

THE LAW
THE COVENANTS
AND THE SABBATH

DR. L. C. THOMAS.

1368

The Law and Covenants and the Sabbath

Thomas, LC. Dr.
Archives 230 T458 c.1

The Law, the Covenants,

AND THE

SABBATH.

ALSO, AN EPITOME OF

The Great Salvation:

AND AN

APPENDIX,

INCLUDING VARIOUS OTHER SUBJECTS, IN BRIEF.

By DR. L. C. THOMAS,

OF DOVER, DELAWARE.

“The secret of the Lord is with them that fear him; and he will shew them his COVENANT.”—Ps. 25: 14.

“All scripture divinely inspired is indeed profitable for Teaching:—
Tim. 3: 16. Dia.

“The word of God, correctly understood, is true orthodoxy, and no man’s principles ought to be condemned until it is shown that this standard of truth does not warrant them.”
W. BALFOUR, D. D.

PUBLISHED BY THE AUTHOR.

1883.

COPYRIGHTED 1883.
BY DR. L. C. THOMAS, DOVER, DELAWARE.

THE JAMES & WEBB PRINTING COMPANY,
WILMINGTON, DEL.

PREFACE.

Having made the Law, the Covenants, and the Sabbath, the subjects of special study and investigation for more than a quarter of a century; and feeling that there is much of interest and importance in connection therewith, not generally well understood; is the writer's only apology for issuing this work. It is more especially intended for the honest and already interested bible student.

The author has not aimed at exhausting the subjects, nor to do more than merely to open them out, correct some erroneous views, and aid the earnest sincere enquirer, in arriving at a correct understanding of them.

Neither has he aimed at elegance of style, or flowery language; but in plain common language, to enlighten the understanding, and to bring the correct apprehension of the truth, on the subjects treated, down to the lowest common capacity; even at the expense and seeming weakness of some repetition, and the presentation of the same points in different ways, and various connections.

As designed, this book will be found to be different in several particulars, from all others, on the subjects discussed. Indeed, if it were not, the author might have spared himself the labor of writing and the expense of publishing.

One of the chief objects of many writers, is to avoid as much as possible, all common-place language; and to write in high-flown flowery words, and a learned assuming style; so as to impress the reader with the idea that their associations and life have been up in an elevated sphere among the higher classes of the people. The great and noble aim of making known *the* TRUTH, in language easily understood by *all* classes, is not therefore their chief object;

but a vastly inferior object is included. But in the following pages, the author has particularly designed to set forth the TRUTH in "words easy to be understood;" (1 Cor. 14 : 9-23) and in "great plainness of speech," (2 Cor. 3 : 12) to "prove all things" by the *naked* "WORD," like the great Apostle Paul, who said, "not with excellency of speech, * * not with enticing words of man's wisdom;" thus following also, in the footsteps of a greater than Paul, who "made *himself* of no reputation," but spake his *Father's* words. So, the author seeks not popular applause. *Mihi cura futuri*—"My care is for the future life."

"He is aware that to most people, it will seem quite unnecessary and superfluous to devote so much time and investigation to the subject or question of seventh-day keeping. But to the writer, it seems a matter to be greatly deplored, that so many, in consequence of a lack of light, on that subject, should go all their lives with their necks bowed down to such a "yoke of bondage"—"a yoke which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear." (Gal. 5 : 1. Acts 15 : 10.) Besides, others are continually being caught by the same lamentable delusion; and yielding their necks to receive the same unnecessary and unscriptural burdensome yoke; instead of Christ's "easy yoke." The writer sympathizes with them; and therefore desires, in endeavoring to "obey *all* things whatsoever Christ has commanded," not to forget that *command* of his, Mat. 5 : 16; "let your *light* so shine before men, that they may see your good works"—"the fruit of the spirit" instead of "the *works* of the law"—and "glorify your Father which is in heaven." He desires thus to give heed likewise to much earlier commands of Jehovah, viz: "He that hath my word let him speak my word faithfully. What is the chaff to the wheat? saith the Lord." "Thou shalt speak my words unto them, whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear."

He has also *one* object in dwelling on the fourth commandment so particularly and at such length, which he does not feel at liberty to express. He makes this remark, because of his consciousness that this feature will probably be uninteresting, to those who entertain no doubts as to the seventh day Sabbath having been done away, the same as all other works of the old law.

Another aim he has had in view, is to eulogize, and if possible, to *immortalize* in the mind of the reader, RIGHT and DUTY—

the universal, *duty* to do *right* through LOVE to God and man, the highest and holiest law—the will of God.

While the author does not expect this work to interest and benefit those who understand these subjects as well as himself; he hopes it may fall into the hands of some of that class, who, although deeply interested in the “things which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began,” and are anxious to attain to a correct understanding of them; have not as yet accomplished that desideratum, as to some of the things herein discussed: and also, into the hands of some of the thousands, who, though claiming to be christians, are nevertheless destitute of a knowledge of these important things; and that they may become interested, and induced to look further into the revealed purpose of Jehovah; until they become *attracted* by the glad tidings of the kingdom of God; and thereby “*drawn*” into the “one body,” and “only name given under heaven whereby man can be saved.”

THE HIGHER OR SUPERIOR LAW.*

There is a great universal eternal law of RIGHT and DUTY, which has its origin in the infinite immutable Attributes of Jehovah; called by Dr. Adam Clark, "that *Rule of Right*, which proceeds from His own immaculate holiness." This law of right, includes all the Godly or moral principles of justice, truth, benevolence, goodness, temperance, kindness, honesty, &c., &c; having for their impelling power or mainspring of action, LOVE to God and man.

Man's present and eternal good and welfare, and the glory of God, require obedience to this great law; that it should be the rule of life. These moral principles which constitute this great law of God, may be called *axioms*; that is, when by any means it is made known to us, what *is* justice, truth, benevolence, &c., it is at once self evident to us, that they are *right* and *duty*, that we should be obedient to them through LOVE.

This great moral law has been called "The higher or superior law;" which definition we accept as correct. This moral law is in perfect harmony with *natural* law, with all the physical laws of nature, of life and being, throughout the entire universe of God; and with all truth, science and sound philosophy.

All alike had their origin in him. Hence the apostle said, "in him *we* live and move and have our being."

RIGHT, is that which is in harmony with the will of God—conformity to this great law or will of God—this higher or superior LAW. † Hence conformity of life to this superior law,

* Law, signifies "Rule of action." Says Webster: "Law is not a series of actions, but the cause or *principle* from which they proceed, and of which they are the evidence."

† The higher law—the great eternal immutable perfect moral law—is not made up of language, letters, words, commands nor enactments, but of *principles* of Right and Duty through Love; which existed *before* any of these things, or any other things. It is true that language, letters, words and commands, can be made use of to express, declare and command (*very imperfectly* however) these principles, requiring observance and obedience, but that is all. When these have all waxed old, expired and perished; the principles—the perfect moral law—ever remains unimpaired. No human language can *perfectly* express this wonderful law, any more than it can fully and perfectly describe the immaculate Attributes of Jehovah.

these great moral principles of right and duty, through love, is righteousness.

According to all Lexicographers, moral duties or principles, are "*fundamental* truths—axioms or *self-evident* truth or ground of action." "Rule of action or BASIS of a system." "Moral duties arise out of the nature of the case itself, *prior* to external command." *Positive* duties do not arise out of the nature of the case, but from external *commands*." Hence "a *moral* precept is a duty commanded because it is *right*. But a *positive* precept is *right* because it is commanded." To illustrate: God commanded the Jews, to "honor thy father and thy mother." Also, that "three times thou shalt keep a feast unto me in the year." The first was commanded because it was right. The second was right because it was commanded. The first was a *moral* precept. The second was a *positive* precept. The first command was *based* on a moral principle that was *always* right and duty *before* the command, and also after the command had expired. The second was not based on moral principle, and was never a duty, until *after* the positive command had been given, and only for so long a time as the command was in force. So, also, were circumcision, and the Passover, *positive* law; and called "the law of the Lord," Ex. 13:9. Young, a celebrated writer on "the Science of Government," in speaking of this higher law, as existing in both the law of revelation and the laws of nature, said: "The *will* of the Creator *is his law*, and is called the law of nature. This law is founded in those relations of justice which existed in the nature of things *prior* to any *positive* precept; that is, it is a *perfect rule* for all rational and moral beings, and is *right* in itself, without depending on any *positive* command to make it so. It is that eternal law of RIGHT to which God himself conforms. Man as a social being is subject to the same law."*

Then in speaking of the *law of Revelation* he says. "This revealed or divine law *agrees* with the original law of nature.

* I quote occasionally from uninspired writers some valuable truth, not as proof, but because it is in harmony with the word of God. Paul did so, (Acts 17: 28; Titus 1: 12.) and said, "those things which ye have both learned and received, and heard, and seen in me, do." Phil. 4: 9. For all *proof*, I appeal "to the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them," Isa. 8: 20.

"Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." *Episcopal Creed*, Art. VI.

Both originate from the same source and are equally binding. All human laws derive their force from the laws of nature and revelation; and so far as they are contrary to the natural or divine law, they are not morally binding upon men." In speaking of what is called the *common law*, both of England and this country, he says; "it is *founded* on the *principles* of justice."

Another very able writer, William Hosmer, says; "the constitution of things clearly unfolds *a higher law* than man can ordain." "The existence and claims of such a law constitute an all-pervading truth." "God made the law in accordance with the eternal and immutable integrity of his own nature. This law of God in reference to all things human, is *semper et ubique eadem*—always and everywhere the same. There is no power but of God. Men have his authority to do *right*, but never to do *wrong*. This wonderful law is over all equally." In reference to the perfect harmony between this higher law as indicated in the laws of nature and the *revealed word*, he says; "That the revealed word of God *sanctions* and *upholds* all the great *principles* embodied in the *constitution of the world*, is a self-evident truth." The writer's namesake, the late Dr. John Thomas, than whom, no abler *Biblical expositor* ever lived; in referring to the great work of creation and entire purpose of God, as revealed in the Scriptures; and the harmony of the whole, with these great eternal immutable principles of Right; wrote as follows. "God, then, had in his own mind a pattern, or design, of all the work that was before him, before he uttered a word, or his Spirit began to move. This design, or archetype, which placed the beginning and the end of all things before him, in one panoramic view, was constructed in *harmony* with the principles—the *eternal principles* of his vast, unbounded realm; which coincide with the *immutable attributes of his character*."* Elpis Israel Page 151.

The great and learned Blackstone of England, in his introduction to his Law Commentaries, Sec. 2, says; The Creator "has laid down only such laws as were founded in those relations of justice, that existed in the nature of things *antecedent* to *any* positive precept. These are the eternal, immutable laws of good and evil, to which the Creator himself, in all his dispensations, conforms; and which he has enabled human reason to discover, so far as they are necessary for the conduct of human actions. Such among others, are these *principles*: that

*Italics by the writer, as in sundry other quotations.

we should live honestly, should hurt nobody, and should render to every one his due ; to which three general *precepts*, Justinian has reduced the whole doctrine of the law. This law of nature being coeval with mankind, and dictated by God himself, is of course *superior* in obligation to any other. It is binding over all the globe, in all countries and at all times."

These great moral principles (The writer thinks the term "*Godly* principles" would be more correct) of right and duty, not only had their origin in the attributes of God, but by virtue of man having been "created in the image of God," they have their reflex or counterpart, to a certain extent, in the nature of man—in his mental constitution, as an animal, intellectual, social and moral being ; thus, being made capable of recognizing and governing himself by those Godly principles—that higher law—and which "Godly image" constitutes him an accountable creature, accountable or responsible to his Maker for the proper use of his god-like powers, at least under certain circumstances : and is therefore to be judged by him "who will render unto every man according to his deeds." Rom. 2 : 6. Every human power or faculty originates and indicates its own right of exercise or action, and its own peculiar function in life and being. Here, therefore, is the origin and foundation of all human Rights—rights that are sacred and inalienable. Being thus constituted, obedience of his physical powers, to *external* requirements, can be compelled by the infliction of pains and penalties, or he can be forced by physical power to submit to unjust laws, and great wrongs, but his mental powers *cannot* be thus forced to yield obedience. No physical force, for instance, can possibly compel his powers of *faith* or *affection* to yield obedience. No physical force can compel him to either *believe* or *love* : and yet by proper, clear positive testimony or proof, heard and understood, he can be actually *compelled* to believe : he cannot withhold or avoid conviction, although he may refuse to acknowledge it. And so while no physical power can possibly compel man to love that which to his mind is hateful and detestable, yet he *cannot avoid* loving that which to him is exceedingly pleasing, attractive and desirable.

Says Hosmer, "man is unable to separate himself from moral powers ; his nature has in it the elements of morality. We have already seen that the great laws of man's physical and moral nature are sovereign."

Says Dr. Cudworth, "even God himself cannot force man

to obey an unrighteous law." God cannot be unjust. He cannot require what is not right. His immutable wisdom and goodness, His attributes, His perfections, render it impossible.

Hurlbut, a great writer on human rights; in referring to this higher law, as having its reflex in the mental constitution of man says; "man's sense of Justice—the great monitor of the human mind, forever prompting the "*inner man*" "to do unto others as he would that others should do unto him"—is thus uttering the *eternal rule of equity and right.*" *

S. M. Hopkins D. D. of the Auburn Theological Seminary; speaking of the law of Moses, says, "*The moral precepts* of the law have their *basis* in the *unalterable relations* of men to each other and to God." These relations consist in man having been "made in the image of God." But greater men than any of these, and many centuries before they lived, recognized and wrote concerning this higher law as characterizing the natural moral powers of the mind of man. St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans, says, "I find then a law that when I would do good (*right-Dia.*) evil is present with me. For I delight (just as David did) in the law of God after (or according to *Dia.*) the *inward* man: but I see a law in my *members* warring against the law of my *mind*, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members." Rom. 7 : 21-23. The great Apostle here distinctly recognizes two laws—This higher law of "Right," of the moral powers of the "mind"—which is in harmony with the *Spirit* (not the letter) of the Decalogue, from which he had, in verse 7, just quoted, and to the "Spirit" of which he had, in verses 6 and 14, just referred: and second to the law in his "members"—"that is, in my flesh," as he explains in v. 18. This he calls "the law of *Sin*," (which was developed in the flesh" by Adam's transgression) having reference to the sinful

* These moral principles would not be so self-evident to man, were it not that they have their reflex in the constitution of the human mind; hence, God's sinaitic revealed and expressed commands to observe and keep or obey them, were not given so much to make them known, as to compel obedience to them by commands, or law, with penalties for disobedience: Thus making "sin (that is, their transgression) exceeding sinful." These principles have ever constituted God's great immutable moral law. But since the giving of the commands, or law, compelling obedience by the threatening death penalty and other penalties, a certain portion of that law (the decalogue) which had its basis upon these principles, came to be considered and called God's moral law and so it was to a certain extent, so far as it expressed, and was characterized by these principles, and no farther. So it can be said of many other parts, or commands of the law of Moses. This however, was a very different law; and much inferior to the pure unoriginated immutable principles themselves; which constitute the higher *perfect* moral law, and which includes ALL Right and Duty, under all circumstances.

works of the flesh and the works of "the *letter*" of the old law, which, having been "taken out of the way and nailed to the cross," (Col. 2 : 14), had therefore become sinful, but which the flesh with its sinful law, was constantly impelling him to observe, "keeping up a warfare against the moral powers of his mind.* But his moral powers of mind," or "inner man," having been "*strengthened* by faith in the spirit of truth"—(Eph. 3 : 16, 17) The words of Christ, which are "spirit and life"—he was enabled to "keep his *body* under and bring it into subjection." 1 Cor. 9 : 27. As to the Spirit and letter of the old law, to which I have referred, and the important difference between them, &c., I shall soon speak at length.

The Apostle Peter, also recognized and wrote of "the hidden man" of the moral powers or affections, and called it, after enlightenment and obedience of the truth, "a meek and quiet *Spirit*, which is, in the sight of God a great price." 1 Peter 3 : 4. We may rest assured that no discord or confliction will ever be discovered between revelation and nature. The Scriptures correctly interpreted and understood always agree with and corroborate the laws of nature, Science, and Philosophy, and with ALL TRUTH of every nature in the entire universe. The Deity will never contradict himself. No discord or imperfection in all his works. No conflict or disagreement between his moral principles or precepts, and his positive commands. No confliction between his great universal eternal immutable law, and his *temporary* laws. Nearly twenty-five hundred years before the temporary law of Moses was given, "Enoch walked with God," to do which, was to live and conduct himself according to God's will or law—both natural and revealed law,

* The Apostle takes particular pains in verses 22 and 23 of this chapter, (Rom 7.) to show that by "the law of God," he does not mean "the *letter*"—that is, the old law itself, which he had just said "we are delivered from,"—but, that he means the "*spirit*" (v. 6) —the moral principles contained in the old law, which have their reflex in "the *inward* man"—"the mind"—which spirit or moral principles, he says, are "after, or *according to*" the powers of the inward man—the powers of the mind; and which spirit, or moral principles, constitute the eternal immutable moral law of God. One of these moral principles is Benevolence: accordingly one of man's natural mental faculties or powers, is Benevolence. Another moral principle is Justice: So one of the faculties of the mind, is Conscientiousness. Another moral principle is worship: its reflex, or corresponding natural human faculty being Veneration. So every moral principle has its reflex in the human mind, thus constituting "the law of God according to (Dia) the inward man;" and in which great law of *Right and Duty*, the Apostle says he delighted. So far as the old law of Moses contained, expressed, or represented these great, holy, righteous, imperishable principles, it was "holy, just and good, and spiritual." See further on this, in other places. See also "image of God," Appendix.

And Noah also, "was a *just* man and *perfect* in his generation, and Noah walked with God." Gen. 5 : 22-24, and 6 : 9. For Noah to be a just and perfect man, and walk with God, was to live and conduct himself according to this higher law about which I have been speaking, these great moral principles, having their origin in God, and their reflex in the mental constitution of man, and in the laws of nature. God said to Noah, "Thee have I seen *righteous* before me in this generation." Gen. 7 : 1. I have shown that righteousness consists in conformity of life to the *will or law* of God through *love*. We find also that what Paul said was correct, "until (or *before*) the law *sin* was in the world," for, away back there, at the beginning of the human race, God said to Cain, "If thou doest *well*, shalt thou not be accepted? And if thou doest not well, *sin* lieth at the door." And John tells us that "sin is the transgression of the law." Although Cain did not break or transgress the law of Moses—the 6th commandment of the Decalogue,—which says "thou shalt not kill," for that law was not given until about 2500 years after this, yet it was just as wrong to kill, and just as great a "*sin*" as it was, after the law was given at Mount Sinai, for it was a transgression of the higher law of right. It was just as much a transgression of the will or law of God, as it was after the law of Moses—the ten commandments—was given.

We are also told that away back there, "God looked upon the earth, and behold it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted *his way* upon the earth." Gen. 6 : 12. "His way," was His will—His law,—the great godly principles of Right and Duty.* The people—all flesh—were living in open violation of these, His righteous Will, and had thus "corrupted his way upon the earth, and the earth was filled with violence" and wickedness. Again we are informed that "Er, Judah's first born was *wicked* in the sight of the Lord; and the Lord slew him." Gen. 38 : 7. Thus we see that twenty-five hundred years before and "until the law, sin was in the world," and that this higher or superior law—these great immutable moral *principles* (not the *commands* given to Moses) of Right and Duty, requiring

* Man was created *constitutionally* under law—subject to natural and moral law. The natural law, the law of life and being; the moral law, the law of right and duty. Obedience to natural law led to health, happiness, and long life: disobedience, to disease, pain, and premature death. Obedience to moral law, led to development of a Godly character, a re-living from natural death, with a Godly or incorruptible nature: disobedience, to degeneracy, moral death, and eternal death or non-existence. Thus the law, and thus the penalty of transgression, from of old.

obedience, through love, as the Rule of action in life, were binding before the law—binding upon the entire human family—all flesh. And for that reason, and for that object—they were stamped upon, or imprinted in man's mental constitution, or organization, at his creation, and embodied in all the laws of nature, and finally, more plainly *revealed* and commanded in the written word by their Author; *all* for the guidance of man—that man, with all these, might have light, ample and sufficient, to enable him to live and conduct himself according to God's will or law, and not “corrupt his *way*,” but develop a godly *character*, ultimately to be honored with a godly *nature*.

It will now be clearly seen, that the *Will* of God, is the source or origin of all righteous law, that his will is in itself, “the higher law.” This law was never his *temporary* law. This law is eternal and immutable. From the history of the past, as revealed in God's word, we perceive its existence and requirements, all the way down from the creation, through all the twenty-five hundred years preceding the giving of the law of Moses. Abraham kept this higher law of Right and Duty—The will and way of God. For God said of him, “I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep *the way* of the Lord, to do *justice* and judgment; that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him.” Gen. 18 : 19. Again, he says, “Because that Abraham obeyed my *voice*, and kept my *charge*, my *commandments*, my *statutes* and my *laws*” Gen. 26 : 5. God had made known to Abraham his will, in the case alluded to, by his “*voice*,” and “*commanded*” him to “Take now thy son, thine only son Isaac and offer him for a burnt offering upon one of the mountains which I will *tell* thee of.” Gen. 22 : 2. Abraham obeyed, and God called it obeying his “*laws*,” and his “*charge*” as well as his “*voice*” and “*commands*.” We are not informed how much was included in “I will *tell* the of.” But God said “because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy Son” &c, that he had sworn by himself, that he would bless him, and that his seed (Christ) should “possess the gate of his enemies.” Gen. 22 : 16-18.

David also refers to this great law—the “*Will*” of God, when he says, “I delight to do thy WILL, O my God: yea thy *law* is within my heart.” He here uses Will and law interchangeably, thus showing that the *law* which was within his

heart was the *Will* of God. Ps. ~~119~~¹¹⁰: 8. Again he says "O how I *love* thy law!" Ps. 119: 97. Again, "Thy law is my delight." Ps. 119: 77. Again, "Thy *testimonies also* are my delight," v. 24. And, "great peace have they who love thy law." v. 165. Again, "Thy righteousness is an *everlasting* righteousness, and thy *law* is THE TRUTH." v. 142. "It is my meditation all the day," v. 97. In all these places, and in many many others from the beginning to the end of the Psalms, David, in all those *written* by *him*, continually referred to the wonderful Will or Purpose of God, as made known or manifested in various ways by him "who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the prophets;" and particularly as expressed in the great promises and *covenant* made with Abraham, many centuries before; of which covenant God had said, "Be ye mindful always of his covenant; the *word* which he *commanded* to a thousand generations; which he made with Abraham, and of his oath unto Isaac; and hath confirmed the same to Jacob for a LAW, and to Israel for an everlasting covenant, Saying, unto Thee will I give the land of Canaan, the lot of your inheritance." (1 Chron. 16: 15-18.) Which covenant, (as I shall hereafter show, and as David knew and understood) included in one of its promises, the "added or temporary law covenant,—the ten commandments, &c.

But more particularly still, did David refer to, and his mind continually dwell upon, the will or purpose or law of God as embodied and expressed in the promises and *covenant* which God had made to and with *him* personally and *sworn* to; called "an everlasting covenant,—the sure mercies of David." Isa. 55: 3. This covenant with David, although included in the great covenant with Abraham, was personally made with David, an account of which we have, 2 Sam. 7: 5-16. "And thine *house* and thy *kingdom* shall be established forever before thee; thy *throne* shall be established forever." (See also 1 Chron. 28: 4-8) "Thus saith the Lord; David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel." Jer. 33: 17. "I have made a *covenant* with my chosen, I have *sworn* unto David my servant." "My mercy will I keep for him for evermore, and my covenant shall stand fast with him. His seed will I make to endure forever, and his throne as the days of heaven. My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips. Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David." Ps. 89: 3, 28, 29, 30, 35.

It will be noticed that the will or purpose of God as made known and expressed in the promises of the Covenant with Abraham, was called "a law," (1 Chron. 16 : 17,) that is, the covenant had its conditions or external works to be *obeyed* by man : namely circumcision, as a "*token* of the covenant," and as the first item or beginning of the Sinaitic covenant, or entire law by Moses. "Every man child among you *shall* be circumcised." Gen. 17 : 10, 11. This requirement or command being a part of the covenant, and being afterwards incorporated into the entire law of Moses, constituted the covenant "a *law* for Jacob," or the house of Israel—the will of God expressed in a temporary law of external works—the conditions part of the higher law or will of God. The covenant with David, which was a further development of the will or purpose of God, contained the same conditions, or temporary law of works, to be obeyed. Hence God said of David "if his children forsake my *law* and walk not in my judgment ; if they break my statutes, and keep not my commandments ; then will I visit their transgressions with the rod and their iniquity with stripes, nevertheless my loving kindness will I not *utterly* take from him, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail." Ps. 89 : 31—33. Again, "if he (Solomon) commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, &c., but my mercy shall not depart away from him." 2 Sam. 7 : 14, 15. And again, "if thy children (David's children) take heed to their way, to walk before me in truth, with all their heart, and with all their soul, there shall not fail thee (said he) a man on the throne of Israel." 1 Kings 2 : 4. David's children or natural descendents, failed to thus obey. and therefore the throne or Kingdom of David has been overturned and become no more, for the time being, and all his natural children scattered and dispersed among the nations, to be trodden down and chastened with the rod of men and with stripes, and great "tribulation," (Deut. 4 : 30) and for many centuries David has therefore failed to have a man among his *natural* descendents "to sit on the throne of Israel." But he has one son—a *Spiritually* begotten "Son of David,"—who is also "Son of God"—who has a right to the throne of his father David : and when he comes "whose right it is, it shall be given him." (Ezk. 21 : 25-27.) "For it is not *utterly* taken from" David and his sons. Ps. 89 : 33. Although the sceptre has departed for the time being, it was not to be an *utter* departure. It is to be "*restored*" or "*rebuilt*." Acts 15 : 16. Luke 1 : 32. Mat. 19 : 28. Acts 3 : 21. and ch. 1 : 6 and ch. 2 : 30 and Ezk. 37 : 21-28.

Thus I have been particular to briefly refer to the promises and covenants with Abraham and David, and their conditions which constituted God's temporary law of Moses; for the purpose of showing why it was that David was so elated, and why he so extolled and loved and delighted in, and meditated upon, the will or *law* of God. It is evident that he understood God's law by Moses, which included the ten commandments, to be a part—the temporary conditional part—of God's will or great purpose, as set forth in “the covenants of promise” (Eph. 2 : 12) to Abraham and himself, from his dying *charge* to his son Solomon, in these words. “Now the days of David drew nigh that he should *die*; and he *charged* Solomon his son, saying, I go the way of all the earth: be thou strong therefore, and show thyself a man; and keep the charge of the Lord thy God, to walk in *his way*, to keep his statutes, and his *commandments*, and his judgments, and his *testimonies*, as it is written in the law of Moses, that thou mayst prosper in all that thou doest, and whithersoever thou turnest thyself: that the Lord may continue *his word concerning me*.” 1 Kings 2 : 1-4. God's word concerning David was God's purpose or will, a part, or one feature of which, was, that if David's sons were obedient to God's way or law, and took heed to do the right and duty through love—to walk before God in truth, with *all their heart*, and with *all their soul*—thus keeping the law of Moses in its *spirit* or righteousness, which is a higher law than merely the *letter*; then, in that case, there would not fail to be a proper man to sit on the throne of David. That is, the Kingdom of Israel, which was in a flourishing condition under David, and which had been given “to David and his sons forever, by a covenant of salt” (signifying perpetuity and incorruptibility) and which was called “*the Kingdom of the Lord*, in the hand of the sons of David,” (2 Chron. 13 : 5,8. 1 Chron. 28 : 4,5.) should be *continued without a break*—without being overturned—Should not be taken out of the hands of David's *natural* sons or descendents, clear down to the time, for his Spiritual son—the Son of God—to take the throne. However, David's sons failed to walk according to the higher law, and hence the kingdom has been overturned for the time being as above shown. But this state of things, like the law of Moses, is only a part—the *temporary* feature—of the purpose of God. God has a higher, a much superior part or feature of his will or “eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord; (Eph. 3 : 11

& ch 1 : 9-11.) namely ; that his great eternal law of Right, goodness, justice, benevolence, mercy and &c., which constitute his own rule of action towards man, and which characterize his purpose, *shall ultimately prevail*. No matter how disobedient the Sons of David. No matter if their disobedience was the cause of the kingdom being taken away from them, and of its being overturned and being no more for the time being. No matter what interferes, or who opposes ; this *unconditional* feature or part of his purpose or will, shall be accomplished. His Son shall surely return. In him shall all Nations be blessed. The Kingdom of David shall be restored again to Israel. It shall not again be overturned. It shall stand forever. "A King shall reign and prosper," on the throne of David. "With *righteousness* shall he judge the poor, and reprove with *equity* for the meek of the earth." Isa. 11 : 4. The people, then, will not "omit *judgment mercy and faith*." Mat. 23 : 23. He "will establish his throne with *justice and judgment*." "He shall execute *judgment and justice* in the earth." Jer. 23 : 5. "Of the increase of his government and peace, there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his Kingdom, to order it and to establish it with *judgment* and with *justice*, from henceforth even for ever." Isa. 9 : 7.

Of course it was very desirable to David that his sons should be obedient, so that he should never fail to have a man to sit on his throne, and thus his kingdom be continued without a break, or temporary cessation. But it was the superior, unconditional feature of God's purpose and law—the "*sure mercies of David*"—that unconditional and *sure* feature of God's purpose, brought to view in such declarations as the following, that caused David's heart to be "glad," and to "rejoice" and "sing;" viz: although his son "Solomon did evil in the sight of the Lord, and went not *fully* after the Lord, as David his father did, yet God said, "I will for this afflict the seed of David, BUT NOT FOREVER." 1 Kings 11 : 6, 39. "David being a Prophet, and *knowing* that God had *sworn with an oath to him*, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would *raise up* Christ (his *spiritual* son, as well as his natural descendent on the side of his mother) to sit on his throne ; he *seeing this before*, spake of the *resurrection* of Christ," to the effect that God would not leave his son in the grave, nor suffer his Holy One to see corruption. Acts 2 : 30, 31. Ps. 16 : 9, 10. "As concerning that he raised him up from the dead, no more to

return to corruption, he said on this wise, I will give you the sure mercies of David." Acts 13 : 34. "I will make an *everlasting covenant* with you even the *sure mercies* of David." Isa. 55 : 3.

It was *not* therefore the temporary law of works, or condition of the covenant, but it was the higher law or will of God as expressed in the covenant—the *sure mercies*, which caused David to say, "my heart is *glad*, and my glory *rejoiceth*; my flesh also shall rest in *hope*." (Ps. 16 : 9.) and, "O let the nations be *glad* and *sing* for *joy*; for thou shalt judge the people *righteously*, and *govern* the nations *upon earth*." Ps. 67 : 4. "Then shall the earth yield her increase, and God, even our own God shall bless us, and all the ends of the earth shall fear him." "Let the Isles be glad. Let the earth *rejoice*." Ps. 7 : 1. "Let the heavens rejoice, and let the earth be glad. Let the field be joyful, and all that is therein; then shall the trees of the wood rejoice before the Lord; for he cometh to judge the earth; he shall judge (rule) the world with righteousness, and the people with his truth." Ps. 96 : 11. "I will *sing* of the mercies of the Lord forever." David understood the great purpose of God as revealed in the covenant with Abraham and with himself, and of the great superiority of these covenants, over the first or Sinaitic covenant. He understood that his Royal Son was to be the mediator and ratifier of the Abrahamic covenant, of which the covenant made with himself was only a development, that when he came, he would fulfill and take away the first will or old law covenant, with all its conditions or works, and bring into force and establish the second will or new covenant (as he says himself, Ps. 40 : 78) with its new and higher law of conditions or works—the fruits of the Spirit—the new path—"the straight and narrow way that leadeth unto life." He had a comprehensive view and understanding of these wonderful things both of the past and the future, as developments of God's will. He knew that God's word and "oath" were "sure"—would never fail; and that his will was *law*. And he said "O how I *love* thy law." He loved God's law even in its temporary or inferior form, or feature, as the law of Moses, and loved to keep and obey all its commandments and requirements; and he loved and obeyed the higher law—the law of faith, (the faith of Abraham, which he had) "that worketh by love" to do the "Right" whatever that might be. Hence he said, "I esteem *all* thy precepts (both moral and

positive) concerning *all* things to be RIGHT; and I *hate every false way.*" Ps. 119 : 128. "I know thy judgments are *right.*" Ps. 33 : 4. "Thy throne O God, is forever and ever: the sceptre of thy kingdom is a *right* sceptre." Ps. 45 : 6. He understood that the covenants contained God's "eternal purpose," and that God's purpose was his will, and his will was his law, and his law was the "Right," and that the right included not only all moral precepts, but all the *positive* commands and requirements of God, so long as they are in force.

Jehovah himself has always acted according to this rule or law; it being the great law of his own Holy and Immutable Nature, and which therefore characterizes all his works, including all his dealings towards man. The very constitution of creation, and of Nature, and of all things, bears the impress of this great law of *Right*. We see it in the laws of Nature, in the constitution of man, in all Science, and Philosophy, in *all* truth, as well as in his entire *revealed* will.

Therefore in all ages, whosoever lived and walked up to this universal law of "Right," received his approval, acceptance, and blessings. Hence it is said, The *ways* of the Lord are *right*, and the *just* shall walk in them. "Hosea 14 : 9 God sent by His prophet and made known to Solomon that he would take away from him ten tribes, and give them to Jereboam, because Solomon had "not walked in *my ways*, to do that which is *right* in mine eyes, and to keep my statutes and judgments as did David thy father." 1 Kings 11 : 28-39. "The *thoughts* of the righteous are *right.*" Prov. 12 : 5. God said to the Israelites, "And thou shalt do that which is *right* and *good* in the sight of the Lord. Deut. 6 : 18. "And Asa did that which was *right* in the eyes of the Lord, as did David his father." 1 Kings 15 : 11. "Jehoash did that which was *right.*" "Amaziah did that which was *right.*" "Jotham did that which was *right.*" &c. &c.

(This great law of God and of Christ, and the old law of Moses are both brought into view in 1 Cor. 9 : 21, very distinctly and prominently.)

We see this immutable law of Right and goodness as the substratum of God's entire revealed will. We see it in these words: So God created man in his own image—in the likeness of God: male and female created he them. And God said be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth." &c. We see it in these words, "Of every tree of the garden thou mayest

freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." We see it after Adam sinned in these words: "It shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." We see his righteous law in his words to Cain. "If thou doest *well*, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well *sin* lieth at the door." We see it in, "Enoch walked with God;" and in "Noah was a *just* man," and in "all flesh had corrupted *his way* upon the earth." We see it in the great promises and everlasting covenant with Abraham and David. We see it as the basis or substratum of the temporary covenant, and law of Moses at Sinai—of all the commandments, types and shadows pointing down to Christ. We see it in its greater development—its perfect features and its *purity* of character, in Christ's new law, in the gospel and its conditions and exceeding great and precious promises, of eternal life and the kingdom, and finally in God's *way of life*. Having set forth the "higher or superior law," so far as I deem it necessary for my purpose in this little work, I now come to consider one of the chief subjects had in view, namely:

"THE LAW OF MOSES."

This law was given to the children of Israel at Mount Sinai, about 1500 years before Christ; which was about 2500 after the earth was brought into a condition fit for the abode of man, and man had been formed of the dust of the ground." 430 years before this law was given, God had called and chosen Abraham, as the Progenitor of the Hebrew Nation, or children of Israel, and at the time the law was given to them, they numbered upwards of 600,000 men of war, 20 years old and upwards, besides all under that age, and all the women and children, including which, there must have been over two millions. Ex. 38 : 26. This great body of descendents of Abraham Isaac and Jacob were in the wilderness of Sinai, just started on their route from Egypt to the land of Canaan, when God gave them the law "by the hand of Moses." Lev. 26 : 46. Hence the law, although really "the law of God," is also called "the law of Moses;" and in writing about this law, when I use the term "the law," I mean the ten commandments and all the rites and ceremonies taken together, except when I refer only to some particular *part* of the law. Although the law in its entirety, was not given to the Israelites until after their exodus

from Egypt and arrival at Sinai; yet four hundred and thirty years before that, God's purpose to bring them out of Egypt, and give them a law, which would include a system of types; is indicated, and its *germ* can be clearly seen in a clause of four verses, included in the promise and covenant of Abraham; a part of which reads as follows." "But in the fourth generation they shall come hither again." Gen. 15 : 13-16. Also in the law and type of circumcision—the "token of the covenant which was entailed, as commanded, on all his posterity; and which was intended to be, and 430 years afterwards, was, re-enacted and included in the law; and which therefore may really be said to be the *beginning* of the types and ordinances of the law.

The next item of the law given, was the *passover*; which was called an *ordinance*, as well as a law, as follows. "This is the ordinance of the passover." Ex. 12 : 43. "One law ("the law of the Lord.") Ex. 13 : 9 shall be to him that is home born and unto the stranger that sojourneth among you," (v. 49,) after the stranger had been circumcised. "For no circumcised person shall eat thereof." v. 48. These ordinances, the *beginning* of the law, were given to *them* throughout *their* generations. These were both *positive* law, not being based on moral *principles*; but *right*, because commanded by God. "The third item of the law given was the law of "*The Sabbath*;" which is also called an ordinance, as well as a law and a statute. "There he made for them a statute, and an *ordinance*, and there he *proved* them. Behold I will rain bread from heaven for you; and the people shall go out and gather a certain rate every day, that I may *prove* them, whether they will walk in my *law* or no. And it shall come to pass that on the sixth day they shall prepare that which they shall bring in; and it shall be twice as much as they gather daily. See for the Lord hath given you the Sabbath, therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days; abide ye every man in his place. Let no man go out of his place on the seventh day. So the people rested on the seventh day." Ex. 15 : 25 and ch. 16 : 4-30.

This is the first time the children of Israel were required to keep the Sabbath, and where the Sabbath was *made known* to them. "And madest known unto them thy holy Sabbath." Neh. 9 : 14. This was about thirty days before they arrived at Mount Sinai, the "mount of God," or "Horeb." When they had arrived, God told Moses (Ex. 19 : 3-5) to tell the children

of Israel" * * "now therefore if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my *covenant*, not only the one he had previously made with Abraham, which included circumcision, as their part to be kept and obeyed ; but also the one he was *about to make*, as an *addition* to that, ("because of transgressions") and which was to form the elements or fundamentals of the entire temporary law ; which law was necessary, in order that "sin might become exceeding sinful." Rom. 7 : 13. And because "by the law is the knowledge of sin." Rom. 3 : 20. Then as we are informed in the next chapter (Ex. 20.) God proceeded at once to make known the covenant, to which he referred in chap., 19 : 5., that is, the ten commandments : which are expressly called "his covenant." (Deut. 4 : 13) and which together with all the *other* moral precepts, form the fundamental words, of the entire law. That is, the entire law, made up of the commandments, sacrifices, offerings, ordinances, holy days, rites and ceremonies, &c., &c., together with the immediate death penalty and other penalties, was based or founded upon the great Godly or moral principles or duties, of RIGHT through LOVE. Right, including justice, honesty, goodness, wisdom &c, which constitute the "*higher law*," as before shown and which underlie the ten commandments and many of the other commands, as their substrata.* Which higher or superior law, or great principles have their origin in the eternal immutable Attributes of Jehovah, as before shown ; or in other words in his WILL. It is necessary to have a clear understanding of the difference between these principles underlying the law, as its substratum, (called the "*Spirit*" of the law,) and the law itself ; and the difference between keeping the "*spirit*" of the law and keeping its "*letter*." These principles being co-existent and co-eternal with the Deity, as his will, or the great law of Right, never had therefore, either beginning or end ; and are both eternal and immutable. But not so with the Law of Moses. That, as I have already shown, had a beginning ; and, as I design to clearly show, also had an end ; and was therefore only the *temporary* law of God.

* The eternal immutable principles of Right and Duty, form the *basis* of the Decalogue and many other commands of the law ; and the Decalogue, together with all the other commands that were founded on moral principles, formed the *basis* of the entire law of Moses.

Arthur Andrew of England, a very able writer, and expositor of the scriptures ; in speaking of the *conditions* of the Sinaitic Covenant, says : "those to be observed by the Israelites, were the ten commandments—the *basis* of the whole law."

Keeping in view the difference between *moral* precepts and *positive* precepts; that moral precepts consist of commands to keep or obey moral principles of Right and Duty, which were *always* Right and Duty *before* the commands; and that positive precepts, consist of commands to keep and obey that which was never Right and Duty until so commanded. Or, in other words, a *moral* precept is a command to do that which was always right and duty to do; or to not do that which was always wrong to do; and a *positive* precept is a command to do that which was never a duty until the command was given.*

I say keeping this in view, it will not be difficult to perceive both these two elements in the law—that the law was made up of *both* these two kinds of commands. And keeping in view also that the *spirit* of the law consists in these moral principles that were always Right and Duty, before the law was given; and that the *letter* of the law consists simply in the letters and words required to express and write the law, both its moral and positive commands, and all its requirements; it will be easy to perceive and understand the difference between the letter and spirit.†

To illustrate. The commands, “Thou shalt not kill;” “Thou shalt not steal;” “Him shall ye worship;” “Ye shall not swear by my name falsely;” “Thou shalt rest;” and the like, are all a part of the law—a part of its words and letter, expressive of moral principles, and are all *moral* precepts, because the moral principles they expressed were all intrinsically right and duty, *before* the commands were given; Some of them being in the Decalogue and some not. They were commanded

* Moral principle, is whatever was *always* Right and Duty. Moral precept, is a *command* to keep or obey a *moral principle*. Positive precept, is a command to do what is *not* moral principle. Moral principles, constitute God's great *perfect moral law*. Moral principles, commanded, constitute God's *declared, incomplete, imperfect, temporary*, moral law. Moral principles, commanded in the law of Moses, were the *moral part*. All commands, to do what is not moral principle, were the *positive part*. Moral principles, have neither beginning nor end, therefore *always Right*. All *commands*, had a beginning, and may therefore have an end. All *moral law*, or commands, were Right and Duty *before* the command. All *positive law*, or commands, are Right and Duty *because* commanded of God. Therefore, the universal, unoriginated, immutable, eternal moral principles, which had their origin in the immaculate Attributes of Jehovah, and whose motive power of obedience, is LOVE, constitute God's great *perfect moral law* of Right and Duty.

† The late Dr. Thomas, before quoted, in speaking of the Jews as a nation, at the present time, in their relation to the law of Moses, said, “His law is to them a dead *letter* and without *spirit*, for they neither understand it, nor keep it, nor can they if they would.” Herald, Vol. 6, Page 8.

because they were right and duty. Then again; "Ye shall circumcise the flesh;" "Thou shalt sacrifice the Passover;" "Thou shalt keep the feast of weeks;" "*On the seventh day* (thou shalt rest;) are all a part of the law, a part of its words or letter, but are *not moral* precepts, not expressive of moral principles, but are all *positive* precepts, because they were never duties until commanded in the law. They were therefore right and duty because commanded of God. It will be noticed that the fourth commandment of the Decalogue contains both a moral and a positive precept; similar to the following: "On the Seventh day, thou shalt rest; in earing time and in harvest thou shalt rest." Ex. 34: 21. To *rest* whenever one needed rest, was a moral principle or axiom of Right and Duty always, before the law; which no person, however obtuse in mind, can fail to see. It is self-evident. But to refrain from work on the Seventh day, or any other particular day, and rest, and perform sacrifices and ordinances, was not a moral principle of right and duty, nor was it ever a positive precept, and therefore never a duty at all until commanded. That part of the fourth commandment, therefore, was a *positive* precept and became right and duty because commanded of God, and for so long a time as he required it, and no longer. It will be seen therefore that these moral principles which were always right and duty, underlie, and are expressed by (although imperfectly) the words and letter, not only of the Decalogue, but also of *other parts* of the law, such as I have quoted, viz: "HIM shall ye *worship*," and "in earing time and in harvest thou shalt *rest*," and many other parts that might be quoted. It was always right and duty to worship and always right and duty to rest in earing time and in harvest, (but not necessarily on the seventh days,) as indicated or shown by the Attributes of God, the nature of things, and the constitution of man. Hence, these parts of the law, equally as much as the Decalogue, are *moral* precepts, expressive, to some extent, of the great eternal immutable principles that underlie them—the spirit of the law—the higher law of Right and Duty.

Then again, a part of the spirit of the law, or higher law of Right and Duty, is, that its motive power is always and necessarily LOVE; nothing else. That is, Right and Duty, to be obeyed by or through love. But the Mosaic law, had for its motive power—its mainspring of action or obedience, as expressed in its words or letter—threatening penalties; *fear* instead of love. Hence the difference between the law and its spirit,

must be obvious to all ; and that to do away with the Mosaic law in its entirety, could not in the least affect the great imperishable principles, upon which it was based.

The words, " thou shalt not kill," are a part of the letter of that law, as given on Sinai. But the *spirit* of those words or letter, that is, the right and duty to refrain from murder through love to God and man, existed co-eternally with God. In other words, the immutable principles of Right and Duty *always* forbade murder. Hence God said to Noah and his sons, 850 years *before* the law, " whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." Gen. 9 : 6. But even *these* words did not *make* it wrong to murder, and duty to refrain from it. It was always so. Therefore, to do away with the command, thou shalt not kill, would not make it right to kill, would not affect in the least the immutable principles of Right and Duty, upon which the command hangs, or is based. Just so is it with the entire law of Moses. To strike out, and do away with every word, every letter, every " jot and tittle " (Mat. 5 : 18) of the law of Moses, including the ten commandments, forever ; would not, could not affect in the least, in any possible way, one single particle or iota, of the imperishable Godly principles of Right Duty through love, and all included in them ; any more than the accidental destruction by fire, of every particle of a common " Note of hand," would cancel or do away with the moral obligation or duty to pay the debt expressed by words and letter in the Note.

But it will however be observed, and should be distinctly understood and borne in mind, that thus doing away with the law in its entirety, or the letter of the law having thus run out, and completely expired ; all its *positive* precepts, that is, everything about it, every particle and iota, which was right and duty simply because God required and commanded it, to serve his purpose for a certain time, has of course, and of necessity expired with it, and cease to be binding on any person. The imperishable principles alone, upon which it was based, as its spirit, and which having been embodied in Christ's new and superior law by him and his Apostles, still remain imperishable duties. Although the new law of Christ contains some *positive* precepts, such as the ordinances of baptism, the Lord's supper and other things, which will ultimately be fulfilled and pass away, yet it is vastly, infinitely, superior to the law of Moses. Including its spirit, it is a perfect law. It is called " the perfect law of lib-

erty;” and to which David prophetically referred, when he said, “the law of the Lord is *perfect* converting the soul:” And in another place, when he said, “O how I love thy law.” He also called it “the path of life,” as before shown. Its perfection consists in its motive power—“*faith that worketh by love.*” The *positive* precepts, of Christ’s law, will probably undergo a change or pass away, and be substituted by the new National conditions or requirements of his new covenant, when the time shall have arrived, for it to be made or completed with Israel and the left of all nations, and when “the law shall go forth out of Zion,” to which I shall again refer.

I have shown that Right and Duty did not have their origin in the law—the ten commandments—but in the will of God. That Right includes all moral or Godly principles, having their origin in the attributes of Jehovah. These principles were therefore right and duty before the law, before the bible, before the creation of man. It is easy to be seen, then, that it was right and duty *before* the law was given, to have no other Gods; to not make or bow down to graven images; to not take the name of the Lord in vain; to rest and worship; to honor father and mother; to not murder; nor commit adultery; nor steal; nor bear false witness; nor covet. And that it was right and duty to be just, benevolent, honest, temperate, good, righteous, affectionate, &c., &c.

It follows therefore that these principles, must of necessity, be the basis or substratum of the law (and all other righteous laws) and that to do away with the law in its entirety, could not possibly affect these eternal immutable Godly principles. These being right and duty before the law, would still remain, and continue as ever, to be binding, as Right and Duty. These principles are therefore, what I term, and have shown to be, the higher or superior law; and the ten commandments and entire law of Moses, to be the temporary law. In other words these principles are the *spirit*, and the law of Moses the letter.*

*The *letter* of the law was given to the Children of Israel. They were the only Nation upon which it was binding. Hence Paul said, Rom. 3 : 19, “now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law.” But the *Spirit*, righteousness, or real intention of it, was for all Nations. That was the higher, universal eternal law of Right by love. Dr. Clark speaks of this new and higher law, which Paul called “the newness of Spirit,” as follows; calling it “that method of saving sinners, which is not of works, but by faith in Christ Jesus; and is not restrained to *any particular people*, as the law and its privileges were; but is *unto all* mankind in its *intention* and *offer*; and becomes effectual to them that *believe*, for God hath now made *no difference* between the Jews and Gentiles.”

But there were many other commandments and requirements of the law, outside the ten fundamental words, which in themselves were not founded on these moral principles, (only as they were the basis of the ten commandments, which these outside requirements were intended to carry out) but were *positive* commands and requirements, such as Circumcision and the Passover, which were right and duty, because God required and commanded them, and because they constituted God's own appointed way, for the time being, or so long as suited his purposes, of carrying out his higher law, or Godly principles underlying the ten commandments.

One of the learned writers, before quoted, in speaking of the Law of nature, said ; "This law is *founded* in those relations of *justice* which exist in the nature of things, *prior* to any positive precept." And, in speaking of the common law of England and of this country, said; "It is *founded* on the *principles* of justice." So just in the same way, was the law of Moses *founded* on the *principles* of Right and Duty.

It appears to me, that no person can fail to see distinctly, the difference between the law and the moral principles underlying, or contained in it, between the higher and the temporary law, between the spirit and the letter, the internal and the external. For the law is similar to every other written document. All have their letter and spirit, external and internal. If simply an "agreement:" it is first in mind,—two minds agree. Then the external acts, putting it in written words on paper signing and sealing. The agreement is the internal or spirit, the written document the external or letter. The *casual* destruction of the paper with all its words or letter, leaves the agreement still *morally* binding on both parties. That cannot be destroyed even by fire. Take a common "Note of hand:" the obligation is first entered into or made. Then the Note by its letter is a written expression of the obligation. But an accidental burning of the note, would not cancel the moral obligation. The destruction of the letter would not affect the spirit. The note might be very defective in its style of expression, its orthography, its words and letters, and its penmanship ; and therefore fail to be a correct or proper expression of the more perfect and important obligation ; which may be a just and sacred claim on the one part, and promise on the other part. The Note with all its imperfections, is however a good and valuable factor in the matter, for the purpose intended, viz , as legal evidence of

the existence of the obligation. Yet, in a moral point of view, it is comparatively of little consequence. Thus it was with the law. Thus it is with the constitutional law of the Universe. It is the order of Nature in all its departments, The vegetable kingdom with all its various productions, from the tiny seed of the smallest flower to the huge and sturdy oak, or the mammoth Redwood "*Gigantea*" Tree of the Calveras or Mariposa Grove, near the Yosemite Valley in California; some of which reach the almost incredible height of 325 feet, with a diameter of over 30 feet; all have an exterior and an interior—the material body and form, and the interior hidden nondescript *principle* of LIFE.

The Animal Kingdom also, with its physical external, built up or produced and maintained from a similar internal unseen life principle; including man, as to his *moral* character, consisting of his outward acts and life, as the result of the internal mental or "inward man" It is the order of Nature, that the internal, is the superior, the most important; the external the inferior, the less important, and also that the outward, although inferior, should however be a harmonious and true index of the inward, as to character. It is also the order of the GOD of Nature, that his highest work—responsible man, should develop and manifest a godly outward character, as the native result of the reception of the pure principles of godliness within; that having the heart "purified by faith," the external life or character should correspond. That the inward purity should manifest itself in outward acts. Yet, he so constituted man that he has the *power* to resist and disobey this law of God, and reverse his Divine order and harmonious arrangement, so far as his own acts and character are concerned; and which he frequently does, by putting on a fair exterior of morality and pretended godliness; while in mind, at heart, he is the very reverse—corrupt and wicked. He is then, like those to whom Christ talked very plainly, saying "woe unto you Scribes and Pharisees," "blind guides," "serpents," "generation of vipers," ye also *outwardly* appear righteous unto men, but *within* ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity." Matt. 23 : 28. Yet, except in such cases, as a rule, as a law of human nature which had its origin in God, the external character is the result of the internal—the mind: thus exemplifying the great and universal law of harmony. Hence Christ said, "either make the tree good and his fruit good; or else make the tree corrupt and his fruit corrupt; for the tree is known by his fruit. O

generation of vipers, *how can ye, being evil, speak good things? for out of the abundance of the heart, the mouth speaketh.*" Mat. 12 : 33. An external moral character, or fair exterior, matters little, in the sight of God, if the heart be corrupt. It is the heart God looks at, not the heartless specious words and acts. The most exact and circumspect *morality*, in the absence of a heart "purified by *faith*," and strict *obedience* to his prescribed duties, availeth nothing in the sight of God. Acts 15 : 9 & 1 Pet. 1 : 22. A person may be *naturally* very good—have a good *natural* heart—very kind, honest, moral, benevolent, educated and refined; all these excellent natural traits constituting him a model citizen, externally, a very pleasing companion, a true friend, an affectionate husband, and father, a useful member of society &c., &c. There are *many* such people. But the theory held and put forth by some—some of similar stamp—of their own "kith and kin" in character—that such "good" people are necessarily *Christians*, is one of the most specious, insidious and delusive errors, and does more to lessen the importance of the word of God, and cause the people to lose sight of God's law of faith, and obedience to just what his word sets forth as the "new and living way" of salvation, than all the teachings and influence of openly avowed infidels, and all the corrupt practices of wicked men who make no pretensions of goodness. Thousands of excellent and intelligent people both in the popular churches and outside, are feeling themselves perfectly safe and secure in the enjoyment and practice of the popular specious fallacy, that if they are honest and just in their deal between man and man, and strictly moral and good in all their transactions and relations in life; that is, if they are really good according to the popular idea of goodness, or in *their own way*; it is all that is necessary; that they must surely be accepted of God, in the great day of accounts; that there are so many ideas as to the teachings of God's word, such a *variety of ways* taught, to be saved, and some of them clashing, and inconsistent, even absurd; therefore they will mark out and take a way of their own!*

* "Hence if a man refused to be cleansed, or be not cleansed, it is folly for him to talk of being just, or holy, or righteous in the sight of God. He may be what the world calls "good and pious:" he may overflow with the milk of human kindness, be very "wise" and learned, devout of tone, oily in speech, of solemn face, and exuberant in profession of "love" to Christ and all mankind, and may pass before his fellows as a saint too holy for this nether world; but if he have not submitted to the righteousness of God, Rom. 3 : 22, "in the obedience of the truth," ("obedience to the faith," Rom. 1 : 5.) he is but a "pious" sinner, uncleaned, and therefore unholy and profane." Ed. "Herald," Vol. 5. Page 203.

