

"Christians: '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 unchangeable and eternally binding on all intelligent creatures. I see no connection between the death of Christ and the destruction of the moral law.'—Elder Barton W. Stone.

"Alexander Campbell: 'The Everlasting Ten.' — Popular Lectures."

"Thus we have seen clearly established the distinction between 'provisional and temporary;' the other, 'changeless and eternal.' the law of ritualism and the law of Ten Commandments. The one, having completed its mission, expired in the death of Christ; the other, continuing on in its everlasting perfection, 'as not depending either on time or place, or any other circumstances liable to change,' makes known forever the duty of man to his God. The one, a 'law of commandments contained in ordinances,' was in itself subsidiary, dependent, and incomplete; the other consisted of 'ten precepts, brief, comprehensive, and authoritative,'—a complete law in itself."

By this time the reader will see very clearly that the publishers of the tract have just followed those before them to prove their theory. Take that method of proof away from our modern teachers and they would surely be left without any evidence of their own thought. They would be helpless. While much more could be said on the subject, we now close this brief article trusting some may become interested as the result of reading this booklet, and desire more on the great subject of God's laws and statutes. If such should become thus interested we would recommend them to the "Book of the Law Found Again," where the whole subject in all its bearings is taken up fully.

perificial is the view of those who would place the Decalogue in the same category with the ceremonial law, and regard it as given only for the Jews. The whole ceremonial law had rather a significance only on the supposition that the Decalogue was not a relative thing suited to the capacity and development of the time when it was given, but the purely absolute representation of the eternal, independent will of God.' — Commentary, Heb. 9:25."

The Moral and Ceremonial Law



PRICE 15 CENTS

Published by
UNION PUBLISHING COMPANY
 Britton, Oklahoma.

THE MORAL AND CEREMONIAL LAW

Blind Leaders of the Blind; Babylon in Babylon; An Examination of Falsehood.

We have in our hand a tract of sixteen pages published by the Pacific Press of Mountain View, Calif., entitled, "The Ceremonial and Moral Law."

This tract belongs to the series of the "Bible Students' Library" of the Seventh Day Adventists. That people, as all well know, have much to say about the law and the importance of coming out of Babylon (the denominations) and coming into them, the "true church."

The subject treated in this tract is such a clear exposition of their own error we cannot pass it by without notice. If the students who read this tract accept it as truth, then we say they are not a bright class of students, and need to change teachers. If the publishers of the tract believe they are teachers of the truth we would advise them to take some lessons to learn what is truth before they call others out of Babylon to come in among them. For if they are not Babylon, then we do not know what Babylon, (confusion as to what is truth) is. We use the whole tract so there can be no excuse.

"Ceremonial and Moral Law Distinguished

1. "The Lord Jesus came into the world to suffer and die for the sins of men. John the Baptist, seeing Him, cried out, 'Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.' Since the time of Adam's transgression the people of God had looked forward by faith in His coming, that through the shedding of His blood they might be 'saved from wrath through Him.'

2. "His coming was prefigured, or foreshadowed, by the sacrificial system, which consisted in the shedding of blood by the slaying of innocent beasts, and the offering of their bodies in burnt sacrifice upon the altar. In this way, the children of God manifested their faith in the sacrifice of the coming Saviour, 'as of a lamb without blemish and without spot.' 1 Peter 1:19. Thus, 'by faith, Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice,' when he slew the innocent lamb. He thereby confessed to all about him that he believed the blood of the Son of God was to be shed for his sins. So with Abraham as he built his altar wherever he went; and so with his descendants, the Israelites, to whom God gave minute and specific instruction regarding the ceremonial sacrificial system.

3. "There was virtue in this system only as 'a shadow of things to come,' for, 'it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins.' Heb. 10:4. Therefore, the one great object of this system of types and shadows was to point forward to the Lamb of God, 'in whom we have redemption through His blood, even the forgiveness of sins.' Col. 1:14. When, therefore, the Lamb of God had 'made peace through the blood of His cross' (Col. 1:20), when in His expiring agony He cried, 'It is finished,' type had met antitype; shadow had met substance. Henceforth the sacrificial ordinances and ceremonies of the temple were at an end; for at the death of Jesus, 'the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom.' Matt. 27:51.

4. "The great sacrifice had been offered. The remedy for sin had come. He had been 'brought as a lamb to the slaughter' (Isa. 53:7), and because of this, the ceremonies and rites which had so long pointed forward to this great event, being no longer needed, in the nature of things, ceased to exist. Paul speaks of this ritual system as 'the law of commandments contained in ordinances,' which Christ 'abolished in His flesh.' Eph. 2:15. In the ninth chapter of Hebrews is spoken of as follows: 'Which (temple or sanctuary) was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience; which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances (rites, or ceremonies, margin), imposed on them until the time of reformation.' Heb. 9:10."

The very first thing stated in this tract we now examine is wrong. Namely, it says the people of God had looked forward to the time when he would shed his blood to save them. That is misleading and untrue. Adam accepted by faith the promise and it was immaterial to him when Christ would die. Adam's salvation was in his belief that God would do what he promised, and that faith made his salvation sure as soon as he accepted it. The record says Abraham believed God and it was accounted to him for righteousness. The practice teachers have in using that word, "looking forward," to the cross is unscriptural. Man's salvation was just as sure to Adam on the promise of God as it was to those who witnessed the crucifixion. Anything else would have been unbelief. And now those who only accept Christ because he has died, are in the same condition of unbelief. So to begin with, drop out that expression, "looking forward to Christ," or "back to him," for salvation. No such use is made in the scriptures. The same thought is again expressed in paragraph two. - "His coming."

