

THE
SEVENTH DAY OF THE WEEK
IS THE
SABBATH OF THE LORD.

"The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath; therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." Mark ii, 27, 28.

THE word *man*, when used in its broadest sense, means all mankind. "Man goeth forth unto his work and to his labor." Ps. civ, 23. "So man lieth down, and riseth not; till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep." Job xiv, 12. Labor and death is the lot of the entire fallen race. In this sense "the Sabbath was made for man"—for the entire race of mankind—Adam and all his posterity.

The Pharisees charged the disciples of our Lord with Sabbath-breaking, for simply plucking the "ears of corn" as they passed through the field on the Sabbath, and were hungry. See Matt. xii, 1. "Behold," said they, "why do they on the Sabbath-day that which is not lawful?" They mistook the real design of the Sabbath, and viewed the institution in a wrong light; as if man was made to serve the Sabbath; that it was a burden to him, and not adapted to his wants. This error our Lord corrects when he says, "The Sabbath was made for man,

and not man for the Sabbath." The Sabbath is perfectly adapted to man's condition. His physical and spiritual wants require rest and a day to devote to the special service of God.

The record of the institution of the Sabbath is in Gen. ii, 2, 3. "And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made, and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. 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."

Notice the order of the events of the first week of time. First, the creation in six days; second, God rested from the work of creation on the seventh day; and, third, he sanctified and blessed the day in which he had rested. It is evident that God resting on the seventh day did not make it holy; for after he had rested through the entire day, he *then* "blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because that in it he *had* rested." To sanctify is "to separate, set apart, or appoint to a holy, sacred, or religious use." In doing this to the seventh day, at the close of the first week of time, God made the Sabbath "for man."

"Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy. 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, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates." Ex. xx, 8-10. This is the great Sabbath law. It is associated with nine other moral precepts, whose perpetuity is universally acknowledged. It lies in the very bosom of the decalogue. We here call attention to several points of interest:—

1. Sabbath signifies Rest. Substitute the word Rest for Sabbath, and the commandment becomes very clear—"Remember the Rest-day to keep it holy. [Certainly some particular day is denoted; for it is *the* Rest-day, not a Rest-day.] Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Rest of the Lord thy God," &c. We have seen the record in Gen. ii, 2, 3, that God rested on the seventh day. That day, and no other day of the week, was his Rest-day. The fourth commandment requires that his Rest-day should be remembered and kept holy; therefore the seventh day, and no other day of the week, is the Rest, or Sabbath of the Lord our God. Those who would observe the first, or either of the other days of the week in which God wrought in the creation, may claim that they keep a rest-day; but it is not *the* Rest-day of the fourth commandment. *The* Rest-day of the Lord is the very day in which the Lord rested. Hence we see that the Sabbath law is based upon the events of the first week of time.

2. This commandment points back over a period of 2500 years to creation for the reasons, and the only reasons given in the Bible, for the institution of the Sabbath, which are as follows:—(1) "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, (2) and rested the seventh day; (3) wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day, and hallowed it." Verse 11. How natural the conclusion that the existence of the institution dates from, and runs parallel with, the given reasons why the institution should exist. How absurd the idea that the Jews were the only people whose attention should be called to God's work of

creation and his holy Rest! How much, rather, to be admired is the doctrine of the Lord:—"The Sabbath was made for man."

3. The fourth commandment declares that "the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day and hallowed it." When did God bless the seventh-day? At creation. Have we any record that he again hallowed it at a later period? None. Then what did God bless at creation? "The Sabbath-day." The great Law-giver here recognizes the seventh day as the Sabbath, and gives it this name, at the very time he sanctified and blessed it at the close of the first week.

The institution of the Sabbath at creation is not affected by the fact that there is no direct testimony respecting its observance recorded in the book of Genesis. Nor is it very strange when we consider that the history of nearly 2500 years is summed up in its fifty chapters, and that the life of him who was deemed worthy of translation is stated in the sentence: "Enoch walked with God; and he was not; for God took him." No direct mention is made in the book of Genesis of future punishment, the resurrection of the body, the revelation of the Lord in flaming fire, or of the judgment of the great day. Yet it is presumed that no one but a Universalist or a Sadducee would argue from this that these great doctrines were not believed by the Patriarchs. In the absence of direct testimony either way, it is by no means certain that "holy men of old" did not regard the Sabbath. But the fact that they reckoned time by weeks and by sevens of days [Gen. xxix, 27, 28; viii, 10, 12] is no small evidence that they did observe the Sabbath.

The reckoning of time by weeks is not derived from anything in nature. The division of time into months might be suggested by the phases of the moon, and the division into years by the returning seasons; but we look in vain to the natural world for something to which we may refer the origin of the custom of reckoning time by weeks. It can be traced to but one source; viz., the six days' work of creation, and the rest of the seventh.

The brief record of the first 2500 years of time touches only the great events of that period. And because the record of that period does not directly speak of the Sabbath, it is supposed by some that it did not then exist, but that it was only a Jewish institution, having its origin at Mount Sinai. We would respectfully call the attention of such to Ex. xvi, where the Sabbath is mentioned in connection with the giving of the manna.

The Lord said to Moses, "Behold, I will rain bread from heaven for you; and the people shall go out and gather a certain rate every day, that I may prove them, whether they will walk in my law, or no. And it shall come to pass that on the sixth day they shall prepare what they bring in; and it shall be twice as much as they gather daily." Verses 4, 5. On the sixth day the people gathered a double portion of manna. Then said Moses, "This is that which the Lord hath said, To-morrow 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. And on the seventh day, Moses said, "Eat that to-day; for to-day is a Sabbath unto the Lord; to-day ye shall not find it in the field.

Six days shall ye gather it; but on the seventh day, which is the Sabbath of the Lord, in it there shall be none. And it came to pass that there went out some of the people on the seventh day for to gather, and they found none. And the Lord said unto Moses, How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws? see, for that the Lord *hath given* you the Sabbath." Verses 23-29.

All this transpired thirty days before the children of Israel saw Mount Sinai. They departed from Egypt on the fifteenth day of the first month, and came to the wilderness of Sin, where the manna was given, on the fifteenth day of the second month. Ex. xvi, 1. They then journeyed to Rephidim, and then came to the desert of Sinai on the fifteenth day of the third month. Mark this:—The Lord said to Moses thirty days before the children of Israel saw Mount Sinai, where we are sometimes told that the Sabbath was instituted for the Jews alone, at the giving of the law, "How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws? see, for that the Lord [will give you the Sabbath in about a month? No.] *hath given* you the Sabbath." Thus we see that Ex. xvi, furnishes the best of evidence that the Sabbath had not its origin at Sinai. God and Moses speak of it as of an old institution. The children of Israel had been from the house of bondage, where they could not observe the Sabbath, only thirty days when the Lord called their attention to it, and guarded its observance by a three-fold miracle in giving the manna.

THE SABBATH A MEMORIAL

A memorial is that which serves to keep in memory. The Passover and Feast of unleavened bread were designed to call to mind the deliverance of the children of Israel from Egyptian bondage, and thus keep in memory their great Deliverer. The Lord's Supper and Baptism were given to remind the church of the death, burial and resurrection of Christ, and thus keep in memory our Lord and Master.

The Sabbath was designed to call to mind Jehovah's Rest on the seventh day, after he had created all things in six, and thus keep in memory the living God, the Creator of the heavens and the earth. It is the great safe-guard against Atheism and Idolatry. If men had always kept the Sabbath, they never could have forgotten God; never would have doubted the existence of the Creator, for this institution was designed to point them back to the time when *he* created the heavens and the earth. And they never would have worshiped other gods, for this institution points out the true God, who created all things in six days, and rested on the seventh.

The Sabbath, then, is a memorial of the living God. The institution is perfectly calculated to call the Creator of all things to mind, and keep him in perpetual remembrance. God wrought six days in the work of creation, and rested on the seventh day. The Sabbath law says, "Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath [Rest] of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." He who observes, and understandingly celebrates Jehovah's Rest-day in its weekly returns, is in a special manner led to contemplate his six days' work of creation. And as he

views the heavens above, and the earth beneath, and surveys the Creator's handy-works, his mind is led upward to the living God. Among all the holy institutions God has given to man, none is more sacred than the Sabbath. It stands in the very front. It is the mighty monument, reared at creation to point our race heavenward to the omnipotent God. It is the chord that binds finite man to the infinite God; the chain that links earth to heaven, and man to his Creator.

But we are told that the Sabbath was instituted for the Jews alone, to commemorate their deliverance from Egypt, and the following passage is cited as proof:—"And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched-out arm; therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath-day." Deut. v. 15.

Give this text all its meaning, and it utterly fails to prove what it is said to prove. Look at the circumstances under which it was spoken. While the children of Israel were slaves in Egypt, they could not keep the Sabbath, and God had stretched out his arm and brought them from the house of bondage where they could observe his Rest-day. Moses here refers to the time when the Lord commanded them to keep the Sabbath, at the giving of the manna, and does not mention one act by which God then made the Sabbath.

But thirty days later, God spake the Sabbath law in the audience of the people, and refers back to creation as the time when, and for the reasons why, the Sabbath was instituted, as follows:—"For [because].

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." Ex. xx, 11.

But the idea that the Sabbath can commemorate the deliverance of Israel from Egypt will not bear a moment's investigation. That deliverance had two yearly memorials, fit as to their character and time. The passover was a memorial of the destroying angel passing over the houses of Israel when he saw the blood of the lamb stamped upon their door-posts, as he went on his way to destroy the first-born of man and beast in all Egypt. As they prepared and ate the lamb in Egypt, so were they to do annually.

The feast of unleavened bread was a memorial of their sudden departure from Egypt. The destroying angel went on his way, and smote all the first-born in the land of Egypt, from the first-born of Pharaoh unto the first-born of the captive, and there was a great cry in Egypt. Pharaoh rose up in the night and called for Moses and Aaron, and said to them, "Rise up, and get you forth from among my people." "And the Egyptians were urgent upon the people, that they might send them out of the land in haste; for they said, We be all dead men." And the children of Israel "took their dough before it was leavened, their kneading troughs being bound up in their clothes upon their shoulders," and journeyed from Rameses to Succoth, and there "baked unleavened cakes of the dough which they brought forth out of Egypt, for it was not leavened; because they were thrust out of Egypt." The design of the feast of unleavened bread was to keep this circumstance in remembrance; for when their children

should inquire for the reason of this feast, they were to point them back to the time when their fathers were thrust out of Egypt at midnight, taking with them dough which they afterwards baked and ate, unleavened.

