

REVIEW

—OF—

W. G. SPRINGER
(Disciple Minister)

ON THE SABBATH,

LAW OF GOD

AND

First Day of the Week,

WITH AN APPENDIX ON THE PERPETUITY
OF THE SABBATH AND LAW.

BY B. F. SNOOK.

~~~~~  
"I am a companion of all them that fear thee, and of them that  
keep thy precepts." Ps. cxix, 63.

"Depart from me ye evil doers, for I will keep the command-  
ments of my God." Verse 115.  
~~~~~

—————
STEAM PRESS OF THE REVIEW AND HERALD OFFICE:
BATTLE CREEK, MICH.

1860.

JAMES WHITE LIBRARY
ANDREWS UNIVERSITY
BERRIEN SPRINGS, MICH. 49104

REVIEW OF W. G. SPRINGER.

"THE Sabbath and Lord's day (or first day of the week)," is the title of a small work, of 44 pages, written by Wm. G. Springer, a minister of the denomination called Disciples, or Campbellites.

This title is rather novel. The writer uses the phrase, "First day of the week" synonymous with the phrase, "Lord's day," the former occurring eight times in the New Testament, and the latter but once. By what authority he is justified in such use of these terms we would be glad to know! Certain we are that the Bible does not justify him in any such perversions.

Where did any *inspired* writer ever use such an expression as the above title? Nowhere! Did Christ, or either of his Apostles, ever use the phrase "Lord's day" and "First day of the week," synonymous or interchangeably? They never did. The very title of this work is without any divine authority. It is false and baseless. Therefore if the book be according to the title, we will find it of *similar* character.

The object of the writer of this work is to show that we are wrong who believe that the Sabbath of the Lord should be kept "*according to the commandment*," and that those are right who keep the first day of the week *without* a commandment—not according to the commandment, but "*according to a tradition*." In our review we

BV
125-
.575
HER.

214739

will present every argument, assertion, and assumption in the writer's *own words*, and will then try, fairly and logically, to expose the fallacy of every position which he has taken. We will show that he has not made a point without a misapplication or perversion of the Scriptures, and that he has not instituted an argument, but that can either be fairly turned against him, or scripturally met and subverted.

The author and his book appear well endorsed. A. Chatterton, editor of "*The Christian Evangelist*," says:

"Unless the Advent Sabbatarians can produce something better than we have yet seen, this is a complete *upsetter* of their **WHOLE THEORY**. This document is from the pen of our excellent Wm. G. Springer. Bro. Springer has been *hidden too long*, this will *reveal him*."—*Evangelist*, p. 337.

This is a good recommendation, and contains some very important matter. 1. We are informed that we must get up something better than this gentleman editor has yet seen, or we are upset—lost beyond the possibility of ever being found! We are somewhat at a loss to know what he means. Does he mean that we must get up something better on the Sabbath question? or does he mean that we must get up something better on our whole system than he has yet seen? We presume this is what he meant, for he says Springer has "*upset our WHOLE THEORY!*" Astonishing! The editor must either have been beside himself when he penned the above, or he must have unbounded confidence in the above book.

Mr. Editor, is it not truly a wonderful production, written on the Sabbath question *only*, that will "upset" our entire system of religion which

is altogether founded on the Bible? If such a thing can be, it is certainly a greater wonder than "Aladdin's Lamp!" We think, however, that it would not be a difficult matter for us to show his editorship something even on the Sabbath question, already gotten up, which he could not get around. But he has "seen," yes, and not "perceived." Well did Isaiah speak, when he said of such, "Seeing many things, but thou observest not; opening the ears, but he heareth not." Chap. xlii, 20.

2. Mr. Springer was once *hid*, and until very lately has remained *hid*. But where and from what has he been *hid*? Did not Ezekiel well speak when he said, "They have *hid* their eyes from my Sabbaths, and I am *profaned* among them?" Chap. xxii, 26. He has now, however, come out of his *den*, or hiding-place, by publishing an "upsetter" to our whole theory. Truly, here we are reminded of Ezekiel's foxes in the deserts. Chap. xiii, 4.

CHAPTER I.

INSTITUTION OF THE SABBATH.

SECTION 1, page 1, the writer says:

"The perpetuity of the Sabbath with many is now an absorbing question, and in writing in opposition to it, we realize the fact that there is no midway ground. It is either perpetual or it is not. If perpetual *we are bound to observe it.*"

To the above we have no objections. We believe that the Sabbath question is now creating

great interest. Men who will investigate for themselves begin to see that it is far safer to keep the Sabbath according to the commandment, than Sunday according to the *tradition*. Many of Mr. Springer's brethren are beginning to see the light of truth on this question, and are walking out into its bright blazes. He realizes that the interest on the Sabbath is growing, and that as it grows and increases, proportionally his brethren are leaving the tradition of Sunday-keeping and his cause grows weaker. This is the reason why he has so fox-like come out of his hiding-place, and raised his pen against us. We are well assured that Mr. S. knows that when he opposes this truth, there is no midway ground.

Well should he have considered the saying of Christ, "He that is not *with me* is *against me*; and he that *gathereth* not with me *SCATTERETH* abroad," before taking the stand which he has. Matt. xii, 30. Did Christ ever give a discourse against the Sabbath? Never. Then how can those gather with Christ whose whole ministry almost is to tear down the Sabbath? Mr. S. has said more, we think, in this last remark than he will stand up to against he gets through his book.

He says, "If the Sabbath is perpetual, we are bound to observe it." Amen. That is just what we contend for. This is a good concession; therefore all your efforts to destroy the obligation to keep the Sabbath, by trying to prove the abolition of the law are entirely fruitless, vain, and amount to nothing at all. You, sir, must first prove the abolition of the law itself, before you destroy the obligation to keep it; for you have now acknowledged that as long as it exists "we

are bound to keep it." Query. But how are we bound to keep it, if it is only binding on the Jew, as you say in another place? Be careful here, sir, or we shall have Springer *vs.* Springer! We will have use for this again.

SEC. 2. "If the observance of the seventh day according to the fourth command in the decalogue is of perpetual obligation, our nation with little exception is weekly breaking God's law."

The truth of this we do not deny. But it seems to me that there was no good intended by such a statement. Why then was it made? Because of the argument in it? No. For there is none in it; but for the effect. He well knew that man's natural disposition is to go with the multitude; hence to terrify his readers and influence them against the truth, he must inform them that if the Sabbath is perpetual almost the whole nation is living in sin. This is truly a strange argument! He would argue as follows:

1. If the Sabbath is binding, the multitudes are living in sin.

2. Conclusion. Therefore the Sabbath is not binding! We admit the premises, but do not believe that the conclusion is legitimate. The same argument will prove that God has no command binding at the present time. To illustrate: If the commands forbidding murder, adultery, false-witness and covetousness, are binding, the multitudes are living in sin. Therefore these commands are not binding.

This reasoning would not only invalidate every law of God, but would subvert the entire government of God. "Come, now, and let us reason together," perhaps you have something in your sys-

tem, which, if binding, will involve as much sin. Your denomination requires the weekly participation of the Lord's supper. How many do this? Scarcely one half of your own brethren. Now, sir, if your position on this subject is correct, not only this whole nation, but all professing Christians, with few exceptions, the world over, are living in sin. But would we say, therefore, you are wrong? No sir. Notwithstanding your own principle of reasoning would prove your theory wrong! Remember the next time you use this argument, that it may be used in more ways than one.

What if the multitudes are living in sin? Does not our Saviour teach that the many are in the broad way, and the few in the narrow? Matt. vii, 13, 14. You appear to desire to change the order, and have the few in the broad road and the many in the narrow. You had better carry out the legitimate results of your theory and turn Universalist, and then instead of quoting what our Lord said, say,

"Broad is the road that leads to life,
And thousands walk together there;
But narrow is the way to death,
Without one lonely traveller!!"

SEC. 3. "On the supposition that they succeed in convincing one-half of our nation of the perpetuity of the Jewish Sabbath, what a jargon!"

He argues on the principle that whatever causes division or confusion is not binding. The Sabbath if kept by one-half of our nation would cause a great jargon!! Therefore the Sabbath command is not binding. According to him, Christ did not come to send a sword, but peace! Matt. x, 34.

Therefore he will cry, Peace! peace! 1 Thess. v, 3. No confusion! no jargon! Division there has always been, and always will be. Truth will always cause a division. And the Sabbath divides those who serve God from those who serve him not. There was division and jargon in Noah's day. Would that prove that what he preached was not true? "Oh, yes," says Mr. S., "it caused jargon." There was division in Lot's time, and there will be a division in the judgment. "Blessed are they that do his commandments." Rev. xxii, 14.

Such arguments never weigh with an enlightened mind. Nothing but the most inveterate prejudice against the truth could have ever originated such statements. The man of God can see the carnal mind in them as plainly as he can see his face in a mirror. Mr. Springer has also given sad evidence of a great want of reverence for God and his word. He and his brethren boast much of standing on the Bible *alone!!* talk much of purity of speech! and calling Bible things by Bible names! Notwithstanding he can call the Sabbath of the Lord the *Jewish Sabbath!* Do they find this name in the Bible? Never! But where? In the Acts of the Man of Sin, or some one of his latter-day sons. There is where we find all such names, but not in the Bible. But is there any of their much boasted purity of speech to be seen here in *nick-naming* this divine institution? No. But to the contrary, we can see that men will resort to any subterfuge, however profane, to accomplish a bad end. Mr. S. and his brethren should never complain of being called "*Campbellites.*"

SEC. 4, p. 2, he quotes Bro. Waggoner as saying:

"We find a mass of testimony, which it is impossible to evade, that the law of God, the ten commandments, are ever binding: that under all dispensations mankind are under the same obligations to observe them."

This he denies, and affirms that the "ten commandments were given first to Moses more than two thousand years this side of the creation of the world." If this be true, God gave no law for the moral government of men prior to the exodus of Israel from Egypt. Therefore the world was without law from Adam to Moses; hence, without sin! But we have much evidence both conclusive and reliable, that the law of God did exist, and was binding from Adam to Moses, through the entire age of the patriarchs. First, men are said then to have been righteous. Proof. "Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was *righteous*." Paul speaking of all the patriarchs says, "Who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought *righteousness*." Heb. xi, 6, 33. "And spared not the old world, but saved Noah, the eighth person, a preacher of *righteousness*, bringing in the flood upon the world of the *ungodly*," 2 Pet. ii, 5. "Noah was a *just* man, and perfect in his generations, and Noah walked with God." Gen. vi, 9. "And the Lord said unto Noah, Come thou, and all thy house into the ark, for thee have I seen righteous before me in this generation." Chap. vii, 1. "And Enoch walked with God, and he was not, for God took him." Gen. v, 24. "For before his translation he had this testimony, that he pleased God." Heb. xi, 5. These

are all said to have been righteous—to have "wrought righteousness"—to have "walked with God." Many more might be adduced, but these are enough to prove our proposition.

And here, now, we spring an important question. How were they righteous? We answer, by doing righteousness. "He that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as He is righteous. He that committeth sin is of the Devil." 1 John iii, 7, 8. "Whosoever doeth not righteousness, is not of God." Verse 10. "Every one that doeth righteousness is born of God." Chap. ii, 29.

In this testimony John states 1, Who is righteous. 2, Who is of the Devil, and 3, Who is of, and who is not of God. He that does righteousness is born of God; is of him; is not of the Devil; does not commit sin. But sin is the transgression of the law, therefore he does not transgress the law, but obeys it. He that is of the Devil doeth not righteousness; does not obey the law, but *committeth sin*; transgresses the law; is not born of God; is not of him; does not love him.

Having shown how righteousness is attained and wrought, we proceed to show in the next place what *right* is; what *righteousness* is. David says, "The statutes of the Lord are *RIGHT*." Ps. xix, 8. But, David, What do you mean by the statutes of the Lord? Ans. "The *COMMANDMENT* of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes." Very good, since by the "statutes of the Lord" you mean his "commandments," all is plain, and we understand you. Again. "Thy testimonies that thou hast *commanded* are righteous and very faithful." "For all thy com-

MANDMENTS ARE RIGHTEOUSNESS." Ps. cxix, 138, 172. Therefore, according to this inspired witness, the law of God is the standard of right—of righteousness. Hence those who do right, and work righteousness, must conform to this divine standard. Proof. "And it shall be our RIGHTEOUSNESS if we observe to do all these commandments before the Lord our God, as he hath commanded us." Deut. vi, 25. The patriarchs Abel, Noah, Enoch, Lot, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and many others, "walked with God," "did right," "wrought righteousness." Therefore God's law existed in their times, and they conformed to it.

Men are said to have been wicked, sinful and corrupt before any law was ever given by Moses. Proof. Cain was wicked and slew his brother. Gen. iv, 8. John says, Cain was of that wicked one, the Devil. 1 John iii, 12. But who is of the Devil? Ans. "He that committeth sin." Verse 8. What is sin? Verse 4. "Sin is the transgression of the law." Therefore God's law was binding on man as early as Cain's day and time, and he broke the law by killing his brother. The Antediluvians are said to have been so wicked, that God destroyed them off the face of the earth. Gen. vii, 21-23. But could they have been wicked and sinners, if there was no moral law for them to conform to? They could not. "For where no law is, there is no transgression." Rom. iv, 15. "But sin is not imputed when there is no law." Chap. v, 13. Then could God have been just in punishing them? He could not. But they were sinners, and God was just in punishing them for their great wickedness. There-

fore God's law existed in their time, and by violating it they became sinners. Joseph refused to comply with the immodest request of Potiphar's wife, saying "How then can I do this GREAT WICKEDNESS and *sin* against God?" Gen. xxxix, 9. But how could he have sinned against God unless the law was binding which forbade sin? He could not, "for where no law is there is no sin." But he would have sinned had he yielded to her request. Therefore God's great moral law was binding in Joseph's day. The Sodomites were so wicked that God destroyed them by raining fire and brimstone upon them. Gen. xix, 12, 13. Peter says, They vexed righteous Lot with their filthy conversation and their *unlawful* deeds. 2 Pet. ii, 7.

There is direct proof that the law of God was binding upon the Sodomites, and that they violated it and received their just punishment. If the law had not been given till Moses, as Springer says, then we ask how could their deeds have been *lawful* or *unlawful*? for an action can no more be *unlawful* in the *absence* of law than it can be *lawful*. But we have strong proof that even the Sabbath law existed and was binding before the Israelites arrived at Mount Sinai. "Then said the Lord unto Moses, Behold I will rain bread from heaven for you, and the people shall go out and gather a certain rate every day, that I may prove them whether they will walk in MY LAW or no." Ex. xvi, 4. "And the Lord said, How long refuse ye to keep MY COMMANDMENTS and MY LAWS?" Verse 28. This last was spoken by way of rebuke against those who went out to gather manna on the Sabbath, and in connection with

verse 4, proves conclusively the existence of the Sabbath law prior to their arrival at the mount.

Besides the foregoing facts, we have the most positive and direct evidence that God has ever had a law for man's government. Gen. xxvi, 5. "Because that Abraham obeyed my voice and kept my charge, my *commandments*, my *statutes* and my *laws*," &c. Also, "If thou wilt diligently hearken to the voice of the Lord thy God, and wilt do that which is right in his sight, and wilt give ear to his *commandments*, and keep *all his STATUTES*," &c. Ex. xv, 26. Again, "How long refuse ye to keep my *commandments* and my *LAWS*?" Chap. xvi, 28. The foregoing facts and these plain Scriptures warrant us in setting down Springer against the Bible, No. 1.

We conclude from the premises now established;

1. That God's law has existed and been binding as far back as his dispensations of mercy extend.
2. That sin has always been the same; the transgression of the law of God.
3. That if Mr. S. is right, from Adam to Moses there was no law.
4. During that time there was no sin, for sin is the transgression of the law.
5. That God acted unjustly in destroying men as sinners, when in reality they were not. Having disproved his negative assertion, we will now show the view that the "ten commandments were first given to Moses" is false in point of fact. *God gave his law, in his own person, to the whole congregation of Israel.* Ex. xix, 11. "And be ready against the third day; for the third day the Lord will come down in the sight of all the people upon mount Sinai." Chap. xx, 1. "And God spake all these words." Verse 18. "And all the people saw the thunder-

ings and lightnings, and the noise of the trumpet, and the mountain smoking, and when the people saw it they removed and stood afar off." Verse 19. "And they said unto Moses, Speak thou with us and we will hear, but let not God speak with us lest we die." Verse 22. "And the Lord said unto Moses, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, Ye have seen that I have talked with you from heaven." "The Lord spake unto you out of the midst of the fire. *Ye heard the voice of the words, but saw no similitude, only ye heard a voice.*" Deut. iv, 12. This evidence is conclusive, that on Mount Sinai God spake his law to all the people, and that THEY heard his own voice. But Mr. S. says, "God gave his law first to Moses." What an unauthorized assertion! How opposed to the Bible!! Astonishing it is that men will thus falsify in order to serve a purpose! Here we mark Springer against the Bible, No. 2.

SEC. 5, p. 18. "Nor is the seventh day any better adapted to the moral social duties, than the first day of the week. The proof is then that the Sabbath is not a moral law, but a positive institution. It could not nor never did exist except by positive law." P. 5. "Moses does not say that God sanctified the Sabbath, but a day, the seventh day."

Of Gen. ii, 2, 3, he says:

"There is certainly no definite proof in this passage that the Sabbath was instituted in Eden, in the family of Adam in Paradise."

To which we reply, First. Well did Ezekiel speak when he said of these modern priests, "Her priests have violated my law, and have profaned mine holy things: they have put no difference between the holy and profane (by saying there is no difference between days; one day is as good as

another, notwithstanding God has sanctified the seventh), neither have they showed difference between the unclean and clean, and have hid their eyes from my Sabbaths, and I am profaned among them." Eze. xxii, 26. Springer makes no difference between the holy and profane, between the clean and unclean, hence he has shown that he is against the Bible, No. 3.

Second. In opposition to his statement, "the Sabbath cannot exist except by positive law," we affirm that the Sabbath was instituted prior to the giving of any law, and hence that it can exist independent of law.

Arg. 1. "Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made: and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. 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." Gen. ii, 1-3. Here we have the facts and reasons on which the Sabbath was instituted. The facts are,

1. God wrought or labored six days.

2. He rested on the seventh day. "On the sixth day God ended his work which he HAD made: and he rested on the seventh day," is the reading of the Septuagint, the Syriac and Samaritan, and this should be considered the genuine reading. *Dr. A. Clarke's Com. on Gen. ii.*

3. He blessed and sanctified the seventh day. But why did God rest on the seventh day? "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth." Ex. xx, 11. Then why did he bless and sanctify the seventh day? "Because that in it he had

rested from all his work which God created and made." Gen. ii, 3. Thus his working on the six days was the cause of his resting on the seventh day. And his resting on the seventh day was the reason why he blessed it. The time when these acts were performed should be carefully noted. The first act was that of labor. This occupies the first six days. The second was that of rest. This occupied the first seventh day of time. The third took place when the seventh day was past. "God blessed the seventh day and hallowed it, because that in it he had rested." Hence it must have been on the first day of the second week that this act of blessing and sanctifying took place. "The blessing and sanctification of the seventh day therefore relate not to the first seventh day of time, but to the seventh day of the week for time to come, in memory of God's rest on that day from creation." *J. N. Andrews' Sabbatic Institution*, p. 6.