Just a thought will show this to be wrong.

There are no scriptures which set the definite time of the crucifixion till after the Babylonish captivity, which was three thousand years after the creation of the world. It is said in Jeremiah seventeen that if **Israel would obey God, Jerusalem would stand for ever.** The theocracy would have continued to the end of the world, and then his death would have occurred. So it was Israel's disobedience that caused the sacrifices to cease (588 B. C.) and not the crucifixion. Read Hosea 3:4. Again, it is clear to anyone who knows the truth, what the set seasons of worship teach, such as the Passover, Pentecost, Day of Atonement, Feast of Tabernacles, and so on, that none of them but the Passover met their antitype at the crucifixion. This is too positive for anyone to doubt for a moment.

Paragraph 3. In this paragraph the same thought is still pressed and is now tried to be sustained by **scripture.** The scripture used we will see on examination has no reference whatever to the use made of it. First Colossians, second chapter, is used. Next Ephesians 2:15; next Hebrews 9:10.

I wish to notice these scriptures. In Colossians second chapter Paul warns the Gentile converts against a certain class of teachers who were troubling them through vain philosophy and vain deceit, "after the rudiments of the world and not after Christ." First, who were those teachers? By turning to Acts 17:18 we learn they were Epicureans and Stoics at the Gentile city of Athens. Not Jews at all. These men claimed Paul "was a setter forth of strange gods." This shows they were heathen philosophers. Paul says in Colossians two, their doctrine was after "the rudiments of the world." So it is settled they were a class who knew nothing of the true God nor of Bible teaching at all.

Paul warns them further in verse eighteen: "Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility in worshipping of angels," (spirits of devils, fallen angels). Paul says, "They intrude into those things which he hath not seen, being puffed up in their fleshly mind." In verse twenty Paul says, "Therefore

if ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world why as though living in the world are ye subject to ordinances." What ordinances? It would not take a very wise man to answer correctly. Namely, the ordinances of heathenism based on vain philosophy, which was Baal worship in any age of the world. Verse twenty-one says, "They are after the commandments and doctrines of men."

Now is it not strange that an intelligent man or woman would apply Colossians second chapter to the law of Moses, commanded him by God? No one but a blind, ignorant person, who knew not the Bible would do it. And such were we at one time. But, says one, did heathen worship have new moons, meat offerings, drink offerings, and sabbaths in its system? Yes. Read the following scriptures. Lev. 18:3; Hosea 2:10; 1 Kings 11th and 12th chapters; Ezekiel 20; and so on.

But, says one, does not this scripture say these were a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ? Does not that teach the coming of Christ and his body as casting a shadow backwards from the cross before he came? No, indeed. This again shows our ignorance when such positions are taken. What is the body here mentioned? Chapter one, verse eighteen, I read: "He is the head of the body, the church." In verse twenty-four I read again, "For his body's sake which is the church." So the body in Colossians two has no reference whatever to the body of Christ on the cross as the substance of the shadow. Neither has the expression of, a shadow of **things to come**, any reference to the advent of Christ.

Now, says Paul in verse sixteen and seventeen, "Let no man therefore judge you in meat nor in drink, nor in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon nor of sabbath days, which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ." What body? We reply, the true church, not a Baal organization, either before Christ or after Christ. The true church is the church of the first born, made up of those whose names are written in heaven, at all ages and times of the world's history. That is the true church and the only

church today, as well as then, or any other time. So the body is the true church, the substance.

The planet worship was a shadow on the mind of the heathen of things to come. To them, all blessings came from their nature gods, which they worshipped. But to the Christian all things come to them as a result of their membership being in heaven and worshipping the true God from which all blessings flow. "The giver of every good and perfect gift." So the question in Colossians, is it the true church or is it Baal that Paul is teaching? The Lord forgive our blindness in the past on this question and lead others to acknowledge the true worship of God by coming out of Babylon and teaching the whole truth.

The next scripture is Ephesians 2:15. We will take the liberty to quote the whole thought from verse 11 to 22.

"Wherefore remember, that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called Uncircumcision by that which is called the Circumcision in the flesh made by hands;

"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:

"But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ.

"For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us;

"Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace;

"And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby:

"And came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh.

"For through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father.

Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God;

And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone;

"In whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord:

"In whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit."—Eph. 2:11-22.

Note, Paul addresses them who are Gentiles. Second, in times past they were far off without God and hope in the world. Third, they become nigh

through Christ. Fourth, this was accomplished by the "middle wall of partition" being broken down. Fifth, this wall was broken down by slaying the enmity that existed between them. Sixth, that enmity was the commandments contained in ordinances. Thus again, anyone ought to see that these ordinances which were contrary to the Christian, were not ordinances which God commanded. But like the Colossian ordinances, they were the ordinances of heathen worship. When these ordinances were broken down which contained heathen commandments of men, then they were both reconciled unto God **in one body** (the true church) by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby. Verse 16. Again we say, is it not strange that those who stand before the people as teachers will teach those commandments to be those given to Moses by the Lord himself? Next, that the body is the body of Christ, as it hung on the cross, instead of its being the true church which is the body? That body, says Paul, is the temple, the church, "fitly framed together for an habitation of God through the spirit." We do pray that the denomination that issued this tract here examined, will not only cease to publish and teach such things longer, but that they will also come out as men and admit their mistake as we have done. The same thought is expressed concerning those set days of heathen worship in Galatians, which reads as follows:

"Howbeit then, when ye knew not God, ye did service unto them which by nature are no gods.

