**“Exposition of 2 Corinthians 3:7-11” The Signs of the Times, 15, 30.**

E. J. Waggoner

Several questions have of late been asked us upon 2 Corinthians 3:7-11. As that is a passage which those who are striving to teach the law often find difficult to explain, and which enemies of truth use with great confidence as being opposed to the law, we will try to give a simple scriptural exposition of it. The fifth and sixth verses of the chapter read as follows:- {SITI August 5, 1889, p. 295.213}

“Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think anything as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God; who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit; for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life.” {SITI August 5, 1889, p. 295.214}

It will be noticed that the last clause of verse 5 is an answer to the question, “Who is sufficient for these things?” asked in verse 16 of the preceding chapter. The subject which is under consideration is the Christian ministry, as is seen by verse 6, and the first verse of chapter 4. The apostle is showing its excellence, and in so doing contrasts it with the ministry of the old covenant. The word “testament” in verse 6, means “covenant,” and the statement is that we are made ministers of the new covenant; “not of the letter, but of the spirit; for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life.” Many people seem to have the idea that in this verse Paul is contrasting the two testaments or covenants. The old covenant they call the letter, and the new covenant the spirit. But one who reads the verse carefully cannot fail to see that this is an error. The old covenant is not referred to till we reach the seventh verse. Paul’s statement is simply to the effect that he and his associates were ministers of the spirit of the new covenant, and not of its letter; for the new covenant has its letter as well as the old. On this point Dr. Clarke makes the following pertinent comment: {SITI August 5, 1889, p. 295.215}

“Every institution has its letter as well as its spirit; as every word must refer to something of which it is the sign or significator. The gospel has both its letter and its spirit, and multitudes of professing Christians, by resting in the letter, receive not the life which it is calculated to impart. Water, in baptism, is the letter that points out the purification of the soul; they who rest in this letter are without this purification; and dying in that state, they die eternally. Bread and wine in the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, are the letter; the atoning efficacy of the death of Jesus, and the grace communicated by this to the soul of the believer, are the spirit. Multitudes rest in this letter, simply receiving these symbols without reference to the atonement or to their guilt; and thus lose the benefit of the atonement and the salvation of their souls.... It may be safely asserted that the Jews in no period of their history ever rested more in the letter of their law than the vast majority of Christians are doing in the letter of their gospel. Unto multitudes of Christians Christ may truly say, Ye will not come unto me that ye may have life.” {SITI August 5, 1889, p. 472.1}

In the above quotation it is shown that the letter of the new covenant kills; but the reason why it kills will be made plain after we have made a brief comparison of the two covenants. These two covenants with their ministrations are brought to view in contrast in verses 7 and 8, which read thus:- {SITI August 5, 1889, p. 472.2}

“But if the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away; how shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious?” {SITI August 5, 1889, p. 472.3}

In this verse the old covenant is called the “ministration of death.” Why it was so called is very apparent to one who understands what the old covenant was. We will state it briefly. Before the Lord gave the ten commandments from Mount Sinai, he said to the Jews:- {SITI August 5, 1889, p. 472.4}

“Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles’ wings, and brought you unto myself. Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people; for all the earth is mine; and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel.” Exodus 19:4-5. {SITI August 5, 1889, p. 472.5}

On the third day after this, the Lord spoke the ten commandments in the hearing of all the people: “and he added no more; and he wrote them in two tables of stone.” Deuteronomy 5:22. Then Moses went up to the Lord in the mount, and the Lord gave to him precepts growing out of the ten commandments. See Exodus 21, 22 and 23. The confirmation of the covenant, the preliminaries of which are given in Exodus 19:5-8, is related in Exodus 24:3-8. There learn that, {SITI August 5, 1889, p. 472.6}