The question of time being now settled we proceed to notice the manner of instituting the Sabbath. This was by resting. "The term Sabbath is transferred from the Hebrew language, and means rest." *Buck's Theological Dictionary*.

The day therefore upon which the Lord *sabbatized*, or *rested*, would consequently be his *Sabbath*, or *rest-day*. He sabbatized on the *seventh* day, therefore the *seventh day* became the *rest-day* of the Lord. But did his resting on the seventh day make it a holy day? It did not. It simply made it his Sabbath, or rest-day. His blessing the Sabbath made it a holy day. "Wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day and hallowed it." Ex. xx, 11.

But Mr. S. says that "Moses does not say that God blessed the Sabbath-day." Moses, however, denies the charge, as we have seen. This proves Springer against the Bible, No. 4.

The Sabbath or rest-day of the Lord, therefore, became a holy, blessed and sanctified day by Jehovah's act of blessing and sanctifying it. "The Hebrew word *gidash*, here rendered sanctified and hallowed, is defined by Gesenius, to pronounce holy, to sanctify, to institute any holy thing." *Heb. Lex.* p. 914.

Webster defines the word sanctify, "to consecrate or set apart to a holy or religious use; to invoke a blessing upon."

Therefore God instituted the Sabbath in Paradise on the first seventh day of time. Here we are happy to see that notwithstanding the furious opposition of Mr. S., the plainness of the truth here constrains him to make a most fatal admission. On p. 6 he says:

"That God set apart the seventh day is certain, and to our mind it is equally certain that he kept it thus set apart until he led his chosen Israel out of the land of bondage."

This we regard as giving up the issue. He has certainly given us the handle of this argument, and taken hold of the blade. If God set apart the seventh day, to what did he set it apart? Most certainly to a holy day of worship. And you say he kept it so till the exodus. Did he there unsanctify it and sanctify another day? He did not. Did he ever unsanctify it? Never. Thus the once hidden but now revealed man has got himself into a net from which even his "Bro. Chatterton" cannot deliver him. All right. This is

good evidence of the imbecility of his system, and that he contends against the truth. But was the seventh day the rest-day or Sabbath of the Lord? Springer says it was not. But the Bible says, "To-morrow (the seventh day) is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord." Ex. xvi, 23. "But on the seventh day which is the Sabbath." Verse 26. "So the people rested on the seventh day." Verse 30. This makes Springer against the Bible, No. 5. The argument stands as follows:

God did set apart the seventh day in Eden by resting upon it. *Springer.*

The seventh day is the Sabbath. *Bible.*

Therefore by taking Springer with the Bible it follows that the Sabbath was instituted in Eden. Here we remark that Mr. S. is not only against the Bible, but is also against the father of his own denomination. A. Campbell says, The seventh day was observed from Abraham, yea, *from creation.* *Deb. with Owen,* p. 302.

The religious and moral institutions of patriarchal worship were the Sabbath, prayer, praise, &c. These were parts of the system which continued for 2500 years. *Christ. System,* p. 130.

The righteous always regarded the conclusion of the week as holy to the Lord. In the wilderness *before the giving of the law* we find the Jews observing the Sabbath. *Id.*

What a wide difference between this aged father and his obstinate son. Campbell says the Sabbath was observed from creation. Springer says that it was not observed till the Jews came into the wilderness. This is Springer *vs.* Campbell, No. 1.

A. Campbell says the Sabbath is a moral insti-

tution. Springer, that the Sabbath is not moral, and cannot exist but by positive law. This makes Springer *vs.* Campbell, No. 2.

Campbell says that the Sabbath was a part of the form of worship which continued 2500 years this side of creation. Springer says the Sabbath did not exist for 2500 years this side of creation. This makes Springer *vs.* Campbell, No. 3.

If Mr. S. did not believe that the law was abolished we would here quote for his benefit the command which says, "Children, obey your parents in the Lord, for this is right," the first commandment with promise. But under the present circumstances we think he had better go and instruct father Campbell, and persuade him to call back these errors that he has taught throughout his ministerial life. We would recommend Mr. S. to consider well the following before continuing any longer in his rebellious course against the leader of his church:

"Larger ships may venture more,
But little boats should keep near shore."

Arg. 2. Ex. xx, 8. "Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy." This command, according to Mr. S., creates the Sabbath. If so, the Sabbath could not have existed prior to the giving of the command. But we have proved from Ex. xvi that the Sabbath did exist at least thirty-three days before the public proclamation of this law. This will make Springer against the Bible, No. 6.

This command is the most conclusive evidence that the Sabbath existed for ages before its proclamation on the mount. The word *remember* should be enough on this point. Webster says, "Remember; to hold in the mind an idea which

had been in the mind before." God required them to call to mind an idea that had been in their minds before. That idea was the Sabbath. The command therefore refers to, and protects a pre-existent institution and does not create it. It does not make the Sabbath, but is simply a protecting shield thrown around it. Neither does it create the obligation to keep the Sabbath. for it was kept before this command was given on Sinai. Therefore the institution possesses an inherent obligation, and the command enforces it. To this Mr. S. bears witness, for he says, "If it is perpetual we are bound to observe it." This, however could not be unless the obligation rests in and grows out of the nature of the institution. The fourth command and the seventh are alike in their intentions. They both refer to, and guard pre-existent, divine institutions. The seventh command does not institute matrimony, but preserves its purity. The fourth command requires men to call to grateful remembrance the sanctity of the holy Sabbath of the Lord, and to honor it by resting upon it as God did. These arguments we regard as conclusive proof of our affirmative, and submit the question.

SEC. 6, p. 5. Referring to the Sabbatic Catechism he quotes as follows: "What do we find in the book of Genesis? Ans. The institution of the Sabbath, but not the name." At this he becomes very much astonished! and astonished exclaims, "Here is an institution without a name for 2500 years. Fatal admission!!"

Not quite so fast, sir! perhaps we will relieve you of your great wonder. The Catechism to which you refer does not say that the Sabbath was

without name, but simply says the name is not in the book of Genesis. God rested upon the seventh day and blessed it, and the Spirit of inspiration says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath." This is enough for the honest who believe their Bibles. But how is it with your Sunday institution? When was it named Lord's day, as you call it? Did Christ or the apostles so name it? Never. It remained *nameless* for more than two hundred years, and was then named Lord's day, not by divine authority, but by the authority of the *Catholics*. Is this astonishing? Does Mr. S. now wonder? Again we "hear another writer, B. F. Snook, on the same point. He says the Sabbath was appointed to be kept in commemoration of God's laboring and resting. As such it was observed in *near all* ages. He does not say in all ages, as Mr. Waggoner does." Mr. Snook was correct in saying what he did, and neither did he contradict J. H. Waggoner nor A. Campbell, but now says with them that the Sabbath was observed from Abraham, yea, from creation!! Get away from it if you can.

Sec. 7, p. 7. "We have now clearly" [yes, clear as mud] "shown when the Sabbath was not given. And we now propose to prove when it was given." And with equal clearness we have shown to whom it was given, and the same proof will show to whom it was not given. 1. The facts on which this command was based had not all transpired until the exode from Egypt. The first fact is already seen in Gen. ii, 2, 3. The second fact is seen in Deut. v, 12-15."

We reply to the foregoing as follows: 1. By fair, logical argument he has not proved a point. 2. He has dealt out a number of assertions, but these only prove one point—that he is destitute of

argument. 3. He assumes that the facts on which the Sabbath was instituted had not all transpired until the exodus. We will now examine this assumption and show that it has no foundation in the word of God. But what are the facts on which the Sabbath was instituted? Ex. xx, 11. "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day, wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day and hallowed it." Ex. xxxi, 15-17. Six days may work be done, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of rest, holy to the Lord. Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath. For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested and was refreshed.

The facts brought to view in the foregoing are, 1. "The Lord created the heavens and earth in six days." 2. He "rested on the seventh day and was refreshed." 3. He "blessed and sanctified the seventh day," which "is the Sabbath."

Query. 1. Why did God rest on the seventh day? Because "he delivered Israel out of bondage?" No; but because he labored the six preceding days. 2. Why did he bless and sanctify the seventh day? Because "he delivered Israel from bondage?" No; but because that "in it he had rested from all his work which he had made."

These are the facts in the premises. These are the facts that inspiration bases the institution upon. Neither is there a fact upon which the institution of the Sabbath is based but what is comprehended in the foregoing. Had these trans-

pired before the exode? If so, then we have Springer against the Bible, No. 7.

But he *imagines* that the deliverance of Israel from Egypt constitutes one of the facts upon which the Sabbath was instituted, and argues that therefore the Sabbath did not exist prior to that event. Well, we will examine this, feeling well assured that when we bring it to the test of the divine standard of truth we shall discover "TEKEL" plainly inscribed upon it. His only proof is Deut. v, 12, 15. "Keep the Sabbath-day to sanctify it as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee." "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." We reply to this, 1. That it does not say when the Sabbath was instituted. 2. Neither does it tell how the Sabbath was instituted. 3. It is not of itself a command, but a requirement based upon the Sabbath command; "Keep the Sabbath as the Lord thy God commanded thee." But where have we the command as given by the Lord himself? In Ex. xx, 8, we learn the time when, and the way by which, the Sabbath was made. There all the reasons and facts of the institution are given. Deut. v, 12-15 does not give a reason or fact on which the Sabbath was instituted, neither does it, or any other scripture, say that the Sabbath commemorated Israel's deliverance from Egyptian bondage. His argument stands as follows: 1. Cause. Thou wast a servant in Egypt and I delivered thee thence. 2. Effect. Therefore I com-

mand thee to keep the Sabbath. Therefore the Sabbath grew out of the act of the deliverance from the bondage of Egypt, did not exist prior to that event, and was only binding on the subjects of the deliverance.

This is the argument fairly stated. We will now show that if it proves anything it proves too much, and hence proves nothing. 1. Mr. Springer says in another place that the Sabbath cannot exist but by positive law. Then he affirms that the law was given first on mount Sinai. Now the Sabbath cannot grow out of both the law and the deliverance from Egypt. And if it grew out of their deliverance from Egypt it could not have grown out of the law; for according to Springer the law was not given for thirty-three days after this event. And if the Sabbath grew out of the law, as S. says, then it did not exist before Israel came to the mount. But the Sabbath did exist in the wilderness. Ex. xvi. Therefore the Sabbath did not grow out of the law. But does Ex. xvi give the history of the institution of the Sabbath? Does it say that the Sabbath was instituted in the wilderness? It says no such thing. It treats the Sabbath as an existing institution, and not as anything new. Therefore we conclude that the Sabbath did not grow out of the deliverance of Israel from Egypt, and that it was not instituted in the wilderness.

Now if the above premises and conclusions are correct, it follows that the Sabbath was never binding on any man who was not a BOND-MAN in Egypt. This conclusion is either true or false. If false, it proves that the premises are unsound, and hence the argument is worth noth-

ing. If true, it forever limits the Sabbath to the generation ONLY, that was delivered from Egyptian bondage. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob never were in Egyptian bondage, therefore the Sabbath neither existed in their time, nor was binding upon them, notwithstanding it is said they "obeyed his laws and commandments," and his law says, "Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy." But David, Solomon, Samuel, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Christ and all the good of his time, NEVER were bondmen in Egypt, therefore the Sabbath did not exist in their times, and was not binding upon them. Therefore the Sabbath ceased to be binding when the last one died of the generation which came out of Egypt. But the Sabbath was binding long after that generation passed away; therefore neither the obligation to keep it, nor its institution, owe their origin to Israel's deliverance from Egypt.

We will further expose the fallacy of the reasoning of S. by applying it to some other scriptures. Deut. xxiv, 17, 18. "Thou shalt not pervert the judgment of the stranger, nor of the fatherless, nor take a widow's raiment to pledge. But thou shalt remember that thou wast a bondman in Egypt, and the Lord thy God redeemed thee thence, *therefore* I command thee to do this thing." "Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment. . . . I am the Lord your God which brought you out of the land of Egypt. *Therefore* shall ye observe all my statutes, and all my judgments, and do them." Lev. xix, 35, 37.

Now, by applying Mr. Springer's process of reasoning to these scriptures we would reason as follows: 1. Cause. "Thou wast a bondman in

Egypt and I redeemed thee thence." 2. Effect. Therefore thou shalt not pervert the judgment of the fatherless nor of the widow.

It is evident that where the cause does not exist there is no effect. Therefore those who never were redeemed from Egyptian bondage were never under any obligation to refrain from perverting the judgment of the fatherless and widow.

Again: Cause. I the Lord brought you out of the land of Egypt. Effect. Therefore ye shall do no unrighteousness. (What is unrighteousness? All unrighteousness is sin. 1 John v, 17.) Ye shall observe all my statutes, and judgments, to do them. These obligations rest only on those who were delivered from Egypt. Therefore all others could sin and disrespect the judgments of the Lord. This shows to a demonstration that Mr. S. errs, in neither understanding logic nor the Scriptures.

But what is the true import of this text which he so severely tortures? Evidently this. When the Israelites were servants in Egypt they could not keep the Sabbath. God delivered them from their slavery and they became freemen, hence they could then keep the Sabbath, and the Lord then required it of them. The above scriptures must be explained in the same way.

As further proof that the Sabbath was instituted in the wilderness, Neh. ix, 13, 14, is adduced. "Thou camest down also upon mount Sinai and spakest with them from heaven, and gavest them right judgments and true laws, good statutes and commandments, and madest known unto them thy holy Sabbath." Here is the argument. Israel knew nothing of the Sabbath before it was made


known; for, say they, How could it have been made known unto them if they had had a previous knowledge of it? But when was it made known? Springer says in the wilderness; but Nehemiah that it was made known on mount Sinai. This makes Springer against the Bible, No. 8.

Mr. S. quotes Nehemiah to prove that the Sabbath was given in the wilderness. But alas! he refuses to bless him with his testimony, and testifies to the contrary. What must the honest reader think of the candor and Christianity of a man who will so glaringly pervert the Scriptures to serve his purpose? The very same argument which proves that the Sabbath did not exist before it was made known, proves that God himself did not exist prior to making himself known to Israel in Egypt. 1. God made himself known to Israel in Egypt. Proof. Eze. xx, 5. Thus saith the Lord God, In the day when I chose Israel, and made myself known unto them in the land of Egypt. *Therefore* God came into being in the land of Egypt; neither had Israel a previous knowledge of him. If so, he could not have made himself known unto them. Such is the reasoning of Mr. S.! Such is the legitimate result of his position!!

2. Israel knew God before he made himself known to them, and they cried and prayed unto him. Ex. iii, 7. *Therefore* if Israel knew God before he made himself known in the wilderness, they also might have known the Sabbath before it was made known on mount Sinai. Proof. Ex. xvi. But God could not have made himself known to Israel in Egypt, unless he had before existed. Therefore the Sabbath could not have been made

known to them on mount Sinai unless it had existed before. Thus, after all, Mr. Springer's argument proves conclusively that the Sabbath must have existed before it was made known on the mount.

We have now proved that the position of Mr. S. that "the deliverance of Israel from Egypt is one of the facts of the Sabbath," is unsound and contrary to the Scriptures. This being established it follows that his conclusions are equally unsound and anti-scriptural. He concludes, 1. That the Sabbath never existed before the exodus. 2. That it was binding on the Jews only. We have disproved his first conclusion. His second is self-evidently false, 1. Because a small portion only of the Jewish nation were ever in Egyptian bondage. 2. The facts and reasons upon which the Sabbath was instituted are appropriate to all men and nations. "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and rested the seventh day. Wherefore he blessed the Sabbath-day and hallowed it." Truly these facts and reasons apply equally to all. Therefore the institution based upon them must apply to all, and must have been made for all.

We will now show that the Scriptures teach that the Sabbath was made for man in general, for man's benefit. Mr. S. says "the Sabbath was given for temporal rest, also for the benefit of man and beast." Very good. Gentile men and Gentile beasts need rest as well as the Jew and his beast. Is God partial? If not, then he gave the Sabbath for the benefit of all. We are glad that Mr. S. made the above statement. Query. Did man need a Sabbath before Israel was redeemed from bondage?  Would not the Sab-

bath have been a benefit to Israel while in bondage? Does the Gentile need rest? Would not the holy Sabbath be for his benefit? It is plainly to be seen that Mr. S. has taken two positions in regard to whom the Sabbath was given. 1. He says it was given to the Jews only. 2. It was given to man for his benefit. This will make Springer *vs.* Springer, No. 1. Christ says "the Sabbath was made for *man*." Mark ii, 27. This limits the Sabbath to man. For him it was made. Query. Who is man? If we can learn this then we shall know precisely for whom the Sabbath was made. "The Lord God formed *man* of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." Gen. ii, 7. Therefore *man* is made of the dust of the ground, has the breath of life, and is a living soul. For *man* thus made the Sabbath was made. Query. 1. Is the Gentile made of the dust of the ground? 2. Has he the breath of life? 3. Is he a living soul? 4. Is he a *man*? If so, then the Sabbath was made for him.

"*Man* that is born of a woman, is of few days and full of trouble." But "*Man* lieth down." "*Man* dieth and wasteth away." "*Man* giveth up the ghost." "If a *Man* die, shall he live again?" Job xiv. Does the above evidence prove anything in regard to man in general? or only the Jew in particular? Do not these Scriptures apply equally to all men? For man "born of woman," "that lieth down," and "giveth up the ghost," the Sabbath was made. Paul testifies that the woman was made for *Man*. 1 Cor. xi, 9. Christ, that the "Sabbath was made for man." The woman

and the Sabbath go together and were made for the same man. Therefore if the Sabbath was made for the *Jew*-man only, the woman was also made for the *Jew*-man only; and those who hold that the Sabbath is the property of the Jews only, ought to give their women to them; for according to their doctrine the woman belongs to them only.

Again. "Thus saith the Lord, keep ye judgment and do justice, for my salvation is near to come, and my righteousness to be revealed. Blessed is the *man* that doeth this, and the son of man that layeth hold on it, *that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it.*" "Also the sons of the *stranger* that join themselves to the Lord, to serve him, and to love the name of the Lord, to be his servants, every one that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and TAKETH hold of MY COVENANT." Isa. lvi, 1, 2, 6. In this testimony we see the following important points. 1. Any man is blessed who will keep judgment and do justice. 2. Any man is blessed who will keep the Sabbath from polluting it, and his hand from doing evil. 3. If the son of the *stranger* will take hold of God's covenant and keep the Sabbath, he shall be brought to God's holy mountain or kingdom.

Before we adduce the argument contained herein we must show where this applies. Isa. lvi, applies to the gospel age. We argue the truth of this, 1, from its connection. Chapters lii, liii, liv, lv, are by the New Testament writers referred to as belonging to this dispensation. 2. Chapters lvii, lviii, lix, lx, and lxi, also belong to this dispensation. 3. We argue the truth of the above proposition from the chapter itself.