"But now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage?

"Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years.

"I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain."—Gal. 4:8-11.

The next reference used by the writer is found in Heb. 9. We quote verse ten also.

"Which was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience:

"Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation."—Heb. 9:9, 19.

Again, is it not strange that professed teachers cannot better locate the correct place to use scripture?

The book of Hebrews, as the name signifies, shows it to be addressed to the Lord's professed people, who had rejected Christ. Their eyes were blinded as to the teaching of the law, written by Moses, though they were very zealous of the law. They could not see the lesson of faith taught by its object lessons and expected to be saved by obedience alone to the law. In other words, work out their salvation by works, in the place of getting the lesson of faith which the law taught. Poor, blind guides they were. Paul says that service was a figure for the time present, a school-master to bring them to Christ. Gal. 3:24. Not to his birth and crucifixion but to faith in Christ as the "promised Redeemer," in every age of the world. Both the systems of Baal worship and also of God were educational teaching certain lessons by the kindergarten method. One taught the service of the true, the other of the false. To trust in the ordinances of the true alone for salvation was a mistake. The truth, the Lord's service teaches, is what saves, through faith. Paul says these ordinances of the Lord were carnal or fleshly. He says this figure of washings and carnal ordinances "were imposed on them till the time of the reformation." What reformation? Not a reform introduced by Christ in a change of worship when here, for he taught obedience to the law of Moses. He said that "all things which those who sit in Moses seat bid them do, that observe and do, but do not after their works." So no reformation was introduced by him. Hence the reformation here spoken of was that when the individual was sufficiently taught by the sacrificial law to exercise faith in Christ as his Redeemer, in any age when he accepted Christ. Then the reformation was made and he was no longer under the school-master. Gal. 3:24, 25. So again we see that every text used is used only in a way which exposes a lack of knowledge of the Bible on the laws of God.

The tract continues as follows. We here quote paragraphs 5 to 8.

"The Ceremonial Law

5. "This law of commandments contained in ordinances; this law which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, together with all other Mosaic rites and

ceremonies, is known to Bible students as the 'ceremonial law.' It was written by Moses in a book, as we shall see later, and had to do exclusively with the sacrifices and services of the temple; with divers washings, meats and drinks, feast days and holy days, with days of the moon, etc.; together with the ceremonial sabbath days, spoken of in Leviticus 23 and other scriptures, as follows:

6. "In the seventh month, in the first day of the month, shall ye have a sabbath, a memorial of blowing of trumpets, an holy convocation. Ye shall do no servile work therein; but ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord. Also on the tenth day of this seventh month there shall be a day of atonement; it shall be an holy convocation unto you; and ye shall afflict your souls, and offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord. And ye shall do no work in that same day; for it is a day of atonement, to make an atonement for you before the Lord your God. For whatsoever soul it be that shall not be afflicted in that same day, he shall be cut off from among his people. And whatsoever soul it be that doeth any work in that same day, the same soul will I destroy from among his people. . . . It shall be unto you a Sabbath of rest, and ye shall afflict your souls."

7. "These ceremonial sabbath days were entirely distinct from the weekly Sabbath of the fourth commandment. Their count had nothing whatever to do with the days of the week, as they were yearly sabbaths, and came on the first day of the seventh month, and on the tenth day of the seventh month, etc., without regard to the day of the week.

8. "The prime object of these typical sabbaths was to point forward to Christ. For on those days the priests were instructed to 'offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord;' thus typifying Him who made 'His soul an offering for sin.' The tenth day of the seventh month was the annual day for atonement, in which all were to afflict their souls, and confess their sins. And those of the people who had a true sense of the meaning of the sacrifices and offerings of that day, understood that the blood of the victims could not atone for their sins, but simply their faith manifested in the great provision God would make in the future."

We note paragraph 7. This paragraph quotes from the law concerning the day of atonement on the tenth day of the seventh month. Note, prior to this, this tract teaches that the sabbath days and sacrifices ended at the cross, when type met antitype. Now do the Seventh Day Adventists believe this? No. They say the antitype of the atonement met its fulfillment in 1844. Thus we see they contradict their own argument. In paragraph 8 the writer says these sabbaths pointed forward to Christ. Thus a plain denial of their own teaching. This question becomes more interesting as we pursue it. It surely reveals the weakness of the position taken, that the law of Moses was

abolished and nailed to the cross, which is so universally taught. We now quote from paragraph 9 to 13.

Contention Among Believers and Unbelievers.

9. "After the death of Christ, many of the Jewish converts to Christianity were slow to discern that these days which had foreshadowed the death of Christ had passed away in His death, and that the law of commandments contained in ordinances had been abolished. They still argued in favor of circumcision, and the ceremonial days of the old dispensation under the Mosaic law. And often, disputes arose between the Jewish and the Gentile Christians, and uncharitable judgment was pronounced owing to the conflicting opinions in this matter. The Jewish Christians argued that their Gentile brethren could not be saved unless they observed the rite of circumcision, and the holy days of ceremonial sabbaths of the Jewish system. The Gentiles, on the other hand, took the Jewish Christians to task for still observing the days and ceremonies which had been abolished. Owing to this controversy, Paul wrote to the Roman Christians:

10. "Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? . . . One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it." Rom. 14:4-6.