The writer is acquainted with more than one, similar to the above described model citizen, useful member of society; and would here say, that it is possible for a person to be all that, and yet totally reject the scriptures as being of Divine authenticity; and even *ridicule* much of them; refusing to believe their teachings, except such as harmonize with his own fleshly thinkings, and theory of morality and goodness. Such a person is not interested in the purpose of God—in the wonderful things he has in his goodness and mercy revealed by the mouth of all his holy Prophets, and caused to be “written aforetime for our learning, that we might have *hope*.” He don’t “*search* the scriptures.” He don’t believe they are “able to make him wise unto salvation.” Even if he is one of those *moral* churchgoers, who does *profess* and really think, he believes the Scriptures; yet he may never have “*Searched* the scriptures,” as to what the “great salvation” is, and therefore, Paul’s question, “how shall we accept if we *neglect* so great salvation,” does not trouble him. Although the scriptures so plainly teach, *God’s way* of Salvation, so definitely expressed in Christ’s *command* to the Apostles, when he sent them out to *save* the Nations; viz: “go ye into all the world and preach *the gospel* to every creature, he that *believeth* and is baptized shall be *saved*, but he that *believeth not* shall be damned;” yet he has not taken great pains to carefully search, in order to learn and understand *what that gospel is*, which he must believe and obey in order to be *saved*, and which Paul says is “the *power* of God unto *salvation*, to every one that *believeth*.” Oh no, he has got *a way of his own*, and he is *naturally* a very fine moral man. He is therefore destitute of the “knowledge of salvation by the remission of sins.” Luke 1 : 77. He is a very fine *moral* man, but his heart has never been *purified by faith*; he has a good *natural* heart, and really thinks his own way is about right, and that he can please God, by being good, although the scriptures say “without *faith* it is *impossible* to please God.” He reads *one* passage, which he thinks he understands, and which he thinks supports his position, viz: “in every nation, he that feareth him, and *worketh* righteousness is accepted with him.” Acts 10 : 35. He thinks he understands what it is to *work* righteousness, and that he tries to make it his business to do that kind of *work*. He does not therefore pay attention to Christ’s words; “this is the work of God to *believe* on him whom he hath sent.” John 6 : 29. But when his attention is called to that; he then takes the position

that he does really after all *believe* in Christ. Ask him if to believe in Christ includes believing his teachings? O yes of course. Ask him, well do you believe Christ's gospel, that he "preached in all the cities and villages?" Certainly. What then is that gospel? Here we get a different answer from every one, or various answers from various people. Although it is so plainly revealed, although it has ever been the theme of all the Prophets; that which Christ and the apostles preached everywhere, and which Luke called "those things which are *most surely believed* among us," ch. 1 : 1, and which Philip preached in the city of Samaria, "the things concerning the Kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ," Acts 8 : 12, and which in v. 25 are called "the gospel," and which Paul calls the things *hoped for*." Although these things are of so much importance, that to believe and obey them, first, by "baptism for the remission of sins," and then by the observance of all things commanded," &c., thus working "the work of God," thus "working righteousness," and becoming "accepted *in* Christ is made the condition of salvation; yet, this *moral*, this good man, in his own way, knows nothing about them. He has not been attracted, "*drawn*," by them to Christ. He is not therefore one of the "taught of God." John 6 : 44, 45. He has not availed himself of God's own appointed way, or means of "Righteousness for remission of sins that are past." Rom. 3 : 25. He is therefore in his sins. He has not "worked righteousness" in *God's* way, but in *his own* way, and is not therefore "accepted with him." His heart not having been purified by *faith*, "is not *right* in the sight of God," (Acts 8 : 21, Ps. 78 : 37,) although his *out side* character *appears* all right. Not having complied with Christ's "law of *faith* that *worketh* by *love*," and purifies the heart, he cannot say with David; "O how I *love* thy law;" "For thy *law* is my *delight*." Nor like Paul; "For I *delight* in the *law* of God after the *inward* man." His inward man is nothing but a *natural* moral man. And "the natural man receiveth not the things of the *spirit* of God, for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he *know* them because they are *spiritually* discerned." 1 Cor. 2 : 14. Hence, we conclude that the *natural* inward man or heart, be it ever so good, can produce only an outward *moral* man, not a *godly* man. It is absolutely necessary to become like Christ,—"*an Israelite indeed*," "*circumcised in heart*." "*He is not a Jew, (or Israelite indeed) which is one outwardly,*

neither is that circumcision, which is *outward* in the flesh: but he is a Jew which is one *inwardly*, and circumcision is that of the heart, in the *spirit* and not in the *letter*." Rom. 2 : 28, 29. It is indispensably necessary that the internal purity of the heart manifest itself, let its light shine by good works," "the fruit of the spirit;" that the internal may be a light, a benefit to the world through the external. So also was it necessary that the internal godly principles or *spirit* of the law should be made manifest to the world by or through the external words or *letter* of the law, that the world might be benefited by the knowledge of what was right, and what was sin, and that "sin might become exceeding sinful."

Now then, as to the difference between *keeping* the spirit, and keeping the letter. There are two ways to keep or obey the law, *any* law; inwardly and outwardly; through love, and through fear; with the heart, and not with the heart; willingly and unwillingly.*

It was God's desire that his law in all ages, should be kept or obeyed *willingly*: Such was his intention or design, as to the law of Moses. Hence he said, "If ye be *willing* and *obedient* ye shall eat the fruit of the land." Isa 1 : 19 And Paul said, "if there be *first* a *willing* mind, it is accepted." 2 Cor. 8 : 11, 12. King David understood this, for he said to his son Solomon, "know thou the God of thy father, and serve him

* It has been taught and written by "The signs of the times" of Oakland California together with many other great mistakes and errors, in consequence of not understanding the law, and the covenants; in writing upon what he termed, "the law of ten commandments," as follows; "Love is the spring of obedience, and obedience is the proof of love. They are positively inseparable." This is a mistake. He ought to have known, that *fear*—fear of threatened penalties—is *very frequently* the spring of obedience; and that such was the case under the law of Moses which included the ten commandments. A person could obey every one of the ten commandments, and the entire law, and not do it through love, either to God or man; but simply through fear of its threatening penalties; for love is not commanded in the decalogue. That would however, be obeying the *letter* of the law, but not the *spirit* or intent. The spirit of the law required obedience to Right through love; and right, under that law, was to keep and perform all its sacrifices, rites and ceremonies because God then so required. But those duties are not the Right now. Other duties, as set forth in Christ's law, constitute the Right now—obedience to *them* through love. No doubt some theorists, who read this, will think that the ten commandments and the rites and ceremonies, are somewhat *mixed* by the writer; and so they are; as he will prove positively in the subsequent pages of this work, that they are altogether *one* law, and not *two* laws—that this two-law theory is the foundation and cause of much blundering, misunderstanding, misconstruing, and misapplication of the scriptures; and also that *all* the popular Denominations of the day, are in much darkness in regard to the ten commandments, or the law of Moses.

with a perfect heart and *willing* mind; for the Lord searcheth all hearts." 1 Chron. 28 : 9. To obey unwillingly, is not obeying with the heart, that is, the affections, or through love; but because of compulsion, because of fear of threatened punishment, or penalties. God barely mentioned the word "love," once, in the ten commandments, saying he would show mercy unto them that kept his commandments through love, but we have no account of his commanding or requiring the children of Israel to "do that which is *right* and *good*" and to love him, once in the entire law, as given at first at Mount Sinai; nor until 40 years afterward. Deut. 6 : 5, 18. *Then* he told them through Moses, that they must *love* him with all their heart and do *right* and *good*. Thus showing them, that, although he had not given that as one of the ten commandments, nor commanded it anywhere, as a part of the law and covenant which he made with them at Sinai, forty years before, with the penalty of death, in case they did not obey; yet that he desired and required them to obey him through *love*, because of love for him. At the same time, he did not threaten them with any penalty or punishment whatever, in case they did not love him, provided they kept the letter of the law. Why did he take this course? If obedience through love, be of the utmost importance, if that be the highest requirement, the *superior* law, the spirit, real intent or design of all righteous law, why then did not God make it one of the ten commandments, and write it on the tables of stone, as one of the fundamentals of the law, with the penalty of death annexed; to be inflicted, in case they did not obey through love—in case they failed to love him with all their heart, &c. I answer, that God himself, had so constituted man that it was *impossible* to force or *compel* him to love, by the pains and penalties of *any* law. It was then as now, simply impossible by such means, to *force* man to do right and duty through love, to keep the *spirit* of the law through love. It was then, and is now, impossible to force man to believe and obey through love, by even the severest torture and death: and yet, faith and obedience through love to God and man, are what God both desired and required, then and now; for they constitute the motive power to godliness, to the development of a Godly character, which is ultimately to be honored with a Godly nature. But man *cannot* believe without evidence, nor love what is not lovable and attractive. Hence, of what use would it have been, to have put such requirements or command-

ments in the law, to be enforced by threatening penalties. Although right and duty through love, or faith and obedience through love to God and man, are what God requires above all things else ; yet, it was never his design or purpose to *force* man to it, by the penalties of the law. He therefore so constituted man that it cannot possibly be done. Man's spiritual, moral or godly powers, *cannot* be thus impelled or excited to action, nor controlled and restrained from action. These powers can only be incited to action by a *higher* motive—the motive contained in the revelation of God with all his wonderful attributes, of omnipotence, omniscience, omnipresence, righteousness, justice, goodness, mercy, and surpassing love ; and his “exceeding great and precious promises,” or “glad tidings,” in reference to man, his future purposes, &c., &c. These, and these alone, can induce man to believe, love and obey the requirements of God, whatever those requirements may be. These only, can cause man to “repent and *turn* to God and *do works* meet for repentance.” Acts 26 : 20. Hence, Paul said “the *goodness* of God *leadeth* thee to repentance.” Rom. 2 : 4. The preaching of hell-fire and eternal torments and torture, can never do it, can never induce man to *love* God. The gospel contains no such horrible, revolting and repulsive motive. It is, “God so *loved* the world that he gave his only begotten son, that whosoever *believeth* in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life.” John 3 : 16. It is not, go preach “endless misery,” “eternal torture,” a “never dying soul,” in hell. *Not one* of these terms are to be found in scripture. But it is, “go preach the *gospel*, (glad tidings) he that believeth and is baptized shall be *saved*,” but he that believeth not shall be damned,” condemned to *death*, not endless misery, but simply loss of eternal life, simply loss of the promised reward, simply *death*—endless *death*—“the soul that sinneth it shall *die*.” Right and wrong, good and evil, life and death, are set before the world. This is a part of Christ's new law. Hence he said, “He that heareth my word (the gospel of the kingdom which he preached in “*all* the cities and villages,” the words of the *spirit* expressed by him, “they are *spirit* and they are life”—the *spirit's* mind expressed in words) and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, (in its incipiency) and shall not come into *condemnation* ; but is passed from death unto life.” John 5 : 24. And Paul said, “if ye live after the flesh ye shall *die* ; but if ye through the *spirit*, do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall *live*.”

To mortify (put to death, Dia.) the deeds, or practices of the body, "through the *spirit*," is this; by the exercise of the *spiritual* faculties of the "inner man," "the spirit of your mind," (Eph. 4 : 23) to believe, love, and obey the words of the *spirit*, called the *spirit* of truth," (John 14 : 17.) the words of Christ, of which he said, "they are *spirit* and they are life," called by Paul "the law of the *spirit* of life," (Rom, 8 : 2) thus producing "the *fruit* of the *spirit*, in *all* goodness and righteousness and truth," (Eph. 5 : 9.) which would be "serving in newness of the *spirit*, and not in the oldness of the letter," of the law, (Rom. 7 : 6.) and worshiping God, who "is a *spirit* ; and they that worship him must worship him in *spirit* and in truth." John 4 : 24. *

But to return. This higher motive, that is, higher than the law with its penalties, is what induces the higher powers to obey the higher law through love. I have shown that the higher law is obedience to God through love, and that this is the spirit of the law of Moses. For an Israelite to keep the spirit of the law, under Moses, it was necessary to keep the letter also. While the law was in force, it could not be kept in its spirit, without keeping its letter also. But to keep it in its spirit, was to keep not only every one of the ten commandments, and every other command named, but also every other *unnamed* duty, to do the *right*, under all circumstances and on all occasions, and to do it all through love; "for the fruit of the *spirit* is in *all* goodness and righteousness and truth. Eph, 5 : 9. But now that the law is abolished, or done away, the spirit of it, that is the Godly principles which formed its basis, are still to be kept, by keeping the new law of Christ, all things whatsoever he has commanded, and *all other things* not commanded by either him or his Apostles, which are right and duty, under all circumstances, and on all occasions, as far as possible, and to do all through love. "In *all* things willing to live honestly." "In *every* good work to do his will." Heb. 13 : 18, 29. There were many things in the times of Moses, which were right and duty, according to the spirit or intent of the law, which could not be named in the letter of the law. So it is now, under Christ's new law. But they are all included In the spirit or intent, for as then so it is now, "the fruit of the *spirit* is in *all* goodness."

*Dr. Clark, speaking of the righteousness or spirit of the law, as its design and purpose, said; "Loving God with all our heart, soul, mind, and strength; and our neighbor as ourselves; thus the *righteousness*, the *spirit*, design and purpose of the law, is fulfilled in us." Rom. 8 : 4.

Hence, it will be seen that the letter of the law included just what was commanded, not only the ten commandments, but all other commands and requirements about all the sacrifices, rites and ceremonies, and no more. But the spirit included *more*, even all right and duty, not commanded, or whether commanded or not. It will also be seen, that obedience to the letter, could be forced or compelled, by threatening physical penalties, and was so forced. But, that obedience to the spirit could not be forced ; that is, obedience through *love*, to the law, and to all right and duty, could not be forced by penalties. This alone is sufficient to show the difference between the letter and spirit, and the difference in keeping them. That great and worthy man and writer before quoted, the late Dr. Thomas, in referring to the letter and spirit of the law, and particularly to the fourth commandment, wrote as follows : “ For an Israelite to remember the seventh day, to keep it holy, *spiritually*, as well as well as ceremonially, so as to obtain the blessing which it *shadowed* forth, he must have had an Abrahamic faith, in the promised blessing and have ceased or rested from the works of “sinful flesh.” The blessing promised to Israelites who were Abraham’s seed by faith, as well as by fleshly descent, for a *spiritual* observance of the seventh day (and which, until the “hand writing,” or Mosaic law, was blotted out and nailed to the cross, could (not be *spiritually* observed and ceremonially profaned) was, that they should “delight in the Lord, ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed with the heritage of Jacob their father, when the time to fulfill the promises made to Abraham, Israel, and Jacob, should arrive.” Isa. 58 : 13, 14. *Elpis Israel*, Page 22. This, together with the Scripture quotation, illustrates the only way to keep the *spirit* of the law. But the blessing referred to, was not to be received by virtue of the law ; but by the Abrahamic covenant, through faith in its promises, and obedience to the law ; that is, to the spirit of the law through love, which included *more* than the letter, as above shown. The law could not give justification or remission of sins, nor eternal life. These could only be obtained by virtue of the Abrahamic covenant, and the “precious *blood* of Christ,” by which the covenant was brought into force, and made the *new* covenant. The blood of bulls and goats under the law, could not give these.

But a greater than Dr. Thomas, even the great Apostle Paul, has said, in speaking of the spirit and letter of the law,

the ten commandments, as follows. "But now are we delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held: that we should serve in newness of *spirit*, and not in the oldness of the *letter*." Rom. 7 : 6.* Again the same Apostle, in speaking of *the law*, said; "he is a Jew which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the *spirit*, and not in the *letter*." Rom. 2 : 27-29. Again in his second letter to the Corinthians 3 : 6, in speaking of the letter of the ten commandments, written and engraven in stones, he said, "for the *letter* killeth, but the *spirit* giveth life."

But a still greater than all, even our Saviour himself, when asked by the tempting lawyer, "which is the *great* commandment *in* the law," answered, not by quoting any of the ten commandments, but by quoting what had been given subsequently to the giving of the law, as the sum total, or spirit of the law, the motive power of the higher law, namely: thou shalt *love* the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, with all thy soul and with all thy mind. This is the *first* (in importance) and *great* commandment. (Those of the Decalogue were *small* in comparison to this) and the second is like unto it; thou shalt *love* thy neighbor as thyself. On these *two*, hang (or rest, as on a basis) all the *law* and all the *prophets*." The "first or *great*" one, being the sum total, or spirit of the first four, and the "second," of the last six of the ten commandments. All "*hang*," or depend, on these two, as the motive power, or main spring of action, of the basis or *spirit* of the law. Even David,

*Dr. Clark speaks very wisely on the first thirteen verses of this chapter. He says, "it is all the same whether we understand these words, (that is the 1 & 2 verses) as speaking of a law *abrogated*, so that it cannot command; or of its objects being dead, so that it has none to bind. In either case *the law has no force*. On v. 4, he says: 'but now ye are become dead to that law; a modest inoffensive mode of speech, (that was absolutely necessary, even after the law was completely fulfilled, and had been nailed to the cross; that the Apostles should talk and teach about it in modest inoffensive language, just as Christ deemed it best to do, even *before* the law was all fulfilled) for *the law, which was once your husband is dead*; God has determined that it shall be no longer in force; so that now, as a woman whose husband is dead, is freed from the law of that husband, or from her conjugal vow, and may legally be married to another: so God, who gave the law under which ye have hitherto lived, designed that it should be in force only till the advent of the Messiah. That advent has taken place, the *law* has consequently ceased, and now ye are called to take on you the yoke of the *gospel*, and lay down the yoke of the law; and this is the *design* of God, that you should do so. We are now brought under a more *spiritual* dispensation; (or covenant) now, we know the *spiritual import* of all the Mosaic precepts. We see that the law refers to the *gospel*, and can only be fulfilled by the *gospel*. * * The true *intent* and *meaning* of all, are now fully disclosed * * We serve God now, not according to the *old literal* sense, but in the true *spiritual* meaning."

away back in his day, understood the necessity of obedience through *love*, if he would obtain eternal life, hence he said, O, how I *love* thy law." "I *delight* in thy law." "I *delight* to do thy will." But what he so loved, and delighted in, was something more than the old law, which was then in force; it consisted in the *new* law, within the scope of his prophetic vision, the things of the everlasting covenant made with him. For he said, "he hath made with me, an everlasting covenant, ordered in all things, and *sure*: for *this* is *all my salvation and desire*." 2 Sam. 2 : 3, 5.

It was exceedingly difficult for man to keep the law perfectly, in its spirit as well as the letter, because of "the weakness of the flesh." But Christ could and *did* do so. He is the only one that ever did keep it perfectly, all his life. Hence, he was entitled to *eternal* life, not by virtue of the law, but because of his sinless holy life, and *willing* obedience unto death; in harmony with the Abrahamic covenant. By his becoming "obedient unto death," he was given "a name above every name;" was "highly exalted," and made "Lord," and "became the author of eternal salvation," or Life Giver; was "made after the power of an endless life;" which power or force, he, by his obedient death, gave to the "better testament," or covenant, of which he was "the surety." See Phil. 2 : 7-11 and Heb. 5 : 8, 9, and 7 : 17, 22.

There were three reasons why the law could not give eternal life. First; the blood of its sacrifices could not justify from, or remit sin. Second; it therefore contained no *promise* of *eternal* life. Third; man could not keep it perfectly all his life, because of "the weakness of the flesh." Therefore, "by the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified." Rom. 3 : 20. Gal. 2 : 16. If there had been a law given, which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law." Gal. 3 : 21. If righteousness come by the law, (the letter or "works of the law") then Christ is dead in vain." Gal. 2 : 16, 21. Hence, the scripture "concluded that *all* are under Sin (because none have kept the law perfectly as did Christ) that the *promise* (of eternal life) by faith of Jesus Christ, might be given to them that *believe*." Gal. 3 : 22. For what the law could not do, (that is, give justification, or remission of sins, and eternal life) in that it was *weak through the flesh*, God sending his own Son, in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh: that the righteousness (or "spirit") of the law,

might be fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh but after the *spirit*." Rom. 8 : 3, 4. That is, Christ showed, by not gratifying the sinful inclinations of his flesh, (which was a likeness of *our* sinful flesh, and therefore, being in all points tempted as we are) by living a holy life, without sin, that it was wrong and sinful, to live after the flesh, to obey that "law of sin," which Paul said he found in his "flesh"—in his "members," a few verses previous; and thus Christ by his righteous life condemned sin in the flesh, and then by submitting to death—a penal death—he judicially condemned the sinful flesh itself, the sinful mortal nature, to be totally and endlessly destroyed; and by virtue of a resurrection to incorruptibility, "changed in a moment" to the "Divine Nature"—*spirit* nature.* Thus by his holy life, in sinful flesh, (called *sinful* because of its excessive inclinations, or tendency to sin developed by Adam and transmitted) and his obedience even unto death, and by his "*precious blood*" which brought into force the Abrahamic covenant, as the "*new covenant*," with its *new law* of conditions or works: which covenant could do what the old or first covenant and law, could not do; namely; it could give justification or remission of sins and eternal life, according to its "better promises," and "better hope," being a "better covenant." Heb. 7 : 19, 22, and ch. 8, 6. Had Christ not lived a life without sin, his death could not have saved man. It was necessary that his life should be holy, and his blood therefore, "*precious blood, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot.*" 1 Pet. 1 : 19. There was no remission of sins, under the law, except in prospect or type; until the shedding of Christ's precious blood—the appointed Lamb of God. "He appeared to put away sin, by the sacrifice of himself." Heb. 9 : 26. "And for this cause he is the *Mediator* of the new testament, (or covenant) that by means of death, for the redemption of the *transgressions* under the *first* testament (or covenant) they which are called (if they *obey* the call) might receive the promise of *eternal inheritance.*" Heb. 9 : 15. No promise of either remission of sins or *eternal* life or inheritance, in the first covenant. Hence what the law could not do, the "second" or new covenant and law *can do*, by virtue of Christ's death and blood.

* It seems to be evident that God condemned the flesh as deserving death (destruction) because of its proneness to sin; which proneness was developed from its necessarily active, but good constitution. It was intrinsically active and good. But the feature of its native constitutional activity, was developed by the sin of Adam into extreme or over strong and *lustful* character, which became a fixed proneness to sin, or a *law* of "sin in the flesh."

He thus showed God's "path of life," the *new* and living way," (Heb. 10 : 20) which David said, while personating his Royal Son, God would "*show*" unto him. Ps. 16 : 11. He brought life and immortality to light through the gospel. He showed that the path or way of life, is to not "walk after the flesh," but keep the righteousness of the law, walking after the spirit, through faith in him—his gospel—induction into the one body and name, obedience to all his commands through love, and ultimately a resurrection unto immortality and eternal life.

HOW THEN DID CHRIST KEEP THE LAW? He kept it by doing nothing wrong or sinful—by doing and obeying *all* right and duty, through love—the spirit, and intent of the law. The real intent or object of the law was to keep the children of Israel from doing anything wrong or sinful ; not merely to keep the ten commandments and all sacrifices and other requirements, named or expressed by the words and letter of the law, but that they should refrain from *all* wrong, evil or sin, and observe and do *all* right and duties, whether named or expressed in the word or letter of the law or not ; and all through LOVE to God and man. This, I say was the *spirit* and real intent of the law. This, is just what Christ did. He did not observe and keep the sacrifices, rites and ceremonies, feasts, holy days rest days or Sabbaths, &c., of the law : although, in order to get the Jews to hear and become enlightened by his teaching, he was, as also the Apostles, compelled to bend a little to their prejudices, (as Moses did "because of the *hardness* of their *hearts*," Mat. 19 : 8, or stubborn dispositions, Dia.) and almost seem to observe these old requirements of the letter of the law, which under Moses constituted the law of God, but which pointed down to him ; and which, when he had come, to whom by their types they pointed, therefore waxed old, and ceased to be duties to be observed and kept any longer. As soon as he made his appearance as the promised and typified Messiah, the law ceased to be the teacher or schoolmaster, and began at once to be fulfilled, and wax old, until by his teaching, example, holy life, and obedience unto death, he completely fulfilled, or filled full," every "jot and tittle," so that at his death, the old law, which was "holy just and good" for the purpose intended, became completely useless as a rule of life, under Christ the great "Teacher come from God," and his superior law ; and was therefore taken out of the way, and nailed to the cross, Col. 2 : 14. Its spirit remaining as em-

bodied in the new law of Christ—the words and commands of God, in the teachings of Christ and the Apostles, (instead of the words and commands of God by Moses) constituting *the law of God* of this dispensation ; to be kept or obeyed through LOVE to God and our neighbor.

From the “time Jesus began to preach,” (Mat. 4 : 17,) until his obedience unto death, the law was *being* fulfilled. It was the transition period, from the law of Moses to the law of Christ—from the old to the new law. Therefore the law was not *all* fulfilled at any time during his life in the flesh. Its sacrifices, types and even the letter of the Decalogue began to wax old at once, as soon as he began to teach and set forth his new and superior law—*his own* “commandments” and “sayings” as in Mat. 5 : 19, and Ch. 7 : 24. Or, commencing with chap. 5 : 17, and ending with chap. 7. But he was very careful not to detract from, or lessen the importance of the *spirit* of the ten commandments and other parts of the law from which he quoted ; as may be seen from one, of several similar quotations, namely. “Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery ;” but *I* say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.” This seventh commandment of the Decalogue, would not be broken or disobeyed, as to its *letter*, so long as a person refrained from the external act forbidden ; but the *spirit* of it, could be violated by the unchastity or wicked intent of the heart. The *spirit* of this command therefore require *more* than the *letter*. That is, the spirit, or Godly principles of Right and duty, upon which the letter is based, requires that a person refrain, not only from the act, but also from unhallowed, unchaste desires or wicked intentions. This one case is enough to illustrate the entire law, as to the difference between the letter and the spirit, between the old law of Moses and new law of Christ ; and especially between the letter of the ten commandments and the spirit. and the difference between *keeping* the letter and keeping the spirit.

But to return. It required time, patience, and careful instruction, to educate and bring the people who had been born and brought up under the old law, and all their lives been taught that its observance and obedience, especially circumcision and the Decalogue, were of the utmost importance, as being the law of God, (as it truly was, while in force) to see and

understand, that the letter of the law, which was the law itself, was to be fulfilled, superseded and done away by the "newness of the spirit," in and by Christ and his law. Hence Christ knowing full well, the constitution of the human mind, that it could not be forced, into conviction and change, and the strength, and power of resistance there was in prejudice, did not teach or require an abrupt and total change at once. As before said, both Christ and the Apostles were compelled to bend or yield somewhat to their pre-taught ideas and prejudices. That is, they did not tell them plainly, in so many words that the law was to be entirely superseded, even the ten commandments, by Christ and his law; that they must abandon it at once. It was not necessary to do so. Such a course would have been unwise, and even wrong. It was right that they should come to the light, to the knowledge of the truth by degrees. It was right and proper that the law in part, especially the ten commandments, should remain in force more or less, all through the transition period, until Christ had fully and completely developed and made known his new law, and until the old law had been completely fulfilled and nailed to the cross. Hence the manner he talked about the ten commandments, and the law as a whole; always connecting their observance with *love*—the motive power of the *spirit* of the law, and teaching obedience through love, and showing that the whole law could be *fulfilled* (not *kept*) by LOVE.

After the death of Christ, and the complete fulfillment and expiration of the law, the Apostles still had the old law prejudice to contend with.* To enable the Jews to see and understand the matter in its true light, was one of the most difficult

* Our Saviour foreseeing that this powerful prejudice in favor of the law, would continue to exist after his death, with all the unbelieving Jews, and to some extent among those even who believed; and that those who believed and understood the true position of the law—that it was done away entirely at his death—would be persecuted for not continuing to observe it, therefore said, when foretelling of the destruction of Jerusalem; "Then let them (all his disciples) which be in Judea flee into the mountains: But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the *Sabbath* day." Mat. 24. He well knew what would be the consequence in either case: that if in the winter they would suffer and perish with cold. And if on the Sabbath, the prejudice of the Jews against traveling on the Sabbath, &c., would be an insurmountable difficulty. Or, in the words of Dr. Clarke, in his comments on this passage: "That you may not raise the indignation of the Jews by traveling on that day, and so suffer that *death* out of the city which you had endeavored to escape from within. Besides, on the Sabbath days, the Jews not only kept within doors, but the gates of all the cities and towns, in every place, were kept shut and barred, so that if their flight should be on a Sabbath, they could not expect admission into any place of security in the land."

and delicate points with which they had to constantly contend. So many, like the churches of Galatia, Judea and Jerusalem, were jealous of the law, and determined to remain under, and keep the old law ; even those who "*believed.*" Acts 21 : 20-24 Ch. 15 : 1, 5. Gal. 4 : 21. Even at the present day, thousands of people are in much darkness and confusion, in reference to the law. While they see and are compelled to admit that the law of Moses is done away, that it has been superseded by the law of Christ, yet they hold that a part of it—the ten commandments, are still binding. Then if asked about the fourth commandment, they say no that is *not* binding, or rather, say they, another law, or if not another law, then custom or example, or something else, has *changed* the fourth commandment from the *seventh* to the *first* day of the week, some how or other ! They are well aware that the Decalogue was a part of the law of Moses (and as I have amply proven) and yet, while the law is done away, the Decalogue *in part* is still binding ! They are not under the law, and under the law at the same time ! Such is the inconsistency and confusion, resulting from not understanding the matter. They, like the Galatians, know that the Sinaitic law included the ten commandments, that it was added because of transgressions, as a schoolmaster, to teach what was sin &c., till the seed (Christ) should come ; that when he came, the Jews were no longer under a schoolmaster : and yet, they think that Gentiles, to whom the law was never given, are now under a *part* of it—under a law that was *never* binding on *them* ! The law difficulty therefore still exists. And yet, it does seem as if *any* person of common intelligence, should be able to see and clearly understand, that the great eternal imperishable moral principles of Right and Duty, cannot be affected in the least, by the expiration of the expressed law in its entirety—the entire words and letter. That the *change* consists entirely in this, namely ; that everything that was Right and Duty before the law was given, is right and duty still, now that the law, every letter and iota, is expired and done away—just as if it had never been given.

As before said, there were two ways of keeping the law—all its commandments and requirements—according to the *letter* only, and according to both the letter and *spirit*. The one way entitling to exemption from the penalties, and long occupancy or life in the promised land ; the other entitling to exemption from the penalties and to *eternal* inheritance and *eternal* life in

that land, as we shall more plainly show. To keep the law according to the letter was to keep or obey all its commands and requirements, simply because God had commanded them, and affixed a penalty in case of disobedience; that is, through fear of the penalty. But to keep them according to the spirit, or real design, was to be obedient through LOVE—to be moved to action by a sense of *right, duty* and *love*—to honor father and mother because of love towards them and towards God who gave the command, and because of love for Right and Duty; and to keep *all*—not only the ten commandments—but all other, even to keep the feasts unto God, because they *loved* God who gave the command, and because of love for right and duty: knowing that not only are all moral precepts or axioms, right and duty, but also that all God's *positive* commands are right and duty, and should be obeyed according to the requirements of the higher law, through love, instead of fear. The law consisted in the making known and enacting for a particular purpose and specified time, a system of duties—that which was right and duty, according to God's purpose—for that age of the world, and for that people which he had chosen, to observe and keep; and which system of duties, recognized, and was based upon these moral principles. To illustrate what I mean by commands or duties, *based upon* these principles, let us take the first commandment of the Decalogue. "Thou shalt have no other Gods before me, &c." This was commanded because it was *right* to have no other Gods, and wrong to have other Gods. It was just as right, and just as much a duty to refrain from having other gods, and just as wrong to have them before this command was given, as after. Hence this right and duty were moral principles which existed before the law—always existed—never had a beginning; and therefore the higher law. But never before so plainly made known and expressed, together with the way of keeping and manifesting obedience to the command (that is, by sacrifices and external worship) and the penalty for disobedience, as by the law of Moses.

Now to keep this command strictly according to the letter, was to refrain from having other gods, and offering sacrifices &c., as overt acts of obedience and worship, according to the requirements of the command, (2 Kings 17:36-38,) simply because God so commanded, and through fear of the threatening penalty, in case of disobedience. But to keep this command according to the spirit, was to keep it through *love*, not

merely because God had commanded it, and annexed a penalty, but because of genuine love to God, and love of right and duty ; which principle of love is the only true moving power or cause of obedience connected with the higher law. Deut. 6 : 5. and ch. 10 : 12-13, and ch., 13 : 3, Lev. 19 : 18. But it should always be borne in mind, that this great Godly principle of LOVE never exists apart from *faith*. Ex. 14 : 31, and ch., 19 : 9 ; 2 Chron. 20 : 20. Faith must of necessity precede it. Now then, every one of the ten commandments might be illustrated the same way. But it seems to me quite unnecessary. It was about 2,500 years after the creation of man, before these moral precepts were so plainly made known. But during all that time—"until the law, *sin was in the world*," but sin is "not imputed, where there is no law," (Rom. 5 : 13,) that is, when there is no *revealed* law. If, therefore, sin was in the world before the law of Moses, or law of God, as it is sometimes called, was given, it follows that some other law—the higher law—was in existence, "for sin is the transgression of the law." 1 John 3 : 4. "For where no law is there is no transgression." Rom. 4 : 15. Hence it follows that for 2,500 years before the law was given on Mount Sinai, the will or law of God—the great moral principles of Right and Duty—existed as law ; and that therefore, then as now, "all unrighteousness is sin," (1 John 5 : 17,) always was and always will be. God will not, cannot, ever either supersede, or suspend, even for a limited time, even for one moment, his own eternal universal, immutable law of "RIGHT," by any temporary law, or any other way.

The Law of Moses was added to the promise or everlasting covenant made with Abraham, "because of transgressions, till the seed (Christ) should come to whom the promise was made." Gal. 3 : 19. It was a "schoolmaster," or tutor, to bring the children of Israel—God's chosen people—to Christ. Gal. 3 : 16, 19, 24. No farther. It therefore needed no repealing. It contained within itself, the limit of its own continuance, and expired *Ex necessitate rei*—because it was fulfilled by Christ who had come, and who was the *end* of the law for righteousness, to every one that believeth in him. He came not to destroy the law, nor to make void the law, but to *fulfill* it ; that is *pleroo*, to make full, both as to its requirements and its types ; not *shamar*, to keep ; thus magnifying, and "establishing" the law, as being "holy, just and good" for the *purpose intended* by its Author ; but not as good as a better one—Christ's new law.

Hence, having perfectly filled its purpose, it was taken out of the way. "It would be very foolish, because the law was "good" to prefer it to one that is infinitely *better*. And yet, to suit a theory, some do so.

Again the law, and things under the law, were intended for and comprised a series or system of types and shadows. "Now all these things happened unto them for *types*, and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come." 1 Cor. 10 : 11. The Law contained a "*shadow of good things to come*" Heb. 10 : 1. Col. 2 : 17. In its sacrifices, in its circumcision, in its passover, in its rest day, in its good works &c., it pointed down to Christ. He was the substance or "body" which cast the shadow, or to which the shadow pointed. The shadow ended when it reached the substance. He fulfilled all. He came to fulfill "every jot and tittle" of the law. He did what he came to do. That is, in its incipency or beginning. Every type and shadow has its end in him. That is to say, during his life and death, he was the *beginning* of the fulfillment of every type—the antitype of all.

As to the "*works*" of the law contained in the Decalogue, of which the Jews professed to be so zealous, for fear Christ should do away or destroy them; he taught his Disciples (Mat. 5 : 16,) that he had come to *fulfill* the law, not to destroy good works, that they must let their *light* shine by doing good works—that the way to manifest to men their new and superior light, was by the higher order of good works, which *he* was inaugurating, and requiring through *love*; and thus fulfilling the law.* He taught them that they, by *their* good works must "*exceed* the righteousness of the scribes and pharisees," who taught it was necessary to live up to the requirements of the letter of the law. He proceeds therefore to *quote* from the law, both from the ten commandments, and other commandments, as all ONE LAW—"the law;" and to show them, that he requires them to be kept "in newness of the *Spirit*, and not in the oldness of the letter"—the same great truth that Paul also taught in his Epistle to the Romans, ch. 7 : 6, where, in speaking of the same law of ten commandments, from which he quoted (v. 7,) just as Christ did, thus giving *positive proof* that it was the law of the

* Thus it will be seen by this and other scriptures, (John 8 : 3-11, Deut. 22 : 22,) That as soon as Christ began to teach, he commenced to bring about a "change," by *setting aside* the old law and its penalties—even the ten commandments—and substituting his own higher law—obedience to right and duty through love—the words "put into his mouth by his Father," and therefore the law of God.

ten commandments, of which he spoke ; he said, “now we are *delivered from the law*, that being *dead* wherein we were held ; that we should serve in *newness of Spirit*, and not in the *oldness of the letter*.” But to return to Christ’s teaching, Mat. 5 : 19. He says, “whosoever therefore shall break one of *these* (his own) commandments, (which he was about to utter, in contrast to the letter of the old ones from which he would quote) and shall teach men so &c. For *I* say unto you, except your righteousness shall *exceed* the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.”

Dr. Adam Clarke, in his Commentary, speaks as follows on this passage : “Unless your righteousness abound more—unless it takes in not only the *letter*, but the *spirit* and *design* of the moral precept, &c., more than that of the Scribes and Pharisees, who only attend to the *letter* of the law, and had indeed made even that of no effect by their traditions—ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. * * He who sees the heart and judges it by the *eternal law*, punishes as much a *word*, or a *desire* (that is, as much as the *act*,) if the *hatred* whence they proceed be complete and perfected.”

Then Christ proceeds in verse 21st, to quote the *letter* of the law, and to show and command the “*change*” from the letter to the spirit. “For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a *change* in the law.” Heb. 7 : 11-12. Christ being a Priest of a higher order, than those under the old law—“of the order of Melchizedek”—his sacrifice, his teachings and his law, were all, therefore, of a higher order also. Hence he began at once to teach and to show that, he was the great “Teacher come from God,” “A Prophet like unto Moses,” but even “greater than Solomon,” and of whom God had said, “I will put *MY words* in his mouth, and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. Whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, “shall be destroyed.” Deut. 18 : 18. Acts 3 : 23. On this occasion, up in a mountain in Galilee, Christ was teaching his Disciples, but a great multitude of people were present. It was the occasion of that great inimitable sermon, called “Christ’s Sermon on the Mount.” Mat. 5 : 1. He pronounced blessings on the poor in spirit,” “they that mourn,” “the meek,” “the merciful,” “the pure in heart,” “the peace makers,” “the persecuted,” &c., &c. He taught them how to pray, chapter 6 : 9. He told them to “lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth,” to “seek

first the Kingdom of God, and *his* righteousness," which was of a higher order than the righteousness of the Pharisees. He taught them "straight is the gate and narrow is *the way*, which leadeth unto *life*, and *few* there be that find it;" (which is "the path of life" David said God would *show* his Royal Son. Ps. 16: 11.) He taught them that they were to be "perfect." He gave them many commandments of his own, which his Father had "put into his mouth" to say unto the people; and he wound up his sermon or sayings in these words, "whosoever heareth these *sayings* of *mine*, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a *wise* man, which built his house upon a rock." &c. Chap. 7: 24. He referred to and quoted from the old ten commandment law, for the purpose of showing that his "sayings," *his* commands, were of a higher order, a higher or superior law; that they were the embodiment of the "*Spirit*" of the old law, ("the righteousness" of the old law. Rom. 8: 4—obedience to right through love), into his *new higher* law, of faith that worketh (obeys) by love;" (Gal. 5: 6, James 2: 17,) but without the penalty of immediate death, in case of disobedience; because as soon as he had completely fulfilled every jot and tittle of the old law by doing and becoming the substance or body of all its types, and by his death on the cross, he was to go to the Father," and then, "if we sin we have an advocate with the Father." He first quotes the 6th commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," &c. But I say unto you that whosoever is *angry* with his brother without a cause, shall be in danger of the judgment, &c., chap. 5: 21-22. Then he quotes the 7th commandment, "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old times, Thou shalt not commit adultery: But I say unto you, that whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." verses 27-28. And thus he goes on, showing the superiority of *his* commandments over the ten commandments—the commandments of the law—which were waxing old, becoming null and void, being fulfilled and superseded by *his new* commandment of *love*, as the result of faith; which St. James calls "the Royal law" and "is the *fulfilling* of the law." Rom. 13: 10. Although the law was thus by Christ's teachings, work, and "obedience unto death," fulfilled and superseded in all its requirements and types, and finally nailed to the cross, yet it is spoken of as having been "abolished," "done away." (2 Cor. 3: 11-14,) "blotted out," (Col. 2: 14.) "disannulled," Heb. 7: 18. Still, all this is the result of its

ceasing to be, as before shown, and its ultimate *complete* fulfillment, by Christ at the cross.

But Christ said also, that he came not only to fulfill the law, but the *Prophets* likewise. So, in one sense he did do ; that is, he, and those he empowered, were from that time to be the teachers, the instructors and foretellers of God's words, of God's "law and testimony," as to his great purposes. Not only so, but the prophets, that is, the unfulfilled prophecies, *commenced* to be literally fulfilled in and by him then, and are to be completed in and by him when he comes the "second time without a sin offering, to those who are *expecting* him, in order to *Salvation.*" Heb. 9 : 28. Dia.

The law was given and designed as a schoolmaster to teach or educate the children of Israel, as to the character of God, and as to what was right and wrong, as to their duty to God and to each other, and as to the purposes of God in the future ; and to require and develope obedience and fidelity. Hence, he said, "That I may *prove* them whether they will walk in my *law* or no." Ex. 16 : 4, ch. 15 : 25, ch. 20 : 20. "For the Lord your God *proveth* you to know whether ye *love* the Lord your God" Deut. 13 : 3. And again, "That he might *prove* thee to do thee good at the latter end." Deut. 8 : 16. But this law was to be their tutor or teacher only until "the seed (Christ) should come to whom the promise was made." Gal. 3 : 16, 19. Hence we are told that "the law and the prophets prophesied (*instructed*, Dia.) until John" the baptist ; since that time the Kingdom of God is preached ; or is the means of instruction and enlightenment. As soon as Christ, the great "teacher come from God," the "Prophet like unto Moses," had come, and "began to be about thirty years of age ;" the following declarations of Jehovah *began* to be fulfilled, their fulfillment to be *completed*, at his return or *second* coming : namely : "I will put my words in *his* mouth ; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him." Deut. 18 : 18. "*Him* shall ye hear in *all things* whatsoever *he* shall say unto you : And it shall come to pass, that *every* soul, which will not hear that prophet (or teacher) shall be *destroyed* from among the people." Acts 3 : 22, 23. Hear Moses no longer, but "hear ye *him*—my Beloved Son." Mat. 17 : 5. The temporary law of Moses, or God's particular, specified temporary "*way*" or 'manner,' (2 Kings 17 : 26, 28, 34, 36,) of keeping or carrying out the great moral principles underlying the law having accomplished the purpose intended by Him, became null and void. But the prin-

ciples themselves, still remain, as important and as binding as ever; and are all embodied, and incorporated in the *new* law of Christ, the great Prophet or Teacher come from God; to be kept through love. The new law of this great Teacher is, "Go ye therefore and *teach* (disciple) all nations, baptizing them into the name of the father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. (Dia.) *Teaching* them to observe *all things* whatsoever I have commanded you." Mat. 28 : 19, 20. "Go ye into all the world and preach the *gospel* to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." (condemned) Mark 16 : 15, 16. Also, all "*the things*" written by Paul, and the other Apostles, by virtue of Christ's teaching- and commands, and of which Paul says they are the commandments of the Lord." 1 Cor. 14 : 37. Including also the Great Teacher's *new* way of keeping his new law, as follows: "A *new* Commandment I give unto you, That ye *love* one another." John 13 : 34. *

The higher or superior law of Christ, as partially set forth in the above quotations, embodied all—every one—of the great moral principles of Right and Duty, which formed the substrata or spirit of every one of the ten commandments and entire law, as before said. These moral principles were binding *before* the law, and are still binding *since* the law. But that cannot be said of the law itself. It was just as wrong to murder, or commit adultery, or steal, *before* the law—before God said and wrote, "Thou shalt not kill," "thou shalt not steal," &c. on mount Sinai, as after. But the wrong or sin was not imputed when there was no revealed or declared law, to make known the right and the wrong. The law was given to make known what was right and duty, and what was wrong and sinful, *intrinsically*, and eternally—"That sin might become exceeding sinful," (Rom. 7 : 13 and ch. 5 : 13) and man made responsible. Hence Right and Duty, and wrong and sin, did not have their origin in that law. Nor did they begin with the law. They existed before the law: And now that the law is done away, right and wrong still exist.

Let us illustrate by taking the entire Decalogue; beginning with the 1st Commandment.

* Although this new commandment was given to his disciples, (John 13 : 34 and 15 : 12, 13) and *only* to such as have previously become his true disciples, as the "*greater love*" which should characterize them, and which they should act out and exemplify toward one another as their *new* rule of life; yet it was the same indispensable principle, or true motive power of obedience, so prominent in all his teachings: and of which Paul said, "And now abideth faith hope and love, but the greatest of these is LOVE."

1st. It is just as right, and just as much a duty, *now*, when the law is done away, to "have no other gods," and just as much a wrong and sin, to have them, as it was when the law was in force.

2nd. It is just as right, and just as much a duty, to "not bow down to other gods, nor serve them," and just as much a wrong and sin, to do so, *now*, as it was when the law was in force.

3d. It is just as right, and just as much a duty, to "not take the name of the Lord in vain," and just as much a wrong and sin, to do so, *now*, as it was for the Jews when they were "under the law."

4th. It is just as right, and just as much a duty, to "rest" and "worship," and just as much a wrong and sin, not to do so, *now*, as it was for the Jews before the law was "abolished."

5th. It is just as right, and just as much a duty, to "honor thy father and thy mother," and just as much a wrong and sin not to do so, *now*, as it was for the Jews before the law was "blotted out."

6th. It is just as right, and just as much a duty, to "not kill, or do any murder," and just as much a wrong or sin, to do so, *now*, as it was for the Jews before the law was "disannulled."

7th. It is just as right, and just as much a duty, to "not commit adultery," and just as much a wrong or sin, to do so *now*, as it was for the Jews before the law was "done away."

8th. It is just as right, and just as much a duty, to "not steal," and just as much a wrong or sin, to steal, *now*, as it was for the Jews before they were "delivered from the law."

9th. It is just as right, and just as much a duty, not to "bear false witness," and just as much a wrong or sin, to do so, *now*, as it was for the Jews, (to whom the law was given,) before the law was "taken out of the way."

10th. It is just as right, and just as much a duty, to "not covet," and just as much a wrong or sin, to covet, *now*, as it was for the Jews, before the law was "nailed to the cross."

Hence, it will be clearly seen that the doing away with the temporary law of Moses, does not affect or do away with the higher or superior law of Right and Duty, or any of the great immutable moral principles, which formed the basis or substratum of it: that there was a great difference between the moral principles underlying the law, and the law itself: that there was a great difference between the *letter* of the law and its *spirit*. Even the *letters* "written and engraved in stones," were only

for a temporary law, and have been "done away." 2 Cor. 3 : 7. But the *spirit* of them is, ever has been, and ever will be high and sacred, powerful and binding; not only on the Jew, but on all intelligent or responsible human beings; especially on those aware of its existence, as made known in and by the law of Christ—the "words of God," "put in his mouth."

The moral principles underlying the first four commandments of the Decalogue, (making known duty to *God*, and called by Christ, "the first and great commandment." Mat. 22 : 38) are love, right, duty, obedience, worship, rest, goodness &c; and yet neither love, right, duty, obedience, worship, rest, nor goodness, are commanded by the *letter* of those four commandments; no, not in the entire Decalogue!

The moral principles underlying the last six commandments of the Decalogue, (making known duty towards fellow *man*, and called by Christ "the second like unto the first," 39th. v.) are love, right, honesty, justice, mercy, virtue, goodness &c.: and yet, not one of these Godly principles, are even named or required in the *letter* of those six commandments!

Strange as it may appear, a certain class, who do not understand the law, and who think that they are required to keep according to the letter, a *part* of the fourth commandment, instead of the spirit of the whole, hold that the ten commandments, (so destitute in their *letter*, of moral principles,) constituted, of themselves alone, "the law of God," and *do yet*: and that the balance of the law, constituted "the law of Moses"—two separate laws! But we shall have occasion to notice more particularly the fallacy of their pet idea.

In other parts of the law, we have important *additions* to these ten commandments, and the particular specified way or manner they are to be carried out, that is by sacrifices, rites and ceremonies, &c.; and the penalties for disobedience: and we have also their spirit, real intent or design, and moral principles, or law of Christ, briefly brought to view.

To illustrate: we have an *addition* to the first commandment, requiring obedience and worship, and the manner of worship. "HIM shall ye *worship*, and to HIM shall ye do sacrifice," &c. 2 Kings 17 : 36, 37, 38. This is an additional part of the first commandment, although not written on the tables of stone. We have an addition to the second commandment, including the *penalty* for disobedience, (no penalty being named in the entire Decalogue), commanding them, in case that even a

“son or daughter or the wife of thy bosom,” entice thee saying, let us go and *serve other Gods*,” &c., “thou shalt surely kill him,” &c. Deut. 13: 6-9. We have additions to the third commandment, as follows; “ye shall not swear by my name *falsely*, neither shalt thou profane the name of thy God.” Lev. 19: 12. Holy and reverend is his *name*.” Ps. 111: 9. See also Lev. 24: 16. Neither does the Decalogue contain all the fourth commandment. We have additions to that also, as follows: “The burnt offering of *every sabbath*,” of two lambs, two tenth deals of flour, mingled with oil and one-fourth of a hin of wine, and also an offering for “*every morning*,” as a perpetual *ordinance*, (“*every morning*” includes the *Sabbath* offering,) unto the Lord,” as “*worship*”. Num. 28: 9, 10, Ex. 29: 36-38. Ezk. 46: 1-14. “The man (that gathered sticks on the Sabbath,) shall be surely put to death.” Num. 15: 35. So we might give numerous similar additions, to all the remaining six commandments. See additions to the fifth commandment, Deut. 21: 18-21; and to the sixth commandment, Lev. 24: 17; and the seventh commandment, Lev. 20: 10; and the eighth commandment Ex. 22: 1; and the ninth commandment, Deut. 19: 16-19; and the tenth commandment, Hab. 1: 9, and Jer. 22: 13. These additions show that parts of the same “*one law*” are contained in the ten commandments, and other parts are not contained in them; showing also, that God, in his wisdom, did not see fit to write on the two tables of stone, all that appertains to the ten commandments; that he considered it only necessary to write on the two tables, the fundamental words of the entire law; the basis or substrata of the ten commandments, being much more durable, and imperishable even, than letters engraven in stones, namely: the immutable moral principles of his own Nature and Will—the higher law, of Right and Duty, and obedience through love. Hence, by virtue of the ten commandments underlying the whole law, and these principles underlying the ten commandments, it will be seen that these principles form therefore the substratum of the entire law of Moses. *

We have the great principle of action or obedience con-

* We would not be misunderstood here. We do not mean that all the moral principle contained in or underlying the law, form the substrata of the ten commandments alone. For there are other parts or commands which contain, or which are based as directly upon moral principle as the commands of the Decalogue; and by which the moral principles underlying them, are quite as clearly and definitely expressed, and even more so: as will be hereinafter illustrated.

ned with the higher law, the *true* principle of action that *should be* the moving cause of obedience, to *all* of God's requirements, in *all* ages—which is equal to all the law and all the prophets, and even to Christ's new law—brought to view in the following words. "And thou shalt LOVE the Lord thy God, with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might." Deut. 6 : 5. "Thou shalt LOVE thy neighbor as thyself." Lev. 19 : 18. *This*, so far as the true *principle of action* or obedience is concerned, is "the *Royal law*," and is so called by James 2 : 8 ; and "the law of liberty." verse 12. *This* is "the law of Christ." Gal. 6 : 2. chap. 5 : 14, 22. John 13 : 34. That is, it is required by him as the *moving power of obedience* to his law. This high requirement was not made known, in the above words quoted from Deuteronomy, until forty years after the law was given at Mount Sinai. Neither was there any *penalty* given for non-observance, as *love* cannot be compelled by threatening penalties. Those passages are not, therefore, strictly speaking, a part of the Sinaitic *law*. But were evidently given to show the *spirit* of the law. *

Again, the difference between the law and the principles underlying it, between the *letter* and the *Spirit*, may be clearly seen by the following. The "letter" required "circumcision of the flesh;" the "Spirit," real intent or "righteousness of the law" requires "circumcision of the heart in the Spirit." (That is, the *affections* must be "cut off" from things on the earth, and set on God and "things above," (Col. 3 : 2,) culminating in the obedience of baptism—"the circumcision of Christ." (Col. 2 : 11.) According to the letter, therefore, he is a Jew which is one outwardly ; but according to the Spirit, he is a Jew which is one inwardly. Rom. 2 : 28, 29.

The letter of the first commandment says, "Thou shalt have no other Gods." The Spirit, requires *more* than is even named or required, in the letter of the first commandment ; namely : "Thou shalt *love* God." It might be possible to have no other God, thus obeying the *letter* of the first commandment, and yet not *love* God, and so fail to keep the *spirit* or real intent of the commandment.

The letter of the second commandment says, "Thou shalt not bow down thyself to nor serve" other Gods. The spirit of that command is more. "HIM shall ye *worship*." 2 Kings 17 :

* Dr. Clark speaks of this *Spirit* or righteousness of the law as brought to view in these words, as follows. "*Loving* God with all our heart, soul, mind and strength; and our neighbor as ourselves; thus the *righteousness*, the *Spirit*, design and purpose of the law is fulfilled in us."

36. "Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and *serve* him." Deut. 6 : 13. Mat. 4 : 10. The Spirit requires that "we should *serve* in the newness of *spirit*." Rom. 7 : 6. The letter of the second commandment is negative; neither worship, fear, nor service, (its real intent) being commanded or required by it !

The letter of the third commandment, says "Thou shalt not take the *name* of the Lord thy God in vain." The spirit of it is, that his *name* must be *loved*, (Ps. 69 : 36, Heb. 6 : 10,) "trusted in," (Mat, 12 : 21,) praised, exalted, "believed into," or "put on," &c. But not so required or commanded by the letter of the command itself.