1. It applies in a time in which the Lord gath-

ered the "out casts," or lost sheep of Israel. Matt. x, 6.

2. When others, the Gentiles, shall be gathered. Verse 8; John x, 16; Isa. lxxv, 2; Rom. x, 20, 21.

3. When God's house, or church, is a house of prayer for all people. Verse 7. The Christian dispensation therefore is the time to which the foregoing chapter is applicable, and the first verses show that it applies down in the time when "salvation is near;" "*for my salvation is near to come.*" But when will salvation come? i.e. eternal salvation?

Ans. At the second coming of Christ. Proof. "I will come again and receive you unto myself, that where I am, there ye may be also." John xiv, 3. "When Christ, who is *our life*, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory." Col. iii,

4. The saints "are kept by the power of God, through faith unto salvation *ready to be revealed in the last time.*" 1 Pet. i, 5. "Unto them that look for him, shall he appear the second time, without sin, *unto salvation.*" Heb. ix, 27. Therefore, the foregoing testimony being true, the stranger has the privilege of keeping the Sabbath in the gospel age, and particularly is this privilege made prominent, in the last of the age.

But who is the stranger? Ans. The Gentile. Proof. Wherefore, remember that ye, being in time past Gentiles in the flesh; that at that time ye were without Christ; being *aliens* from the *commonwealth* of Israel, and *strangers* from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world. Eph. ii, 11, 12. This forever settles the great question of the rights of the gentile to the benefits of the Sabbatic institu-

tion. This testimony however proves more yet, namely, that the covenant or constitution of God is yet binding, and that the Gentiles shall be blessed for taking hold of it. But what is God's covenant? Ans. The ten commandments. Proof. Deut. iv, 13. "He gave unto you his *covenant* which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments." Every one therefore who will now take hold of God's covenant, will keep the Sabbath of the fourth command which is thereby enjoined, and shall receive an abundant entrance into God's everlasting kingdom.

We have now gone through Mr. Springer's arguments on the institution of the Sabbath, and have given them a fair and candid examination. We now call upon the reader to prayerfully decide how we have met the foregoing positions and objections to the Lord's holy Sabbath. Reader, be sure that you decide according to the word which shall judge you in the last day. This is a decision whose results will follow you to the judgment seat of Christ. There we must all account for every action here. There the saint who has done his Fathers will, who has resisted the temptations of Satan, and safely overcome the rugged conflicts of the stormy sea of time, will receive a glorious crown of eternal life, will dwell amid the radiations of the glory of God, and enjoy the blissful society of all the redeemed for ever and ever. Oh let us decide for truth. Let us have the truth, and let us hold on to it.

"Truth is the gem for which we seek,
Oh, tell us where shall it be found;
For this we search and pray and weep,
That truth may in our hearts abound.

Then as we would our God obey,
 In letter and in spirit too;
 Oh, let us keep the seventh day,
 For it is plainly brought to view."

Amen.

CHAPTER II.

REVIEW OF SPRINGER ON THE LAW OF GOD.

SEC. 1. We now proceed to the investigation of the second part of Mr. Springer's book. The subject herein treated is the abolition of God's law. We affirm that God's law of "ten commandments" is now binding in this dispensation. He denies this, and holds that this law was abolished by the Son of God, in his death on the cross. He has adduced several arguments in proof of his negative position, which we will now examine in the order of his arrangement.

On p. 11 he says :

"Our first argument is based on the Saviour's words, 'Think not that I am come to destroy the law and the prophets. I am not come to destroy but to fulfill. Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled, Matt. v, 17, 18. The first point in the argument is, that Christ came not to destroy the law or the prophets."

We cannot imagine why Mr. S. should think that there is any evidence in this text that the law is abolished. He says the first point of "argument is, that Christ came not to *destroy* the law or the prophets." We readily grant it; for if he came to destroy the law he came to abolish it, and

if he did not come to destroy, he did not come to abolish it.

He says, "I am not come to DESTROY." This word is from the Greek word *kataluo* which Greenfield defines, "To destroy; demolish; overthrow; render null and void; *abrogate*." Web., "To break; demolish; ruin; kill; take away; *put an end to*." Therefore, according to these standard authors, Christ did not come to demolish, to kill, to *abrogate*, *abolish*, to *render null* and void, to put an end to the law and the prophets. This text is the most direct proof of the fact that Christ did not come to abolish God's law. He also says:



"It is clearly implied that the law, after it was fulfilled, would pass away."

That Christ came to fulfill the law and the *prophets*, we believe and admit. The word fulfill, as here used, is from the Greek *plero-o* which signifies "to fulfill, teach, to preach;" Greenfield. "To answer a law by obedience;" Web. "To ratify;" Campbell. Therefore Christ in fulfilling the law did not kill it or take it away, but taught it, preached it, ratified it. He argues "that the law died, passed away, when it was fulfilled." We see however that there is no such idea in the text. But he says, "why talk of passing away, if the law did not pass away?" We answer, Christ did not say that the law would pass away, but he declared that till heaven and earth pass, not one iota or least part of the law should fail till all be fulfilled. All what? Both law and prophets. Have the prophets all been fulfilled yet? They have not. Therefore the least part of the law has not yet passed away. This is the major premise of our Saviour's argument to show that the law of which he was speaking is perpetual in its obligations.

But why did S. stop when he did? Why did he so garble and pervert the language of Christ by tearing the above Scriptures from its connection? Evidently because he knew the next verse, if quoted, would overturn his whole theory of no-lawism. Hear it, it is the conclusion which Christ drew from the above premise. "Therefore whosoever shall break one of these least commandments and teach men so—he shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven, but whosoever shall do and teach them the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." Verse 19. *First.* Of what law was our Saviour speaking? We answer, The connection shows very clearly that he was talking of the law of ten commandments. In verse 21 he quotes the sixth commandment, "Thou shalt not kill;" and in verse 27, the seventh, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," which proves conclusively the truth of this answer. *Second.* The phrase "kingdom of heaven" is translated "reign of heaven" by Campbell, which we think is an improvement of the common version.

Christ therefore teaches, 1. That whosoever shall do and teach others to do the precepts of this law, shall be of great esteem in the reign of heaven. 2. That whosoever shall violate one of the least of these precepts, and teach others to do so, shall be of "no esteem in the reign of heaven." *Camp. Trans.* But can obedience to this law be a condition of God's esteem in his kingdom, if it was abolished? It cannot. Therefore Mr. Springer's first witness testifies against him, and proves that the law of God is binding co-extensive with the duration of heaven and earth. This makes Mr. Springer *vs.* the Bible, No. 9.

We will now show the absurdity of the position

of S., that when a law is fulfilled it is abolished, by showing that it proves too much. Christ demanded baptism of John, saying, "Thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness." Mat. iii, 15. Query. Did Christ abolish all righteousness in his baptism? Mr. Springer's argument says, Yes, "for that which is fulfilled is abolished." This then proves that the institution of baptism was abolished and passed away when Christ was baptized. Thus you see, Mr. S., that this proves too much for you! "Bear ye one another's burdens and so fulfill the law of Christ." Gal. vi, 2. This command Paul gave the Galatians. Did they obey it? if so they fulfilled it, and hence abolished it, according to Mr. S. Therefore if the position of S. is true, "that when a law is fulfilled it is abolished," is done away, 1. Christ by fulfilling his Father's law abolished it, and took it away. 2. The church at Galatia fulfilled the law of Christ and hence abolished it, and took it out of the way. Therefore the world since then has been without any law. Query. Does this look any like no lawism? That this reasoning of Mr. S. and his conclusion are wrong is self evident. James proves that the law of God was binding in his day, notwithstanding Christ had fulfilled it. And he enjoined upon all Christians the duty of obeying it. "If ye FULFILL the royal law according to the Scriptures, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, ye do well." James ii, 8. Query. 1. James, what law do you mean? Ans.  That law which said, "Thou shalt not kill," and "Thou shalt not commit adultery." 2. What is the consequence of violating this law? Ans.  "But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin and are convicted of the law as transgressors." Why is this?

Ans. ☞ "For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and offend in one point, he is guilty of all." Chap. ii, 8-11.

Therefore this testimony proves 1. That the law of God is binding in the Christian dispensation and should be obeyed. 2. That this law is the code of ten commandments. This is proved by his quoting the *sixth* and *seventh* commandments. 3. That the violation of this law is *SIN*, and that by it is the knowledge of sin. See also, 1 John iii, 4; Rom. iii, 20; vii, 7.

Sec. 2. "Our second argument is that Christ abolished the law."

The word *abolish* Webster defines, "To make void; annul; abrogate; *destroy*; put an end to." Therefore if Christ abolished his Father's law, he killed it; destroyed it; made it null and void, and put an END to it! This he says he came not to do, as we have unanswerably proved in Sec. 1. Therefore he did not *destroy* or *abrogate* the law which he came to fulfill; and hence if he abolished any law, it was another law and not this.

We will now examine his proof in 2 Cor. iii, 7-13. Here S. says:

"This connection is clear proof that the law is abolished."

We grant that this testimony proves the abolition of the ministration of God's law, which ministration was the law of types and shadows. Heb. x, 1. But we deny that Paul here testified that the moral law, the law of ten commands, was abolished, 1. Because if he did he contradicts himself. Proof. "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid, yea we establish the law." Rom. iii, 31. The phrase "make void," is from the Greek word *katargeo*, which in 2 Cor. iii, 13, is translated, "*abolished*," and "*done away*"

in verses 7, 11, and 14, which proves that it should have been so rendered above. Therefore Paul's testimony to the Romans, in regard to the law of God, is the following: "Do we *abolish* the law through faith?" Springer says, "Yes." This makes Springer *vs.* the Bible, No. 10. But Paul says, "God forbid, we establish, confirm, ratify the law." This proof is unanswerable. It never can be subverted. His argument stands thus: The ministration of death was written on the tables of stone and was glorious. That which was done away was glorious. Therefore that which was engraven on stones was abolished. The premise of this argument is not true; it is an unauthorized assumption.

He assumes 1. That the ministration was written upon the tables of stone. 2. That the adjective "*glorious*" is ascribed to that which was thereon written. Neither of these points can be proved by any man living. Hence his conclusion is only drawn from his assumptions, and is *worth nothing*.

In verse 9 two ministrations are brought to view. 1. The ministration of condemnation. Greek, *katakriseos*. "Censure; blame; accusation, condemnation." *Greenfield*. 2. The ministration of righteousness, Greek, *dikaiousune*: "Justification; pardon; favor." *Greenfield*. The first ministration accused, blamed and condemned the sinner. The second grants to the sinner grace, pardon and justification. The first censured, accused, blamed and condemned none but sinners; therefore none but the transgressors of the law came under its notice. Hence, if the law was obeyed, the ministration made no condemnations. This proves that the thing ministered and the min-

istration are *distinct*. The second ministration offers pardon and justification to the sinner; the second ministers salvation to the lost. Hence before man needs the grace and pardon thus offered he must be a sinner, a transgressor—not of the ministration or gospel, but of the law. 1 John iii, 4. But what was written? Paul says, *death*. But may we not as truly say that life, also, was written? We may. The commandments were appointed to life, to all who obeyed them. Lev. xviii, 5; Eze. xx, 11, 13, 21; Rom. vii, 10. And the penalty for their violation was death. Eze. xviii, 24; Rom. vii, 10. Hence obedience to the law was the cause of life to him who obeyed; and disobedience was the cause of death to him who disobeyed it. In this sense only is death said to have been written. The Apostle used a form of speech which frequently occurs in the Bible. A similar expression is found in 2 Kings, iv, 40: "O thou man of God, there is *death* in the pot." Not literal death, but the *CAUSE* of *death*.

But what was done away? "The ten commandments," says S., but Paul says, "That which was *VAILED*." What was veiled? The ten commandments? Ans. Ex. xxxiv, 35. "And the children of Israel saw the face of Moses, that the skin of his face shone, and Moses put a veil upon *the ten commandments*." "That is just my position," says Mr. S. But we read it *wrong* to prove your position right. We will now read it *right* to prove your position *wrong*. "And Moses put the veil upon *his FACE*;" this veil covered the glory of Moses' face. Hence the *glory* of his face was veiled that the children of Israel could not see the end of that which was done away. This glory represented the glory of the typical system, and the passing

away of this glory represented the passing away of the whole ceremonial ministration. Says Paul: "Which *GLORY* was to be done away." Therefore 2 Cor. iii, does not prove the abolition of any of the precepts of God's law of ten commandments.

P. 13: "To this argument also belongs Eph. ii, 14, 15: 'Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances.'"

This testimony only proves the abolition of the *enmity* between Jew and Gentile. And what was that? The law which forbade idolatry, profanity, murder, theft, &c.? If so it was taken away to let the Jew unite with the Gentile in all those crimes forbidden in this law. But this law was never an enemy, but always a friend to man. Neither was this a law of ordinances. Therefore this is not the law which Paul testifies was abolished. But what was the *enmity*? Ans. "Even the law of *commandments contained in ORDINANCES*." And what law contained commandments in ordinances? The *ceremonial*. Proof. Num. xix, 2. "This is the *ordinance* of the law, which the Lord hath commanded, saying, speak unto the children of Israel, that they bring thee a red heifer without spot." Heb. ix, 10. "Which stood in meats and drinks and divers washings and *carnal ordinances* imposed on them till the time of reformation." This is the law which Christ abolished, and not the law which he says he came not to DESTROY, not to ABROGATE. Mr. S. has therefore gained nothing from this witness. The testimony is not in the right direction.

SEC. 3. Mr. S. next denies our position on the two laws, and refers to John vii, 23, to prove that the Sabbath law is the law of Moses. "If a man receive circumcision on the Sabbath-day that the law of Moses should not be broken." He quotes

the margin, "And the law of Moses is not broken," and then says, "The Saviour here calls the Sabbath the law of Moses." This is an unauthorized assertion; the Saviour does no such thing. The reading of the text is correct as it stands. So testify Wesley, Doddridge, Macknight, Campbell, &c.; about as good authority as Mr. Springer. Why did they circumcise on the Sabbath? That the law of Moses be not violated, which required circumcision to be performed on the eighth day, though it should happen to fall upon the Sabbath. Hence this text does not favor the position of S.

He next refers to Heb. x, 28, "He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses," and argues that God's law is here called Moses' law. But this text does not bear him out in his conclusion. Moses' law was despised. The word despised in this text is from the Greek word *atheteo*, and properly signifies to reject, and is so rendered in other places in the New Testament. *Greenfield*. Mark vi, 26; vii, 9; Luke vii, 30; John xii, 48. Therefore he that rejected Moses' law was put to death. But how could they do this? Evidently by despising and refusing the atonement which it offered. It was in this way that the Jews rejected Christ.

He next denies that there is any authority for the distinction of moral law, and quotes Webster to prove that the moral law is the law of God which prescribes our social duties. Very good. Webster also says, "The moral law is summarily contained in the decalogue, or ten commandments." So much for the testimony of Mr. Webster. Mr. S. and his brethren declaim loudly against the use of the phrase, moral law, notwithstanding they

use it themselves. A. Campbell says, "The moral law is *unrepealed*." *Christ. System*, p. 45. But Mr. S. says all law was abolished. Quite a difference between these two great men. This makes Springer *vs.* Campbell, No. 4.

We have the testimony of another of their greatest men—a man of whom I can only speak in the most respectful and affectionate terms. B. W. Stone says, "By the abolition of the law, I do not think that the *moral* law of love to God and love to man was destroyed, for this MUST be UNCHANGEABLY and ETERNALLY binding on ALL intelligent creatures. I see no connection between the death of Christ and the *destruction* of *moral law*; but there is an intimate connection between his death and the *ceremonial laws*, for these were types and shadows of Christ, the antitype and substance. Though the *moral* law was NOT ABOLISHED, yet its political curse was, which I before proved to be death under Moses." *Works of B. W. Stone*, by J. M. Mather, p. 113.

What rich and wholesome instruction this ripe and aged servant of God could derive from Mr. Springer's essays on the law of God!! If he were yet living it would certainly be *the duty* of Mr. S. to more perfectly expound the Scriptures to him!!!

SEC. 4, p. 19. "Our third argument is drawn from the decision of the apostolic council at Jerusalem. This council assembled for the express purpose of deciding this question of the perpetuity of the law. Acts xv."

This argument is all assumption and assertion. The moral law is not mentioned once in the whole of this chapter. Verse 1 tells us what those Judaizing teachers taught that caused the dissension. "Except ye be *circumcised* after the manner of

Moses ye cannot be saved." These teachers urged the necessity of keeping up the rite of circumcision, and of observing the law. What law? The ten commandments? No; but the law of Moses. They therefore urged the observance of the ceremonial, and not the moral, law. In consequence of this, a dissension arose among the brethren, and a council was convened at Jerusalem to consider this matter. Of *what*? Whether the Gentiles should have *other* gods before them? Whether they should steal, murder, and commit adultery, &c.? Whether the ten commandments are binding on the Gentiles? Yes, says Mr. S., that was it. But Luke says it was to consider whether the Gentiles should be circumcised and keep the law of MOSES. This makes Springer *vs.* the Bible, No. 11.

We are now prepared to examine the decision of this council. And what was it? S. says, Peter decided that the law was a yoke, and James that it was troublesome; hence he decides that it was a troublesome yoke. Therefore they all decided that the Gentiles should not be troubled with this *troublesome* yoke. Such is the report as given by Mr. S. We think, however that if he would reflect, he would conclude that the only *yoke* and *trouble* to him in God's holy law, is that which requires the observance of the seventh day. Even his own theory does not promise salvation to him, who will violate either of the nine commandments. Therefore he has *nine-tenths* of this *troublesome yoke* in his own system, or he is partial in the law. Mal. ii, 8, 9. "For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and unto us to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things, that ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from

blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication, from which if ye keep yourselves ye shall do well." Acts xv, 28, 29. "Here," says S., "this question is forever put to rest, and there is no Sabbath in the decision. Indeed, it is absolutely excluded." Wonderful conclusion! Astonishing!! Is there anything said in the decision about idolatry, profanity, murder, theft, adultery, and false witness? Not one word. Therefore according to the wisdom of Mr. S. the commands forbidding all these crimes are not binding on the Gentiles. They are absolutely excluded. And why are they excluded? For the same reason that the Sabbath is excluded. Because they were not mentioned in the decision. Therefore they could worship idols, steal, lie, murder, commit adultery, &c., and be saved if they would only refrain from blood offered to idols, things strangled, and from fornication. This is just as conclusive as the conclusion of S. that they could violate the Sabbath because it was not mentioned in the decision, for not a command of the whole decalogue is therein mentioned.