11. "Here is a true setting forth of the matter as it stood at that time. To illustrate: Some of the Jewish converts esteemed the tenth day of the seventh month above common days, and regarded it to the Lord, whereas the Gentile converts did not regard the day as sacred. Paul showed them that it was no sin either to regard the day, or not to regard it, as the day had lost its former significance. He said, 'Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.' And now, if a Jewish Christian still wished to regard it as holy, it would be no sin for him to do so. And if the Gentile Christian disregarded the day (which he had a right to do), his Jewish brother had no authority to sit in judgment upon him for so doing. On the contrary, the Gentile must not condemn his Jewish brother for keeping the day if he chose. Concerning this same matter, Paul wrote to the Colossians:

12. "Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to His cross. . . . Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days; which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ." Col. 2:14-17.

13. "The 'sabbath days' here brought to view as a part of the typical system, are the very ones mentioned in Leviticus 23; for they are said to be 'a shadow of things to come.' And such, indeed, in their prime significance, and exclusively such, were the typical sabbath days of the ceremonial system. This being true, the sabbath of the fourth commandment can not possibly be placed in the same category with the shadowy 'sabbath days' of the ceremonial law; for, first of all, the Sabbath day of Jehovah be-

longs to the moral law of Ten Commandments, an eternal and unchangeable code, as we shall see; and besides, the term 'sabbath days' is in the plural, denoting the different typical sabbath days, such as the first day of the seventh month, and the tenth day of the seventh month, etc., while God's seventh-day Sabbath is spoken of in the Bible as the Sabbath day, singular number."

The writer says that the law of Moses is known by Bible students to be the ceremonial law. Poor Bible students they are as we will see later. The writer now quotes Romans 14:1-7.

"Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations.

"For one believeth that he may eat all things: another, who is weak, eateth herbs.

"Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not; and let not him which eateth not judge him that eateth: for God hath received him.

"Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth. Yea, he shall be holden up: for God is able to make him stand.

"One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.

"He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it. He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks; and he that eateth not to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks.

"For none of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself."—Romans 14:1-7.

Is it possible that a people who claim to be teachers of the law would put forth such an argument as here presented? Namely, they have said the law is abolished and nailed to the cross. No longer of benefit. It was contrary to us. It was against us. Enmity to us. It was the middle wall of partition between us and must be abolished and ended. But now the writer has hold of a text which in his mind contradicts all he has said and so he in the place of seeing what it does teach, admits it was not wrong for the Jews to still believe it. It was no sin neither was it wrong for the Gentile converts to disregard it, if they chose. So after all Christ did nothing very important when he abolished it. Such an argument would not be accepted a moment on the Sabbath question with them. When arguing that question with them they place an entirely different application to Romans 14:4-6. They

will then say, those days in Romans 14 were not days that God had given, but the days regarded of heathen peculiarities such as they held. Not of heathen worship nor Christian worship, but a peculiarity such as the eating of herbs and so on, mentioned in verses one and forward.

We agree with the latter understanding of this scripture. Hence Paul has no reference to any days commanded by God at all. The writer next quotes Colossians 2:14-17. Now he says these are the same days mentioned in Leviticus twenty-third chapter, where the law of Moses is written. We have before shown this to be utterly false. They have no reference whatever to the law of Moses or anything he ever wrote.

We again quote from the tract from paragraphs 14 to 17.

"Not a Type or Shadow

14. "Another reason why the sabbath days here included in the typical economy could not have reference to the weekly Sabbath is, that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment never was a type or a shadow of anything. It was instituted and fully appointed at the creation of the world, before sin entered, and, consequently, before types and shadows were needed. Instead of being a shadow of anything to come, it points unflinchingly back to Creation. Types and shadows were needed to point forward to the remedy for sin, only after sin entered. And as we have seen, the Sabbath day was set apart before the entrance of sin; and, too, there is nothing about the Sabbath day which suggests type or shadow.

15. "Speaking of the handwriting of ordinances, and the ceremonial days of Col. 2:16, Dr. Adam Clarke says: 'The apostle speaks here in reference to some particulars of the handwriting of ordinances, which had been taken away; viz., the distinction of meats and drinks, what was clean and what unclean, according to the law; and the necessity of observing certain holy days or festivals, such as the new moons, and particular sabbaths, or those which should be observed with more than ordinary solemnity; all these had been taken out of the way and nailed to the cross, and were no longer of moral obligation. There is no intimation here that the Sabbath was done away, or that its moral use was superseded, by the introduction of Christianity. I have shown elsewhere that 'Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy' is a command of perpetual obligation, and can never be superseded but by the final termination of time.'

