath-breaking. The sin of slave-holding is not named unless by implication, the sin of Polygamy is certainly not noticed distinctly, yet both these sins were very general in the apostles' days, and certainly very heinous. The New Testament never yet offered its catalogue of sins as a complete list, for some omit to name many grievous sins, and *all* OMIT some that are very heinous. But mark! There is a standard somewhere by which these things are shown to be sins. We ask what is it? Now will you agree to believe the *New Testament*? If so, we pledge ourselves to show that *it is that much hated law of God*.

Hear the beloved disciple: "*Sin is the transgression of the law.*" 1John 3:4. Now hear Paul tell how sin is made manifest: "*By the law is the knowledge of sin.*" Rom.3:20. Hear him again: "*I had not known sin but by the law.*" 7:7,13. This is the only standard by which sin is shown. It is the embodiment of God's

42

own principles of holiness, and never can be improved even by Omnipotence. Ti. 1:2; Rom.7:12.

It is enough that the apostles have told what the standard is by which sin is shown; we take the standard and tell any man who breaks the law of God, either the fourth, the seventh, or the eighth commandment, *he is a sinner*, and "the wages of sin is death!" - We do not rebuke a man for an act of sin by turning to any of the catalogues of sin; we take the standard by which those acts are shown to be sinful and read to him "thus saith the Lord!"

Let me repeat the doctrine: The law of God is the only standard by which the acts of men as moral beings, are shown to be either righteous or wicked in the sight of God. Those who can present any other standard are requested to do it. (1.) The New Testament distinctly teaches the doctrine. Rom.3:20; 7:7; 1John

3:4. (2.) It pronounces this standard perfect. Rom.7:12; James 2:8-12; 1:25. (3.) But for the benefit of those who claim that the New Testament furnishes us with another standard by which sin is shown, besides the law of God, we ask that this imaginary standard may be tested with this question: Does the New Testament show it to be wrong for a man to marry his sister, or his daughter? Shall I be answered as I was sometime since, "Such an act would not be sinful?" Those who wish to see this subject defined, can read it at length, in Lev.18. That the abominations there described are not mere Jewish pollutions, is evident from the fact that the land of Palestine was said to vomit out its first inhabitants on account of these things!

With the following points from the New Testament, we submit the question:

1. The perpetuity and immutability of the law of God is distinctly taught.
2. The law of God is made the standard by which sin is shown.
3. Redemption from its fearful condemnation by the death of God's only Son, lays us under infinitely stronger obligations to keep it.
4. The New Testament solemnly enjoins obedience to the commandments as the condition of entering life eternal.

We cannot help noticing the assertion respecting prejudice. A few to be sure are shocked at the idea of calling God's holy law "the old Jewish law," "miserable rickety old law," and the like expressions, but the prejudices of the mass are all against the observer of Jehovah's Rest-day. Witness the expressions of contempt thrown upon the institution and its observers. "The old Jewish Sabbath," etc; "Judaizers" etc.etc. Nor can we forbear the remark, that the remainder of the article in question is one of the most shrewd efforts to *create* prejudice, and to throw dust, that we have ever seen. Else why should he refute *things* as arguments, that he knows we do not rest upon, and make assertions respecting us, that are absolutely false! - We notice the following points in the order presented by him:

1. "As the Sabbath is a *type*, some think it should be observed till its antitype - the day of the Lord - comes. But this is a mistake; for the same principle would bind us to keep all the other sabbaths of the Levitical law; and also all the other typical ceremonies that have not yet met their antitypes, such as the cleansing of the Sanctuary, feast of tabernacles, jubilee etc."

We do *not* believe that the Sabbath is a type, consequently have

43

never used the argument which C. refutes. The evidences upon which C. rests, to prove that it is a type, have been reviewed already. - But as C. calls it a type of the day of the Lord - the thousand years, we ask him to explain why the type should be observed after the antitype has come. Isa.66:22,23. Will not those who observe the Sabbath *then*, "walk in a shadow, or in the dark, instead of the light?" (See another column of the same paper.) When C. shall have *refuted his own argument* on "the cleansing of the Sanctuary," we will reconsider the subject. He next says:

2. "Christ did not 'break the law' in abrogating the Sabbatical observance, any more than in abrogating the other legal ceremonies; he will 'fulfill' it as well as the rest, in its time."

We ask C. if Christ did not break the law, in violating the fourth commandment *before* it was abolished? Does not C. believe that Col.2, proves the abolition of the fourth commandment at Christ's death? Will he now say that he abolished it at the beginning of his ministry? If so, we think that the law must have been very hard to destroy, [Luke 16:17,] to have needed abolition twice! First, *before the ministry of Jesus*, second, *at his death*. If you say the law was abolished but once, and that this was done at the death of Christ, as we may infer from your use of Col.2, we ask if Christ did not break the law in violating the fourth commandment before that time? The absurdity of two abolitions of the law is quite equal to the two or three times of instituting the Sabbath.