“Moses came and told the people all the words of the Lord, and all the judgments; and all the people answered with one voice, and said, All the words which the Lord hath said will we do.” After this “Moses wrote all the words of the Lord;” and after he had built an altar and offered sacrifices, and read in the audience of the people; and they said, All that the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient.” Then “Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it on the people, and said, Behold, the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words.” Thus was the covenant confirmed. We learn from this that the old covenant was simply an agreement between God and the children of Israel, concerning the commandments of God. The people on their part promised faithfully to keep the commandments, and the Lord promised to make of them a great nation. {SITI August 5, 1889, p. 472.7}

In connection with this covenant there were “ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary,” Hebrews 9:1. This sanctuary is described in Exodus 25; 26, 27, and 30, and the principal “ordinances of divine service,” are described in Exodus 29:38-42, and Leviticus, chapters 4 and 16. With these facts before us, we may understand why the ministration of the first covenant was called a “ministration of death.” {SITI August 5, 1889, p. 472.8}

(1) In this covenant the people had made an explicit agreement to keep the law of God. (2) By this law is the knowledge of sin (Romans 3:20), “for sin is the transgression of the law.” 1 John 3:4. (3) The “ordinances of divine service” connected with the first covenant were for sin; but Paul tells us (Hebrews 10:4) that “it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins.” Those “ordinances of divine service” were only “a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things,” and therefore the sacrifices which the people offered had no power to make them perfect. Therefore (4) all who had to do with the old covenant alone were condemned to death; “for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God” (Romans 3:23); “and the wages of sin is death.” Romans 6:23. There was in the old covenant no provision for the forgiveness of sins; therefore the ministration of that old covenant, which was performed by earthly priests, was, so far as their work extended, the ministration of death. Only the perfect can have life, and their ministration made nothing perfect. {SITI August 5, 1889, p. 472.9}

It is true that during the time of the ministration of the old covenant, sins were forgiven (Leviticus 4:26, 31, 35), and this forgiveness was real, but it was obtained solely by virtue of faith in the promised sacrifice of Christ, and not because of anything in the old covenant. Paul says of Christ, in Hebrews 9:15, that “he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, *for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament*, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance.” Thus we see that when sins committed under the first covenant were forgiven, they were forgiven by virtue of the second covenant. {SITI August 5, 1889, p. 472.10}

Some stumble over the first clause of 2 Corinthians 3:7, “The ministration of death, written and engraven in stones,” but the Scriptures furnish means for the complete exposition of this. Paul cannot mean that the ministration was written and engraven in stones, for that would be impossible, because the ministration was the service of the priests. Then it must be that he means that death was written and engraven in stones. But some will say, “This makes nonsense of the text.” Let us see. It is very easy to ascertain what was written and engraven in stone. Exodus 31:18 says that the Lord “gave to Moses, when he had made an end of communing with him upon Mount Sinai, two tables of testimony, tables of stone, written with the finger of God.” “And Moses turned, and went down from the mount, and the two tables of the testimony were in his hand. The tables were written on both their sides; on the one side and on the other were they written. And the tables were the work of God, and the writing was the writing of God, graven upon the tables.” Exodus 32:15, 16. These two tables were broken, and after Moses had, by the command of the Lord, made two other tables, he said, “And he [the Lord] wrote on the tables, according to the first writing, the ten commandments, which the Lord spake unto you in the mount, out of the midst of the fire, in the day of the assembly.” Deuteronomy 10:4. These texts show that it was the ten commandments, and the ten commandments alone, that were written and engraven in stones; and therefore by the word “death,” in 2 Corinthians 3:7, Paul must refer to the ten commandments. {SITI August 5, 1889, p. 472.11}

But is it allowable to speak of the ten commandments as “death”? Are they death to anybody? It certainly is allowable, for they are death to all men, because all have sinned, and the “wages of sin is death.” The law is the cause of death to every sinner that shall perish, and so by metonymy it is called death. In like manner the sons of the prophets said of the poisonous gourds, “There is death [*i.e*., a cause of death] in the pot” (2 Kings 4:40); and the Lord said that “the tree of the field is man’s life” (sustainer of life). Deuteronomy 20:19. So when Paul describes his conviction as a sinner, he says of the law, “And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death.” Romans 7:10. {SITI August 5, 1889, p. 472.12}