We will now take a view of their fitness as to time. The passover lamb was slain in Egypt on the fourteenth day of the month Abib. So was the passover observed; not weekly, nor monthly; but on the same day of the same month, annually. In like manner, as to time, was also the feast of unleavened bread observed. Here, then, are two memorials of the deliverance of Israel, perfectly fitting in their character, and as to their time.

Now we will see if the rest of the holy Sabbath also is a fit memorial of that event. The children of Israel left Egypt in haste. They were even thrust out by night. To say that such a rush could be commemorated by rest, is the very height of folly!! Again, that deliverance occurred on the fifteenth day of the first month; and as the fifteenth day of Abib came but once a year, the memorial of that deliverance could not be weekly, but annual.

But the Sabbath is indeed a memorial, and when correctly applied, its fitness to the event to be commemorated will be seen and admired. God *rested* (or ceased to create) after the six days of creation. Man is required to celebrate that rest by ceasing to labor. Rest commemorates rest. God rested on the seventh day of the first week. Man is required to rest the same day of every week.

PERPETUITY OF THE SABBATH.

We have seen that God laid the foundation of Sabbath by resting on the seventh day, placed the institution upon this foundation at creation when he sanctified his Rest-day and hallowed it, and that the fourth commandment points back to creation for the reasons of the institution; inseparably connecting the Sabbath with Jehovah's Rest on the seventh day.

Pass down through the period of the Prophets, and you will find the greatest blessings promised to those who should keep the Sabbath, and the greatest curses threatened for its desecration. Come to the period of the First Advent, and there you cannot find the least evidence that Christ removed the Sabbath from the foundation on which his Father had placed it. Instead of this, he styles himself "Lord of the Sabbath-day," and declares that it "was made for man." And when citing his disciples to the future, as far at least as the destruction of Jerusalem, he says:—"But pray ye that your flight be not in the Winter neither on the Sabbath-day." Matt. xxiv, 20. Our Lord here recognizes the existence of the Sabbath, as much so as the existence of the seasons of the year.

And lest some might get the idea that he had come to destroy his Father's law, or to alter some portion of it, he says:—"Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law." Matt. v, 17, 18.

It is true that the Pharisees accused our Lord of Sabbath-breaking: they also charged him with having a devil; but these charges did not make it

so in either case. We do not give as much credit to the testimony of those accusers and crucifiers of our Lord as some do. Jesus testifies :—"I have kept my Father's commandments." John xv. 10.

All the acts performed by our Saviour on the Sabbath were in accordance with the Sabbath law. We do not say that they were in accordance with the notions of the Pharisees. On one occasion when our Lord was in the synagogue, also the man with the withered hand, "they asked him, saying, Is it *lawful* to heal on the Sabbath-days? that they might accuse him. And he said unto them, What man shall there be among you, that shall have one sheep, and if it fall into a pit on the Sabbath-day, will he not lay hold on it, and lift it out? How much then is a man better than a sheep? Wherefore it is *lawful* to do well on the Sabbath-days. Matt. xii, 9-13. See also Luke xiv, 3-6.

Lawful, signifies agreeable to law. In these texts the word means, agreeable to the Sabbath law. When the Pharisees accused Christ of Sabbath-breaking, in healing the sick on that day, he referred them to acts of mercy which they would perform even to dumb beasts on that day, thus exposing their hypocrisy. He then declared such well-doing as merciful acts to man or beast on that day, *lawful*. Now who will take his stand with the Pharisees, and say that Christ's acts of healing on the Sabbath were unlawful? Who will stand with Christ when he declares them *lawful*? Christians should be on the side with Christ.

But we will trace this point still further. Those who teach a change of the Sabbath, date that change from Christ's resurrection. And those who teach

that there is no Sabbath, date its abrogation from his crucifixion. No one argues any change whatever in regard to the Sabbath prior to the death of Christ. They have to admit that the Sabbath law stood in all its binding force throughout his entire ministry. In fact, the assertion that the Sabbath was abolished at the cross, contains a virtual admission that it was in force up to the cross; for it would be folly to talk of abolishing a law not in force. Then to join the Pharisee and say that Christ transgressed this law when he healed the sick on the Sabbath, is virtually charging him with being a sinner; "for sin is the transgression of the law." 1 John iii, 4. But as "in him was no sin," he did not transgress the law. We have a better sacrifice for sin, than that of a transgressor. Praise his name.

That Christ never taught his followers that any change was to take place in regard to the Sabbath, is evident from the course pursued by the holy women who "followed after, and beheld the sepulchre," and how the body of their Lord was laid. "They returned and prepared spices and ointments, and rested the Sabbath-day according to the commandment," [Luke xxiii, 55, 56,] then "upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulchre, bringing the spices which they had prepared," to embalm their Lord. Chap. xxiv, 1.

The Son of God, then, left the Sabbath on the same foundation on which the eternal Father placed it. By healing the sick on that day, and by declaring what was "lawful" to be done on that day, he stripped from the institution the garb of tradition which the blind Jew had thrown around it, and left it standing on its own basis—the fourth commandment.

The writers of the four Gospels, who wrote at different periods after the ascension of Christ, all speak of the Sabbath as then existing, and of the first day of the week as quite another thing. These faithful men, aided by the Holy Ghost to record the most important events that this fallen world ever witnessed, most certainly hand down to us the very views they held of those two days at the time they wrote the Gospels. Not one of those four writers give the least intimation that any change had taken place in regard to the Sabbath. If so important an event as the change, or the abrogation of the Sabbath, occurred at our Lord's first advent, they would not have failed to record it.

The same distinction between the Sabbath and the first day of the week is also kept up in the book of Acts. The Sabbath is mentioned as still existing, and the first day of the week is spoken of as another day. "And when the Jews were gone out of the synagogue, the *Gentiles* besought that these words might be preached to *them* the next Sabbath. And the next Sabbath-day came almost the whole city together to hear the word of God." Acts xiii, 42, 44.

Here are some things worthy of special notice. It was the Gentiles, not the Jews, that invited Paul to preach to them on the Sabbath. If Paul taught the people that the Sabbath was a Jewish institution, and that it had been abolished, it seems really unaccountable that the Gentiles, who were entirely disconnected with the Jewish religion, should request him to preach to them on the Sabbath. It is evident that the reason why they invited Paul to preach to them on the Sabbath, was because they knew he regarded the seventh day as the Sabbath of the Lord.

If that request of the Gentiles had been made to a modern preacher, he might have replied, You need not wait till another Jewish Sabbath. To-morrow is the Lord's day. We will preach to you to-morrow. And if, as Doctors of Divinity teach, it was the design of Heaven that the observance of the first day of the week should rest upon "apostolic example" alone, what an excellent chance the Apostle had to set the example in the city of Antioch, when the people were so very anxious to hear, and were in a good state to receive right impressions. But instead of setting an example favoring the first day of the week, the Apostle entirely overlooked it, and the poor Gentiles had to wait till the Sabbath came round!

But was it the Apostle's manner to preach on the Sabbath? "And Paul, *as his manner was*, went in unto them, and three Sabbath-days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures." Acts xvii, 2. "And he reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks. Chap. xviii, 4.

It is sometimes said that the only reason why Paul preached on the Sabbath, was because the Jews were assembled in their synagogues on that day. But this is not true; for we find the Apostle and his companions preaching elsewhere besides in the synagogues, on the Sabbath. "And on the Sabbath we went out of the city by a *river side, where prayer was wont to be made*; and we sat down, and spake unto the women which resorted thither." Acts xvi, 13.

If that meeting by the *river side* had been on the first day of the week, then the advocates of the first day might with some degree of propriety talk of apostolic example for observing that day. But there is

no record in the New Testament of a public meeting of the Apostles in the day-time of the first day of the week.

While Paul was a prisoner at Rome, he called the chief of the Jews together and said unto them, "Men and brethren, though I have committed nothing against the people, or customs of our fathers, yet was I delivered prisoner from Jerusalem into the hands of the Romans." Acts xxviii, 17.

If the Apostle had taught the people any change whatever in regard to the Sabbath, his testimony would have been denied by those Jews, and he would have been silenced at once. But instead of this, it is said of him in verses 30, 31, "And Paul dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, no man forbidding him."

The Apostles, then, regarded the Sabbath as resting on the very foundation where Jehovah had placed it at creation, and where his Son Jesus Christ had left it. Whatever weight may be given to their example in regard to the Sabbath, as far as New-Testament writers have spoken, it is all on the side of the seventh day. But God has never left his people to be directed in any important duty with only the example of even inspired men. There is a plain precept for every duty which he requires at our hand. The Sabbath precept is indeed plain. The teachings of our Lord as to the Sabbath, by precept and example, were also plain. And the example of the holy Apostles was in accordance with the testimony of the Father and the Son. Amen.

OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

FIRST OBJECTION.—The Sabbath cannot now be observed as the Jews were required to keep it. The law required them to remain in their houses on that day. “Abide ye every man in his place, let no man go out of his place on the seventh day.” Ex. xvi, 29.

ANSWER.—Probably there is no reader of the Holy Scriptures who really believes that God required the whole Jewish nation, for 1600 years, to remain in their houses through the entire Sabbath of twenty-four hours, yet this objection is often repeated. We will here state a few facts:—

1. The text quoted [Ex. xvi, 29] is no part of the great Sabbath law written with the finger of God in the tables of stone. Ex. xx, 8–11.

2. The text had direct reference to the children of Israel going out to gather manna on the Sabbath, after they had been told that on the seventh day none would be found in the field. Ex. xvi, 23–29. And it is decidedly wrong to quote this by-law, given to the Israelites under such circumstances, as the great law of the Sabbath.

3. The law that came from God through Moses required them to go out of their houses on the Sabbath. First, they observed *all* the offerings on the Sabbath that they did on the other six days, also two lambs, with a meat-offering and a drink-offering. Num. xxviii, 9, 10. Second, they had on the Sabbath a “holy convocation” or religious assembly, [Lev. xxiii, 3,] therefore they could not remain in their houses on that day.