3. "Some who are preaching the Sabbath, think they are the 'angel' of Rev. 7:2, sealing the servants of God in their foreheads, and the Sabbath is that seal of the 'living God.' "

How wicked a thing it must be then to keep the fourth commandment! Rather, how wicked must it be to *misrepresent* those who are so doing! The idea conveyed by the above, that those who are trying to do and to teach the commandments [Matt.5:17-19] believe themselves to be the angel of Rev.7, with the seal of the 'living God' is *false*, and is only thrown in for effect. Perhaps one or two individuals may have suggested the idea, but it has never been received by us as a body, nor do I know of one person that thus believes. - Read the following from the *Review and Herald* for February, 1851. "We learned that it had been reported in Bristol, (Vt.,) that we profess to be the angel ascending from the East, having the seal of the living God, etc. Rev.7:2. But those who have read our writings, and have known our faith, *know better*." We believe, however, that the four winds are about to be loosened, and that the time of trouble such as never was, will soon commence. Dan.12:1; Jer.25:30-36; Isa.17:12,14; Rev.13:14-17; 12:17. We find no promise that those will be sealed, who break the commandments and teach men so. Can C. point it out? At another time we may notice this subject at length.

4. "Akin to the above is the assertions of the same persons, that observing the first day of the week as a Sabbath, is having the Mark of the Beast and exposes to the wrath of God denounced by the third angel in Rev.14:9-11."

It is not a thing impossible that the Mark of the Beast may have some connection with the very institution for which C. puts forth all the plea that he is able. It is well remarked by J. B. Cook, that,

44

"Every enactment relative to the religious observance of the first day, *originated with the Pope and Potentates of Rome*, and those who in this matter sympathize with them." - It is true that the Papal power was to "think to *change* times and laws." Dan.7:25. It is true that the Mark of the Beast stands in opposition to, or in contrast with, the commandments of God. Rev.14:9-12. It is also true that when the commandments of God are now presented, this Papal institution, now universally observed in the place of the fourth commandment, is arrayed against them with all the energy that can be imparted to it. It is evident also from Rev. 12:17, that the Dragon shall yet make war on those who shall be found keeping the commandments of God. It is further evident that the Two-horned Beast is yet

to require on pain of death, that men worship the Image of the first Beast, and also that they receive his Mark. But let the Mark of the Beast refer to what it may, what has C. to say against keeping "the commandments of God," brought to view in the next verse to that which speaks of the Mark of the Beast? Rev.14:9-12. And on which side would he stand, should the Dragon *now* make war on the commandment-keepers? This subject may be noticed at length hereafter. For a refutation of the view that the three angels of Rev.14:1-13 refer to the future age, see *Review and Herald*, Vol.II. No.8. C. next informs his readers that there is no evidence that man needs a day of rest.

"5. Jesus did indeed say, the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath, but Sabbatarians reverse this principle, by asserting that man was made expressly for the Sabbath - originally constituted for keeping it."

The Editor of the *Harbinger* who recommends C.'s article as "plain Bible testimony," directly contradicts the view of C. Hear him: "He [poor fallen man] has needed rest from his hard labors, and God in his good pleasure, in giving his law, the law of Moses to his *chosen people*, provided a day of rest for them, and through them to all mankind who would submit to *law*." - *Harbinger for Nov.1, 1851*.

In this obscure corner, C. finds a space to use up the testimony of our Lord, relative to God's design in making the Sabbath. Why did he not present this *divine* answer, when he discussed the question, "For whom was the Sabbath instituted?" And why should he misrepresent us, who believe that the Sabbath was *designed for, and adapted* to man's temporal and eternal well being, by saying that we believe "that man was made expressly for the Sabbath?" Nay, why does he impeach the Highest Wisdom, by saying that *he made something for man, that he did not need!*

In order to present to the reader the commentary of C., we quote Matt.24:20. "But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath day." Hear him expound it:

"6. The reference to the Sabbath in Matt.24:20, only shows that the Jews who rejected Christ, would be keeping the Sabbath at the destruction of Jerusalem, and would, in consequence, add to the dangers of the disciples flight, by punishing them (perhaps with death) for fleeing on that day."

We are indebted to him, for a suitable commentary on his own remarks. Mark how appropriate it is:

45

"But how does he know this: there is nothing of the kind said. This is a bare *inference*, without a shadow of foundation in positive testimony: hence it is on his part, an arrogant assumption!"