The letter of the fourth commandment requires physical *rest* and external *worship* on the particular day appointed. "Thou shalt not do any work," on the seventh day or Sabbath. Ex. 20 : 10. Thou shalt "*worship*" by offering a sacrificial "*ordinance*" on the Sabbath day, two lambs &c.,—"the burnt offering of *every Sabbath*, beside the continual burnt offering." Num. 28 : 9, 10. Thus "the people of the land shall *worship* at the door of this gate." Ezk. 46 : 3. But the *spirit* of the fourth commandment, (which spirit is the law of Christ) is this. "In burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin, thou hast had no pleasure." Heb. 10 : 6. "True worshipers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth." John 4 : 23. To *obey* is better than sacrifice." Therefore Christ said (by David) "I come to *do thy will* O God," and he "became *obedient* unto death of the cross." Phil. 2 : 8. Thus "he *taketh away* the first (will or covenant, with its law of sacrifices and their appointed days) that he may establish the second" (will or covenant,) "through the offering of the *body* of Jesus Christ," once for all." Heb. 10 : 6-10. Thus by his death *completely* taking away the first or law covenant, with all its sacrifices and holy days, "nailing it to his cross," and establishing, ratifying and bringing into force the second or new will or covenant, under which, genuine faith and obedience through love, constitute God's new appointed way of keeping the *spirit*, or moral principles of *rest* and *worship*, underlying the fourth commandment. The letter of the fourth commandment requires *physical* rest from *physical* works. But the spirit of it requires *spiritual* rest from sinful works. Hence Christ said, "come unto me and *I will give you rest*." But I shall have occasion to speak more at length on this point hereafter. There is no necessity of going through all the ten commandments in this way.

But to illustrate still further. According to the letter of

the law, the Jew was required to give one tenth as "tithes," for the Lord. But according to the spirit, a person who is a Jew "inwardly"—having been taken out among the Gentiles by the gospel—is required to give according to circumstances, "as God hath prospered him," 1 Cor. 16 : 2. It may be more, or it may be less. According to the letter of the law, the Jew, must not commit adultery. If he did, he was "put to death." So long as he refrained from *the act*, he kept the *letter* of the law. But according to the spirit of the law, whosoever *looketh* on a woman to lust after her, hath broken the *spirit* of the law, and committed adultery with her already in his heart." Mat. 5 : 28. Thus according to Christ's new law, *the higher* law, the "*spirit*" of the old law; an unhallowed *look* is contemplated unchastity. So according to the letter of the law, the Jew must not murder. If he did, he was put to death. So long however, as he refrained from the *act*, he did not break, but actually kept, the strict letter of the law. But if he at the same time had in his heart to murder, if he had the *intent* to murder, he broke the spirit although he kept the letter of the law. Hence Christ taught, Mat. 5 : 21, 22, that according to his new law, even an angry feeling, was *latent* murder. Every one of the ten commandments separately might be illustrated in the same way, and would show just as plainly as these, the great difference between the letter and the spirit, and that although the letter is done away, the spirit, or righteousness of the law is still binding. But I deem it unnecessary to dwell longer on this point here, especially, as the same important feature of the law, will appear more forcibly, and become still plainer, at every step of our investigation *

* The difference between the righteousness or *spirit* of the law and the *letter*, is illustrated by the late Dr. Thomas, in the following remarks in reference to the Lord's Supper; namely. "If a Christian drink of the Lord's cup, not discerning the Lord's body, or with malice and wickedness, he eats and drinks condemnation to himself, and does not "fulfill the *righteousness* of the law;" but on the contrary, "offers the blood of Jehovah's sacrifice with leaven," which is death. To eat bread and drink wine at the table of the Lord, is to "offer up *spiritual* sacrifice." This offering is "acceptable to God through Jesus Christ," 1 Pet. 2 : 5, when offered not in the *letter* but in the *spirit* of the law. The *letter* of the law is, "thou shalt not offer the blood of my bulls and goats, heifers and lambs, with fermented bread;" but the *spirit* of the law, "Thou shalt not eat my flesh and drink my blood with malice and wickedness; or thou shalt be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." John. 6 : 53-58 and 1 Cor. 11 : 27. We conclude, therefore, that the quality of the bread matters not, so that we eat it in purity and truth, discerning the Lord's body. * * * The quality of our meat or drink commendeth us not to God, 1 Cor. 8 : 8; but the fulfilling all *righteousness*, witnessed by the law, and the Prophets. Mat. 3 : 15; Rom. 3 : 21. In doing this, we worship him in *spirit* and in truth." This also shows the Dr's idea as to the kind or quality of the bread and wine to be used for the ordinance of the Lord's supper.

We will now carefully examine a few passages of Scripture, having a direct bearing on the subject of the law of Moses, one of which, of itself alone, should forever settle the question, as to whether or not, the ten commandments are still binding. I refer to Paul's second letter to the "Church at Corinth," ch. 3 : 2-17. In the 3d verse, we are taught that the "Epistle," letter, or law of Christ, was written with the Spirit, not in tables of stone, but in the *hearts* of those who composed the Church of God at Corinth, through the instrumentality of Paul and Timothy; who, as shown by verse 6, had been made "able ministers of the new testament; (or covenant) not of the letter but of the *Spirit*," and which new testament, is called in verse 3, "the epistle of Christ." We are also taught in verse 6, that the letter, which is the *old* covenant or law killeth, but the Spirit, which is the new covenant, or law of Christ, giveth life. Then, in verse 7, that the old law covenant, or ten commandments, "written and engraven in stones," was "the ministration of death." Just the same as he taught in his letter to the saints at Rome; (Rom. 7 : 6-9) where he says he "found the law or commandment to be unto *death*." He also taught in verse 7, that "the ministration of death written and engraven in stones, (the ten commandments) was glorious," and *was to be* done away. And verse 11, that it "*is* done away." He says, "if that which is done away *was* glorious, much more that which remaineth *is* glorious." What was it he said *is* done away?" That which *was* glorious." What *was* glorious? In verse 7, he says it was that which was written and engraven in stones—the *letter* of the law or ten commandments, which he called the ministration of death, and then asks in the 8th verse, "How shall not the ministration of the *Spirit* be rather glorious?" Thus contrasting the letter written and engraven in stones, (the letter of the ten commandments, for nothing else was ever written and engraven on the two tables of stone,) which he says is done away, with the spirit which *remaineth*. And in the 9th verse he contrasts the ministration of death, the *letter* of the law engraven in stones with the "*righteousness*:" merely changing the word death, to condemnation, and the word spirit to righteousness. Then again, in verse 13, in speaking of the same old covenant, or law of Moses, he refers to the letter of the law as a "*vail*," which prevented the children of Israel from seeing or looking beyond, to the "end," design or spirit of the law—the greater or more glorious ministration—that

“giveth life” which was all the time underlying the law and showing that the veil was to have an end, and now “*is abolished.*” And in the next verse he shows that although the veil (or letter) *is done away* in Christ; yet, that the minds of the unbelieving Jews were still blinded by keeping the veil upon their hearts, so that they could not see beyond the glory that shined in the face of Moses and his law, to that which was to be the greater glory of Christ and his new law. “Nevertheless when it (their hearts) shall turn to the Lord, the veil will be taken from around it.” (Dia) That is, the greater glory of Christ shined by *reflection* in the face of Moses. The veil therefore represents the old law, the old covenant; and the glory that shined in the face of Moses, back of or beyond the veil, represented or typified the greater glory of the new law, the new covenant under Christ and which is to be made, or *completed* with the Jews (Ez. 20 : 36-38) and written in their hearts, and become the means of *turning* their hearts to the Lord.” Heb. 8 : 10, Rom. 11 : 26.

Again, Paul in writing to some of the believing Jews in the Churches of Asia, but who still, not understanding, “desired to be under the law,” (Gal. 4 : 21,) told them that they were children of the *free* woman,” (verse 31,) and therefore free from the old law, and that they should therefore, “stand fast in the liberty (freedom) wherewith Christ hath made us *free*, and be not entangled again with the yoke of *bondage*,” the old law, (ch. 5 : 1.) and that “Christ is become of *no effect* unto you whosoever of you is justified by the law : ye are fallen from grace.” verse 4. Observe, Paul is speaking here of the *covenant* made at Sinai—the ten commandments, (Deut. 4 : 13)—which he calls “the *law*,” (Gal. 3 : 17 and 4 : 21—24.) and which he says, ch. 3 : 24, 25, was “our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ,” and that after faith is come (that is, Christ in whom we are to have faith) we are “no longer under a schoolmaster.” Now circumcision, and the 7th day sabbath, and the sacrifices, all pointing down to Christ, were all parts of this old Sinaitic covenant law—this *one* law of Moses,—as well as every one of the ten commandments. Paul proceeds to show the galatians in verse 6 ch. 5, just what I am contending for and trying to make plain, that nothing availeth “but *faith* that *worketh* by LOVE.” Not faith that worketh any of the works of the law, by which no flesh shall be justified; for he says, “as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse.” Neither is it faith that

worketh the works of the flesh, but which worketh the works or "fruit of the spirit, *love*," &c., *against* such, he says in verse 23, "there is *no law*." In verse 13, he tells them not to allow the freedom from the law, to be an occasion to the flesh, but by *love* "serve one another:" And in the next verse, he tells them just as he afterwards wrote to the Gentile church at Rome, that *all* the law, referring directly to the ten commandment law, is fulfilled by this one word "*love*,"—(Rom. 13 : 8-10)—that not one of the words of the law, not one thing or part of the law (except the moral principles of Right and Duty which had been embodied in Christ's new law to be kept through love) is binding on either Jew or Gentile. All, all, is fulfilled by love; not *natural* love, or love of degenerate human nature—sinful flesh,—but of a higher principle or law, love generated or produced by *faith* in Christ, faith that "cometh by hearing, and hearing by the WORD of God," (Rom. 10 : 17) called,

"THE WORD OF LIFE." Or God's WAY of LIFE. The word of God, is the word of the Kingdom," Matt. 13 : 19, which must be *understood* in order to generate and bring forth the faith and obedience through love. It is "the word which by the *Gospel* is preached unto you," and which is called by Peter the "incorruptible *seed*, by which we are *begotten* again." 1 Peter 1 : 23-25. Luke 8 : 11, 15. This is called "*good seed*," and begets and produces "children of the kingdom." Matt. 13 : 37, 38. This word is therefore called "the WORD of LIFE." 1 John 1 : 1, 2. Acts 5 : 20. It is also called "the word of truth, THE GOSPEL." Eph. 1 : 13. James 1 : 18. "The *power* of God." Rom. 1 : 16. This Gospel or word is called "the glad tidings of the Kingdom of God," which Christ and the Apostles preached. Luke 8 : 1. Matt. 4 : 17, 23, and chap. 9 : 35, and chap. 10 : 7. Mark 1 : 14, 15, and chap. 16 : 15, 16. Luke 19 : 12. This word, or Gospel of the Kingdom is called, "the things concerning the Kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ," which in the days of the Apostles, when heard, understood and believed, was immediately obeyed, by the believer being baptized—immersed—into the *one* Name of the Father and Son and Holy Spirit, Acts : 8-12, Matt. 28 : 19, 20, Acts 10 : 34-48, and chap. 11 : 1, 14, 19, 21, 24, and chap. 16 : 30-34, and chap. 2 : 41, and chap. 8 : 37, and chap. 16 : 14, 15, and chap. 18 : 8, and chap. 22 : 16, and chap. 19 : 5. Paul calls this gospel or word, "the word of faith which we preach," Rom. 10 : 8. And he preached this gospel or glad tidings, for

many years every where, calling it the whole counsel or will of God. Acts 20 : 25-27. And preached it "for the obedience of faith," that is to be believed and obeyed. Rom. 1 : 5, and chap. 16 : 26. He preached it in the city of Corinth, a year and six months. Acts 18 : 11. In Ephesus, three months, and disputed daily in the school of one Tyrannus about it, for two years : so that, "all they that dwelt in Asia heard the word." Acts 19 : 8-10. Also in the city of Rome, "two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him, preaching the Kingdom of God," &c. Acts 28 : 22-31.

What is this Kingdom, and the *glad tidings* about it? It is the "restoring again the Kingdom to Israel." Acts 1 : 6. It is the same Kingdom of Israel that once existed and flourished in the Land of Canaan or Palestine, under Saul, David, and Solomon, and other Israelite kings ; which was called and known as, "the Kingdom of the LORD, in the hand of the sons of David." 2 Chron. 13 : 5, 8. 1 Chron. 28 : 4, 5, and ch. 17 : 14, and ch. 29 : 23. And which kingdom was to be overturned, overturned, overturned, "and be no more *until* he come whose right it is, and I will give it him." Ezk. 21 : 27. Zedekiah was the king under and for the Lord, (2 Chron. 9 : 8,) "on the throne of the Lord", at that time, which was nearly 600 years before Christ, and was the *last* Israelite that ever sat on the throne. But although that throne and kingdom, which was the typical Kingdom of God, was overturned and became no more ; yet it is to be restored again to Israel, in a perfect and permanent form, by and at the return of the *immortal* Son of David. He is the one whose right it is. From this passage under consideration, taken in connection with Gen. 49 : 10, which reads, "the sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a law-giver from between his feet, until Shiloh come, and unto him shall the gathering of the people be," it has been supposed, that when Christ was here, it was *then* his right to restore the kingdom to Israel—that he whose right it is had come.—But it is a mistake. This last passage properly rendered, reads, as follows : "The scepter shall not *utterly* depart from Judah, nor a law-giver from between his feet, *for* Shiloh shall come, and unto him shall the gathering of the people be." Ps. 89 : 33, and Amos 9 : 8, and Lev. 26 : 44, and 2 Sam. 7 : 15. (See Dr. Young's commentary, and also Dr. John Thomas'.) The right to the throne of David, belongs according to the law, to the *eldest* Son. Christ was not *then* David's eldest descendent or son ; but is now, and there-

fore will be when he comes, the one whose right it is. Besides the Kingdom when restored, is to be as it was before, the Kingdom of *God* in the hands of David's Son; therefore the one whose right it is, must be God's Son, as well as David's son. When Christ was here, he was only the Son of God by begetting, in mind and character, but not as to his *nature*. He was God's "only *begotten* Son." But when he was "declared to be the Son of God with power according to the *Spirit* of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead," (Rom. 1 : 4,) unto incorruptibility, thus being "the first *born* from the dead," then he was the Son of God in *nature*, as well as in mind and character. His mortal put on immortality. Hence, ever since then, he has been the rightful heir to the Kingdom of Israel, which is to be the Kingdom of David, and the Kingdom of God. The restoration of this kingdom, has been spoken of by the mouth of the holy Prophets since the world began, (or from of old. Dia.) Acts 3 : 21. This kingdom is therefore to be restored to Israel, when Christ returns as the one whose right it is, and then "the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David; and he shall *reign* over the house of Jacob forever; and of his *kingdom* there shall be no end." Luke 1 : 32, 33. The house of Jacob, over which he is to reign, will be composed of the living descendents of the twelve sons of Jacob—the twelve Tribes of Israel. They are to be regathered from all countries, wherever they have been scattered; into the land of their forefathers—the land of Canaan or Palestine—to be the *subjects* of the Kingdom proper; Christ, and under him the twelve Apostles, and all the rest of the members of the "one body" of which he is "the Head;" to be the immortal Rulers, or "Kings and Priests" over them; and ultimately over all the nations of the earth, as the *Dominion* of the Kingdom. Christ told the twelve Apostles, "that *ye* which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve Tribes of Israel." Mat. 19 : 28. *When* will Christ sit on the throne of his glory? Answer. "When the Son of man shall *come* in his glory, and all the holy Angels with him, *then* shall he sit upon the throne of his glory; and before him all nations shall be gathered." Ch. 25 : 31. The twelve Tribes are still a distinct people from all other Nations, and are to be gathered into their own land, the land promised and covenanted to their Fathers, Abraham, (and his

seed, *Christ*, Gal. 3 : 16,) Isaac, Jacob, David, and all Israel. Gen. 12 : 1-7, and ch 15 : 7-18, and ch. 17 : 7, 8, ch. 22 : 15-18, ch. 26 : 3, ch. 28 : 13, ch. 35 : 9, 2. Sam. 7 : 10-17, Jer. 24 : 6-9, ch. 33 : 37-44, 1 Chron. 16 : 13-19. When thus gathered, they are to become the *subjects* of the Kingdom of Israel restored.

The following quotations alone, should be sufficient proof ; although not a tithe of what the scriptures contain. "And in that day, there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people ; to it shall the Gentiles seek : and his *rest* shall be glorious. And it shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall set his hand a *second time* to recover the remnant of his people, which shall be left from Assyria, and *from Egypt*, and from Pathros, and from Cush, and from Elam, and from Shinar, and from Hamath, and from the islands of the sea. And he shall set up an ensign for the Nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of *Israel*, and gather the dispersed of *Judah*, from the four corners of the earth. * * And there shall be an highway for the remnant of his people, which shall be left, from Assyria ; *like as it was* to Israel in the day that he came up out of the land of Egypt." Isa. 11 : 10, 11, 12, 16.

"Thus saith the Lord God ; Behold, I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen, whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land : and I will make them one nation, in the land upon the mountains of Israel : and one king shall be king to them all : and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all : * * * And David my servant shall be King over them ; (that is, Christ, David's Royal son, David the second, as David the first had been dead more than 400 years, at the time the Prophet Ezekiel uttered this Prophecy) and they shall have one Shepherd : they shall also walk in my Judgment, and observe my statutes, and do them. And they shall dwell in the land that I have given unto Jacob my servant, wherein your fathers have dwelt ; and they shall dwell therein, even they, and their children, and their children's children *forever* : and my servant David shall be their Prince forever. Moreover I will make a covenant of peace with them ; it shall be an everlasting covenant with them : and I will place them, and multiply them, and will set my sanctuary in the midst of them *for evermore*. My tabernacle also shall be with them : yea I will be their God, and they shall be my people.

And the heathen shall know that I the Lord do sanctify Israel, when my sanctuary shall be in the midst of them forevermore. Ezk. 37 : 21-28.

All fulfilled prophecy has been *literally* fulfilled : therefore this is also to have a literal fulfillment. Without doubt, these prophecies have *already commenced* to be fulfilled. According to these prophecies, their fulfillment is to be *in part* before the return of David's Royal Son, and be completed *after* his return. Hence, the present is *only* the commencement of what *may* be many years being completed. The duration and end of the dispersion and down-treading of the children of Israel, has been fixed by Him who over-ruleth all things according to His will. His chosen people, and chosen land, and chosen City—"Jerusalem—shall be trodden down of the Gentiles *until* the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." Luke 21 : 24. "Blindness in part is happened to Israel, *until* the fullness of the Gentiles be come in. And so all Israel (that is, a "*remnant*" of all Israel, "for they are not all Israel, which are of Israel," Rom. 9 : 6,27,) shall be saved : as it is written, there shall come out of Zion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob." The house of Jacob is the twelve Tribes of Israel. Rom. 11 : 25,26.

Before Christ can "reign on the throne of his father David, over the house of Jacob forever;" (Luke 1 : 32, 33), before he can restore again the Kingdom to Israel; they must be regathered into their own land, which land is the same old territory, of the former typical Kingdom of Israel—Kingdom of David—Kingdom of God.

I said that the regathering is doubtless *now commenced*. For many years such a *movement* has been in progress, and has been constantly increasing in its dimensions and rapidity. It began by the abrogation of the Turkish law which prevented Jews from holding land in that old territory. Next came the organization in England of the Palestine, Exploration Society, under the presidency of the Prince of Wales; by which a scientific survey of Palestine has since been completed.

Then, "the Universal Israelite Alliance with Headquarters in London, by which the scattered Nation became an organic unit for the first time after centuries of isolated helpless exile.

Still later, in 1875, Sir Moses Montefiore, an old and universally respected Jew, commenced his wonderful efforts and schemes in that direction.

Since that, various other schemes with the same object, including that of Mr. Laurence Oliphant, known as the Gilead Scheme, have been devised.

But what is still more remarkable, is the extraordinary persecution of the Jews, which suddenly sprang up near the close of 1881, in various European countries, and the wonderful movements, resulting therefrom since that time. The persecution seemed to originate in Germany. From there it spread in a more violent form to Russia, where the mass of the Jewish population of the world is thought to be located. This persecution continued until the *Liverpool Daily Post* said, that "thousands of Jewish homes have been desolated, and about 100,000 families have been heartlessly cast adrift to meet the severity of a Jewish winter." An influential committee was formed in England, comprising the Archbishop of Canterbury, Cardinal Manning, Lord Shaftsbury, the Dean of Westminster, and Canons Liddon and Farrar, for the purpose of arousing the English people to action on behalf of the Jews.

Thus it has continued and still continues, until one of the circulars to the Jews, says, "over a million Jews are reduced to beggary and starvation.

Mr. Oliphant, writing to the *London Times*, says: "In what manner the British Nation can come to the relief of at least a million of people prepared for an exodus, is for them to consider.

"The *Jewish World*, announced that there are at the present moment in Palestine about 90 agents, sent by various colonization societies in Russia and Rumania, to survey the country for purposes of colonization."

Mr. Oliphant writing to the *Times*, said, "The dominant idea of the Eastern Jew, is to return to Palestine." We are informed that there was a meeting in May last, (1882,) at Jassy, at which 39 delegates attended, representing numerous Palestine Colonization Societies; the object of the meeting, being to "devise a scheme how best to carry into operation the emigration of a large section of Rumanian Jews."

The *Jewish Chronicle* says, "Palestine has been the ideal of all Jewish hearts since Jews lost it. It is scarcely too much to say, that *the return is beginning*, under our very eyes."

A Constantinople correspondent of the *Jewish Chronicle*, says that, "some *hundreds* of Societies had been formed, each

numbering from fifty to three hundred families, * * for colonization purposes."

One of the Jewish circulars says, "If 50,000 families are enabled to cross the frontier, this is the utmost they can hope to rescue." That is, within a certain time.*

Thus, we have the most indubitable evidence that the long prophesied return of the Jews, has commenced. We think the hand of God is visible in this, just as oppression and persecution were the cause of the first exodus from Egypt into the promised land, to become the typical kingdom of God, so oppression and persecution was to be, and is the cause of the second exodus, of the same people, into the same land, to become the subjects of the antitypical, permanent kingdom of God. His purposes must and will be accomplished, in his own way and time. He will restore the kingdom to Israel. The Royal Son of David, is now gone, like a "Nobleman into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom and to return." Luke 19 : 11, 12. Dan. 7 : 14-27. When he returns it will be as King of Kings and Lord of Lords" 1 Tim. 6 : 15. He will then raise the dead—"they that are Christ's at his coming." 1 Cor. 15 : 23. He will restore or "build again the tabernacle of David." Acts 15 : 16, 17. He will then "put down all rule and all authority and power, for he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet." 1 Cor. 15 : 24, 25. And he will "subdue all things unto himself." Phil. 3 : 21. All the "kingdoms of this world" are to become his, and "all people, and Nations, and languages, serve and obey him." Dan. 7 : 14-27. And "every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess." Phil. 2 : 9-11. And "he

* "It is estimated that there are 3,000,000 Jews in Russia, Rumania and Turkey, who, exposed to popular outbreaks, are beginning to look towards Palestine, their ancient land, as the place where they must ultimately find a refuge."

Dr. Black of Inverness, said in his lectures as to his visit to the Holy Land that since he went there, "thousands of acres between Joppa and Jerusalem had been purchased, on which to found a Jewish Colony.

SCHEME FOR RESTORING PALESTINE.—BOSTON, October 31.—The Palestine Colonization and Christian Missionary Association has been incorporated here. It is formed for the purpose of colonizing Palestine with industrious and energetic Christians, and by their prudence, labor and perseverance to restore it to its former grandeur, so it will not only be the centre of the world, geographically, but also in art, science and wealth. Members of the association claim that under proper management the soil can be restored to a very high state of cultivation, mineral resources developed and mechanical industries established, thereby producing vast commercial intercourse between other nations. The purpose of the association is to run a line of packets between Boston and Palestine and the officers are negotiating for the purchase of suitable vessels.—1882

shall reign forever and ever," (Rev. 11 : 15-18) not up in heaven, but *under* the whole heaven," (Dan. 7 : 27) "on the earth," jointly with "his brethren"—the "one body" of "Kings and Priests," (Rev. 5 : 9, 10.) the people now being "taken out from the Gentiles—all nations—for his Name," Acts 15 : 14.—"a *peculiar* people, a chosen generation, a Royal Priesthood, an holy Nation—the people of God." 1 Pet. 2 : 9, 10.

Such is the Kingdom of God, which the Disciples and Christ preached everywhere, as before shown, and which Christ said he was *sent* to preach, Luke 4 : 43, and which he taught his Disciples to pray for in these words, "Thy Kingdom come, thy will be done *on earth* as it is in heaven." Christ the King of this Kingdom, is the one "Seed" of Abraham in whom all Nations are to be blessed according to the promise to Abraham. Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, and to seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ." Gal. 3 : 16. When he returns to "possess the gate of his enemies," and to set up his Kingdom, as above shown, he will by his righteous Rule, bless all nations, and ultimately cause the will of God to be done on earth as in heaven. He is not only to be King of Israel, to reign over the twelve tribes of the Kingdom proper, but he is to have Dominions in all lands, and "his Dominion shall be from sea to sea and from the river to the ends of the earth." Zech. 9 : 10. This Kingdom is not, therefore, in the heart. Christ never told the wicked caviling Pharisees, that "the Kingdom of God is within you." Luke 17 : 21. But he said the King, or Majesty of the heavens is *among* you. (See margin and Diaglott). King and kingdom are sometimes used synonymously. See Mark 7 : 9, 10, and Dan. 7 : 17. The moral principles that characterize this kingdom, as to its Rulers, are "righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit;" Rom. 14 : 17; who are not *in* the kingdom, or inheritors of it as yet, nor can they be, until it comes; but are now simply "*heirs*;" for it is a matter of *promise*. "Hearken my beloved brethren. Hath not God chosen the poor of this world, rich in faith, and *heirs* of that kingdom which he hath *promised* to them that love him?" James 2 : 5. Therefore it is impossible that persons can be "*translated* into the kingdom" as yet, before it is in existence, but they may become heirs, or "*qualified*," or "*changed for* the kingdom." Col. 1 : 12, 13. (See Diaglott.)

The glad tidings or good news of this Kingdom constitute the gospel, that Christ commissioned and commanded the Apostles to go and preach in all the world, to all nations; saying he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned, or condemned. Paul teaches us that there is no other gospel, but this gospel of the Kingdom, which he preached; and says, "though an angel from heaven preach any other unto you, than that which we have preached unto you, *let him be accursed.*" "But I certify to you brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me, is not after man." Gal. 1: 8-11. He also says, in ch. 3: 8, that this gospel was preached to Abraham. "The Scripture foreseeing that God would justify the nations through faith, preached before, the *gospel* unto Abraham: saying in thee shall all the nations be blessed." This shows that the promise to Abraham, and the gospel are the same: that the covenant with Abraham, that he and his seed, (Christ,) should have the land of Canaan (Palestine) for an "everlasting possession," and be a blessing to all nations, and that his seed (Christ) shall possess the gate of his enemies." (Gen. 17: 7,8, ch. 22: 17.) comprises the glad tidings of the Kingdom—the gospel. And he says, Rom. 1: 16, "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the *power of God* unto salvation, unto every one that believeth. It is God's power or means, through which he saves man from sin and death to eternal life in the Kingdom. This gospel of the Kingdom, not only includes the things of the Kingdom, but also "the things of the NAME;" "the things concerning the name of Jesus Christ." Acts 8: 12, ch. 28: 31. Luke 24: 27,44. That is, his origin, nature, offices, doctrine, death, resurrection, NAME, present position and return to reign. This Kingdom is the only Kingdom of God spoken of in the Scriptures. It is never called the "Kingdom of grace," but is sometimes called the Kingdom of heaven; because it *is* the Kingdom of the God of heaven which he has promised to set up "on the earth" *under* the whole heaven," and to give it to him whose right it is"—the rightful Heir—His only begotten Son; and to *all* his children who are rich in faith, *heirs*"—"joint heirs with Jesus Christ:" and which Kingdom is heavenly in its character and purpose of causing the will of God to be done on earth as in heaven. These terms, Kingdom of God, and Kingdom of heaven, are therefore used synonymously, thus showing that they are one and the same. Mat. 11: 12, Luke 16: 16.

Ever since the days of John the Baptist, when this kingdom began to be preached by him ; although it sets forth a glorious state of things on earth, and requires an upright holy life, in order to participate in its honors, and promises to be a blessing to all nations ; yet in consequence of the perverseness, and great wickedness of the human heart ; the proclamation of the gospel of the kingdom has always met with much opposition and persecution ; so much so, that those who by faith and obedience, desire and *try* to become inheritors of it, are compelled to *press* or *force* their way towards or into it, (Mat. 11 : 12, Luke 16 : 16) against "violent" opposers, all their lives ; ultimately to enter the kingdom "through much tribulation." Acts 14 : 22. So that, "every one," "*all* that live godly in Christ Jesus, shall suffer persecution." 2 Tim. 3 : 12.

We have a miniature representation of the *coming* of this kingdom ; that is to say, Christ took three of his Disciples, Peter, James, and John, up into a high mountain and gave them a true miniature representation in "*vision*," of that great event when he shall come to set up his kingdom. Christ was "transfigured before them, and his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light ;" thus representing himself as he will appear when he "comes in his kingdom." Moses, who had been dead for centuries, appeared to be present, representing the righteous dead who will be raised, at Christ's coming, to incorruptibility, to become immortal Kings and Priests : and Elijah the Prophet, who was translated to heaven, 900 years before, also appeared to be present ; representing those of the righteous who will be living, when Christ comes, and who will be "changed in a moment" without death, as Elijah was, to immortals ; and caught up together with the resurrected righteous, "to meet the Lord in the air." Peter, James, and John falling on their faces, being "sore afraid," thus representing the mortal Jewish Nation, or twelve Tribes of Israel, who will fall on their faces with fear, at the glorious presence of the great King of all the earth. Mat. 16 : 27, 28. Ch. 17 : 1-9. Mark 9 : 1-10. Luke 9 : 27-36.

It has been supposed by some who do not understand these things, that these passages teach that the kingdom of God was at *that* time, in some way or other, set up. But as before shown, the kingdom is a matter of *promise*, and Christ took this method of giving for the benefit not only of his Disciples then with him, but also *all others* who should afterwards become his disciples ;

an ocular typical representation of it, by means of a "*vision.*" Mat. 17 : 9. Besides, no person having a proper understanding of the nature of the kingdom—what the kingdom of God is—can *possibly* hold that it was then set up, or is in a person's *heart*, or that it is yet in existence, except that the territory, the King and the subjects are in existence, and the joint heirs or Rulers, are some asleep in Christ, and some living, and others being taken out of the Gentiles. But the kingdom itself, is still a matter of promise, still to be prayed for, and still to come.

The glad tidings or gospel of this kingdom, is the *only gospel* spoken of in all the scriptures : although variously expressed. It is sometimes called "the gospel of God," "the gospel of Christ," "the gospel of his son," "the gospel of the grace of God," "the gospel of peace;" and Paul calls it, "my gospel," "the gospel of your salvation," "that gospel which I preach." Yet these are all used interchangeably, and are all the same one gospel, that Christ and Paul preached every where ; "the gospel of the Kingdom," and generally called "*the gospel.*" Paul distinctly taught that there is no other, that "another gospel, is *not* another," Gal. 1 : 6-12,, and that this "gospel is the *power* of God unto salvation to every one that *believeth.*" But not to those who *don't* believe it. It follows therefore that in order to be saved, one must *believe* the gospel ; *faith* in the gospel being the *condition*. He that believeth not shall be damned," (condemned, to death). Whoever, therefore, heareth, understandeth and believeth this one gospel, has "the faith of the gospel," called the "one faith." Eph. 4 : 5. But which like the one gospel, is variously expressed ; being called not only the one faith, but also "the faith of the gospel;" Phil. 1 : 27 ; "like precious faith;" 2 Pet. 1 : 1 ; "*the* faith once delivered unto the saints," and which they who are called "should earnestly contend for;" Jude 1 : 3 ; "the faith which is the substance (basis) of things hoped for;" Heb. 11 : 1 ; being the things *promised* by God in the gospel ; "the faith of Abraham," who "*staggered not*" at the promise of God, through unbelief ; but was *strong* in faith, giving glory to God ; and being *fully persuaded* that what he had *promised*, he was able to perform. And therefore, it was imputed to him for righteousness." Rom. 4 : 3-22. But this faith is not "perfect faith," until it produces good works, obedience, as in the case of Abraham. James 2 : 21. Not the works of the *old* law, (Rom. 2 : 27, 28. Ch. 4 : 2), but of the law of Liberty, Christ's

new law of obedience through love ; the works or " fruit of the spirit." For faith without works is dead." James 2 : 12-24.

True or real faith and works go together, are inseparable : good works or obedience, being the only evidence of real faith, which like Abraham's, has " the *steps* of that faith," (Rom. 4 : 12,) the first step of which, under the new law of Christ, is repentance and baptism, or, rather, repentance being the turning about, and baptism the first step. " He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."

Without this one " perfect " faith it is impossible to please God," Heb. 11 : 6 ; and all who have it belong to " the household of faith." Gal 6 : 10. They are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the Saints, (of the commonwealth of Israel) and of the household or family of God." Eph. 2 : 12-19. And being the household or family of God, God's children, they are " *heirs* of God, *joint-heirs* with Jesus Christ," Rom 8 : 17 ; being the " *chosen*, the poor of this world, rich in faith, and *heirs* (not yet *inheritors*) of that *Kingdom* which he hath promised to them that love him." James 2 : 5. While " the Nobleman is gone to receive unto himself a Kingdom and to return, the heirs, like that honorable counsellor, Joseph of Arimathea, who waited for the kingdom of God, Mark 15 : 43 ; are also waiting for the same ; and while, like " the Church of the Thessalonians," they have " turned to God to serve the living and true GOD and to *wait* for his SON from heaven." 1 Thess. 1 : 10. " They walk not by sight but by faith"—2 Cor. 5 : 7—by that " faith that worketh by love," " observing all things Christ and the Apostles, by his authority have commanded ; thus " purifying their hearts by faith."—Acts 15 : 9.

There are hundreds of faiths in the world, but only one genuine faith, one faith of the gospel ; concerning which, our Saviour, when he was here, made this very significant remark : " When the Son of man cometh shall he find *the* faith on the earth !" (See Dia. and new version) Luke 18 : 8 ; having direct reference (as may be clearly seen by examination of the passage) to faith in his speedy return to reign, and judge, and to avenge his own elect.

While there are so many spurious faiths in the world ; all the members of the " household of faith," whosoever and wherever they are, having come to the knowledge of the genuine faith through the hearing, understanding, believing and obeying

the only gospel, and having by the first "*step*" of "obedience to the faith," been baptized into the "one body" of Christ, and thus having had the one name of Jesus, Jehovah, or *Yahweh*, called, named, or placed upon them, (Num. 6: 27. 2 Chron. 7: 14,) have thus become constituents of the one body, or people, or name; which is being "taken out of the Gentiles *for* his name"—"a *peculiar* people, a chosen generation, a Royal Priesthood, an holy nation, called out of darkness into marvelous light." 1 Pet. 2: 9.

All those, I say, are "endeavoring to keep the *unity* of the Spirit," the Spirit of truth,—the Spirit's mind *expressed* in "the *word* of truth the gospel"—(Eph. 1: 13), and which is the spirit or righteousness of the *old* law, or ten commandments, embodied and *expressed* in the words of Christ's new law, the gospel of life. "The *words* that I speak unto you, they are *spirit*, and they are *life*." John 6: 63. Ch. 3: 34. Ch. 14: 17.

This *unity* of the Spirit is expressed in these words: "There is *one body*, and *one spirit*, even as ye are called in *one hope* of your calling; *one Lord*, *one faith*, *one baptism*, *one God* and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all," that is, all the body of Christ, who are endeavoring to keep, (not the old law,) but "the *unity* of the Spirit in the bond of peace," "till we all come in the *unity* of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a *perfect man*, unto the measure of the stature of the *fullness* of Christ."—Eph. 4: 3, 13.

When all the members of the body of Christ, *now* being taken out of the Gentiles as aforesaid, by the proclamation of the glad tidings, shall have been "*chosen in him* and predestinated unto the adoption of *children*, by Jesus Christ to himself," (Eph. 1: 4, 5,) and the body of Christ completed; and altogether with the Head, become "a perfect man," endowed with God's perfect, incorruptible, "Divine Nature," to be his Kings and Priests, immortal Rulers, in his Kingdom; (for "*flesh and blood* cannot inherit the Kingdom of God." 1 Cor. 15: 50.) for the complete accomplishment of his great purpose, the blessing of all Nations, and bringing about that glorious state of things on this Planet, when the will of God will be done on earth as it is in heaven: then, the whole earth, which "abideth forever;" (Eccl. 1: 4. Ps. 96: 10. Ps. 104: 5,) and has been "given to the children of men;" Ps. 115: 16, and Ps. 37: 9, 18, 22, 29. Matt. 5: 5, shall be full of the glory of God;

as he hath sworn, by himself, to accomplish, as his great and ultimate purpose so far as revealed. His fiat hath gone forth in these words. "As truly as I live, all the earth shall be filled with the glory of the Lord." Num. 14 : 21.

"Every man that hath *this hope* in him, purifieth himself even as he is pure." 1 John 3 : 3. "By patient continuance in well doing, seeking for glory and honor and immortality, that God may render unto him eternal life." Rom. 2 : 6, 7. Having sought "first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, that all necessary things might be added ;" (Matt. 6 : 33.) and continuing steadfastly in the Apostle's doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers ;" (Acts 2 : 42,) observing all things whatsoever Christ has commanded ; "following peace with all men, and holiness, without which, no man shall see the Lord."

I have now very briefly, but carefully, pointed out *God's Way of Life* ; what a person must believe and do in order to be saved ; giving a succinct statement of what that salvation is : of the faith, the gospel, the kingdom, the hope, the one body, the name, the *new* law of Christ, &c., &c., in all of which, nothing can be found, nor in all the teachings of Christ and the Apostles, requiring the old law, or any part of it, to be kept since Christ took it out of the way, nailing it to the cross." But instead of that, Paul said "I have kept *the FAITH.*" 2 Tim. 4 : 7.

THE TWO LAW THEORY.

There is a certain class, who, in order to sustain an erroneous idea—that it is still necessary to keep the seventh day—have labored hard, to make it appear, not that one law was given in two parts, but that there were *two* laws ; one called the law of God, the other called the law of Moses. That the ten commandments were not the law of Moses, but the law of God : And that the rites and ceremonies, sacrifices and ordinances were not the law of God, but the law of Moses ; and that while the law of Moses, with all its sacrifices and ordinances, is done away, the law of God is not done away ; and that the Sabbath is never called an "ordinance," but is a part of the law of God, and therefore not done away like all the other ordinances. They do not seem to be aware that the Sabbath or seventh day, with its regularly established sacrificial offerings, was properly and strictly an "ordinance," and *was* so called. They do not seem to be

aware that the whole of the Sabbath law, is not contained in the Decalogue, as hereinbefore shown. Therefore when we quote to them such passages as the following, viz: "We are not under the law," Rom. 6 : 14, They answer. "Oh, that refers to the law of Moses, not to the law of God. We admit that the law of Moses is done away, and that we are therefore not under it. But not so with the law of God! The Sabbath law is a part of the law of God, which is still binding, and therefore, we are still under that law!" But the last dodge is, now taken by *some* of that class, to get around this passage, that, "there is no contradiction in saying we are not under the law when we are keeping it, &c!" This writer I presume had discovered that the Apostle Paul was speaking of the ten commandments, when he said "we are not under the law," as can be clearly seen by close examination. But all I have to say about this position is, that it is *too shallow*, to need any showing up. When I quote, "the law was given by Moses," John 1 : 17. "Oh yes, the ceremonial law was, but not the law of God!" When I quote to them, "now are we delivered from the law," Rom. 7 : 6; or, "the Gentiles which have not the law," Rom. 2 : 14; or, "the law of *commandments* contained in ordinances is "abolished," Eph. 2 : 15; or, the law "*written and engraven in stones*, is done away," 2 Cor. 3 : 7-13; or, that Christ is the *end of the law* for righteousness, "to every one that believeth," Rom. 10 : 4; or, that "no man is justified by the law"—the "*works of the law*," Gal. 2 : 16; or, that "as many as are of the *works of the law*, are under the *curse*," Gal. 3 : 10 and 5 : 4; or, that the law was added because of transgressions, *till* the seed should come," Gal. 3 : 19, Oh yes, they answer, "those all refer to the *ceremonial* law, the law of Moses, not to the law of God!" Upon this one unscriptural, and therefore erroneous position, that there are two laws, one being the ten commandments and called the "law of God," or, "law of the Lord," and the other not including the ten commandments, but including all the sacrifices, rites and ceremonies, ordinances &c, called "the law of Moses"—*two* separate and distinct laws—the ten commandment law, not being done away, and the ceremonial law, as they call it, being entirely done away.

On this unscriptural position, we say, the entire superstructure, of the seventh day Sabbath still in force, hangs, or is based. If this one position be unscriptural, then their theory, as to the necessity of keeping a *part* of the old seventh day

Sabbath law, goes down. Of course, I am aware, that they think they have other supports in the scriptures. But I say, if the theory be deprived of *this one*, it must go down.

They *seem* to be unconscious of the facts, which we now proceed to point out and prove, namely; that the law of God, and the law of Moses, are *one*, and *not two* laws. And that their much to be deplored mistake, is in not understanding that there is a wide difference between the letter, and the Spirit of the law, and what that difference is. That the law is one thing, and the moral principles on which it is based is quite another thing, that the letter and the law are the same, and that the Spirit and moral principles are the same. They confound the ten commandments with the moral law. This is a great mistake, as I have already shown. The ten commandments are *not* the moral law, but are based on the moral law, or moral principles as their substrata; which existed *before* the law, and still exist now that the law of Moses is no more. But having, we think, already made these points clear, we will now proceed to *prove* that

THE LAW OF GOD AND LAW OF MOSES, ARE ONE, NOT TWO LAWS.

This point should be positively and forever set at rest, by the following Scriptures.

The ten commandments are the Lord's covenant. Proof: "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. 4:13.

Moses *wrote* all the words of the Lord which he spake, including the Decalogue, or this covenant, in *the book of the covenant*, before God wrote the covenant on the two tables of stone. Proof: "And God *spake* all these words, saying, Thou shalt have no other Gods before me." (&c., all the ten commandments.) "And Moses wrote *all* the words of the Lord." * * "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." This was the occasion of making, entering into, and dedication by blood, and recording in a book, of this covenant—the law covenant—which included, not only the ten commandments, but ALL the words of the Lord, commencing with chapter 20, and ending with the 8th verse of chapter 24. And this book, is here named "the book of the covenant." Now then, let it be kept in mind how much had

been written in the book of the covenant up to this time, written by Moses, and by him dedicated, with blood—all *before* God wrote the same covenant (or its fundamentals) on the two tables of stone.

This book of the covenant is called "the book of the LAW." Proof: "And Hilkiah the high Priest said unto Shaphan the Scribe, I have found *the book of the law* in the house of the Lord. And Hilkiah gave the book to Shaphan and he read it. * * And Shaphan the Scribe showed the King, saying, Hilkiah the Priest hath delivered me a book. And Shaphan read it before the King." And the King read in the ears of all the people," *the book of the covenant*, which was found in the house of the Lord." 2 Kings 22 : 8, 10 and Ch. 23 : 2.

Moses delivered this book of the law covenant, to the priests, the Sons of Levi, to be put in the ark of the covenant, to be kept and read before all Israel at the end of every seven years. Proof: "And it came to pass when Moses had made an *end* of writing the words of *this law* in a book until they were *finished*, that Moses commanded the Levites which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord saying: Take *this book of the law*, and put it in the side of the ark of the *covenant* of the Lord your God, that it may be there for a witness (or testimony) against thee. * * At the end of every seven years, thou shalt read *this law* before all Israel in their hearing." Deut. 31 : 24-26 and verses 10, 11.

The two tables of *testimony* (which was the same as a part of what Moses had written in the book of the law covenant) were also put into the ark of the covenant—ark of the testimony. Proof: "And thou shalt put into the ark, the *testimony* which I shall give thee. * * And he gave unto Moses, when he had made an end of communing with him upon Mount Sinai, two tables of testimony, tables of stone, written with the finger of God. * * "And it came to pass in the first month, in the second year, on the first day of the month, that the tabernacle was reared up. * * And he took and put the testimony into the ark, and he brought the ark into the tabernacle." Ex. 25 : 16 and chap. 31 : 18, and chap. 40 : 17-21.

This book of the law, is called the book of the *law of the LORD* and the Levites took it out, and took it with them to teach the people. Proof: And the Levites, priests, "taught in Judah, and had the book of the law of the Lord with them, and went about throughout all the cities of Judah and taught

the people. 2 Chron. 17: 9. It will be observed, that this book was called the book of the *law of the LORD*, although it contained not only the ten commandments but also *all* that the Lord hath said"—*all* the law of Moses—which he himself had written in this book of the law.

This book of the law of the LORD, is called the book of the law of *Moses*. Proof: "As Moses the servant of the Lord commanded the children of Israel, as it is written in the book of the law of *Moses*," * * "And he wrote there upon the stones a *copy of the law of Moses*, which he wrote in the presence of the children of Israel." (As before shown Ex. 24: 4-8.) Josh. 8: 31, 32. See also Luke 2: 22, 23.

This book of the law of the Lord was given by Moses. Proof: "Hilkiah, the priest, found a book of the law of the Lord *given by Moses*. And Hilkiah answered, and said to Shaphan the scribe, I have found the book *of the law*, in the house of the Lord." 2 Chron. 34: 14, 15. chap 33: 8. This same book given by Moses, is called in verses 30, 31, of this chapter, "the book of the covenant."

The ten commandments are called the law of Moses, also, in the New Testament. I will refer to one place, viz: "He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses." Heb. 10: 28, compare with Deut. 17: 2, 6, 7.

The law of circumcision and Passover, are called "the Lord's law," before the ten commandments were given, as *everything* commanded by the Lord through Moses, was the law of the Lord. Ex. 13: 9.

The book of the law of *Moses*, and the law of GOD all one, and used interchangeably. Proof: "They spake unto Ezra, the scribe, to bring the book of the *law of Moses*, which the Lord had commanded to Israel; * * and the Levites caused the people to understand *the law*, and the people stood in their place. So they read in the book in the *law of GOD*, distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading." Neh. 8: 1, 8.

Ezra read in this book of the *law of GOD*, "from morning until midday." "Also day after day, from the first day to the last day, he read in the book of the *law of GOD*." Neh. 8: 3-18. This law of God must therefore have contained more than the ten commandments!

The law of burnt offerings for the Sabbath, new moons, and set feasts, &c., was a part of and written in this law of the

Lord. Proof: "And the burnt offerings for the Sabbath, and for the new moons, and for the set feasts, and it is written in the *law of the Lord.*" 2 Chron. 31:3. Again, "To offer burnt offerings unto the Lord upon the alter of burnt offerings continually, morning and evening, and to do *all* that is written in the *law of the LORD*, which he commanded Israel." 1 Chron. 16:40. See also Luke 2:22-39.

Joshua also wrote a statute and an ordinance, and other things, in this book of the *law of God*. Proof: "So Joshua set them a statute and an ordinance in Shechem. And Joshua wrote these words in the book of the law of God." Josh. 24:26.

The "*whole law*," was commanded and given by the hand of Moses: Proof: "So that they will take heed to do *ALL that I have commanded* them, according to the *whole law*, and the statutes, and the ordinances, *by the hand of Moses.*" 2 Chron. 33:8. Again; "*These* are the statutes and judgments and laws, which the Lord made between him and the children of Israel, in Mount Sinai, *by the hand of Moses.*" "*These*," included the *Sabbath law* in Ch. 23:3, and what St. James calls "the Royal law," in chap. 19:18, and in fact, *all* the law, as given at Mount Sinai, which includes of course, the ten commandments. Therefore when John said, Ch. 1:17, that "the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth come by Jesus Christ," he was right.

But, I do not think it necessary to dwell longer on this point. Much more evidence might be adduced, if it were necessary; but I think I have clearly and positively proven that the law of God and law of Moses are the same—not two laws but one law: that the law covenant, the ten commandments—the tables of testimony, the law of sacrifices, ordinances, feast days, sabbaths, holy days, rites and ceremonies, are all included in, and go to make up the *ONE* law of God, called also the law of Moses.

I might add, that "the law," in the singular, occurs more than 400 times in the Bible, and not once is there any mention of, or reference to, this law of God, or law of Moses, as *two* laws, *per se*. Why then was this theory got up? We will not say that it looks as if it must have been got up by designing men, to endeavour, if possible to sustain an unscriptural position or doctrine; but it was in consequence of not understanding the higher law—the eternal immutable law of Right and Duty—

which, forming the substratum of the Decalogue, is called the spirit in contradistinction to the letter of the law, or law itself, as before shown, and that what was once the law of God, the *letter* is not the law of God now.*

“The law and the testimony,” and “the law of God,” are the same; and under the old dispensation, consisted of, and included, “Moses and the Prophets” in their entirety. “For he established a testimony in Jacob and appointed a law in Israel.” Ps. 78 : 5, 10. But under Christ, “the law and the testimony,” or law of God, is quite a different thing, consisting of the *gospel*, and the entire testimony of Christ and the Apostles, and the Prophets, or unfulfilled prophecies. These in their entirety comprise, “the law of God,” “the commandments of God.”

The spirit of God, which was the spirit of Christ in the Prophet Isaiah, (1 Pet. 1 : 11,) testified concerning the times and work of Christ and his Disciples as follows: “Bind up the testimony, seal the law among *my disciples*” Isa. 8 : 16. “Bind up the testimony;” that is, make it complete and binding.

* *The law of God*, now in force, consists of his commandments by Christ and the Apostles, the “*words*” which he put into Christ’s mouth, to be spoken and commanded by him and his Apostles, for the purpose of being *believed* and obeyed, in order to salvation, in order to avoid endless death—“everlasting destruction,” “everlasting punishment,” by obtaining eternal life. Hence, God said, I will raise up a Prophet like unto Moses, “and will put *my words* in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall *command* him.” And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken unto *my words* which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him,” (Dent. 18 : 18, 19,) or as the Apostle words it, “shall be *destroyed* from among the people.” Acts 3 : 22, 23. Hence, to believe in Christ, is to believe God’s law, words, or commandments, by Christ. Therefore John said, “*this* is his, (God’s) commandment, that we should *believe* on the name of his Son Jesus Christ, and *love* one another, as *he* gave us commandment. And he that keepeth his commandments, dwelleth in him, and he in him.” 1 John 3 : 22-24. John 6 : 29. That great Prophet, Christ himself, said, “I do nothing of myself; but as my Father hath taught me, I speak to the world those things which I have heard of him.” John 8 : 26-28. “For he whom God hath sent, speaketh *the words of God*.” John 3 : 34. “He that is of God, heareth *God’s words*.” John 8 : 47. How can it be possible therefore, for any one whose mind is not terribly warped and bent, to think that the passages which speak of the necessity of keeping the commandments of God, refer to and mean the ten commandments of the decalogue? For instance, such as the following: “Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life.” Rev. 22 : 14. “This is the love of God that we keep his commandments.” 1 John 5 : 3. “Here are they who keep the commandments of God and the *faith of Jesus*.” Rev. 14 : 12. How can any one think that the old ten commands of the Decalogue are the words of God put into Christ’s mouth to be spoken again, instead of the superior law of Christ? And yet, there is a class who *do* think so, because of the decalogue containing the 4th commandment!!!

Christ said to his Disciples, "whatsoever ye shall *bind* on earth, shall be bound in heaven." Mat. 18 : 18. He gave them "the *Keys* of the Kingdom. Mat. 16 : 19. "Seal the law among my Disciples;" that is, make it sure, confirmed. Paul said to the Church of God at Corinth, "even as the *testimony* of Christ was *confirmed* in you." 1 Cor. 1 : 6. They "were *scaled* with that holy spirit of promise," Eph. 1 : 13, and "given the earnest of the spirit." 2 Cor. 1 : 22. Thus the law of God by Christ and his Disciples, has been confirmed, made sure and binding. This is the only place the word "*Disciples*" ("taught ones," Dr. Young) occurs in the Old Testament, and clearly refers, as also verse 20, to the then future "law and testimony" of Christ and his Disciples, the "taught of God," (John 6 : 45,) who, in these days (when so many forms of spiritualism prevail, and many people, even seek to learn the state of the dead, and things of the future, by imaginary spirit rapping, "peeping and muttering") being true disciples of Christ, or taught ones, refer directly to the scriptures, and say, "to the law and to the testimony, if they (your imaginary spirits, or your spiritualizing teachers) speak not according to THIS WORD, it is because there is no light in them," verse 10. Paul, speaking for himself and Silvanus and Timotheus, said to the Church, "because *our testimony* among you was believed," 2 Thess. 1 : 10, and in Acts 20 : 21-24, he tells us what that *testimony* was. He says his ministry which he had received of the Lord Jesus, was, "to *testify* the *gospel* of the grace of God," and in verse 21, *testifying* both to Jews and to Greeks, repentance towards God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." "And when they had appointed him a day, there came many to him, unto his lodging; to whom 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. And in 1 Cor. 2 : 1, he calls it "the *testimony of God.*" In Rev. 12 : 17, we have a reference to those "which keep the commandments of God, and the *testimony* of Jesus Christ;" and in John 3 : 32-34, we are told that the *testimony* of Christ was "the *words of God.*"

These scriptures show clearly that the words or commands of God, by Christ and the Apostles, constitute "the law of God," during Gentile times, "the law and testimony" of this dispensation. Therefore, to suppose that "the law and the testimony," the law of God, or the commandments of God, are the same now

under Christ, that they were under Moses, appears to the writer, extremely foolish and silly. I may add that "the testimony" occurs in the New Testament 30 times, and never once refers to, or means, the ten commandments of the law of Moses, although under Moses they constituted the chief element of "the testimony," and so called constantly.