Now we ask, Did the law which God gave to the

Jews, relative to ordinances, oblige them to break his holy Sabbath? Never! It would make God the veriest tyrant in the universe to cause Sabbath-breakers to be stoned to death, and at the same time give the Jews a system of religion that compelled them to break the Sabbath!!

4. After the children of Israel had passed over Jordan, they went round the city of Jericho with the ark of God seven successive days. One of those days was the Sabbath. It is evident, then, that Ex. xvi, 29, referred only to the case of the manna. The act of going round Jericho on the Sabbath with the ark, was not a violation of the Sabbath law contained in the ark.

SECOND OBJECTION.—The Jews were not allowed to gather sticks to kindle a fire on the Sabbath, and it is not possible to keep the day as strictly as they were required to.

ANSWER—The great universal Sabbath law, the fourth commandment, does not mention gathering sticks, or kindling fires. We have the account [Num. xv, 32–37] that “while the children of Israel were in the wilderness, they found a man that gathered sticks upon the Sabbath-day;” but we are not told for what purpose he gathered them.

The Israelites were commanded to cook on the sixth day the manna to be eaten on the seventh. To have kindled fires on the Sabbath to wash their clothes or cook their manna, would have been doing on the Sabbath the work of one of the six laboring days. They had no need of fires on the Sabbath. They were in a mild climate; their food was rained down from heaven, and their clothes were miraculously preserved. “There was not one feeble person

among their tribes." Ps. cv, 37. For them, under such circumstances, to have kindled a fire on the Sabbath, would have been an open violation of the Sabbath law.

We are differently situated. We live in an age when the race has become comparatively feeble, and in the cold season of the year we would kindle a fire on the Sabbath as an act of mercy and necessity, the same as we would water an ox or a horse, or lift a sheep from a pit. Such acts, the "Lord of the Sabbath" pronounced "*lawful*." But it is evidently wrong, and a violation of the Sabbath, to neglect to make those necessary preparations for the rest of the holy Sabbath which can be consistently made on the sixth day. The Sabbath law forbids our doing on the seventh day that which can be done on the sixth, and also what is not really an act of mercy and necessity. The Sabbath law did not oblige the Jews to suffer either cold or hunger; neither does it us, for "the law is holy, just and good."

THIRD OBJECTION.—The law of the Sabbath required that the Sabbath-breaker should be stoned to death; and the same penalty should now be inflicted if the law exists.

ANSWER.—We call attention to the following facts:

1. The fourth commandment does not mention stoning the Sabbath-breaker.

2. Temporal death never was the full and final penalty for breaking the law of God. For if it was, then he who murdered, blasphemed, or broke the Sabbath, under the Jewish economy, only had to be stoned to death to satisfy the law. And in the judgment his sin cannot appear against him; for the law was fully satisfied when he suffered temporal death. But the penalty of God's law was, and still

is, Eternal Death. "Sin is the transgression of the law," and "the wages [penalty] of sin is death."

3. Temporal death was also inflicted upon the Israelites if they transgressed others of the commandments of God beside the fourth. Read Lev. xxiv, 11-16. Here the son of the Israelitish woman "blasphemed the name of the Lord, and cursed," and the Lord said, "Let all the congregation stone him." He broke the third commandment. And it will be seen by comparing Num. xv, 32-36, with Lev. xxiv, 11-16, that he who broke the fourth commandment, and he that broke the third, shared the same fate. Is the third commandment still binding? "Certainly," says the objector, "the commandment, 'Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain,' is binding with all its force." We ask, Should the blasphemer now be stoned to death? The objector will have to acknowledge that although the third commandment is binding in this dispensation, the gospel does not inflict temporal death on the blasphemer. In the Jewish dispensation there was no atonement that could reach his case, therefore he was stoned to death, and removed from Israel. But under the gospel, the atoning blood of Christ can reach his case, and wash away the sin of blasphemy, so mercy now pleads for the transgressor of the third commandment, that he may be spared, that he may repent of the sin of blasphemy and live. This is just the position we would take in regard to the fourth commandment. And we may now see why the Apostle called the gospel covenant the *better covenant*. Mercy now pleads for the Sabbath-breaker, that he may be spared, turn from his sin, find pardon and live. In this respect the ministra-

tion of God's law under the gospel, far excels [2 Cor. iii] the ministration of condemnation and death, under the Jewish economy.

FOURTH OBJECTION.—Deut. v, 2, 3, shows that the Sabbath was made for the Jews alone. "The Lord our God made a covenant with us in Horeb. The Lord made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day." If the covenant mentioned here is the ten commandments, then the Sabbath was not made for the fathers, but only for the Jews.

ANSWER.—Let us see if this view of the text does not prove too much for the objector. Admitting that the ten commandments are this "covenant," therefore the duty to keep the Sabbath was not binding on the fathers, does it not prove that the duties enforced by the other nine commandments also were not binding on the fathers? Abraham, then, could disregard the seventh day, because the covenant was not made with the fathers, and Isaac and Jacob could have other gods, bow down to graven images, take the name of the Lord in vain, kill, commit adultery, steal, bear false witness and covet, for the same reason, that the covenant was not made with the fathers!!!

Thirty days before the children of Israel saw Mount Sinai, where the covenant was made, God gave the following rebuke: "How long refuse ye to keep my *commandments* and my *laws*? see, for that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath." This shows that God's commandments and laws, embracing the Sabbath, existed before this covenant was made in Horeb, therefore Deut. v, 2, 3, proves nothing against the Sabbath. The covenant referred to was the mu-

tual agreement between the children of Israel and the Lord, [Ex. xix,] the ten commandments [Ex. xx] being the moral conditions of the covenant.

FIFTH OBJECTION.—The word Sabbath is not found in the Bible until after the account of the children of Israel leaving Egypt; so it was not instituted at creation, but at Sinai when the law was given.

ANSWER.—The entire record of about 2500 years from creation is contained in the first fifty-two chapters of the Bible. Only the most important events from creation to the deliverance of Israel from Egypt are noticed, therefore it is no marvel that we do not find the word Sabbath. But what seems really remarkable is that at a later period, even when the Sabbath-breaker was stoned to death, we do not find the word Sabbath in the Sacred Record for more than 500 years.

It is recorded [Gen. ii, 2, 3] that God rested on the seventh day, and that he sanctified and blessed his Rest-day. The fourth commandment points back to what God did *on* the seventh day, and *to* the seventh day, as the only reasons why the Sabbath was instituted. But this fact alone, that God and Moses speak of the Sabbath in a familiar style one month before Israel saw Sinai, is perfectly destructive of the idea that it was instituted at the giving of the law.

SIXTH OBJECTION.—Christ is our example, and he broke the Sabbath.

ANSWER.—We will first notice the Sabbath law. "Six days shalt thou labor and do all *thy work*," that is, labor necessary to this life. "But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work;" that is, cease from the toil of the six days, and engage in the special service

of God. It may be said of the priests who offered unto the Lord on the Sabbath all the usual daily offerings, and two-lambs extra, that they labored; but what God required them to do on the Sabbath was not what the fourth commandment calls "labor," and "thy work." When Christ was accused of Sabbath-breaking he justified himself on the ground that what he did on the Sabbath was "lawful." His merciful acts on that day cannot with the least propriety be classed with what the Sabbath law calls "labor," and "thy work;" but rather, let those acts be classed with the ministration of the priests in holy things on that day. It is true that Christ declared his disciples "guiltless" in plucking the corn and eating it on the Sabbath. But it is said of them that they "were an hungered;" and where has God forbidden eating on the Sabbath to satisfy hunger? Nowhere.

Christ said to the impotent man whom he healed on the Sabbath, [John v, 8,] "Rise, take up thy bed and walk." Two of the Prophets speak against bearing burdens on the Sabbath; but they refer to burdens of merchandise, such as "sheaves, wine, grapes and figs," [Jer. xvii; Neh. xiii,] which were brought into Jerusalem to sell. Now let the objector compare conveying burdens of merchandise to market to sell for worldly gain, with the healed man with his bed praising God, and he may see the difference. One was labor for worldly gain, while the other was for the glory of God. One was a violation of the Sabbath law, but the other was an act of mercy which manifested the power of God.

SEVENTH OBJECTION. The commandment to keep the Sabbath is not given in the New Testament, therefore it is not a Christian duty to keep it.

ANSWER.—It is true that the fourth commandment is not given over a second time in the New Testament; neither is the second, but this falls far short of proving that Christians are released from the duties enjoined by those commandments. If it be said that we have in the New Testament that which is equivalent to the second commandment, then we cite Matt. xxiv, 20; Luke xxiii, 55, 56; Acts xiii, 42, 44; xvi, 13; xvii, 2; xviii, 4, where the Sabbath is mentioned as existing in the gospel.

Not one of the ten commandments is given in the New Testament on a new account, or given as a new law. Christ, Paul, John and James, refer to them as a whole, and have quoted some of them; but they speak of them as the original law of God. And why should a second edition of the Sabbath law be given in the New Testament unless the original [Ex. xx, 8–11,] were abolished? When the objector will prove by plain testimony that the first edition of the fourth commandment has been abolished, then we will either show a second edition from the New Testament, or give up the Sabbath. We teach the Sabbath of the Bible. Let those who assert that it is abolished, produce one plain text to prove their assertion. This is a reasonable request. Will they produce the text? We want none of their inferences from Rom. xiv; Col. ii, 14–17, which have been a hundred times repeated. They should not be allowed in a case like this. God gave the Sabbath law in the plainest language possible; and no man should be convinced that it has been abolished, unless he can find testimony as positive and plain, coming from as high authority.

Rom. xiv, does not mention the Sabbath. But

the objector *infers* that the expression "every day alike," [verse 5,] embraces the seventh-day Sabbath. So we might infer from the phrase "him that eateth not," [verse 3,] that a portion of the Christian church in Paul's day lived without eating. Or from the phrase, "gather a certain rate *every day*," [Ex. xvi, 4,] that God commanded the Israelites to gather manna on the Sabbath, when there was none rained from heaven on that day. The Apostle's subject relates to the Jewish notions of eating, which troubled Gentile believers. And how perfectly natural that Paul is here speaking of feast days. And how very unnatural the inference that in his remarks he is mixing up "meat," "drink," "herbs," and seventh-day Sabbath all together.