C. next asserts that the duty of keeping the fourth commandment is only *inferred* from the New Testament. We have presented the direct testimony of the Lord Jesus Christ, also that of the apostles Paul, James and John, relative to the perpetuity and immutability of the law of God, and though he has nowhere attempted to refute these testimonies, they amount, in his estimation, to nothing but an inference. But his inference for Sunday, which will not stand the test of a single moment's investigation, he brings forward with which to establish a kind of

first-day institution out of apostolic preference! "O reason, thou art fled to brutish beasts!"

God's act of resting upon the seventh day and blessing and sanctifying it, is an "inference which is not sufficient to establish a truth or a religious duty," but an inference drawn from two instances in which the first day is mentioned, (both of which contain evidence the reverse of that desired,) is sufficient to establish apostolic preference for the first day instead of Jehovah's Sabbath! "The days of visitation are come; the days of recompense are come; Israel shall know it: the prophet is a fool, the spiritual man is mad, for the multitude of thine iniquity, and the great hatred." Hos.9:7.

It is with feelings of deep sorrow, and painful regret, that we have witnessed this last attempt to make void the law of God. Ps.119:126,136; Rom.3:31. We weep, not merely that *the mighty have fallen and the weapons of war have perished*, [2Sam.1:27,] but rather that they have joined the Philistines, the enemies of the ark of God. Would to God that C., instead of counting "the great things" of God's law "a strange thing," had prayed, "open thou mine eyes that I may see wondrous things out of thy law," then might he have been able to say with evangelical David, "O how love I thy law;" or with the great Apostle to the Gentiles, "I delight in the law of God." Alas, that that other law of sin that is in the members, should lead C. to war in this desperate manner against the law of God. The report of that Bible class evinces, as indeed every thing connected with the article plainly shows, that instead of canvassing the evidences on which Jehovah's law and Sabbath rest, every thing was said against them that could well be brought to bear. "Be not deceived, God is not mocked."

With a few suggestions, we submit the whole subject.

1. The blood of Jesus was shed for our transgressions of the moral law. Is it not very remarkable, then, that he himself was its transgressor? 1John 3:4,5; Isa. 53:5,6,11; Heb.9:28; 1Pet.2:22-24.

2. The doctrine of the atonement establishes the moral law. The law of shadows that only typified the death of the Lamb of God, came to its end, the substance, at his death. Col.2:14-17. The royal law from the King Eternal, which condemned the whole world and showed them to be guilty before God, was thus magnified and made honorable by the death of God's only Son. Through his blood pardon is offered to fallen guilty man. But when mercy shall have given place to justice, the claims of the holy law will be vindicated.

46

Would it not be very remarkable, should it then be found that the blood of Christ had blotted out the moral law. Rom.3.

3. The doctrine of the destruction of the wicked, rests upon the perpetuity of the law of God. The wages of sin is death. Rom.6. Sin is the transgression of the law. 1John 3; Rom.4:15. But the law is abolished! How unreasonable is this last idea, when we consider that the men who hold to it, talk much of the "penalty of the law" that will surely overtake the wicked. For a thorough elucidation of the last two points, viz.: the fact that the doctrine of the atonement *establishes* the moral law, and the fact that the doctrine of the destruction of the wicked *rests upon* the perpetuity of the law, the reader is cited to Mr. Dobney's great work on "Future

Punishment" Part 1. We only echo the voice of the *Harbinger* respecting it, when we say, "It is unanswerable."

4. If the death of Christ destroyed the moral law, then the human family are delivered from its fearful sentence, whether they repent or not. This makes the atonement unconditional; hence, it is the real foundation of Universalism. 1Cor. 15:3; Matt.20:28; John 3:16.

5. The doctrine that temporal (instead of the second) death is the ultimate penalty of God's law, is the real foundation of the non-resurrection of the wicked. For after the penalty of the law has been inflicted, those who have suffered it, cannot be raised to suffer *something else*.

6. Is it not very remarkable that while the *Harbinger* is breaking the fourth commandment and teaching men so, it should be continually repeating the sentence, "Death is the penalty of the law?" Would it not be better to unite with those who are trying to do and teach the commandments, and talk of entering into life!

7. The Lord preserveth all them that love him; (this is the love of God that we keep his commandments;) but all the wicked (sin is the transgression of the law) will he destroy. Ps.145:20. And it is a fact of thrilling importance, that when the commandment-keepers enter into life, the wicked shall be left without to be consumed of the second death. Rev.22:14,15; 20:11-15.

8. The plain testimony of the New Testament, relative to the perpetuity of God's law was not noticed by C., neither is it often noticed by its opponents. They "find it very difficult to make any use" of it.

9. Many have noticed the fulfillment of the first sign recorded by Peter, in his second epistle, chap. 3. But is there not one occurrence recorded in the concluding part of the chapter, that furnishes a striking sign of the times in which we live? I refer to the effort now made by many to *wrest the words of Paul* "to their own destruction."