The law of Moses was "holy, just and good," and "spiritual;" for some of the ten commandments, and some of the commands outside the Decalogue, but which were additional *parts* of it; are almost perfect expressions of the pure Godly principle or "Spirit itself," (although *not* expressive of the true motive power of the principle or spirit—love;) for which reason, the law was, in these features, truly intrinsically holy, just and good, and spiritual. But still not as pure and good and spiritual, as one that is more so—the infinitely superior law of Christ with its Godly motive power of LOVE. I say GODLY, because it is written that "God is LOVE." Therefore, although the law, or law covenant, was good, it was not so good that it ought not to have been superseded, as it was, by a *better* one—a "*better* covenant, which was established upon *better* promises." Heb. 8 : 6, with its better and higher order of works through love, as its condition. Paul said the law was "*spiritual*," and, so it was, to a certain extent, in some of its parts. * It was founded on

* Paul said also, that "*circumcision* verily *profiteth*, if thou keep the law. Rom. 2 : 25. And again, "what *profit* is there of circumcision? *Much every way*." Rom. 3 : 1, 2. But because he said that, would it not be foolish to conclude that circumcision is still binding? that it is still one of the requirements of the law of God, as of old? Would it not be much wiser to take into consideration also, what he said on other occasions, as in Gal. 5 : 6, "For *in* Jesus Christ, neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but *faith* which worketh by love." Also 1 Cor. 7 : 19. "Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God." Then again, is it wise to conclude, because the old Decalogue--the ten commandments--were once the commandments of God, and binding, as "the law of God," that such must necessarily be the case now; and that Paul had reference here, to the ten commandments, which were a part of the old Mosaic law, and which, in his second letter to them, chapter 3 : 7, he called the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, which "was to be done away," that is, "the *letter*" thus engraven, which he said in v. 6, "*killeth*?" Would it not be much wiser to come to the conclusion, that when Paul said ye are not under the law, he spoke the truth; and that now, the "sayings" and teachings of *Christ*, which he said were "*God's* words," constitute "the commandments of God," and that to all who are "*in* Christ," neither circumcision, nor *any other part or item*, of the *old* law of God "availeth anything," but *faith* which *worketh* by love in obedience to the *new* law of God—bringing forth "the fruit of the *Spirit*." John said, "*This* is his commandment, that we should *believe* on the name of his Son Jesus Christ." 1 John 3 : 22-24, and John 6 : 29.

spiritual principles of Right. It had a spiritual intent. Its spirit was embodied in Christ's new law, and thus "established." Paul evidently had reference to its spirit, when he said "we establish it." He certainly had no reference to the works or letter of the law, for he had just said "a man is justified by *faith* without the *deeds* of the law." Faith and obedience through love, is the *spirit* of the law. Hence he said, "do we then made void the law through faith? God forbid, we *establish* the law." Rom. 3 : 27-31.

Dr. Clark says, in commenting on this last verse, "we may understand also, the moral law, (that is the moral principles underlying the law,) that which relates to the regulation of the manners or conduct of men. *This* law also was *established*, by the doctrine of salvation by *faith*; because faith works by *love*, and love is the *principle* of obedience; and whosoever received salvation through faith in Christ, receives power to live in holy obedience to every *moral precept*." He also says, "The law considered as a rule of action, though it was *spiritual*, just, holy and good in itself, yet was *insufficient*." "All is excellent and pure; but it neither pardons sin, nor purifies the heart."

"All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." Rom. 3 : 23. All men have transgressed the law of God—the great moral law of Right and Duty; and according to that law are under condemnation. All are also under the condemnation of death, in consequence of Adam's sin. How then could God be *just* without carrying out the penalty of death? How, or in what way could he be just and yet clear guilty man, make him free from the condemnation of a broken just law?" This, is his way of accomplishing the great work—the great desideratum. For he *loved* the world. He desired to *save* them, which could not be done without instituting, and making known, or declaring some means or method by which they could have their past sins, their transgression of the law, *justly* remitted, and thus become righteous, or free from all condemnation. He therefore instituted this plan or method of "*righteousness*." "He so *loved* the world that he gave his *only begotten son*, (to die on behalf of condemned, doomed man) that whosoever *believeth* into him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John 3 : 16. The sinner whoever he may be, may now, by *believing* into Christ "be *justified* freely by his grace, through the redemption that is

in Christ Jesus.” “*Now* the righteousness of God, *without the law*, is manifested.” It is to *believe into* Christ; that is, believe his gospel and be “baptized into him, for the remission of sins, thus putting on Christ, (Gal. 3 : 27,) *in* whom is redemption, “*in* Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption.” 1 Cor. 1 : 30. *This* is “the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto *all* and upon all them that believe.” Man *could not* keep the law perfectly, all his life, and get free from its condemnation that way; therefore he was doomed to perish, doomed to go down to death—endless death, without a ray of hope. But through God’s great love, and free grace, a way of escape has been found out and provided, and manifested or declared; even the death of God’s son, and faith in his blood: “whom God hath set forth to be a *propitiation through faith* in his blood, to *declare* his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, to declare I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be *Just* and the *Justifier* of him which *believeth* in Jesus.” No keeping of the old law is now required not a particle of its works, or letter. Freedom from its condemnation comes through *faith*. Salvation is by faith—the faith of Abraham, who believed God and it was accounted unto him for *righteousness*.” See Rom. 3 : 21—28 and 4 : 3-12. “The righteousness of God,” is absolutely necessary in order to be saved. Paul says it is obtainable “without the law,” and “without the law” means, without *any* of it. He says; “now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the Prophets.” Rom. 3 : 21. That is, the law itself has testified or witnessed by its types and shadows pointing down to Christ and his new law—the “new and living way,” that he was to manifest, of becoming righteous, or getting the righteousness of God, which is by faith without the law: and the Prophets also witnessed to the same thing, by their prophecies about “the path of life,” (Ps. 16 : 1,) the “*new and living way*,” (Heb. 10 : 20,) of getting remission of sins; which is righteousness or justification by faith and baptism, through the blood of Christ, and by “patient continuance in well doing,” ultimately obtaining the remission of sin’s flesh, by being “made partakers of the Divine *Nature*,” in addition to the Divine *character*, of Righteousness. *

* Dr. Clark, in commenting on “the righteousness of God,” Rom 3 : 4, says: “Gods method of saving sinners, is *now* shown by the *gospel*, * * * *without the law*; without any right or claim which might result from *obedience to the law*; and is evidently that which was *intended* by God from the beginning; for it is witnessed by the law and the Prophets.”

God's great moral law of Right and Duty, was required to be kept, during and under the old temporary law of Moses, which includes the ten commandments; by the observance of all the typical sacrifices, offerings, ordinances, holy days, rites and ceremonies, as commanded. But since that old law served its purpose, was fulfilled, and expired; the same great moral law of Right and Duty, is to be kept by the observance of the new law of Christ—all things whatsoever HE hath commanded, through "faith that worketh by love." Paul's writings also being "the commandments of the Lord." 1 Cor. 14: 37. Keeping the *Spirit* of the law when the law was in force—before the coming of Christ—was to keep and obey the *letter* through *faith* and *love*. But keeping the *spirit* of the law, since the law was abolished—since Christ's coming and death—is to keep and obey the *Right* through *faith* and *love*, and the right, is God's will, as made known by Christ—the law of Christ. Hence to keep or obey the *spirit* of the old dead law, is simply to obey the law of Christ through *love*—his gospel, his teachings, by himself and his Apostles. This is a great and wide difference.

The *Spirit* of the *ceremonial* part of the law, is *sacrifice*, *worship*, and *obedience*. It is, of course, the same *spirit*, or godly principles, that formed the basis of the ten commandments, and therefore of the entire law. First, the right and duty, to kill animals and offer them as a sacrifice, a sweet smelling savour to God, was *made* right and duty, by God's *positive* command. Such was the case with *all* his *positive* commands; they created or originated the right and duty. While those commands were in force, obedience to them was God's own appointed *way* for his people to sacrifice, worship and obey him. These commands constituted the *letter* of his law. But those commands have been abolished, the right and duty has therefore ceased; the letter is done away. But the spirit is still binding. Hence, Paul says that things sent to him, to supply his needs, as a *free gift*, from Phillippi, by "the saints in Christ Jesus," were "an odour of a sweet smell, a *sacrifice* acceptable, well-pleasing to God." Phil. 4: 18. And to the "beloved of God" in Rome, he said, "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present *your bodies* a living *sacrifice*, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your *reasonable* service." Rom. 12: 1.

This is the way to obey the *Spirit* of the law of sacrifices.

This was *always* right and duty. This is therefore *moral* or Godly precept. Again, instead of *worshiping* God by performing the rites and ceremonies of the letter of the law, we are now required to "*worship him in spirit and in truth*" John 4 : 24. And Paul said "we are the circumcision which *worship* God in the Spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh." Phil. 3 : 3. That is, circumcision of the flesh was the token, sign, or seal of the old law covenant, which was done away; and therefore Paul had no confidence in it. But the Spirit of it, is still binding, which is circumcision of the heart, through faith and baptism into Christ, which is the true token or seal of the *new* covenant, baptism being the external sign of the internal "*righteousness of the faith,*" and the God-appointed ordinance for remission of sins, and induction "*into Christ Jesus,*" in order to get the circumcision of Christ." Col. 2 : 11. This is now the true way to "*worship* God in the *spirit.*"

And again, the external *obedience* to all the rites and ceremonies of the letter of the law being abolished, the internal or spiritual "*obedience to the faith,*" (Rom. 1 : 5,) "*that worketh by love,* and purifies the heart, "*bringing into captivity every thought, to the obedience of Christ,*" (2 Cor. 10 : 5,) is now required as true real obedience. Obedience to the law, once brought long LIFE, (and other blessings,) in the promised land. But now obedience to the law, to the neglect of Christ's law, brings endless DEATH. But obedience to the Spirit of the law, as embodied in the law of Christ, through love, brings *eternal* life.

"Now the *end* of the commandment (that is, *the law*) is *love* out of a *pure* heart, and of a good conscience, and *faith* unfeigned." 1 Tim. 1 : 5. Here, the Apostle Paul tells Timothy, in amount; that the end or fulfillment of the entire law, is by *faith* that worketh by *love*, thus making the heart *pure*. This, as I have shown, is simply obedience to the *Spirit* of the law. Then he goes on, "from which some having swerved, have turned aside unto vain jangling; desiring to be teachers of the law; understanding neither what they say nor whereof they affirm. But *we* know that the law is good, if a man use it lawfully; knowing this, that the law is not made for a *righteous* man."

A man who keeps the spirit of the law, by faith and love with a pure heart, is a righteous man, and hath thus fulfilled the

law. This is evidently what the Apostle meant, by the law being good *if* a man use it lawfully. The law was to a certain extent "spiritual," and to keep its spirit by faith which worketh by love, was to "use it lawfully." To keep its letter, by circumcision of the flesh, and observing its sacrifices, ordinances, rites and ceremonies, holy days &c., was to use it *unlawfully*.

THE COVENANTS.

I will now briefly consider the covenants, to show that a correct view of them, not only accords with, but positively confirms and substantiates the positions here taken in regard to the law. Besides, the importance of a knowledge and correct understanding of "the covenants of promise" (Eph, 2 : 12) is equal if not paramount to that of any other scriptural subject. The covenants contain the elements of the glad tidings concerning the great salvation. They contain "the exceeding great and precious promises," of "the things hoped for," "the things concerning the kingdom and the name," which constitute the the gospel, and which must be understood believed and obeyed, in order to be "made partakers of the Divine Nature," and of the entire salvation of God.

"Covenant," comes from the Hebrew word *Berith*, and the Greek word *Diatheke*, and signifies, coming together—agreement of minds—or a mutual consent or agreement between two or more persons, having specifications or conditions, either verbal or written, and having a seal or token, and being confirmed or completed over the death of an appointed victim, and by an oath. Jer. 34 : 18, 19, 2 Chron. 15 : 12-15, Gen. 15 : 9-18, Ex. 24 : 3, 8. * In the common terms "Old Testament," and "New Testament," the word testament, is rendered from the Greek *Diatheke*: and the writers of the New Testament, used that Greek word, I think, thirty-three times; in twenty of

* In other words, "Covenant" means agreement, or *at-one-ment* of minds. Hence, it was through the death, or the taking of the *life* of the appointed sacrifice, in the making of a covenant, that the agreement or atonement was effected, completed and made forcible. Therefore to effect and set forth an agreement, or at-one-ment, of minds, it was necessary to enter into a covenant, and make it forcible by the sacrifice of *life*. This important feature of a covenant, that is, confirming it by the sacrifice of the life of an appointed victim, was instituted by God, (Gen. 15 : 9-18,) doubtless, in order that all such covenants, should, in that, as well as some other features, *typify*, and point down to the New Covenant, and its confirmation by the death, the sacrifice of the *life* of "the Lamb of God," to make atonement or "reconciliation for the sins of the people." Which divinely appointed feature, and other features, strongly resemble similar features of a *Testament*, arising from the nature of things.

which, the Translators rendered it "*Covenant*," and in the other thirteen, they rendered it "*Testament*." I am aware there are those who think it incorrect to render *diatheke* by our English word testament; that it should have been rendered covenant in every instance; that a covenant and testament are not near enough alike to be used interchangeably, as they are used in our version. Whether this be correct or not, the writer has known exhibitions of pedantry on this point, to betray a lack of proper or correct knowledge of the covenants of promise.* There can scarcely be a question as to *diatheke* being correctly rendered "covenant," but the question is, was it not also consistently rendered "testament." Are not Covenants and Testaments when carefully considered and compared, very similar, in their chief or leading features? Is not their similarity quite sufficient to admit of their both being rendered from *diatheke*, just as many other Greek words are correctly rendered by *different* English words? Is not their similarity equal to that of many other words called *synonyms*? Let us see. Says Webster, "we rarely find two words *precisely* synonymous:" and quoting from *French*, whom he indorses, he says, "If no words are *synonymous* except those which are *identical* in use and meaning, so that one can in all cases be substituted for the other, we have scarcely *ten* such words in our Language. *Synonyms* are words of like significance, in the *main*, but with a certain *unlikeness* as well." Covenants were, and still continue to be, *variously* made. The same is true of Testaments. But in their *chief* features they were generally the same: these chief features however, are few. The Hebrew covenants of the old Testament, were originally an arrangement, disposition, dispensation, institution or appointment of God, to that Nation, consisting of a coming together, or agreement of minds, entered into, by two or more persons, and confirmed or completed by the death of an appointed victim, and an oath. Any agreement characterized by these chief or leading features, was a *covenant*. Now-a-days, very firm covenants are made and entered into without even all those few features. But as to Testaments, the Hebrews knew nothing of them, because the transmission of property, with them, after death was determined by law, and not by the will

* It matters not to the writer, whether "testament" be a correct rendering or not, so far as his purpose is concerned, which is simply to *illustrate* the truth by reference and comparison to some features of a testament: inasmuch as it is proper to illustrate truth by comparison with any thing that subserves such purpose.

or testament of the previous possessor; a custom so common among other Nations, especially during this dispensation, or Gentile times, although we also have laws, for the disposition of the property of intestates. However, the Testaments of this dispensation and the covenants of the old dispensation, by both of which property (or "good things to come") was transmitted, or granted on conditions, have a very strong resemblance, as we shall see. But first, as to the original words, rendered covenant and Testament. Parkhurst says in his Greek Lexicon, as follows:

Berith in the old Testament, which answers to *Diatheke* in the New Testament, "never strictly speaking" denotes a *covenant*. Therefore covenant is not the *radical* meaning of *Diatheke*.

He also says, "our translators have rendered the word *diatheke*, by *covenant*; and a very erroneous and dangerous opinion has been built on that exposition."

John Pickering, LL. D., in his "Comprehensive Lexicon of the Greek Language," says, the Greek *kaine diatheke*, mean New Testament—new covenant. He also says, that *diathemenos* is testator.*

Dr. Buck, in his Theological Dictionary, says, that *diatheke* "signifies *testament*, as all the blessings of the covenant are freely disposed to us."

Mr. Campbell says, as quoted and endorsed by Dr. Buck; "*kaine diatheke* is almost *always* rendered *New Testament*, yet the word *diatheke* by itself, is *generally* translated *covenant*."

Dr. Campbell also says, "That the *Hebrew* term corresponds much better to the English word *covenant* than *testament*, there can be no question, yet the word *diatheke*, in classical use, is more frequently rendered *testament*. The *proper Greek word for covenant is suntheke*, (placing together).

Dr. MacKnight says, "I acknowledge that in *classical Greek*, *diatheke* commonly signifies a *testament*." A classical Greek writer is one of the first rank; whose style is pure, *correct*, and refined.

* According to Parkhurst, and Pickering, and other Greek Lexicons, *Diatheke* signifies, simply "A Disposition, Dispensation, Institution, Appointment or arrangement." Parkhurst quotes from Junius as follows: "It signifies, saith Junius, neither a testament, nor a covenant, nor an agreement, but as the import of the word simply requires, a *disposition* or *institution* of God." Parkhurst continues; "The Hebrew word in the Old Testament, which almost constantly answered to *diatheke* in the Septuagint is *Berith* which properly denotes a purification or *purification-sacrifice*, never, strictly speaking, a *covenant*."

Webster says, "*Testament* is equivalent to *Covenant*."

It is well known, that the late Dr. Thomas, that great scholar, author, and wonderful biblical expositor, used *Testament* and *Covenant* synonymously.

Another learned author, and exceedingly able biblical expositor, Robert Roberts, of England, in his able work—"Twelve Lectures," page 219, fifth edition, says, in speaking of Heb. 9 : 16, 17, "Here he compares the promises to a testament or will, requiring the death of the individual making the will, before it can come into force. Now, in this case, God was the Testator, and it was impossible that God should die; but the necessity of the case was met, by God manifesting himself through Jesus, and, in him, submitting to death, by which the will, bequeathing eternal life and everlasting possession of the land, to Abraham and his multitudinous seed, came into force."

Dr. MacKnight, in speaking of these same passages, says, "seeing in the verses under consideration, *diatheke* may be translated *covenant*; (instead of *testament*, as in our version) and seeing, when so translated, these verses make a better sense, and agree better with the scope of the apostle's reasoning than if it were translated *a testament*; we can be at no loss to know which translation of *diatheke*, in these verses, ought to be preferred"

Now it is evident, if Dr. MacKnight, Dr. Clarke and others, could have seen that there was a strong resemblance between a covenant and testament, as to their chief features; that the resemblance is as great as between many other words regarded as synonyms; that the facts in the case were as well represented by a *testament* as by a *covenant*; the difficulty together with their objections would have disappeared. "The *scope* of the Apostle's reasoning," would have been as much in harmony with a testament as with a covenant.*

Let it be borne in mind that there was quite a difference, even between covenants; possibly as great a difference, as between a covenant and a testament; that there was quite a

*It should not be a matter of wonder, to those who understand the truth relative to the covenants, that Dr. MacKnight, Dr. Clarke and other commentators may not have had altogether correct views of this subject, when it is known how confused, conflicting and incorrect, their views, as expressed in their commentaries, are, on very many things in God's revealed Will and Plan of Salvation. It may be said of them, perhaps, as an able writer of England said of the translators of our version, in some cases, "they evidently failed to apprehend the Apostle's meaning."

difference also, even between *type* and *antitype*. That is, all the features of antitypes, were not correctly represented by the types; some features not represented at all. For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and *not the very image of the things;* therefore, God's new arrangement, or disposition, or institution, or new covenant, did not correspond, or exactly agree even with the old or type covenant, or any other covenant, or testament.

Hence, one able writer on this subject, said, "we cannot draw a *complete* analogy."

The late Dr. Thomas said, "the type and antitype are as correspondent as the *nature of things* would admit."

Arthur Andrew, an able writer of England says, "in connection with the New Covenant, Jesus Christ occupied the three-fold position of sacrifice, mediator, and one of the parties, (or "heirs," Rom. 8 : 1,) to the Covenant, which renders it *impossible* to find an exact correspondence either with the Mosaic type or with the *ordinary custom*." And yet, this same writer thinks, that because a covenant and an "ordinary will" do not exactly correspond, or nearly so, therefore *diatheke* should not be rendered *testament*. He further says, "From what has been said respecting the confirmation of the Mosaic Covenant, it will be seen that it *harmonizes*, so far as the *different circumstances* of the case would admit, with the Apostle's teaching concerning the confirmation of the Abrahamic Covenant." It will be noticed that the very same thing would be true, as applied to a *Testament*—harmony "so far as the circumstances of the case would admit."

Hence, it is an argument of little weight, against the synonymous use of Covenant and Testament, that their resemblance is not perfect: when we find that, even the resemblance between type and antitype was quite imperfect, and yet, that the antitype is called "the counterpart" of the type: and when we find also, that even the New Covenant, in several of its important features, did not correspond with its type covenant. We find that types were only intended to illustrate, or represent and indicate, certain features of the new arrangement or dispensation. It is no evidence therefore, that because *diatheke* was used to mean covenant, it could not properly mean testament also: for *many* Greek words have *more* than two definitions or uses, quite as different as Covenant and Testament. We have many cases of two different words, being used convertibly, and synonymously,

to express the same idea, which are not strictly the same in meaning, but still so nearly alike, that it is considered *correct*. Covenant and Testament may be of that class. A Testament has some features, which differ somewhat from a covenant; but as before shown, no greater difference than between type and antitype: while at the same time a Testament contains very nearly, those chief features which characterize all proper Hebrew Covenants. As *Deeds* are of different kinds, some containing features that others do not, some being called full covenant, and others limited covenant deeds, and various other differences, yet *all* containing the characteristics which constitute a Deed, and are therefore all correctly called Deeds: so may it be with Covenants. *

It will be found by careful consideration and comparison, therefore, that a Covenant and Testament are much nearer alike, than many suppose at first thought—that they are as nearly alike, as many other things called and known by one name.

A Covenant required an “*agreement* of minds,” by both or all the parties, either before (Ex. 19 : 8,) or at the death of the sacrifice (Ex. 24 : 3,) or after, or both. Deut. 5 : 2, and 29 : 1, Mark 16 : 16.

A Testament or Will requires the same; consent, agreement of minds, or acceptance; either before, at, or after the death of the Testator, in order to probate and inherit.

A Covenant was completed, confirmed or brought into force, by the *death* of the sacrifice or appointed victim. Ex. 24 : 5-8. Num. 20 : 12, Deut. 34 : 4-6. Heb. 9 : 18, 22.

A Testament or Will, is also *always* brought into force by the *death* of a person, and generally by the death of the testator: except in case by the terms of the Testament, the heirs be not allowed to inherit until the death of another person occurs. Heb. 9 : 16, 17.

* Covenants were of different kinds, that is, they were not all made in the same way. Therefore, it would not be well for any person to get into the mind a certain form of an “ordinary Covenant,” and judge altogether by that. Some Covenants were made and entered into without even that all important feature, the shedding of blood: The parties to a covenant may all agree and sign, have it attested or sworn to, completed and recorded, all in one day: or they may take many days, or even years. Or it might be agreed to and executed by one or more parties, and *after their death*, accepted, agreed to and executed, by one or more other parties, and so completed. It would nevertheless be literally a Covenant. A writing containing the offer or promise of a conditional gift, signed, attested, *accepted* and completed, would be a Covenant: and if the gift were not due until after the *death* of the giver, and the subsequent *acceptance* of the grantee; then it would be both a Covenant and a Testament.

A Covenant required a *Mediator*. Says an able English writer, "In many covenants between man and man, the mediator occupied an important position: for instance, where the parties had been at *enmity*, he would frequently, no doubt, be the means of the reconciliation. He was also a witness "to the confirmatory rite."

A Testament also has a mediator, generally called however, an "executor." He acts precisely, in very many cases, as a mediator, between the Testator and the Heirs or Legatees: very frequently, even *writing* the testament, (for we seldom see a *holographic* testament) and otherwise aiding the Testator in arranging the terms and bequests, satisfactory to himself and his heirs, settling former differences, and enmity, &c.; witnessing the will, and after the demise, proving by "oath," and administering the testament in its entirety, thus in all these things, acting as *mediator* between the parties.

A Covenant required a "token" or "seal."

So, also a Testament.

A covenant promised "good things," on conditions, of acceptance and obedience.

So also a Testament, on conditions of acceptance, taking out probate, and the performance of all other necessary legal steps.

It will be seen, that in all these features, which are the chief features of a Covenant; there is a very close resemblance between a Covenant and a Testament.

But let us now consider some of the features of *dissimilarity*, and see which of the two sets correspond the better with the facts and circumstances of the New Covenant under Christ.

A Covenant mediator, was never one of the Parties to the covenant.

A Testament mediator, or executor *may* be and frequently *is*. In this, the New Covenant agrees with a *Testament* better than a Covenant; for Christ, the mediator, *is* one of the parties—one of the "*heirs*." Rom. 8 : 17.

A Covenant mediator was never a "*surety*."

A Testament mediator or executor *may* be, and *is* in many cases. In this, the New Covenant agrees with a *Testament* better than a covenant. Heb. 7 : 22.

A Covenant required a *dividing asunder* of the sacrifice, by the death of which it was brought into force.

A Testament, although frequently brought into force by a violent death, yet it is not *required* that the body be divided asunder. So the New Covenant did not require the body of Christ to be so divided.

In case of Covenant, the blood of the dead victim, was sometimes *literally sprinkled* upon the covenantees, as a type, or representation of the sprinkling and purifying the *heart* by the blood of Christ—"the blood of the new testament, or covenant," through faith.

In case of Testaments or Wills, this of course is never done; although the *hearts* of the "heirs" are generally affected and softened, and not unfrequently made *better* by the death of the Testator. The New Covenant agrees better in this feature, with a testament than with a Covenant; for there was no *literal* sprinkling of the blood of Christ, the mediator and Testator, upon the covenantees or heirs. But by his precious blood, they get remission of sins and pure *hearts* through faith.

But there are other features, or rather *facts* of the New Covenant which were not correctly represented by either a Covenant or Testament of any kind. That is, the mediator of a covenant, was never the appointed sacrifice or victim. Neither was the mediator or executor of a Testament, ever the Testator. Such a feature of a covenant, or of a testament, could not, in the nature of things, be. But in the case of the New Covenant, Christ was both the Mediator and the appointed victim. Not only so, but the Mediator of the New Covenant, was also the *representative* maker, or Testator. God, his Father, was the real maker or Testator, both of the old or typical Covenant, and the New or antitypical Covenant. Moses was the actual *representative* of God, in the making and confirming, or bringing into force, the old Sinaitic typical Covenant: and being only the *representative* maker or Testator, he was of necessity the mediator, between the *real* maker or Testator, and the covenantees or heirs. Therefore, whatever God said, commanded or did, through or by Moses, was exactly the same, to all *intents* and *purposes*, as though he did it in person. Just so, in the case of the New Covenant, or antitype; Christ was of necessity the Mediator between the *real* maker or Testator, between his Father whom he represented in character, word and deed; and the Covenantees or "heirs:" and therefore, whatever God said, commanded or did, through or by Christ, was exactly the same, to all *intents* and *purposes*, as though he did it in person. Christ

was an infinitely better representative of God, than was Moses, who, although he was God's representative, yet he was only a *type* of the true or real representative of God: who, though not God in *person*, was however, God in mind, disposition, character and purpose; being the Logos which became flesh--the Imma-nu-el, who will be—"God manifested in flesh," the brightness of his Father's glory, and the express image of his person; or "the exact impress of his substance." (Dia.) He said, "I do nothing of myself, but as my Father hath taught me." "The Son can do nothing of himself." John said, "he whom God hath sent, speaketh the words of God." He therefore, as God's representative, laid down his life: he died as the Testator of the New Testament, or the appointed victim of the New Covenant; he himself, also being one of the "heirs," or covenantees. He therefore occupied the very singular, unique, or anomalous position, of Mediator between and on behalf of both Covenantor and Covenantees, or Testator and Heirs, and at the same time, being the representative of both, and the appointed victim, as well. He was therefore, not *fully* typified or represented by either a covenant, or testament, nor even by *both*: although *more* fully by both, than by either one.

As to the feature of a Testament, according to which Christ died as representative, or Substitutional Testator; which feature is opposed by an able writer of England, Arthur Andrew, before quoted; we may quote and apply, to sustain this feature, his own language, in reference to the reconciliation of the world to God. He says, "we find in this, as in other respects already noticed, that we cannot draw a *complete* analogy: Christ, through the Mediator, did not *himself* effect the reconciliation—for, "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself." (He means by this, that Christ was not the one who reconciled the world, but *God* being *in* Christ, reconciled the world unto *Himself*, through Christ. This, of course is correct,) —but (he says) he was the *means* by which the reconciliation was effected; and thus we read in Col. 1: 19, 20, that "it pleased the Father that in him should all fullness dwell, and, having *made peace* through the blood of his cross, *by him* to reconcile all things unto himself." This of course is all correct. But, if *God*, being *in* Christ, is the *reconciler*, "through the blood of his cross," why oppose the idea of *God in* Christ, being the *Testator*, "through the blood of his cross?" For, "through the blood of his cross," means through his *death*.

But to return, to the comparison of a covenant and testament. Covenants were never made by first making one, and subsequently making another, and *adding* the latter to the first, and both becoming one Covenant. But, that is a very common feature of a Testament; that is, first to make a Testament, and subsequently make a "*Codicil*," supplement or addition, and attach or add it to the original, as a *part* of the Will. In this also, the New Covenant agrees better with a Testament. But, this feature will be better illustrated when we come to consider the *relation* of the two covenants, old and new.

A Covenant was *never* confirmed or brought into force by the death of one of the parties.

A Testament *always*. Hence, in this feature the New Covenant agrees better with a Testament: for Christ was one of the "heirs"—chief heir—and representative of all the rest: and the fact that the parties to be benefited, are called "heirs," and "inheritors," and the land and life called an "inheritance," suggests a Testament instead of, or more than, a Covenant.

It has been thought by some, who, either have not understood the nature of some wills or testaments, or have not given the subject due consideration, that it is impossible in the nature of things, for a Testator to bring his testament into force, by the death of a substitute, or representative. But such a thing is quite common. That is, a Testator frequently bequeaths property to a friend, wife, brother, or other friend, during life, and then, even, in some cases, according to the testament of his said friend or substitute, to his heirs, thus bringing his testament *partially* into force at his own death, and fully into force by the death of his substitute or representative.

Dr. MacKnight asks, "was it ever known that the Testator was the mediator of his own *Testament*?" I ask, was it ever before known that the victim of a *Covenant* was the mediator also?

Again he asks, if it was ever known, "that it was necessary the testator of a *New Testament* should die to redeem the transgressions of a former *Testament*?" I ask, if it was ever known that it was necessary the covenanter or maker of a *new covenant* should die to redeem the transgressions of a former *covenant*, instead of the appointed victim, or even as both?

It will be seen therefore that seeming incongruities, exist equally in Covenants as in Testaments; or between the facts of the New Covenant, and its type.

Dr. MacKnight asks, "in what sense can the law of Moses be called a Testament?" I answer, the law of Moses, or the old Sinaitic covenant, consisted in a grant or promise of "good things" upon conditions. The conditions were contained in the law. The law or conditions were to be kept and obeyed by the people. The grant or promise was to be fulfilled on the part of God, through the *mediatorship* and *death* of Moses his *representative*. All Testaments contain *conditions*, either expressed or implied or both. If not expressed, the implied are, *acceptance* of the heirs, by acts, and steps necessary for the proof, probate, and reception of the bequests.

It has been said, that the idea, that it was necessary for Moses to *die* as mediator of the old Covenant or Testament, in the capacity of representative Testator before that covenant could be *fully* brought into force and the people permitted to enter the land by virtue of the covenant, has no foundation in the Scriptures: that there is no statement that Moses occupied such a position.

I reply, that every person properly informed in the Scriptures, ought to know, that all the chief acts and circumstances, at least, connected with Moses, who himself was one of the chief types of Christ, were typical of the acts and things of Christ in connection with the New Covenant. The Law Covenant, was an embodiment of types, symbols, and shadows. "All these things happened unto them for ensamples, or types; and they are written for our admonition." They serve therefore to instruct and enlighten, as well as to admonish us. We are thus enabled to judge of the antitype, by the type; and of the type, by the antitype. Many things, seem to us, to have merely "*happened*" unto that typical people, which we find turned out to be, important types. Whether God in his wisdom, caused them so to happen, in order that his purpose in Christ, should be properly foreshadowed, is not for us to say.

As to the death of Moses, it was certainly a very remarkable occurrence. It must be borne in mind, that not only Moses, but Aaron and Joshua, were also remarkable types of Christ. They all represented Christ in some of his wonderful characteristics, in some feature of his great and all-important work of Redemption and Salvation. Moses and Aaron both; represented him during his life and death. Moses typified Christ as law-giver, mediator, representative of God, and confirmer of the promises or covenant by his death. Aaron, as

the high priest of the Covenant, to die for his own sins, and for the sins of the people. Heb. 7 : 27. It so "*happened,*" that they both sinned and had to die, before the children of Israel were permitted to take possession of the land, by virtue of the covenant. God said to them, "*ye shall not bring this congregation into the land which I have given them.*" Num. 20 : 12. And when the congregation finally arrived in the plains of Moab, over against Jericho, by Jordan, near mount Nebo, and the time had come for them to pass over Jordan into the land, God told Moses to get up into the mountain, to the top of Pisgah, and *see* the land, "and die in the mountain whither thou goest." "So Moses the servant of the Lord died there in the land of Moab, according to the *word* of the Lord. And he (God) buried him in a valley in the land of Moab, but no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day. * * His eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated." Deut. 34 : 1-7. And God said of him, "My servant Moses, is *faithful* in all mine house:" which important truth, Paul repeated, saying, "Moses verily was *faithful* in all his house, as a servant, (that is, the house of Israel—God's constituted house, or family) for a testimony of those *things* which were to be *spoken after.*" Heb. 3 : 5.* And Moses three times, told the Children of Israel, that the Lord was angry with *him* for *their* sakes! "Saying *thou* shalt not go in thither." Deut. 1 : 37. And that he afterwards "*besought* the Lord, saying, I pray thee, let *me* go over, and see the good land that is beyond Jordan, that goodly mountain, and Lebanon. But the Lord was wroth with me *for your* sakes, and would not hear me: and said unto me, let it suffice thee; *speak no more unto me of this matter.* Get thee up into the top of Pisgah, and lift up thine eyes westward, and northward, and southward, and eastward, and behold it with thine eyes: for thou shalt not go over this Jordan. But charge Joshua, and encourage him: for *he* shall go over before this people, and he shall cause them to inherit the land which thou shalt see." Deut. 3 : 23-29.

Then again, the Prophet David, four hundred years after the death of Moses and Aaron, in speaking of the wickedness and disobedience of the Children of Israel in the wilderness.

* Dr. Clarke says of this,—"*for a testimony of those things*"—Every ordinance under the law was *typical*; every thing bore a *testimony* to the things which were to be spoken after i. e. to Jesus Christ, the suffering, death, and the glory which should follow; and to his gospel in all its parts. The *faithfulness* of Moses consisted in his scrupulous attention to every ordinance of God."

said, "they angered him (God) also at the waters of strife, so that it *went ill with Moses for their sakes*: because they provoked his spirit, so that *he spake unadvisedly* with his lips." Ps. 106 : 32, 33. And in verse 16, he says, "they envied Moses also in the camp, and Aaron the *saint* of the Lord."

Now what do we learn from all the circumstances relative to the death of Moses? We learn 1st, That the death of Moses was not a *natural* one: for his eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated.

2d. That he therefore had to die to suit the purpose of God. The time had arrived for them to pass over and possess the land.

3d. That he had to die, not altogether because he had disbelieved God on one occasion, at the waters of Meribah, and being provoked by their chiding him, and their striving with the Lord, had spoken unadvisedly: that is, when God commanded him to "take the rod, and gather the assembly together, thou and Aaron thy brother, and *speak ye unto the rock* before their eyes; and it shall give forth his water," they did not believe God; that is, they did not believe the rock would "give forth his water," by being *spoken to*; hence, "Moses lifted up his hand, and with his rod he *smote the rock* twice," at the same time "he spoke unadvisedly with his lips," saying, "Hear now ye rebels; must *we* fetch you water out of this rock?" Num. 20 : 7-13, and 27 : 14. This was both doing and talking differently from what God had commanded them; and Moses was the chief actor. Although the *first* time, 38 years before, God *told* Moses to *smite* the rock. But this time he told him to *speak* to it. This illustrates the necessity of doing *exactly* what God commands, "without adding thereto or diminishing therefrom." Deut. 4 : 2, and 12 : 32.

4th. That although he had thus displeased God, yet some time *afterward*, God said of him, "my servant Moses, is *faithful* in all mine house." (Besides being "very *meek*, above all the men which were upon the face of the earth.") Num. 12 : 3, 7, 8.

5th. That, although he had been faithful, and was meek, and had not been guilty of such great wickedness as was King David, long afterwards, and yet the prophet was sent to David, to tell him that God had "put away thy sin; thou shalt not *die*;" yet, when Moses was exceeding anxious to go over and see the good land, and besought God to let him go, he would

not hear him, but said, "speak *no more* unto me of this matter!" His mouth was thus closed. It looks therefore, as if he must have been a *type* of him, of whom it was written, "he opened not his mouth; he is brought as a *lamb* to the slaughter, he was cut off out of the land of the living; for the transgressions of my people was he stricken; he had done no violence, neither was deceit found in his mouth. Yet it pleased the Lord to *bruise* him." It does not appear by the record, however, that either his *blood*, or the blood of Aaron was shed; as the blood of *animal* sacrifices was included and required as a *part* of the type. But the fact which Moses impressed on their minds three different times during the day, the day of his death; that God was angry with him for *their sakes*, and would not let him go over with them into the land; but that he must *die*, as his brother Aaron had; that their lives had to be sacrificed, as it were, "for their sakes," must have made them feel very bad; and which, together with their acceptance of and entering into the covenant the second time and Nationally, as they had done that very day of his death; must have been the completion and full confirmation of the typical covenant; * and not only that, but also a typical *reconciliation*. For, they "wept for Moses in the plains of Moab *thirty days*; so the days of weeping and mourning for Moses were ended." So also "they mourned for Aaron thirty days, even all the house of Israel;" and God then immediately said to Joshua, "Moses my servant is *dead*; now *therefore* arise, go over this Jordan, thou, and all this people, unto the land which I do give to them." And Joshua, after the death of Moses, "was full of the spirit of wisdom; for Moses had laid his hands upon him; and the children of Israel *hearkened* unto him, and *did* as the Lord commanded Moses." Here was a *reconciliation*; Moses almost seemed to have a resurrection; for, by the laying on of his hands, his spirit and wisdom, being imparted to Joshua, still lived and actuated him, as the spirit of Elijah in John the baptist.

The *purpose* of God required, that "those things which were to be spoken after"—things of the New Covenant, and "the righteousness of God without the law,"—should be "*witnessed*, by the law:" that the types and shadows, symbols and representations, of the law, should be "for a *testimony*." Hence, the

* The able writer Arthur Andrew, before quoted, says, the Mosaic Covenant, "was indeed *partially* brought into force in the wilderness, but not that part which had relation to the possession of the land."

blood of animal sacrifices, the Sinaitic law, Aaron. Moses, Joshua, David &c., were all used, by the infinite manifold wisdom of God, for that purpose. To suit that purpose, "Aaron, the *saint* of the Lord," as David called him, had to be "stripped of his garments, to be put on Eleazar his son," and go "up into Mount Hor, at the *commandment* of the Lord, and *die* there," as the *typical* high priest of the New Covenant. Moses also, the *meekest* man "upon the face of the earth," and *faithful*, had to *die* when "his eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated;" as a *type*, like Aaron, and in connection with him, of that Prophet *like unto* Moses, that was to be raised up, more than 1400 years after; who, though like unto Moses, was to be much better, and greatly superior to Moses every way, and yet, *like* Moses and Aaron, and "without sin," he was to *die*, to lay down his life without opening his mouth to object, for the *sake of*, or on *behalf* of, and for the *sins* of the people, as Mediator between God and man, and as the representative of *both*, to fully confirm the new Covenant, and also to make *reconciliation*, "through the blood of his cross."

But Joshua was permitted, and according to the same purpose, required, to live, and have the honor of going before, and leading the people into the land, to possess it by virtue of the covenant, which was now fully brought into force, and which he was to administer, typically of the true *immortal* Joshua, now soon to come. And David also, although he committed a *great* sin, a *shocking* deed, by which, as Nathan the Prophet told him, he gave "great occasion to the *enemies* of the Lord, to blaspheme," and which has been appropriated and used by the enemies of the Lord, for that very purpose of *blasphemy*, ever since; even clear down to the times of the ungodly Robert Ingersoll, of America, and Charles Bradlaugh, of England; and many others of our faithless times equally noted, and foolish: yet, it was not according to God's purpose, that David should *die* for that terrible crime. His purpose could not be thus thwarted by David's wickedness. Although God was greatly displeased, and punished him severely, yet, it evidently would not have suited his purpose, that David should *die* then; for, eight years before this "*happened*," God had promised David, saying, "I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom;" (2 Sam. 7 : 12;) and this "*seed*," which was *Solomon*, had not yet been born. It would therefore have been *impossible* for God to fulfill that

promise to David, without overlooking his sin, and letting him live. Hence, "Nathan said unto David, the Lord hath put away thy sin; *thou shalt not die.*" 2 Sam. 12 : 13. Solomon was a very important feature in God's purpose, as a significant *type* of Christ, yet to be fulfilled in antitype. It is evident therefore, that the death of Moses and Aaron, before the children of Israel could enter in and possess the land by virtue of the Covenant, was not *altogether* in consequence of *their own comparatively* trifling sin, but, that the purpose of God, made it necessary, as a type of Christ and his death, and that their death, therefore bear a similar relation to the old Covenant, that Christ's death does to the New Covenant.

It has been thought by some that *diatheke* could not properly be rendered *testament*, "because, notwithstanding all its blessings were procured by the death of Christ, and are most freely bestowed, it lost any validity, which as a testament, it is thought to have received by the *death* of Christ, when he revived again on the third day." But, it will be noticed that Christ's revival on the third day, was not typified or represented by a covenant, any more than by a testament. The slain sacrifice or victim, never revived to life again. When the victim was slain, its blood shed, and it was dead, the covenant was in force. So the moment a Testator is actually dead, the personal estate may be taken possession of and taken away *immediately*, and the title of the real estate, passes at once, and becomes vested in the heirs, in fee simple, or according to the terms of the testament; subject only to the necessary steps of acceptance, probate and possession, which steps may be taken immediately after the expiration of the testator; although as before said, testaments and laws are various. Although the *revival* of Christ was not typified by either an ordinary Covenant, or Testament, it was however, in the Mosaic arrangement, or order of things, whether it be called a covenant or testament, or both, *distinctly typified* and represented by *Joshua*. He was a type of Christ in his immortal, Spirit Nature. As Joshua survived Moses and in his "*Spirit of wisdom,*" was prepared in "*three days*" after the death of Moses, to lead the people in, to possess the land, and to administer the Mosaic Testament or Covenant; so, in antitype the true Joshua revived, after three days, and was prepared, by virtue of his Spirit Nature, to give the true people of God, possession of the true inheritance and to administer the New Covenant in its entirety, when the appointed time arrives. But on this point, I shall have more to say in its proper place.

Christ is the antitypical embodiment of *all* types. To him all types point. In him all types concentrate. In his wonderful manifold character, he is the FULLNESS of all. He represented in the New arrangement, the victim, mediator, high priest, covenantor, covenantee, testator, heir, the Logos or Jehovah; and he is now the Advocate or intercessor of his brethren, and is to be the future king of this entire Planet.

Now then, I think from what I have said on this subject, it will be seen, that the facts and circumstances of God's new antitypical arrangement, do not altogether correspond with the old or typical arrangement, whether it be considered as a Covenant, or as a Testament, or both: and that altogether, they agree with the features of the latter, as well as with those of the former: and that there is a greater similarity between a Covenant and a Testament, than many suppose: and that Christ the great central figure of the new arrangement, or order of things, is not fully represented by either, but better and more fully, by both. This suggests the idea, that, because some features of the New Arrangement, would be better represented by a Testament and because Gentile Nations in the times of the Gentiles, when the New Covenant or Testament was to be preached, were better acquainted with them, than with the old Hebrew Covenants; may be the reason why the Holy Spirit, in and through Zacharias, at the birth of his son, John the Baptist, which was the first time: and why Christ the next time: at the institution of the Lord's Supper, and afterwards the Apostles; used the word *diatheke*—the *only Greek word* that can be rendered "Testament"—instead of making use of the word *Suntheke*, which Dr. Campbell, endorsed by Dr. Buck, in his Theological Dictionary, says, is "*the proper Greek word for Covenant.*" If Dr. Campbell and Dr. Buck be right, it is difficult to account for the Holy Spirit, Christ and the Apostles, using *diatheke* instead of *Suntheke*, except upon the grounds above mentioned—that they intentionally used *diatheke*—the only word that could be translated Testament as well as Covenant—so that by the use of *both*, the all-important Divine Arrangement, might be more fully illustrated, and better understood. The New Anglo-American Revision, by a large body of men, learned in both Hebrew and Greek, from several of the leading Denominations of England and America; renders *diatheke*, Heb. 9: 16, 17, "*testament:*" and in the margin, it is said, "*the Greek word here used, signifies both covenant and testament.*" But what is stronger evidence

than even this, and stronger than all other, is, that the *facts*, in the case are equally well, if not better, represented by a testament, and that both covenant and testament serve to illustrate the case, better than either one. The word *testamentum* is often used in Latin to express the Hebrew word which signifies Covenant. Paul, in speaking of the two arrangements, (Heb 1: 10,) the one confirmed by the blood of bulls and of goats, not being able to take away sins, but by its shadows pointing down to the true sacrifice, and referring to what David had prophetically said, showing that Gods will was to be made manifest by the coming of Christ to take away the first and, to establish the second by his own obedience and death, uses the word *theleme*, which is correctly rendered "will," and applied to both the "first" and "second" arrangement, or covenant.* Wiley Jones, a very able biblical writer, of Norfolk, Virginia, says, "The fact that the word translated "testament" (diatheke) means also a "covenant," produces no obscurity in the text, but rather brings out the meaning *more clearly*; because the testament or will referred to, contains within itself, the nature of a covenant also; inasmuch as although it is brought into force by a *death*, yet its bequests are to be given to the heirs on conditions which, as in a covenant, must be *agreed* to and complied with by them." Taking everything into consideration therefore, the writer deems it better to use Covenant and Testament interchangeably.

The covenant made with Abraham, called the "everlasting covenant," "new covenant," &c., was made with him when 99 years old, Gen. 17: 1-11; having been commenced twenty-three years before. when he was about 76 years old. Circumcision of the flesh was a part—the "token," "sign," or "seal"—of that covenant. Gen. 17: 11. Rom. 4: 11. That is, circumcision was the first or beginning of the *conditions* of acceptance and obedience to the covenant, to be performed on the part of Abraham and all his posterity, as evidence of faith and obedience, and as a *shadow* of the circumcision of the heart, in Christ, and of the ultimate putting off the flesh and blood body or nature, at the change from the mortal, to the immortal or "Divine nature." About 26 years after this, when Abraham

* Dr. Clarke in commenting on this passage—"that he may establish the second"—says "The offering the body of Jesus once for all. It will make little odds in the meaning, if we say, "He taketh away the first *covenant*, that he may establish the second *Covenant*; He takes away the first dispensation, that he may establish the second; He takes away the law, that he may establish the gospel. In all these cases, the sense is nearly the same. I prefer the *first*." That is, *Covenant*.

was a hundred and twenty five years old, this covenant was concluded, with him, so far as he was concerned, and "sworn" to, by God, after he had fully tried Abraham, and after adding to the stipulations of the covenant, that Abraham's seed (Christ) shall possess the gate of his enemies," (that is, conquer and rule over them,) &c. Gen. 22 : 16, 17. God first *commenced* to make the covenant by calling Abraham out from his native country, and from his kindred, and from his "father's house," unto a land that he would show him. Then he *promised* Abraham that he would make of him a "great nation, and "bless" him, and make his "name great," and that "in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." "And unto thy seed will I give this land," all the land of Canaan. "To thee will I give it and to thy seed." "And I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee. And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God." Gen. 12 : 1-7 and chap. 13 : 14, 15, and chap. 15 : 4-18, and chap. 17 : 7, 8. Such, in brief, is the covenant made with Abraham.

About 68 years after this, and after Abraham was dead, this same covenant was made with Isaac. Gen. 26 : 3. And about 44 years later, the same covenant was made with Jacob. Gen. 28 : 13, and chap 35 : 9.

About 430 years after God made the covenant with Abraham, when he appeared to Moses to send him to bring the Children of Israel out of Egypt, he said to Moses, "I have established my covenant with them, (Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,) to give them the land of Canaan, the land of their pilgrimage, wherein they were strangers." * * And I will bring you in unto the land, concerning the which I did swear to give it to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob : And I will give it to *you* (the Children of Israel) for an heritage." Ex. 6 : 4, 8.

About 450 years later, a *new development* of this covenant, was made with David. 2 Sam. 7 : 8-19, and ch. 23 : 5. 1 Chron. 17 : 7-17. Ps. 89 : 3, 4, 27-37. Although this covenant was made with Abraham long before the Children of Israel went into bondage in Egypt, yet, it distinctly included the promise of their deliverance from that bondage, and of the possession and occupancy of the promised land of Canaan.

Gen. 15 : 13-16. Ex. 2 : 24. Ps. 105. But this occupancy of the land by them, was only on condition of obedience—for so long a time as the Nation continued to be obedient. For when God had commenced to bring about this great deliverance and exodus through Moses, to give them possession of the promised land, it seems that he, in his wisdom, and for the accomplishment of his great purpose, made an *addition* to the everlasting covenant. That is, an *additional* “covenant;” which should be a *law* (not the ten commandments *alone*, for they alone, or separately, are not the law, and *never so called*,) based or founded upon those great moral principles, included in Right and Duty. Which law should have ten fundamental words or commandments, recognizing those principles, and containing and making known all his requirements, and enforcing observance and obedience by penalties of various kinds. It will be observed that this added covenant, and the law, are so interwoven, or rather so nearly the same, that in treating upon the covenants, much repetition is therefore unavoidable. It seems that the purpose of God required that the duties of this added law covenant, should be at the same time, a system of types and symbols, foreshadowing “good things to come” through the promised seed and the everlasting inheritance of the promised land. The ten fundamental words or commands, were, by synecdoche, called his “covenant,” as before shown, Deut. 4 : 13, although the covenant includes the entire “law of Moses.” *This* covenant and law are therefore synonymous, and used interchangeably. We are informed as to one reason why this law was given. Paul, in speaking of the covenant made with Abraham, says the law “was added because of transgressions.” In their ignorance or moral darkness, as to what was right and wrong, as to duties towards God, and their fellow-man, there being up to the time of their exodus, but very little *revealed* law, the children of Israel were constantly transgressing those great moral principles of Right and Duty, (“for until the law, that is *before* the law, sin was in the world; but sin is not imputed when there is no law,” Rom. 5 : 13,) as well as his positive requirements. He therefore “gave them the law by the hand of Moses,” as before shown; to reveal or make known more plainly what was sin. “For by the law is the knowledge of sin.” Rom. 3 : 20. He gave the law, “that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful.” Rom. 7 : 13. Hence, Paul said “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. 7 : 7.

It will be observed that this law covenant which was added to the Abrahamic covenant, was therefore really a *part* of the Abrahamic, so long as it was in force. It *began* to be added, by the requirement of *circumcision*, which was of itself, by synecdoche, called a "covenant," (Gen. 17 : 9-13,) it being the *beginning* of the law or added covenant, which was completed at Sinai.

At the time God added circumcision as the beginning of the law covenant, which was 15 years after he had made the original covenant with Abraham, he said to Abraham "this is my covenant which ye shall *keep* between me and you and thy seed after thee ; Every man child among you shall be circumcised." Gen. 17 : 10. This was the beginning of the *conditions-part* of the Abrahamic covenant. The balance of the conditions for the covenantees to "*keep*" were given near and at Sinai. Here then we find contained in the Abrahamic covenant, the *germ* of the law covenant—the germ of its promised deliverance from bondage, and occupancy of the land, being in these words: "That nation whom they shall serve, will I judge ; and afterwards *shall they come out* with great substance," * * "in the fourth generation, *they shall come hither* again ;" Gen. 15 : 14, 16, and the germ of the conditions to be *kept* on their part—the germ of the entire law—being the ordinance and law of circumcision of the flesh, as above shown. I said circumcision was called a covenant by synecdoche. I mean that it being a *part*, the beginning, of the law covenant, it was therefore called a covenant—a *part* being put for the *whole*. Besides, it was really a part, the conditions-part of the Abrahamic covenant for the time being. But this law covenant was only added "till the seed (Christ) should come to whom the promise was made." Gal. 3 : 19. It was given to be a schoolmaster or tutor to instruct, and point, and bring, the children of Israel (not all nations, except individuals who sojourned with them and submitted to circumcision and all the law) that they might be justified by faith, the law being powerless for justification. But after he in whom they were to have faith, was come, they were no longer under a schoolmaster. Gal. 3 : 24, 25. This law was to teach them what was right and duty, to teach them all God's requirements, and just *how* or *what way* they were to observe and keep his commandments—his *law* ; that was, by attending

to all his appointed sacrifices, ordinances, rites and ceremonies, on the particular appointed days, seasons and places; all of which, by their types and shadows pointed down to Christ, the body or substance, the antitype, in which and in whom, *all* types and shadows *began* to be fulfilled.

Just *before* God completed this law covenant, when he was just about to complete, and dedicate, and record it through Moses, he told Moses to tell the children of Israel as follows: "Ye have seen what I did to the Egyptians," &c. Now, therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my *covenant* (which he had commenced, or made in part, and was just about to complete) then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people," &c. Ex. 19:5. Moses told them what the Lord said, and they,—“all the people answered” together and said, all that the Lord hath spoken we will do,” that is obey his voice, keep his covenant; &c., although they had not yet heard the covenant, except the three first items, circumcision, Passover and Sabbath. But God having thus through Moses got them to *agree* to keep it in its entirety, by obeying his voice, &c., proceeded at once to have Moses get the people ready, so as to *hear* his voice, when he should come down on Sinai, on the “third day,” and “speak” to them. And he came down on the third day, as he had said, and “*spake* all these words”—the words of the covenant—beginning with the ten commandments—the ten *fundamental* words. But when he had got thus far, the people “*removed* and stood *afar* off,” and said to Moses, “speak *thou* with us and we will *hear*; but let not God speak with us, lest we die.” But Moses told them the object God had, “that his *fear* may be before your faces, that ye *sin* not.” Such was their disposition, and their character, and their ignorance, in consequence of the constant toil, oppression, and persecution, which they had endured all their lives, in Egyptian bondage, that it was no doubt *impossible* for God to rule, direct and control them, and make them obedient, upon any other principle but “*fear*.” Hence, he took this course, as Moses said. And hence, also, all the threatening penalties of the law. It was not until after he had trained, and educated them for *forty years* in the wilderness, in every possible way, consistent with the constitution of man as a free agent, and responsible being, and consistent with his own all wise character and purposes; I say it was not until 40 years had thus passed and after the 600,000 “rebels” had all died, that he required them to “do *right* and *good*,” and to *love*

him with all their heart—to obey him through love! (Deut. 6 : 5, 18,) That is, directly, in so many words!