Col. ii, speaks of sabbath-days, or sabbaths. Lev. xxiii, shows seven Jewish sabbaths, to be celebrated at their appointed times, "*besides the Sabbaths of the Lord.*" See-verse 37, 38. Here the distinction between the two kinds of sabbaths is seen. Paul, in Col. ii, refers to those sabbaths which are classed with "meat," "drink," "new moon" &c, and not to *the Sabbath* which the Law-giver has wisely associated with nine moral precepts.

Behold the display of Divine Power at the giving of the ten commandments. The smoke ascended from Mount Sinai as the smoke of a great furnace; the lightnings flashed, and the thunders of Jehovah rolled down its base. God had descended upon it in awful grandeur to speak in the ears of all the people the ten precepts of his holy law. These precepts were of such a character, of such vast importance, that the great Law-giver did not leave them for man to write; but with his finger engraved them

in tables of stone. Behold them placed in the beautiful ark, overlaid and inlaid with the purest gold. Mark well the victories won by Israel when with the ark of God they crossed Jordan, marched around Jericho, and went forth to battle. See the ark put in the Most Holy of the earthly Sanctuary. It was the center of their religious system, it was the glory of Israel. The fourth commandment was in the ark. And how preposterous the supposition that the Almighty, through his Son Jesus Christ, should abolish his Sabbath, without giving one plain testimony to the fact in the Book of Inspiration. What presumption for men to go on in violation of the fourth commandment, and risk their eternal salvation upon mere inference!! May God help the objector to feel the force of the truth we are here stating.

Now, if the Lord's Sabbath has been abolished, where have the Prophets foretold the event? "Surely the Lord God will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the Prophets." Amos iii, 7. As none of the Prophets have foretold the abolition of the Sabbath, and as none of the Apostles have recorded such an event, we are certain that no such event ever occurred.

EIGHTH OBJECTION.—Paul says that "the ministration of death written and engraven in stones" was abolished; therefore the Sabbath is abolished.

ANSWER.—It will be observed that if this chapter teaches the abolition of the Sabbath, it teaches that all ten of the commandments also are abolished. The Apostle here speaks of two ministrations. He is contrasting the ministration of the law of God under Moses, (which was a ministration of condemnation and death) with the ministration of the same

law under the gospel, (which is the ministration of the Spirit.) It is the ministration of death that is done away, to give place to the more glorious ministration of God's law, called the ministration of the Spirit. A law is one thing, and the ministration of that law is quite another thing.

But we would inquire, Why should all ten of the commandments of God be slain at the cross, even if it was necessary to abolish the fourth? All agree that nine are good, yea, indispensable for the gospel dispensation. Was it an oversight in the Law-giver in placing the Sabbath in the midst of nine moral precepts? And did he have to slay the whole ten in order to get rid of the Sabbath? But if all ten were abolished at the cross, how is it that nine are still binding? "Why," says the objector, "nine of them were re-enacted by Christ for the gospel." But here is a serious difficulty; the objector has nine of the commandments re-enacted during Christ's ministry, before the ten were abolished at his death!!!

If it be said that the apostles re-enacted nine of the commandments for the gospel after their Lord ascended and the Holy Spirit was poured out upon them, we reply that according to this view there was a space between the abolition of the ten, at the cross, and the re-enactment of the nine; a space when there was no law, consequently, no transgression, and men might blaspheme, murder, &c., and not commit sin!!! But if the objector takes the ground that the nine commandments were re-enacted at the cross at the time when he thinks the ten were abolished, then we shall understand him that Heaven aimed a blow that killed all ten of the commandments, and that the same blow, at the same moment, brought nine of them to

life again!! And all this to get rid of the Sabbath which Christ says was made for man.

We will now illustrate the objector's position by a simple figure. Let his ten fingers and thumbs represent the ten commandments. His fore finger on his right hand represents the Sabbath law. This finger has served him well, but now it is diseased, and past cure, and in his way while attempting to labor. It is against him, contrary to him, and he decides to call a surgeon and have it cut off and taken out of the way. The surgeon comes and pronounces the finger past cure. He tells him, that in all his future life, nine will be sufficient. The surgeon cuts off all of his fingers and thumbs. He then lays aside the diseased finger, and sets himself at work joining on the other nine for the objector's benefit during his future life. What a foolish surgeon! And with what folly does the no-Sabbath system charge the all-wise God. We leave the objector to his reflections.

NINTH OBJECTION.—Christ is our law-giver, and he never commanded the observance of the Sabbath.

ANSWER.—Christ did not come to legislate, but to teach his Father's commandments; to "magnify the law, and make it honorable." "Jesus answered them and said, My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me." John vii, 16. "The word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's which sent me." Chap. xiv, 24. "As my Father hath taught me, I speak these things." Chap. viii, 28; xii, 49, 50.

Says the Apostle, "There is one Law-giver who is able to save, and to destroy." James iv, 12. Who is this law-giver? Let another Apostle answer. "If any man sin, [transgress the law,] we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the right-

eous." 1 John ii, 1. If Christ is our law-giver, who is our advocate? We have none! But God the Father is our Law-giver, and Christ is our Advocate.

TENTH OBJECTION.—As the day does not begin at the same time on all parts of the world, east and west, it is not possible for all the inhabitants of the world to keep the same hours for the Sabbath.

ANSWER.—The Sabbath law requires the observance of the *seventh day*. God gave the sun to rule the day. At noon, (an easily ascertained point of time,) the twenty-four-hour day is three-fourths past. The seventh day, governed by the sun which is God's great time-keeper, comes in Palestine six or seven hours sooner than in the State of New York. It can be kept there when it arrives, so can it here.

But if the Sabbath law requires that the same identical twenty-four hours should be kept, instead of the *seventh day*, how could the Jews, scattered east and west in the land of Palestine keep it? They would find precisely the same difficulty that the inhabitants of the world around would.

Let not the advocates of the first day of the week urge this objection; for their first day is affected by it as much as the seventh. If they assert that God's law requires no particular day, but only a seventh portion of time, we reply, then let them cease talking of commemorating redemption, by keeping the first day, which they say was completed at the resurrection of Christ on the first day of the week. Did Christ rise from the dead on some day of the week, and no day in particular!!! Their own profession binds them to the first day of the week, and destroys their seventh-part-of-time theory.

ELEVENTH OBJECTION.—Suppose two should travel around the world, one going east and the other west, when they get round there would be a difference in their reckoning of the days of the week.

ANSWER.—This supposition is frequently offered by advocates of the first-day as forming an objection to the seventh alone. They seem to be blind to the fact that if this objection is of any weight, it is as much against the first day as the seventh; and consequently against the Sabbath institution itself; and if against the institution, then against God; for it impeaches the wisdom of the Creator.

TWELFTH OBJECTION.—The reckoning of the days of the week may not have been preserved, so that we may not be able to tell when the true seventh day comes.

ANSWER. We would first remark that this objection is often urged by those who profess to observe the first day of the week in honor of Christ's resurrection. But are they certain that they observe the true first day of the week? They appear to be. Then they should allow us to be as confident that we observe the true seventh day; for the seventh day is the day before the first.

But God has pointed out the true seventh day, at certain periods of time, in a manner sufficiently plain to satisfy the most sceptical man who has any faith in divine revelation. At the close of the first week, God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because that in it he had rested. Pass down from creation 2500 years to the giving of the manna, [Ex. xvi,] and it will be seen that *there* the God of heaven pointed out the true seventh day. "Six days ye shall gather it; [the manna;] but on the seventh

day, which is the Sabbath, there shall be none."

Now, pass down over a period of about 1600 years, to the First Advent. There the Son of God claims to be *Lord of the Sabbath*. It will be admitted that the Lord of the Sabbath knew when the day of the Sabbath came. If the true seventh day had been lost during that 1600 years, he most certainly would have corrected the error. As he corrected no such error, but kept the day then observed as the Sabbath, it is certain that the true numbering of the days of the week had been preserved during that 1600 years.

We would say to those who hold that the Sabbath is merely Jewish, that to admit that the true numbering of the days of the week was lost during that 1600 years, would reflect greatly upon the character of their Jewish Law-giver. It would charge him with giving the Jews the Sabbath law, with the penalty of death for its violation, then leaving them without means to retain the knowledge of the day!

From the period of the First Advent the true seventh day has been brought down to us with a certainty. The Jews and some Christians have continued its observance, and all agree as to the day on which it occurs. Mahomet selected the sixth day of the week as a Sabbath for his followers, which corresponds with the sixth day of the week as reckoned by Jews and Christians. And the great body of professed Christians have observed the first day of the week, which corresponds with the first day of the week, as reckoned by Jews and Mahometans.

Now have these three great divisions of the human family all made a mistake so that a day may have been lost or a day gained? If so, there was a time when the Jews to a man made this mistake

in reckoning the week; at the same time, and to a man, Christians made a mistake that precisely corresponded; and to crown the whole, the Mahometans made a mistake in the reckoning of the week that precisely corresponded to that of the Jews and Christians! "Believest thou all this?" If a mistake had been made, is it not absolutely certain that there would be a discrepancy somewhere? As there is no such discrepancy, is it not absolutely certain that no such mistake exists? We can hardly find it in our power to believe that the inhabitants of a single school-district could, at the same point of time, have made a mistake in the days of the week, and to heighten the wonder, every one make precisely the same mistake! But when we extend this simultaneous act to all the districts in a town, thence to all the towns in a county, thence to all the counties in a state, and thence to all the states in the Union, we have carried the matter almost an infinite distance beyond reason or credibility.

But all this is not so remarkable as the supposed mistake of Jews, Christians, Mahometans, *and all nations!* That these classes, each composed of many millions, not confined to any country, but scattered in every land under heaven, should all make a mistake—should all make the *same mistake*, and should all make *the same mistake at the same time*, and no individual of the number ever discover, or ever suspect that such a mistake had taken place, is an idea not only absolutely unreasonable and in the highest degree absurd, but it is positively beyond the power of those who would, to credit it.

W.

A P P E N D I X.

WHO IS OUR LAWGIVER ?