16. "Dr. Albert Barnes, speaking of the same text says: 'Or in respect of an holy day.' . . . The word rendered 'holy day'—heorte—means properly a feast or festival, and the allusion here

is to the festivals of the Jews. . . . 'Or of the sabbath days' (Greek, 'of the sabbaths'). The word sabbath in the Old Testament is applied not only to the seventh day, but to all the days of holy rest that were observed by the Hebrews, and particularly to the beginning and close of their great festivals. There is, doubtless, reference to those days in this place, as the word is used in the plural number. . . . There is not the slightest reason to believe that He meant to teach that one of the Ten Commandments had ceased to be binding on mankind. If he had used the word in the singular number—the Sabbath—it would then, of course, have been clear that he meant to teach that that commandment had ceased to be binding, and that a Sabbath was no longer to be observed. But the use of the term in the plural number, and the connection, show that He had His eye on the great number of days which were observed by the Hebrews as festivals, as a part of their ceremonial and typical law, and not to the moral law or the Ten Commandments. No part of the moral law—no one of the Ten Commandments—could be spoken of as 'a shadow of good things to come.' These commandments are, from the nature of the moral law, of perpetual and universal obligation.'

17. "The American Tract Society, in 'New Testament with Notes,' says: 'Judge you;' pronounce you good or bad, according to your treatment of the ceremonial law. A holy day—sabbath days; in the original, a festival sabbath. The days referred to are those required to be observed in the ceremonial law—days associated by God with meats, drinks, and new moons. The passage does not refer to the Sabbath of the moral law, associated with the commands forbidding theft, murder, and adultery. The weekly Sabbath was never against men or contrary to them, but always for them, and promotive of their highest good. The observance of it caused them to ride upon the places of the earth, and to possess the heritage of God's people. Isa. 58:13, 14; Jer. 17:21-27.'"

It is now evident where these errors originated. Namely, taken by Seventh Day Adventists from those who preceded them. The positions taken are not the result of personal study but the result of following the traditions of the elders. That was the trouble in the days of Christ. It is the trouble always. It is right to examine other teaching. But all teaching must be then examined by the word of God. There is very little thought now existing as the result of personal study.

We inquire, where did Adam Clark, Albert Barnes and the American Tract Society get their doctrine? By tradition of the elders of course. But where did the elders get it? From the Roman Catholic priests as they tried to justify their heathen worship, which they clung to, after they, as a nation, adopted profes-

sedly the religion of Christ. Something must be devised by them to do away with the law of Moses before they could practice their heathen worship of Baal. Baal worship was enmity to, and contrary to, the Bible Christian, so they, in place of breaking down the heathen ordinances and wall, as did the apostles, built up the heathen ordinances and wall, and broke down the wall which God had built. This is the fact of the matter, and today the heathen ordinances are established in Babylon in the place of God's ordinances. So S. D. A. people have simply followed in Baal worship and teaching as those before her have done. Further, whenever the S. D. A. measure themselves by others of the same kind, it simply says **they are** of the same kind. Will someone tell us what authority Clark, Barnes and the American Tract Society is? It is the harmonious teaching of the word that is authority, and not man. Why do not the S. D. A. people quote these men who believe in Sunday keeping on the Sunday question? If they are authority on one point why not on another? When I try to prove a point by another man's writing I am following the tradition of the elders. The word of God is the only proof. If any deny this teaching we here give on these scriptures, let them take the same scripture and show wherein we are wrong. That is argument and nothing else is. But we proceed with this erroneous tract. The more it says the more wrong there is in it.

"A Striking Contrast

18. "In order that no one may be confused with regard to the typical system as it stands related to God's great law of righteousness, the following comparison is made between the Ten Commandments, or moral law, and the law of commandments contained in ordinances, or ceremonial law. And, notwithstanding the fact that some teachers of these days are sadly confounding the moral with the ceremonial, it will be seen that the distinction between the two systems is most pronounced. The opinions, also, of leading commentators, reformers, and founders of churches, is given in order that all may see what the true teaching has been in years gone by, and what it still is, in truth, with reference to the two systems, moral and ceremonial.

MORAL LAW
Of Ten Commandments

CEREMONIAL LAW
Of Commandments Contained
In Ordinances

"1. A perfect law.
"The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul.' Ps 19:7.

"All Thy commandments are righteous.' Ps. 119:172.

"Thy righteousness is an everlasting righteousness, and Thy law is the truth.' Ps. 119:142.

"Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandments holy, and just, and good.' Rom. 7:12.

"2. A law in itself spiritual.
"For we know that the law is spiritual.' Rom. 7:14.

"3. Spoken by Jehovah.
"And the Lord spake unto you out of the midst of the fire, . . . And He declared unto you His covenant, which He commanded you to perform, even Ten Commandments.' Deut. 3:12, 13. (Ex. 20:1.)

"4. Written by the Lord upon two tables of stone.

"These words the Lord spake unto all your assembly in the mount out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness, with a great voice; and He added no more. And He wrote them in two tables of stone.' Deut. 5:22. (Ex. 31:18.)

"1. An imperfect law.
"For there is verily a annulling of the commandment going before for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof. For the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did.' Heb. 7:18, 19.
"For the law having a shadow of good things to come, . . . can never with those sacrifices, which they offered year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect.' Heb. 10:1.

"2. A law not in itself spiritual.
"Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation.' Heb. 9:10.

"3. Spoken by Moses.
"And the Lord called unto Moses, . . . saying, Speak unto the children of Israel and say unto them, If any man of you bring an offering,' etc. Lev. 1:1, 2.

"This is the law of the burnt-offering, of the meat-offering, and of the sin-offering,' etc., which the Lord commanded Moses in Mount Sinai, in the day that He commanded the children of Israel to offer their oblations unto the Lord.' Lev. 7:37, 38.

"4. Written by Moses in a book.

"And the Lord said unto Moses. Write thou these words.' Ex. 34:27.