That God's law of ten commands was called by Peter a *yoke*, and by James *troublesome*, we deny. They could not so regard it without coming in collision with other writers of the Bible. David says, "Thy testimonies also are my delight and my counselors." Ps. cxix, 24. "I will *delight* myself in thy *statutes*: I will not forget thy word." Vs. 16. "Make me to go in the path of thy commandments, for therein do I delight." Verse 35. John says, "This is the love of God that we keep his commandments, and his commandments are not *grievous*." 1 John v, 3. Paul says, "I *delight* in the law of God after the inward man." Rom.

vii, 22. "So then with the mind I myself *serve* the law of God." Verse 25.

From the foregoing we conclude that God's law is a *yoke*, is *troublesome*, and *grievous*, only to the *carnally minded*. Rom. viii, 7. We feel well assured that S. has entirely failed to make even a plausible and sensible inference from Acts xv, that the law of God was abolished.

Sec. 5, p. 21. "Our fourth argument is that we cannot be justified by the law. That it is not now a condition of life. Before its abrogation it was to Israel their condition of life.

This argument consists of two assertions. 1. That we cannot now be justified by the law. 2. That it is not now a condition of life. These we will examine in their order. To prove his first assertion he quotes Rom. iii, 20. "Therefore by the deeds of the law, there shall no flesh be justified in his sight." Why not? Springer says because the law was abolished. But Paul assigns as the reason why the sinner cannot be justified by the law, "that by the law is the KNOWLEDGE of sin." Had Mr. S. quoted the whole verse he might have seen plainly why the sinner cannot be justified by the law. But on the supposition of S. that the law was abolished, how could it in Paul's time have been that by which the *knowledge* of sin was acquired? Can a knowledge of sin be obtained by an *old abolished law*? It cannot. Therefore an abolished law never can communicate a knowledge of sin. And hence the law was binding in Paul's time, and was that only by which a knowledge of sin was obtained.

As another reason why the law cannot justify the sinner, Paul adduces the fact that "*all have sinned* and come short of the glory of God." Verse

23. These are the reasons why the sinner cannot be justified by the law. Springer argues that because the law will not justify the sinner, "therefore it was abolished." This same argument, however, would prove that it was always abolished, for it never did, and never could, justify the sinner. He might with equal propriety say that the law of the State which is violated and cannot justify the transgressor, but condemns him, is abolished! It is true of all law, that no violated law can ever justify its violator. A. Campbell says, "It is then *utterly impossible* that any sinner can be legally justified before God by a law which he has in any one instance violated. If then a sinner be justified it must be on some other principle than law." *Christian Baptism*, p. 277.

Now hear Mr. Campbell also say why the sinner cannot be justified by the law. "For should a man keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is *guilty* of ALL. He has despised the *whole authority* of the law and the *Law-giver*." P. 278.

This is why—this is the reason. Query. Mr. Campbell, Please tell us whether you do make the law void through the gospel? Answer. "Salvation in the aggregate is *all of grace*, and all the parts of it are consequently *gracious*. NOR do we in TRUTH, in *obeying the gospel*, MAKE VOID either LAW or GOSPEL." *Baptism*, p. 285.

This shows the sentiments of Mr. Campbell on this great question. How much like Paul he speaks! "Do we then make *void* (abolish) the law through faith? God forbid." But how much Mr. Springer opposes this "*view* of the subject!" He thinks that the law is made entirely void by

the gospel. This makes Springer *vs.* Campbell, No. 5.

Therefore we conclude from the foregoing evidence that the sinner, if pardoned at all, must receive pardon through grace and not through the law. But we believe the law will justify him who obeys it. The law of the State justifies all "law-abiding citizens." So God's law does justify all who obey it. To this Paul gives the most positive testimony. "For not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the *doers* of the law shall (*FALL FROM GRACE*—*Springer*) be JUSTIFIED." Rom. ii, 13. This is conclusive proof that the law will justify him who obeys it, as far as he does obey it.

But Mr. S. says we cannot now be justified by the law. Well, Paul says *we can!* This is the difference between these preachers. Here we mark Springer *vs.* the Bible, No. 12.

Next he quotes Rom. iii, 28, to prove that the sinner is "justified by faith *without the deeds* of the law." This we believe. Obedience to the law does not justify the sinner, but brings him back to God: separates him from his sins, and then he is justified by faith. Rom. v, 1. But if he is justified *before* he repents, or obeys the law which heretofore he has violated, he is saved *in his sins*, not *from* them. This cannot be, for Christ came to save his people *FROM* their sins, and not *IN* them. Matt. i, 21.

Again. We think this text proves too much for Mr. S. if he applies it correctly. His argument is that the sinner is justified by faith without *obeying* the law. If so, it follows that while he seeks to be justified, he is a sinner, and hence if Christ justifies him while a *sinner*, he is the MINISTER of

sin. Paul denies this. Gal. ii, 17. 2. That if he is justified *before* he obeys the law which convicts him of sin, he is also pardoned before baptism. Hence this would destroy the doctrine of baptism for remission of sins; and if this were destroyed, when Mr. S. got through with his opposition to the law of God he would have but little of his system left to preach! Next he says:

"Those who are led by the law of faith will bear the fruit of the Spirit, love, joy, peace, long-suffering, and will learn that against such there is *no law*."

What was his object in making this last statement? To make the impression that no law condemned the good fruits of the Spirit? No; but to convey the idea that there is *NO LAW*. Peter, speaking of the evils and perils of the last days, says that some will *wrest* the writings of PAUL as well as the *other* scriptures, to their *own destruction*. 2 Pet. iii, 16. If S. is not guilty of this charge, we cannot imagine what would make a man guilty; for he has certainly most shamefully perverted the scripture referred to. Paul enumerated the fruits of the Spirit and said, "*Against such there is no law*." Gal. v, 23. This however implies that there is a law against the evils spoken of in the same connection. Gal. v, 19-21. That this is true, is proved by verse 18, which says, "But if ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not *under* (the CONDEMNATION of) the law." Here is a class led by the Spirit—not under the law. Query. Could they sin against the law, because they were not under it? "What then? Shall we sin (*transgress the law*) because we are not under the law, but under grace? God *forbid*." Rom. vi, 15. Therefore being under grace

did not give them liberty to sin; but S. very gravely concludes that there is no law. Is not this "*no-lawism*?" If not, what is it?

We pass now to notice the second assertion of S., that "the law is not now a condition of life." We will answer this by proving that the law of God was a condition of life under the Old Testament, and that it is now a condition of life under Christ.

1. The law of God was a condition of life under Moses. Proof. "Ye shall therefore keep *my statutes*, and *my judgments*, which if a man DO, he shall LIVE in them." Lev. xviii, 5. "And I gave them *my statutes*, and shewed them my judgments, which if a man DO he shall even LIVE in them." Eze. xx, 11. Query. What kind of statutes were these? Ans. STATUTES OF LIFE. Eze. xxxiii, 15. "If the wicked restore the pledge, give again that he had robbed, walk in the STATUTES OF LIFE, without committing *iniquity*, he shall *surely* LIVE, he shall not *die*." These scriptures are sufficient proof that the law of God was a condition of life, under Moses.

2. The law of God is a condition of life under Christ. Arg. 1 is founded on the teaching of Christ. Will Springer and his brethren hear him? They *cannot*—they *dare not*, and hold on to their system. They frequently declaim against hearing Moses. We now invite them to hear CHRIST. God has said, "*Hear Him*." Matt. xvii, 5. Christ said to the young man, "If thou wilt enter into *life*, KEEP THE COMMANDMENTS." Matt. xix, 17. The young man here spoken of desired eternal life. He went to Christ and sought its conditions, saying, "Good Master, what *good thing* shall I do, that I may have *eternal life*?" What a great

and important question! What question should more interest man? Who is better prepared to answer it than He who came down from heaven and taught with authority? Did he answer the question? He did. Did he answer it correctly? Most certainly. He who lived as we *should* live, and taught as we *should* teach, did well say, "*If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments*." Therefore the great Teacher, Jesus Christ, has enjoined this code of commandments as a condition of ETERNAL LIFE. Query. What law is it that he here enjoins as a condition of life? Evidently not the law of types and shadows, for it never was a condition of life. Eze. xx, 25. The connection proves conclusively that it is the law of *ten commandments*. The young man saith, Which? Not which *command*, but which *COMMANDMENTS*. This is direct proof that there were then *two codes* of commandments. Hence the young man desiring to know to which code reference was made, "saith unto him, *Which*?" Jesus answered, "Thou shalt do no murder, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Honor thy father and thy mother, and Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Thus he quoted the fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth and ninth precepts of the decalogue, and also the second great commandment on which they hang, in which he refers to the decalogue beyond a doubt.

But says S. and his brethren, "He said nothing of the Sabbath, therefore it is not to be obeyed as a condition of life." We reply, 1. That he said nothing of idolatry or profanity to the young man. Therefore the same argument says that he could get to heaven with other gods before him, and pro-

faning God's name. Believest thou this? If not, renounce your absurd theory. Christ enjoined the whole code to which he referred, as a condition of the blessing of eternal life, and made the above quotations, not to show which of them was essential to be obeyed, but to show which code of commandments must be obeyed in order to enter into life. But Springer argues that Christ taught this before his death—that he abolished the law in his death—"but since the abrogation we are taught differently." P. 21.

If the pope of Rome had thus spoken we should not be astonished, but that any minister professing to follow Christ should so speak, we think is monstrous indeed! Such preachers, if heard and believed, will make more infidels than Christians. It is maintained that since the death of Christ we are not to keep the commandments. We most frankly confess that this is "*different*" from what Christ ever taught. What a difference between Springer and Mr. Campbell! Hear, will you, what Mr. C. says. "He that said not a jot or tittle of his law shall fall to the ground—he that magnified his law and made it *honorable*, will suffer no person to add to or subtract from—to change or to violate it in a single point with impunity." *Deb. with Purcell*, p. 214. This makes Springer *vs.* Campbell, No. 6.

What an astonishingly wide difference between these great theologians! But we are not ready to dismiss Mr. S. from this scripture yet. This declaration of Christ (If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments) is no part of the law to which he enjoined obedience; hence, if the law was abolished, the teachings of Christ are yet binding unless they were also abolished. But if

they were abolished, it follows that we are now no more under Christ than under Moses. Our Saviour said, "If ye love me, keep my commandments." John xiv, 15. But if his teachings are abolished, this obligation is also destroyed. Here is where the pernicious doctrine of "*antinomianism*" leads. It ends in the rejection of what was taught by our Saviour. But the Father of the Son said, "Hear him." Matt. xvii, 5. Therefore his teachings were not abolished, for what he taught was designed for the benefit of his people in all time. It of necessity therefore follows that the declaration, "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments," is as binding now as when it was first spoken. Therefore all who will have life, and obey the sacred injunction of Christ, must keep the commandments even though they were abolished. So we see that Mr. S. cannot get around keeping the commandments, by proving the law abolished. He must now go to keeping them, notwithstanding they are abolished, according to his theory, or willfully disobey Christ, for he commanded us to keep his Father's commandments, and says, "If ye love me, keep my commandments."

But is it reasonable that he would enjoin obedience to an abolished law? It is not. However, such is the truth, if the doctrine of S. is correct. He thinks we are taught very differently since the death of Christ. Different from what? Of course from what Christ *taught*, when he said, "If thou wilt enter into life, *keep* the commandments." This is either *true*, or *false*. If true, the Apostles since the death of Christ have taught that men need not keep the commandments of God; for nothing else would be "*different*" from what Christ taught. We will hear these inspired

witnesses speak for themselves. John says, "This is the *love* of God, that (we believe that the law of God is abolished? No. But that we) KEEP his COMMANDMENTS." 1 John v, 3. "And this is *love*, that we walk after his commandments." 2 John 6. "He that saith, I know him, and *keepeth not* his commandments is a liar, and the truth is not in him." 1 John ii, 4. Is there any authority here given for sinning? Is there any difference between this and what our Saviour taught? There is not. This makes S. vs. the Bible, No. 13.

But he complains that some of his strongest arguments were rejected from publication in his discussion with our editor, Bro. Smith. It is true that his article was not published. But why not? Because of its strength of argument? No. But because of its want of candor and fairness. However he has had an opportunity to publish his rejected article in his book, and we suppose that he has done so. But if it was no stronger in argument when rejected from the *Review* than it is now, its argumentative health must have been extremely feeble!

Our second argument is founded on Rev. xxii, 14. "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." S. cannot object that this was not spoken this side of Christ's death, for Christ declared it in the year A. D. 96, about 63 years after his death. This testimony is conclusive proof, 1. That God in the year 96 had a code of commandments. 2. That in the Christian dispensation obedience to this code is essential to an admittance into the city of God. We regard these arguments as suf-

ficient to prove our proposition, and so submit the question.

SEC. 6. "We base our fifth argument with Paul on the doctrine of wills and testaments." P. 22.

His argument is that the first testament with its carnal laws and priesthood, was abolished and taken away. This we do not deny. But we do deny his forced and illegitimate conclusion that therefore God's holy law of ten commandments was abolished. He quotes Heb. vii, 12 to prove the change or abolition of the first testament. "For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law." Then he assumes that God's law of ten commandments was abolished; but this idea neither follows from the premises nor is favored by the text. The law of Moses confined the priesthood to Aaron and his house, and excluded it from all others. Proof. "And thou shalt appoint Aaron and his sons, and they shall wait on their priest's office, and the stranger that cometh nigh shall be put to death." Num. iii, 10. We remark on this law, 1. This was a "ceremonial law," or law of ceremonies, which is the same. Num. ix, 3. 2. This was a law of carnal (fleshly) commandments. Heb. vii, 16. 3. This law was *not* good, Eze. xx, 25, but was merely "a shadow of good things to come." Heb. x, 1. 4. It was not a condition of life. Eze. xx, 25. 5. It never made sin known, but ministered FOR, on account of sin. Heb. v, 1; x, 8. 6. It was imposed TILL the reformation—till Christ. Chap. ix, 10. 7. No priest besides Aaron's sons could officiate while this law was in force, "for the stranger that cometh nigh shall be put to death." 8. Therefore before Christ could officiate in the priest's office, this law which

confined the priesthood to Aaron's family must be abolished. 9. For this purpose this carnal, weak and unprofitable law was disannulled, and the way opened for Christ to minister in the more glorious Melchisedec priesthood. Proof. "For there is verily a disannulling of the commandment going before, for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof." Heb. vii, 18. This therefore only proves the abolition of the ritual or typical law, and not the abolition of the law which David says, IS PERFECT; Ps. xix, 7, which Solomon says it is the *whole duty* of man to keep; Eccl. xii, 13, which Christ says he came *not to destroy* or abrogate; Matt. v, 17, than which heaven and earth shall sooner pass away; which we must keep if we would have life; Matt. xix, 17, which Paul says is not made void or abolished through faith; Rom. iii, 31, and which is holy, just, spiritual (not carnal), and good. Chap. vii, 12, 14. As further proof of his position, he quotes Heb. x, 9:

"Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first that he may establish the second."

He argues from this that the *will* of God which Christ came to do, is that which was taken away, and therefore the ten commandments were abolished. To this we answer, 1. The conclusion does not follow from the premises. 2. The word "will" in the text is from the Greek word *thelema*, which the Greek Lexicon defines, "Will; design; purpose; statute; command:" whereas the word *will*, meaning covenant or testament is from another word, *diatheke*. 3. The WILL which Christ came to do, is that which he taught his disciples to pray might be done in the earth as it is in heaven. Matt. vi, 10. "Thy kingdom come,

thy *will* be done in earth, as it is in heaven." 4. This will is a condition of relationship with Christ. "For whosoever shall do the WILL of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother." Matt. xii, 50. 5. It is the condition of entrance into the kingdom of heaven. "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the WILL of my Father which is in heaven." Matt. vii, 21. 6. It is a condition of being heard in prayer. "Now we know that God heareth not sinners (transgressors of the law), but if any man be a worshipper of God, and doeth his WILL (obeys the law) him he heareth." John ix, 31. "He that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer shall be abomination." Prov. xxviii, 9. "Yea, when ye make many prayers, I will not hear." Isa. i, 15. "Because they have cast away the LAW of the Lord of hosts, and despised the word of the Holy One of Israel." Chap. v, 24. See also Neh. ix, 29, 30; Jer. xi, 11; xiv, 10, 12; Micah iii, 4; Zech. vii, 11-13. 7. This will is God's law of ten commandments. "I delight to do thy will, O my God." Query. What is God's will? Answer. "Yea, THY LAW is within my heart." Ps. xl, 8. The fact that David here uses the terms "will" and "law" synonymously, is conclusive proof that God's will is identical with his law. That his will is identical with his law of ten commandments is further proved by Rom. ii, 17, 18. "Behold, thou art called a Jew, and retest in the law, and makest thy boast of God, and knowest his will, and approvest the things that are more excellent." Query. How does he know God's will? Ans. "Being instruct-

ed out of the law." Paul, here, beyond a doubt spake of God's will as being his law. But to what law is reference made? To the law of ten commandments. This is proved by the reference to it in verse 21. "Dost thou steal" (break the sixth commandment?), and in verse 22, "Dost thou commit adultery" (break the seventh commandment)? 8. Christ came to do this will. "Sacrifice and offering, and burnt offering, and offering for sin thou wouldst not, neither hadst pleasure therein." Why not? Were they not offered by the law? Yes; they were offered by the Levitical law, but they were offered on account of sin. Heb. v, 1; x, 6. Therefore they only kept sin in remembrance; kept up a remembrance of the transgression of the great law of God. Chap. x, 3. Hence if this law had been obeyed there would have been no necessity for the sacrifices of the ceremonial law; therefore God's pleasure and delight was that they might obey his moral law which *prevented* sin, and thus supersede the necessity of obeying the law of sin offerings.

"Hath the Lord as great *delight* in burnt offerings as in OBEYING the voice of the Lord? Behold to obey is *better* than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams." 1 Sam. xv, 22. "O that thou hadst hearkened to my commandments! then had thy *peace* been as a river, and thy *righteousness* as the waves of the sea." Isa. xlvi, 18. "For I desired mercy and not sacrifice, and the knowledge of God *more* than burnt offerings. But they like men have *transgressed* the covenant, there have they dealt *treacherously* against me." Hos. vi, 6, 7. See also Isa. i, 10-16; Mark xii, 33. When Christ said, "Lo, I come to do thy *will*, O God," this was far more desirable to God

than all burnt sacrifice in which he had no pleasure; therefore Christ came to do God's will; to obey his law, the violation of which is sin; to magnify it and make it honorable; Isa. xlii, 21; and to redeem man from its curse; Gal. iii, 13, he never came to destroy it; Matt. v, 17, to make it void; Rom. iii, 31. Christ did not take this will away; did not abolish it; for it still existed in John's time in the year A. D. 90, about 60 years after the death of Christ. "And the world passeth away and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth forever." 1 John ii, 17.