Thus we find that in every case of the word, the ministration of the old covenant was “the ministration of death.” We have found, then (1) that the law, which was the basis of the covenant, was death to all, and (2) that the ministration concerning that violated law offered no relief, but in itself tended to death. {SITI August 5, 1889, p. 472.13}

Notwithstanding all this, there was a wonderful glory connected with the old covenant and its service. The giving of the law was attended with glory the like of which has never been seen on earth before or since, and will not be until the Lord shall come in the glory of his Father with all his angels. When Moses returned from the mount, his face was so glorified that the people could not look at it; and the glory of the Lord was present in the sanctuary to so great a degree that the priests were forced to obscure it with a cloud of incense, lest they should die. E. J. W. {SITI August 5, 1889, p. 472.14}

(*Concluded next week*.)

**“Exposition of 2 Corinthians 3:7-11. (Concluded.)” The Signs of the Times, 15, 31.**

E. J. Waggoner

(*Concluded*.)

Now let us briefly outline the new covenant. Paul says that this was established upon “better promises.” Its terms are found in Hebrews 8:8-12, which reads thus:- {SITI August 12, 1889, p. 472.15}

“For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord. For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people; and they shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest.For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more.” {SITI August 12, 1889, p. 472.16}

We find here the same condition as in the old covenant,-the people are to obey the law of God. But this covenant is established on “better promises” than the first, in that the Lord promises to forgive their sins, to write the law in their hearts, and to remember their iniquities no more. These things are all accomplished by virtue of Christ, who is the mediator of the new covenant. Hebrews 8:9; 9:15. “The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin” (1 John 1:7), by securing the remission of past sins (Romans 3:24, 25), and enabling us to walk in harmony with the law. Galatians 2:20; Ephesians 2:10; Hebrews 13:20, 21. {SITI August 12, 1889, p. 472.17}

The law, then, is the basis of both covenants; hence it could not be done away with the old covenant, else there could be no new covenant. The terms of the new covenant leave no doubt on this point, and Christ’s connection with it brings the fact out still more clearly. Thus Christ is the minister of this new covenant (Hebrews 8:1, 2), and is now performing the ministration in the true sanctuary in heaven. Hebrews 9:24. His ministration has reference to the law, for he came to save sinners (1 Timothy 1:15), and he is offering his blood to save men from sin. Romans 3:24; 1 John 1:7; Matthew 1:21. This redemption we get through faith (Romans 3:24), and faith establishes the law. Romans 3:31. The law itself, having been violated, brings death; Christ redeems us from its curse (Galatians 3:13), and thus becomes our life. Colossians 3:4. {SITI August 12, 1889, p. 472.18}

Now note the contrast between the two covenants. The first had the ministration of death, because everything connected with it tended to death; the violated law was death to the sinner, and the earthly ministration freed no one from that condemnation. The second covenant has the ministration of the Spirit, because “the Lord is that Spirit” (2 Corinthians 3:17), and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty and life. Galatians 6:8. But although there is no death in the second covenant, there is in the rejection of it, for the law is still death to sinners, and all who are opposed to Christ are sinners, and condemned to death; so Paul says that the letter of the new covenant kills. The reason is that holding the mere letter of the new covenant,-the performance of the gospel ordinances while not receiving Christ in the heart,-is really a rejection of Christ. Of the Lord’s Supper, Paul says that he who does not discern the Lord’s body, eats and drinks damnation to himself. 1 Corinthians 11:20. He is in the same condition as though he had never heard of the new covenant. But in every case, whether of the sinner under the old covenant, or of one who rejects the new, it is the law that causes his death. {SITI August 12, 1889, p. 472.19}

In the text under consideration Paul contrasts the two ministrations as to glory. If the ministration which could not cleanse from sin, was glorious, the ministration of the Spirit, which gives freedom from sin, must be more glorious. “If the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory.” And so much more glorious is the ministration of the second covenant than that of the first, that in comparison the first covenant seems to have had no glory. Why the ministration of the second covenant should be so much ore glorious than that of the first, is because it is established upon “better promises,” and Christ is its minister. {SITI August 12, 1889, p. 472.20}