But to return. Although the people refused to *hear God* speak to them any more, he did not stop giving the law, but Moses drew near, and he continued, saying to Moses, “Thus *thou shalt say* unto the children of Israel,” &c., thus proceeding to speak and set forth the “sacrifices,” burnt offerings, peace offerings, feasts, judgments &c., appertaining to the covenant; as we have it in the 20th, 21st, 22nd, 23rd, and a part of the 24th, chapters. Moses then wrote all the words in a book naming it “the book of the covenant;” which covenant he then dedicated, by blood, bringing it into force at once, as the law of God, by which the people were to be governed. But to which, such additions were made, from time to time, as were found necessary, in the wisdom of Jehovah their King. When Moses dedicated or ratified the covenant, Ex. 24 : 7, 8, although they had agreed to obey, as above shown, yet “all the people with one voice,” agreed again, that “*all that the Lord hath said* will we do, and be obedient.” And Moses said “behold the blood of the *Covenant*, which the Lord hath made with you concerning *all* these words,” not merely the ten words or ten commandments but *all* the words of the Lord from chapter 20 : 1, to the end of chapter 23. Paul says “*every precept.*” Heb. 9 : 19. All were agreed to by the people, and all included in the covenant—the law covenant, or ten commandment covenant.

Here were all the features of a proper real covenant—a written covenant, *agreed* to between God and the people, and by the *blood*, dedicated, ratified, confirmed, and made forcible. But all these acts of completion did not preclude the addition of other stipulations, as found necessary; provided it was not a “*super-addition*,” that is, something to “*annul or invalidate*” the previously ratified covenant. Gal. 3 : 15-17, Dia. The completion consisted in all that was necessary in order to bring it into force, and render it available for the purposes intended.

More than thirty days before God gave Moses the two tables of stone, containing “the testimony,” and a long time before the ark of the testimony was made, he told Moses to tell the people as follows: “And thou shalt put into the ark the testimony which I *shall give* thee.” Ex. 25 : 15.

The covenant with Abraham promised a “seed” in type (Isaac) and antitype (Christ): and that it should be a “one” and “multitude” seed, both natural and spiritual. Isaac, the

natural, or typical "one seed," and the 12 Tribes, the natural, or typical "multitude seed." Christ the spiritual "one seed," and his "brethren"—all the members of the "one body," the spiritual "multitude seed."

The promise of a spiritual multitude seed (all "*in Christ*," or the "one body") is yet in the process of fulfillment. When the body is complete, they are to *inherit* that promised holy land, as an everlasting possession, and under, but jointly, with Christ their Head, its Rulership forever.

One feature of the covenant made with Abraham, was this. "And thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies." Gen. 22 : 17. This is the *germ* of the Kingdom of God, of the ultimate subjugation of all other powers and Kingdoms of earth, by him who is to be "King of Kings and Lord of Lords," and to "subdue all things unto himself," and "put down all rule and all authority," and become the "one King and one Lord over the whole earth;" when the government of this entire Planet shall consist of one pure, glorious, eternal Theocracy.

This feature of the everlasting covenant, "thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies," is therefore of the utmost importance. It was especially so to King David, as in the development of this germ, it came to be an "everlasting covenant *with him*," "even the sure mercies of David," Isa. 55 : 3, making known that God had "*chosen*" out of all the Tribes of Israel, the Tribe of Judah, and of the house of Judah, God had chosen *him*, not only to be King over Israel, but had given the kingdom to him and his sons *forever*; (2 Chron. 13 : 5-8;) and had *sworn* by himself, that the throne and kingdom of the Lord—the Kingdom of Israel—should never "*utterly*" depart, or be taken from his house and sons: (1 Chron. 28 : 4. 2 Sam. 7 : 13, 16. Ps. 89 : 1-36,) and that therefore the "seed," (Christ) promised in the covenant with Abraham, more than 800 years before, which seed was to possess the gate of his enemies, was to come through his house or family, was to be *one of his sons!*

This was glad tidings to David. It caused him to rejoice, and sing and praise God continually. Hence he said, "His praise shall be continually in my mouth." Ps. 34 : 1. And he said, "he hath made with *me* an everlasting covenant, ordered in all things and *sure*; for this is all my salvation, and all my desire." 2 Sam. 23 : 5. It will be seen therefore, that this everlasting covenant with David, was a great and wonderful

development, of the "everlasting covenant" made with Abraham so long before.

The covenant with Abraham, had been typically confirmed or ratified by sacrificial victims, (Gen. 15 : 9-18,) and by an oath, (Heb. 6 : 13-17,) and in Isaac, and by circumcision, and sacrifices under the law, all pointing down to Christ the promised seed ; and also, by Abraham and his seed actually going into the covenanted land for the time being, and occupying it typically, also by the miracles of Christ and the Apostles. So also was the covenant made with David confirmed in the same way, that is, by an oath, and in Solomon, and by David himself and his sons being actually typical kings, of the typical kingdom, in the same covenanted land.

But it was the seed, Christ, by "the sacrifice of himself," by his "own precious blood," that these covenants were anti-typically, really and fully confirmed or ratified and brought into force. These covenants are spoken of in the plural by Paul, Eph. 2 : 12, calling them "the covenants of *promise*," which contain the "*one hope*;" but they are really embraced and included in the *one* everlasting covenant made with Abraham ; called by Paul "*the new covenant*," "the better covenant," "the second" covenant, Heb. 12 : 24, ch. 8 : 6, 7, 8, 13, and "the new testament," "the second will," or testament ; ch. 9 : 15 and 10 : 9 ; and which Abrahamic covenant, became "the *new covenant*" by the real dedication or ratification of the blood of Christ. Just in a similar way, this Abrahamic covenant, and the law covenant, or Sinaitic covenant, were called by Paul, Gal. 4 : 24, "the *two covenants*," although as I have shown, the Abrahamic covenant, clearly contained the *germ* and beginning of the Sinaitic covenant ; and which Paul himself says was "*added*" to the covenant made with Abraham 430 years before the law covenant.

Christ was the "*Mediator* of the new covenant, or testament, Heb. 12 : 24, and *representative* Testator. God, his Father, was the real Testator. "Where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the *death* of the testator." For a testament or Will, is of force, *after* men are dead. Heb. 9 : 16, 17. A will or testament is never in force, while the testator is alive, until after his death. So in case of this great covenant or testament, it was necessary that it should be purged, dedicated or ratified, and brought into force, by the death and blood, of either the Testator, or his Divine Representative. Christ

was "God manifested in flesh." Tim. 3 : 16. He was "the express image of his person," or "the exact impress of his substance." Dia. Heb. 1 : 3. He said, "I do nothing of myself, but as my Father hath taught me." John said, "he whom God hath sent speaketh the *words of God*." Christ said, "I came down from Heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me." "Lo, I come *to do thy will* O God. He taketh away the first (will or testament) that he may establish the second" (will or testament) the *new* covenant. Heb. 10 : 9. Whatever God did through Christ, was just the same as if he did it himself in person. Whatever Christ, God's Son and Divine Representative did, was done by God. Christ therefore acting for God, and doing his will, *died*, not only as a covenant sacrifice, or appointed victim to ratify or confirm, and bring into force the Abrahamic covenant, but, which was a similar thing, as testator of God's will or testament, because, as a covenant never hath force while the appointed confirmatory sacrifice liveth, so "where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator."* Heb. 9 : 16. Christ is also called the "mediator of the new covenant," and the "Surety of a better testament," the "minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to *confirm the promises* made unto the fathers," Rom. 15 : 8. He thus confirmed and brought into force the everlasting covenant, and made it available for justification, remission of sins, righteousness, eternal life, and everlasting inheritance of the Kingdom in the covenanted land.

Therefore now, all who believe in the covenant promises, thus believing *into* Christ, and becoming covenantees—"Abraham's *seed*, and HEIRS according to the promise," Gal. 3 : 17-29, are to be kings and priests, and reign in that land under and jointly with the one seed, the Grand Heir.

All who under the *old* covenant—the law—believed in the promises of the Abrahamic covenant, with the faith of Abraham who "staggered not at the promise," but "being *fully persuaded* that what God had *promised*, he was able to perform," or believed as Philip required of the Eunuch, *with all their heart*, and walked "in the *steps* of that faith," and kept the law in its

* The late Dr. Thomas, before quoted, said, "It is a well established principle of the sacred writings, that what *the Everlasting Father* does by his agents, he is considered as doing by himself. There is a maxim in laws similar to this which runs some how thus: *qui facit per alios, facit per se*, what one doth by, or through, others, he does of himself. If this be borne in mind, many seeming incongruities will be harmonized." *Elpis Israel* P. 164.

letter and spirit, as far as possible, and "*died* in faith not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off," Heb. 11 : 13, Rom. 4 : 12-21; all such had their sins remitted, in promise or prospect, and *actually* by "the precious blood of Christ the Lamb of God."

This everlasting covenant is to be *completed*, (See Diaglott Heb. 8 : 8,) or finished, *after* the king comes, with the houses of Judah and Israel, as a Nation, and subsequently with all other Nations, until "all Nations shall serve and obey him (Christ) and become blessed *in* him; by being "brought into the bond, or delivering of the covenant." Ezk. 20 : 33-44, and ch. 37 : 26, Isa. 61 : 8, Jer. 37 : 40, Heb. 8 : 7-12, and ch. 10 : 16.

The relation the old and new covenants sustain to each other, may be more clearly seen and understood by comparison to a will or testament, which they so strongly resemble. Their relation was similar to a will and codicil. "The last will and testament," as it is called in the nomenclature of our civil law, of a person, is frequently made and executed several years before death. But when the Testator is about to die, having since he made his will, made some addition or change in his property, or for some other reason, he frequently finds it necessary to make *additional* bequests or legacies, or stipulations. The document or instrument, by which this is done, is called a "*codicil*," supplement or *additional* will; and is signed and executed by the Testator, and "*added*" or attached, to the original will, and thus becomes a *part* of the Testator's last will and testament.

To Illustrate. We might suppose a case of common occurrence; that the Testator having made valuable acquisitions to his real estate since making his will, and on account of not having been well treated by one of his sons, he had openly avowed his intention to not include that son as an equal heir or devisee in the division of such newly acquired property, unless that son make proper apology and satisfaction, which the father much desires. He therefore, before making the codicil, chooses his younger brother, (who greatly *loved* the Testator, even as Jonathan loved David, "as he loved his own soul,") to be the sole executor of his will, to act also as mediator between him and the disobedient son; to go to that son, and make known the conditions of his proposed additional will and endeavor to gain his consent to apologize and make satisfaction, and also to obtain the consent of all the sons, to this new arrangement of

equal division, on the ground of such proper apology and satisfaction, on the part of the wayward son. His appointed brother also to act after the Testator's death, (like Joshua,) as sole executor to administer the will, and carry it into effect in all respects. His Brother consents to act; mediates and goes back and forth between the father and sons, until the matter is arranged, and agreement and consent of all parties obtained, through the kind words and acts of the brother and uncle; whose love for the dying Testator, is so great, that he is almost, or quite willing to *die* in his behalf, or in his stead, in the capacity of a mediator, if necessary.

The Testator then proceeds to make the codicil, or additional will. Ex. 19: 5-8 and 24: 3-8. This consent or agreement of minds on the part of the heirs, or legatees is always, necessary *after* the death of the Testator, whether before or not, (in the case of all *testaments*,) by acceptance, and proof of its validity, in order to its being probated, according to law, and in order for the heirs to obtain possession of the inheritance.

We might suppose the estate of the Testator to have consisted of the lovely family home in the City, which was devised by the original will to his wife; and also of an immense two thousand acre plantation or farm, including all the late acquisitions up to the time of his death; rich and fertile, not far away, occupied at the time of his demise, by tenants at will; which was bequeathed by the will to all his six sons equally; the youngest being at that time, only eleven years old: all to come into possession and equal division, in harmony with expressed conditions, in the will, at majority of the youngest son. But that during the time between the death of the Testator and the said majority, or coming of legal age of the youngest son, which might be several years, they might all take possession and *occupy* the land, upon certain conditions, all of which could not then, at the time of making the will, be determined upon, and expressed in the will.

Therefore about five years before the youngest son would attain his majority, or become of age, the Testator finding he was about to die, and knowing that according to his will made several years before, his sons, as his heirs, could not legally come into possession of their estates as *fee simple* inheritors, until the time appointed in the original will, at majority of the youngest son, which would be five years; and knowing that although his will contained a clause granting them the privilege

of *occupying* the land until it could be legally divided, and each one enter upon and inherit his own share of the patrimony, for life, under legal title, according to the terms of the will, but that most of the *conditions* of such occupancy not having been at that time decided upon, and expressed in the will, therefore, it was necessary for him to make a codicil—another will, *in part*,—to be *added*,—attached—to the original will; which codicil, “could not disannul,” “make void,” or “of none effect,” (Gal. 3 : 17. Rom. 4 : 14,) the will, or interfere with it in any way, as to its original intent; but which, by plainly naming, and setting forth the remainder of the conditions, in obedience to which, the heirs could eject the tenants at will, take possession, and occupy the land, until the time arrived when they could legally *inherit* it, as an everlasting possession, according to the original will. He therefore took steps, as above shown to make the codicil.

The codicil set forth, that the heirs might occupy it up to that time, provided they were *obedient* and kept all the conditions. But if not obedient to the conditions, that they should be *cut off*, not only from the *occupancy*, but also the heirship, or right of everlasting *inheritance* of the land.

We might suppose that the said conditions of occupancy in the Codicil were, that the heirs might occupy the land for the whole five years, until it could be legally divided and inherited and held in fee simple, provided they would live in harmony and peace with each other, and continued obedient to *all* the requirements or conditions of the codicil, or *added* will.

By this illustration, the respective importance, and true relationship of the “two covenants,” the old and new covenants, can be seen and understood.

It will be observed that the Will or Testament, represents the Abrahamic covenant. That the codicil or supplement, represents the law covenant of Sinai; that the clause in the will, granting the heirs the privilege of ejecting the tenants at will and occupying the land up to the appointed time of inheritance on conditions, not expressed in the will; represents the clause in the Abrahamic covenant, “they shall come hither again,” &c., Gen. 15 : 13-16. That just as the said clause in the will, was the germ and cause of the codicil, so the clause referred to in the Abrahamic covenant was the germ and necessity of the law, with all the balance of the conditions; that is, all the conditions

except circumcision, Passover and Sabbath which had been previously given, as before shown, and that as the codicil of conditions would run out and become useless, as soon as the time came when the heirs became entitled to inherit the land by virtue of the original will, and obedience to *its* conditions; so in the same way, the law covenant with its conditions, expired and became useless, just as soon as the Abrahamic covenant was brought into force, so that by virtue of that, and obedience to *its* conditions the heirs could become entitled to the *everlasting* inheritance.

The conditions of the law covenant in order that they might have long life in the land, or in order that the Israelites might continue to occupy the land, were, that they should strictly obey the letter of the law—every one of its requirements—*all the works* of the law. Deut. 4: 23-31, Sam. 7: 14, Ps. 89: 30-37, Deut. 27: 26, James 2: 10.

But the conditions of the Abrahamic covenant, in order to obtain *eternal* life and inheritance, were, not only to keep the letter of the law, but also to have the Abrahamic *faith* that works or obeys by *love*, and thus enables them to keep the *spirit* of the law. Now, however, the conditions of the Abrahamic covenant, are changed, from keeping the law of Moses to keeping the law of Christ.

The law is called the "*first* covenant," not because first-made, for it was made 130 years after the other, but because it was first purged or confirmed by the "blood of bulls and goats," and the death of Moses, and thus brought into force first; and was called the "*old* covenant," because as soon as Christ came and began to fulfill it, it could then be said of it, it "decayeth and waxeth old ready to vanish away," (Heb. 8: 13,) and at his death, did vanish away; for by his death the Abrahamic covenant was ratified or confirmed and became the "*new* covenant"—a "*better* covenant which was established upon better promises," Heb. 8: 6-13, and by which the old covenant was entirely superseded.

The Abrahamic covenant is therefore called the "*new* covenant," "*second* covenant," (Heb. 8: 7. ch. 9: 15,) because it was brought into force, second, or last; by being ratified or confirmed by the blood of Christ, who was "a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to *confirm* the promises made unto the fathers. Rom. 15: 8. He took away the *first* will, that he might establish the *second* " by the which will, we

are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ one of all." Heb. 10 : 9, 10.

It will now be observed that the Sinaitic covenant, or law, was simply an elaboration of a *part* of the Abrahamic covenant, one of the promises, namely, "in the fourth generation they shall come hither again." Gen. 15 : 13-16. The law comprised everything necessary for the carrying out and the fulfillment of that promise. So also, the covenant with David was an elaboration of another and more important *part* or promise of the Abrahamic covenant, namely; "and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies," as before shown.

Although the law covenant was made with the children of Israel, through the mediation of Moses, and completed, so far as was necessary to render it available and forcible as a *law*, for the education, or schooling and government of the Nation; which took place about three months and three days, after they left Rameses, (near Cairo,) in the land of Goshen, in Egypt; yet, its full completion did not occur until 40 years afterwards. After they had wandered in the wilderness 40 years, until the rebels had all died out or were destroyed, Deut. 1 : 26 and ch. 2 : 14-16, that is, the 600,000 men over 20 years old, who "did not *believe* the Lord," verse 32. When therefore they had at last arrived "in the plains of Moab, on this side Jordan by Jericho." "where Moses began to declare this law," Num. 22 : 1, and Deut. 1 : 1-5, and where they were in three days, to cross over the Jordan; Moses on the day of his death, repeated or rehearsed what the Lord had done for them during the 40 years, and "spake unto the children of Israel according unto *all* that the Lord had given him in commandment unto them." Deut. 1 : 3. He rehearsed "ALL *this law* which I set before you this day." ch. 4 : 8. After telling them what the Lord had brought them through in the wilderness, and warning them against disobedience, not to "forget the covenant," the law covenant, which the Lord made with them at Sinai, 40 years before, and foreseeing that after they had got into the land, and had been there a long time as a Nation, they would become "corrupt," and be "scattered among the Nations," he reminded them of it, and of the covenant that God made with *their fathers*, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, 470 years before—the everlasting covenant of the nation's ultimate eternal inheritance of the land—that is, those of the nation that would "turn and be obedient." The following are his words. "The Lord shall

scatter you among the Nations.” * * “But if from thence thou shalt seek the Lord thy God, thou shalt find him, if thou seek him with all thy heart and with all thy soul. When thou art in *tribulation* (see Mat. 24 : 21, and Luke 21 : 23, 24,) and all these things are come upon thee, even in the *latter days*, if thou turn to the Lord thy God, &c. * * he will not forsake thee, neither destroy thee (as a Nation) *nor forget the covenant of thy fathers*, which he sware unto them.” Duet. 4 : 23-31, and ch. 30 : 1-10. ch. 7 : 12. ch. 31 : 29. These passages contain very remarkable prophetic enunciations of the Prophet Moses.

But to proceed. Then he repeats and declares, or lays before them the entire law, that had been made with them at Sinai, commencing with the ten commandments, Deut. 5 : 1, and also giving another, by the authority of God of course, the *most important requirement of all others*, one which was not given as one of the commandments of the law covenant, made, dedicated and recorded at Sinai ; nor does not appear to have ever been given as a command up to this time. It reads as follows : “And thou shalt LOVE the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might.” Deut. 6 : 5. This, as before shown, is the “*spirit*”—intent—of the entire law. Then he proceeds to repeat the remainder of the law ; which he undoubtedly *read* in the *book* of the covenant ; for he taught them it was necessary to “observe to do *all* the words of *this law* that are *written in this book*” Deut. 28 : 58. And we are informed that “these are the words of the covenant, which the Lord commanded Moses to make with the children of Israel in the land of Moab, (where they were then congregated,) beside the covenant which he made with them in Horeb,” or Sinai. Deut. 29 : 1. It was necessary for Moses to thus read or “rehearse,” and declare the law, as God had commanded him to do, Ex. 17 : 14, and make the covenant with the children of Israel—cause them “to enter into covenant with the Lord,” ch. 29 : 12-15, the *second time* ; just before passing over Jordan into the land for the same reason that it was necessary for Joshua, immediately after they had passed over, to “circumcise again the children of Israel a *second time* ;” as the Lord commanded him, namely. All the children born during the 40 years in the wilderness, and who, now that the 600,000 rebels’ were consumed because they obeyed not the voice of the Lord,” now formed the principal part of the Nation, had neither entered into the covenant, nor been circumcised. Josh. 5 : 2-7.

Without doubt many of those who were under 20 years old,

at the time of numbering, and the "*children* which in that day had no knowledge between good and evil," as well as some of the Levites; were still living, Num. 1:45, 47, Deut. 1:39, (not being a part of the 603,000 of rebels, who were dead). But these, at least all that were old enough, at the time the covenant was made at Sinai, had accepted it and been circumcised. Moses said unto *them*, "the Lord God made a covenant with us in Horeb. (Sinai.) The Lord made not *this* covenant, (law covenant), with our fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day;" Deut. 5:2, 3; that is with all of us who were present at that time, 40 years ago, and are still alive. But as before said the principal part composing the Nation at that time, had never accepted and entered into it and received its token—circumcision of the flesh. Hence the necessity of making the covenant a second time, and of their entering into the covenant and "oath" as a *Nation*; and before being allowed to go in and possess the land. The signification of the word "Deuteronomy," will be understood by this *second* giving of the law.

Again Moses said neither with you only, do I make this covenant and this oath, but with him that standeth here with us this day before the Lord our God, that is, the *strangers*, see v. 11, and also with him that is *not here* with us this day, ch. 29:14-20: that is, all individuals of the Nation not present, and all the unborn descendants, during the continuance of the covenant, down to the coming of the seed, Christ, were bound by; and included in that *National* covenant; and all to enter, and become covenantees by the token of circumcision of the flesh. So that "every man that is circumcised is a debtor to do the whole law." Gal. 5:3. Moses being the *representative* Testator; acting under and for God, as the mediator between him and Israel; after he had fully completed the National covenant, or "first testament," or "Will," had to *die* before God's chosen constituted house or family, the children of Israel, could go in and possess the land for the purpose of a temporal occupancy, by virtue of the covenant or Testament *

* That the death of Moses was necessary, to fully confirm and bring into force the Sinaitic or law covenant, as a type of the death of Christ for the purpose of fully confirming and bringing into force the Abrahamic covenant; is evident from the fact that "all these things happened unto them for types," or "occurred unto them typically," Dia., and from the fact, that Christ was that Prophet *like unto* Moses. Christ, therefore, being clearly the antitype of Moses, his death for the purpose of giving virtue and force to the new covenant, *must* have been the antitype of the death of Moses for the purpose of giving virtue and force to the old covenant. Joshua also being a type of Christ, as *executor* after the death of Moses to administer the Will.: Christ as the antitype of Joshua, being raised to life to administer the *new testament*.

Now, as "all these things happened unto them for types," this making or entering unto the law covenant a second time, thus completing it with the new Nation, after the rebels were dead, and after it had been in force 40 years—completing it with the entire Nation, just before they were permitted to take possession of the promised land under Joshua—is, *probably* in the near future, to be fulfilled in antitype, in the making or completing the "*new* covenant," (which has been in force, and been entered into by *individuals* for 1800 years) with the Jewish Nation "in the wilderness of the people," after the rebels are purged out, before the Nation is permitted to enter unto the land of Israel, (Ezk 20 : 23-36,) under Christ, the *true* Joshua, and "Captain of the Lord's host." Josh. 5, 15. And as the Nation had to be circumcised by Joshua, according to the letter of the law—circumcision of the flesh—so will the Nation, before being permitted to enter into the land, be required to be circumcised "inwardly," by "the circumcision of the heart, in the *spirit* (of the law) and not in the letter," Rom. 2 : 29, called "the circumcision of Christ," Col. 2 : 11, and which is the *beginning* of the putting off the body of sinful flesh, and the putting on of the Divine Nature—spirit nature—typified by the partaking of the passover as soon as possible, after the circumcision : Josh. 5 : 10 ; which was to be continued as a type, and which will yet have its antitypical fulfillment, so far as the children of Israel are concerned, when they shall ultimately "partake of Christ our passover," by being made partakers of his Divine Nature, and inheriting the land as the *immortal subjects* of the everlasting kingdom of Christ and his brethren—the Kingdom of God. That is, those of the Nation that "*turn*" to God, and become obedient, by entering into the covenant, under its new conditions; circumcision of the heart &c.; instead of circumcision of the flesh, and thus becoming true covenantees—true seed of Abraham.

As the first or old covenant or testament had to be dedicated and brought into force by the blood of animals, and the death of Moses the substitutional or *representative* testator, before *natural* Israel could by and under Joshua go in and occupy the land according to the promise of that covenant ;—so the second or new covenant or testament had to be brought into force, by the blood of Christ, and by his death, as the covenant sacrifice or the substitutional or *representative* Testator, before *spiritual* Israel could, by and under Christ, inherit the eternal life and Kingdom in the land as before shown.

I have said that Moses, on the day of his death, commenced to rehearse the law, beginning with the ten commandments, and that he then made known another requirement, more important than all others, and which had never before been given—"thou shalt *love* the Lord thy God, &c.:" "And thou shalt do that which is *right* and *good*." Deut. 6 : 5, 18. This was given to show what the Lord required, and what he still requires—to show what was the *spirit*, or intent of the law—viz; obedience through LOVE; that he wanted them to keep his commandments, his entire law, through love to him, and love to do *right*, realizing and feeling, that *right*, is whatever he requires whether it be positive commands, that were never duty until the command was given, or moral precepts that were always right and duty.

Although God did not command them to love him, in the Decalogue, yet, that obedience through love, or faith that worketh by love, is the spirit or intent of the law, may be seen still more plainly, or rather, is proved, by numerous passages like the following. "Showing mercy unto thousands of them that LOVE me and keep my commandments." Ex. 20 : 6. "Thou shalt remember all the way which the Lord thy God led thee, these forty years, in the wilderness, to humble thee and to *prove* thee, to know what was *in thy heart*, whether thou wouldest keep his commandments or no." Deut. 8 : 2. "For the Lord your God proveth you, to know whether ye *love* the Lord your God, with all your heart." Ch. 13 : 2. And yet neither faith nor love, were commanded in the letter of the Decalogue. Man could not then, neither can he now, be *compelled* to either believe or love, by threatening penalties, not even by the penalty of death. He can be compelled to *do* or not to *do*, to *act* or not to *act*, to obey physical requirements, though he be destitute of love, but he cannot be compelled to obey through *love*. Love can only be induced by motives set before him, as before shown. Hence we can understand why love was not made one of the commands of the law, with its penalty of death in case of disobedience.

Paul, in speaking of the ten commandments, which he called the law, says, "the commandment which was *ordained* to *life*, I found to be unto death." Rom. 7 : 10. "It is your LIFE." Deut. 32 : 46, 47. As before shown, by strict obedience to the letter, or works of the law, the children of Israel could avoid the penalty of death, penal death, and obtain the

promised, or "ordained" long *life* in the land. But not *eternal* life; for that comes as "the *gift* of God," through "the righteousness of faith," that worketh by love—the only motive or moving power to obedience of the moral principles underlying the law, called the spirit of the law; which obedience, results in "the *fruit* of the spirit." So then, obedience to the law brought life. But obedience to its spirit brings *eternal* life.

Caleb and Joshua kept the law—*more* than the letter: they kept both its letter and spirit, for "they *wholly* followed the Lord." Num. 32 : 12. Therefore, while the others, the 600,000 rebels that would neither believe nor obey, were consumed; Caleb and Joshua were allowed to go in and possess the land. Not only so, but there is no doubt whatever, but what they, having the faith of Abraham; that is, unwavering faith in the great promises made to *him*; the great promises of the everlasting covenant, "staggered not," but firmly believed, "being *fully persuaded*," that what God "had *promised* he was able to perform:" Rom. 3 : 20, 21; and therefore kept the law—*all* the law through *love*. There is no doubt I say, but they died entitled to remission of sins, through the blood of Christ, as soon as it should be shed, and, to "the gift of God, *eternal* life; and when the time comes, to be raised incorruptible and put in possession of the everlasting inheritance of the Kingdom, in that land.

All those "rebels" had the same reasons or grounds for believing and loving God, for faith and love, the same incentives, that Caleb and Joshua had. The wonderful things that were done by the Lord in Egypt, and after he had brought them out with a "mighty hand," and all through the 40 years in the wilderness; of which Moses, when he was recounting them on the day of his death, spoke in such language as this. "He is thy praise, and he is thy God that hath done for thee these great and terrible things, which *thine eyes have seen*. Thy fathers went down into Egypt, with threescore and ten persons; and now the Lord thy God hath made thee as the stars of heaven for multitude. *Therefore* thou shalt LOVE the Lord thy God, and keep his charge and his statutes, and his judgments, and his commandments *always*." This day, was the *first time*, as before said, according to the record, that they were commanded to keep the law—the letter of the law—through *love*. Moses reminds them of God's "greatness, his mighty hand, and his stretched out arm, and his miracles, and his acts, &c., &c.,"

and says, "But *your* eyes have *seen* all the great acts of the Lord which he did." "For I speak not with *your children* which have *not known*, and which have *not seen*," &c. Deut. 10 : 21, 22. ch. 11 : 1-7.

All these wonderful and mighty acts and miracles, were ample and sufficient to have inspired them with faith ; and the *goodness* of God in thus delivering them from bondage and slavery, and from the pursuing hosts of Pharaoh, and from all other enemies, and providing them with food and drink &c., &c., were ample and sufficient to have inspired them with *love*. It is true they *did believe in part* at some periods: for we are told that "Israel saw that great work which the Lord did upon the Egyptians ; and the people feared the Lord, and *believed the Lord*, and his *servant Moses*." Ex. 14 : 31. But when, in the following year, they had arrived at Kadesh-barnea (which was only eleven days journey from Horeb) near where they could have passed over into the land, they sent twelve men over to search out the land, and bring them word, as to the land, and which way they were to go in. When they returned and told them all about it ; all but Caleb and Joshua said they could not go up and possess the land, and Caleb and Joshua said they were "well able," "the *Lord* is with us, *HE* will bring us into this land and give it us." But although they knew and had seen all that God had done for them, and that he had *never once failed* to fulfil his promises ; and that he had *promised* to give them the land, and had brought them out of Egyptian bondage, with a mighty hand, for that very purpose ; yet knowing all this, and all his goodness and mercy towards them ; they believed the ten men, instead of God ; and when Caleb and Joshua insisted, and said, "only *rebel not* ye against the Lord," the people "bade stone them with stones." Num. 13 : 27, to ch. 14 : 11.

Moses said in rehearsing this transaction, on the day of his death, 40 years after it occurred, "yet in *this thing ye did not believe* the Lord your God." "Ye *would not* go up, but *rebelled* against the *commandment* of the Lord your God." Deut. 1 : 26, 32. If they even *partially* believed, as it seems they *must* have done, and could not have avoided, under such circumstances ; yet, their faith was "*weak*," not the "faith that *worketh* by love ;" and "faith without works is dead ;" faith that does not act, that does not produce *obedienc*e is *not real* faith. Had they, like their father Abraham, "who against hope believed in hope,"

“being *not weak* in faith.” but like him, “*staggered not* at the *promise* of God,” through *unbelief*, but *strong* in faith, being fully persuaded that what God had promised, he was *able to perform* ;” Rom. 4: 18-21 ; then they could have entered in, without having been turned back to wander 40 years in the wilderness, until *every one* of the 603,550, except Caleb and Joshua, were dead or consumed. God would not have said to them “your carcasses shall fall in this wilderness, ye shall not come into the land.” Num. 14: 29, 30. Paul would not have had to say of them, a thousand years afterwards, “so we see that they could not enter in because of *unbelief*.” Heb. 3: 19.

Here, I desire to call attention to the fact, that “all these things happened unto them for *types*.” I would to God, that I could “cry aloud and spare not,” and lift up my voice like a trumpet,” (Isa. 58,) and wake up the thousands who are asleep, the tens of thousands who are blind, and yet feel themselves secure, perfectly safe ; because like typical Israel, “they seek God daily, and *delight* to know his ways, *as if* they did righteousness. Wherefore have we *fasted*, say they, and thou seest not.” Isa. 58. All these things were to have a second fulfillment in Antitype. This willing blindness, and unbelief of the “sure word,” of the great *promises* of God, is having, and is to have a great and awful fulfillment in antitype. The type sets forth that, only Caleb and Joshua, out of 600,000 entered into the promised land ! All because of *unbelief*. Who or how many in this day entertain even a partial or weak faith in God’s covenanted, *sworn* to, promises made to Abraham, promises confirmed by the death and blood of God’s son ; promises containing the glad tidings of the *Gospel* ; promises which constitute the “one hope,” “the things hoped for,” which Paul in his day called “the *hope* of the *promise* made of God unto the Fathers, unto which *promise* the twelve tribes, those of them instantly serving God day and night, *hope* to come,” at and through the resurrection of the dead ; and which therefore have not yet had their fulfillment ; Acts 26: 6, 8 ; and which, when the time comes, will, as surely as there is a God in heaven, be literally and completely fulfilled, in the manner set forth by the type ; shutting out and consuming the hundreds of thousands because of *unbelief*. Only those who constantly bear in mind, the wonderful things that God has done, the numerous promises he has made and fulfilled, and that literally ; never yet failing in one single instance, and who therefore, stagger not, but are *strong*

in faith, and *fully persuaded* that what God has *promised*, he is also able to perform ; and like Caleb and Joshua *wholly* follow the Lord, walking in that straight gate and narrow way; because they understand that "strait is the gate and narrow is the way that leadeth unto life, and FEW *there be that find it*. While wide is the gate, and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and *many* there be which go in thereat." Mat. 7 : 13. They bear in mind Christ's words, "many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, *I never knew you !*" Mat. 7 : 22, 23. They do not allow the cares of life, and the popular ideas, and customs of the fashionable world, to supplant or supersede the literal "sayings" of Christ. They do not forget that when he was here he said, "whosoever heareth these sayings of mine and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock." They do not lose sight of what is taught in God's Book about "the man of sin," and of the falling away ; that the time was to come when, "in the *latter times*, some shall *depart from the faith*," 1 Tim. 4 : 1; when they would not endure the sound doctrine ; when the people, even those who profess to be the people of God, and really think they are, will turn away their ears from the truth, unto fables, and at the same time hardly conscious of it ; although Christ said, "*in vain* do they worship me teaching for doctrines the commandments of men;" that in the last days perilous times should come ; that the people would then have a *form* of godliness, but denying the power thereof ; that is, denying the *gospel* which is the *power* of God unto salvation to every one that *believeth* ; that evil men and seducers would wax worse and worse ; that there would scoffers come in the last days, walking after their own lusts, and saying where is the *promise* of his coming? being "willingly ignorant ; that they would "stumble at the word being disobedient;" that people would profess to believe in Christ and, yet by their traditions, unconsciously reject his words, thereby rejecting him ; that the true people of God were to be a "*peculiar* people," having what popular Christendom would consider a *peculiar* faith, and hope : that it would therefore be through much tribulation one must enter the Kingdom of God : that "*all* that will live Godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution : " that Christ said, "blessed are ye when men shall *revile* you and

persecute you, and say all manner of evil against you *falsely*, for my sake. Rejoice and be exceeding glad for great is your reward." "Blessed are ye when men shall *hate* you, and separate you from their company, and shall reproach you, and cast your name out as evil, for the Son of man's sake." "Woe unto you when all men shall speak well of you." That the time cometh that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service:" that when Christ was here he asked this most significant question, "when the Son of man cometh shall he find *faith* on the earth?"

How many in the world occupy the position here described? The writer has no doubt there are a few, for "*few* there be that find it"—undoubtedly few, comparatively speaking, who do "*find*" and walk in this "straight and narrow way," for thus saith the word, and he has the strongest and most unwavering faith in what *God* has *said* and caused to be *said* in his *word*; and therefore entertains the deepest and most profound *reverence* for it.

This "*way* is *God's* way, not the writer's say so. But how many are there who *fully* and *firmly* believe "the *promises* made unto the fathers," and who "stagger not," but are *fully* persuaded," that God will do just what he has said; although *we* have *much more* evidence, indubitable *proof*, that he will, than the 600,000 had. Many very many of the utterances of God's Prophets have been literally fulfilled *since* that time. Others are being fulfilled in like manner under our very eyes. But the people, almost the entire world, are too much absorbed in business to heed these things. Having concluded to go into a city or some other place "and buy, and sell, and get gain," James 4 : 13, they have become "*overcharged* with the cares and business of *this* life, and therefore entirely neglect the things that are necessary to *believe* and *do* in order to obtain eternal life. Even the popular Churches do the same thing. They also have become "*overcharged*," their minds and time are almost entirely taken up in the things of popularity and fashion, as well as in getting gain. They *love* popularity and fashion, and therefore will not hear or give attention to, nor receive the *truth*, nor allow it to be preached in their Pulpits. They "consent not to the wholesome *words*, of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the *doctrine* which is according to godliness," and are therefore, "*destitute of the truth*, (almost) supposing that gain is godliness: from such withdraw thyself." So said

Paul to Timothy, 6 : 3-5. If this is not the condition of *all* the popular churches now, it is rapidly becoming so. They pay no attention to such passages as the following. "Take heed unto yourselves, lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and cares of *this* life, and so that they come upon you unawares. For as a *snare* shall it come on all them that *dwell* on the face of the whole earth." Luke 21 ; 34, 35. These, and the like, are "the *wholesome words* of our Lord Jesus Christ." How many are there now in the Churches who understand and firmly *believe* and preach the only *gospel* that Christ and Paul preached everywhere, in all the Cities and villages, the gospel of the kingdom—the literal "reign of Christ upon the throne of his father David over the house of Ja·ob"—the 12 tribes, in that promised land; although *faith* in this gospel is the *condition* of salvation. Any gospel that does not contain this *promise*, this element, this glad tidings, is not the one gospel. Any other gospel, as Paul says, "is not another." Gal. 1 : 6-9. But who believes it now. Such a gospel, and such a faith as the "one faith," and such a hope as the "one hope," are a together too "*peculiar*." They belong to the "peculiar people." It is all too *unpopular* for the Churches. It is too old fashioned. Only *silly* or *deluded* people believe such trash, such nonsense. Such are the thoughts, and even the words of thousands, of able minded well meaning persons, who have not carefully and thoroughly, and with unprejudiced minds, looked into these things; who cannot for a moment, admit that all the good and able writers, and leaders of the Churches, are or can possibly be mistaken, be in the dark.

How many understand and believe that the great "*rest*" promised and covenanted to Abraham and his seed, Christ, when he shall possess the gate of his enemies, and all nations be blessed in him, and the will of God be done on earth as in heaven, that the great "*rest*" was promised in type and anti-type, and that therefore, the same *gospel* that was "preached before unto Abraham," and preached to the Children of Israel, is the same gospel, that Christ and Paul preached, the same promise of a great and glorious "*rest* that *remaineth* to the people of God." That it has been fulfilled in *type only*, and that because the 600,000 would not *believe* God, he says, "so I swore in my wrath, they shall not enter into my rest." Heb. 3 : 11. Of which terrible destruction of rebels who would not believe God, Paul

speaks with a warning voice, saying, "take heed, *brethren*, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of *unbelief*, in departing from the living God. Let *us* therefore fear, lest a *promise* being left us of entering into *his rest*, any of you should seem to come short of it. For unto *us* was the *gospel* preached, as well as unto them: but the *word* preached did not profit them. *not being mixed with faith* in them that heard it." Heb. 3: 12, and ch. 4: 1, 2. Then in the next verse he says, "For we which have *believed* do enter into rest."

That is, just as soon as persons believe in Christ, by believing in the great promised Rest, they *begin* to realize it, they *begin* to enter into it, by rest from their own *sinful works*, and by peace of mind. The great promised Rest that remains for the people of God *in Christ* actually *begins* by believing *into* Christ, and thus, *in Christ* they *rest* from their sinful works, and so there *remaineth* for such, the balance or *remainder* of the Rest, to be realized at Christ's return, when it is promised, that they shall rest from their "sinful flesh," when not only the mind and character shall rest or be freed from sin, but their body or *nature* also. Persons do not, nor cannot, believe into Christ, while they *reject* this promised Rest, as the 600,000 did. They must, in order to believe in Christ, believe in this *promised* Rest, which Paul here calls "*the gospel*," as he does also, Gal. 3: 8, the gospel of Christ, and be baptized, and thus inducted *into* him. "For as many as have been baptized *into* Christ have put on Christ." Gal. 3: 27. Baptism being God's own appointed means or way to get the application of the blood of Christ, for the remission of sins or justification, and for inducting the believer into Christ, that is, into the name, mind, disposition, character and body, or Church of Christ. They then realize and enjoy the *beginning* of the great Rest. Hence, Paul said, we which have believed *do enter into rest*. But there still *remaineth* the completion of the great Rest.

Any and every person ought to be able to see that it is folly, to talk about being *believers* in Christ while rejecting his gospel, which includes the promised Rest; and that it is folly, yea madness, to suppose we can ever enter into that Rest in unbelief. In the case of the 600,000, refusing to believe and obey, after all they had seen and known of God's wonderful works, power and goodness, they were called *rebels* and "consumed." Think you the antitype of that astonishing and shocking unbelief, ingratitude, rebellion, and condign punish-

ment will fail to be fulfilled? Think you that the loss of eternal life, and the everlasting inheritance in that land, as the sequence of unbelief, ingratitude and hatred, instead of love towards God, applies only to God's chosen Nation, the Children of Israel; and that Gentiles are to go free? I beseech you to not be deluded. Be wise while there still remains a chance. Believe and obey the gospel and be saved. For Christ's words are, that "he that *believeth not* the son, shall not see life:" and that, he that *believeth not* the *gospel*, shall be damned, condemned to *death*; and that, "he that believeth not, is condemned already."

I have shown elsewhere, that this great Rest, which *begins* by faith in Christ and resting from sinful works, and which remains, as to its complete and final reality and fullness, to the people of God; is the antitype or fulfillment of the seventh day Sabbath type which was the *beginning* of the Rest *type*. Hence, that Christ said to the Pharisees, who complained because the Disciples plucked the corn and eat it on their *Rest day*; "come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, (with their wicked works) and I will give you *rest*." Mat. 11 : 28; ch. ch. 12 : 1-12.

But to return. I have dwelt at length on this feature or type of the law, because of its importance, and because of its terrible antitypical fulfillment, in the near future.

The term, "the righteousness of the law," is used in two different senses; "righteousness by *faith*, and righteousness by the *works* of the law." Rom. 9 : 32. Paul, in speaking of himself, and of his position or character, before he was a believer in Christ, when he was very similar in character to thousands in this day, who, like him, are belonging to popular churches or sects, says; "that after the most straitest *sect* of *our* religion, I lived a Pharisee;" and also that he had been "taught according to the perfect manner of the *law* of the fathers, and was *zealous toward God*, as ye *all are* this day, (they were all members of the popular Jewish Churches) and I persecuted *this way* unto the death, (Christ's *new way* of salvation, by believing and obeying the gospel, which *way* is still persecuted by *popular sects*) binding and delivering into prisons both men and women." Act. 26 : 5, and ch. 22 : 3, 4. Then in writing to the saints at Philippi, he further says, ch. 3 : 6, "touching the *righteousness* which is in the law, *blameless*," having reference to the *works* of the law, which in v. 9, he calls

his own righteousness. He says, "And be found *in* him, (Christ) not having mine own righteousness, *which is of the law* (referring again to the *works* of the *letter* of the law) but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith." The "righteousness by faith," of which he speaks here, is the very same as he calls "the righteousness of the *law*," Rom. 8 : 4, meaning the righteousness of the *spirit* of the law, instead of the letter. He says, "That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the *spirit*." In chapter 2 : 26, he also refers to this same true righteousness of the spirit of the law which consists in obedience to *Right* through love, instead of the works. He says, in speaking of circumcision, "Therefore if the uncircumcision (that is the Gentiles) keep the righteousness of the law, shall not his uncircumcision be counted for circumcision?" and then proceeds to show that circumcision of the flesh is keeping the "letter," and circumcision of the heart, is the "*spirit*" of the law. Our Saviour also refers to the superior righteousness that comes from keeping the spirit of the law, in contrast with the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, which was simply the *works* of the law. He says, "For I say unto you, that except your righteousness shall *exceed* the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven." Mat. 5 : 20. It will therefore be seen, that there are the two kinds of the righteousness of the law. That which comes from keeping the works or letter, which Paul calls "*mine own*," and in Rom. 10 : 3, "*their own* righteousness," and which the Prophet Isaiah says, is "as filthy rags" Isa. 64 : 6; and second, that superior righteousness of the law which comes from keeping the spirit of it, through faith in Christ, and his new and higher law.*

One of the great features of superiority and advantage of the new law over the old, is this. Under the new law, "if any man sin we have an Advocate (a *helper*) with the Father, Jesus Christ the Righteous," 1 John 2 : 1; and the sentence is not to be executed, until the expiration of our day of probation, thus giving us a chance of repentance, and development of

* The righteousness of the *works* of the law, which Paul called *his own*, is first brought to view in Deut. 6 : 25, where it is distinctly defined, for the first time in the scriptures, as follows; "And it shall be our *righteousness*, if we observe to *do* ALL these commandments, before the Lord our God, as he hath commanded us." Paul said, that Israel, "hath not attained unto the law of righteousness because they sought it not by faith, but as it were by the *works* of the law. For they stumbled at that stumbling stone." Rom. 9 : 31, 32.

strength, of moral power, and Godly character. But under the old law, the penalty was *immediate penal* death. Besides, the motive, or inducement to obedience, in the old law was a very weak and meagre one in comparison to that of the new law. It was simply avoidance of the threatening penalties, long life, protection and blessings of God in the land, during obedience. But the new law, that is, the Abrahamic *covenant*, with its new force and new conditions, in addition to this, contains the great promises of remission of sins, *Eternal* life, incorruptibility or Divine Nature, Glory, honor, Kings and Priests with Christ, everlasting inheritance of the Kingdom of God, in the holy land, &c., &c., &c. The motive in the old law was not so powerful to induce and enable the Nation, to whom it was given, to overcome the lusts of the flesh, and inspire love to God, and obedience through love, as the new law is. It is true, they had a helper, mediator, or advocate, in Moses, who, although "faithful in all his house," was not equal to *our* Advocate, the Mediator of the new and *better* covenant or law; and who is *touched* with the feelings of our infirmities. Who ever lives, and who is so vastly superior to Moses.

The "*exceeding* great and precious promises of the New Covenant—the gospel—with the new conditions, of faith and obedience through love—the *new* way or law of life, altogether, constitute a *very powerful motive*; to attract and "*draw* all men unto Christ;" that is, all who hear attentively, "the joyful sound," Ps. 89 : 15, the glad tidings.

This motive, wherever it can be brought to bear, begets and inspires love, and obedience. Christ says, "if ye love me, keep my commandments. This is my commandment, that ye *love* one another. If a man love me, he will keep my words." This motive, of the new covenant and law, is powerful to enable its covenantees to reform; to turn about, and take the *right* course; the straight and narrow way; to restrain and control the lusts of the flesh; to observe *all* things whatsoever Christ, not Moses, has commanded: to bring forth the fruit of "the *Spirit*"—works much superior to the works or letter of the old law.

This motive, is the *hope* set before us," Heb. 6 : 18, "the hope of the *promise* made of God unto our fathers." Acts 26 : 18. "Every man that hath this hope in him, purifieth himself."

1 John 3 : 3

But although the law could not give the Israelites remis-

sion of sins, nor eternal life, nor eternal inheritance of the land, nor the everlasting Kingdom of God; yet the Abrahamic covenant could entitle them to *all* these through the faith of Abraham. The exceeding great and precious promises, included in the covenant made with Abraham, although not fully developed, were the embodiment of the great salvation of God." The Abrahamic covenant was the chief thing then as well as now. The law as before shown, was only the embodiment of the temporary conditions or works. It was never intended for the purpose of remission of sins, nor to give eternal life. Neither was it intended as a strong motive power. But all these and much more, are elements of the Abrahamic Covenant. Therefore, although the Children of Israel did not have a powerful motive, great incentives to obedience in the law, yet they had *all* in the Abrahamic covenant, through faith. That is, the Abrahamic, was the "*better* covenant," which was established upon *better* promises," Heb. 8 : 6, with "*a better* hope," ch. 7 : 19. It was the undeveloped expression of the higher law; for it was "*a law*;" It had been "confirmed to Jacob (the twelve Tribes) for a *law*," 1 Chron. 16 : 17, that is, "the law of *faith*," Rom. 3 : 27, "the faith of Abraham," with its indispensable "*steps*" of obedience through love. Rom. 4 : 12. This was as before said, a *higher law*, of ten-fold more importance, than the temporary law of Moses. This law contained then, as now, the *powerful* motive, or incentive to obedience through *love*. Well, the Children Israel had this law, as well as the law of Moses. It was much nearer the perfect expression of the higher law—the pure Godly principles, or spirit underlying the law of Moses—than was the law of Moses itself. By the observance of this law, that is, by firm, strong unwavering faith in the Abrahamic covenant, in its entirety; which necessarily begets or produces love; which love necessarily produces obedience; they were enabled to keep the law of Moses, both in its letter and spirit; not to *perfection* as Christ did, (on account of the weakness of the flesh) and thus, by virtue of their faith and love, even with *imperfect* obedience, they could secure, and become entitled to, remission of their sins, eternal life, everlasting inheritance of the land, and all other promised blessings of the Abrahamic covenant; in due time according to the purpose of God. It is true that the Abrahamic covenant, was not so great, and so wonderful, and so powerful and attractive, at the time the law of Moses was given as its conditions of works, as it

became by after and greater developments, in the covenant with David; and the typical kingdom of God in the holy land or territory of the still future everlasting kingdom of God; and the still later great developments, in the due appearance and manifestation of the promised seed, Christ, the future King; and the further developments through him and his Apostles, of the gospel, or glad tidings of the Kingdom; the new law of conditions of obedience by baptism to the one faith; of all the superior works; superior duties; all to be obeyed through love to God and our neighbor; the elaboration and fulfillment of many prophecies; the fulfillment of the old law; the bringing into *force* the Abrahamic Covenant as a *new* covenant with new conditions; or a new law, or "path of life," God's way, straight and narrow way; the bringing life and immortality to *light* through the *gospel*, &c. &c., until the salvation of God, became, "so GREAT *Salvation*; which at the first (of its present greatness) began to be spoken by the Lord." Heb. 2 : 3. This salvation has developed, until it has become so great, so important, as set forth by the pure gospel; which "is the *power* of God *unto Salvation*, to every one that *believeth*;" that it will not do to even merely *neglect* it. Hence Paul says "how shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation? Therefore, on account of the importance of the Abrahamic covenant, God caused it to be kept continually before their minds, as a motive or incentive to obedience; in language like the following.

And the Lord thy God will bring thee into the land which thy fathers possessed, and thou shalt possess it; and he will do thee good and multiply thee above thy fathers; and the Lord thy God will circumcise thine *heart* and the *heart* of thy seed to *love* the Lord thy God, with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest *live* (forever) that thou mayest dwell in the land which the Lord swore unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac and to Jacob, to give *them*." Deut. 30 : 5, 6, 20.

It will be noticed that the circumcision spoken of in this passage. is not that of the law covenant, but circumcision of the *heart*, (affections,) by virtue of faith in the Abrahamic covenant, "the circumcision made without hands," by the faith. The circumcision of the flesh as under the law covenant, was the *type*. Circumcision of the heart was the *beginning* of the *antitype*. The law covenant could not give this. It comes by the Abrahamic covenant, (which includes the *spirit* of the law,) through faith in its promises, which comprise the glad tidings

of the Gospel. Faith producing love; love producing obedience; obedience producing circumcision of the heart; which, under Christ's new law, begins by faith and baptism into Christ, and ends, or is to be completed, by the putting off this mortal fleshly body, and putting on immortality, at the resurrection.

The law of Moses, including circumcision of the flesh, was a series of stipulations or conditions, upon which by virtue of that promise of occupation, they could go in and "live" in the land; have or realize that law promise—*long life* in the land. "And he said unto them, set your hearts unto ALL the words which I testify among you this day (the day that Moses died) which ye shall command your children to observe to do all the words of this law. For it is not a vain thing for you; because it is your *life*; and through this thing ye shall *prolong your days in the land* whither ye go over Jordan to possess it." Deut. 32 : 46, 47. See also chap. 30 : 17, 18. This occupation of the promised land, by the children of Israel, God's typical people, was to result in the organization of a typical kingdom; according to God's purpose as expressed in these words; "and thou shalt prosper into a kingdom;" Ezk. 16 : 13, and in fulfillment of the following promise. "Now therefore if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, (law,) then ye shall be a *peculiar* treasure unto me above all people; for all the earth is mine; and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy Nation." Ex. 19 : 6, 7. "All these things happened unto them for types."

Paul, in his epistle to the Romans, ch. 2 : 29, teaches us that circumcision of the heart is by or in the spirit of the law, and not the letter; and that the Jews transgressed the law, by the letter and circumcision, that is, by being circumcised according to the letter and not the spirit. He says, "who by the *letter* and circumcision dost transgress the law." Verse 27, and Deut. 30 : 6. The letter and Spirit of the law are *now* always in contrast or antithesis. The one is death, the other is life.

Again; Paul in his allegory, Gal. 4 : 24, illustrates the relative position and importance of these two covenants, in God's purpose. After showing in the beginning of the chapter, that the Children of Israel, while under the elements or rudiments of the law, were in bondage, &c.; he then prefaces the allegory with, "Tell me ye that desire to be under the law &c," verse 21 : then proceeds to show that Abraham's two sons, Ishmael and Isaac, represented the two covenants—the Abrahamic

Covenant, and the Sinaitic or law covenant—that Ishmael, born after the flesh, by Agar (Hagar) the bondwoman, represented the covenant made at Sinai; answering to the old Jerusalem that then was; that is, to the Jewish Commonwealth or Polity, with Jerusalem as its head; which was in *bondage* with her children—the Jewish Nation: and that Isaac, born after the spirit by Sarah the free woman, represented the covenant made with Abraham, answering to the new Jerusalem, which is above, and is free and the mother of all the *spiritual* children—those begotten by the incorruptible seed of the kingdom, and to be born of the spirit. That is to say, the new constitution of things, or commonwealth of Israel, or kingdom of God, and of Israel, soon to come,—to be restored in a perfect and permanent form.

He here teaches also, that one of these two covenants, that is, the Sinaitic or law covenant; was “*cast out*,” like Hagar its representative.

What could possibly be more conclusive as to the fate of *the law*, even the “*ten commandments*,” which were so distinctly called the “*covenant*”—the Sinaitic or law covenant, as I have shown; Deut. 4 : 13, and ch. 5 : 2, 3, having waxed old, and vanished away.

But as to the spirit or righteousness of the law; that still survives imperishable, and is embodied in the law of Christ—the law of faith and love, or, of “*faith that worketh by love*.” “*purifying the heart*,” Gal. 5 : 6, and Acts 15 : 9, producing “*the fruit of the spirit, love*,” &c.; and which law of Christ, now constitutes the new *completed* conditions of the Abrahamic, or now *new* covenant. He that *believeth* and is baptized shall be saved.