"And Moses wrote this law, and delivered it unto the priests, the sons of Levi.' Deut. 31:9.

"And they spake unto Ezra the scribe to bring the book of the law of Moses.' Neh. 8:1. (2 Kings 22:8-16.)

"5. Eternal, therefore requiring obedience from all. 'De we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law.' Rom. 3:31.

"Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets; I came not to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in nowise pass away from the law, till all things be accomplished.' Matt. 5:17, 18, R. V.

"But it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away than for one tittle of the law to fail.' Luke 16:17, R. V.

"If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments.' Matt. 19:17.

"Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God.' 1 Cor. 7:19.

"Blessed are they that do His commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life.' Rev. 22:14."

In the above contrast we would like to say much, but for want of space we mention but a few. Why does not the writer of this tract tell the people about the various laws written by Moses? I presume it is because he has followed the elders till he hardly knows there were other laws written by Moses as well as the law of sacrifices. We have recorded in the book of the law, the civil statutes of God—our civil duties in civil government. We have the dietetic and sanitary laws. We have in most full detail the prophetic law of blessings and cursings, which were to follow the people of God through all ages, as they obeyed or disobeyed God. These temporal judgments would follow them. We have in that book of the law duties in church government, family relations between

"5. Abolished, therefore not requiring obedience from any.

"Having abolished in His flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances.' Eph. 2:15.

"Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to the cross.

. . . . Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days; which are a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ.' Col. 2:14-17.

"Certain which went out from us have troubled you with words, subverting your souls, saying, Ye must be circumcised, and keep the law; to whom we gave no such commandment.' Acts 15:24."

man and wife, parent and children, murder, debt, purchase of land, selling of lands, and many, many other things which stand today as the standard of law for all civilized people and nations. Will those who teach law tell us they were all abolished at the cross? And if so, where shall we now find them as re-enacted in the New Testament? This they cannot do, so how clear it is they have simply followed the teachers before them. Should I do such a thing I would keep Sunday, Good Friday, Ash Wednesday, Easter, Christmas, observe the Lord's Supper quarterly or on Sunday in the place of the time the Lord appointed and many, many other things. Just so in this argument and comparison, they simply follow the elders before them. Why not go just a little back and abolish the second commandment of the decalogue as is done by the Catholics? Why not change the tenth commandment to make up the number ten? Why not observe Sunday as the Catholic instituted it? Now why not believe the Lord when he says to the remnant people, "Remember the law of Moses with the statutes and judgments which he commanded all Israel." Mal. 4:4. While it is true that Moses wrote the book of the law as he was commanded by the Lord, yet does not the writer of this tract know it is called the law of the Lord? Luke 22:6-39

Do not the people who publish that tract know that the law, as a whole, both the ten commandments and the book of the law, are spoken of in many places in the Bible as **The law**? And no distinction is made as the tract here makes. Would they say of the "two witnesses," the law and the prophets," that the law was just the ten commandments, when the whole Bible is covered by the term, "the law and the prophets"? Would they say when it says, "to the law and to the testimony," it was the ten commandments only? Would they say where it says, "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass than for one tittle of the law to fail," it referred to the ten commandments only? And then following, would they claim that "the law of the Lord," "the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus," and scores of other similar statements, all

meant the ten commandments only? If so, we truly say their understanding of scripture is very limited indeed. Sectarianism rides hobbies. Sectarian writers seem to write more to establish some point which they hold as their peculiar faith, to distinguish them from all others, than they do to establish truth. Just so from that standpoint it is easy to see that this tract was written. Namely, to establish the Sabbath and prove it by the tradition of the elders.

Yes, there was a sharp contention over the law and especially the book of the law in the days of the apostles. I read of it in various places. The places thus far considered were not the ordinances of the Lord but ordinances of heathenism. We now cite to some contentions over the book of the law, or rather certain things in the book of the law. First, we have it recorded in Acts 18:21. There Paul says, "I must by all means keep the feast which cometh in Jerusalem." This was nineteen years after the crucifixion. What feast? Was it to keep Sunday? If so Sunday keepers would know this verse well. Was it to keep the Sabbath? If so Sabbath keepers would know just where it was. No, I read it was the Pentecost. For Paul "had determined to sail by Ephesus for he would not spend the time in Asia." For he hastened if it were possible that he might be in Jerusalem at the Pentecost." Please explain if this ordinance was abolished at the crucifixion, why was Paul so anxious to keep it nineteen years after? Too bad that keeping had not been Sabbath or Sunday so one of them at least could have introduced it to us in these last days. Again when Paul arrives at Jerusalem I read:

"And when we were come to Jerusalem, the brethren received us gladly.

"And the day following Paul went in with us unto James; and all the elders were present.

"And when he had saluted them, he declared particularly what things God had wrought among the Gentiles by his ministry.

"And when they heard it, they glorified the Lord, and said unto him, Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are which believe; and they are all zealous of the law:

"And they are informed of thee, that thou teachest all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, saying that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs.

"What is it therefore? the multitude must needs come together: for they will hear that thou are come.

"Do therefore this that we say to thee: We have four men which have a vow on them;

"Then take, and purify thyself with them, and be at charges with them, that they may shave their heads: and all may know that those things, whereof they were informed concerning thee, are nothing; but that thou thyself also walkest orderly, and keepest the law."—Acts 21:17-24.