THERE is one lawgiver, who is able to save and to destroy. James iv, 12. Who is this "one lawgiver?" is an inquiry of vital importance to the Sabbath question, which we shall endeavor to answer from the Scriptures of truth.

By very many it is assumed, first, that Christ is the Christian's lawgiver: and, second, that he has given, in person and by his inspired Apostles, contained in the New Testament, a perfect code of laws for the dispensation of the gospel; then it is asserted that, as the Sabbath law is not repeated in the New Testament, the seventh-day Sabbath is not binding on Christians. This fabric seems very fair; but it rests upon sand.

Deut. xvii, 15-18, is offered as proof that Christ is our lawgiver; but it may be seen that it teaches the reverse. "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him shall ye hearken. . . . And the Lord said unto me, they have well spoken that which they have spoken. I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him." Deut. xviii, 15, 17, 18. Peter speaking of Christ, says, "For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up un-

to you, of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you." Acts iii, 22.

Christ, as a prophet, or teacher, was like Moses. We now inquire, Did Moses legislate? Did he make laws for the people? He did not. Moses received words from the mouth of God and spake them to the people. There is no record that he ever assumed the position of an independent lawgiver; while the inspired record furnishes facts quite the reverse. In the case of the man who gathered sticks on the Sabbath, [Num. xv, 32-36,] Moses did not presume to decide his case, but left that for the great Lawgiver. "And they put him in ward, because it was not declared what should be done unto him. And the Lord said unto Moses, The man shall be surely put to death." See also Num. xxvii, 5-7; Lev. xxiv, 11-14.

That Christ, as a prophet, or teacher, was like Moses, we have the united testimony of Moses, [Deut. xviii, 15,] the Lord, [verse 18,] and Peter, [Acts iii, 22,] therefore he was not an independent lawgiver. Says the eternal Father when speaking of his Son, "He shall speak unto them all that I shall command him." Jesus testifies of himself on the subject, and his testimony agrees with that of his Father. Mark well the following declarations of the Son of God:—

"Jesus answered them, and said, My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me." John vii, 16.

"Then said Jesus unto them, When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I am he, and that I do nothing of myself; but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things." Chap. viii, 28.

“For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak. And I know that his commandment is life everlasting: whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak.” Chap. xii, 49, 50.

“He that loveth me not, keepeth not my sayings: and the word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father’s which sent me.” Chap. xiv, 24.

By these testimonies from the Father and Son we learn that it was not the work of our Lord Jesus Christ to legislate; but he received the doctrines which he taught, from the mouth of the Father, and spake them to the people. In this respect, as a prophet, or teacher, he was like Moses. In both cases the Father is the lawgiver.

The transfiguration is referred to as proof that Christ is the lawgiver in the gospel age. It is said that the presence of both Moses and Christ, (the teachers of both dispensations,) and Moses, being placed upon the back-ground by the voice from heaven, saying “This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased, hear him,” shows that Christ is the lawgiver of the present age, and that his teachings take the place of the law of God. But a very important personage is overlooked by those who take this position. It is the Father. He also appears at the mount of transfiguration. His voice is heard as the highest authority—“This is my beloved Son,” “Hear him.” However ~~in~~ the glory of Christ excelled that of Moses, it did not eclipse the glory of the Author of the ten commandments. The great God spoke the ten precepts of his holy law in the hearing of all the people. He did not leave them with

Moses to write, and deliver to the people: neither was it the work of the Son of God to deliver them; or any portion of them, over a second time for the men of the present dispensation. Under circumstances of awful grandeur the great Lawgiver spoke the ten commandments directly to the people, and wrote them in the tables of stone.

Christ quotes several of them at different times to enforce the doctrines he taught, but not in the sense of giving a new law. He leaves them upon their original basis, as the law of Jehovah, and affirms their immutability. Matt. v, 17-19. He did not take the position of a lawgiver, but, rather, that of a teacher of the law.

If Christ be our lawgiver, who is our advocate? We have none. But the Apostle says, "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." 1 John ii, 1. Here are three parties introduced: (1) the sinner, or transgressor of the law, [Chap. iii, 4,] (2) the Advocate, and (3) the Father whose law the sinner transgresses. The truth on this subject, then, plainly set before us, is that in the dispensation of the gospel, the Father is the lawgiver, and Jesus Christ is the advocate or mediator, between the offending sinner and an offended Lawgiver.

Now take the view that Christ is the Christian's lawgiver. Then "sin is the transgression of the law" of Christ. "And if any man sin, we have an advocate with" Jesus Christ! But who is this advocate? The Papist may answer, The Pope, while the Protestant remains silent.

We frequently hear it asserted, "It is very strange that nine of the commandments are given in the

New Testament, and the fourth left out, if the Sabbath is binding on Christians." But is it not indeed strange that professed Bible students should thus expose their ignorance of the subject of which they speak? It is a fact that the first four commandments are not repeated in the New Testament. Does this prove that we should not regard the first, second and third? If it does not prove this, then it does not prove that the fourth is not binding upon Christians. Is it said that an equivalent is given to those commandments not repeated in the New Testament? we invite the attention of the cavalier to New Testament testimony in regard to the Sabbath.

1. The testimony of Christ in regard to the duty of Christians relative to the Sabbath, as late as the destruction of Jerusalem, and probably much later. "But pray ye that your flight be not in the Winter, neither on the Sabbath-day." Matt. xxiv, 20. Again, "The Sabbath was made for man."

2. The testimony of the apostle Luke relative to the holy women. "And they returned and prepared spices and ointments, and rested the Sabbath-day according to the commandment." Luke xxiii, 56. If the Sabbath law was abolished at the crucifixion, several years before this fact was recorded, of what commandment does the historian speak?

3. The testimony of the same Apostle in regard to Paul's manner. "And Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three Sabbath-days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures." Acts xvii, 2. "And he reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks." Chap. xviii, 4.

"And when the Jews were gone out of the synagogue, the *Gentiles* besought that these words might

be preached to *them* the next Sabbath." "And the next Sabbath-day came almost the whole city together to hear the word of God." Acts xiii, 42, 44. "And on the Sabbath we went out of the city by a *river side where prayer was wont to be made*; and we sat down and spake unto the women which resorted thither." Acts xvi, 13.

Turn to the "Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him," &c. and mark the distinction made between the commandments of God, and the testimony [teachings] of Jesus. Rev. xii, 17; xiv, 12.

Read the testimony of Jesus in Chap. xxii, 14. "Blessed are they that do his [the Father's] commandments," &c. Now if Jesus is the Christian's lawgiver, he would have said of men in the Christian's age, Blessed are they that do *my* commandments. True, we should keep all the sayings of Christ; but what does he say of his teachings? "My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me."

If it be said that the Apostles in their writings have given a code of laws for the gospel age, we reply, that this view makes twelve lawgivers, whereas James says, "*There is one lawgiver.*"

See the commission to the eleven: "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; *teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.*" Matt. xxviii, 19, 20. Christ taught the Apostles what he had received of the Father, and *this* they were to teach men to observe. Notice also the work of the Holy Spirit, and from whom it proceeds. "But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the *Father will send* in my name, he shall teach you all things, and *bring all*

things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." John xiv, 26. "And I will pray the Father, and *he* shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever." Verse 16. The Holy Spirit came from the Father, and one object for which it was sent, was to call to the disciple's memory the words of divine truth which the Son had received of the Father, and had spoken to them. We have, then, the plainest testimony that all revealed truth proceeds from the Father, who is the Christian's lawgiver. W.

2 CORINTHIANS, CHAPTER III.

THIS CHAPTER is, by many persons, supposed to teach the abolition of the ten commandments. We think this doctrine is not in any wise countenanced by this portion of scripture. Let us carefully attend to what the Apostle has written in this chapter.

Two ministrations are presented. The one is the ministration of death; the other is the ministration of the Spirit. Verses 6, 7. The word "ministration" signifies service performed by a minister or servant. Hence, two classes of ministers are introduced. The one class is Moses and those who, after him, carried out the work of ministration which he began. The other class of ministers is the apostles, and those who carry forward the work commenced by them. The one class is the ministers of the Old Testament; the other class is the ministers of the New.

The two objects concerning which these ministrations are performed, are denominated "death," and

“the Spirit.” Let us now inquire respecting the meaning of these terms as here used. What is meant by the word “death,” in the sentence, “the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones?” We answer that it can only signify *the words* engraven upon the tables of stone; as though the sentence read, “the ministration of the ten commandments, written and engraven in stone.” The reason why the law of God is called “death,” may be gathered from the following scriptures: “the letter killeth;” “by the law is the knowledge of sin;” “the law worketh wrath; for where no law is, there is no transgression;” “the law entered that the offense might abound;” “I was alive without the law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died. And the commandment which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death. For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me. Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good. Was then that which was good made death unto me? God forbid. But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good; that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful.”

What is meant by the word “Spirit” as used in this chapter? This word is definitely applied in verse 17: “Now the Lord is that Spirit.” Then we understand that the law of God slays the sinner, and is hence denominated “death;” while the Lord is that Spirit who makes alive the sinner thus slain. Hence we understand the Lord from heaven to be the life-giving Spirit here referred to.

With these remarks we introduce verses 7 and 8. “But if the ministration of death, written and engra-

ven 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?"

Those who offer this verse as proof that the ten commandments are abolished, have fallen into that error by confounding the *ministration* of that which was engraven upon stones, with the law itself that was there engraven. Thus making the law of God and the ministration of that law mean the same thing. But the next verse by furnishing a perfect parallel to the sentence in question, exhibits the absurdity of that view. "How shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious?" No one will claim that the *ministration* of the Spirit is the Spirit itself. Let them treat verse 7 with as much consistency as they do verse 8, and they will avoid the error that the ministration of the ten commandments is the ten commandments themselves.

But verse 7 must distinctly mark the meaning of Paul in the use of the word "ministration;" and no one who will carefully read the verse need to confound the ministration with the commandments. Notice the first clause of the verse: "But if the ministration of death written and engraven in stones was glorious;" now read the explanatory clause and you may understand what that ministration was, and in what its glory consisted: "*so that* the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance." Then the last clause of the verse is a distinct explanation of the first. The ministration or service to which Paul refers, was commenced by Moses when he took the ten com-

mandments from Jehovah and brought them down to the people. That ministration was so glorious that the minister by whom it was performed, veiled his face to hide its glory. The full account of this interesting ministration of Moses may be read in Ex. xxxiv, 29-35. Nothing can be plainer, therefore, than the fact that by the word "ministration" in verse 7, Paul means not the ten commandments, but the *service* of Moses the minister, in bringing down from God that law which he had just engraven on the tables of stone.