“For if that which is done away was glorious, much more than which remaineth is glorious.” 2 Corinthians 3:11. Now what was done away? The answer must be that it is that which was glorious. Verse 9 states that it was the *ministration* of condemnation that was glorious. Then it must be the *ministration* of condemnation that was done away; that which remains is the ministration of the Spirit. By no possibility can verse 11 be made to refer to the law, because it contrasts something done away with something that remains. And we have found that the law is the basis of both covenants, and therefore it cannot have been done away but the *ministration* of the old covenant as well as the covenant itself was done away, as was indicated by the fading glory upon the countenance of Moses. But it needs no abstract reasoning to show that it is the tabernacle service, and that alone, to which the apostle refers in verse 11 as being “done away,” for he says, “if that which is done away was glorious,” showing by the “if” that he had before called attention to something glorious; and the only thing which he has so designated in this connection, is the *ministration* of death. Verse 7. {SITI August 12, 1889, p. 472.21}

We think that any reader who carefully follows this brief exposition will be able to see for himself, on reading 2 Corinthians 3:7-11 that the apostle is simply contrasting the glory of the *service* of the two covenants, and that the law of God is not under consideration at all, except by an incidental allusion which goes to show its permanent character. E. J. W. {SITI August 12, 1889, p. 472.22}

**“Faith and Humility” The Signs of the Times, 15, 32.**

E. J. Waggoner

“For I say, through the grace given unto me, to every man that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think; but to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith.” Romans 12:3. This text indicates that the greater a man’s faith is, the less will he think of himself. As the apostle expresses it, he will “think soberly.” Pride is intoxication. Just as alcohol stimulates a man without building him up, and finally deprives him of reason, so a man, to use a common expression, “loses his head” when he gets to hunting for the good traits in his character. And withal pride, like alcohol, furnishes no nourishment with which to build a man up. If a man is to grow strong, he must receive nourishment from a source outside of himself; but the vain person lives upon himself, and so becomes poorer by what he feeds upon. And as alcohol causes a man to stumble in his walk, and finally brings him to ruin, so “pride goeth before destruction, and a haughty spirit before a fall.” Proverbs 16:18. {SITI August 19, 1889, p. 472.23}

So the apostle well describes humility as thinking soberly. But why will a man live soberly, according to the measure of faith which he possesses? The answer is not difficult. Faith is that which justifies the sinner. Romans 5:1. If men were not sinful, they would have no need of faith. The only reason for having faith in Christ is to secure pardon for past sins, and freedom from the love of sin. No man will exercise faith in Christ unless he feels himself to be a sinner. It is the sense of sin, which comes by the law, that drives a man to Christ that he may be justified by faith. Therefore for a man to confess Christ, is to acknowledge himself a sinner. Great diseases call for great remedies; the weaker a man is, the more aid will have to be given him. So the more the man feels his sinful condition, the more faith in Christ will he exercise. Therefore it is true that great faith on the part of any person is an evidence that that person feels that he is by nature very weak and sinful, and that without Christ he is nothing. {SITI August 19, 1889, p. 472.24}

But such a feeling is in itself humility, which is nothing else but “a sense of one’s own unworthiness through imperfection and sinfulness.” Such a man estimates himself at his true value, which is nothing. And since faith in Christ cannot be exercised by any except those who “have no confidence in the flesh,” it follows that the man who walks by faith will be a humble man. It is only when Christians lose their sense of unworthiness, and begin to look upon themselves with complacency, that they lose faith. When the individual is nothing I his own eyes, Christ is everything; but when he begins to rise in his own estimation, Christ sinks out of sight. Nothing can produce true humility but a knowledge of one’s natural imperfections. {SITI August 19, 1889, p. 472.25}