From these premises we draw the following conclusions: 1. If Christ abolished his Father's law, he taught his disciples to pray for something, which he knew they would never see come to pass; for he taught them to pray that this law might be obeyed on earth as it is in heaven. If he did this, he imposed on them an unreasonable duty; to say which would be to impeach his wisdom. Therefore we conclude he did not destroy the law. 2. If he destroyed this will, or law, he destroyed the condition of relationship with himself. Therefore either nobody is related to him or everybody is; and if so, universalism is the result, and if not, universalism will be the inevitable result; for all will then universally perish without law! 3. If he destroyed this will and took it away, he destroyed the condition of entrance into the kingdom of heaven; therefore either nobody will enter the kingdom or everybody will. If everybody does, universal salvation is certain; if nobody does, universal destruction is just as certain. Hence we have *universalism* let the scale turn either way. 4. If he did destroy his Father's law, he destroyed the condi-

tion of being heard in prayer. Therefore either God will hear the prayers of all, without condition, or he will hear the prayers of none. If the former, universal salvation follows; if the latter, universal destruction as legitimately follows. Hence here is more universalism! 5. If he took this will away he destroyed his Father's law, therefore God now has no law, and, as sin is the transgression of his law, it follows that since its destruction there has been *no SIN* in the world; and that for more than eighteen hundred years the world has been in the glorious light of a millennium, without having the *least knowledge of it!* This is far ahead of universalism. What great discoveries arise from this antinomian theory!! So the advocates of the no-law theory are determined to be universalists one way or the other. Such are the absurdities of a theory at war with every doctrine of the Bible.

The preceding arguments we regard as most triumphantly overturning the no-law theory, and irrefutably establishing the perpetuity of God's holy law. We now leave Mr. Springer's argument on "wills," granting him a most hearty welcome to all that he can prove by it.

Sec. 7, p. 26. "We base our sixth argument on the doctrine of covenants. Web. defines this word as follows: 'A mutual consent or agreement of two or more persons to do or forbear some act or thing; a contract; stipulation.' A covenant is created by deed in writing, sealed and executed."

The word is from the Greek *diatheke*, which Greenfield defines: "Institution, dispensation, covenant, mutual promises with mutual conditions." It occurs thirty-three times in the New Testament; is translated by the word "covenant" twenty times, and by the word "testament" thirteen times. "It

should have been rendered by the word covenant in every place where it occurs."—*Campbell, Macknight, Doddridge, and Clarke*. The argument of S. is that the ten commandments are the first covenant. The first covenant was abolished. Therefore the ten commandments were abolished.

The major premise of this argument is false, as we will now show. The following particulars are essential to all covenants. 1. The parties. 2. The time. 3. The place. 4. Its design, 5. The agreement. 6. Its dedication. We will now identify the above covenant by searching out its essential particulars and then show that the argument of S. is unscriptural. 1. The parties. These were God and the children of Israel. "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." Deut. v, 2, 3. 2. The time. It was made in the third month, after Israel's departure from Egypt, and the same day. "In the third month when the children of Israel were gone forth out of the land of Egypt, the same day came they into the wilderness of Sinai. . . . And Moses went up unto God, and the Lord called unto him out of the mountain, saying, thus shalt thou say unto the house of Jacob, and tell the children of Israel." Ex. xix, 1, 3. 3. The place where it was made. This was Horeb. Deut. v, 2. 4. The design, or end, to be accomplished by the covenant. This we find briefly stated in Ex. xix, 5. If ye will *obey* my voice, indeed, and keep my COVENANT then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me." This proves that God made a covenant with them to bring them to obedience to his covenant. Query. What is his covenant?

We answer: It is a covenant composed of commandments which he has commanded forever. "And he declared unto you his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments; and he wrote them upon two tables of stone." Deut. iv, 13. "But the mercy of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting upon them that fear him, and his righteousness unto children's children; to such as keep his covenant, and to those that remember his commandments to do them." Ps. ciii, 17, 18. "The works of his hands are verity and judgment. All his commandments are sure. They stand fast forever and ever. . . . He hath commanded his covenant for ever." Ps. cxi, 7, 8. These scriptures show most clearly that God's covenant is composed altogether of commandments; that he has commanded his covenant to be observed throughout all time; therefore the design of the covenant made in Horeb, was to bring Israel to obedience to God's law of ten commandments. 5. The covenant or agreement. This was an agreement: (1.) On the part of God to make of Israel a peculiar people; Ex. xix, 5, also a kingdom of priests and an holy nation. Verse 6. (2.) On the part of Israel to obey all things whatsoever God would command. Verse 8; xxiv, 7. This is the Horeb covenant. 6. The dedication. Was this covenant reduced to writing and dedicated? "And Moses wrote all the words of the Lord, and rose up early in the morning, and builded an altar under the hill, and twelve pillars according to the twelve tribes of Israel." "And he took the book of the covenant, and read in the audience of the people; and they said all that the Lord hath said will we do and be obedient." Ex. xxiv, 4, 7. "And Moses took the blood and sprinkled it on

the people, and said, behold the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words." Verse 8. "Whereupon neither the first testament was dedicated without blood. For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and all the people, saying, This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you." Heb. ix, 18-20.

The facts stated in the above scriptures are, 1. That Moses wrote the Horeb covenant in a book. 2. That it was dedicated with blood. 3. Paul calls this covenant the first testament. The ten commandments cannot be this covenant for the following reasons, made apparent by a juxtaposition:

HOREB COVENANT.

GOD'S COVENANT.

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>1 The Horeb covenant was an <i>agreement</i> between God and Israel. Ex. xix, 5, 7.</p> <p>2. The Horeb covenant was made just <i>three months</i> after Israel's departure from Egypt. Ex. xix, 1, 2.</p> <p>3. The design of the Horeb covenant was to produce obedience to God's covenant. Verse 5.</p> <p>4. <i>Moses</i> wrote this covenant in a book. Ex. xxiv, 3, 4.</p> | <p>1. God's covenant is a covenant of COMMANDMENTS. Deut. iv, 13; Ps. ciii, 17, 18; Ps. cxi, 7-10.</p> <p>2. God's covenant was proclaimed in ten commandments <i>three days</i> after the former. Ex. xix, 11.</p> <p>3. The design of God's covenant was to preserve Israel from sin that they might have life. Lev. xviii, 5; Isa. xlvi, 18.</p> <p>4. <i>God</i> wrote his covenant with his <i>own hand</i> upon two tables of stone. Deut. iv, 13; Ex. xxxi, 18.</p> |
|---|--|

5. This covenant was dedicated with blood. Heb. ix, 18, 20.

6. This covenant was kept in the SIDE of the ark. Deut. xxxi, 26.

7. The Levitical priesthood grew out of this covenant. Ex. xix, 6.

8. This covenant was not made with the patriarchs, but with their children.

5. No blood was ever sprinkled on God's covenant—the ten commandments.

6. God's covenant was placed IN the ark. Deut. x, 5.

7. No priesthood grew out of God's covenant.

8. God's covenant of commandments was given to the patriarchs. Ps. cv, 7-10. For Abraham obeyed my voice and kept my charge, my statutes, my commandments and my laws. Gen. xxvi, 5.

But Springer will have it that the ten commandments are the Horeb covenant. The foregoing reasons which we have adduced show the falsity of this supposition. We will now show that if his proof is worth anything, it proves too much, and hence for him proves nothing. If the ten commandments are the Horeb covenant, it follows that the patriarchs were under NO OBLIGATION TO OBEY THEM, for no one outside of a covenant is under any obligation to perform any of its stipulations; therefore they could all get to heaven with *other gods* before them; *profaning God's name, murdering, stealing, and committing adultery*. Thus we see that his witnesses, if they prove anything, prove too much, and therefore prove nothing. But we have proved in Chap. I, that every one of the ten commandments existed in the patriarchal age of the world; that the Sabbath was plainly spoken of before the Israelites

came to Mount Sinai where the *covenant was made*. Therefore all of Mr. Springer's labor to prove the abolition of God's covenant of commandments by proving the abolition of the Horeb covenant, is spent in vain, and amounts to naught but a *perversion of the Scriptures!*

But he says we have Hagar in our system; that we have not cast out the bond-woman. Such empty prating as this does not deserve a thought, but as he has put it in his book, we will notice it.

1. He assumes that the ten commandments are the bond-woman. 2. He then concludes that all who keep them, serve the *bond-woman*. If his assumption is true, it then follows, 1. That the patriarchs served the bond-woman, for they certainly kept the COMMANDMENTS of God. Gen. xxvi, 5. 2. That *Mr. Springer and his brethren* have NINE-TENTHS OF HAGAR in their system, for they at least acknowledge *nine* of the commandments binding. 3. That notwithstanding the *untiring efforts* of S. and his colleagues to EXTERMINATE AND CAST OUT HAGAR, they *themselves being judges*, have only CAST OUT ONE-TENTH of her. 4. That seeing it is a difficult task to get entirely rid of Hagar (*for she clings to them like a sister*)! they have concluded to keep *nine-tenths of her*, which they have dressed up in the *new gown* of "*No-Lawism*" and called SARAH!! Paul applies the allegory of the bond woman to the Jewish church which grew out of the Horeb covenant, and not out of the ten commandments; therefore Hagar was *cast out* when the first covenant was taken away. Again he says:

"We have then with all ease taken the law from our opponents by proving its abrogation beyond all doubt."

With this assumption in his mind, he seems much delighted. He has taken the law from us! How very much A. Campbell was mistaken when he charged upon the Roman Catholics the sin of annulling the law of God, and setting aside every moral obligation! "Does it (the Catholic rule of interpretation) not annul the laws of God and set aside every moral obligation?" *Deb. with Purcell*, p. 204. Mr. Springer says, No. The Catholics never made void the law of God. I did it, *by proving its abolition!* This makes *S. vs. Campbell*, No. 7.

SEC. 8, p. 33. "Our seventh argument is that Paul never could have decided the seventh-day observance of such little importance, if it was binding in this dispensation as a moral duty. He places it among the ceremonial feasts and shadows."

This is no argument, and therefore does not demand a reply; but seeing that he has placed it before the public as such, we will give it a passing notice. He refers to Rom. xiv, 1-6 as proof. His proof, however, does not mention the seventh day. Neither did Paul place the Sabbath of the Lord among the feasts and shadows of the ceremonial law. His proof only shows that there was a contention among the brethren at Rome about certain meats and festival days. The Jew regarded the festival days of the law as yet sacred, but the Gentile could see no difference between these and other days. Hence he esteemed every day. A. Clarke says, "We *add here* ALIKE, and make the text say what I am sure never was intended." Compare Rom. xiv. The word ALIKE is not in the original text, and is supplied without divine authority. That the seventh day is excep-

ted in the above evidence is certain. 1. From the fact that it is not mentioned. 2. The term "every" does not absolutely include it. In Ex. xvi, God said, that the people should gather manna "every day," verse 4, but that the seventh-day was excepted is evident from verse 26, which says, "Six days shall ye gather it; but on the seventh-day, which is the Sabbath, in it there shall be none." He next refers to Col. ii, 16. "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or the new moon, or of the sabbath days." *Campbell, Macknight and Doddridge* render this thus, "Let no one therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a *festival*, or of a new moon, or of sabbaths, which are a shadow of things to come." This text evidently refers to the ceremonial sabbaths, spoken of in Lev. xxiii, which were always associated with meats, drinks, and new moons. That these were to cease, the prophets testified, saying, "I will also cause all her mirth to cease, her feast days, her new moons, and her sabbaths, and all her solemn feasts." Hosea ii, 11. That this scripture does not include the Sabbath of the Lord is evident, 1. Because it is never classed with the festivals of the ceremonial law. 2. It is never called *her* sabbaths, but *MY* sabbaths, the Sabbath of the Lord. 3. It is not now, nor ever was, a shadow. It could not typify anything in the system of salvation, because it was made before man needed a Saviour. We have now replied to everything which Mr. Springer has adduced on the subject under consideration. The foregoing replies we now commend to the reader, asking a candid investigation, and an impartial decision. O reader! decide for truth, obey God, and he will

bless you. Keep his commandments, and he will grant you an entrance into his everlasting kingdom. And when Satan tempts you, rebuke him with the word of the Lord, saying, "Depart from me you evil doer, for I will keep the commandments of my God." Ps. cxix, 115.

CHAPTER III.

REVIEW OF SPRINGER ON THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK.

SEC. 1, p. 36. "Have we in the Christian institution a Sabbath? To which we answer: We have no day in the gospel institution which Christ or the apostles call the Sabbath; nor does the new covenant or law of Christ require Christians to observe a holy day in the same manner that the Jews were required to observe the Sabbath."

To this we remark, by gospel institution we suppose S. means the New Testament, hence his conclusion is that there is no day in the New Testament which is called the Sabbath. If he had said that the first day of the week is no where called the Sabbath by Christ or his apostles, he would not have made us wonder; but that he should say "there is no day called the Sabbath, in the New Testament" is passing strange! He certainly knew better when he made the statement. If not, his ignorance must be great! If he will carefully read the following Scriptures he will learn that there is a day in the New Testament which Christ called THE SABBATH. Matt. xii, 1, 5, 8, 10, 12; xxiv, 20; Luke iv, 16, 31; vi, 1-9; xxiii, 56. Also by referring to the following texts he will see that there is a day in the New Testament called by the

apostles THE SABBATH. Acts xiii, 14, 42, 44; xvi, 13; xvii, 2; xviii, 4. This makes S. *vs.* the Bible, No. 14.

"The law of Christ does not require Christians to observe a holy day in the same manner that the Jews were required to observe the Sabbath."

Query. How were the Jews required to observe the Sabbath? We answer. They were to observe it, worshiping God upon it. Lev. xxiii, 3; Num. xxviii, 9; Acts xiii, 14, 15; Ex. xx, 8-11. These scriptures show, 1. That the Sabbath was God's holy day. 2. That upon it the Jews were to have an holy convocation. 3. That it was the day on which they met for prayers. Therefore if Springer's statement is true, Christians are not required to observe any holy day by having a holy convocation upon it; by meeting for prayer, praise and thanksgiving. Is this the gospel he preaches? The French infidels would have rejoiced under such a gospel!!

Next says he, "Was the Sabbath changed to the first day of the week? We answer, no. The Bible nowhere gives any account of such change."

A. Campbell says: "The Sabbath cannot be changed unless creation be gone through again." *Christ. Bap.*, p. 44. "The reason must be changed before the day of observance could be altered." *Deb. with Owen*, p. 303. Query. What is the reason? Ans. "The Lord rested on the Sabbath day and hallowed it." So we say of its abolition. The creation must be destroyed before the Sabbath can be abolished, for it will commemorate these works as long as they endure. Therefore we conclude that the abolition of the Sabbath is recorded in the same chapter in which

the change of it is recorded; namely, in the first part of the acts of the Man of Sin. A. Campbell in his debate with the Catholic Bishop, charged the sin of setting the Sabbath aside against the Papal power. "The Sabbath as a divine institution is set aside." *Deb. with Purcell*, p. 193. But S. says, Christ abolished it! If so, then Campbell has borne false witness against his neighbor, the Pope. This makes Springer *vs.* Campbell No. 8.

SEC. 2. "While then it is a fact that Christians have nothing to do with the Jewish Sabbath, it is also a fact that we have in the new institution a day of holy convocation, a day of public assemblies and public worship. It is the Lord's day because it is his resurrection day. And this day in its design is as far superior to the Jewish Sabbath, as the Christian institution is to the Jewish."

To this we reply, 1. That Christians have nothing to do with the Sabbath, is not true, 1st. The same law which says that they shall not swear, steal, commit adultery, and worship idols, says also, Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy. James says that we must obey this law. Chap. ii, 8-11. 2d. The disciples of Christ kept the Sabbath according to the commandment, and that too, after his death, when it is said the law was abolished. Luke xxiii, 56. Therefore if they could keep the Sabbath according to the commandment we can, and should do so. This makes Springer *vs.* the Bible, No. 15.

2. It is not a fact that the first day of the week is a day of holy convocations. It is not so called by any New Testament writer. This makes Springer *vs.* the Bible, No. 16.

3. Who told him that Sunday is so far superior

to the Sabbath? Did Christ? No. Paul? or any other apostle? No. Who did? The Pope, or some one of his sons, and nobody else.

4. Neither is it true that Sunday is the Lord's day. The Bible nowhere says so. For this statement he has the authority of a thus saith Springer, thus saith Campbell, thus saith the Pope, still higher authority. But he says it is called Lord's day in Rev. i, 10. Who told him so? This is not original. He borrowed it from the Catholics. Proof. "By whom was it (the Sabbath) changed? By the governors of the church, the apostles, who also kept it, for St. John was in the Spirit on the *Lord's day*, which was SUNDAY." *Christ. Doct.*, pp. 57, 59.

Here is where he got his information. Jesus is Lord of the Sabbath. Mark ii, 28. The day of which he is Lord is his day, therefore the Sabbath is the Lord's day. See also Isa. lviii, 13. This makes Springer *vs.* the Bible, No. 17.

SEC. 3. He next argues that the first day of the week "was symbolized by the holy convocation on the fifteenth day of the first month, and the offering of the first-fruits."

The feast of unleavened bread was celebrated in commemoration of their deliverance from Egyptian bondage. This took place on the fifteenth of the first month. Therefore the feast of unleavened bread was celebrated on the same day of the month. Ex. xii, 17. He says the fifteenth day of the month came on the first day of the week. Why did he not give us his proof? The feast was confined to the day of the month, and not to any particular day of the week. But he argues that it always came on the first day of the week. Why did he not prove it? We shall not be astonished to learn that he believes that Christmas always

comes on Friday, or some one particular day of the week !!

"This holy convocation on the first day of the week represents the Christian's first day of the week. The festival on this day represents the Lord's supper on the first day of the week." P. 38.

We ask S. the following questions: 1. How could one meeting in a year, on the fifteenth of the month, represent fifty-two meetings in a year, all on the FIRST DAY of the week? 2. If this typifies anything, does it not rather typify one meeting in a year, and that on the fifteenth of the first month? 3. If the holy convocation on the first day typifies Christians' meeting on the first day of the week, does not the holy convocation on the seventh day typify Christians' meeting on the seventh day of the week? We think so, for the very verse which says that they had a holy convocation on the first day, says they also had a holy convocation on the seventh day. Verse 16.

We think that Mr. Springer's eyes must have been blinded when he read Ex. xii, or he certainly would have seen this !! The offering of the first-fruits had no typical allusion whatever to the sanctifying of the first day of the week. It only typified the resurrection of Christ. So Paul testifies in 1 Cor. xv, 20. "But now is Christ risen from the dead and become the first-fruits of them that slept.

Sec. 4. "The first day of the week is the commemorative day in the gospel institution. If not, then the gospel dispensation has no commemorative day. It is common among nations to have a day that commemorates the facts that gave them a national existence." P. 39.

Here we have quite a cluster of assertions. Wonder if these pass for argument with him! His

argument is this: It is common among nations to have a commemorative day. Therefore the first day of the week is the commemorative day for this age. We admit the premise, but see no reason why the conclusion follows. But what does the first day commemorate? The resurrection of Christ, he says. But does the Bible say so? It does not. He borrowed this from the Pope. This makes Springer *vs.* the Bible, No. 18. But if not, then we have no commemorative day. This is only the word of Springer, a thus saith the man. We are not yet prepared to exchange Bible truth for his assertions.