Although the Abrahamic covenant was made with Abraham so long ago, and brought into force by the blood of Christ, thus becoming the *new* or second covenant, at the very same time the Sinaitic or law covenant, “*first*” covenant, (because first brought into force,) was “*nailed to the cross*; yet in one sense it is not completed: in other words, all its covenantees have not yet entered into it: for, although it is now, and has been ever since the shedding of the precious blood of Christ, available for the remission of sins as to *individual* covenantees, by faith and baptism, into his death; so as to get, in that first act of obedience, the application of that blood, without which there is “*no remission*,” Heb. 9 : 22; and at the same time putting on

the one name, and thus becoming a member of the one body ; which is being taken out of the Gentiles *for* the name ;" Acts 15 : 14-17 ; yet when Christ the Mediator of this better covenant comes, it is to be completed, by being made, as before mentioned, with Israel as a *Nation*, in "the wilderness of the people," after the rebels are purged out ; and subsequently with *all* nations, or those that will be "*left* of all the Nations," after the great battle, which is to take place, when all nations shall be gathered against Jerusalem. Zech. 14 : 2-16.

"And I will bring you out from the people, and will gather you out of the countries wherein ye are scattered, with a mighty hand, and with a stretched out arm, and with fury poured out. And I will bring you into the wilderness of the people, and there will I plead with you face to face. *Like* as I pleaded with your fathers in the wilderness of the land of Egypt, so will I plead with you saith the Lord God. And I will cause you to pass under the rod, (of correction,) and I will bring you into the bond (or a delivering, margin) of the covenant. And I will purge out from among you the *rebels*, &c." Ezk. 20 : 33-38.

This prophecy was uttered about 800 years after the exodus of the children of Israel from Egypt, to which the Prophet refers as being the *type*: for he says, "*like* as I pleaded with your fathers, in the wilderness of the land of Egypt ; *so will* I plead, &c." This has never been fulfilled, but *will* most surely be fulfilled, and undoubtedly in the *near future*.

Again : "Nevertheless I will remember my covenant with thee, in the days of thy youth ; and I will establish unto thee (the *Nation* of Israel) an *everlasting covenant*." Ezk. 16 : 59, 60.

Again : "Moreover I will make a covenant of peace with them ; it shall be an everlasting covenant with them ; and I will place them and multiply them, and will set my sanctuary in the midst of them *forevermore*." Ezk. 37 : 26.

Again : "Behold the days come saith the Lord, when I will make (*complete*, Dia.) a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah ;" not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the days when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt ; Heb. 8 : 8, 9 ; that is, not according to the Sinaitic or law covenant, but according to the Abrahamic or "*new covenant*."

Again : "This is my covenant that I will make with them

after those days. (that is, after the days of their dispersion and being trodden down during the times of the Gentiles, Jer. 31 : 27-33. Acts 15 : 14-17,) saith the Lord ; I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them ; and their sins and iniquities will I remember no more." Heb. 10 : 16,17. This passage is a quotation by Paul, from the words of the Holy Spirit, through the Prophet Jeremiah. Jer. 31 : 33. The Prophet had just been foretelling about the days of the scattering and regathering of Israel ; and then proceeds to tell of the making or completing of the new covenant with them at that time, when, at the coming of the great King, they shall have been regathered ; caused to pass under the rod of correction and instruction ; the rebels destroyed from among them ; (which may require many years ;) and the balance—the obedient portion—as a Nation, be allowed to go into the promised land, to be the *subjects*, (not Rulers,) of the Kingdom of God ; according to the everlasting covenant made with Abraham ; the new conditions of which, (not yet fully made known,) having been propounded to them, as the "bond or delivering" of the covenant, for their acceptance and obedience.

This is all to take place at the termination of Gentile Rule—"the times of the Gentiles"—when "the seed to whom the promise was made," in that covenant, comes: when the Kingdom shall be *restored* to Israel ; when the son and heir of David shall come to "sit upon the throne of his father David ;" when he comes "whose right it is," and the throne and kingdom of David shall be given him ; when he shall "return and build again the tabernacle of David ;" when the Noblemen that is gone "into a far country to receive unto himself a kingdom and to return," shall arrive, as "King of Kings, and Lord of Lords ;" as the Son of God, to set up the Kingdom of God, for which Christ taught his Disciples to pray, and which kingdom is to flourish and increase, until "all Nations shall serve and obey him," and until "every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess," and all "the Kingdoms of this world are become the Kingdoms of our Lord and his Christ," "under, (not up in,) the whole heaven."

But when Christ comes to make the new covenant with them, as a Nation ; how is it, that it is to be done by putting his laws into their mind and writing them in their hearts ? As we are told Heb. 8 : 10. "I will put my laws into their mind and write them in their hearts." How will this be done ? I

answer, he will propound, or offer the new covenant with its new conditions, to them, and “*plead* with them,” as the Prophet Ezekiel foretells. That is, he will offer them all the great *promises* of the covenant, upon the conditions of the strong unwavering faith of Abraham, and implicit, willing, loving obedience. He will show them that the promises of the covenant have been wonderfully developed; that he himself is the “seed” of Abraham, promised in the covenant; that he came more than eighteen hundred years ago; and was crucified by their Nation; that he was “Jesus of Nazareth:” and that his own people, his own brethren, the Jews, took him, led him, like a lamb to the slaughter; and delivered him to Pilate the Roman Governor; that they murdered him—“killed the Prince of life, when Pilate was determined to let him go:” that his precious blood was thus shed; by which this Abrahamic covenant was brought into force, and made the *new* covenant; by virtue of which he offered them remission of their sins, eternal life and everlasting inheritance of the land of Canaan; upon condition of faith in him and in all the promises of the covenant, which his death and blood had been required to confirm; and which he as its mediator now offered to them upon condition of unwavering faith and obedience through LOVE: not obedience through *fear* of threatening penalties—the old conditions under the law. Thus Christ, the true Joseph, will make himself known to his brethren of the flesh. Thus he will make known the terms of the new covenant, and “*plead* with them” to accept it in its entirety; through faith and loving obedience; thus becoming true spiritual covenantees; and entitled to enter the promised land, and possess it, and live in it forever; and to all the promised blessings of the covenant; as subjects of the Kingdom of God. With all that hear, understand believe and accept; repentance and conversion, or *turning* from their transgressions or evil doings to God, will follow as a sequence. A radical *change* in mind and heart and disposition, and as a sequence in their character and external acts, conduct, and life as a whole.

Their minds thus becoming spiritized, their hearts or affections changed, the lusts of the flesh crucified, so that they love what they once hated, and hate what they once loved; they will thus become “new creatures in Christ;” their affections being set on the things promised, and “hoped for.”

But those that *will not accept* will be “rebels,” and be

“purged out,” or destroyed, and not allowed to “enter into the land of Israel.” Ezk. 20 : 38.

Isaiah foretells as follows. “And the Redeemer shall come to Zion, and unto them that *turn from transgression* in Jacob.” Isa. 59 : 20.

And Jeremiah foretells as follows. “And they shall be my people and I will be their God ; *for* they shall *return* unto me with their whole *heart*.” Jer. 24 : 7.

“There shall come out of Zion the Deliverer, and shall *turn away* ungodliness from Jacob.” Rom. 11 : 26. That is, he shall *turn* them away from ungodliness, not by physical force, for the mind, the heart or affections, *cannot* be thus turned. But he will *turn* them by “the *power* of God, which is the gospel”—the moral power of the glad tidings, or promises contained in the everlasting covenant, by attracting power, or the power of attraction. That, is God’s way of *turning* and saving both individuals and Nations. Hence we have this language in Acts 3 : 26, by the Apostle Peter : “unto you first, God having raised up his Son Jesus sent him to *bless* you in *turning away* every one of you from his iniquities”—turned away and blessed by faith in Christ—by faith in his gospel—the *power* of God—the spirit word—the word of life—Christ’s words : “they are *spirit* and they are *life*.”

This is the way God puts his laws into the mind and heart, thus changing and turning them. Man’s mind and heart are naturally prone to evil. His mind and heart being set on *evil* things, he follows after them. But if he can be arrested so as to get his attention, and be presented with *good* things that are very *attractive*—the things of the kingdom and name—things *promised* in the covenant and gospel ; he can be *turned* away from evil to good ; *changed* in mind, heart and disposition, and thus turned to God ; and he will then follow after the things God has promised ; being “*fully persuaded*” that what he hath promised he is both able and willing to perform.

Thus will the law that is to “go forth out of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem, be put in the minds and written by *impression*, in the hearts of “every one that is left of all the nations,” which are to come against Jerusalem ; who will therefore, “go up from year to year to worship the King, the Lord of hosts.” Zech. 14 : 16.

Christ, the King, will not force or compel the reception of his law or word of life, “the word of the kingdom,” “the good

seed ;" into the mind and heart, but attract—"draw" through faith. Our Saviour said, "No man *can* come to me, except the Father which hath sent me *draw* him : and I will raise him up at the last day. It is written in the prophets, and they shall all be *taught* of God. Every man therefore that hath heard and *learned* of the Father, cometh unto me ;" John 6 : 44, 45 ; And I, if I be lifted up from the earth will *draw* all men unto me." John 12 : 32. All, who come to Christ, are first "*taught*," ("go *teach* all nations &c.") and, through *faith* in what they are taught, they are attracted or *drawn* to acceptance and obedience through love. That is, by the attractiveness, of what they are taught, consisting of wonderful glorious desirable things, promised and sworn to by our Heavenly Father, we are *drawn* to believe or have faith in the promise; the faith produces love, and love produces obedience : For Christ said, "if a man love me he *will* keep my words:" and obedience consists, in being baptized, and *turning* away from evil doing, to righteousness ; in *turning* away from the thinkings of the fleshly mind, to the dictates of the enlightened spiritual mind ; in turning away from earthly things, to heavenly things ; in turning away from the things once loved to the things once hated ; in turning away from a dishonest wicked life, to an honest holy life ; in turning away from obeying "the law of sin in our members or flesh, to the law of God." Rom. 7 : 18, 25.

Thus, when the new covenant law of faith and obedience through love ; shall be accepted and obeyed by Israel and the Nations; then "many Nations shall be *joined* to the Lord, in that day, and shall be my people." "Yea many people and strong Nations shall come to seek the Lord of hosts in Jerusalem, and to *pray* before the Lord ;" "and shall even go up from year to year to worship the King, the Lord of hosts." Zech. 2 : 11. chap. 8 : 22, chap. 14 : 16. "Be mindful always of his *covenant* ; the word which he commanded to a thousand generations ; even of the covenant which he made with Abraham, and of his oath unto Isaac, and hath confirmed the same to Jacob for a LAW, and to Israel for an everlasting covenant, saying, unto thee will I give the land of Canaan, the lot of your inheritance." 1 Chron. 16 : 15-18.

This everlasting covenant contains "the HOPE of Israel," for the preaching of which, Paul was bound with a chain. Acts 28 : 20. He said, "And now I stand and am judged for the *hope* of the *promise* made of God unto our fathers ; unto which

promise our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, *hope* to come, for which *hope's* sake King Agrippa, I am accused of the Jews." He preached that this hope is to be realized; that is, the promise made of God unto the fathers, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, in the everlasting covenant is to be fulfilled, at the resurrection of the dead. Hence he asks King Agrippa, why should it be thought a thing incredible with you, that God should raise the dead? Acts 26:6-8. And hence also, when he was before the chief priests and all their council, he said, "of the hope and resurrection of the dead, I am called in question." Acts 23:6. This is the "one hope." There is no other gospel hope. All others, are gotten up by man, consisting of things that *God hath never promised*, and are therefore spurious. Therefore, all who are "without Christ, being aliens from the Commonwealth of Israel, and *strangers to the covenants of promise*, having NO HOPE, and without God in the world," (Eph. 2:12,) are to be pitied; no matter what other hope they may have. To obtain this hope, a person must, of necessity, believe the promises—the covenants—Abrahamic and Davidic, that contain it; with strong faith—the faith of Abraham, who "staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief; but was strong in faith, giving glory to God: and being *fully persuaded* that what he had *promised* he was able to perform." Rom. 5:3-21.

The law of faith and obedience through love, being immutable, it will therefore, doubtless be the law that will go forth out of Zion. It will doubtless continue to be as now, "he that *loveth* another, hath fulfilled the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbor: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law." Rom. 13:8-10.

The words "fulfilled" in v. 8, and "fulfilling," v. 10, are rendered from the Greek *pleroo* and *pleroo*, to fill, make full, and not from *shamar*, to keep, observe. Hence *love* is the making full, and not the *keeping* of the law—not the *keeping* of the five commandments of the Decalogue there quoted by Paul; as some hold and teach, in order to sustain, by that means, the theory of seventh day keeping, according to the fourth commandment. They admit that love is the fulfilling of the law, but claim, that

means *keeping* the ten commandments. But *pleroo* never means to keep, and is never so rendered. Therefore to "*fulfill*" the law by love, does not mean to *keep* the letter of the law. It never did, even when the law was in force. The law, then, could be *kept* or *obeyed* through love, but not *fulfilled* by love. Acts of obedience, were required, the *letter* of the law must be obeyed or kept, then, even though they loved with all the heart. But not so now. It can now be fulfilled by love alone. The spirit of the law only, (which is not the law itself,) is now to be kept, by keeping the law of Christ, through love. Love, although it fulfills the old law, does not exempt from keeping Christ's new law, which embodies the *spirit* of the old.

Love to God and man, impels or moves to obedience to whatever is the law of God *now*, as revealed or made known by his word: not what *was once* his law in the time of Moses, but which having been fulfilled and superseded by Christ, is *not* therefore the law of God *now*: such as sacrifices, Mosaic rites and ceremonies, feast days, holy days, rest days, and the entire law of Moses, which was once *the law of God* by Moses, as I have clearly shown. "God hath in these last days spoken unto us *by his Son.*" (Heb. 1 : 2.) Hence, the law of God, to which love impels obedience now, is simply what has been commanded by God through Christ and his Apostles—what has been by *them* made know as his WILL, and our *duty*, the *new conditions* or LAW of the everlasting covenant. 1 John 3 : 23, 24. John 6 : 29. *

* Paul said, "the things that I write unto you, *are the COMMANDMENTS of the Lord.*" 1 Cor. 14 : 37. And Peter said, "be mindful of the *words* which were spoken before by the holy Prophets, and of the *COMMANDMENT of us the apostles* of the Lord and Saviour." 2 Pet. 3 : 2. Christ said, "Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you." John 15 : 14. "If ye love me *keep MY commandments.*" John 14 : 15. "For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me HE gave me a commandment, what I should say and what I should speak." John 12 : 49. God said, "him *shall ye hear* in all things whatsoever HE shall say unto you," * every soul which will not hear that Prophet shall be destroyed." Acts 3 : 22, 23. Where or when did either Christ or the Apostles ever say "keep the Sabbath day holy?" Or keep the ten commandments, after the law was completely fulfilled and nailed to the cross? Where, oh where?

J. N. Andrews, in his work, "The History of the Sabbath," page 503, speaks of the ingenious and plausible arguments by which men attempt to prove that God has abolished his own sacred law!" Could anything be more absurd? He *admits* that God *has* abolished his own sacred law of *circumcision*, which he gave to Abraham, (Gen. 17 : 10-12.) and his own sacred law of the *passover* which was called "the *Lord's law*," (Ex. 13 : 9,) and his own sacred law of "burnt offerings for the *Sabbaths*" (2 Chron. 31 : 3, 1 Chron. 16 : 40. Luke 2 : 22-39,) and his own sacred law about *many other* things contained "in the book of the *law of God.*" Neh. 8 : 3-18. And yet, he has the effrontery to make use of such language as the above; just as if such a thing could not possibly be, nor ever was known to be, as God abolishing his own sacred laws. Again I ask, could anything be more absurd than for a man to make use of such language while admitting the very thing he thus repudiates? Or could anything be more absurd than the idea that God has abolished a part of his old law, but could not consistently abolish the whole of it, and give a superior one. Or that "the law of God" always means the ten commandments! Does the sapient author suppose *all* his readers so stupid as not to perceive the fallaciousness of such positions?

Hence, to love and keep Christ's *new* law, is to *fulfill* the *old* law without *keeping* its works.

I have now gone through with a brief exposition of the covenants. I will RECAPITULATE a little. I have shown that the covenant with Abraham, was made about 1913 years before Christ, and called an everlasting covenant: that it promised to Abraham and his seed (Christ) all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting inheritance; which promise necessarily included eternal life. That the covenant contained or included a promise to Abraham's *natural* seed, or descendants, namely; that "in the fourth generation, they shall come hither again," (that is, into the land of Canaan where Abraham then was,) which promise, when fully developed included their exodus from Egypt; deliverance from bondage; and their occupation of the promised land so long as they were obedient to the Sinaitic law, or added covenant, under which, the promise to the natural seed was fulfilled: after the making and dedication of the added covenant, by the blood of oxen. But that the original covenant made with Abraham four hundred and thirty years before the added or law covenant, could not be dedicated, or confirmed or brought into force by the blood of oxen, bulls or goats; and was not therefore brought into force, until Christ the Lamb of God came and laid down his life; by whose precious blood the Abrahamic covenant was fully confirmed and made forcible, and available for the remission of sins and ultimately of sinful flesh; and inheritance of the Divine Nature, and eternal life in the Kingdom of God to be in that land; through faith in the covenant and its mediator; his death, blood, resurrection and teachings. That the added or law covenant, having been added because of transgression, until the seed (Christ) should come; therefore waxed old, when he came and fulfilled it, in its every jot and tittle, in all its requirements and types, and which, at his death, "vanished away" or expired *ex necessitate rei*, and was finally nailed to the cross, as an old dead law; the Abrahamic covenant being thus made the second or new covenant, by the death and blood of Christ, at the same time the first or old law covenant was nailed to the cross. That the Abrahamic covenant contained among its great promises, one that was the *germ* of the covenant made with David, which was developed until it came to be an everlasting covenant securing to him and his sons, the kingdom of Israel, as the kingdom of God, forever. That the kingdom of Israel under

David, as it existed in the promised land under the law, which constituted the conditions or law of that kingdom; was a *typical* kingdom; and was called the kingdom of the Lord, as well as the kingdom of Israel. That when the children of Israel became very wicked and disobedient, in the days of Zedekiah, the last Israelite King; the kingdom was overturned and became no more; and is to be no more until he come whose right it is, and then it shall be given him, and he is to come and reorganize and set it up in a perfect and permanent form; or in other words, to restore again the kingdom to Israel. That the Sinaitic or law covenant, was added to the Abrahamic covenant, like a codicil to a will or Testament, as a temporary provision, until Christ, the seed, the great spiritual heir of the promised inheritance, should come; added to enable the natural seed to go in and occupy the land during obedience. That, although this added covenant was dedicated and brought into force, so far as necessary to make it available as a law, by which to govern the Nation; yet, in order that it might be brought completely or fully into force; so as to enable the Nation to go in and possess and occupy the land under Joshua; it was necessary for Moses to die, as the representative Testator. That Christ also had to die as the antitype of Moses, as the representative Testator of the "*better Testament*"—as the Mediator of the *new* covenant—thus bringing it into force, and making it possible for the covenantees to have their sins remitted, and ultimately to get eternal life, and become Joint Rulers—Kings and Priests—under and with the Grand Heir, Christ the Son of David, and Son of God. That Christ was raised from the dead to become the antitype of Joshua, to administer the will, or new covenant. That the Abrahamic Covenant, although previously typically confirmed, by the sacrificial victims, and the oath of God, was thus by the death, blood and resurrection of Christ antitypically, fully and completely dedicated and confirmed. That this everlasting covenant—this new covenant, is to be completed by being offered to and made with the Jewish Nation, at their near future regathering, and subsequently with the remnants, or left of all other Nations, after the King comes. That the Old Covenant promised only temporary occupation of the land; The New, promises everlasting inheritance of the land; and therefore eternal life.

The Old, contained *types* of Christ and his great work. The New, Christ himself, and all things to be accomplished by him.

The Old promised a typical kingdom under David and Solomon. The New a literal Kingdom under Christ—the seed that was to “possess the gate of his enemies” and *rule* over them. Gen. 22 : 17.

The old was represented by a “bond” woman—Hagar who is in bondage with her children. The New is represented by a “free woman”—Sarah—the mother of us all—the children of promise.

The children of the old Covenant, the natural seed, and their mother the old Jerusalem ; not to be *heirs*, but cast out.

The children of the new Covenant are the heirs, and are to be the inheritors of the Kingdom.

The old Covenant had the Jerusalem that now is, (or then was,) as the head of the old arrangement or Mosaic constitution of things. The new Covenant, is to have the *exalted* Jerusalem as the head of the new arrangement, or constitution of things under Christ.

The Old, “had a *Shadow* of good things to come.” The New, is the gospel, or glad tidings of the good things already commenced to come in Christ the *substance*.

Under the Old, Moses was the representative Testator or Covenantor ; Aaron the high priest ; Joshua, the Mediator or executor ; the *natural* seed of Abraham the covenantees or legatees ; oxen the appointed sacrifice ; dedicated by their blood and the blood of bulls and goats ; circumcision of the *flesh* the seal or token ; was confirmed by the oath of the real Testator ; (Ex. 13 : 11 Deut. 7 : 8 ;) and fully brought into force by the death of Moses and Aaron.

Under the New, Christ is the representative Testator or Covenantor ; also the Mediator, Executor, High Priest, and appointed Sacrifice ; the *Spiritual* seed of Abraham the covenantees or heirs ; of which Christ is also chief. It was confirmed by the oath of God the real Testator or Covenantor ; (Heb. 6 : 17 ;) and dedicated and brought fully into force by the death and precious blood of Christ ; baptism into Christ, and “circumcision of the heart,” which is also the circumcision of Christ,” the seal or token.

The old had the ordinance of the Passover, and only those who had been circumcised, had a right to partake.

The New has the ordinance of the “Lord’s Supper,” and only those who are circumcised in *heart*, have a right to partake.

The Old had its *typical* “rest,” which commenced with

the seventh day Sabbath, and had its completeness or fullness (as a *type*) under David's reign.

The New has its *antitypical* "Rest," beginning by faith in Christ, and to have its fullness, "that which remaineth" under the reign of David's Son—the Messiah—when the law of God is to go forth from Zion. Since God gave his Son as a sacrifice, "for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles," he has been silent: he says, "I have long time holden my peace; I have been still, and restrained myself." But he says of the Messiah—the future "king of the whole earth"—"He shall not fail nor be discouraged, till he has set judgment in the earth: and the isles shall wait for *his law*." "The sceptre shall not *utterly* depart from Judah nor a law giver from between his feet, for Shiloh shall come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be." "In that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an Ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek; and his REST shall be *glorious*." "He shall build the temple of the Lord; and he shall bear the glory; and he shall sit and *rule* upon his throne;" "And the law shall go forth of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." Then shall the law of God be *greatly* "*magnified* and become *very honorable*" (Isa. 42: 1-21.) throughout the whole earth. The *will of God* through his Son, shall then be the universal law of the land. Then the time will have arrived, for which our Saviour taught his followers to pray—"thy kingdom come thy will be done on earth as in heaven." Then "the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea." Then *cometh* the time when "they shall teach, no more every man his neighbor and every man his brother, saying know the *Lord*, for they shall know me from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord." Then will the great purpose of Jehovah be accomplished, namely: As truly as I live, all the earth shall be filled with the glory of the Lord." Numbers 14: 21.

I will now bring my remarks on the covenants to a termination, by a quotation from the writings of one of the ablest living Biblical expositors—R. Roberts of Birmingham, England. "Little remains to be said in illustration of the remaining provisions of the Covenant. That God will establish the throne of his kingdom forever, in the hands of Jesus; and under him, to give to Israel the sure dwelling place from which they shall never be removed, is made evident in other lectures. These

two conclusions are amongst the most copiously attested doctrines of the word of God. In the light of them all prophecy is intelligible; without them, the Old Testament is what orthodox people practicably find it to be—a dark vision a dead letter. For this, the Apostacy is responsible. By intermixing pagan dogmas with the doctrine of revelation, it has succeeded in mystifying the oracles of God to an extent which is hopeless as regards the majority of people. It has drawn a thick veil over their faces; it has made the bible unintelligible, and brought it into ridicule and contempt with many who, with a better understanding, would bow before the sublimity and splendour of the scheme it unfolds for the redemption of this fair planet from the evil that now reigns. This lamentable result cannot be remedied to any material extent at present. A few here and there will surrender to the power of Judgment and testimony; but the great majority will continue in bondage to the power of error numerically elaborated. Seduced by the deception practiced upon their senses by the circumstances existing in Society, they are deaf to the voice of reason; they look around them, and behold a crowd walking in the stereotyped ways of *popular religion*; and though, taken man by man, they could estimate their opinions at their proper value—which, in the majority of cases from the ignorance that prevails, is no value at all—yet the mere dead weight of numbers gives the collective sentiment a power which they cannot resist, and they allow themselves to be dragged like manacled slaves at the chariot wheels of a system of faith which will not stand for a moment when tried on its own merits. Every one man in the crowd sees the rest as a crowd, and overpowered by the sight of the crowd, he bows to the collective opinion, though it be but a mere traditional bias, and not a conviction on evidence. In this way each man in the great orthodox communities, is held in bondage by all the rest, and the bondage is riveted hard and fast by the influence of the church, chapel, college, vestry, school, bazaar, tea party, private interest, and the whole machinery of the system. Nothing will break into this intellectual slavery but the iron rod of the son of David. When he comes to vest in his single person, the authority now exercised by all the kings and parliaments of the world; when he lays hold with unsparing hand, upon the vested interests which obstruct the path of general progress, and shivers to atoms the rotten fabrics of respectable superstition, when he overturturns the

institutions which foolish crowds fall down and worship, through the mere power of antiquity; when he sends forth to all the world the decree of a divine and omnipotent absolutism; when he sets up a system of worship to which he will command conformity on pain of death; and demands the allegiance of every soul to be personally tendered at Jerusalem, the city of the great king; when he comes to sweep from the face of the earth, the tangled cobweb of existing institutions which shelters ignorance, vice, and misery, while professedly *based* on RIGHT, religion, and morality; and to deal, with even hand, the swift and powerful awards of unerring justice; when he, in fact, breaks in pieces the whole constitution of human society, as now put together and substitutes for it a new order of things, having the revived kingdom of David, in the land of Palestine, as its centre and basis of operations—then, and not till then, will mankind see their folly, and “come from the ends of the earth, and say, surely our fathers have inherited lies and vanity, and things wherein their is no profit.” Jer. 16: 19.

There is no hope till then. Men may preach, and write, and spend money; print Bibles, support “ministers of the gospel,” send missionaries to the heathen, get up societies for putting down the various evils that effect Society and for popularizing government: such efforts will effect a modicum of good in the channels of activity; but so far as bringing mankind into harmony with divine wisdom is concerned, they might as well attempt to construct a ladder to the moon. Error will predominate; selfishness will prevail; monopoly will lift its ugly head to heaven; poverty will degrade the millions; war devour its prey and impose its burdens on the living; in a word SIN WILL REIGN till the Lion of the tribe of Judah comes upon the scene in righteous indignation, and scatters the proud in the imagination, taking upon himself the mighty task which long and dismal centuries have proved man’s utter incapacity for; he will “judge the people righteously and govern the nations upon earth.” (Ps. lxxvii.) “In that day there shall be one Lord, and his name One.” Zech. 14: 9. Till then, we wait in faith and patience.” *Twelve Lectures*, .P. 262.

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. 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. 2 : 2, 3. This account of the Creation was written by Moses about 2500 years after the forming the earth and sea into its present shape and condition, fit for the abode of man, (which was at first “without form, and void,” chap. 1 : 2.) and after “God formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and *man* became a *living* soul.” chap. 2 : 7.

It does not seem likely that Moses wrote the Penteteuch, during the first forty years of his life, spent amid the splendors and learning of the Egyptian Court, nor the second forty years of lonely nomadic life, in Midian, after his flight from the face of Pharoah to that place ; but it is altogether likely, that it was during the last forty years of his life ; while he was the illustrious Prophet and legislator, under God, of the Children of Israel, as their leader in the wilderness, that he was inspired to write this historical account ; and make a record of all these wonderful and most important things. He was probably assisted by Aaron, who had charge of the book, (Deut. 31 : 9, 24, and 30 : 10. Ex. 28 : 1,) commencing as soon as they arrived at Horeb about two months after they left Rameses in Egypt ; at the time when the Lord said unto Moses, “write this for a memorial in a book, and rehearse it in the ears of Joshua,” Ex. 17 : 14, who was 36 years younger than Moses: And Moses *did rehearse* not only this but the entire law, and all the wonderful doings of God, in the ears of Joshua, and the renewed Nation of Israel ; at Moab, on the day of his death, as before shown. After the death of Moses, Joshua also, wrote some things in the book, and again renewed the Covenant with the Nation; the people accepting and agreeing, and saying unto him, “The Lord our God will we serve, and his voice will we *obey* ;” which word Joshua wrote “in the book of the law of God.” Josh. 24 : 24:26. He probably added some such passages as Ex. 16 : 35. After the death of Joshua, other inspired persons wrote some things in the book.

* It would be a great mistake for any person to suppose that all the light shed on the Sabbath question in this work, can be obtained by commencing here, without reading what has been said in the preceding pages, upon “the Law and the Covenants.” A knowledge of the Law as a whole, and of the Covenants, is indispensable, if the reader desire to get a clear and correct understanding of the Sabbath law, and whether it is obligatory or not:

Now Moses in writing this brief account about the Creation, and God's resting on the seventh day and sanctifying it &c., does not appear to have been instructed to inform us particularly, just how long a time, the earth was without form, and void, before it was by him in six days, formed into its present condition, fit for the abode of man: nor how long the days were; whether of 24 hours, or of a cycle of years, between "the evenings and mornings;" nor how long a time it was, after he had ended his work and rested on the seventh day, before he "sanctified" or set it apart. We cannot tell positively, from the account, whether he set it apart (for that is the meaning of "sanctified") for a type day, and a "sign," at once, immediately, or whether it was at the time God "*made known*" the Sabbath to the children of Israel, and for the first time required them to keep it; (about 30 days before they arrived at Sinai,) that he "blessed," "hallowed," and "sanctified," or set it apart, for them to keep.* For "*there* he made for them a statute and an ordinance, and *there* he proved them. 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: (that is, the law he was just then going to make :) and it shall come to pass, that on the sixth day, they shall prepare that which they

* If any think the passage Gen. 2 : 3, indicates that the blessing of the day took place *then*—at creation, to such Dr. Paley says; "The blessing and sanctification were not actually made till many ages afterwards. The words do not assert that God *then* blessed the seventh day, but *for that reason*; and if any ask why the Sabbath was *then* mentioned if not then appointed, the answer is at hand; the order of connection and not of time, introduced the mention of the Sabbath in the history of the subject which it was ordained to commemorate." The language is that "God blessed and sanctified the seventh day because that in it he *had* rested." It will be observed that the pluperfect tense is here used, which signifies that the act of *resting* was prior in point of time to the *blessing* and *sanctification*. No Grammarian will dispute this. It does not say because he rested, but "because he *had* rested." I would here observe, that there are some Bible students who think it very doubtful if the rendering of this passage be strictly correct. It is quite possible say they, that the *rest*, *blessing* and *sanctification* are altogether, *still in the future*, and therefore, that it was in the *original*, expressed according to the beautiful and striking peculiarity of the Hebrew and Eastern writers; who in speaking of things of the *future*, made use of the present tense, in harmony with the will of God, who often "speaks of things that be not, as though they were already done:" and who "declares the end from the beginning and from ancient times the things that are *not yet done*." Isa. 46: 10. That God's work of the "new creation" is *not yet done*. That Christ is the "beginning of the creation of God," and of the great "rest." Hence he said, "My father worketh hitherto, and I work:" "I must work the works of him that sent me:" My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to *finish* his work." But the writer considers such an idea, in part, a great mistake.

bring in ; and it shall be twice as much as they gather daily. See, for the Lord hath given you the *Sabbath*, therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days ; abide ye every man in his place. Let no man go out of his place on the seventh day. So the people rested on the seventh day." Ex. 15 : 25. Ch. 16 : 4-30. And the Prophet Nehemiah, about 1046 years afterwards, in speaking of God's dealing with them at this time, said : " And *made known* unto them thy holy sabbath." Neh. 9 : 14." One thing is clear from the language and circumstances of this occasion, carefully read and considered ; that Israel never had the Sabbath law until then—thirty days before they arrived at Mount Sinai—for, they did not understand why they had to gather double on the sixth day, &c.

It is evident therefore, that if God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, at the time he rested, and " *because* that in it, he had rested," he did so because he intended it as a type or " Shadow" of the GREAT REST, which he at that time *purposed* to promise and accomplish in or by Christ : also intending to select and choose a " people," and require *them* to keep the Sabbath as a type until the antitype or " body" should come, in whom the type should *commence* to be fulfilled : that is, until the body or substance (Christ) that cast the shadow, should come and the type *begin* to be fulfilled in antitype, by faith into Christ. It may be asked, how do we *know* that God purposed or intended at the time he rested, to select and choose a people, set them apart, and give them the Sabbath, or rest day, to be kept by them, as a holy day, and a type ; and to be a " sign"—remembrancer—that God brought them out of Egypt, where they were " servants" and had no rest ?" I answer ; we know that God thus purposed, because *he did do so* : and because " *known* unto God are all his works from the *beginning*." Acts 15 : 18. God indicated by his own rest, the great Rest, both in its type and antitype. He afterwards *promised* it in the promise and Covenant to Abraham ; and 430 years after that promise, he gave a rest-day to Israel to be kept as a *type* of it, as above shown.

God rested when he had finished his work of the physical creation of the earth and man. His resting was a type of the great spiritual antitypical Rest, when he shall have finished his work of the " *new creation*"—*spiritual* creation—of which Christ is the " beginning ;" (Rev. 3 : 14. Col. 1 : 15-18 ;) not

only the beginning of the new creation, but also the beginning of the great Rest.*

We see therefore, that the law, from its very beginning, which began with the circumcision, passover, and sabbath law, was also the beginning of a system of types, as elsewhere stated—the beginning of the “Shadow of good things to come.” Not only were the Sabbaths a Shadow of things to come,” and Christ the body or substance, Col. 2 : 16, 17, but “*all* these things happened unto them for types.” 1 Cor. 10 : 11. The Hebrew Nation itself was a type. Its head and founder—the Hebrew, Abraham—was a type, and “father of the faithful.” Their going into Egyptian bondage was a type. Their sojourn there and exodus from there, their sojourn in the wilderness, their entrance into Canaan, and the temporal kingdom and “rest” (Deut. 12 : 9, 10. Josh. 21 : 44. 2 Sam. 7 : 1. 1 Chron. 17,) under David, were types.

Circumcision, the first item of the law, began with the head of the Nation. It was typical of the ultimate putting off “the flesh of sin,” and putting on immortality—“the Divine Nature—the spirit nature of Christ. The antitype *begins* with the circumcision of the heart—the circumcision of Christ”—the putting off the old man or character with his deeds, and putting on Christ, by the act of baptism—the “one baptism”—thus being baptized into him, in *obedience* to the “one faith,” and getting

* At the 28th verse of the 11th chapter of Matthew, (where the 12th chapter *should* have begun,) we are informed that Christ said, “come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden and I will give you *rest*.” He and his Disciples were then just about to go through the corn. It was on the Sabbath, or Jews *rest-day*; and Christ knowing that his disciples were hungry, and that they would pluck and eat the ears of corn, and that the Pharisees would undoubtedly find fault and charge them with breaking the Sabbath: he therefore began to enlighten them in reference to the Sabbath, as having been a type or shadow pointing down to him. Had they understood his object in thus commencing, all at once, to talk about the “*Rest*” or Sabbath, and telling them to come to him and find *rest*, and understood what he meant, they would have seen that his aim was to *instruct* them, and to show them that he was the body or substance of the *rest-shadow*, and therefore, their rest day or Sabbath, was at an *end in him*, and *no longer binding*. That when he said come to me, and take *my* yoke upon you and learn of me, and ye shall find *rest* unto yourselves, for my yoke is easy &c.: he meant, lay off the old yoke of the rest-day, and of the law; by faith in me and my teachings, and by obedience; and you shall have the real *spiritual* antitypical *Rest*—its *beginning* by rest from your load of sin and wicked works, or remission of sins, and ultimately the balance, or that which “*remaineth*,” that is, the putting off of this *body* of sinful flesh, and putting on the divine nature—immortality—and the inheritance of the kingdom. Paul corroborates this, by saying, “we which have believed *do enter into rest*, * * he that is entered into his rest, he also hath ceased from his *own* works,” that is, his own *fleshly* or wicked works. Heb. 4 : 3, 10.

his mind, spirit, disposition, words and character as a whole ; and becoming a member of the "one" "body," and a constituent of the "one Name:" and ending by being made partaker of his "Divine Nature"—"glorious body" at the resurrection.

The Passover, the next item in order, was also a type. Its lamb, a type of "the Lamb of God." A lamb slain ; so Christ ; a lamb without blemish ; so Christ ; slain without a bone being broken ; so Christ. The sprinkling of the blood, and partaking of the lamb, their passover, saved them from being destroyed : so "Christ *our* passover is sacrificed for us ;" and by the sprinkling of "the precious blood of Christ as of a lamb without blemish ;" and partaking of him, now, in mind and character (through faith and obedience) and ultimately in body and nature ; we shall be saved from the "everlasting destruction," (not annihilation,)—the doom of all who die out of Christ.

So, the seventh day sabbath, which was the third item of the law, was also a type—a "shadow of things to come :and as Christ is the "*body*" that cast or was the cause of ALL the shadows, therefore, not only the circumcision type, and the passover type, ended in him, and their antitypes *commenced* to be fulfilled in him, as I have shown ; but such is the case with the sabbath type and *all other* types and shadows. The "rest" of the seventh day, and the "rest" under King David in the land of Canaan, were both typical of the great "Rest" in and under Christ. The type *began* with the seventh day rest, and had its fullness—the fullness of the type—(not its termination,) under King David in the land of Canaan. So the antitype begins *in* Christ, by faith, and is to have its fullness in the "rest," not merely from sin, but from "sinful flesh," in the partaking of the "Divine nature, and *under* Christ's reign—the reign of David's "Lord"—the son and heir of David ; when the Kingdom of David is restored to Israel. That will be the Rest, that the prophet Isaiah referred to, when, in prophesying of Christ—"a root of Jesse"—he said ; "to it shall the Gentiles seek ; and HIS *Rest* shall be glorious." Isa. 11 : 10. As it was with David under the type, after "the land was *subdued* before the Lord, and before his people", (1 Chron. 22 : 18,) "when the King sat in his house, and the Lord had given him *rest* round about from his enemies." 2 Sam. 7 : 1. So, after Christ comes to "restore again the tabernacle of David," and to sit on the throne of his father David," which is "the Kingdom of the Lord in the hands of the sons of David," (2

Chron 2: 8,) and "shall reign over the house of Jacob," (the 12 tribes of Jacob,) after he shall have first "put down all rule and authority and all power," "and when all things shall be subdued unto him;" (1 Cor. 15: 24-28;) then shall the remaining part of the great Rest, or, "the rest that *remaineth* to the people of God" (Heb. 4: 9)—the "*glorious Rest*"—be realized. The rest from one's own sinful works, by faith and baptism into Christ, thus laying off the old yoke of the law, and taking on Christ's new and "easy yoke," of doing what *he* commands—his higher order of works—is therefore the *beginning* of the fulfillment, or antitype of the seventh day rest; which like all other types, ended in Christ the substance.

A question naturally arises here. Why were these three items of the law, the circumcision, passover and Sabbath law, given to the Children of Israel, before the giving of the entire law at Sinai—the law of circumcision 430 years, the passover law 60 days, the Sabbath law, in part 30 days, before the giving of the law in its entirety at Sinai? As they were all included in the one entire law of God, by the hand of Moses, at Sinai; why did not God wait until their arrival there, and then give them *all* at the same time? The Greek word *sumbaino*—correctly rendered *happened*—which God caused to be used in the passage before quoted, namely, "all these things *happened* unto them for ensamples or types: and they are written for our admonition (or instruction) upon whom the ends of the world (ages) are come," appears to me to be explanatory on this point. Let us therefore be both instructed and admonished by careful attention to the *wording*; without troubling ourselves as to whether or not God himself *caused* the happenings, or brought about the circumstances, by which they were caused.

When in the all-wise and infinite purpose of God, the time had arrived for him to select or choose a man to be the Head and Founder of a chosen Nation, for his own particular purpose; it so *happened* that Abraham was just a man of the right kind; perhaps the first and only man of whom God could say, "I know *him*, that *he* will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment; that the Lord may bring upon Abraham *that which he hath spoken of him.*" God required a man who would *believe* him, who would *obey* him, who would be faithful, and who would command his children, so that after his death, they also would obey him and keep his way, or law; at least, far enough and long enough for him to accomplish his

purpose or "way" through them; which was, to make a covenant with him and his seed or posterity; which covenant should have a "token"—distinctive sign—by which they would be distinguished, separated or set apart, from all other people or Nations, as his chosen peculiar people; all the way down to "the end of the law." It so "*happened*" therefore, that circumcision of the flesh, was the best token—the most suitable for his purpose as a *token*, a *type* and a *law*, all at the same time. Hence the reason why this much of what was to be the National law, was given so long before the law in its entirety was required and given.

While the posterity of Abraham were in Egypt, increasing and growing up to be a Nation, in slavery, or bondage; they were under the laws of Egypt, and did not require a National law of their own until after their exodus. But before that could be accomplished, it so "*happened*," that it became necessary under the circumstances, for the institution of the passover and its law; that is to say, in order that Pharoah be made willing to let them go, the first born of Egypt must be destroyed. The passover therefore, became necessary to save Israel's first born from the same destruction. It seems that God's purpose was, that all these happenings should be so appropriated and manipulated in his hands, as to become instructive and admonishing types, examples, or representations of "good things to come," in Christ. Hence, we see from the circumstances of the case, why it was necessary for the passover law and type, to be given, and obedience thereto required, before they could start—60 days before the whole law was required and given at Sinai. In a similar way, it became necessary for the Sabbath law and type to be given, in part, 30 days before their arrival at Mount Sinai. It so "*happened*" that in the wilderness, the people could not get food, became hungry, and "murmured against Moses and Aaron." It therefore became necessary for God to "rain bread from heaven," to supply that great congregation of over a million! That bread was manna; and as in God's purpose that manna was to be a type of Christ—"the *true* bread from heaven," (John 6 : 32,) it was therefore necessary to give them a Sabbath or *rest*-day law; which should also be a type—a shadow of the great Rest. Therefore as in the purpose of God the true bread of life, Jesus Christ, was to be crucified by that Nation, and gathered into the grave, and lie in the grave over the Sabbath, and not see corruption, (for "God's holy one was not to be suffered to see corruption.") So the manna to be a type,

must, after being gathered, be kept over the Sabbath without becoming corrupt according to its nature. But how could this be, without a Sabbath was instituted? This made the rest-day or Sabbath a necessity, as part of the type. Thus, the hungering 30 days before their arrival at Sinai, necessitated the giving the manna *then*; and the manna, in order to be a type, necessitated the rest-day, or Sabbath with its type and its law *then*. Therefore, they were commanded to rest on the seventh day, which was to them a reason for gathering a double portion on the sixth day. Ex. 16: 4-30. Then also, in order that the manna should be a type of Christ in his incorruptible nature, and of the eternal life, deposited, or "hid with Christ by God"—(Col. 3: 3, Dia.)—"the hidden manna"—(Rev. 2: 17.) God said, "take a pot, and put an omar full of manna therein, and lay it up before the Lord, to be kept for your generations; so Aaron laid it up before the testimony to be kept." This could not have been done however, until the testimony (the "two tables of testimony") was given, and "the ark of the testimony," and "the tabernacle," made. Ex. 25: 9-22. There it remained without corrupting, doubtless, until the type was fulfilled in antitype; that is, until Christ was raised from the dead, and entered into the holy place with an incorruptible nature. Christ himself is therefore the antitype of the ark, and the incorruptible nature and eternal life in him, is the antitype of the incorruptible manna, put into the ark by Aaron.

I think we are now able to understand how it was that these beginnings of the law, were given previous to the giving of the law in its entirety, at Sinai.

IS THE SEVENTH DAY SABBATH STILL BINDING? *

Can it be possible, that it is necessary to ask such a question, or to take time to consider such a question, in view of the light thrown upon the entire law, and the two Covenants?

* The Sabbath law being a part of the old or first covenant, was called "a *perpetual COVENANT*." That is, to continue without intermission, or interruption during that dispensation or the continuance of the law: like the Aaronic priesthood, or "*priest's office* of Aaron and his sons," and "the *perpetual incense*, throughout *their generations*:" not throughout other nations, nor without end. Ex. 29: 9, and 30: 8, and 31: 16.

Christ said, "If ye *love* me keep MY commandments." John 14: 15. "He that hath MY *commandments* and keepeth THEM, he it is that *loveth* me." John 14: 21. "If a man *love* me he *will* keep my words." John 14: 23. Peter said "be mindful of the *words* which were spoken before by the holy Prophets, and of the *commandment* of us the *Apostles* of the Lord and Saviour." 2 Pet. 3: 2. Not in all the words or commands of Christ and his Apostles, can there once be found to "remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy!" Never once after the law was fulfilled, and had expired, and was nailed to the cross, did they say keep the ten commandments, or the law of Moses. But the burden of their teaching was the keeping and observing by love *their own* sayings, words, and commandments, *received from God*.

I have shown and proved beyond a question, the *unity* of the law; that the two law theory has no foundation in Scripture: and therefore, when Paul said, to both Jews and Gentiles, "ye are not under the law," and that "we are delivered from the law," he could not have meant merely the ceremonial part of the law; but he meant just what he said, "the law," including the fourth commandment as well as all other commandments of the law. How then can the seventh day sabbath be binding?

I have shown clearly, that while the law itself has been fulfilled and superseded by Christ and his new law; as he himself said he came to do; that the spirit, the righteousness, the moral principles underlying the law, are still in force and binding; just the same as they were before the law was given; and therefore, while the seventh day Sabbath law, or fourth commandment is also done away like all the rest; yet the spirit, or moral principles of proper physical rest, and true worship, upon which the rest-day law was based, are still in force, and just as binding, as they were before the law was given. How then can the seventh day rest be binding?

I think I have also made it clear, that the rest-day or Sabbath, having been a type or "shadow," as called, Col. 2 : 17, and Heb. 10 : 1, had its end in Christ the body; where *all* types and shadows ended, by the *commencement* of the antitype, or substance, in him. How then can the seventh day sabbath be still binding?

I have shown that the law of God, since the death of Christ, does not consist of the decalogue or ten commandments, as a whole or in part, but that "the law of God," the commandments of God," "the law and testimony," now consist of the sayings and teachings of Christ and his Apostles, who taught that the old law, which included the ten commandments, was fulfilled and nailed to the cross, thus having its "*end*" in Christ. How then can a *part* of the fourth commandment, be still in force?

I have shown by the fifth chapter of Matthew, and other scriptures, that the works of the law of Moses were superseded by Christ's higher law of works, the works or fruit of the Spirit, all things whatsoever *he* hath commanded. How then can the seventh day observance, or any other requirement of the law, be binding?

I have shown clearly and positively, that the ten commandments were included in the first or old covenant, which waxed

old, and was superseded by the second or *new* covenant. How then can the fourth commandment be still in force?

I have shown that we should not serve God in the oldness of the *letter* of the law, but in newness of the *Spirit*. How then can it be still necessary to keep the fourth commandment in the oldness of the letter, instead of the moral principles, of proper rest and worship, upon which it was founded?

I have shown that, while the letter of the law was, keep the commandments in the way pointed out, otherwise, suffer the penalty of immediate penal death; its spirit was, obedience to all right and duty through love—to “LOVE the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, and thy neighbor as thyself;” which was not one of the ten commandments, but which is of more importance than all of them; and by which, they can now all be fulfilled, without any of the *works* of the law. How then can it be still necessary to keep the old Sabbath, in part?

I have shown that the seventh day keepers, make this mistake. They suppose that the ten commandments should be kept; but instead of that, it is the moral principles underlying them, that are still binding. That these great moral principles, of Right and Duty, which were always binding before the law, and upon which the ten commandments and entire law were based, are embodied in the teachings or law of Christ, to be kept through *love*, and therefore, the ten commandments and entire law, became useless, was fulfilled, and finally nailed to the cross. How then can the fourth commandment, be still binding?

I have shown that the law was given to the Children of Israel throughout *their* generations; but *never given to the Gentiles*; and that neither the Sabbath law, nor any other part of the law, was ever required to be kept by the Gentiles, except the few strangers that sojourned with them, and submitted to circumcision. Ex. 12: 48, 49. How then can the Sabbath law be binding on Gentiles?

I have shown that the law (not the ceremonial law as some say, but the one law, including the ten commandments) was added till the seed (Christ) was come; and was then fulfilled and superseded by him and his new law. How then can the fourth commandment be still in force?

I have shown that the law with all its penalties, sacrifices, ordinances, types and shadows, rites and ceremonies, feast days and holy days, expired *Ex necessitate rei*, from the necessity of

the case, or by virtue of its own expressed limit: nothing remaining except the moral principles upon which the whole was based, and which principles, were Jehovah's great universal, eternal, immutable law of Right through Love; binding both before and since the law. How then can the one holy day of the fourth commandment be still binding? In other words, if the law with all its holy days, is done away in Christ, as I have clearly and positively shown to be the case; how is it possible for *one* of its holy days to be still binding?

The seventh day people admit that all sacrifices, even the sacrifices of the seventh day Sabbath, and which were a part of the Sabbath law, are done away; and that all other Sabbaths or holy days are done away. But because the weekly Sabbath, or holy day, was expressed *in* the decalogue, as well as out of it, and the other Sabbaths were not; therefore the weekly is still binding while the others are all done away! Now the keeping of all the other commandments, as well as the fourth, required the observance of "rest"-days, or Sabbaths, in order to keep the commandments, and worship and obey God, in his own appointed way or manner: Therefore, those Sabbaths and holy days, were really a part of the other nine commandments (showing the way of keeping them) just as much as if they had been expressed right in connection with them (had it been possible or best) similar to the fourth commandment. But, it seems, that God thought best to add and enjoin both the holy days and sacrifices of the nine commandments, in *other places* of the law, just as he did the *sacrifices* of the fourth commandment; and to express the holy day or rest, of the fourth commandment within itself; that rest day being a type which had been indicated by his own rest at Creation, as before shown. But because he thus expressed the Sabbath of the fourth commandment *in* the decalogue itself, and the holy days of the other commandments *outside* the decalogue; the erroneous idea has been conceived, that, although forced to admit that the sacrifices of the seventh day; and the death penalty for picking up sticks, or making a fire on that day; and the prohibition against carrying burdens, &c, &c., on that day; are all done away, like all other ceremonies and holy days of the law; yet, that the seventh day Sabbath is still in force!

Is it possible for any person who fully, or even half understands the law, and the purpose of God, to hold such an idea? I think not. With all honest people who *understand* the subject,

such a position I think, must look very inconsistent and erroneous.

The writer has no doubt but most of those who thus hold, are honest: especially when he considers the disadvantages they are subjected to, by the observance of their supposed duty to keep the seventh day; even in their partial or small part observance of the fourth commandment.* But it is all because they have, as yet, failed to understand either the law or the covenants. It seems almost unnecessary to adduce anything farther on this point. But there are a few more passages of scripture, which it might be well to consider in this connection.

It is supposed by some, that on two or three occasions, our Saviour plainly taught, that in order to obtain eternal life, it was necessary to keep the ten commandments, just the same way they were kept under the law of Moses. One of these occasions, we have recorded in the three parallel passages of Math. 19: 16—23. Mark 10: 17—25, and Luke 18: 18—24; which must all be carefully read and compared, in order to get the full and correct understanding of our Saviour's teaching on that occasion.

In the first place however, before considering these passages; let me say: If it were a fact, that our Saviour did on all these occasions, teach the keeping of the ten commandments in the old way, that is, in the oldness of the letter, instead of the newness of spirit, still, it would not afford the least argument in favor of the necessity of so keeping them now. For this reason. At that time the law had not been fulfilled; and was not completely fulfilled and entirely useless, until the new and superior law of Christ, as embodied in his teachings, had been fully and plainly made known; and until the old law was "taken out of the way and nailed to the cross" at his death. Although the law and the Prophets were until John, that is, were the instructors or teachers until John, (Dia,) who first began to preach the Kingdom of God; which continued from that time to be preached; (Matt. 11: 13. Luke 16: 16, 17;) yet, the law was not *ful-*

* The writer has however, been called a "dishonest man" right to his face, because of his opposition to this Sabbath delusion; by one who had always known him as having a high reputation for strict honesty and devotedness to biblical truth; even to the sacrifice of friends and standing, among the popular Religious Denominations of the day. But coming as it did, from one who had been taught from childhood, that seventh-day keeping is still an indispensable requirement of the law of God, and binding on Gentiles as well as Jews; and who therefore did not *understand* the law; such language gave no offence, but was received in kindness; believing the person who uttered it, to be honest and sincere, although laboring under a sad delusion.

filled at that time: for, not one jot or tittle of the law was to fail till *all* fulfilled. From the time of John the Baptist until the death of Christ, the law was *being* fulfilled. That was the transition period, between the law and the gospel. During all this period, the law was "waxing old," but was not entirely useless and unnecessary, nor abolished. The letter of the ten commandments, was therefore actually necessary, to a certain extent, as the rule of life; until Christ's new rule or law was fully made known, by all the divine sayings and teachings of his life; and inaugurated by all the tragic and eventful scenes of his death. And even after his death, and the old law in its entirety, completely at an end; it was an exceedingly delicate and difficult work to convince the people that such was the case. (Indeed it is still, to this day, very difficult to convince some people!) our Saviour even taught the observance of the cleansing "*offerings*," of the law of Moses, but it does not follow that those offerings are therefore binding *now*, since the complete fulfillment of the law. When he had healed the leper, he told him, "go thy way, show thyself to the Priest, and *offer for thy cleansing* those things which Moses commanded." Mark 1: 44.*

Hence it will be seen, that whatever sanction Christ may have given, or seemed to give to the observance of the ten commandments, is no evidence whatever, that they are binding now, nor any one of them. Why have not those seventh day people, seen this point?