In harmony with these ideas, and the text first quoted, are the words of the prophet Habbakuk: “Behold, his soul which is lifted up is not upright in him; but the just shall live by his faith.” Habakkuk 2:4. Faith and humility are inseparable. We ask again. Why does a man exercise faith in Christ? Simply because he feels a need of Christ; he has no confidence in his own strength, and feels that without Christ he must perish. It is not natural for the human heart to acknowledge another as superior. “The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked.” Independence, boastfulness, and self-conceit are natural to the human heart. But “if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature.” He became a new creature in consequence of acknowledging his wretched sinfulness, and pleading for mercy through Christ. This in itself was a humiliation of soul. Now, so long as he continues in that state of justification by faith, he must retain a sense of his own unworthiness, for by the law of faith boasting is excluded. {SITI August 19, 1889, p. 472.26}

Says the beloved disciples: “This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith.” 1 John 5:4. It is only as we exercise faith that God’s strength supplies our lack, and keeps us from falling. And since faith and humility are so closely joined together, Bunyan has beautifully written,- {SITI August 19, 1889, p. 472.27}

*“He that is down needs fear no fall;
He that is low, no pride;
He that is humble ever shall
Have God to be his guide.” {SITI August 19, 1889, p. 472.28}*

The man who is lifted up with pride and self-esteem must assuredly fall sooner or later, for the time will come when “the lofty looks of man shall be humbled,” and the Lord alone exalted; but the man who is down cannot fall, for he is already as low as he can be. But such an one shall not always be abased. The promise is, “Humble yourselves in the sight of the Lord, and he shall lift you up,” James 4:10. Not in their own estimation, not in the estimation of the world, will such be lifted up, but they will be raised up to sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus. Ephesians 2:6. {SITI August 19, 1889, p. 472.29}

“Thus saith the Lord, Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, neither let the mighty man glory in his might, let not the rich man glory in his riches; but let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me, that I am the Lord which exercise lovingkindness, judgment, and righteousness, in the earth: for in these things I delight, saith the Lord.” Jeremiah 9:23, 24. {SITI August 19, 1889, p. 472.30}

“But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption: That, according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord.” 1 Corinthians 1:30, 31. {SITI August 19, 1889, p. 472.31}

Therefore “God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world.” Galatians 6:14. E. J. W. {SITI August 19, 1889, p. 472.32}

 **“Extent of the Sabbath Commandment” The Signs of the Times, 15, 33.**

E. J. Waggoner

Although there is no limitation either in the Sabbath commandment as spoken from Mt. Sinai, or as recorded in Genesis 2:1-3, the fact that many claim that it was limited in its application, makes it necessary for us to consider the question, For whom was the Sabbath sanctified? or, in other words, who were commanded to keep the Sabbath holy? When we consider that the day was sanctified, *i.e.*, appointed or commanded, in Eden, there can be but one answer: The commandment was given to those then living. It is not possible that it could have been otherwise. But the account here is anticipative, and the holy Sabbath was then sanctified for the use of some future generation. For to every commandment there must be two parties; the one commanding and the one commanded. A command cannot be made unless someone is present to receive it. In this case God issued the command, and Adam and Eve were the ones to whom it was directed. But they represented all who should afterward live upon the earth. See Genesis 3:20. If follows, then, that the Sabbath commandment embraces the whole world; all who have descended from Adam and Eve. {SITI August 26, 1889, p. 472.33}

In harmony with this conclusion we have the words of our Saviour, in Mark 2:27. “The Sabbath was made for man.” This can mean nothing less than the whole human race, for the word “man,” when used without any limiting word, means “mankind; the totality of men.” When the word is limited, it means man to the exclusion of women; and no one will claim that the women of whatever race or class of people to whom the commandment is given are not under obligation to keep the Sabbath. No one will be found bold enough to claim that the word “man” in Mark 2:27 has a different meaning from what it has in Genesis 1:27; 2:7. {SITI August 26, 1889, p. 472.34}