The ministration commenced by Moses, was carried forward through the entire period of the Old Testament. Moses placed the two tables in the ark, and placed the ark in the Most Holy Place of the typical sanctuary. Ex. xl; Deut. x. He then set apart the Levitical order of priesthood to minister before that ark while the typical sanctuary should continue. Ex. xxviii; xxix; Lev. viii; ix. When Moses brought down that holy law, it was to that sinful, rebellious people, but "condemnation" and "death;" for it could only show their guilt in the sight of God. It showed them exposed to its just penalty, and contained in itself no promise of pardon.

But the ministration committed to the apostles and their successors, was expressly appointed to hold out pardon to the guilty, hope to the desponding, salvation to the lost. It recognizes indeed the great fact that the whole human family are under the just condemnation of the law of God, as its transgressors; [Rom. iii, 19;] but it bases its offer of pardon on the fact that Christ has died for the human family thus situated, [2 Cor. v, 14, 15,] and that all who will avail themselves of this great propitiation may be

forgiven freely. The great subject of this ministration is Christ, the life-giving Spirit, who has died for us. The priesthood which Moses appointed to minister before the ark of the testament in the typical sanctuary, offered no sacrifice that could take away sin; it could only cite penitent sinners forward to the great Sacrifice that should be offered for the sins of men. But in the heavenly Sanctuary before the ark of God's testament, stands that great High Priest who has laid down his life for the world, and who is able to save to the uttermost all that come to God through him. Heb. vii; viii; Rev. xi, 19.

If therefore the ministration that could only exhibit man's guilt and just condemnation, was so glorious that Moses, its minister, had to veil the glory of his countenance, how unspeakably glorious must that ministration be, that offers life, pardon and salvation to the guilty, the condemned, the lost!

Moses while performing that ministration had a veil upon his face; but in contrast with this, Paul says, "But we all with *open* [literally *unveiled*] face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory even as by the Spirit of the Lord."

Let us now inquire respecting the thing abolished in verse 7. That the word *glory*, inserted by the translators in its last clause, was rightly placed there, admits of certain proof. For the expression "teen katargoumeneen," rendered, "which glory was to be done way," is in the feminine accusative, and hence *necessarily* refers to "teen doxan," "the glory," which immediately precedes it, and is in the *same* gender and case, and not to "he diakonia," "the ministration," which is more remote, and is of

a *different* case. On this point there can be no dispute. Hence the translators by inserting the word "glory" in the last clause of this verse, have faithfully expressed the sense of the original.

Then Paul in verse 7, asserts the abolition of the glory of the former ministration. Verse 10 tells us that though that ministration was made glorious, yet in this respect it had no glory, by reason of the glory that excelleth. Now verse 11 will explain to us how the glory of the former ministration was done away, and also in what respect that ministration had no glory. It is more correctly rendered by Macknight than by our version. For "dixees" must signify, "by glory," and not the adjective, "glorious." As rendered by Macknight it reads: "Besides if that which is abolished, is abolished by glory, much more that which remaineth, remaineth in glory." Two important facts are determined by this verse. 1. That the glory of the former ministration was done away by the surpassing glory of the present ministration, just as the glory of the stars is done away by the glory of the sun arising in his strength. 2. And hence we understand that it had no glory by reason of the glory that excelleth, in the same manner that we understand that the stars have no glory when the sun shines.

We will now quote verses 13 and 14. "And not as Moses, which put a vail over his face, that the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished; but their minds were blinded; for until this day remaineth the same vail untaken away in the reading of the Old Testament; which vail is done away in Christ." Verse 13 being explanatory of verse 7, we have here a

good opportunity to determine what was abolished. And we shall find its statement on this point the same as that of verse 7. *When* the veil 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 the veil hide? for the answer to this question determines the whole matter. Were the tables of stone hidden by that veil? No verily. But it was the glory of that ministration, which glory in the estimation of the Jews still abides. The veil upon his face hid that which is abolished; but the tables of stone were neither hidden nor obscured by the veil: he held them in his hands. Ex. xxxiv, 29.

The veil with which Moses hid the glory of his face still remains upon literal Israel. They still connect in an inseparable manner the great constitution, the ten commandments, with the glory that enshrouded Moses and that attended the Levitical ministration, not seeing that that ministration has given place to another of far surpassing glory. Israel cannot see that the hidden glory is gone; but as they can still see that holy law, they believe that that glory must abide as well as that law. Others at the present day fall into the opposite error. 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 ministering for us, the *ark of God* abides as well as it did in the earthly tabernacle. Rev. xi, 19. They think highly indeed of the mercy-seat; but the law of God contained in the ark beneath that mercy-seat, is despised and counted a thing of naught. Ex. xxv, 17-22; Heb. ix, 4. But they 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 act of Moses in covering from the sight of Israel the glory that beamed from his face at the commencement of that ministration represented this great truth; viz., that that ministration with its glory was not to abide; and that when it should be succeeded by a ministration that could give life and pardon to guilty man, Israel would not understand the fact. To this day the veil is upon their heart. Every thing relating to the ministration and the glory in the reading of the Old Testament, is with them inseparably connected with Moses. This veil is done away in Christ; and when the heart shall turn to the Lord, the veil shall be taken away. Every thing relating to salvation and glory will then be associated with Christ and the better ministration.

In this chapter, therefore, there is no intimation that the law of God is abolished. Those who make it teach such a doctrine, wrest the words of Paul to their own destruction. Even the verses on which such persons lay the greatest stress become a complete absurdity when made to teach the abolition of the ten commandments. For in the first place they have to assume that the word "ministration" instead of signifying service performed by a minister, [as the word invariably signifies, and is expressly so applied in the latter part of verse 7,] signifies the ten commandments. This absurd assumption is the basis of the doctrine. Let us see how consistent a doctrine can be erected upon this basis. It stands thus: If the ten commandments ~~are~~ glorious, so that the children of Israel could ~~not~~ steadfastly behold the

face of Moses &c. Any one can see how incongruous such a statement would be. To say that the ministration was glorious so that they could not behold the face of the minister, is a statement perfectly consistent, being indeed the very thing that Paul has affirmed; but to say that the tables of stone were the subjects of this glory, and yet, have that glory only appear upon the face of Moses is reasoning from unlike to unlike. If the tables of stone constituted this glorious ministration, why was not the vail which hid that glory wrapped about the tables of stone, and not placed before the face of the minister? The answer is obvious. It was the service performed by Moses that was thus glorious: and that glory was hidden when Moses veiled his face.

It remains that we quote two or three texts in which Paul directly teaches the perpetuity of the law of God. The word of Paul was not yea and nay, so that he does not affirm a doctrine in one place and deny it in another.

1. The following is Dr. Bloomfield's translation of 1 Cor. vii, 19. with his note appended:

"Circumcision is of no moment, and uncircumcision of no moment; but keeping the commandments of God is something of consequence; i. e., as being the test of genuine faith."

2. "Children, obey your parents in the Lord; for this is right. Honor thy father and mother; which is the first commandment with promise; that it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long upon the earth." Eph. vi, 1-3. In this text it is certain that Paul enforces the duty of children to their parents, by the commandment which he quotes, thus acknowledging its supreme authority. Nor can the

argument from this text be evaded by saying that he quoted it from a revised code which Christ had established. For it is a fact, that although Christ has quoted this commandment, he has never appended a promise to it; much less has he added the one here quoted by Paul. But it is also a fact that this commandment does stand in the decalogue not only as its first commandment with promise, but with the very promise in question annexed. Hence it is certain that Paul acknowledges the fifth precept of the decalogue as the fountain-head of all authority on this point.

3. "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law." Rom. iii, 31. Now it is an interesting fact that the verb "katargeo" which in 2 Cor. iii, is rendered 'done away,' "abolished," is the same one that in Rom. iii, 31, is rendered "make void." We have shown that the word is not used in 2 Cor. iii, with reference to the law of God. As a demonstration of the truth on this point, we present these words of Paul to the Romans. In the strongest manner he expresses his abhorrence of the sentiment that the law of God is abolished. Those who make Paul in 2 Cor. iii, utter a sentiment which in Rom. iii, he solemnly disavows, should pause and reflect, lest they thus wrest his words to their own destruction.

Ministration signifies not a law, but a service performed by a minister. We present every instance where "diakonia," the word rendered ministration in 2 Cor. iii, occurs, the word in italics being the translation:

Luke x, 40. Martha was troubled about much *servicing*,
 Acts i, 17. had obtained part of this *ministry*.
 25. he may take part of this *ministry*.

- vii, 21. neglected in the daily *ministration*.
 4. to the *ministry* of the word.
 xi, 29. determined to send *relief* unto the
 xii, 25. they had fulfilled their *ministry*,
 xx, 24. the *ministry*, which I have received
 xxi, 19. among the Gentiles by his *ministry*.
 Rom. xi, 13. I magnify mine *office*:
 xii, 7. Or *ministry*, let us wait on our *ministering*:
 xv, 31. that my *service* which I have
 I Cor. xii, 5. differences of *administrations*,
 xvi, 15. themselves to the *ministry* of the *saints*,
 2 Cor. iii, 7. if the *ministration* of death
 8. the *ministration* of the Spirit
 9. the *ministration* of condemnation
 — the *ministration* of righteousness
 iv, 1. seeing we have this *ministry*,
 v, 18. the *ministry* of reconciliation;
 vi, 3. that the *ministry* be not blamed:
 viii, 4. the fellowship of the *ministering* to
 ix, 1. the *ministering* to the *saints*,
 12. For the *administration* of this *service*
 13. the *experiment* of this *ministration*
 14. the *pages* of them, to *do* you *service*. [lit. for *min-*
istering to you]
 15. the *work* of the *ministry*,
 16. take heed to the *ministry*
 17. putting me into the *ministry*;
 18. the full *proof* of thy *ministry*.
 19. profitable to me for the *ministry*.
 20. sent forth to *minister* for them
 21. show thy works, and charity, and *services*,

COLOSSIANS II, 14--17.