But we will now proceed to notice carefully these scriptures, to ascertain just what our Saviour did say and mean. "A certain *Ruler* came running and kneeled to him, and asked him, Good Master what good thing shall I do that I may inherit eternal life? And Jesus said unto him, * * thou knowest the commandments, if thou wilt enter into life keep the commandments; Do not commit adultery, Do not steal, Do not bear false witness, Defraud not, Honor thy father and mother. And he answered and said unto him, Master all these have I ob-

* Why, it is almost a wonder, that some people, who hang on to the *old* law, and think they are "*Justified*" in keeping a small part of one of its commandments, and who take pleasure, in denominating those who hold to the necessity of strictly observing the *new* superior law of Christ instead of the old law Moses, as "Antinomians;" it is almost a wonder that such people do not think it necessary also to keep this part of the law, "offer for thy cleansing," *because Christ commanded it*; and because Paul once submitted to it: Acts 21: 26 Even an *Editor* of one of the seventh-day-keeping papers makes this unjust application of the term "Antinomian," when he certainly must, or ought to know that according to Webster that appellation belongs to a sect who holds doctrines which supersede the necessity of *good works* and a *virtuous life*." Does this look honest?

served, or kept, from my youth up." But our Saviour went further. He taught him distinctly, that it was necessary to do *more*, that is, that it was necessary to keep them "in newness of *spirit*, not in the oldness of the *letter*": that is, it was necessary to actually *love* his neighbor as himself. Hence he *added* what was not one of the ten commandments, viz: "Thou shalt *love* thy neighbor as thyself;" and explained or showed him that those six commandments, all containing duties to his fellowman, must be kept through *love*; and that *he had not* kept them in *that way*; for he had hoarded up his riches and *loved* and "trusted" in *them*, and had not sold his great possessions and given to the poor. He had let his neighbor, the poor, suffer which was proof that although, he had observed all external duties towards his neighbor, just as required by the *letter* of those six commandments; yet, he had not done so in their true *spirit*, or real intent—through *love*—which, if that had been the moving "*principle*" of action, would have induced him to do *more* than the strict letter of the commands—the law—required.*

Hence, where the spirit or principle of *love* exists as the cause of action, the letter of the law is not necessary, but is *entirely useless*. Our Saviour's teaching on that occasion, distinctly shows, that keeping those commandments according to their letter, without being actuated by the spirit or principle of love, was not sufficient; that such a person "shall hardly enter unto the kingdom of heaven." Mat. 19 : 23 The Apostle Paul, in his epistle to the "beloved of God, called to be saints," in Rome; taught exactly, the same great and indispensable

* Our Saviour's teaching on this occasion, was strictly in accord with what is called, "Christ's sermon on the Mount," which was previous to this conversation with the kneeling Ruler, in which sermon he had uttered that important and renowned requirement of his law, the embodiment of man's duty to his fellow man, which has ever since been known as "*the Golden rule*," namely; "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law and the prophets." As this "golden rule" was not the requirement of the *letter* of the law, not even of the decalogue, Christ must have had reference to the *spirit* of "the law and the prophets,"—*all right and duty through love*—the very same as he showed to be necessary for that young Ruler to do, and which was much more important than the strict keeping of the letter as the Ruler had done. "Thou shalt *love* thy neighbor as thyself." Hadst thou thus *loved*, thou wouldst not have aimed to just strictly keep the letter of the law, just doing what the law *said*, but thou wouldst have done *more* than the law said, even more than the letter of the law required; thou wouldst have sold that thou hadst and given to the poor, because they needed it, and were suffering for it. That would have been doing unto others as thou wouldst have others do to thee. Hadst thou had the *love*, the law would have been *useless*; for *love* impells obedience to *Right* and *Duty* without any law whatever. Hence love is the *fulfilling* of the law without *keeping* it, by doing what the law does not require.

truth ; that is, the necessity of keeping the *spirit* of the ten commandments through love, instead of the *letter*. This, is Christ's new and superior law. Paul exactly followed Christ's teaching. He said, " he that *loveth* another hath fulfilled the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet ; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt *love* thy neighbor as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbor ; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law." Rom. 13 : 8-10. * This "very rich young Ruler, who had great possessions, and who came running and kneeling to Christ ;" said, "all these have I kept from my youth up." There is no doubt he told the truth ; for our Saviour did not say anything to the contrary, but replied "yet *lackest* thou *one thing*." And from what Christ said to his disciples after the young man went away "sorrowful and grieved," it is evident that one "lack was sufficient to shut him out of the Kingdom of Heaven. He had observed and kept the *letter* of the law strictly, which could be done and had been done by many, from the commencement no doubt ; that is through *fear* instead of *love*—fear of the threatening penalties. As I have shown, it was possible to refrain from murder, when *hate* and a *desire* to murder were in the heart, and when only *fear* of the *penalty* prevented. That would be keeping the *letter*. But if *love* were the actuating principle in the heart, then, even *without any law* or threatened penalty, one would not only

* An able biblical writer and expositor of England, in speaking of the law, says : "But although not under the law," our lives (referring to the true "brethren" of Christ) are in harmony with all its requirements, because the *love* of God and the *love* of our neighbor is the *spirit* and *essence* of the law, as enjoined for obedience. We are not only delivered from the Law, but from its curse. Under the law, death was its penalty of its deliberate breach. Under Christ, *all manner* of sin is forbidden ; but all manner of sin shall be forgiven to those who confess and forsake it. * * Meantime, the brethren and sisters of Christ, are strangers and pilgrims, seeking to please God by obedience to *His* commandments. These *commandments* are preserved to us in the *sayings* and *writings* of Christ and his *Apostles*. If the keeping of the Sabbath, and the other nine commandments remained to us for observance, surely so momentous a subject, would not be left in obscurity, especially as a council of the Apostles was convened for the special purpose of considering whether the *Gentiles* were to keep the law of Moses. Surely this would have been the time to say that the Sabbath must be kept, and to warn the brethren against neglecting to keep the Sabbath day." They did not mention it, nor in any of the letters preserved to us, do any of the Apostles ask the brethren to remember the Sabbath Day to keep it holy. Their reasoning and persuasion is all in an opposite direction. Christ and *his* commandments, is the burden of their teaching, Let us rejoice, brethren and sisters, that Christ has made us *free*, and let us stand fast in that *liberty*, taking good heed to the law, which *he* hath given us.

refrain from murder, but would have no *hate* nor *desire* to murder in the heart. This would be keeping the *spirit* of the law through love. This illustration will apply to the entire decalogue. The young man had refrained from adultery, because the law forbade it. He had refrained from stealing because the law forbade it; and not from *love* to his neighbor. He had not borne false witness against his fellow man, because the law forbade it; and not because of *love* towards him. He had honored his father and mother because the law required him so to do; and not perhaps because he *loved* them; for he loved his riches; his heart was set on his great possessions; and therefore, although he had not stolen, yet he had not given that help and support to the poor that he ought to have done; because of the lack of love, that is, he did not *love* Right and Duty, and obedience through love; which is the *spirit* of the law. The old way was, keep the letter through fear. The new way is, keep the spirit through love. A wide difference.

It is true, that *after* the law *had* been given on Mount Sinai, and the covenant containing it had been dedicated, and the law thus brought into force, as far as necessary for the guidance and government of the Nation; they were for the *first time* required to *love* their neighbor, and about forty years later, they were commanded for the *first time* to *love* God. But even then, these requirements did not form a part of the threatening penalty-law, which had been previously completed; but they were the expression of the *spirit* of the law, as to its superior moving principle of obedience. These requirements were really, and still are, a part of the Abrahamic Covenant, which has been "confirmed to Jacob (the *house* of Jacob or Israel) for a *law*," 1 Chron. 16 : 17; and when Christ came to confirm that covenant, and bring it into force with its new law of *love*, or faith that worketh by love; he made these requirements—LOVE to God and our neighbor—a very prominent feature of his teachings, at all times and on all occasions. He taught that, now, to keep the ten commandments by observance of the letter, as of old, without the principle of love, will not do. If the *one* thing—love—is "*lacking*," there is no entrance into the kingdom of God. Even *faith* unless it *works* by love, is of no avail: as James says, it is "*dead*."* He taught that not

* And Paul said, "though I have *all faith* so I could remove mountains, and have not *love*, I am nothing. * * * and now abide *faith, hope, love*, these three; but the greatest of these is *love*." 1 Cor. 13 : 2, 13. If faith do not produce love, and love produce obedient good works—"the *fruit of the spirit*"—"the *spirit of truth*," not the letter; it is of no avail. It is still too weak—"little faith."

only the old law, the ten commandments must be kept through love so long as it was necessary to keep them at all, or until fulfilled and superseded by the new law; but also, that his own commandments must be kept through love: that love was the fulfilling of the whole law. He said a great deal about it. He even went so far as to require more or greater love than had ever before been required, and gave that new requirement, as a feature of his new law or commandment. Previous to this, no more had been required than to love thy neighbor *as thyself*." But Christ's love, as exemplified in his death, *exceeded* this; he loved his brethren more than his own life: and his *new* commandment requires all his "brethren" to imitate the great love manifested by their "elder Brother;" who said, "ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you." He said, "A NEW commandment I give unto you, That ye LOVE one another; AS I have loved you, that ye also love one another. * * This is MY *commandment*; That ye love one another, *as* I have loved you. Greater love hath no man than this, that a man *lay down his life* for his friends. John 13 : 34, and 15 : 12, 13. Although love had been required, yet, such *great* love as that, which would cause one, to even *lay down his life*, if need be, for another, as Christ afterward did, thus exemplifying his teachings; had never before been required of man. Hence our Saviour said it was *his* NEW commandment—his higher, purer holier law—given to *his disciples*, and to them only—to no other people, nation or class, except his *true disciples*, learners, or followers, in all ages since that time: and which new law of "*greater love*" was to be exemplified by them, by the washing of one another's feet, *if need be*—i. e. countries and under circumstances where such an act of kindness is *necessary*—as done by him on that occasion: and to be exemplified by them even to the laying down of life, if need be, for one another—*brethren* of the like precious faith,"—for the truth's sake. Hence, John corroborates this doctrine, or new law of Christ, as to the indispensable necessity of greater love, as follows: "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer." This agrees with the teaching of Christ, Mat. 5 : 22. "But I say unto you, that whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment." But John proceeds, "and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him. Hereby perceive we the *love*, because he laid down his life for us: and *we* ought to lay down our lives for the *brethren*." 1 John 3 : 15, 16. Immediately after Christ

had given this new commandment to his disciples—that very night—after he had exemplified it by washing their feet, he also exemplified it by *laying down his life* for them; even for the whole world. “God commendeth his *love* toward us, in that, *while we were yet sinners*, Christ died for us.” Rom. 5 : 8. But, it is self-evident to all who have *honest* hearts and *thinking* minds, that these examples of Christ, of laying down of life, and washing of feet, are only to be followed when circumstances render it necessary, and for the truth’s sake : that our Saviour did not intend to be understood by his disciples, that it was necessary for them without any cause or necessity, to lay down their lives for each other. That would not be following the example he gave them; for in his case, there was a cause, a necessity for him to lay down his life, “for,” and “on behalf” of (not in the stead of) the world. He therefore, under such circumstances, was willing, obedient unto death.” “God *gave* his son,” and his Son “*gave* himself, a ransom for all.” In the same way his example of washing their feet on the same occasion to show this GREAT *love*, is to be understood : not, as *misunderstood* by the sect of short sighted “Feet Washers.”

But, let us return to the consideration of the other scriptures, where it has been supposed that Christ taught the necessity of keeping the ten commandments. We want, if possible, to get the full and correct understanding of our Saviour’s teaching on this important subject. Another passage is found recorded in Luke 10 : 25-37. “And behold a certain *Lawyer* stood up and *tempted* him, saying, Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? He said unto him, what is written *in* the law? How readest thou? And he answering said, thou shalt *love* the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and, with all thy mind; and thy neighbor as thyself. And he said unto him thou hast answered *right*: this do and thou shalt live.” Here we have exactly the same teaching, as in the case of the young rich Ruler. It was not by *keeping all the commandments*, that eternal life was to be inherited, but by *love* to God and our neighbor; so in this case. “Do *this*, and thou shalt *live*,” (eternally.) Not one word in all this conversation about it being necessary to keep the letter of the ten commandments. But it was keeping the *Spirit* of them, that was to save. This was a sharp man, a lawyer who *understood* the law and the difference between the letter of the law and the spirit of it. He knew and understood that the

spirit of it had been brought to view in the words which he quoted, once, and only once, in all the old Scriptures. We are informed that "when the Jews made a man a Doctor of the Law, they gave him authority to *teach* and *explain* the *Scriptures*, and the *Law of God* to the people." This lawyer therefore, well understood that the words he quoted were not the ten commandments, were not the law itself; but had been once expressed *in* the law, to show its basis, spirit, intent, righteousness, as to the higher, *true* motive power of obedience: and doubtless was aware that Christ had been teaching the same thing, as in Mat. 5: 17-43, and that true righteousness consisted in keeping the Spirit of the law, that "except your righteousness shall exceed that of the Scribes and Pharisees ye shall in *no case* enter into the kingdom of heaven;" that this, was the higher law of him who was called the great "Teacher come from God." He therefore "stood up and tempted him," or to "try him," (Dia.) but did not intend to let Christ get the start of him. He therefore answered him exactly according to the question, by quoting, not the law itself, but what was "written *in* the law." Our Saviour said unto him, thou hast answered *right*: *this* do and thou shalt live." There is no doubt if the Lawyer had quoted the law itself, any or all of the ten commandments, Christ would have added the words which the lawyer quoted, as he did in the case of the Ruler, (Mat 19: 19,) and said, as he did, *this* do and thou shalt live. But the lawyer himself quoting it, made it unnecessary, of course, for Christ to do so.

However, the lawyer still continued, and "willing to justify himself," said, "who is my neighbor?" Christ then proceeded to illustrate, and make that question clear. He showed up the case of the poor Jew who went down from Jerusalem to Jericho, and fell among thieves, and was left by them half dead; while a Priest and a Levite, from whom he had a right to expect and receive help; when they saw him, passed by on the other side, thus violating both the letter (Deut. 22: 1-4,) and spirit (Lev. 19: 18,) of the law; the Samaritan, who was on a journey, and from whom, the poor Jew had no reason to expect help, because of the enmity between the two Nations; when he saw him, had *compassion* (*love* to fellow man) and went and bound up his wounds, paid all expenses, &c., although, not being under the Jewish law, he was not required so to do, by that law; while the Priest and Levite were under it, and in duty bound to obey.

The Samaritan being bound only by the great universal law of Right and Duty through Love to God and man, acted out the true character of a "neighbor." Just as soon as he came *near* enough to see the half dead helpless condition of the poor Jew, his natural enemy, he considered him as his *neighbor*, and prompted by compassion, acted accordingly. The principle by which he was actuated was *love* to fellow man. Christ, in answering the Lawyer's question, by this illustration, not only forever settled the question "who *is* my neighbor," by showing that any one, even an enemy, who is in need, is our neighbor; but he also showed that the righteousness of the spirit of the law, or *love* to our neighbor, by which the good Samaritan was actuated, or prompted to do the *Right*, was far superior and more powerful than that of the law itself—the letter. The Priest and Levite, were under the law. But there was nothing in the *letter* of the law that *exactly* fit that case, although the passage referred to (Deut. 22 : 1-4,) is near enough to show the *intent* of the law. There were many other cases that the letter did not *exactly* fit. But the spirit, real intent, that is "*love* God, and *love* thy neighbor as thyself" covers the whole ground—includes all Right and Duty, under all circumstances, to be performed by love. This universal superior law was binding on the Samaritan, and he kept it. Paul's words apply to this Samaritan—this Gentile. "Therefore if the uncircumcision (those who are *not Jews*, under the law) keep the *righteousness* of the law, shall not his uncircumcision be counted for circumcision?" And again, "For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these having not the law are a law unto themselves." Rom. 2 : 14, 26. Christ told the Lawyer to "go thou and do likewise." Not one word about keeping any of the sacrifices, ordinances, rites and ceremonies, holy days or Sabbaths, or even the ten commandments; although the law had not yet been entirely done away with. But the principle of *love* to God and man which always prompts to do the Right and Duty even then, superseded the actual necessity of the old law in its entirety—rendered it useless, as to its letter.

In strict harmony with the teachings of Christ on these occasions, that it is the Spirit or righteousness of the law, and not the law itself, that is now to be kept; and that when he said keep the commandments, he *always* meant and took pains to *show* that he meant, keep them "in newness of Spirit, and

not in the oldness of the letter," we have his answer to another of those sharp Lawyers: but one who was not only sharp, or well posted; but who was "not far from the kingdom of God."

We have the record of this occasion, in the two parallel passages, Mat. 22 : 35-40, and Mark 12 : 28-34. Dr. Clark, in his commentary, says, speaking of *this* Lawyer, as follows. "These teachers of the law, were the same as the Scribes," (but a certain sect of them different from the others), "who rejected all the *traditions of the elders*, and admitted nothing but the *written* word. *These* are allowed to have kept more closely to the *spiritual* meaning of the law."

This Scribe or Lawyer (Mark 12 : 28) asked Christ, "which is the first commandment of all? That is, the first, not in order, but in importance. Our Saviour did not answer by quoting any of the commandments of the law, for they were not of so much importance as the great God-like principle of LOVE; the true moving power of obedience to Right and Duty. Hence, his answer was, "the first is, thou shalt *love* the Lord thy God with all thy heart, &c., and the second (in importance) this, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. There is no other commandment greater than these." The Scribe or Lawyer answered, "Thou hast said the truth, &c., and to love him with all the heart, &c., and to love his neighbor as himself, is more than all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices," (of the law.) "And when Jesus saw that he answered discreetly, he said unto him; thou art not *far* from the kingdom of God." No one can fail to see, from this, that it was not because this Scribe kept the ten commandments of the law, that Christ thus commended him, and told him he was not far from the kingdom; but because "he answered *discreetly*;" showing that he *understood* that it was not the ten commandments, but the greater commandment, *love*, the impelling or moving power to obey *his* commands; by which he was to become an heir of the kingdom of God. "If ye *love* me keep *my* commandments." John 14 : 15-23. This is the *love* of *God* that we keep *his* commandments." 1 John 5 : 3. "And *this* is *his* (God's) commandment, that we should *believe* on the name of his Son Jesus Christ, and *love* one another," as *he* (Christ) gave us commandment." 1 John 3 : 23. And Paul said, "the things that *I* write unto you are the *commandments* of the *Lord*;" 1 Cor. 14 : 37,) not the commandments of the old law, which are obsolete.

It will be seen therefore, that in *every instance* where our

Saviour was interrogated as to the ten commandments, or where he said anything about keeping them, or wherever he was asked what was necessary to do in order to inherit eternal life ; he invariably pointed to LOVE—obedience to *his* commands—*his* teachings, *his* sayings, *his* Gospel, through *faith* that worketh by *love*. When Christ was only twelve years old, he was found in the Temple at Jerusalem, “Sitting in the midst of the Doctors both hearing them and asking them questions.” and even at that early age, “all that heard him were astonished at his *understanding* and *answers* :” And when he was in the City of Nazareth where he was brought up ; we are informed that “his custom was” to go into the synagogue on the *Sabbath day* and stand up and read from the scriptures. And on one occasion, he read from the Prophet Esaias, a prophecy concerning himself and his mission, as follows. “The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me *to preach the Gospel*,” &c. And when he was thirty years of age, and the time had therefore arrived for him to enter upon his mission of preaching the gospel, and instructing the people in all things relative to the old law and the new law, and the way of obtaining eternal life ; we are informed that he commenced in Galilee, by preaching the gospel of the kingdom—the things or glad tidings concerning his own reign upon the throne of his father David, as had been announced by the Angel to Mary his Mother. Luke 1 : 32. Mark says, ch. 1 : 14, “Now after that John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the Gospel of the kingdom of God, and saying, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand ; repent ye and *believe the gospel*.” Or, as the Diaglott renders it, “God’s Royal Majesty has approached ; Reform and believe in the good message.” Mathew says, ch. 9 : 35, “And Jesus went about *all* the cities and villages teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing every sickness and disease among the people.” And even previous to this we are informed, Mat. 5 : 17, that he commenced at once, to enlighten the people also with reference to the old law, and his new law, comparing and showing the superiority of his law over the ten commandments.

This course he continued to pursue, all the time he was here in the flesh, *without ever once* teaching the *necessity* of keeping the letter of the law, or of the ten commandments, or of the fourth commandment, or seventh day Sabbath : when he said

keep the commandments he always had reference to the *spirit* of them, as I have shown; although the letter was not altogether "abolished" and taken "out of the way;" until it was nailed to his cross, at his death. And *after* his death and resurrection, he ended up his mission, just as he was about to be "recieved up into heaven," by instructing his Disciples just how they were to go forth to save the people—to save the world. He gave them the "great Commission," or *commandment*, as follows. "And he said unto them, go ye into all the world, and preach *the gospel* to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." "Go ye therefore and *teach* all Nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Teaching them to *observe all things* whatsoever I *have commanded* you. Mark 16: 15, 16, and Matt. 28: 19, 20. Had he ever commanded them to keep the seventh day Sabbath? If so, where? O where! This was the way they were to *save* the people—by the preaching of the gospel which "is the *power* of God unto *salvation*, to every one that *believeth*." This gospel was to show the way to "inherit eternal life." It was by *faith* in the gospel. Faith is therefore the *condition* of salvation. But mind; it must be "faith which *worketh* by *love*," (Gal. 5: 6,) causing the believer to *obey*, by being baptized and observing *all things* whatsoever he has commanded.

Again, it is supposed by some, from Acts 21: 20-27, and other passages, that Paul, himself, kept the law, including the sabbath. But this also is a mistake. Previous to this, he had distinctly taught both Jews and Gentiles, (Acts 13: 39. Gal. 5: 18. Rom. 6: 14 and 7: 6,) that they "could not be justified by the law," that they were "not under the law," that they were "delivered from the law," "that the law *was* a schoolmaster to bring the Jews" to Christ, but after that, they were no longer under a schoolmaster, that the Jews who were formerly in bondage under the law, had been redeemed, &c. &c.

It is true, when Paul was told, by James and all the Elders present, the day following his arrival at Jerusalem on this occasion, how many thousands (or myriads) of Jews would be present, which *believed*, and yet were "*all zealous of the law*," who had been informed how he was teaching even the Jews, to forsake Moses, and that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs; that he took the advice of his brethren, to act wisely; to take a wise course, similar to that

which he took a year or two before, because of the prejudice of the Jews. Although he knew and understood, as he afterwards wrote Timothy (1 Tim. 1 : 5-10,) that "the end (or design) of the commandment (or law) was *love*, &c., from which some had turned aside, desiring to be teachers of *the law*, not understanding" the things they affirmed. But, he says, "*we know* that the law is good, *if* a man use it lawfully," and that the law was not made for a righteous man," one like himself who walked orderly, keeping the law lawfully; that is, according to the end or design of it, obedience to God through *love*. Although he knew all this: yet, when he was about to go and visit *the brethren*, a year or two before this, in every city, to see how they were doing: considering it best to take Timothy with him, and being aware that the Jews where he was going, were zealous of the law as yet, and that they all knew that Timothy's father was a Greek, and therefore of course had not likely circumcised Timothy; he therefore "took and circumcised him *because of the Jews*." Not because it was necessary to keep the law, not because circumcision was necessary; for under other circumstances, a year or more before he circumcised Timothy; when certain men from Judea, taught the brethren that except they were circumcised they could not be saved, and wanted he should have Titus circumcised, and whom Paul called "false brethren" who desired to bring them into bondage under the yoke of the law; he refused.

Paul would not nor did not yield, "no not for an hour; that the *truth* of the *gospel* might continue." He would not under such circumstances, yield, to have Titus circumcised. He therefore communicated the *gospel* to them who were of reputation, "*privately*," showing them, that the gospel did not require circumcision, and the keeping of the law. Acts 15 : 1-10. Gal. 2 : 1-5. Paul was too wise for them. They did not ensnare him. But in the case of Timothy, the circumstances were very different. Paul doubtless knew that both himself and Timothy would be better able to get access to the prejudiced Jew, and have better success in spreading and establishing the gospel; and thus ultimately, by degrees bring the believing Jews to see and understand, that in and by Christ and the gospel, the law was to be entirely and completely fulfilled and superseded. He was therefore willing for the time being, to bend a little to their prejudices—as far as he could *harmlessly*. He said, "All things are lawful unto *me*, but all

things are not expedient: all things are lawful for me, but I will not be brought under the *power* of any." 1 Cor. 6: 12. He was willing to be made all things to all men, that he might by all means save some. Unto the Jews he became *as a Jew*, that he might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law (or to whom the law was given and who thought they were still under the law) as if he were *under the law*; that he might gain *them*: and to the Gentiles, that are "*without the law*," who are really not without law, but are under the law of "*Christ, and of God*," as if he were under *Christ's law*, that he might gain *them*, the Gentiles. He says, "I have made myself a *servant* unto all, that I might gain the more: and this I do for the gospel's sake. 1 Cor. 9: 22, 23. He practised this course of action, as far as he could without "*doing evil that good may come*." Thus, he tried, as far as consistent, to please all men in all things, not seeking his own profit, but "*the profit of many that they may be saved*." 1 Cor. 10: 33. Paul considered that Peter and Barnabas and some others, carried this idea *too far* on one occasion, and opposed Peter and "*blamed*" him. Gal. 2: 11. But both Paul and James, and other brethren, endeavoured to obey the *command* of Christ, "*be as wise as serpents, and harmless as doves*." Paul said, let no man think me a fool." He was so wise and prudent, that some *said*, he was crafty and caught them with guile. 2 Cor. 12: 16. On the occasion under consideration, James and all the elders present, advised him as to the best course to take under the circumstances, and he agreed with them and took it. It was strictly true, that Paul did "*walk orderly and kept the law*," by using it lawfully; as he wrote to Timothy: "*the law is good if a man use it lawfully*;" that is, as he wrote to those in Rome, "*in newness of spirit and not in the oldness of the letter*." In order that the Jews might possibly come to the conclusion, that matters were not so very bad, and so give him a hearing, Paul took the four men who had a vow on them, and purified himself with them, being at the expense of the offering for every one of them, according to the law of purifying. It seems that they deemed it wise to take that course, and bend enough to do that much, in hopes thereby to appease them if possible. There were several things required by the law, such as divers washings, purifications, vows and their offerings, which, in themselves, did not seem to be so very objectionable, if understood not to be necessary in order to be saved, during the transition period from the law to the gospel.

However there were certain Jews from Asia, who stirred up

the people, and took Paul and went to kill him. But God overruled and caused all to result in the further development of his all-wise purpose.

Again, it has been held by some, that because Christ and Paul, and some of the other Apostles, had a *custom* of going into the synagogues to read and speak to the Jews, on the seventh-day Sabbath, because on that day they were always assembled together; therefore Christ and the apostles kept the seventh day, according to the requirement of the law. They seem to forget that the Apostles and disciples, and all the enlightened *believers* in Christ, had a *custom* of meeting on the *first* day of the week. Luke 24:33, Acts 20:7, 1 Cor. 16:1, and 11:18, 20, 33, and 14:23-40. Not that there is any evidence, whatever, that they were commanded so to do; but for some reason, probably because it was the day of the week on which our Saviour rose from the dead; it became a *custom* to meet on that day. It is true that some of the Jews who were believers in Christ, but who as yet, at that early date, were in the dark as to the law; did do like those women at the time of his crucifixion, who "*rested* the Sabbath day according to the commandment." Luke 23:56. But *why* did they rest on the seventh day Sabbath? Simply because as yet they did not understand the old scriptures, as to the expiration of the law, nor the teachings of Christ and the Apostles, which at that time had not yet been written. Just for the same reason that they and Nicodemus, and Joseph, unnecessarily "brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes, of about an hundred pounds weight" to enbalm the body of Jesus; "for *as yet* they *knew not* the scripture that he must rise again from the dead" John 19:39, and 20:9. Although Christ had plainly taught it. Matt. 20:19. And David had said away back in his time, that God would not suffer his Holy One to see corruption. However, it seems they had not understood it. So even now, there are some who continue to think it is necessary to *rest* on the seventh day, simply because "*as yet* they *knew not*"—do not understand the scriptures

This *not understanding* the scriptures, was in those days, and *still is*, the cause of great and grave errors, and much foolishness; even among all the popular Sects of Christendom. But, when we consider how plainly and distinctly, our Saviour had, just before his crucifixion, taught all the apostles, all about his death and resurrection, and yet, that "they *understood none* of these things," (Luke 18:31-34,) we almost cease to wonder,

that so many in this our day, appear to be honest, and yet do not understand the plain distinct teaching of the scriptures on various important points.

It was the unbelieving wicked Jews, generally, who assembled in all the synagogues, on the seventh day or Sabbath; and Christ frequently went in, and also into other places, where he could get an opportunity to speak and teach, not only on the Sabbath, but other days. The Apostles continued this practice after his death.* But this is no evidence whatever, that they kept the seventh day or "rested on the Sabbath according to the commandment." Neither is there any evidence whatever, in the entire bible that they did so, or required others to do so; or that they kept, or taught the necessity of keeping the old law, or any part of it for either Jew or Gentile. But the very reverse. Christ not only taught that the Sabbath law could be broken with impunity, but when he and his disciples were charged with breaking that law, did he admit they had done wrong, or did he even intimate that it was necessary to keep the Sabbath? No! He justified both himself and his disciples. Although they *condemned* them, yet he showed them that they had condemned them when they were "guiltless." He said to them, "If ye had *known what this meaneth*, I will have *mercy* and *not sacrifice*, ye would not have condemned the *guiltless*." Mat. 12 : 7. They did not understand that "*mercy*" and "*goodness*," which were the spirit of the law, were better than "*sacrifice*," or doing penance according to the letter of the law. He told them that he was "*Lord* even of the Sabbath day," and therefore had the right to abolish it if he wished, and all

* Hence, we are informed that "Paul, *as his manner was*, went in unto them, and three Sabbath days reasoned with them out of the scriptures, opening and alleging that Christ must needs have suffered, and risen again from the dead; and that this Jesus, whom I preach unto you, is Christ." Acts 17 : 2, 3. And when his eyes were first opened, and he saw that Jesus was the very Christ; we are told, that "*straightway* he preached Christ *in the synagogues*, that he is the Son of God." Acts 9 : 20. "And he reasoned in the synagogue *EVERY Sabbath*, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks." Acts 18 : 4. This is quite sufficient to show any one who desires to see, that Paul did not keep the Sabbath according to the old law, but, as his manner was, and as Christ's "*custom*" was, he availed himself of the opportunity of going in among the *unbelieving* Jews and Greeks, to "reason," "teach," and "persuade" them. That was his business, his *work*. So it was Christ's business or "*work*," to go about to "preach," and "teach," and heal the sick. Both, availed themselves of every opportunity, even on the Sabbaths. Hence, on one Sabbath, when Christ had cured the impotent man, and told him to take up his bed and walk, the Jews sought to slay him, because, as they said, he "had *broken* the Sabbath," as the law said, carry no burdens, do *no work*. But "Jesus answered them, my Father *worketh* hitherto, and I *work*." John 5 : 9-18.

the say about it; that he was "*greater* than the *temple*," in which the Priests of olden time were allowed to profane or violate the Sabbath and be blameless. So now that he who was greater than the temple, and even Lord of the Sabbath had come, those who did not observe that old law were blameless, or guiltless. He told them that the Sabbath was made for, or because of the man, not the man for or because of the Sabbath; *therefore*, (so *that*, Dia.) the man (the Son of man) is the Lord, the greater, the superior, the master, of the Sabbath, which was therefore to be used as *he* thought best. He told them distinctly, "it is lawful *to do well* on the Sabbath days;" and so it is on *all* days. On another occasion he asked them "is it lawful to do *good* on the Sabbath days, or to do *evil*?" Thus showing them, that it was right to do anything *good*, any *good* thing, act or work, anything not evil. Mark 3 : 4. To do *evil*, would be wrong either on the Sabbath or any other day. This is clearly Christ's teaching on these occasions as recorded in the parallel places of Mat. 12 : 1-12. Mark 2 : 23, 28, and 3 : 1-4. Luke 6 : 1-11.* Although

* The literal rendering of the Greek of Mark 2 : 27, is, "The Sabbath was made for, or because of the man, and not the man because of the Sabbath; so that the Son of the man is Lord even of the sabbath" Therefore, he has the right to set it aside in the same way as all the rest of the law; given to end in and by him.

S. M. Hopkins D. D. of the Auburn Theological Seminary, says, "The rendering of this passage (Mark 2 : 27,) in our English version (unlike that of Luther and Calvin) fails to express the true meaning of the original. What Jesus said, was not that the Sabbath was made for man or humanity at large, but for the man (*ton anthropon*) the Jewish Sabbath for Jewish man; just as we should say that the constitution was made for the people (the American people) and not the people for the constitution. The failure of our translators to appreciate the force of the Greek article in this passage, has largely contributed to mistaken views, as to the universal and permanent obligations of the fourth commandment."

A well known *apocryphal* saying attributed to *our Lord*, is so much in harmony with his own acts, and with his exposition of the law, that, if not genuine (as there is strong reason to believe it is,) it at least shows what was the *earliest understanding of his teachings* on this subject. Seeing one working on the Sabbath (the Jewish Sabbath, of course,) he said to him "O, man, if indeed thou knowest what thou doest, thou art blessed; but if thou knowest not, thou art cursed and a transgressor of the law," making the whole quality of the act, turn on the question of the man's own enlightenment as to the binding obligation, under circumstances, of the fourth commandment" Dr. Hopkins further says, "That neither Christ nor His apostles, nor the primitive fathers taught that the fourth commandment was of moral and perpetual obligation. Our Divine Lord taught, on the other hand, that the Sabbath was a positive *Jewish* institution, made for the *Jewish* man"

Paul, in speaking of Jews and Gentiles, speaks of them as two *bodies*, as the *Jewish man* and *Gentile man*, saying, "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." Eph. 2 : 15, 16. and ch. 3 : 6.

Dr. Adam Clarke says of Mark 2 : 28. "Some have understood this as applying to *men in general*, and not to Christ. *The Son of man*, [any man] is Lord of the Sabbath; *i. e.* it was made for him, for his ease, comfort, and use, and to these purposes he is to apply it."

the law had said, "thou shalt not do any work." "Take heed to yourselves, and, bear no burden on the Sabbath day," Jer. 17 : 21,) yet Christ told the impotent man to take up his bed and walk, on the Sabbath day. John 5 : 9, and he made clay and opened the blind man's eyes : and thus plainly showed them, that anything except "*evil*," could now be done on the Sabbath days : and therefore, that the *letter* of the fourth commandment which required them to offer sacrifices, and to refrain from all kinds of work, both *good* and *evil*, and to rest physically the entire seventh day, from six o'clock until six the next night, and to keep it as a "*holy day*," and to kindle no fire, and to gather no sticks, and to suffer death in case of disobedience ; that the letter of the law which once required all this, is now done away, and nothing but the *spirit* upon which it was based, that is, the moral principles of proper physical *rest*, and true *worship* on any day or all days, remain to be observed.

Christ also taught them on the same occasion, as before shown. that the "*rest-shadow*," which was contained in the Sabbath law, had terminated in him as the substance, and that therefore, they and all others, who were weary and heavy laden with sins, were now to come unto him and find *rest* ; that by faith in him, and taking his yoke of obedience, they could have their load of sins remitted, and *begin* to realize the great anti-typical Rest, which is ultimately to culminate in the *complete* remission, or putting off the body of sinful flesh, and the everlasting inheritance of the Kingdom.

It may be noticed, that Paul's teaching in Rom. 14 : 5, that it is *right* to esteem every day alike, perfectly accords with the teachings of Christ on these occasions.

It has been said and written, astonishing as it may appear, that "no one will claim that the fourth commandment contains moral principle (!) There can be no moral principle enveloped in the observance of one day in seven ; nor any obligation in the absence of a positive precept." Did not the fourth commandment require "*rest* ;" and also "*worship*" by burnt offerings ? Are not rest and worship moral principles—duties that were such even before the fourth commandment was given ? What is moral principle ? It is, as before shown, simply "*fundamental truth*"—truth that was *always* right and duty in the nature of things, *before* it was commanded ; or whether commanded at all. So, proper physical *rest* and *worship* were *always* Right and Duty. They were implanted in the very

nature of man at his creation. He was so constituted as to require both rest and worship. He has in his very nature or constitution, the natural desire, capacity, and need, for both rest and worship. These were therefore, fundamental truths, or moral principles, having their origin in God—always truth, *always* Right and Duty. The fourth commandment to rest and worship on the seventh day, was *based* or *founded* on these moral principles: but so far as the *seventh day* is concerned, or any other particular day, any one can see at once, that there is no moral principle involved in it. That much, was simply a *positive* command; right and duty because it was commanded of God, and for so long a time as it continued to be his requirement and command, and no longer. But after that positive command or letter, to rest and worship on that particular day, in the manner prescribed or ordered; had expired and ceased to be binding; the spirit or moral principles of proper rest and worship, still remain as binding as ever, to be kept as Right and Duty, through love to God and man.

It will be seen therefore, that the fourth commandment contained both *positive* precept and *moral* precept; that the positive precept or letter of the fourth commandment differs from the letter of all the other nine commandments of the decalogue, in being more distinct from its spirit or moral principles upon which it was based, or in other words that a *part* of the manner of keeping its spirit, was expressed *within* itself, while as to the other nine, the *whole* of the manner of keeping them was expressed *outside* of the Decalogue.

It appears to the writer, that it is hardly possible for any honest person, whose mind has not been beclouded and badly warped and bent by the training of childhood, or a long continued course of erroneous thinking, and misapprehension and misapplication of scripture; to fail to see, that as it is with the entire law, so it is, of course, with the fourth commandment; that every item or particle, except the pure moral principles which formed its substrata, has been fulfilled and superseded in and by Christ and his new law of faith and obedience through love

Or it might perhaps be worded this way. Although the law has thus been fulfilled and superseded, yet the righteousness of the spirit of the law remains. This *cannot* be superseded, or done away. Therefore the new law of Christ absolutely requires and enforces the strict observance—the keeping—of the *whole* law, “in *newness of spirit*”—a stricter and higher observance

of every moral element or principle underlying every one of the ten commandments, through *love*. This, is the "*change*" in the law of God. It is a change from the letter to the spirit, from the law of God by Moses, to the law of God by Christ, from the old to the new law, from the temporary to the eternal, from the old Covenant, to the new Covenant. Under the old law Aaron was the High Priest, under the new law Christ is the High Priest. The priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a *change also of the law.*" Heb. 7 : 12. The old law required the *Jew* to rest on the seventh day, and do acts of worship by sacrifices, and do no work either good or evil. The new law, requires the *true Jew*, who has become "one inwardly, by circumcision of the heart," to rest and worship, not on the seventh day, particularly, nor the first day, nor a seventh part of the time; but a proper and necessary share, and at such times as circumstances may dictate as best or necessary; it may be *more* than one seventh, even "*daily*" sometimes, (Heb. 3 : 13,) or it may be less: and to do so from *love* to God and his word, and to man, and his needs—"doing *good* unto all men *as we have opportunity*; especially unto the household of faith." Gal. 6 : 10.

The new law of Christ, requires the true Jew, to observe proper and necessary *rest* from work or physical labor, and to take time to "search the scriptures," John 5 : 39; to "assemble ourselves together," Heb. 10 : 25; to "examine ourselves whether we be in the faith," 2 Cor. 13 : 5; to "exhort one another *daily*," Heb. 3 : 13; to "observe the breaking of bread, and prayers—partaking of the Lord's Supper." Acts 2 : 42; Luke 22 : 19; 1 Cor. 11 : 23-34; "making supplication, prayers, intercessions, giving thanks in behalf of all men;" and to "lead a quiet and peaceable life in *ALL goodness and honesty.*" 1 Tim. 2 : 12.

Thus, as the people of God, taken out of the Gentiles, "*for his name*," and upon whom "his name has been called," or placed, or named, (Acts 15 : 14-17,) "*a peculiar people*," (1 Pet. 2 : 9,) aiming to honor "that worthy NAME by which they are called," (James 2 : 7,) which name, like Paul, they "*bear* before the Gentiles," (Acts 9 : 15,) and which name of God or Jehovah or Yahweh, the "more excellent name which Christ also, *inherited*," (Heb. 1 : 4,) and, which is named on "the *whole family* in heaven and earth," (Eph. 3 : 14,) that is, the "one body," of which Christ is the head, (Eph. 1 : 22,) and *into* which body

they and all obedient believers of the gospel, have been "baptized," (Gal. 3 : 27,) (Matt. 28 : 19,) thus becoming constituents of the one Body and one Name—the "only name under heaven given among men, *whereby we must be saved.*" Acts 4 : 12: They affiliate not, with the popular denominations of the day, who reject the truth because of its unpopularity; but ever "speaking the *truth in love*, that they may grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ," Eph. 4 : 15; and that they may ultimately inherit eternal life and the kingdom of God.

It will be seen from all this that the "*change of the law*" is a great one; but a change very much for the better. That the law of God by and under Christ, is a very different thing, from the temporary law of God, by and under Moses: that the law of God, by and under Christ, is much the superior in all respects. Who can reasonably, or even *possibly* object to this? Methinks *no one* would or *could*, except on account of a *pet theory*, or of a badly warped and bent mind, or a lack of light and understanding, on the subject, or the being destitute, of "an *honest and good heart.*" Luke 8 : 15. It can hardly be expected that those *leaders* who have labored under the mistake so long; who have spent so much time and means in the publishing of their periodicals and books, in trying to sustain the delusion as being the truth: and who really think (no doubt) that they have succeeded in doing it; and have induced so many others to think so too, and to follow their teaching: it can hardly be expected that any of *those* will ever see and acknowledge their mistake, and abandon it. Their minds have been bent for so many years, many, even from childhood; they are like a little tree that has been bent equally long, and which can never recover its normal upright position—"Just as the twig is *bent* the tree inclines," although a poetic effusion, is nevertheless an important truth. It is not a matter of wonder, that to any one who has been brought up and trained from infancy, to observe and keep the seventh day as a holy day; it should *seem* right and duty, and be *difficult* for them to see otherwise. But it is a matter of surprise, that persons who have not been so brought up, and who claim to have fair mental powers; can so stultify themselves as to accept some of the positions and teachings of the seventh day theory, and reject plain positive truth expressed in the Scriptures. When we see with what zeal and energy, the seventh-day people labor, to

spread their great mistake and error, by their Periodicals and Books published not only in the English, but also, in the Danish, Swedish, French, German, Italian and Holland languages; we cannot help thinking, and saying in our hearts, "what a pity!"* Neither can we avoid *thinking* of Paul's language relative to his brethren in the flesh, Rom. 10 : 1-4, as follows: "Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved. For I bear them record that they have a *zeal* of God, but *not according to knowledge*. For they being ignorant of *God's* righteousness, and going about to establish *their own* righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God. For Christ is the *end of the law* for righteousness to *everyone* that *believeth*." Do they not *believe*? Now it does appear to the writer, that no one whose mind is not badly warped, can fail to see, that to every one that *believeth* in Christ, he is the *end of the law* for righteousness: that they are justified by FAITH *without the deeds of the law*," (Rom. 3 : 28,) that "God's righteousness" which Paul speaks of, is "the righteousness of God which is *by faith* of Jesus Christ unto all and upon *all* them that *believe*."—"The righteousness of God *without the law*," Rom. 3 : 21 : 22; that they should *put off* the *yoke* of the *law*, when they put on the *yoke* of Christ; that none of the works of the law are now necessary in order to be righteous: and if no flesh can be justified or made righteous by the works of the law, then why is it necessary to keep the works of the law? Remember, I have proved positively that there are not *two* laws, a "ceremonial law," and a law of God,

* SABBATH PAPERS.—In the United States there are published, in behalf of the Bible Sabbath, two monthly, one semi-monthly and three weekly papers. In England a quarterly, and at Basel, Switzerland, a monthly are issued in the interest of this oft-recurring question. The monthlies are published in the Danish, Swedish, and French languages. Nearly one hundred books and tracts are now issued (A. D. 1877) in defense of the doctrine, that the seventh day is the Sabbath, and the demand is increasing."—*Sabbath Memoriam*.

Thus the baleful and burdensome delusion is spreading, and many being induced to bow their heads and bend their necks to the slavish "yoke." But there are other equally foolish and pernicious (although less burdensome and more popular) errors being much more rapidly and extensively promulgated, by all the popular Denominations of the day. So it goes, while TRUTH, of the utmost importance—God's purpose, and way of life, as revealed in his word—has only here and there an advocate, walking in the "straight and narrow way," with the "few there be that find it," illustrating our Saviour's significant question, viz: "when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?" Or, as rendered in the Diaglott; "But when the Son of man comes, will he find *this belief* on the land? (Luke 18 : 8.) What belief? Why, that God will speedily avenge his elect, or "chosen ones who are crying to him day and night," at the coming of his Son.

in the time of Moses, as has been supposed and taught, but that the law of Moses included the ten commandments, and that the law of Moses, was the law of God; and that the law of God has been *changed*, and consists now of the law of Christ. 1 Cor. 9 : 21.

Let us refer to a few of the inconsistent positions and teachings above alluded to. First: that theory teaches that the seventh day Sabbath law, being a part of the ten commandment law, was given to all Nations, and not to the Jewish Nation only. In a work by one of the leading advocates entitled "the seventh-day Sabbath," the author says, "in Eden he (God) gave the Sabbatic institution!" Another says, "the Sabbath was given to Adam before he sinned!" Who can swallow these assertions, in the absence of one word of proof in the entire bible? Especially when the Scriptures inform us to the contrary, so plainly—that the ten commandments and the entire law, were given in the wilderness of Sinai, twenty-five hundred years after the creation: and given only to the Children of Israel. Even in the decalogue itself; we find it, as follows: "*Remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God, brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm: THEREFORE the Lord thy God commanded THEE to keep the sabbath day.*" Deut. 5 : 15. Is it possible that *any* person's mind can be so obtuse and warped, as not to see from this passage; first, that the command to keep the Sabbath, was given to the *Israelites* as a Nation; no other Nations being present, nor one word about other Nations being included. Second: that it was given after the Exodus—after their deliverance from Egyptian servitude. And third: the *reason why* they were thus required, by that command or law, to keep the Sabbath; that is, because of such deliverance—"THEREFORE," * As I have previously shown, (Ex. 16 : 4, 29,) it was thirty days before this, that the command

* We are informed, that after a disputation held at the University of Oxford in 1622, the learned Dr. Prideaux, then Regius Professor at the University, gave his "determination" as follows: "1st. That the Sabbath was not instituted in the first creation of the world, nor ever kept by any of the ancient patriarchs who lived before Moses; therefore no moral or perpetual precept." "2d, that the sanctifying of one day in seven is *ceremonial* only."

The fact, that, we are informed Num. 15 : 34, when the man was found gathering sticks on the Sabbath, "they put him in ward because it was not declared what should be done to him," that is, in *what way* he should be put to death," proves that the Sabbath was a new institution—that the *manner* of executing the penalty, had not yet been declared, or made known. It is most unreasonableness therefore, that the Sabbath law had been in existence for 2500 years.

was first given, at least, the Sabbath law in part: and here in the fourth commandment, God informs them *why* he gave the command. And afterwards he told them, it was also a “*sign*” between him and *them*, (Ezk. 20 : 12, Ex. 31 : 13,) not between him and any other Nation; and the object of the sign: that is, that they might know that he had thus “*sanctified*”—*set them apart from* all other Nations, for a special purpose. He also told them *why* he had selected that particular day—the seventh day—for their rest-day, and blessed and sanctified it, or set it apart, for that purpose: because he himself had rested on the seventh day at the creation of the world: as a type, to indicate the GREAT REST, commencing by faith in Christ; the balance, or “*that which remaineth,*” to be realized at his second coming: which type he designed to be continued by his chosen typical people, clear down to the beginning of the antitype—Christ the body, or substance, of the shadow or type. This is the point where the shadow ended; even according to the teaching of Sabbatarians themselves: for one of them, whose book lies before me says, “*all shadows cease when they reach their bodies which cast them. Follow the shadow of the tree to its body, and there the shadow ends.*” In Ex. 15 : 25, and 16 : 4, where God first gave them the Sabbath law, he speaks of another reason why he gave them that law: “*that I may prove them whether they will walk in my law or no:*” that is the law he was just then making for that purpose. He had evidently made the law—“*statute and an ordinance*”—a few days before, (Ex. 15 25, 26) “*in the wilderness,*” and after they had gone back to the Red sea (Num. 33 : 8-10.) and returned to the same wilderness again, (Ex. 16 : 2-4.) he carried the law into effect. It is preposterous to suppose that this law, which was made for the Israelites, because they had been servants in Egypt and had no *rest*, and as a *sign* of their being set apart from all other Nations; it is simply absurd to suppose it was made more than 2000 years before the Israelites existed—in the Garden of Eden! Or that it was made for any other Nation. There is no doubt however, when God rested on the seventh day, he intended it should be a *type* of his ultimate great Rest, in and by Christ; and to be given to the people which he should choose; to be kept as a holyday or rest day, and as a rememberancer of their great deliverance from servitude, where they had no *rest* and as a sign, to distinguish them from other Nations: “*For known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the*

world." Acts 15 : 18. He however permitted individual strangers of other Nations, who desired to *sojourn* with them, and share the blessings and protection of God, to do so ; but upon the express condition, that they were to enter into the Covenant (Deut. 29 : 11, 12) by submitting to be circumcised, and coming under the "*one law*" (Ex. 12 : 43-49. Gen. 17 : 12, 23-27) thus becoming "*Joined to the Lord,*" (Isa. 56 : 3-6) as members and citizens of his chosen people or Nation. The Prophet Nehemiah said, "Thou camest down also upon mount Sinai, and spakest with them from heaven, and gavest them right judgment, and true laws, good statutes and commandments : and madest known unto them thy holy sabbath, and commandedst them precepts, statutes, and laws by the hand of Moses thy servant." Neh. 9 : 13, 14. He don't say that God made known *his holy Sabbath* from mount Sinai ; but, "by the hand of *Moses,*" which was thirty two days before God came down on Sinai. But it is positive proof, that the Sabbath was made known to them *through Moses* ; and therefore, that they had never been required to keep it before ; which is also evident, from the fact that at the time it was made known by Moses, the people did not understand, and Moses was obliged to explain to them. Ex. 16 : 23-29. There is not one passage in all the scriptures showing that the Sabbath law, was made in Eden ; or that it was ever commanded, or made known or that it existed, for 2500 years after the creation ; or that it was ever given to any other Nation ; or that any other Nation was ever required to keep it. Paul said distinctly, "the Gentiles *have not* the law." Rom. 2 : 14.

But I would here remark, that although seventh day advocates have all labored hard and long, by catching at every little thing imaginable, in the absence of any scriptural proof, in order if possible to make it appear that the Sabbath law was given to Adam in Eden, and was given to all Nations, and that Abraham kept it, &c , &c., which they think would show its great importance ; yet. this is not the question. This after all is of little consequence. We admit that the Sabbath was once the *law of God*, given to the Israelites. That, alone, gave it great importance. The great question is, has it ceased to be the law of God, or is it still in force ? So were sacrifices of bulls and goats, and heifers and lambs, once the law of God. But that has long since ceased to be the law of God. While the offering of such sacrifices, was the law of God in force, it was right and

duty to obey it. Yea, of the utmost importance to obey it. So it was with the Sabbath law. It matters not, when, or to whom, the Sabbath law was given; so long as it can be shown and proved clearly and positively, that the entire law is done away; that it is not now the law of God.

It may be possible, that a law for sacrifices and Sabbaths, may be re-enacted in the future. Indeed the scriptures seem to teach that such will be the case for a season and a particular and necessary purpose. But for this dispensation the seventh-day Sabbath law is not in force. It is no longer the law of God. However, we will still further consider, some of the great mistakes, and short sighted positions of Sabbatarians, as we find them in this little work before named; the author of which, is an editor, and one of the leading advocates.

He says on page 3, "Abraham is said to have obeyed the voice of the Lord, and kept his charge, his commandments, his statutes and his laws. Gen. 26: 5. The Sabbath must certainly have been included in the commandments, statutes and laws which Abraham obeyed." Now, let us look at the grounds for this assertion. Abraham lived and obeyed God, just one hundred years after God called him. He obeyed God's first command to him, to "get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will show thee." This was no small act of obedience. But he lived just one hundred years after this, and obeyed God's every requirement. He "builded an alter unto the Lord." "He walked through the land, in the length and breadth of it," at God's command. He took a heifer, and a goat, and a ram &c. &c., and offered the covenant sacrifice at God's command. He obeyed God's "charge," and "walked before the Lord to be perfect." He obeyed God's statute and law of circumcision, and circumcised himself, and all the men of his house the very "selfsame day, as God had said unto him." He did not hesitate or delay. He "commanded his children to keep the *way* of the Lord, to do *justice* and *judgment*." He cast out Hagar at God's requirement. At God's command he took Isaac to "offer him up for a burnt offering." Then, when directed, he took the ram and offered instead. Thus for one hundred years, he faithfully and lovingly obeyed all God's commands and requirements of every nature and kind. But during his entire life of 175 years, not one solitary word or hint about his keeping the Sabbath, or about any such law or custom, or requirement of

God, as to Abraham or any other person or Nation. Yet this Sabbath Advocate comes to the sage and astonishing conclusion, that "the Sabbath *must certainly* have been included." This, is the kind of proof, this is the kind of reasoning, that the theory is largely built upon. There is no reason, nor soundness in it. It looks like building a house on a sandy foundation. Instead of Abraham commanding his children to keep the seventh day, they were to "keep *the way* of the Lord to do *justice* and *judgment*;" that is, the way of *Right* and *duty*, whether commanded or not. But the children of Sabbath keepers, seem to regard obedience to that item of the old law, as of more importance than all the law of Christ; and certainly of more importance than the first step of obedience to the gospel, even though that step be for the remission of sins—the condition of salvation: as some have neglected it *for years*, after having professed to believe the gospel (although in the days of the Apostles, it was *always* attended to at once, sometimes the *same hour* of believing, right in the middle of the night) and yet, all those years *very particular* in keeping *in part*, the fourth commandment! This looks like having more respect for the old law, than for the gospel. This looks like a lack of a proper understanding of one's most important interests. Yes, it looks like *delusion*. Christ said "he that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved." Annanias said to Saul, "why *tarryest* thou, arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Peter said, "repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins; * * then they that gladly received his word, were baptized: and the same day there were added about three thousand souls." No matter if they had kept the Sabbath all their lives, or whether they kept it or not. That would not save them. That was a matter of little consequence, for "salvation is by faith"—faith in, and obedience to, the gospel not the keeping of the law. Peter "*commanded* them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." But all this is unheeded by many. Some pet theory takes the precedence. Even those positive direct *commands* are apparently of less consequence with some, than that one old obsolete command of the law. For they neglect the one for years, while they are *very particular* to observe the other. Could anything show more plainly, a warped and prejudiced mind? Again, this writer, like D. M. Canright, and other advocates of seventh day keeping—all—make an egre-

gious mistake, by confounding the ten commandments with the moral principles, underlying or contained in them. No person living can *possibly* understand this subject, the law, and the Sabbath, who labors under so great a mistake; who does not understand distinctly, the difference between the law, and the moral principles underlying it; and between positive precepts, and moral precepts: or, understanding, yet confounding them all together. Although I have previously illustrated this point and its importance, I will refer to it again in this connection. Our writer says, "though the *ten commandments*, or the moral law, was not given in a written form until the children of Israel had gone out of Egypt, yet the *principles* of the moral law, were known before that time and obeyed, and their violation was known to have been sin." And Canright says, these *principles* have *always* existed; * * they were as binding upon the antediluvians as upon the Jews, and they are as obligatory now as then. We can conceive of no Nation, generation, or individual, that could violate these *precepts* with impunity. This *law* is as eternal and unchangeable as the Creator." Now all this is pretty good and nearly correct, *except* the confounding of the ten commandments with the moral principles—the calling and treating them as one and the same.