His next proof is Acts xx, 7. "And upon the first day of the week when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow, and continued his speech until midnight." But does this text say that we should observe the first day of the week *religiously*? Does it give us the privilege of working on the Sabbath? It does not. It only proves that there was one meeting on that day. This was a *night* meeting. This is proved by the facts in the case. 1. The many lights. Verse 8. 2. Paul's continuing his speech till midnight. 3. Eutychus' falling asleep. This was on the night following the seventh, or Sabbath, day. The day always begins and ends at sunset. Gen. i. The Sabbath began Friday evening. Lev. xxiii, 32; Neh. xiii, 19; Luke xxiii, 54. Therefore the first day began just where the Sabbath ended. Hence Paul preached till midnight on Saturday night, then restored the young man who fell from the third loft, and broke bread after midnight, continued his speech till break of day, and then on Sunday morning started on his long journey to Jeru-

salem. Thus you see that Paul kept this man-made Sabbath traveling on his long journey.

That we are correct we give the concurrent testimony of two very learned scripture expositors. Prof. H. B. Hacket, of Newton Theological Institution, says, "The Jews reckoned the day from evening to morning, and on that principle the evening of the first day of the week would be our Saturday evening. If Luke reckoned so here, as many commentators suppose, the apostle then waited for the expiration of the Jewish Sabbath, and held his last religious service with the brethren at Troas at the beginning of the Christian Sabbath; i. e., on Saturday evening, and consequently resumed his journey on SUNDAY MORNING." *Com. on Acts*, pp. 229, 230.

Kitto, a learned historian, says, "It has from this last circumstance been inferred that the assembly commenced after sunset on the Sabbath, at which hour the first day of the week had commenced, according to the Jewish reckoning." (*Jahn's Bib. Antiq.*, § 398.) *Kitto's Bib. Ency. Art. Lord's day.* Therefore this text, instead of proving that Sunday is a day of religious devotions, proves it a day of business.

His next and last text is 1 Cor. xvi, 2. "Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come." "Here," says he, "is a *command*." A command for what? To meet every Sunday and have the hat passed around to gather the contribution? Such we admit it should be to suit S. But Paul says, "Let every one of you lay BY HIM." The argument turns on the phrase, "by him." Greenfield translates the original of this phrase, "by one's self,

AT HOME." Justin Edwards says, "Lay by him in store, AT HOME." *Notes on New Testament.* This is in harmony with most other authorities. This text therefore proves unanswerably, that Sunday is a business day.

Now our corollary is this: that as the apostle's custom was to keep "back nothing that was profitable" to his brethren, if Sunday-keeping was profitable and necessary he would not have kept it back. But the fact that he did keep it back is conclusive proof that it is neither profitable nor necessary.

His next evidence is a quotation from Mosheim: "For that this day was set apart for religious worship by the apostles themselves, we have the most *unexceptionable testimony*." This proves the point if Mosheim tells the truth. He says "that this day was set apart by the apostles themselves." What does he prove it by? The most *unexceptionable testimony*. That is the kind. We will believe all such testimony. Well, with us the Bible is that kind of testimony. And it does not say one word about the apostles' ever setting apart the first day of the week. Hence we conclude that Mosheim was either mistaken, or desired to build up an error by an assertion, without scripture proof: therefore we reject his testimony.

As good historical proof that Sunday is a man-made institution, we quote the language of Neander: "Opposition to Judaism introduced the *particular festival Sunday*, very early indeed into the *place of the Sabbath*. . . . The festival Sunday, like all other festivals, was always only a *human ordinance*, and it was far from the intention of the apostles to establish a divine command in this respect; far from them and from the early

apostolic church, to transfer the laws of the Sabbath to Sunday." *Church History*, p. 168.

Finally he concludes by proving by A. Campbell what he well knows he cannot prove by the Bible. Campbell says: "Christians by apostolic example, which to them is the same as precept, are, in honor of the commencement of the New creation, constrained by Christ's authority and grace to meet on the first day of the week, to show forth his death, and to commemorate his resurrection." For this assertion there is not one word of scriptural authority. It is only authorized by tradition. Where did Christ ever give any authority for meeting on the first day of the week? We answer, He never gave any such authority in any time or place. Campbell has the authority of the Catholic Church for his statement, but not the authority of Christ. Proof:

"Ques. 1. What is this day of rest?"

"Ans. The seventh day of the week, or Saturday. Gen. ii, 2, 3.

"Ques. 2. Is it then Saturday we should sanctify in order to obey God?"

"Ans. During the old law Saturday was the day sanctified; but the *church*, instructed by Jesus Christ, and directed by the Spirit of God, has substituted Sunday for Saturday.

"Hath the church power to make this change?"

"Ans. Certainly, since the Spirit of God is her guide, the change is inspired by that Holy Spirit. The uniform, universal and perpetual tradition of all ages and nations attest the antiquity of, and consequently the divine assent to, this change."—*Cath. Cat. of Religion*.

"Quest. 4. How prove you that the church hath power to command feasts and holy days?"

"Ans. By the very act of *changing the Sabbath*, which Protestants allow of.

"Ques. 5. How prove you that?"

"Ans. Because by keeping Sunday they acknowledge the church's power to ordain feasts and to command them under sin."—*Abridgment of Christ. Doct.*, pp. 57, 59.

"Ques. 6. What are the days which the church commands to be kept holy?"

"Ans. The Sunday, or the Lord's day, which we observe by apostolic tradition, instead of the Sabbath. 2. The feasts of our Lord's nativity, or Christmas-day; his circumcision, or New-Year's day; the Epiphany, or Twelfth-day; Easterday, or the day of our Lord's resurrection, with the Monday following; the day of our Lord's ascension; Whitsunday, or the day of the coming down of the Holy Ghost, with the Monday following; Trinity Sunday; Corpus Christi, or the feasts of the blessed Sacrament. 3. We keep the days of the Annunciation and Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary. 4. We observe the feast of All-Saints, of St. John the Baptist, of the Holy Apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul. 5. In this kingdom we keep the feast of St. Patrick, our principal patron."

Here we have a multitude of days, all on an equal basis, having the same authority. Now if Campbell and his brethren wish to keep one of these days, they should, to be consistent, keep them *all*, and give honor to the Pope for the privilege of so-doing.

We have now carefully gone through with the evidence of S. on the first day of the week, and sincerely conclude that there is no divine authority for

it; that those who keep it make void the commandment of God by their tradition. Matt. xv, 1-9.

O reader, let us beseech you to forsake the tradition of Sunday-keeping. Turn your feet from the Lord's Sabbath, from polluting it. Keep the commandments of God and the faith Jesus. Live to your Maker's praise, and he will at last bless you with an abundant entrance into the everlasting kingdom. There you will meet with the patriarchs, prophets and apostles of old, who have all obeyed the commandments of God. Yea, there you will meet with the obedient of all ages. These will be your associates and companions. With them you will live eternally! With them you will range the golden streets of the New Jerusalem! Amen.

APPENDIX.

CHAPTER IV.

PERPETUITY OF THE SABBATH.

PROPOSITION. *The Seventh-day Sabbath exists in the Christian dispensation.*

Arg. 1. *Is founded on the necessity of a Sabbath.* The Sabbath was made for man's benefit. Mark ii, 27. It was instituted to supply man and beast with time for rest. The necessity of this grows out of man's nature, and his relation to his Creator. His nature is yet the same, and his relation to his Creator is yet the same. Therefore the same necessity now demands the continuance of the Sabbath, that demanded its institution. The Sabbath, therefore, will continue as long as man lasts; or until his present nature and relation to his God so changes that the necessity for its continuance is destroyed.

Arg. 2. *The institution of the Sabbath.* "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." Gen. ii, 2. The facts brought to view in this text are the following: 1. God wrought. 2. He rested, or sabbatized, as the word rest means. His resting on the seventh day made it his rest-day. His act of resting was the cause. The effect is, the Sabbath was made for man. It is yet true that God rested on the seventh day. Hence the CAUSE of the Sabbath is yet in existence. Therefore the Sabbath made for man, the EFFECT, yet exists.

Arg. 3. *The sanctification of the Sabbath.* "And God blessed the seventh day and hallowed it, because that in it he had rested from all the works which God created and made."

Gen. ii, 3. "Wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day and hallowed it." Ex. xx, 11. These scriptures state an important fact, that God blessed the Sabbath, the day on which he rested. The word *bleſs* ſignifies, "to conſecrate to a ſacred or religious uſe; to call a bleſſing upon." *Webſter*. Therefore God called a bleſſing upon the ſeventh day, and conſecrated it to a holy and religious uſe. It is yet a fact that God bleſſed the Sabbath-day and hallowed it. Therefore the effect ſtill exiſts. The Sabbath is yet a holy and ſanctified day. Theſe are the facts on which the Sabbath was inſtituted.

A. Campbell ſays, "The REASON muſt be changed before the day of obſervance could be altered. [Query. What is the reaſon? Ans.] The Lord REſTED on the SEVENTH DAY and HALLOWED it." *Deb. with Owen*, p. 303. Is it yet true that God reſted on the Sabbath and hallowed it? If ſo, A. Campbell ſays the day of obſervance cannot be altered. It is yet true that God reſted on the ſeventh day and hallowed it, therefore the Sabbath yet remains.

Again, before the ſeventh day can ever become profane, God muſt take his bleſſing and ſanctity from it. Has he done this? If ſo, where is the proof? If not, the ſeventh day is yet holy time. Query. 1. Did God ever reſt on the firſt day of the week? He did not. 2. Did he ever bleſs and ſanctify the firſt day? Never. 3. Did he ever command anybody to keep the firſt day? Never. 4. Did he ever promiſe a bleſſing to thoſe who keep it? Never. 5. Did he ever threaten puniſhment againſt thoſe who work on it? Never.

Arg. 4. *The Sabbath is a moral inſtitution*. Our nature demands a time of reſt. This we have in the Sabbath which God gave us. But how much time do we need for reſt and devotion? All writers of any note ſay "one-ſeventh of our time." Well, God has ſanctified juſt that much, and He has choſen the day. The ſeventh day is his reſt-day. This is the day upon which he commands us to reſt and worſhip him. A. Campbell ſays, "The Sabbath is a moral inſtitution." *Chriſt. System*, p. 130. Query. Is it morally right for us to profane God's name? No. It is right for us to

uſe his name only in a devotional manner. Then is it right to profane his holy Sabbath? No more right than to profane his name. The Sabbath is the Lord's time. And it is juſt as wrong to ſteal his time as it is to ſteal anything elſe. Theſe reaſons ſhow that the Sabbath is a moral inſtitution. That which is moral changes not, therefore the Sabbath is the ſame now that it ever has been.

Arg. 5. *The Sabbath is the ſign of God*. "It is a ſign between me and the children of Iſrael, forever; for in ſix days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the ſeventh day he reſted and was reſreſhed." Ex. xxxi, 17. The facts here ſtated are the following: 1. The Sabbath is a ſign of God forever. 2. The reaſon why it is a ſign is that God made heaven and earth in ſix days, and reſted on the ſeventh day. A ſign is a token or memorial; ſomething by which another thing is made known; a monument to preſerve the memory of a thing. The Sabbath is therefore God's memorial—the monument to preſerve the memory of his works. It always points back to creation for its origin. The reaſon of its being the ſign of God, is ſtill in exiſtence. Therefore it remains the memorial of God, and as ſuch endureth "throughout all generations." Ps. cxxxv, 13. A. Campbell ſays, "The Sabbath cannot be changed, unleſs creation be gone through again." *Chriſt. Bap.* p. 44. So we ſay of its abolition. The inſtitution muſt laſt as long as the facts on which it is baſed.

Arg. 6. *Chriſt regarded the Sabbath as a divine inſtitution and treated it as ſuch*. "At that time Jeſus went on the Sabbath day through the corn; and his diſciples were an hungered, and began to pluck the ears of corn, and to eat." Matt. xii, 1. The Pharisees accuſed them of doing wrong. But Chriſt rebuked them, ſaying, "If ye had known what this meaneth, I will have mercy and not ſacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltleſs." Verſe 7. "For the Son of man is Lord, even of the Sabbath day." Verſe 8. From this we conclude that the Saviour regarded the Sabbath as a divine inſtitution, and that he acknowledged himſelf Lord of it. That of which he is Lord is his. He is Lord of the

Sabbath. Therefore the Sabbath is the LORD'S DAY. Isa. lviii, 13.

Arg. 7. *The Sabbath was Christ's day of worship.* Luke iv, 16: "And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up; and as his custom was he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and stood up for to read;" "and came down to Capernaum, a city of Gallilee, and taught them on the Sabbath days." Verse 31. Thus our Saviour honored the Sabbath. It was his day for worship, and it was his custom to worship upon it. Here is the *example* of Jesus for keeping the Sabbath. Is it safe to follow him and honor the Sabbath as he honored it? If so, let "*commandment-keepers*" never be discouraged, for they are certainly in the way their Saviour trod. Those who do not keep the Sabbath do not follow the example of their Lord. They do not live as he lived. They walk not in his paths.

Arg. 8. *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. Paul in his "manner" followed Christ in his "custom." This is further attested by his preaching in Corinth. Acts xviii, 4. "And he reasoned in the synagogue *every Sabbath*, and persuaded the Jews and Greeks." Query. How long did he remain in Corinth? Ans. "And he continued there a year and six months." Verse 11. How many Sabbaths are there in that length of time? Just seventy-eight; therefore Paul observed seventy-eight Sabbaths in Corinth. But it is objected that Paul preached on the Sabbath to get a hearing from the Jews. That this is not true is evident from Acts xiii, 42-44: "And when the Jews were gone out of the synagogue, the Gentiles besought that these words might be preached unto them the next Sabbath." "And the next Sabbath day came almost the whole city together to hear the word of God." From this it is apparent: 1. The Sabbath was then the day religiously observed by both Jew and Gentile. 2. That Paul was not a "Sunday-keeper;" for had he been he would have said to the Gentiles who demanded preaching the next Sabbath, "To-morrow is the Christian Sab-

bath, the first day of the week, the Lord's day; come out then and you shall hear the word of the Lord. You need not wait for another *Jewish* Sabbath to come round before you hear the gospel, you shall hear it to-morrow if you will only come out to meeting." 3. If Paul had known that there was any importance attached to the religious observance of the first day of the week, he would *there* and *then* have made it known. The fact that he made no such thing known is evidence that it did not exist.

Arg. 9. Matt. xxiv, 20. "Pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath day." This cannot apply to any time in the Christian dispensation earlier than A. D. 70. If the Sabbath did not then exist, there was no necessity for their praying that their flight be not upon it. But the fact that Christ taught them thus to pray, is the most conclusive evidence of its existence then. If it existed then it exists yet. The Sabbath is perpetual with the *seasons*. "Pray that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath day." Therefore the Lord's Sabbath will continue as long as the seasons revolve.

Arg. 10. "And they returned and prepared spices and ointments, and rested the Sabbath day ACCORDING TO THE COMMANDMENT." Luke xxiii, 56. This scripture is sufficient of itself to sustain our proposition. Here we have the example of the Lord's disciples resting on the Sabbath, in the New Testament, according to the commandment. This they did after the time when it is claimed that the law was abolished. Query. Did the disciples ever keep the first day of the week, according to the commandment? Never! Therefore let all who desire the truth, and wish to take the Bible for their guide, come out, and instead of keeping Sunday according to tradition, keep the Sabbath according to the commandment of God.

Arg. 11. *Is founded on the testimony of learned men and eminent historians.*

1. ATHANASIUS, Bishop of Alexandria in the fourth century, said: "We assemble on Saturday, not that we are infected with Judaism, but only to worship Jesus, the Lord of the Sabbath." *Dr. Case's Work*, p. 175.

2. "The American Presbyterian Board of publication, in tract No. 118 states that the observance of the seventh-day Sabbath *did not cease*, till it was abolished after the empire became Christian:" that is, *after* the state came under Pal- rule.

3. ROBINSON says the Waldenses kept the Sabbath. "They were called Sabbati and Sabbatati, so named from the Hebrew word Sabbath, because THEY KEPT the Saturday for the Lord's day." *Hist. Baptism.*

4. EDWARD BREEWOOD, Prof. in Gresham College, London, in a treatise on the Sabbath, in 1630, says: "It is commonly believed that the Jewish Sabbath was changed into the Lord's day by Christian emperors, and they know little who do not know that the *ancient Sabbath* did remain, and was observed by the eastern churches three hundred years after our Saviour's passion."

5. SOCRATES, A. D. 440, says: "There are various customs concerning assembling, for though all the churches throughout the whole world celebrate the sacred mysteries on the Sabbath day, yet the Alexandrians and the Romans, from an ancient tradition, refuse to do this." *Ecl. Hist. p. 289.*

6. M. DE LA ROQUE, a French Protestant, says: "It evidently appears that before any change was introduced, the church religiously observed the Sabbath for MANY AGES; and of consequence are obliged to keep it."

7. A. CAMPBELL says: "The moral and religious institutions of the Patriarchal, or family worship, which continued from the fall of Adam to the covenant of circumcision, were the Sabbath, the service of the altar, oral instruction, prayer, praise and benediction. Family worship was then the first social worship; and during the first ages of the world (for at least two thousand five hundred years) it was the only social worship of divine authority. Though other institutions have since been added, this has *never been superseded*. While the forms of this worship have always been adapted to the genius of the various revelations of God vouchsafed to mankind, it has continued through all the changes of six thousand years, and will continue till the day when men, like the angels of God,

shall neither marry nor give in marriage." *Christ. Syst. pp. 128-29-30.*

CHAPTER V.

PERPETUITY OF GOD'S LAW.

PROPOSITION.—*The Scriptures teach that God's law of ten commandments is binding on all men.*

Law is a rule of action; a rule of direction; that which governs or has a tendency to rule. Webster says, "Moral law: a law which prescribes to men their religious and social duties; in other words, their duties to God and to each other. The moral law is summarily contained in the decalogue, or ten commandments, written by the finger of God on two tables of stone, and delivered to Moses on mount Sinai."

Arg. 1. *The necessity for this law.* Man is a moral agent; has the capacity to do right or wrong; and is therefore a subject of law. He sustains the relation of creature to his Creator, and of brother and fellow-creature to his fellow-man. In order to his happiness it is necessary that he lives near to his God. Moral law requires him thus to live. Hence, conformity to this law is indispensably necessary to man's happiness. Therefore as long as it is necessary for man to live in intimate nearness to God, moral law will be needed. This law is also necessary for the protection of man in the enjoyment of his natural and inalienable rights which God has given him; therefore the necessity for moral law will be perpetual with the *nature* of man.

Arg. 2. *Its nature.* It is moral, having its origin in man's relation to God and to his fellow-man.

1. The first four precepts have respect to certain natural duties which man owes to his God. He is our Creator, and by creation we are his. This relation demands (1.) That we love him supremely. (2.) That we spend all of our time in his service. (3.) That we speak of his name only in the

most reverential and affectionate manner. (4.) That we reverence his *institutions*, and use them only as he has given us privilege and direction.