It is also most evident from the Scriptures that God designed to have the Sabbath kept by all men in all parts of the world. Christ said that “the Sabbath was made for man,” and the inspired apostle declared that God “hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth.” Acts 17:26. The God who made the round earth, and made all men to dwell on all the face of it, also made the Sabbath for man-all men-to keep as his holy day. What further evidence is needed to show that God designs that “all men everywhere” should keep the Sabbath. {SITI August 26, 1889, p. 472.35}

This being the case, it is manifestly improper to speak of the Sabbath as the “Jewish Sabbath,” for it belongs to no special class of men. It belongs to no man at all, but is the property of God; he claims it as his own. See the commandment, also Isaiah 58:13. If men, regardless of the commandment, choose to rest on some other day, they may call it *their* Sabbath, or give it any name they please; but “the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord.” There is just as much difference between keeping man’s Sabbath and the Sabbath of the Lord as there is between worshiping man and worshiping God. {SITI August 26, 1889, p. 472.36}

We see that the commandment, as given at creation and renewed on Sinai, furnishes no warrant whatever to the idea that the Sabbath was to be local, or was given simply to the Jews. Not only this, but even in the Old Testament it is expressly stated that the Sabbath was not designed for the Jews alone. Thus we read: “Blessed is the man that doeth this, and the son of man that layeth hold on it; that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and keepeth his hand from doing any evil.... Also the sons of the stranger, that join themselves to the Lord, to serve him, and to love the name of the Lord, to be his servants, every one that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and taketh hold of my covenant; even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer; their burnt offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted upon mine altar; for mine house shall be called an house of prayer for all people.” Isaiah 56:2, 6, 7. {SITI August 26, 1889, p. 472.37}

The position of the commandment in the law of God is also enough of itself to convince anyone that it is binding upon all men. Even profane persons will admit that it is wrong to take God’s name in vain; and none claim that there is any privileged class who may swear with impunity. The fifth commandment is almost universally disregarded, yet no one thinks of asserting that its obligation does not extend to all mankind. The sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth are admitted to be of universal obligation, yet they are no more emphatic than the fourth, and the penalty for disregarding them is no more severe than that for violating the Sabbath commandment. {SITI August 26, 1889, p. 472.38}

It is true that the Sabbath rests solely on the commandment. This is urged by some as an objection. They say that it was always wrong to kill or to steal, but was not always wrong to break the Sabbath, since the Sabbath did not always exist. Hence they claim that the Sabbath is not moral. To this we reply (1) that the Sabbath has existed ever since day and night existed; (2) that God has always been the Supreme Being, and it always has been wrong to disobey him. Therefore, whenever he issues a command it is man’s moral duty to obey. (3) The Lord claims the Sabbath as his own; he calls it “my holy day;” he has set bounds about it, and forbidden man to trespass upon it; he warns us not to venture to take it for our own use. Now if we violate this commandment, we take that which is not our own, and are guilty of theft, a thing which is admitted by all to be immoral. Many other proofs might be adduced to show the morality of the fourth commandment. {SITI August 26, 1889, p. 472.39}

But although “the Sabbath was made for man,” it does not thereby become his property, to do with as he pleases. It was made for his use, not for his abuse. Paul, in 1 Corinthians 11:9, says that the woman was made for the man. He does not mean that she was made to be the slave of man, who could be taken or put away at his pleasure, as in heathen lands, but that she was made as a help, a blessing to man. So the Sabbath was made *for* man, *i.e.*, not against him; it was designed to aid him both spiritually and physically. A farmer who has hired servants may, in order to lighten their labor, buy certain tools for them. But no one would suppose that the servants would have any right to sell those tools which their employer had thus purchased. All would understand that he bought them for the servants to *use*, and to use in his service only. On this subject the “Speaker’s Commentary” uses the following forcible language:- {SITI August 26, 1889, p. 472.40}

“On what principle of legislation can it be maintain that, because law are imposed by the ruler for the benefit of the subject, therefore they may be dispensed with by the subject at his own convenience? This is utterly untenable as regards the laws of man; still more as regards the laws of God.” E. J. W. {SITI August 26, 1889, p. 472.41}