Here we learn the same class that now falsely accuses had accused Paul of disregarding the portion of the law pertaining to circumcision. The apostles and thousands of Jews could not fellowship him if that be true. Paul was willing to prove it was not true as we read:

"Then Paul took the men, and the next day purifying himself with them entered into the temple, to signify the accomplishment of the days of purification, until that an offering should be offered for every one of them.

"And when the seven days were almost ended, the Jews which were of Asia, when they saw him in the temple, stirred up the people, and laid hands on him,

"Crying out, Men of Israel, help: This is the man, that teacheth all men every where against the people, and the law, and this place: and further brought Greeks also into the temple, and hath polluted this holy place."—Acts 21:25-28.

Does the above sound like Paul did not practice the law of Moses? He had shorn his head at Cenchrea before going up to Jerusalem for he had taken a vow according to the law. Acts 18:18. After he leaves Jerusalem and appears before Felix the governor, he says, "I confess that after the way they call heresy so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things written in the law and in the prophets." Acts 24:14. Once more as he appears before Festus, he again says, "Neither against the law of the Jews, neither against the temple, nor yet against Caesar have I offended." Acts 25:8. And last at Rome, the last sermon we have any record of Paul's preaching he said he "expounded and testified the kingdom of God persuading them concerning Jesus, both out of the law of Moses and out of the prophets from morning till evening. Acts 28:23.

Then again in Acts fifteenth chapter there is a record of another contention over the law. Certain men from Jerusalem had gone to Antioch and taught,

"That except they were circumcised and kept the law they could not be saved." Thus they made the act of circumcision the point of salvation. They believed in what is called "the works of the law." That is, salvation by works alone and not salvation by faith, which the law taught, in its object lessons. So this discussion was, whether a man could be saved by the law alone or by the faith the law taught, which existed in Christ, the Savior. This was met by the apostles saying they would teach the new converts among the Gentiles to abstain from those things strangled, from idols, and from fornication, as taught in the law of Moses, and they could learn the rest required, by "hearing the law read every Sabbath day in the synagogue." The Jew, who disbelieved in Christ, thought the main thing was to be circumcised the same as some now believe the main thing is to be baptized. But the advice of the apostles was to obey the most needful things first by abstaining from the habits the Gentiles had in breaking the law of Moses, and then by hearing the law read each Sabbath they could learn more, and then do that also, as the truth unfolded to them. So there was no abolishing of the law in the mind of Christ or the apostles. That idea never came till after there came a falling away and damnable heresies began to come in as the apostle said they would. Those damnable things are still being taught even in our day. They try to sustain them by proving the theory to be true, by appealing to the tradition of the elders as we next read.

What Men Have Said

"1. A perfect law.

"Spurgeon: 'The law of God is a divine law—holy, heavenly, perfect. . . . There is not a command too many; there is not one too few; but it is so incomparable that its perfection is a proof of its divinity.'" Spurgeon's Sermons, page 280.

"Alexander Campbell: 'God's ten words, not only in the Old Testament, but in all revela-

What Men Have Said

"1. An imperfect law.

"Dr. Barnes: 'The ceremonial laws are such as are appointed to meet certain states of society, or to regulate the religious rites and ceremonies of a people. These can be changed when circumstances are changed, and yet the moral law be untouched.'"—Comments on Matt. 5:18.

"Bishop Hopkins: 'The ceremonial law was wholly taken

tion, are the most emphatically regarded as the synopsis of all religion and morality.'"—Debate with Purcell, page 215.

"Dr. Adam Clarke: 'It would be almost impossible for a man to have that just notion of the demerit of sin so as to produce repentance, or to see the nature and necessity of the death of Christ, if the law were not applied to his conscience by the light of the Holy Spirit; it is then alone that he sees himself to be carnal and sold under sin; and that the law of the commandments is holy, just, and good.'"—Comments on Rom. 7:13.

"2. A law in itself spiritual.

"Scott: 'This law is so extensive that we can not measure it; so spiritual that we can not evade it, and so reasonable that we can not find fault with it.'"—Comments on Ex. 20:1-17.

"Nevin: 'The moral law, summarily comprehended in the Ten Commandments uttered from Mount Sinai, requires in all its precepts a spiritual obedience.'"—Biblical Antiquities.

"3. Spoken by Jehovah.

"Buck: 'Moral law is that declaration of God's will which directs and binds all men, in every age and place, to their whole duty to Him. It was most solemnly proclaimed by God Himself at Sinai.'"—Theological Dictionary.

"4. Written by the Lord upon two tables of stone.

"Scott: 'But God Himself

up enjoining those observations of sacrifices and offerings, and various methods of purification and cleansings, which were typical of Christ, and that sacrifice of His which alone was able to take away sin.'"—Complete Works of Bishop Hopkins, The Ten Commandments, p. 7, ed. 1841.

"'And concerning this it is that the apostle (Paul) is to be understood, when in his epistles he so often speaks of the abrogation and disannulling of the law. He speaks it, I say, of the ceremonial law and Aaronical observations.'"—Idem, page 8.

"2. A law not in itself spiritual.

"Nevin: 'The ceremonial law of the Jews comprehended a vast number of precepts. It stood in meats and drinks, and divers washings and carnal ordinances, imposed on them till the time of reformation.'"—Biblical Antiquities.

"Justin Edwards: 'The other kind, called ceremonial laws, related to outward observances which were not obligatory till they were commanded, and then were binding only on the Jews till the death of Christ.'"—Sabbath Manual, page 133.