On this relation is based the first four commandments; therefore before they can be abolished, this relation, out of which they grow, must be destroyed. But it can never be destroyed while man is the creature of God; therefore these commandments will be binding equally long.

2. The last six have respect to the duties which men owe to each other. (1.) All men are creatures of the same Creator. (2.) Are brethren of the same Father. (3.) Possess the same natural rights. These relations demand (a) That they love each other. (b) Treat each other with brotherly kindness. (c) That they respect and protect each other's rights. On these relations the last six commandments are based, and out of them they grow; therefore they will be as perpetual as the immutable relations which gave birth to their existence.

Arg. 3. *Obedience to this law preserves innocence.* Innocence signifies in a moral sense, "freedom from crime, sin or guilt." *Web.* Innocence is opposed to guilt. Innocence is the natural state of man. Obedience to the law of God preserves his innocence and keeps him near his Creator. In disobedience he loses his innocence and becomes guilty; becomes a sinner. Enoch was innocent, because he walked with God; obeyed his law. Gen. v, 24. Little children are innocent because they have never sinned. Matt. xviii, 1-6. Men are not innocent, but guilty, because they have sinned against the law. 1 John iii, 4; Rom. iii, 23. Therefore we conclude, 1. That if man had always obeyed the moral law he would have been innocent. 2. If all would yet obey, they would be innocent; that is, if they would begin at innocence, and continue from their youth up.

Arg. 4. *It is a standard of right and wrong.* David says: "The statutes of the Lord are right." Ps. xix, 8. "All thy commandments are RIGHTEOUSNESS." Ps. cxix, 172. The principles of right are ever the same; they change not. God's law contained the principles of righteousness in Da-

vid's time; therefore it is yet the same. He who obeys it is righteous; he who disobeys it is a sinner. 1 John iii, 6.

Arg. 5. *It is the law for man's moral government.* 1. In the first age of the world God says, "Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes and my laws." Gen. xxvi, 5. 2. In the second age Inspiration says, "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God and keep his commandments, for this is the WHOLE DUTY OF MAN." Eccl. xii, 13. 3. In the third age Jesus says, "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the COMMANDMENTS." Matt. xix, 17. And John says, "By this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God, and keep his commandments. For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments; and his commandments are not GRIEVOUS." 1 John v, 2, 3.

Arg. 6. *Its violation is sin.* 1 John iii, 4. "For sin is the transgression of the law." Query. Could its violation be sin if it were abolished? It could not. Sin therefore is not the transgression of the gospel, but of the law. The gospel does not make sin known. The knowledge of sin is by the law. Rom. iii, 20. Query. Could an abolished law make sin known? It could not. Therefore we conclude that, as sin is the transgression of the law and not of the gospel, and as by the law is the knowledge of sin, and not by the gospel, that the law must of necessity be binding.

Arg. 7. *It demanded an atonement.* "If a soul shall sin through ignorance against any of the commandments of the Lord concerning things which ought not to be done," &c., Lev. iv, 2, "the priest shall make an atonement for him as concerning his sin, and it shall be forgiven him." Verse 26. Hence where there was no sin there was no necessity for an atonement. Query. What law made the atonement? Not the moral, for its violation made the atonement necessary; but the ceremonial. But if the moral law had been obeyed, no atonement would have been necessary, and hence there would have been no necessity for the ceremonial law. Therefore, if man had obeyed God, Christ need not have died to atone for his sins. But man sinned, hence Christ

died to save him from his sins, to make an atonement for him. Matt. i, 21; xxvi, 28; 1 Cor. xv, 1-4. But if this law could have been abolished, man could have been saved without an atonement. For the law being destroyed, its curse would also be destroyed; and hence there would have been no necessity for the death of Christ. If God could have taken his law back, and saved his Son from dying, would he not have done it? He certainly would. But this he could not do without overthrowing his own moral government. If he could not, his Son could not; therefore Christ in his death did not abolish the law, but sanctioned its binding obligation by suffering for man's sins.

Arg. 8. *The doctrine of repentance.* Repentance signifies a turning away from sin. 2 Cor. vii, 10. Repentance is a condition of salvation. If however man is not a sinner, he need not repent, for Christ came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance. Matt. ix, 13. Therefore if the law is abolished, there can be no repentance; but if the law is binding, sinners are commanded to repent. The doctrine of repentance, therefore, stands upon the existence of the law, and falls with its abolition.

Arg. 9. *The gospel of salvation.* The word "gospel" in its common acceptation means, "good news." The gospel is a remedial system: a system of salvation. "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation." Rom. i, 16. The sinner is lost and cannot save himself; hence God in mercy has made provisions in the gospel for his salvation. But who needs salvation? The sinner. Who is a sinner? The transgressor of the law. But if the law is abolished, how then? It is not binding, and it is not sin to transgress it. Therefore if the law is abolished there are now no sinners, and as sinners only need the gospel, it follows that the gospel is now useless, and is not needed by any man living. Hence the utility of the gospel stands with the perpetuity of the law, and its inutility with its abolition. But the fact that the gospel is a remedy is evidence that there is a disease which it is designed to heal. That disease is sin; and sin is the transgression of the law; therefore the law is binding.

Arg. 10. *The teaching of Christ.* "Think not that I am come to destroy (abolish, abrogate, kill, ruin, *Webster*) the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy (abolish), but to fulfill (to ratify). For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all (both law and prophets) be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall DO AND TEACH them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." Matt. v, 17-19. "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments. Chap. xix, 17. "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." Rev. xxii, 14.

From these scriptures we conclude, 1. That those who keep the commandments, and teach others to do so, shall have the esteem of God. 2. Those who break any of his commandments and teach others to do so, are the "ministers of sin." 3. That all who obey his commandments have the promise of eternal life, and of an entrance into the ever-blessed city of God. The law must therefore be binding.

Arg. 11. *The teaching of the apostles.* "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law." Rom. iii, 31. The phrase "make void" in this text is from the Greek word *katargeo*, which Greenfield defines "abolish." It is so translated in 2 Cor. iii. This text, translated as in other places, would correctly read, "Do we abolish the law through faith? God forbid." This forever settles this question, and should stop the mouth of every antinomian. "What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin but *by the law*; for I had not known lust except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." Rom. vii, 7. "Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good." Verse 12. "For we know that the law is *spiritual*." Verse 14. "For I delight in the law of God after the inward man." Verse 22. "So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God."

Verse 25. "Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God is SOMETHING." *Whiting's Trans.* 1 Cor. vii, 19. "If ye fulfill the royal law according to the Scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, ye do well. But if ye have respect unto persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors. For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. For he [that law—margin] that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law." James ii, 8-11. "Honor thy father and mother, which is the first commandment with promise." Eph. vi, 2. "For this is the love of God that we keep his commandments; and his commandments are not grievous." 1 John v, 3. These scriptures are sufficiently explicit without comment.

Arg. 12. "And the temple of God was opened in heaven, and there was seen in his temple the ARK of his TESTAMENT." Rev. xi, 19. The ark contained the ten commandments. Ex. xl, 20; Deut. x, 5. God's ark is now in his temple in heaven, and yet contains his law or covenant.

Arg. 13. *The New Testament recognizes and sanctions the existence of the law of the Sabbath.* "Wherefore it is lawful to do well on the Sabbath-days." Matt. xii, 12. That which is lawful is according to an existing law. But no deed or act can be according to law unless there is a law to which it conforms. Luke xxiii, 56 is additional proof of this. "And they returned and prepared spices and ointments, and rested the Sabbath-day ACCORDING TO THE COMMANDMENT."

Having now proved by the most unanswerable arguments that God's law is perpetual in its obligations, we will in the next place show that its obligations rest upon all responsible men.

1. The relations of all men to God and to each other are the same. The moral obligations growing out of these relations are the same. Therefore these obligations are binding on all men.

2. (1) None are sinners but transgressors of the law. (2)

None have transgressed the law but those on whom it is binding. (3) All are sinners; all have sinned. Rom. iii, 23. (4) Therefore the law is binding on all.

3. (1) No man can sin unless the law is binding on him. (2) All men have sinned. Rom. iii, 9, 23; Gal. iii, 22. (3) Therefore the law is binding on all. Rom. iii, 19.

4. (1) Sinners, and not the righteous, can repent. Matt. ix, 13. (2) None are sinners but those under the law. Rom. iii, 19. (3) All are commanded to repent. Acts xvii, 30. (4) Therefore, all are under the law; all can repent.

5. (1) Sinners only are commanded to repent. (2) None are sinners but those under the law. (3) If the Jew only is under the law, then *he only* is commanded to repent.

6. (1) None but sinners need salvation. (2) None are sinners but those under the law. (3) The whole world is under the law. (4) Therefore, all are sinners; all need salvation.

7. (1) None but sinners need salvation. (2) None are sinners but those under the law. (3) If the Jew only is under the law, then he only is a sinner; he only needs salvation.

8. (1) Christ died for sinners only. (2) All are sinners. (3) Therefore Christ died for all.

9. But if Christ died only for sinners, and the Jew only is a sinner, then Christ died *only* for the Jew.

These reasons show sufficiently plain that the law is binding on all men.

EXCUSES CONSIDERED.

1. *It is inconvenient to keep the seventh day.* Matt. xvi, 24. "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me." Chap. x, 38; Mark viii, 34; Luke ix, 23; xiv, 27.

2. *I have a family to support; it will interfere with my business.* Matt. xvi, 25, 26. "For whosoever will save his

life shall lose it; and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it. For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?" Chap. vi, 24, 31-33; Luke xii, 15-37; 1 Tim. iv, 8; Ps. xxxvii, 3; Isa. lxx, 13, 14.

3. *Everybody keeps the first day* Matt. vii, 13, 14. "Enter ye in at the strait gate: for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat: because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." Prov. xi, 21; xvi, 5.


4. *Many learned men teach that it is right.* Hos. x, 13. "Ye have ploughed wickedness, ye have reaped iniquity; ye have eaten the fruit of lies: because thou didst trust in thy way, in the multitude of thy mighty men." 1 Cor. i, 25-27; Rev. xviii, 23.

5. *We are unlearned and must look to them for instruction.* Prov. xix, 27. "Cease, my son, to hear the instruction that causeth to err from the words of knowledge." 2 Tim. iii, 1-7.

6. *The laws of our country enforce it.* Acts iv, 19. "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye." Chap. v, 29; Dan. iii, 16-18; vi, 10.


7. *It causes trouble and division.* Luke xii, 51, 52. "Suppose ye that I am come to give peace on earth? I tell you, Nay; but rather division. For from henceforth there shall be five in one house divided, three against two, and two against three." Verse 49; Matt. x, 34-37; John xv, 19; xvii, 14; 1 Kings xviii, 17, 18.

8. *I should lose my influence and bring reproach.* Matt. v, 11, 12. "Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. Rejoice and be exceeding glad, for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you." Luke vi, 22, 23, 26; 1 John iv, 5.

9. *It makes no difference what day I keep if I keep it right.* Ex. xx, 9, 10. "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." Matt. xv, 8, 9.  To keep any day right is to keep it as God's law directs; otherwise his law is not right. To keep *every day right* is to work on the first six and rest the seventh.

10. *I am afraid of new doctrines.* Ex. xx, 11. "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." Gen. ii, 2, 3.

11. *I do not think these old laws are binding.* Jer. vi, 16. "Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls." Chap. xviii, 15.

12. *The apostle teaches that old things are passed away.* 2 Cor. v, 17. "Therefore, if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new."  The "old man" of sin must pass away. Then the man becomes new—not the law.—*Review of Fillio by J. H. Waggoner.*

CONCLUSION.

We now conclude our little work with extracts from A. Campbell, which are a sledge-hammer stroke against antimonianism. We number them for convenience. He says:

1. "No license is given to offense. The moral law is UNREPEALED." *Christ. System*, p. 43.

2. "For should a man keep the whole law and offend in *one point*, he is guilty of all. He has despised the *whole* authority of the law and Law-giver. It is then *utterly impossible* that any sinner can be forensically or legally justified by a law which he has in *any one instance violated*." [Query. If this is true, and sin is the transgression of the gospel, what will become of all sinners?—*Snook*.] "If then a man be

justified, it must be on some other principle *than law*. He must be justified by favor." *Baptism*, p. 277. "Salvation in the aggregate is all of grace; and all the parts of it are consequently gracious. Nor do we in truth, in obeying the gospel, or in being buried in baptism, MAKE VOID *either law or gospel*, but *establish and confirm BOTH*." P. 258.

3. "When I think of the nature of sin, and the holy and IMMUTABLE laws of God against whom it is committed, I see no difference between one sin and another. There may be great and little sins as to their temporal relations and consequences; but when He against whom every sin is committed, and that DIVINE and HOLY LAW which is violated is considered, we must say with the apostle, that he that offendeth in one point is guilty of all." *Deb. with Purcell*, p. 204.

4. Referring to the decalogue in the Catholic Bible, he says, "Are these the ten commandments of God, as all Roman Catholic children are taught? The single fact that the four archbishops of Ireland, and the Roman Catholic college of Maynooth, should have *impiously* dared to strike one commandment from the ten which God wrote on two tables with his own finger, and should have changed and divided the tenth into two, speaks volumes in proof of my allegation against the Romanist's *rule of faith*." P. 214.

5. "It is a poor apology for this *expurgation* of the decalogue, that it is so done in the Douay Bible. What myriads then through this fraud must have lived and died in the belief that the second commandment was no part of God's law. It is clearly proved that the pastors of the church have *struck out* one of God's TEN WORDS, which not only in the *Old Testament*, but in *all revelation*, are most emphatically regarded as the synopsis of all religion and morality. They have also made a ninth commandment out of the tenth, and their ninth in that independent position becomes identical with the seventh commandment, and makes God use tautology in the only instrument in the universe that he wrote with his own hand." P. 214.

To further show how Mr. Springer is at variance with his own denomination we give the following from their Youth's paper, "The Christian Sunday School Journal," of June 1, 1853, issued by their Publishing Association at Cincinnati, which was accompanied in that sheet with an illustration of Moses receiving the two tables of stone:

"MOSES RECEIVING THE TEN COMMANDMENTS.

"Do you wish to keep God's laws? You have done a great many naughty things. God could punish you, but he is very kind. He sent his own dear Son to die upon the cross, that he might forgive you all your naughtiness. The Son of God *mind*ed all the ten laws, yet he suffered for our sins. You have not minded God's laws; you have often been naughty, yet God will forgive you, because his Son, the Lord Jesus Christ, died for you.

"Here is a little prayer for you: 'O God, forgive me all my sins, because Jesus died for me.'

"I hope you will soon be able to learn the ten laws or commandments, and I hope you will *try to mind* them. You may read about Moses in the Bible, in Exodus xix and xx.

"These are the ten commandments:"

[Here follows the ten commandments *in full*, with the same at their close in verse.]

MARK OF THE BEAST, AND SEAL OF THE LIVING GOD.

UPON the announcement of this subject, the objection may arise in the mind, that we cannot tell what the mark of the beast is—that there are various opinions respecting it, and that we cannot settle down with assurance and certainty upon anything in relation to it. In reply to this it is sufficient to say, that God has given, in his word, a most solemn warning against the reception of the mark of the beast, accompanied with the most awful threatening of his unmingled wrath against all who do not heed the warning. Rev. xiv, 9-12. It would be unjust in God thus to threaten men, if it is impossible for them to ascertain the meaning of the terms of the warning. Hence, with the full assurance of the justice and reasonableness of all God's requirements and threatenings, we unhesitatingly say, we can understand what the mark of the beast is. The word of God, with the fulfillment in history of some of its prophecies, amply furnish us in this matter; so that we can arrive, not merely to an opinion, but to full assurance of faith.

The angel declared to Daniel, concerning these last days, "The wise shall understand." Chap. xii, 10. "The time of the end" has arrived, and the warning voice of the third angel, Rev. xiv, 9-12, is already being heard. Consequently the time is fully come for us to know what the mark of the beast is, that we may avoid it, and escape the threatened wrath.

The terms, mark and sign, are synonymous in signification, both being defined, by Webster, by the word token. The scriptural use of the term seal is the same. In proof of this we refer to Rom. iv, 11, where Paul af-

firms of Abraham, that "he received the *sign* of circumcision, a *seal* of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised." Again, the word rendered *seal* in Rev. vii, 2, common version, is rendered *sign* by other translators: "having the sign of the living God." Verse 3. "Hurt not the earth, neither the sea, nor the trees, till we have signed the servants of our God in their foreheads." But in Eze. ix, 4, we read, "Set a *mark* upon the foreheads of the men that sigh and cry for all the abominations that are done in the midst thereof."

Thus these terms are used interchangeably in the Scriptures. Hence, the mark of the beast is his sign, seal, or token; and the seal of God is his mark or sign. These are not literal marks in the flesh, of course, but religious institutions or observances which will serve as marks of distinction between the worshipers of the beast and the worshipers of the true and living God; and, as we shall see in the sequel, they are institutions that stand, as rivals, directly opposed to each other. Therefore we treat of them in connection.

The sealing of the servants of God is the last work to be done for them in this probationary state—a work which is to prepare them to stand in the great day of wrath. The opening of the sixth seal, as recorded in Rev. vi, brings us to the day of wrath. Its commencement is indicated by those signs in the natural heavens which are the precursors of the second advent and the day of wrath, when it will be said, "The great day of his wrath is come, and who shall be able to stand?" Here, at the commencement of chap. vii, the sealing of the servants of God is introduced. The winds are held—the pouring out of the vials of wrath is staid, till the servants of God all receive a mark in the forehead, to distinguish them from the worshipers of the best, who have the mark of the beast in the same place. One hundred and forty-four thousand Israelites indeed, are found, (not literal Jews, whose unbelief has kept them separate from Christians—the true Israel of God; but

those that are Jews inwardly,) who are accounted worthy, through faith in Christ, to pass through the day of wrath, and be translated to heaven without tasting death. The translation of the 144,000, distinguishes them from the saints who have fallen by death, whose resurrection follows the sealing of the former. Says John, "After this I beheld, and lo, a great multitude that no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands." Verse 9. The immortal state follows; for it is said of these, "They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more," also, "God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes." Verses 16, 17.

In another prophetic chain of the book of Revelation, the 144,000 are again noticed. This chain, commencing with chap. xii, and ending with chap. xiv, 5, brings to view all the great persecutions of the saints during the gospel age, and the deliverance of those that are alive and remain to the second advent. The three great persecuting powers are symbolized as a great red dragon, a beast with seven heads and ten horns, and an image of this beast, which is formed by the false prophet or a beast with two horns like a lamb, but that spake as a dragon. This image—the last persecuting power, issues a decree of death against all that will not worship the beast, and receive his mark in their forehead or hand. Of course the saints of God will not give up the truth, and follow after the beast and receive his mark. They will sooner die the death threatened. But do they die? No, indeed. Christ comes and delivers them, and takes them up to mount Zion, to the heavenly Jerusalem. "And I looked, and lo, a Lamb stood on the mount Zion, and with him an hundred forty and four thousand, having his Father's name written in their foreheads." They have the seal of God, and not the mark of the beast, in their foreheads. They heeded not the threatening of death, and they are delivered without seeing death. They sing a song that no man

could learn but the hundred and forty-four thousand, "which were redeemed from the earth." It is said also that "these were redeemed from among men;" by which expressions, in connection with the revealed fact that the Christians, living at the time of Christ's second coming, will not die, we learn that they are translated from among living men upon the earth.