THE second chapter of Colossians teaches that the hand-writing of ordinances has been blotted out and nailed to the cross. Many produce this scripture as proof that the ten commandments are abolished. We inquire therefore, is the hand-writing of ordinances the ten commandments? Let the following facts answer:—

1. The hand-writing of ordinances is here represented as having been blotted out by the shedding of Christ's blood. If this hand-writing of ordinances is the ten commandments, it follows that the blood of Christ was shed to blot out the prohibition against other gods; the prohibition of graven images; the prohibition of blasphemy; the commandment to hallow the sanctified Rest-day of the Lord; the first commandment with promise; and the prohibitions of murder, adultery, theft, false witness and covetousness! Would the Infinite Law-giver give his own Son to die for such a purpose?

2. But to teach that Christ died to blot out the moral law, is to deny the plainest facts. Because that the law of God which was holy, just and good, condemned the whole human family, and showed that all mankind were sinners, and under its just sentence, God provided a method of redemption by which he could be just, and yet could justify him that believeth in Jesus. This did not consist in sending his Son to destroy the law of the Father; but it consisted in this, that the Son of God should take upon himself human nature, and offer up his own life a ransom for many; thus making the great propitiation through which guilty man may come to God and find pardon for the transgression of his holy law. Rom. iii, 19-31; Matt. xx, 28; I Pet. ii, 24; Isa. liii, 10. Having done this he returned to his Father, and became a great High Priest in the heavenly Sanctuary before the Ark containing his Father's law. Whoever, therefore, repents of his transgression, and comes to God through this "Advocate with the Fa-

ther," may find pardon for all his sins. This view of man's redemption is based on the plainest facts of scripture, and presents the character of God in a light in which mercy and truth meet together, and righteousness and peace kiss each other. Ps. lxxxv, 10, 11. Well might Paul exclaim when presenting this great subject, "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law."

3. But what is it that is abolished in consequence of the hand-writing of ordinances being nailed to the cross? We answer, Meats, drinks, feast-days, (for this is the literal rendering of the word,) new-moons and sabbaths, (plural.) Thus upon the very face of this text is found the most decisive evidence that Paul was not referring to the ten commandments. For it is absurd to believe that Paul should speak of the abolition of the ten commandments, and as the consequence of that abolition, should speak of certain unimportant things as having been done away, which, by the way, were never contained in the decalogue. It may be objected, that the decalogue contained the sabbaths (the word is plural) which are here abolished. We answer, Not so. The decalogue contained but one Sabbath of the Lord. But besides the Sabbath of the Lord, embodied in the fourth commandment, the twenty-third chapter of Leviticus presents four annual sabbaths, associated with the feasts and new moons of the typical system. The Sabbath of the Lord "was made FOR man," but these sabbaths connected with the new moons, &c., are said to be AGAINST him. Mark ii, 27: Col. ii, 14. It is not

the Sabbath (singular) associated with the precepts of the moral law, that is here referred to, but the sabbaths (plural) associated with their feasts and new moons. Lev. xxiii, 24, 32, 37-39. The one was made at creation, the others in the wilderness of Sinai.

4. But while it is plainly stated in Col. ii, that the hand-writing of ordinances, or shadow of good things to come, is abolished, it is elsewhere in the New Testament plainly stated that the royal law, embodying all the ten commandments, is yet in full force. No one can deny this who will carefully read James ii, 8-12. And the fact is distinctly stated that the violation of one of the commandments makes the transgressor guilty of all. It follows therefore, that the hand-writing of ordinances, and the royal law of ten commandments, are two distinct codes.

The reasons presented demonstrate the fact that the ten commandments are not referred to in Col. ii. But those who seize this scripture to prove the abolition of the decalogue, generally point with triumph to the expression, "holy day," which occurs in verse 16. "If the term, sabbath-days," say they, "refers to the ceremonial sabbaths, [Lev. xxiii, 24-39,] the term, holy day, must certainly designate the Sabbath of the fourth commandment." The fact that some, who have the means of knowing better, have applied this expression to the Sabbath, renders it proper that this perversion should be exposed.

This word is translated from *heorte*, which occurs twenty-seven times in the Greek Testament. Twenty-six times it is rendered, in our version, *feast*, and once, viz., Col. ii, 16, it is rendered *holy day*.

Matt. xxvi, 5. they said, Not on the *feast* day,

- xxvii, 15. at that *feast* the governor was
 Mark xiv, 2. they said, Not on the *feast* day,
 xv, 6. Now at that *feast* he released unto
 Luke ii, 41. at the *feast* of the passover.
 42. after the custom of the *feast*,
 xxii, 1. the *feast* of unleavened bread
 xxiii, 17. release one unto them at the *feast*.
 John ii, 23. at the passover in the *feast* day,
 iv, 45, at Jerusalem at the *feast*: for they also
 went unto the *feast*.
 v, 1. there was a *feast* of the Jews:
 vi, 4. a *feast* of the Jews, was nigh.
 vii, 2. the Jews' *feast* of tabernacles was
 8. Go ye up unto this *feast*: I go not up
 yet unto this *feast*;
 10. went he also up unto the *feast*,
 11. Jews sought him at the *feast*,
 14. about the midst of the *feast*.
 37. that great day of the *feast*,
 xi, 56. he will not come to the *feast*?
 xii, 12. were come to the *feast*,
 20. to worship at the *feast*:
 xiii, 1. before the *feast* of the passover,
 29. need of against the *feast*;
 Acts xviii, 21. by all means keep this *feast*
 Col. ii, 16. or in respect of an *holy day*,

It is thus rendered by several lexicons:

“Heorte, a feast or festival, holiday.” *Liddell and Scott Robinson's* Lexicon gives the same. “A solemn feast, public festival, holy day.” *Greenfield*.

Col. ii, 16 is thus rendered in different versions:—

“Let no man, therefore, judge you in meat, or in drink or in respect of a festival day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbaths.”—*Douay Bible*.

“Wherefore, let no one judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a festival, or of a new moon, or of sabbaths.”—*Macknight*.

“Let no man therefore judge you in food, or in drink, or in respect to a holy day, or the new moon, or the sabbaths.”—*Whiting*.

“Let none therefore judge you in meat, or drink, or in respect of a feast day, or of the new moon, or of sabbath days.”—*Wesley*.

“Let no one therefore call you to an account about meat and drink, or with respect to a festival, or a new moon, or sabbaths.”—*Wakefield*.

It is therefore manifest that the Apostle used this word to designate the Jewish feasts—the abolition of which he here teaches. The sabbaths and the feast days of the Jewish ritual expired with that ritual; but the Sabbath of the Lord, hallowed before the fall, abides, with the other precepts of the moral law, throughout duration.

J. N. A.

The two Tills of Matt. v, 18.

THE perpetuity of every jot and tittle of God's law is supported by the use of two *tills*. 1. Till *heaven and earth pass*. This is quite strong, and carries the mind to a period of time which is still in the future. On this, I think there can be no disagreement. 2. Till *all be fulfilled*. Here is the disputed ground. We are told that this reaches only to the crucifixion. That Christ fulfilled all the law, and nailed it to his cross. But I should think it most natural to reserve the stronger expression for the final one. Let us read the *text* to suit the views of our opponents. According to their interpretation, the Lord wished to assure his hearers that no part of the law would pass, till the crucifixion, which was nearly three years and a half in the future. Then it would stand like this. After cautioning the people not to think he had come to destroy the law or the prophets, he would say, *For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till three years and a half.*

It has often been shown, that to fulfill a *law* is to

obey it, not to abolish it. But leaving this point, I remark that the subject of discourse includes something besides the law, namely, the prophets. He says, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law *or the prophets*: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill." He came in fulfillment of the prophecies. But have *all* the prophecies been fulfilled? Nay verily. Heaven and earth must not only pass, but new heavens and earth must be created before *all* is fulfilled. The prophet Isaiah says, "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." This must be fulfilled before even the fourth commandment of the law can pass.

I conclude, then, that the second *till* is the stronger of the two. The first reaches to the passing of the present heavens and earth; the second, not only to the making of the new heavens and earth, but to the unlimited extent of their duration. R. F. C.

CONSISTENCY.

CONSISTENCY is a rare jewel. Truth is consistent with itself; but error has as many heads and horns as the Apocalyptic dragon. This is well illustrated by the following veritable *creed*.

Article 1. I believe that the Sabbath has been changed to the first day of the week.

Article 2. I believe that Sunday is ~~the~~ the true seventh day, and that it should be observed.

Article 3. I believe that we cannot tell what day the seventh day is.

Article 4. I believe that we are only required to keep one seventh part of time.

Article 5. I believe that the commandment to keep the seventh day is abolished.

Article 6. I believe that those who keep the Sabbath of the fourth commandment will fall from grace.

Article 7. I believe that every one should be fully persuaded in their own mind, whether to keep the Sabbath or not.

Reader, the foregoing is not a mere fancy sketch; I have met with a large number, who in the course of a single conversation, have avowed their faith in all the articles of the above creed. There are plenty of such all around you. Is this your creed? If so, permit me to point you to a better one. It consists of ten articles, and may be found in Ex. xx. Allow me to recommend this creed to you as infallible, it having been given by Jehovah in person, and written with his own finger on stone. You will find in its fourth article all the errors of the foregoing creed pointed out. What men have said of certain creeds of their own construction, may be said of this in truth: "If a man keep not this, no doubt he shall perish everlastingly."

J. N. A.

THOUGHTS ON THE SABBATH.

THOSE who observe the Sabbath of the Bible, are able to present as its foundation, a *divine* institution. "God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it." Gen. ii, 3. To sanctify is "to separate, set apart, or appoint to a holy, sacred, or religious use." *Web-*

ster. It was by this act of the great Creator, that the Sabbath was made for man. Ex. xx, 11; Mark ii, 27. As God has never taken this blessing from the seventh day, and has never given to secular purposes the day which he here "set apart to a holy use," the original institution still exists. As he has never sanctified another day as a weekly Sabbath, the Sabbath of the Lord is the *only* Sabbatic institution. Ex. xx, 10.