Instead of saying to those "who are troubled" respecting their disobedience to the fourth commandment, "continue in sin ('the transgression of the law') that grace may abound," we do say "to you who are troubled rest with us" upon God's Holy Sabbath, and you will find how "blessed" a thing it is to obey God. Amen.

EXTRACT FROM A LETTER TO O. R. L. CROZIER

THE language of Christ, that "the Sabbath was made for man," (standing in direct contradiction of your inferences to prove that it was made for the Hebrews only,) you attempt to get over by saying that Christ's testimony does not bear against your view, "unless it can first be proved that the Israelites were not men." Mark the contrast. Christ says "the Sabbath was made for man." You point to a fraction of the human family, and say that it was made for that fraction only, and that Christ's words do not show the contrary, unless I can prove that that fraction is not composed of men! How weak and *unreasonable* is such an assertion! How reasonable the statement, that it was made for the Gentiles as well as the Jews, unless it can be proved that the Gentiles are not men. If you have any proof to

offer that they are not men, it will help your case: if you have not, you stand in array against the statement of the Lord Jesus Christ.

That the Sabbath was a sign between God and Israel, simply shows that it designated them as the worshipers of the *true God* in distinction from the nations around them who worshiped "the gods that *have not made the heavens and the earth.*" Jer.10:10-12; Eze.20:20.

The great stress laid on the language of the fourth commandment to prove that the Jews alone should keep it, shows how difficult a case you have undertaken. It is very true that the words, "thou," "thy," and "thine," do often occur; but had you taken the trouble to read the other commandments, you would have found precisely the same words often used. Notice in particular the fifth and tenth commandments. If the words "thy" and "thine," restrict the duty enjoined in the fourth commandment to the Jews only, then they also restrict to them the duties enjoined in the other precepts. And as the term "*thy God*" occurs five times in the Decalogue, it goes as far to prove that the God of the Bible is a Jewish God, as it does to prove that the Sabbath of the Lord is a Jewish Sabbath.

But what is quite as remarkable, the two commandments, which you are pleased to admit as binding on all men in all ages, were given to the Jews as really as were the ten. And these use the same "*Jewish*" pronoun quite as freely as that hard-to-be-got-rid-of fourth commandment. "*Thou* shalt love the Lord *thy* God with all *thine* heart, and with all *thy* soul, and with all *thy* might." "*Thou* shalt love *thy* neighbor as *thyself.*"

48

You deem the language referred to as the most explicit, and unanswerable proof that the fourth commandment belonged to the Jews only, and that whosoever should teach differently, exposes himself to the penalty of adding to the law of God. Now don't be too strong. Whosoever, on this reasoning, shall teach that either of the two great principles, or any of the ten precepts that grow out of these principles, are binding on any other besides the Jews, exposes himself to the penalty of adding to the law. And inasmuch as God is said to be "*thy God*" he must be "the God of the Jews only, and not of the Gentiles also!"

But to determine who the "thee" and "thou" are, to whom the law speaks, I inquire, To how many does the law speak? To the Jews only, or to all the family of fallen man? Paul answers:

"Now we know that what things so ever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law; that *every mouth* may be stopped, and *all the world* may become guilty before God." Rom.3:19.

Our views of the two commandments, and the ten, are in harmony with the words of Christ, of Paul, and of James. Matt.22:35-40; Rom.13:9; James 2:8-12. Your statement that we contradict the words of Christ in Matt.22:40, is false. We regard these two great precepts, and the ten which grow out of them, as the Royal Law of God. Your remark that "the Decalogue is inapplicable as a universal and perpetual law," and that it has given way to "the unencumbered moral law," was not intended, we presume, with reference to the statutes that forbid idolatry, blasphemy, disobedience to parents, murder, adultery, theft, false-witness and

covetousness. O no. But the precept embodying the Sabbath that was made for man at Creation, was Jewish, and had obtained a place in that "holy, spiritual, just and good law," to get rid of which, it was all abolished.

The Gentiles were amenable to the law of God, or they were not. If they were not amenable to the law of God, then they must be regarded as moral beings, but accountable only to the gods of their own creating. But if they were amenable to the law of God, they were amenable to its fourth precept, the holy Sabbath.

To your remark respecting the existence of the Sabbath in the New Earth, and your query whether wearisome labor will then exist, I answer that inasmuch as the prophet Isaiah, in speaking of the New Earth, says that all flesh shall assemble from Sabbath to Sabbath to worship before Jehovah, we are decidedly of the opinion that it will exist in that holy state. Nor does this imply that wearisome labor will then exist, any more than the statement of Ex.31:17, that the great Creator *rested* on the seventh day and was *refreshed*, implies that he was wearied with his work of Creation. - *Review and Herald*, Vol.III, No.2. page 12.