The sealing of the saints being the last work done for them in their probationary state, before their final deliverance, it must be accomplished by the preaching of the last message of mercy to man. Consequently the third angel's message, Rev. xiv, 9-12, is the sealing message, containing the seal of the living God. There can be no message later than this, for it decides the destiny of all that hear it. All who reject it must suffer the unmingled wrath of God. And it is followed by the coming of the Son of man.

From the fact that the third angel warns against the reception of the mark of the beast, we may readily infer that he bears the seal of God, which stands in direct opposition to that mark. Men are to choose between the two, and this choice decides their destiny. O, solemn message! Our eternal all is depending upon the choice we make! And we are the people to whom this message is sent. The last call of mercy has reached our ears! Save thy people, O Lord!

The two opposing marks are to be received in the forehead, which is a symbol of the mind and affections, since the forehead is the seat of the intellectual faculties. The seal of God can be received nowhere else. He accepts of no obedience but that which is from the heart. But the beast seems to be more accommodating. If you do not choose his mark in the forehead, you may receive it in your right hand. If you do not believe and love his institutions, you may obey them outwardly—carry out his requirements with your right hand, which is a symbol of outward actions. The Devil does not care for sincerity of heart in his service. If he can hire us to fall down and worship him, or in any way

cause us to disobey God, his object, which is our ruin, is accomplished.

Those who receive the seal of God, have the Lamb's "Father's name written in their foreheads." Rev. xiv, 1. Those who receive the mark of the beast, receive "the mark of his name." Verse 11. Name is used in a figurative sense to denote authority. In the name of the people, in the name of the king, signify by the authority of the people, or of the king. In the name of Jesus Christ, means by the authority of Jesus Christ. Hence, the mark of the beast is a sign or token of his authority, standing in opposition to the sign of the authority of the Father.

The third message warns us against submitting to the authority of the beast and receiving the mark of his authority, and presents us the "commandments of God (the Father) and the faith of Jesus," (the Son.) The seal of God, the token of his authority, must be found in connection with his *commandments*, though it is received through faith in Jesus, and applied by the Holy Spirit, "whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption."

A law, in order to have any force to impel obedience, must have a seal, which is a sign of the authority of the law-giver, indicating the extent of his dominion and, consequently, his right to rule. For example: The president of the United States issues an order to the army, and simply signs it with his name—*Abraham Lincoln*. No officer in command under him would dare to obey the order. Why not? Because the document is wanting in an important particular. It does not tell us which of the Abraham Lincolns is its author. The title and seal are wanting. But let him add to his name, President of the United States, and affix the seal of the government, and the order will be obeyed. This addition is the mark of his name or authority. It tells who Abraham Lincoln is. He is President. It gives us the extent of his jurisdiction—the United States; and, being the rightful ruler, he must be obeyed.

The law of God—the ten commandments—doubtless has a seal—a sign of the authority of the Lawgiver—some sign of royalty which distinguishes the true and living God from every other god or king in the universe. But what is it, and where shall it be found? Let us examine the law and see. Suppose you go on a mission to preach the gospel of salvation to a heathen nation. They are idolaters—worshippers of the sun. You must prove them sinners, or they can feel no need of salvation from sin. You cannot point out their sins, but by the use of God's law; for "sin is the transgression of the law." And in order to convince them of the sin of idolatry, you must point out to them the true God, and show them what he requires. You read to them the first commandment: "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." The question would naturally arise: Who is the God that gives this command? It may be the missionary for aught he can learn from the command. It may be the sun. Says one of your hearers, "I keep this commandment—I have no god but the sun. It is the most brilliant object that I can see, and I believe it is the only true god." You cannot convince him of his error by this precept, and you read the second. This forbids the worship of images as a sin against God, but gives no additional light by which we may distinguish the true God from anything but images. The heathen claims that he keeps this command also. He worships no images—he adores the sun, and only the sun. You read the third precept, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain; for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain." Still the heathen is unconvinced. He has not learned the true and living God, but is satisfied with the sun, and says he never pronounces his name, but with the utmost reverence. You pass by the fourth commandment as a Jewish law, abolished at the cross, and read the fifth. The name of God is found in it, but no more light on the identity of the law-giver, or his right to command our obedience. The remaining

five commandments have not so much as the name of God in them. Where are the signature and seal of this law? or has it none? Please read the commandment you passed by, as out of date: "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: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day and hallowed it." Ah! here it is. In six days the Lord *made* heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is. The *MAKER* of all things is the author of the law. Here is his signature, at the bottom of that table which teaches our duty expressly to him as our Maker. Here is the seal of the living God—a sign which distinguishes him from all "the gods that have not made the heavens and the earth." (See Jer. x, 10-12.) This shows the extent of his dominion, and his right to rule. He made the universe, and he has a right to govern it. This teaches the heathen that, not the sun, but the Maker of it, is the true and living God. This gives authority to the law—it is the mark of God's name.

This reasoning seems plausible, and if we find it sustained by scripture proof, it must be admitted as true. We turn then to Ex. xxxi, 13. "Verily my Sabbaths ye shall keep; for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you." Verses 16, 17. "Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant. It is a sign between me and the children of Israel forever: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested and was refreshed." Eze. xx, 12. "Moreover also I gave them my Sabbaths, to be a sign be-

tween me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them." Verse 20. "And hallow my Sabbaths; and they shall be a sign between me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord your God."

These testimonies are to the point. The Sabbath is a sign between God and the people that know him. It is a sign of the knowledge of the true God. It is a perpetual covenant. It is a sign between God and the children of Israel forever. It is not a sign that pointed to, and ended at, the cross; but it ever points back to the creation. "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and rested the seventh day." There are Israelites still upon earth, both the literal seed, and the true "Israel of God." Understand the term Israel as we will, the Sabbath is still obligatory upon them, and a sign of the knowledge of the true God.

Here I must digress a little to show who are the children of Israel. There is a class of persons that have a "veil upon their hearts," "in the reading of the Old Testament," which leads them to give the good promises made to the children of Israel, to the "sons of Belial"—to the literal seed or nominal Israel, that "are not of Israel." There was a clear distinction between these two classes, even in the old dispensation; and this is made so clear in the New Testament that those who will "turn to the Lord" can have the veil taken away. Jacob's name was changed to Israel because he had power with God and prevailed. Israel then signifies those that prevail with God. Says David, "Truly God is good to Israel." Who are Israel? "Such as are of a clean heart." Ps. lxxiii, 1. Says Paul, when speaking of those whose hearts are clean, "All Israel shall be saved." Rom. xi, 26. But when he speaks of nominal Israel, he says, "Though the number of the children of Israel be as the sand of the sea, a remnant shall be saved." Chap. ix, 27. "They are not all Israel that are of Israel; neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children; but, in Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, They which are the

children of the flesh, these are not the children of God; but the children of the promise are counted for the seed." Verses 6-8. "And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise." Gal. iii, 29. Then those good promises to Israel will be fulfilled to the Christians. All Israel will be saved, and none but Israel will be saved. Not only so, but the *tribes* of Israel will be saved; and all the good, whether Jews or Gentiles, whether serving their generation by the will of God in the former or in the latter dispensation, will be numbered in those tribes. James was an apostle of our Lord Jesus Christ, and no one can doubt that he wrote to Christians. Hear what he says. "James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ, to the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad, greeting. My brethren," &c. The names of the twelve tribes of Israel will be perpetuated to all eternity, on the gates of the city of God; and all those that prove themselves the children of Abraham by doing "the works of Abraham," Jno. viii, 39, will have right to the tree of life, and enter in through the gates into the city. See Gen. xxvi, 5; Rev. xxii, 14.

I have shown that the 144,000 are the "servants of God" of the last generation; that they are sealed just before the day of wrath; and that they are redeemed from among men. It is no wonder that they are of the tribes of Israel; for they are Israelites indeed. Jesus said of Nathaniel, "Behold an Israelite indeed, *in whom is no guile!*" John i, 47. Such is to be the character of the 144,000—"In their mouth was found no guile; for they are without fault before the throne of God." Rev. xiv, 5.

We have found that the Sabbath is the sign of the living God. It is a sign between him and his people, and the seal of his law. We now inquire, What is the sign of the beast? We agree with Protestants in general, that the beast is a symbol of the Papacy. The little horn of Dan. vii, 8, is a symbol of the same power. Their specifications are identical; consequently,

the power signified is the same. Their great words against the Most High, or blasphemies; their war against the saints, and prevailing against them; and the period of duration given to each—time, times and a half, or forty-two months—amply prove the identity of the two symbols. Paul's man of sin, 2 Thess. ii, who was to oppose and exalt himself above all that is called God, and sit in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God, is the same—the wicked Papacy. But how could he exalt himself above God so effectually, but by changing his law, tearing off its seal, trampling it in the dust, and giving to mankind a law upon his own authority and responsibility? This he has done. We might readily infer this from the message of the third angel, where the worship and mark of the beast are put in contrast with the commandments of God. But the testimony concerning this power, as recorded in Dan. vii, 25, plainly reveals the fact. "And he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws." The laws that he would think to change can be no other than the laws of God. To change human laws would not distinguish this power from an earthly government. All human legislators do this. But it is evidently an unchangeable law. The Douay version conveys this idea. It says he shall "think himself *able* to change times and laws." The laws of God are truly unchangeable, but this power attempts a change, and professes to men his improved version of it, still claiming that the law thus modified is the law of God.

Now all that observe the first day of the week, or Sunday, instead of the seventh, must admit that there has been a change in the requirements of the ten commandments. Many of these still profess to hold to their immutability, but in works they deny their profession, for they practice a change. If the fourth commandment requires us to keep the first day of the week now, it required the same of David, Isaiah and Dan-

iel; otherwise there has been a change in the law.

We inquire, By what authority has the change been made? Some say that Christ made the change, but the prophecy foretold that the beast—the man of sin—the little horn—should think to do this very work. Did Christ do the work foretold of anti-christ? Ask Protestants who this beast is, that should think to change times and laws, and they will tell you it is the Papacy. Why? Because it has fulfilled the specifications of the prophecy. Has the Papacy spoken great words against the Most High? Yes; it has claimed the titles and prerogatives of Jehovah. Has it worn out the saints of the Most High? Certainly; millions of the saints have fallen by that persecuting power. Has it thought to change the law of him who saith, "I change not?" No, say they, Christ is the author of the change.

But what is the testimony of Christ on this point? What does he answer to this charge? Matt. v, 17. "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill." He did not then, as some affirm, abolish the law; but did he not *change* it a very little? Verse 18. "For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." The law then is unchangeable. Not a *letter* or a *mark* can pass from it, till the heavens pass away with a great noise and the elements melt with fervent heat. To substitute the first day for the seventh, and to observe it to commemorate some other event than the creation, is certainly changing the commandment more than a jot or tittle. Then if we receive the testimony of Christ himself, he is not the author of the change. Who is?

We will examine the testimony of the Roman Catholic church on this point; and if we find it in harmony with the prophecy which Protestants are agreed applies to that church, we shall receive it as the truth; since we have proved that Christ made no change whatever in the law of God. All that I am about to quote is

from standard authors of the Roman church. The Catholic Catechism of the Christian Religion has the following questions and answers on the Sabbath commandment:

"Q. What does God ordain by this commandment?

"A. He ordains that we sanctify in a special manner this day on which he rested from the labor of creation.

"Q. What is this day of rest?

"A. The seventh day of the week, or Saturday; for he employed six days in creation, and rested on the seventh. Gen. ii, 2; Heb. iv, 1, &c.

"Q. Is it then Saturday we should sanctify, in order to obey the ordinance of God?

"A. During the old law, Saturday was the day sanctified; but the church, instructed by Jesus Christ and directed by the Spirit of God, has substituted Sunday for Saturday, so we now sanctify the first and not the seventh day. Sunday means, and now is, the day of the Lord.

"Q. Had the church power to make such change?

"A. Certainly, since the Spirit of God is her guide, the change is inspired by that Holy Spirit. The uniform, universal and perpetual tradition of all ages and nations attest the antiquity of, and consequently the divine assent to, this change; even the bitterest enemies of God's church admit and adopt it."

Milner's "End of Controversy," a Catholic work, has the following:

"The first precept in the Bible is that of sanctifying the seventh day; God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it. Gen. ii, 3. This precept was confirmed by God in the ten commandments; Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy; the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. Ex. xx. On the other hand Christ declares that he is not come to destroy the law, but to fulfill it. Matt. v, 17. He himself observed the Sabbath; and as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath-day.' Luke iv, 16. His disciples likewise observed it; they 'rested the Sabbath-day according to the commandment.' Luke xxiii, 56. Yet with all this weight of scripture authority for keeping the Sabbath, or seventh day holy, Protestants of all denominations make this a profane day, and transfer the obligation of it to the first day of the week, or the Sunday. Now what authority have they for doing this? None whatever, except the unwritten word, or *tradition of the Catholic church*, which declares that the apostles made the change in honor of

Christ's resurrection, and the descent of the Holy Ghost upon that day of the week."

The following is from the "Catholic Christian Instructed," by Dr. Challoner:

"Q. What are the days which the church commands to be kept holy?

"A. First, the Sundays, or Lord's day, which we observe by apostolic tradition, instead of the Sabbath, &c.

"Q. What warrant have you for keeping the Sunday preferable to the ancient Sabbath which was the Saturday?

"A. We have for it the authority of the Catholic church and apostolic tradition."

The reader will bear in mind that the object of our present inquiry is the mark of the beast. We have identified the beast fully. We have found the power that has arisen in fulfillment of the prophecies, that has fulfilled every specification given. It has spoken great words against the Most High. It has worn out the saints of the Most High. And it boasts of having changed the law of the Most High; claiming the power and authority to do so, independently of the written word of God. We inquire, What is the mark or sign of that authority?—what is the mark of his name?

We have seen that God gave to man an institution commemorative of his creative power and goodness, which naturally reminds us of his right to command and our duty to obey. This Sabbath institution he has declared to be a sign between him and his people forever. Has the beast—the Papal church—given us any institution as a sign of his power and authority, by the observance of which we acknowledge his right to make laws, "to ordain feasts, and to command men under sin?" We shall presently see.

We have found the seal of God connected with his law, and in the third Angel's message the worship and mark of the beast are put in contrast with the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus; consequently they are in direct opposition;—the worship of the beast is in opposition to the commandments and the faith in general, and the mark of that power stands op-

posed to the sign of God in particular. It is well known that the Roman church has not only corrupted the commandments of God, so as to allow of bowing down to images, but that she has changed and corrupted the institutions of the gospel—baptism and the Lord's supper. To follow her in these corruptions is, at least to them that know the truth, a part of the worship of the beast. But the mark of the beast is not any one or all of these things, but a single, definite institution, opposed to the sign of God, which is a sign of his authority to make all these changes and corruptions of the word of God. It must therefore be a counterfeit sabbath, instituted as a rival to the Sabbath of the Lord our God. Has the self-styled Catholic church given us such sign of her power? She has. Read carefully the following from the "Abridgment of Christian Doctrine," a Catholic catechism of the first authority, from which I have already quoted :

"Q. How prove you that the church hath power to command feasts and holy days?

"A. By the very act of changing the Sabbath into Sunday, which Protestants allow of; and therefore they fondly contradict themselves, by keeping Sunday strictly, and breaking most other feasts commanded by the same church.

"Q. How prove you that?

"A. Because by keeping Sunday they acknowledge the church's power to ordain feasts, and to command them under sin; and by not keeping the rest by her commanded, they again deny, in fact, the same power."

The following is from the "Doctrinal Catechism," another Catholic work :

"Q. Have you any other way of proving that the church has power to institute festivals of precept?

"A. Had she not such power, she could not have done that in which all modern religionists agree with her;—she could not have substituted the observance of Sunday the first day of the week, for the observance of Saturday the seventh day, a change for which there is no Scriptural authority."

Here we have the mark of the beast. The very act of changing the Sabbath into Sunday, without any Scriptural authority, is the proof of his power and au-

thority, and the keeping of Sunday is an acknowledgment of the same.

Some have thought and reasoned like this: A day is a day—one is as good as another; and if I keep one day as I should, it makes no difference what day it is. Such reasoning is utterly fallacious. We ought to know that God requires obedience to his word. When God says, Keep the seventh day holy, it is for us to obey; and to keep no day at all would be better than to mock him with a substitute. If we are not willing to obey him, he would choose to have us make no pretensions of it. "I would thou wert either cold or hot." Now when we see that the first-day sabbath is set up as a rival of the Sabbath of the Lord; that it was established by the man of sin, and is the mark of his name, or of his authority to change the law of God; none can fail to see that it makes a vast difference which day we keep. It is no wonder that the unmingled wrath of God is to be poured out upon those, who, knowing his will, choose in preference to obey the beast.

Reader, which will you choose? God is calling upon you to choose whether you will keep his commandments and receive his seal, or obey his rival, the beast and receive his mark. He is warning you of the awful consequences of the latter. The great day of his wrath is just before us, and we need a shield in that day. The destroying angel is about to pass through; the men with the slaughter weapons are about to smite; the four winds are about to be loosed; and nothing but God's token, mark or seal, will cause the destroyer to pass over us. See Ex. xii, 13; Eze. ix; Rev. vii, 1-4. Already has the angel ascended from the east, having the seal of the living God. The sealing message—that of the third angel—is being proclaimed. The time has come for the fulfillment of the prophetic message of Isa. viii, 16. "Bind up the testimony, seal the law among my disciples." The beast, the changer of times and laws, has broken God's testimony, and it must be bound up; he has torn the seal (the Sabbath) from the

law, and it must be restored; and while the angel with the seal of the living God passes through, the servants of God are sealed in their foreheads, while at the same time the seal is restored to the law among those servants or disciples.

O, heed the warning voice which God in his great mercy is sending forth. Forsake the commandments of the beast, and keep the commandments of God. Receive the seal of God in your forehead. Keep all the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. And when the vials of wrath are poured out—when the earth is being desolated of its inhabitants, “because they have transgressed the laws, changed the ordinance, broken the everlasting covenant”—you will have a covering from the storm—a shelter beneath the wings of the Almighty—and finally, having got the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, you will stand with the Lamb upon the mount Zion, having his Father’s name written in your forehead, and join in the song of deliverance that none can learn but those that have stood amid the perils of these last days, have heeded the last solemn warning to mankind, and are “redeemed from the earth”—“from among men”—being caught up to meet their descending Lord, to be forever with him. May God grant, dear reader, that this may be your happy lot and mine. And though we may never see each other’s faces here, may we sing together the new song in the kingdom of God.

R. F. C.

Price (post paid), \$2.00 per hundred.

Address ELD. JAMES WHITE, Battle Creek, Mich.