As God made the Sabbath in paradise, when the morning stars sang together and all the sons of God shouted for joy, it follows that it is not Jewish, not a carnal ordinance, not a yoke of bondage, but a sacred institution made for the well-being of the human family, while yet upright. The great Creator rested first on the seventh day and was refreshed. Ex. xxxi, 17. The Son of God who kept his Father's commandments, followed this example, [John xv, 10; Ex. xx, 8—11,] and thus, also, did the entire church so far as inspiration gives us the facts.

After giving the institution of the Sabbath, the book of Genesis, in its brief record of 2370 years, does not again mention it. This has been urged as ample proof that those holy men, who during this period were perfect and walked with God in the observance of his commandments, statutes and laws, [Gen. v, 24; vi, 9; xxvi, 5,] all lived in open profanation of that day which God had blessed and set apart to a holy use. But the book of Genesis also omits any distinct reference to the doctrine of future punishment, the resurrection of the body, the revelation of the Lord in flaming fire, and the judgment

of the great day. Does this silence prove that the patriarchs did not believe these great doctrines? Does it make them any the less sacred?

But the Sabbath is not mentioned from Moses to David, a period of five hundred years during which it was enforced by the penalty of death. Does this prove that it was not observed during this period? The jubilee occupied a very prominent place in the typical system, yet in the whole Bible a single instance of its observance is not recorded. What is still more remarkable, there is not on record a single instance of the observance of the great day of atonement, notwithstanding the work in the holiest on that day was the most important service connected with the worldly Sanctuary. And yet the observance of the other and less important festivals of the seventh month, which are so intimately connected with the day of atonement, the one preceding it by ten days, the other following it in five, is repeatedly and particularly recorded. Ezra iii, 1-6; Neh. viii, 2, 9-12, 14-18; 1 Kings viii, 2, 65; 2 Chron. v, 3; vii, 8, 9; John vii, 2-14, 37. It would be sophistry to say that this silence respecting the day of atonement, when there were so many instances for it to be mentioned, proves that that day was never observed; and yet it is actually a better argument than the similar one urged against the Sabbath from the book of Genesis.

The reckoning of time by weeks was established in Gen. i; ii. This period of time is marked only by the recurrence of the sanctified Rest-day of the Creator. That the patriarchs reckoned time by weeks and

by sevens of days, is evident from several texts. Gen. xxix, 27, 28; viii, 10, 12; vii, 4, 10; L, 10; Job ii, 13. That the reckoning of the week was rightly kept appears evident from the fact that in Ex. xvi, Moses on the *sixth* day declares that "tomorrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord." Verses 22, 23.

But if the opponents of the Sabbath, claim that a knowledge of the true seventh day was lost in the patriarchal age, we will now show that before God gave the ten commandments he pointed out the true seventh day in a manner which could not be mistaken. First. By a direct miracle, God caused the fall of a certain quantity of manna each day of the week to the sixth day when there was a double quantity. Ex. xvi, 4, 5, 29. Second. On the seventh day, which Moses calls the Sabbath, there was none. Verses 25-27. Third. That which was gathered on the sixth day kept good over the seventh, whereas it would corrupt in the same length of time on other days. Compare verses 23, 24, with verses 19, 20. This three-fold weekly miracle continued the space of forty years. Verse 35; Joshua v, 12. The fact is settled, then, beyond all controversy that the Sabbath of the Lord which was made in Paradise, was here directly pointed out by God himself. And to this important testimony we add the declaration of Nehemiah, ix, 13, 14, that God made known to Israel his holy Sabbath.

No one pretends that the true seventh day was lost by the Jewish church after this. And it is certain that as late as our Lord's crucifixion they ob-

served the true seventh day. They rested upon the day enjoined in the fourth commandment; namely, the day which the Lord rested upon and hallowed at creation. Luke xxiii., 55, 56; Ex. xx, 8--11; Gen. ii, 3.

Since the record of inspiration closed, the Jews and the Christians, each scattered in every land under heaven, have carefully kept the reckoning of the week. If a mistake in this reckoning had been made, a discrepancy would at once manifest this. For it is certain that every Jew and every Christian under heaven could not at the same time make the same mistake. The fact that there is no such discrepancy is decisive testimony that such mistake has not been made. Consequently we have the true seventh day from creation.

When God gave his law in person, in the hearing of the people, by the fourth precept of that law he solemnly enforced the observance of the holy Sabbath. Ex. xx, 8--11. In explicit language the great Law-giver states the reason why he made the Sabbath and the time when this act was performed. "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore [i. e., for this reason] the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it." This is the reason why God made the Sabbath. It is the same reason that is stated in Gen. ii, 3.

The act by which God made the Sabbath is here stated with distinctness. It was his act of blessing and hallowing his Rest-day. The time when this act was performed is here given as in Gen. ii, 2nd; name-

ly, the close of the creation week. And it is worthy of note that in thus giving the fourth commandment, God calls the seventh day the Sabbath at the time when he thus placed his blessing upon it. This most effectually shuts the mouths of those who deny the institution of the Sabbath at creation.

The great design of the Sabbath was that there might be a standing memorial of God's act of creation. Its observance would have saved the world from atheism and idolatry; for it has ever pointed back to God, the great first cause; and it has ever pointed out the true God, the great Creator, in distinction from "the gods that have not made the heavens and the earth."

We have now considered three important facts in the history of the Sabbath. First, its institution at creation; second, the fact that the true seventh day was pointed out to Israel; and third, the grand law of the Sabbath, the fourth commandment. As we proceed in this investigation we notice three different Sabbaths. First, the *weekly* Sabbath of the Lord, the seventh day. Ex. xx, 10. Second, the *annual* sabbaths of the Jews, the first, tenth, fifteenth and twenty-third days of the seventh month. Lev. xxiii, 24, 27-32, 39. And third, the septennial sabbath of the land, the seventh year. Lev. xxv, 1-7.

The Sabbath of the Lord was instituted at creation, and at Sinai was embodied in the royal law, every precept of which according to James ii, 8-12, is still binding upon us. But the sabbaths of the Jews and the sabbath of the land were instituted in the wilderness, and embodied in the hand-writing of ordinances, with the feasts, new-moons and ceremonies of the

Jewish church. That hand-writing of ordinances, which was a shadow of good things to come, was nailed to the cross by our Lord, thus taking all these festivals out of the way.

The most precious blessings are promised to those who observe the Sabbath of the Lord. Isa. lvi; lviii, 13, 14. And it is worthy of notice that this prophecy pertains to a period of time when the salvation of the Lord is near to be revealed. Heb. ix, 28; Isa. xlv. 17. The blessing is promised to the sons of the stranger, the Gentiles, [Ex. xii, 48, 49; Isa. xiv, 1; Eph. ii, 12,] as well as to the people of Israel. If they will keep the Sabbath holy unto the Lord while dispersed in the four quarters of the earth; God will bring them again to his holy mountain. The promises here made by the prophet shall be verified when the outcasts of Israel and the sons of the stranger shall come from the east and from the west and shall sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of God. Matt. viii, 11.

Notice the distinction between the Sabbath of the Lord and the sabbaths of the Jews as presented in the prophets. Of the perpetuity of the former let us judge after reading Isa. lxvi, 22, 23, where we are informed of its observance in the New Earth. But the Lord assures us by the prophet that the latter shall cease. Hos. ii, 11. The fulfillment of this prophecy may be read in Col. ii, 14-17. The weekly Sabbath is styled "the Sabbath of the Lord." "my Sabbath," &c. Ex. xx, 10; Isa. lvi, 4; Eze. xx, 12-24; xxii, 8, 26. The annual and septennial sabbaths are styled "her sabbaths" and "your sabbaths."

Hos. ii, 11; Lev. xxlii, 32; xxvi, 34, 35, 43; 2 Chron. xxxvi, 21; Lam. i, 7.

Though the Scriptures nowhere teach or authorize the change of the Sabbath, yet they plainly point out the power that should do this. Let the reader compare Dan. vii, 25, with the history of the Papal power, and carefully mark its acts of changing and mutilating the divine constitution, the ten commandments.

We have seen the grand law of the Sabbath embodied in the decalogue. We come now to the New Testament. That our Lord did not destroy that law, or lessen our obligation to obey it, he clearly teaches in Matt. v, 17-19. And we may with the utmost safety affirm "that the apostles did not disturb what their Lord left untouched." Rom. iii. 31; James ii, 8-12. We say therefore that the New Testament teaches the perpetuity of God's law, and *for that reason does not re-enact it.*

Our Lord came to "magnify the law and make it honorable." Isa. xlii, 21. He kept his Father's commandments, and solemnly enjoined obedience to them, pointedly rebuking those who made them void that they might keep the traditions of the elders. John xv, 10; Matt. xix, 16-19; xv, 3-9. "The Sabbath was made for man," says the Saviour, "and not man for the Sabbath." Mark ii, 27. If the Sabbath was made for man, then it belongs alike to Jews and Christians, and to all our race. The statement carries the mind back to the creation of our race and evinces that the Sabbath was made in immediate connection with that event. On the one hand our Lord

rebukes the Pharisaic observance of the Sabbath; on the other, he rebukes with equal force that class of modern teachers who affirm that the Sabbath of the Lord which Infinite Wisdom made *for* man before the fall, was one of those sabbaths which were *against* him, *contrary* to him and taken out of the way at the death of Christ. Col. ii.

The fact that those, who had been with Jesus during his ministry, "rested the Sabbath-day according to the commandment," after his crucifixion, and resumed labor on the first day of the week [Luke xxiii, 55-56; xxiv, 1] shows clearly that they knew nothing of the supposed change of the Sabbath. Yet Jesus testifies that all things which he had heard of his Father he had made known unto them. John xv, 15. The fact that God has never *sanctified* the first day of the week shows plainly that it is not sacred time, and not a divine instituted Sabbath. The fact that God has never required us to rest on this day shows that its observance in the place of the Sabbath of the Lord, is a clear instance of making void the commandments of God to keep the traditions of men. Mark vii, 6-13; Prov. xxx, 6.

That sanctified time exists in the gospel dispensation, or in other words, that there is a day which belongs to God, is clear from Rev. i, 10. That "the Lord's day," is the Sabbath-day is plain from Isa. lviii. As the Sabbath was made for man, we find it under all dispensations, and in every part of the Bible. Those therefore who profane the Sabbath, sin against God and wound their own souls.

J. N. A.