"3. Spoken by Moses.

"Methodists: 'Although the law given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites, doth not bind Christians; . . . yet notwithstanding, no Christian whatsoever is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral.'"—Disciplin, Art. 6.

"4. Written by Moses in a book.

"'And it came to pass, when

wrote the Ten Commandments, the substance of the moral law, on the tables of stone.—Comments on Ex. 34:27.

“Presbyterians: ‘The moral law is summarily comprehended in the Ten Commandments, which were delivered by the voice of God upon Mount Sinai, and written by Him on two tables of stone.’—Confession of Faith, ed. 1883.

“5. Eternal, therefore requiring obedience from all.

“John Wesley: ‘But the moral law contained in the Ten Commandments, and enforced by the prophets, He (Christ) did not take away. It was not the design of His coming to revoke any part of this. This is a law which never can be broken, which stands fast as the faithful witness in heaven.’ The moral law stands on an entirely different foundation from the ceremonial or ritual law, which was only designed for a temporary restraint upon a disobedient and stiff-necked people; whereas this was from the beginning of the world, being ‘written not on tables of stone,’ but on the hearts of all the children of men, when they came out of the hands of the Creator. . . . Every part of this law must remain in force upon all mankind and in all ages, as not depending either on time or place, or any other circumstances liable to change; but on the nature of God and the nature of man, and their unchangeable relation to each other.’—Sermons, Vol. 1, sermon 25.

“Martin Luther: ‘Ques.—Are we under obligation to keep the moral law? Ans.—

Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book, until they were finished, that Moses commanded the Levites, . . . Take this book of the law and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant.’ Deut. 31:24-26.

“Scott: ‘Moses wrote in a book the judicial and ceremonial precepts that he had received.’—Comments on Ex. 34:27.

“5. Abolished, therefore not requiring obedience from any.

“John Wesley: ‘The ritual or ceremonial law, delivered by Moses to the children of Israel, containing all the injunctions and ordinances which related to the old sacrifices and services of the temple, our Lord indeed did come to destroy, to dissolve, and utterly abolish. To this bear all the apostles witness; not only Barnabas and Paul, who vehemently withstood those who taught that Christians ‘ought to keep the law of Moses’ (Acts 15:6); not only St. Peter, who termed the insisting on this, on the observance of the ritual law, a ‘tempting of God,’ and ‘putting a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers,’ and he, ‘nor we were able to bear;’ but ‘all the apostles, elders, and brethren, being assembled with one accord’ (verse 10), declared that to command them to keep this law, was to subvert their souls; and that ‘it seemed good to the Holy Ghost’ and to them ‘to lay no such burden upon them.’ This ‘handwriting of ordinances’ our Lord did ‘blot out,’ taken away, and nail to His cross. Verse 24.’—Sermons, Vol. 1, sermon 25.

Yes; because it is founded on the nature of God; and can not be changed; it is of universal application, which was impossible with respect to the ceremonial and civil laws. Christ demands obedience to His law.’—Shorter Catechism, ed. 1834.

“Calvin: ‘The law has sustained no diminution of its authority, but ought always to receive from us the same veneration and obedience.’—Institutes, book 2.

“Dr. Adam Clarke: ‘And let it be observed that the law did not answer this end merely among the Jews in the days of the apostles; it is just as necessary to the Gentiles to the present hour. Nor do we find that true repentance takes place where the moral law is not preached and enforced. Those who preach only the Gospel to sinners, at best only heal the hurt of the daughter of my people slightly.’—Comments on Rom. 7:13.

“Baptists: ‘We believe that the law of God is the eternal and unchangeable rule of His moral government; that it is holy, just, and good.’—Church Manual.

“Martin Luther: ‘I wonder exceedingly how it came to be imputed to me that I should reject the law of Ten Commandments. . . . Can it be imaginable that there should be any sin where there is no law? Whosoever abrogates the law must of necessity abrogate sin also.’—Spiritual Antichrist.

“John Wesley: ‘Beware of antinomianism, making void the law, or any part of it, through faith.’—Christian Perfection.

“Martin Luther: ‘Ques.—Are we under obligation to law of the Jews? Ans.—No; keep the ceremonial, or church the ordinances which it enjoined were only types and shadows of Christ; and when they were fulfilled by His death, and the distinction between the Jew and Gentile was removed, the ceremonial law was abolished, because it was no longer necessary.’—Shorter Catechism, ed. 1834.

“Rev. George Elliot: ‘By the phrase ‘the ten words’ as well as in the general scope of Hebrew legislation, the moral law is fully distinguished from the civil and ceremonial law. The first is an abiding statement of the divine will; the last consists of transient ordinances having but a temporary and local meaning.’—Essay on the Abiding Sabbath, page 116.

“Scott: ‘Moses wrote in a book the judicial and ceremonial precepts that he had received; but God Himself wrote the Ten Commandments, the substance of the moral law, on the tables of stone. This difference strongly marked the permanency and perpetual obligation of the moral law, and the inferior importance and temporary obligation of the ceremonial institutions.’—Comments on Ex. 34:27.

“Christians: ‘But there is an intimate connection between His (Christ’s) death and the ceremonial laws; for these were types and shadows of Christ, the antitype and substance.’—Elder Barton W. Stone.

“Olshausen: ‘There was represented in the holy of holies the absolute relation of the absolutely holy God to the sinful people. . . . How very su-