Yes, these *principles* have *always* existed: they are co-eternal with the Creator. But, can that be said of the ten commandments? Can that be said of the law? Can that be said of the fourth commandment? It will be seen at once, that such an idea is preposterous. No proof is required. I need only to ask the question, for every one to see at once, that this is a most egregious blunder, a blunder that quite incapacitates its votaries, and renders them powerless to understand either the law as a whole, or even the fourth commandment. But this is their theory and their position—the ten commandments and the moral principles one and the same.

Yes, these great universal, godly, unoriginated, immutable, imperishable *principles*, *were* binding upon the antediluvians. But can that be said of the ten commandments? Can that be said of the fourth commandment? These principles always existed. But God's commands to keep or obey them, in the way pointed out, and those commands written down in letters; constituted *the law* of Moses—the law of God "by the hand of Moses," and *did not* always exist. The moral principles never had a beginning, but the law of the ten commandments had a be-

ginning chiefly at Sinai. It will be seen therefore, that the principles are one thing, and the ten commandments quite another thing; and that it is a great mistake to regard them as one and the same, and is the cause of many other great mistakes. The *moral principle* of the second command of the decalogue is true heart-worship of God, by obedience to him, in the observance or all Right and Duty through love. But the letter, the law, the commandment, is, "thou shalt not bow down thyself" to idols or other gods, but thou shalt worship God by the offering of sacrifices, &c. Now the commandment, the law, has ceased, is done away; but the moral principle of true spiritual worship, is still in force. Again, the *moral principle* of the fourth command, is proper *rest*; But the letter, the commandment is, thou shalt *rest* on the *seventh day*, and offer the regular Sabbath sacrifices. Now the command, the law, has ceased, is done away; but the moral principle, that is, the duty of proper "*rest*" is still in force. Thus it is, with *all* the ten commandments as previously shown. The *letter*, the law, is done away, but the *spirit*, the principles, are still in force. Canright says, "these *principles* are as obligatory now as then." That is also true. But can that be said of the law, of which the ten commandments formed a part? No, for it was added only till the promised seed should come. The law was therefore given only as a *temporary* law. But the principles are an *eternal* law—a temporary law founded on an eternal law. It will be seen therefore, that it is the confounding of the commandments with the moral principles, which has caused them to come to the erroneous conclusion, that the ten commandments are God's perfect, unchangeable, moral law; and second, that the ten commandments must therefore be the law of God, and the other commands the law of Moses! . Hence, their two-law-theory.

A third erroneous conclusion is, that the fourth commandment, being one of the ten, must therefore be perfect and unchangeable, or in the words of J. N. Andrews, author of "History of the Sabbath," (a work of over 500 pages which lies before me) in his preface; speaking of the Sabbath, he says; "it constitutes the very *heart* of the law of God, and so long as that law endures, so long shall the authority of this sacred institution stand fast." This man, although an able writer, was so blinded by this great delusion, he could not see that the law of God to which he refers, was only God's *temporary* law, including all the sacrifices and circumcision, and which, with

its "very heart" had expired, more than eighteen hundred years before : and that its *Spirit*—the unchangeable moral principles it contains, still lives in the *new* law of God by his Son—God's "words" and "commands" which he put into Christ's mouth to speak to the world.

However, it is not expected that those persons in whose minds the erroneous positions of this delusion, have become so deeply imbedded and fossilized, will ever be able to see their mistake. Again, the law contained also many commands not founded on moral principles. All such were of course *positive* commands, or precepts. It will be seen therefore, that the fourth commandment was part *moral* precept, and part *positive* precept. That is, "thou shalt rest," is *moral* precept or law ; because it is a command founded on the moral principle of *Rest*, which as a Right and Duty, never had a beginning, nor will ever have an end. But the other part, that is, "on the seventh day," (Ex. 34 : 21,) is *not* moral precept, but *positive* precept or law, because to rest *on that particular day*, is a command *not* founded on a moral principle ; for, to rest on the seventh day, or any other particular day, more than another, is *not* one of the eternal moral principles of Right and Duty. This does not need proof. It is self evident to every thinking mind. Just so, another part of the Sabbath law, viz : "he shall worship," is a moral precept : but the other part, viz ; "at the threshold of the gate ;" or "at the door of this gate ;" (Ezk. 46 : 2, 3,) or, to offer "the burnt offering of every Sabbath ;" (Num. 28 : 9, 10,) *were not* moral precepts ; because, while worship was always right and duty, and always will be ; to worship at the threshold of that gate, or any other gate, or by the medium of burnt offerings, was not moral principle ; and has therefore been all done away. It will be seen therefore, by this illustration, that while the moral principles of proper necessary Rest and Worship, are still right and duty, and as obligatory as ever ; the particular day, place, and manner, that is, the entire fourth commandment law, has expired, with all other *positive* precepts, or the entire law ; leaving nothing but the moral principles, which are embodied in the law of Christ.

Again, this writer says, on page 10, " what is God's law by which he will judge the world ? The ten commandments contain the *principles* and precepts of right, and their violation, or neglect, would be sin." Here again he is badly mixed and wrong, because of not distinguishing between the ten commandments

and the principles, underlying them ; thinking them all the same ; and which causes him to make this mistake, namely : He thinks God's law by which he will condemn and judge the world, is the ten commandments. Whereas, it is the *principles* upon which they are based, as embodied in Christ's law, or words ; by which he will judge the world through his son. Hence Christ says, "for the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the son." He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not *my words*, hath one that judgeth him : *the word that I have spoken*, the same shall *judge* him in the last day." The ten commandments are no longer the law of God. It is those imperishable principles, as embodied in Christ's words, which his Father "put in his mouth," (Deut. 18 : 18,) that constitute the law of God now. "For he whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God. John 3 : 34.

Canright says, "In fact we find frequent reference to the violation of the commandments all the way from Adam to Moses ; hence we know the law existed then !" See how mixed, and warped, and mistaken, he is. He means, violation of moral principles, not the ten commandments. Neither the commandments, nor the law, were in existence from Adam to Moses, which he could have seen and understood, if his mind were not so bent. Now look at his erroneous conclusion. He says, "Hence *we know* that the law existed then." He could not see, nor realize that Paul had set that point at rest : "for until (that is, *before*) the law, sin was in the world : but sin is not imputed when there is *no law*. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses." Rom. 5 : 13, 14. This passage clearly teaches us that the law (that is, the Sinaitic revealed law) was *not* in the world from Adam to Moses ; but that *sin* was in the world, not transgression of *that law* (because as he says, "*no law*" was in the world) but, sin was by transgression of moral principles of Right and Duty : and because there was no law, the sins were not imputed. These writers were trying to make out, that the fourth commandment law was in the world from Adam to Moses, because the people did wrong and sinned by transgressing the great principles of Right and Duty. But I ask, was the keeping of the seventh day one of those moral principles that never had a beginning ? It is deplorable that there is an occasion to ask such a question.

Again, this writer, on page 13 quotes two parallel passages, as follows : "For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all

be fulfilled." Mat. 5 : 18. "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass than one tittle of the law to fail." Luke 16 : 17. On the next page he says, "Then as the law, not even one jot or tittle of it, is to pass away, *before* the heavens and earth, it, including the Sabbath command, is still in existence; with *all* its binding obligations; and it will always remain," &c.. Whereas, those passages simply teach, that the law cannot pass away *till* every jot and tittle is fulfilled. Instead therefore, of their containing proof that it was to "always remain," they prove the very reverse; namely, that not only the Sabbath law, but the entire law was to pass away when every jot and tittle was fulfilled.

Again, if "the Sabbath command is still in existence with all its binding obligations," how is it that they don't keep all those obligations? One of the binding obligations of the Sabbath law, was, "the burnt offering of *every* Sabbath." Num. 28 : 10. Do they keep it? Another was, "worship at the door of this gate." Do they keep it? Another was, gather no sticks, "ye shall kindle no fire." Do they keep it? Another was, "Take heed to yourselves, and bear no burden on the Sabbath day." Jer. 17 : 21. Do they heed it? Another was, "whosoever doeth *any* work therein shall be *put to death*." Does the Sabbath law still remain entire? "Oh consistency, thou art a Jewel!" If, as he says, "the law, not even one jot or tittle of it, is to pass away *before* the heavens and earth, it, including the Sabbath," why don't they keep it? Why don't they heed what God said about *diminishing* it? "Ye shall not *add* unto *the word* which I command you," neither shall ye *diminish* aught from it, that ye may keep the *commandments* of the Lord your God which I command you." "What thing soever I command you, observe to do it : thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it." Deut. 4 : 2, and 12 : 32. Are these not God's *words*—words that "the Lord *spake*?" Also the following, namely : "This is the burnt offering of every Sabbath?" Do they glibly answer, with reference to this and the other obligatory requirements of the Sabbath law, above quoted, in the specious words of J. N. Andrews, that these "were laws pertaining to the Sabbath, that were *no part* of the Sabbatic institution! That this language does not form *part* of the fourth commandment, the *grand* law of the Sabbath?" That is, do they get out of obeying these binding obligations of the Sabbath law, because not in the decalogue? Why not then disregard the following, because not

in the decalogue? "Thou shalt *love* the Lord thy God." "Thou shalt *love* thy neighbor." "Ye shall do no unrighteousness in meteyard, in weight or measure. *Just* balances, just weights, &c, ye shall have." Lev. 19 : 35. "Ye shall not *lie* one to another?" Why not get out of all these, and numerous other commands, on the same principle; merely because not found in the decalogue?*

But perhaps they think there has been a "*change*" in the Sabbath law, or fourth commandment! No; that cannot be; for this writer holds that the Sabbath is a part of their so-called "unchangeable" moral law—one of its precepts—of which he says, on page 17, Jesus "never taught that at his death, or at his resurrection, his Father's law would cease, or *one* of its precepts would be *changed*!"

Again, he says, the change of dispensation, in no way necessitated a *change* or abrogation of the moral law." It matters not, with them, that Paul says "the Priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a *change* also of the law;" Heb. 7 : 12 ; that is, not a change *in* the law, but a change "*of* the law"—a change of the entire law, for a new and greatly superior law; because of the new superior "High Priest," "Great Teacher," or "Prophet like unto Moses"—a *new* Law-Giver. Oh no, that must be got around some way, like many other passages: So, on the next page, he says, "The idea of *change* of this law reflects upon the wisdom of God." Canright says, "every precept shall stand. Not even a letter shall be changed, till heaven and earth shall pass away!" This is what they teach, and yet they know, and every one else knows, that they do not even *half* keep the Sabbath law. Do they say, it is *impossible* to keep it in all countries? That is true. But that fact proves God never commanded, nor required, nor intended it to be kept by all people, in all countries. He is too wise and too good to command all people to keep a law, which is impossible to be kept in most countries by any one. The truth is,

* If the seventh day Sabbath law, is to be kept at all, then every jot and tittle of its obligatory requirements must be observed. No portion can be left out to suit the will or fancy of any person, or class of persons. If it be not kept as a whole it is not kept at all. To an unbiased mind nothing can be plainer than this.

An able biblical writer of England says on this point as follows: "We dare not pick out (like Saul who was rejected for his disobedience) one part, and say "I will keep this part of the commandment, and leave out another part of it." We are either under the law, and bound to keep it out and out, or we have been delivered from it, and fulfill the *spirit* of it in the new commandments we have under Christ." ♦

while they have been compelled to change the way of keeping it; omitting and contravening some of its binding obligations, yet they continue to say, "*no change!*" "No change!" It is true there has been no change by either Christ or the Apostles, from the *seventh*, to the *first* day of the week, simply because the seventh-day Sabbath, as a requirement of God, was to cease, and did cease, together with all other requirements of the law, at the death of Christ: being *changed* for, and superseded by the *new* law of the great "Teacher," the *immortal* High Priest, who, after he was raised to incorruptibility, and before he was received up into heaven; met with his eleven disciples; condensed all his teachings while in the flesh, as the new law of salvation; into faith in the gospel, and observance of "*all things whatsoever I have commanded you;*" commissioning and commanding them to go into all the world and proclaim to the people, the way to be saved.

Again; our writer says, on page 6, "This *moral law* is *right in itself*, depending upon nothing else for its validity or righteousness, and therefore good at all times and for all people:" And, as before quoted, "the idea of a change, reflects upon the wisdom of God."

Now this language is all right and correct, when applied to God's great immutable perfect moral law, consisting of the eternal moral principles of Right and Duty; but altogether wrong, and misleading, when applied to the ten commandments as he applies it, confounding the principles with the commands.

Canright says, "This is the law (meaning the ten commandments) for which we plead. These *principles* have always existed; every precept shall stand. Not even a *letter*, or the corner of a letter shall be changed." He talks about *letters of principles*! Does he not know that principles have no *letters*? The ten commandments have letters and words. But principles never. Here is the difficulty. Here is the blunder. They do not discriminate between the commandments and the moral principles, between the *letter* and the *spirit*. Neither between moral *precepts* and moral *principles*. When a moral principle is commanded, it then becomes a moral precept. Moral *principles* are not made up of letters, words, or commands; but of whatever is morally Right and Duty in itself, not dependent for its validity, upon any letter, word, precept or command. It is true, that language, letters, words and commands, can be made use of, and have been, to enjoin the observance of these moral

principles : but in a very imperfect manner however ; and that is all. That is, no human language can *perfectly* express these principles—this wonderful moral law ; any more than it can fully and perfectly describe the immaculate Attributes of Jehovah. When language, letters, words and commands, have all waxed old, and perished, the principles—the perfect moral law—ever remains unimpaired. This confounding of the ten commandments with the principles underlying them, is the cause of the utterance of such language as this, page 16. “ Were the law (meaning the ten commandments) to pass away, or be abolished, there would be no need of a Saviour or sacrifice for sin, for there would be nothing to hold the person guilty, or condemn him by!” Is it possible to conceive anything more foolish and short-sighted? His mind seems to be so intent upon, and so bent to, “ the law of Moses,” that he don’t see “ the law of Christ,”—he can’t see that the law, embodies all the moral *principles* of the old law, which it has superseded, that Christ’s new “ law of faith ” and “ love,” is greatly superior to the old law of “ sin and death,” and is “ the law of God ”—“ the law and the testimony ” of this dispensation. Oh no ; in his estimation, nothing equals, nothing can equal, the ten commandments. If they were done away, “ there would be *nothing*,” &c. ! Such language is enough to astonish any person.

But, again, he is not willing to admit that Christ could give the world a new law : for he says, page 27, in speaking of Christ ; “ he came not as a law-giver !” * It matters not to him, if Paul does say “ fulfill the *law of Christ*.” It matters not if “ God hath in these last days spoken unto us *by* his Son.” Heb.

* Dr. Clarke, in commenting on James 4 : 11, 12 : after showing that the correct rendering, requires the words “ and Judge ” to follow law giver in verse 12, making it read, “ There is one law giver and Judge ;” says, “ But what is that *law* of which St. James speaks ? and who is this *Law giver* and *Judge* ? Most critics think that the *law* mentioned here, is the same as that which he elsewhere calls the *royal law* and the *law of liberty* ; thereby meaning the *gospel* : and that *Christ* is the person who is called the *Law giver* and *Judge*.” It matters not however, whether St. James had reference to Christ or God : for if the Father be the one Law-giver and Judge, he has appointed his Son as his representative, to speak and act for him in all respects, and put his words and commands in Christ’s mouth, to speak to the world, as *his law*. Hence Christ says, “ I do nothing of myself ; but as my Father hath taught me. I speak to the world those things which I have heard of him. For he whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God.” Yet he frequently calls those words his own ; saying, “ He that rejecteth me and receiveth not *my words*, hath one that *Judgeth* him : The *word that I have spoken*, the same shall *Judge* him in the last day.” John 12 : 48. In the same way God’s *law* is called “ the law of Christ ; as the old law of God was also the law of Moses : *God hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son.*” Heb.” 1 : 2.

1 : 2. It matters not if Christ says a "new commandment "I give unto you." It matters not, if Paul in speaking of the law of Christ, calls it "the law of faith," as given by Christ, "he that *believeth* and is baptized shall be *saved*, and he that *believeth* not shall be *condemned*." He don't seem to recognize this all important law of Christ, by which the world, all people, are to be judged, and either "saved" or "condemned" to death. He must have forgotten that God said "I will put *my words* in his mouth ; and he *shall* speak unto them all that I *command* him." He must forget that "*the things* that Paul wrote," that is, "*the things* of the Kingdom and the name," which he had learned from Christ's teachings, and Apostolic commission, are now, "*the commandments of the Lord*," instead of the ten commandments. 1 Cor. 14 : 37.

These people seem to have forgotten the circumstances of that wonderful occasion, when God himself came down in sight of all the people, upon Sinai, in a thick cloud, where they could hear his voice, and commenced giving them the law ; and how they became so frightened when he had spoken to them as far as the end of the tenth commandment, that "they removed and stood afar off ; and said to Moses, speak *thou* with us and we will hear ; but let not God speak with us lest we die. We have heard his voice, and if we hear the voice of the Lord our God any more, then we shall die." And God said to Moses, "they have well said, all that they have spoken, (and therefore, "as thou desiredst,") I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee and I will put *my words* in *his* mouth ; and HE shall speak unto them all that I *command* him." Ex. 19 : 9, and 28 : 18, and Deut. 5 : 22-25, and 18 : 15-19. Can they not see from this, one good reason why God did not continue speaking directly to the people, with his "great voice?" Why it is said, "he added no more?" Why he gave all the rest of the law to them, through Moses? Is it not just possible that, but for the reason here given, God might have continued speaking, and "added more" equally important commands, to the ten : but which were spoken to them through Moses. shortly after : such as, "thou shalt not *lie* one to another." Lev. 19 : 11. "Thou shalt not follow a multitude to *do evil*." Ex. 23 : 8. "*Just* balances, *Just* weights, shall ye have." Lev. 19 : 36. "Thou shalt do that which is *right* and *good* in the sight of the Lord," Deut. 6 : 18. "Thou shalt *love* thy neighbor as thyself?" Lev. 19 : 18. All these are equally as important commands as those of the dec-

alogue : and the last, is *more* important than *all* those in the decalogue ; between man and man ; which would not be needed, for those who thus *love*. However, whether God would have added more, had the people been able to have heard them and lived ; and written them as he did the ten, on the tables of stone or not ; is a matter with which we need not trouble ourselves. But from the circumstances, and what God said and did, we can see plainly why he made Moses his law-giver under him ; thus complying with their desire and request, after saying they had spoken well. We also see that God took that occasion to make known to them his purpose, to be carried out or fulfilled fifteen hundred years afterwards ; of raising up another Prophet, teacher, Law giver, like unto Moses, but much greater, to speak "*God's words*" to the people, all God's "commands," God's superior law, in place of the temporary one he was then giving.

Will not the Sabbatarians allow me to divert their attention for a little, from the law of Moses to the law of Christ ; to the "words" and "commandments" of God, through Christ, as the law of God, called by James, when speaking of its high and only motive power—love—the ROYAL LAW—"the law of *liberty*?" Can they not see that *this* is the *change*? Not a change *in* the law, that is, a change from the seventh day to the first-day of the week, (in support of which there is not a particle of evidence in the entire bible,) but a change *of* the law—the entire law—as previously shown ; an *old* law changed for a *new* one. Let us compare them a little. The old law was as follows : Keep these ten commandments and other commandments by offering sacrifices, observing all feast days, and holy days, Sabbath days, and all rites and ceremonies, just exactly as commanded ; and thou shalt be blessed and protected and have long life in the land. (Not remission of sins nor *eternal* life.) But if you refuse and will not obey, you shall be punished with the penalty of the law—immediate penal death.

The new law of Christ, is as follows : "He that heareth *my word* and believeth in him that sent me, hath *everlasting* life." John 5 : 24. "Whosoever heareth *these sayings of mine*, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man which built his house upon a rock. Matt. 7 : 24. "For he whom God hath sent speaketh *the words of God*." John 3 : 34. "I speak to the world those things which I have heard of him." John 8 : 26. "If ye *continue* in *my word*, then are ye my disciples indeed."

chap. 8 : 3. "Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you." John 15 : 14. "Seek first *the kingdom* of God and *his* righteousness." Matt. 6 : 33. "He that believeth *the Gospel* and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be condemned." "Teach all Nations, baptizing them into the name, * * teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Mark 28 : 19. "Ye have heard it was said by them of old time thou shalt not kill &c., but I say unto you, that whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause, shall be in danger of the judgment. Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, thou shalt not commit adultery ; but I say whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already, in his heart." Matt. 5 : 21, 27. "I say unto you swear not at all." "I say love your enemies."

The "*golden rule*" is also a part of Christ's new law, his *command*. viz : "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them : for *this* is the law and the Prophets." Mat. 7 : 12. This is certainly not be found in the ten commandments, nor in the *letter* of the entire law. Christ therefore had reference to the *spirit* of the law and the Prophets: what James called "the *Royal Law*"—the *perfect* law of liberty"—namely, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." James 2 : 8, 12, and 1 : 25, that is, the *motive power* of the perfect law, the highest feature of it. And what Paul called "the law of Christ," (Gal. 5 : 1, 14 and 6 : 2,) who further said, on the night of his death, to those who had received his words and *continued* in them, that is, his disciples ; as follows: "A *new* commandment I give unto *you*, that ye love one another as I have loved you. Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." "Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you." John 13 : 34, and 15 : 12-14. The penalty against transgressors of *this* law, is not *immediate* penal death. For now, if any man sin we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." 1 John 2 : 1. The transgressor therefore has another chance for his life, under this law ; a chance to reform and try again, all through life. But ultimately, if he continue in sin, and die out of Christ, the penalty is death—the "second death," without a hope of a revival. Who can fail to see the infinite superiority of the new law over the old one ; even though it does not, from beginning to end, once command or require the keeping of either the

seventh day or first day, nor say one word about the sin of Sabbath breaking?

Again; our writer quotes, on page 31, "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have a right to the tree of life;" &c. Rev. 22 : 14: And on next page; "Here are they who keep the commandments of God and the *faith* of Jesus." Rev. 14 : 12. Canright also quotes the same, and 1 John 5 : 3. "This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments." Now they, and I believe all other Sabbatharians, quote these, and many other similar passages, and then come to the sage conclusion that they all mean the ten commandments! They can't see any other "commandments of God" or "law of God" but the decalogue. Oh no! The ten commandments contain the *fourth*! But the Commandments of God, and the law of God by Christ and the Apostles, do not. That seems to be where the difficulty is. That fourth commandment in their eyes is of the utmost importance. So it was once; and so were many other commands of the law once of great importance; which they themselves admit are now dead. That such is the case with the Sabbath law also, and the entire law, I have clearly proved. Our writer says, page 31, "The Savior said, If thou wilt enter into life keep the commandments." I reply, the law was in force at that time; that is, it was not completely fulfilled and done away until Christ's death, when it was nailed to the cross; besides Christ meant the *spirit* of them, as previously shown more at length.*

Again; they constantly eulogize the ten commandments. They call them "the *perfect* law," "the unchangeable law," "the law that is right in itself," they say, "these alone, are a law as eternal and unchangeable as the Creator," "the commandments of the Lord," &c. Such is their language continually. Although the great Apostle Paul said, "the things that I write unto you, *are the commandments of the Lord,*"

* The moral principles are of course the same in both laws. They form the substrata of both laws. But these great principles which have ever constituted God's perfect moral law were greatly "*magnified*," and made much more "*honorable*," by Christ, as embodied in his superior law. While the two laws are both based upon the same imperishable Godly principles of Right and Duty; yet the two laws themselves are widely different: Christ's law being infinitely superior to that of Moses, which was only given as a *temporary* law: but which, so long as it was God's law, was holy just and good, and spiritual; and exceedingly important: and our Saviour showed its great importance, by not allowing one jot or tittle of it, to pass without being fulfilled in and by himself.

(1 Cor. 14 : 37.)* yet, as the commandment of the Lord by Paul don't contain their so called unchangeable Sabbath law, which they think so much of, and which they have decided is the "*very heart*" of God's perfect unchangeable eternal moral law; therefore, they say nothing about them, but constantly eulogize the old ten commandments, apparently shutting their eyes to the clearest light.

The great importance with which they regard the seventh day, can be seen by such foolish expressions as this; published by one of them. "If man had always observed this memorial, (seventh day Sabbath,) none would have forgotten God, and there never would have been an infidel in the world!" Their position is, that all outside the ten commandments is the law of Moses and has been done away. Hence, a part of the Sabbath law being outside the ten commandments is therefore done away. In other words the Sabbath law was composed of *two* laws, one given by God, and therefore unchangeable; the other given by Moses, and therefore done away!! † Let us examine this position a little. Let us select other commandments *outside* the decalogue, and lay them alongside the ten *in* the decalogue, and compare.

IN THE DECALOGUE.

NOT IN THE DECALOGUE.

1. "Thou shalt have no other Gods before me." "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven images."

"Thou shalt *love* the Lord thy God with all thine heart." Deut. 6 : 5.

2. Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them nor serve them."

"Him shall ye *worship*, and to him shall ye do sacrifice." 2 Kings 17 : 36.

* Peter says, "be mindful of the *words* which were spoken before by the holy Prophets, and of the *commandment of us the apostles* of the Lord and Savior." 2 Pet. 3 : 2. Not a word about being mindful of *the law*, or of the command the Sabbatarians worship and eulogize so much, viz : "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." What was the matter? Why Peter must have been a *negligent* Sabbatarian! if any.

† James White, who was one of the ablest leading Sabbatarians, said, "Jesus did destroy the law of Moses, nailing it to his cross, and took it out of the way, at his crucifixion, but the law of the ten commandments, he did not come to destroy."

It would be fatal to their theory to admit the *whole* truth; that is, that the entire law is taken out of the way, and the moral *principles* only, remaining in force; because the seventh day being a command and not a principle, it would therefore follow that it is taken out of the way, like all the other commands, and only the moral principles of *Rest* and *Worship* remaining in force.

3. "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain."
4. "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."
5. Honor thy father and thy mother."
6. "Thou shalt not kill."
7. "Thou shalt not commit adultery."
8. "Thou shalt not steal."
9. "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor."
10. "Thou shalt not covet anything that is thy neighbor's."
- "Thou shalt *fear* the Lord thy God and *serve* him." Deut. 6 : 13.
- "The people of the land shall *worship* at the door of this gate before the Lord in the *Sabbaths*." (Ezk. 46 : 3.) "This is the burnt offering of *every Sabbath*." Num. 28 : 10.*
- "Thou shalt rise up before the hoary head, and *honor* the face of the old man." Lev. 19 : 32.
- "Thou shalt neither *vex* a stranger, nor *oppress* him." Ex. 22 : 21.
- "Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do *evil*." Ex. 23 : 2. Turn ye from your *evil* ways." 2 Kings 17 : 13.
- "Thou shalt take no gift; for the gift blindeth the wise, and perverteth the words of the righteous." Ex. 23 : 8.
- "Thou shalt *love* thy neighbor as thyself." "Ye shall not *lie* one to another." Lev. 19 : 11, 16. "Thou shalt do that which is *right* and *good* in the sight of the Lord." Deut. 6 : 18.
- "Ye shall do no *unrighteousness* in judgment, in meteyard, in weight or in measure. *Just* balances, *just* weights, shall ye have." Lev. 19 : 35, 36.

* There is no doubt but these passages were to have a typical and antitypical fulfillment; that is, Ezk. 46 : 1-14, was doubtless typically fulfilled after the return from Babylon, in the rebuilt city of Jerusalem, and to be antitypically fulfilled, after the return which is now in the near future, and the rebuilding of the City and Temple according to the plan of Ezekiel's vision.

It will be noticed that while this selection commands *love* to God and man, the decalogue does not: and that this alone is not only *equal* to *all* the ten commandments, but of *much more* importance more important than *every letter*, every command, of their so called "unchangeable *perfect* moral law." It will also be seen that this selection commands the *worship* of God while the ten commandments do not. That these command to *fear* and *serve* God, while the ten do not. That these command both *rest* and *worship* by the offering of sacrifices on the seventh day, while their so called "perfect law of the Lord," only commands *rest* on the seventh day.

That while this selection from the law outside the decalogue, commands to honor the hoary head, old men—*all old people*—the decalogue, commands only honor to Father and Mother.

That, while this selection commands not to even *vex* or *opress* the stranger, the decalogue does not, but forbids murder.

That while this selection commands to turn from evil—*all evil*,—the decalogue, does not, but forbids only a few evils or sins.

That while this selection forbids the taking or receiving a *gift* as a *bribe* to pervert the judgment or blind the eyes, the decalogue does not: but says thou shalt not *steal*.

That, while this selection commands to *love* thy neighbor, and to do *right* and *good*, and to not *lie*, their so called *perfect* law, does not command any of these, but not to bear false witness against our neighbor.

That, while this selection commands to do no *unrighteousness* in judgment, and to do *justice* in dealing with all, by *just* weights and measures, the decalogue does not, but says thou shalt not *covet* anything that is thy neighbor's. Now I ask, are the ten so superior—perfect, *immutable*, eternal? The others, dead, ceremonial, done away!

It will be seen therefore that their position is manifestly wrong, an egregious error: that they labor under a great mistake; that the ten commands are *not the perfect moral law*, that there are other commands outside the decalogue more important than any within it; and that it must certainly be a mistake to suppose the more important ones are done away, and those of the decalogue are ever enduring and unchangeable. It does not need arguments to show that the outside selections contain, or are based upon moral principles equally as much or more than those of the decalogue. It is self-evident to any

person who will give it a moment's thought. There is nothing in the Scriptures to sustain the idea that the commands of the decalogue were to be perpetuated and the others to be done away. It is a trumped up idea. I have shown that they are all ONE LAW; and therefore, when we are told that the law was added because of transgressions *till the seed should come*, and that it was a schoolmaster to bring the Jews to Christ, and that it is no longer a schoolmaster, and that we are not under the law &c., &c., it means the ten commands of the decalogue as much as all other commands. Their mistake is this: it is the *moral principles* underlying the ten commands and *all the other moral* commands of the entire law; it is these great eternal immutable *principles*, that constitute the "unchangeable *perfect* law of God," and not the commands. The mistake is, they are resting in the *letter*, the *commanded works* of the law, instead of the *spirit*, which always was and is still Right and Duty *without* any command. The mistake is, that the ten commands *do not* constitute the perfect moral law, but *that* law consists of the *spirit*—the eternal immutable moral principles of Right and Duty, upon which the letter, the commands are based. The commands themselves, were only the imperfect temporary law. Their erroneous position leads them necessarily into all sorts of mistakes misapprehension and misconstruings of the Scriptures. They must have two or three laws where there is but one, so that they can explain some passages as referring to one, and others to another law. Although as I have previously shown, there is not the slightest foundation or proof for the assumption.

Our writer *asserts* as follows: "He gave them a moral law, a judicial law, and a ceremonial law!" Then on page 29, he says, "Their ceremonial law met its fulfillment in Christ, and their judicial law governed them only while in a national capacity!" That would leave the ten commandments only, their so called moral law still in force. All the others, such important ones as above selected, and many others, all containing equally pure moral principles have expired. All this, is trumped up—mere assertion. Where is the first word about their two laws, or three laws? Or, where in the Scriptures, find they, "ceremonial law?"

Again; our writer, like other seventh day writers, tries to make out, because Christ and the Apostles had a custom of going into the synagogues on the Sabbath day to reason with and per-

suade the unbelieving Jews; that this is proof that they kept the Sabbath according to the requirements of the law. They ought to know better. They ought to know that the Sabbath law, required the offering of the regular "every Sabbath" sacrifices, just as much, and just as strictly, as it required *rest* from all their daily avocations. These sacrifices were acts of *worship*, which, as I have shown, were the strict requirements of God, as his own appointed way to keep the Sabbath by rest and worship. Now these Sabbath advocates, ought to know, that there is not one particle of evidence, that Christ and the Apostles, went into the synagogues on the Sabbath days, for the purpose of joining with the unbelieving wicked Jews, in the *keeping* their so-called unchangeable Sabbath law. But that they went in, because it was the very best chance they could get, to reason with and persuade the unbelieving Jews to accept Christ. Not once is it said that they *kept* the Sabbath. Again; our writer quotes Acts 25 : 8, and Acts 28 : 17, to prove that Paul *kept* the *law*, and the *customs* of the fathers; namely: "Neither against the law of the Jews, neither against the temple, nor yet against Cæsar, have I *offended* anything at all." "Though I have committed nothing against the people, or the customs of our fathers." Now Paul did not say he had done nothing against the law, but that he had not "*offended*," or as the Greek reads, had done nothing "*wrong*" against the law; and so he had "*committed*" no *sin* or *wrong* against the "*customs*." He *had*, previous to this, as we are informed, Ch. 15 : 2, 22-24, taken a decided stand *against* both the *law*, and the *custom* (Luke 2 : 27.) of circumcision, and had no small dissension and disputation" about it. But, as he said, he had not done or committed "anything at all against the law, that was *wrong* or *sinful*." In a similar manner, he opposed the keeping of the Sabbaths of the law—*all* of them. In writing to the brethren at Colosse, after speaking of the hand writing of ordinances, and telling them that they had been blotted out and taken out of the way, and nailed to the cross, &c., he says, "let no one therefore *rule* you in food, or in drink, or in respect of a festival, or of a new moon, or of Sabbaths, which are shadows of the future things, but the body is Christ." (Dia.) That is, let no one rule, induce or compel you to observe them any longer, as they are blotted out, taken out of the way, and nailed to the cross; and therefore, to observe them now, is merely "a show of wisdom in *will-*

worship," v. 22. They were only *shadows* at the best, pointing down to Christ the body or substance, and were therefore ended in Christ.* In his letter to the Saints at Ephesus, he said, "Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law or commandments contained in ordinances," &c. And to the Churches of Galatia, he wrote just about in the same way, against the law, and all its ordinances, feast days, holy days, and months, and times and years, and condemning them for desiring to be under the law. He says, "Ye observe *days*, &c. I am *afraid* of you lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain. Evidently he had labored against observing days—*any*

* On this passage, Col. 4: 14-17, I cannot do better than to quote the words of an able author whose work lies before me. He says, "The passage, therefore, is clearly prohibitory. Indeed, I know of no commentator who ever doubted it. The observance, then, of the distinctions of meats and drinks, of holy days, of new moons, and of *Sabbaths*, required by the Mosaic law, is *prohibited* under the gospel. No wonder then, that Luther and the other Reformers declare that the "holy Scripture hath done away the Sabbath." By "Sabbaths," (for such is the original word translated *Sabbath days*) are undoubtedly meant *all* those seasons of rest, which are called by that name in the Old Testament, whether occurring weekly, monthly, annually, or septennially. By what rule of correct interpretation, the weekly Sabbath is excluded, I am totally at a loss to determine. The keeping of "Sabbaths" is prohibited by this text: and the name certainly includes one and all of them, unless the text itself contains the exception. But it does not contain any exception, nor is there any exception to be found in the New Testament. * * The keeping of a *holy day* is prohibited; and as all agree that the weekly Sabbath is a holy day, we are brought to the same result as before: namely, *that the Sabbath is not a Christian institution.*

Of Gal. 4: 9-11—"Ye *observe days*, and months, and times and yeas. I am *afraid* of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain." The same author says: "Does not he who keeps a weekly Sabbath, *observe days*? If the Apostle had intended that the Galatians should keep a weekly Sabbath, would he, in this unqualified manner, have *chided* them for *observing days*? Would he not rather have said, Besides the Sabbath which ye are required to keep, ye observe *other days*, etc. If they had been required to keep a Sabbath (no matter on what day of the week), is it reasonable to suppose that the Apostle would have reproved them for observing among other days, this very Sabbath which they had been required to keep?"

That eminent and devout student and critic of the Scriptures, Dean Alfred, in his commentary, on this passage, says, "Notice here how utterly such a verse is at variance with *any* and *every* theory of a Christian Sabbath, cutting at the root as it does of all obligatory observance of times as such. In the same spirit the Apostle in Col. 2: 16, vindicates the freedom of Christians from any obligation to observe what was *typical* in the Old Testament service, and in this class he places the Sabbath, which things, he says, are a *shadow* of things to come, but the *body* is Christ." And on 14: 5, he says, "Now the question is, supposing the divine obligation of one day in seven to have been recognized by him (Paul) in *any* form, could he have thus spoken? The obvious inference from his strain of arguing is, that he knew of no such obligation, but believed *all times and days* to be to the Christian strong in faith, alike." Indeed Paul *said*, "another esteemeth *every day alike*," admitting the fact, by not disputing it, as he certainly would have done, had it not been true.

holy days, Gal. 4: 10-21. I am well aware that these Scriptures are all construed so as to make them fit Sabbatarianism, by erroneous explanations, and refusing to admit the plain evident meaning, and the facts in the case.

Our writer says on page 13, like all other Sabbath advocates, "the law of the ten commandments contained no *ordinances*." Therefore, they conclude that in these passages which teach the blotting out, the abolition, and the nailing to the cross of the ordinances, the apostle had no reference to the weekly Sabbath. But this is also a mistake. They don't seem to know that an *ordinance* is simply "a *rule* or *law* established by authority," an *observance commanded*." (Webster.) Besides as previously shown, the Sabbath law, at the time it was first commanded was called "an ordinance." Ex. 15: 25. and 16: 4. Anything commanded, ordained or ordered to be done as a regular standing rule or law on any particular day, or every day, is literally and strictly an ordinance; * and the burnt offering which was commanded to be observed every morning including *Sabbath* morning was called "a *perpetual* ordinance." Ezk. 46: 13, 14, and Num. 28: 6-10. (The antitype of these is not yet completed). So, the appointment and command to observe the seventh day as a day of *rest*, even *before* the sacrifices were ordered, was an *ordinance*, and so called: and when the offerings were commanded as acts of *worship* on that day, those offerings became a *part* of the ordinance. Paul did not say in Col. 2: 16, "Sabbath *days*" as added or inserted by the translators of our version, but he said "or of the Sabbaths, which are a shadow," &c. It is therefore simply absurd, to say the weekly Sabbath is not included. Again, it is equally absurd, to say, because Christ taught in the synagogues, on the Sabbath days, as he did in other places, (Acts 16: 13,) and on other days, (Luke 5: 1-17,) and because the apostles and disciples did the same, not only on the Sabbaths, but also on the *first* day of the week, and on other days; after Christ's death; that they did so, for the purpose of keeping the Sabbath, and did thus keep the seventh day, as required by their so called unchangeable Sabbath law! This course, this custom, this practice, was simply and exactly, keeping the *spirit* of the fourth commandment; but not the keeping of the *letter*, the commandment itself. By this practice they observed and carried

* Even "the powers that be," the Civil Rulers, and the civil law, or Civil Government. Paul says, "are *ordained* of God," and therefore the "ordinance" of God. Hence he says, "whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the *ordinance* of God." Rom. 13: 1, 2
All the regular stated acts of worship and obedience, required by God under the law, were literally ord ered orrdained by him and therefore *ordinances*.

out the spirit, the *moral principles* of proper *rest* and *worship* and doing good not only on the seventh and first, but other days, and on all proper occasions, as circumstances rendered proper and morally necessary.

One of the Sabbath advocates, a leading writer, admitted that the *letter* of the law killeth, and the *spirit* giveth life. He first quoted from Paul as follows: "For I was alive without the law once; but when the commandment came, sia revived and I died." Rom. 7 : 9. Then he said; "In this way the *letter, or law*, killeth, but the *spirit* giveth life. 2 Cor. 3 : 6." While he thus acknowledged the letter to be *the law*, yet he did not see that the spirit is the moral principles underlying the letter or law, that these compose the higher law, while the letter was merely the temporary law.

The same writer said, The *Royal Law* from the king eternal, was thus engraven in stones to impress us with its perpetuity." * * * The ten commandments are the Royal Law, the great constitution of righteous principles!" This is simply untrue. The Royal Law is only once mentioned or named in the entire scriptures; where it is distinctly defined to be this; namely: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." James 2 : 8. Now I ask, is it true that this is one of the ten commandments? Is it true that James calls it the ten commandments, the Royal Law? Is it true that what James calls the Royal Law was written or "*engraven in stones*, to impress us with its perpetuity?" Such barefaced, assertions without one particle of scriptural foundation, and not only so, but so contrary to self evident *facts* are to be found quite frequently: and it is certainly astonishing that any person who claims to be honest and truthful should make such groundless statements. What St. James calls the Royal Law, is one of the highest moral precepts founded upon the purest moral principles, love: which is the true motive power of the supreme law of God, and which induces or impels obedience to "the golden rule" or law, "do unto others as you would have others do to you."*

* A very able biblical writer of England, J. J. Andrew, says of this passage James 2 : 10 &c., as follows. "Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. This verse forms part of a rebuke administered by James to certain believers who paid more attention to the rich than the poor. They thus ignored the command, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself; an injunction which had been uttered by Jesus, (Mat 12 : 39, and Paul, (Gal. 5 : 14). This was one of the two commands on which, said Jesus, hang all the law and the Prophets. It is therefore, very appropriately called by James, "the royal law." (ch. 2 : 8.) It is a mistake to say that this appellation is applied to the whole decalogue. The Apostle does not say so. He singles out one particular commandment, (*outside* the decalogue,) and calls that "the royal law." The *principle* contained in this command was equally binding after as before the abolition of the Mosaic covenant. *Many* of the injunctions to disciples of Jesus Christ embody it. James's reference to the whole law was by way of illustration, not to enforce its compliance." See further subsequent remarks on these passages.

He talks about the ten *commandments* being the great constitution of righteous *principles*. It was not the *principles* that were engraven in stones; it was the *letter*, the words of the ten commandments, which have been cancelled, done away; the principles still remaining. But no principle in a 7th day.

It does certainly seem that if the minds of seventh day keepers, were not warped or bent, or their "heads turned," they could not possibly fail to see that the seventh day item of the decalogue, is *the only item* of the ten commandments which is not founded or based upon moral principle. It needs no *proof* of this: for any person, who will give it a moment's thought cannot avoid seeing that *rest* and *worship* are moral principles, which were always right and duty, but that to do so on the seventh day, any more than any other day, was never a duty until the *command* was given, and therefore not a *moral principle* but a *positive command*, as well as its sacrifices and ordinances; and therefore, like all the other sacrifices, ordinances and holy days, have been fulfilled, expired and done away, and were nailed to the cross.

Again; it is taught by the Sabbatarians, that the seventh day Sabbath is to be continued in the Age to come. That conclusion is built upon this passage, namely: "And it shall come to pass, that from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me saith the Lord." Isa. 66: 23. Hence, J. N. Andrews before quoted, closes his "History of the Sabbath," with these words, namely: "The gathering of the nations that are saved, to the presence of the Creator, from the *whole face of the new earth* on each successive Sabbath, attests the sacredness of the Sabbath even in that holy state, and sets the seal of the Most High to the perpetuity of this ancient institution."

This is a sample of their mode of proving many assumed points of their delusive theory. There is not *one word* in the above passage, nor in the entire Scriptures about the seventh day Sabbath being continued or perpetuated. If the seventh day or weekly Sabbath is here referred to, it is not so stated. There is no doubt but there will be days set apart and appointed for rest-days or Sabbaths, in the Age to come, for the purpose of Rest and Worship. But, that they will be the seventh day continued, and that the nations from the *whole face of the earth* are to be gathered every seventh day is very doubtful indeed! But that there will be rest days or Sabbaths, perhaps weekly, monthly,

and yearly, there is no doubt whatever. However this is no evidence that the seventh-day law is now in force or ever will be. But it is thought by some, from Ezk. 43 : 27, and Lev. 23 : 39, that the *first* and *eighth* days may may be Sabbaths of the future. It may be so. *

Again ; it is erroneously held that Paul and James taught the necessity of keeping the ten commandments. Let us examine a little as to what they say. Paul says, Rom. 6 : 14, "For sin shall not have dominion over you ; for ye are *not under the law*, but under grace ;" and 15 verses further on, he says ; "But now we are *delivered from the law* : that (referring to the *letter*—the law itself)—being dead, wherein we were held ; that we should serve in newness of *spirit*, and not in the oldness of the letter." Now, no person of unbiased mind, can fail to see that Paul was not speaking, in these quotations, of any so called "ceremonial law," but of the ten commandments ; for, in the very next verse he quotes the last commandment in the decalogue ; thus proving *positively* that he means *that law* which includes the *ten commandments*. This alone should be sufficient to settle the question as to Paul. But in ch. 13 : 8-10, he says, "Owe no man anything but to *love* one another ; for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the *law*." Then quoting some of the ten commandments showing that he is still speaking of the *same law* of which he was speaking in ch. 6, when he said, "ye are not under the law." He then adds, "and if there be *any other* commandment (no matter what, or whether in the decalogue or outside) it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt *love* thy neighbor as thyself. Love worketh *no ill* to his neighbor ; therefore love is the *fulfilling* of the law." He does not say love is the *keeping* of the law, or ten commandments, "for he that loveth another *hath fulfilled* the law." Just as soon as a person thus *loves* his neighbor, the law (or ten commandments) becomes entirely useless ; it is no longer

* In the epistle ascribed to Barnabas, we read as follows. " And the words, " He rested on the seventh day signify this ; after that his Son hath come and hath judged the ungodly * * then shall He rest well on the seventh day ! * * Behold therefore, who it is that rested properly and sanctifieth it ; even when we ourselves, having first been sanctified * * and having received the promise, when iniquity exists no longer, but all things have become new, we shall be able to sanctify it. And farther, He saith unto them, your new moons and your Sabbaths I cannot endure. See now what he meaneth. Your Sabbaths, as they now are, are not acceptable unto Me ; but that which I have made is, even that in which, *after that I have brought all things to an end*, I shall make a beginning of the *eighth* day, which thing is the beginning of another world. (Translated from the Greek by Dr. Hoole)

needed; for, as love worketh *no ill*, he is ever ready and anxious to do *right* by his neighbor; to do his *duty* to his neighbor, to render him any and *every* assistance, even *much more* than the law *says* or *requires*, even to do if necessary, as Christ required the young Ruler to do, to part with his goods, his "great possessions," to help his poor needy neighbor; which is altogether *more* than the law says or requires. He is therefore no longer guided by the *letter* of the old law, but by the higher law of Right and Duty through love; which is the *spirit*, the "*righteousness*" of the law; "the law of Christ"—"the golden rule"—"the Royal Law." Hence, he is no longer under the old law. This is in substance exactly the teaching of Paul as to the law. In the 2nd chapter also, he refers to two of the ten commandments in speaking of the law, in a similar way. He tells the Jew that "circumcision verily profiteth," that there was an "advantage" and a "profit, much every way" in being a Jew, "if thou keep the law;" that is, "the righteousness" or spirit of the law, instead of the letter. It was necessary for them to be circumcised in "*heart*, in the *spirit* and *not* in the letter," and "keep the *righteousness* of the law"—do right and duty from the heart—affections, or *love*. He said, if "Gentiles, which have not the law," that is, "if the uncircumcision, keep the righteousness of the law," it condemned them, the Jews who have the law and "makest his" boast of the law, but transgressed it by merely keeping the "letter." Hence, He says shall not uncircumcision (Gentiles) which is by nature, if it *fulfill* the law (by doing right, or righteousness without any law). Judge (condemn) thee, who by the *letter* and circumcision dost *transgress* the law? For he is *not* a Jew which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh: "But he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the *spirit* (of the law) and not in the *letter*." Rom. 2 : 14-29 and 3 : 1, 2.

The Apostle's teaching here exactly accords with that of the other parts of this epistle, to which I have referred, and his epistle to the Galatians; and with all of Christ's teachings to the rich young ruler, the tempting lawyer, the discreet scribe, and on all other occasions; the sum of which, is that the all important thing, is the keeping of the spirit, the righteousness of the law through LOVE. James teaches the very same all-important truth. He says, ch. 2:8, "If ye fulfil the Royal Law according to the Scripture, thou shalt love thy neighbor as

thyself, ye do well." Be governed by that law, and all is well and right. You will have no use for the old law. There will be no danger of your "having respect to persons," and thus committing sin: no danger of offending in one point and thus being guilty of all: for obedience to this Royal Law sets you "*free*" from the old law, it sets you at "*liberty*" from the old law, even from all the ten commandments. It is "the *perfect* law of *liberty*." ch. 1:25. Therefore, "So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of *liberty*," v. 12, which is the motive power of the begetting, life-giving "word of truth" — "the gospel," (ch. 1:18 and Eph. 1:13,) to be obeyed by love. As Paul said, Gal. 5:1, "Stand fast therefore in the *liberty* (freedom from the law) wherewith Christ has made us *free*, and not be entangled again with the *yoke* of bondage," (the old law,) "which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear." Acts 15:10. "For, brethren, ye have been called unto *liberty*; (liberty or freedom from the law, the yoke of bondage;) only, use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by *love* serve one another." (Now that you are free from the law, it is necessary to do right and duty through *love*.) "For all the law is fulfilled in *one word*, even in this: Thou shalt *love* thy neighbor as thyself." (Gal. 5:13, 14.) This is the *spirit* of the law: "if ye be led of the spirit, ye are not under the law," v. 18. "Bear ye one another's burdens, (through *love*) and so fulfil *the law of Christ*." ch. 6:2.

It will be seen therefore, that there is a perfect harmony between the teaching of Christ and the apostles relative to the law, including the ten commandments; with this exception; Christ never said "ye are not under the law," as Paul and James did; for that could not strictly be said during his life; as some parts of the law were in force until after his death. That declaration therefore, "ye are not under the law," would not have been strictly true at any time during Christ's life, but has been a very important truth, ever since his death. This is the only difference in their teaching in regard to the law.

Let us consider again in another form, the great difference between the old law and the law of Christ. The old law, or rather the ten commandments as given at Sinai, did not say "do right," nor "do good," nor "be good," nor "be honest," nor "do not lie," nor "be just," nor "be kind," nor "love God," nor "love thy neighbor," nor "give to the poor," nor "feed the starving," nor "visit and assist the sick and suffering;"

while the new law by Christ and the Apostles, requires and commands strict observance and obedience to *all* the *moral principles* contained in the words above named, but not commanded in the decalogue; and also all the moral principles underlying the law outside the decalogue; and MUCH MORE *in addition*. Let us see.

IN THE DECALOGUE.

1. "Thou shalt have no other Gods before me." "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image."

2. "Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them nor serve them."

3. "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain."

4. "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."

5. "Honor thy father and thy mother."

6. "Thou shalt not kill."

7. "Thou shalt not commit adultery."

OUTSIDE THE DECALOGUE.

Keep yourselves from idols." 1 John 5 : 21.

"Flee from idolatry." 1 Cor. 10 : 14. Eph. 5 : 5.

"I say swear not at all." Matt. 5 : 34. "Above all things, my brethren swear not, neither by heaven, neither by the earth, neither by *any other oath*." James 5 : 12. 1 Tim. 6 : 1.

"Come unto me and I will give you *rest*." Matt. 11 : 28. "Forget not the assembling yourselves together." Heb. 10 : 25. "God is a spirit; and they who *worship* him must worship him in *spirit* and in *truth*." John 4 : 24.

"Honor thy father and mother." "*Obe*y your parents." Eph. 6 : 12.

"Who so ever hateth his brother is a murderer" 1 John 3 : 15. Matt. 5 : 21, 22.

"Who so ever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery already in his heart." Matt. 5 : 28. Heb. 13 : 4.

8. "Thou shalt not steal."

"Let him that stole steal no more," but *give* to him that *needeth*." Eph. 4 : 28.

9. "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor."

"*Speak evil* of no man." Tit. 3 : 2. "Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger and clamor and *evil speaking*, be put away from you, with all malice ; and be *kind* one to another, tenderhearted, forgiving one another." Eph. 4 : 31, 32. "Lie not one to another." Col. 3 : 9.

NOTE.—Let Seventh-day keepers and all others choose *honestly* between the two sets of commandments—between the two laws, the law of Moses and the law of Christ, the *old* law of God and the *new* law of God.

10. "Thou shalt not covet anything that is thy neighbors."

Take heed and beware of *covetousness*." Luke 12 : 15. 1 Tim. 6 : 7. "Fornication and *all* uncleanness or *covetousness*, let it not be once named among you, as becometh saints." Eph. 5 : 3-5. "Thou shalt *love* the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength and with all thy mind ; and thy neighbor as thyself." Luke 10 : 27, and Matt. 22 : 37-40. "*Love* your *enemies*." Matt. 5 : 44.

NOTE.—Let Seventh-day keepers note the contrast between the old and new law. What need of the ten commandments when we have them *all* and *much more* in the law of Christ, *except the "Seventh-day" part* of the fourth commandment. Let them think, and talk, and write, about Christ's law, and eulogize and extol that, instead of the ten commandments, simply because it says "Seventh-day" ! ! !

"Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so unto them." Mat. 7 : 12. "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." Mat. 5 : 48.

"Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth." Mat. 6 : 20.

"Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness ; and all these things shall be added unto you." Mat. 6 : 33.

"Enter ye in at the straight gate ; straight is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and *few* there be that find it." Mat. 7 : 14,

"Without *faith* it is impossible to please God." Heb. 11 :

6. "If ye *believe not* that I am he, ye shall die in your sins." John 8 : 24. "He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved ; but he that believeth not shall be condemned."

“Observe *all* things whatsoever I have commanded.”

“As we have opportunity let us *do good* unto *all men* especially unto them who are of the *household of faith*.” Eph. 6 : 10. “Full of *goodness*, filled with all knowledge.” Rom. 15 : 14. “Let him turn away from evil and *do good*.” 1 Pet. 3 : 11.

“Abhor that which is evil ; cleave to that which is *good*.” Rom. 12 : 9. “Be followers of that which is *good*.” 1 Pet. 3 : 13. “Follow that which is *good*.” 1 Thess. 5 : 15. 3 John, 11. “Abound in *every good work*.” 2 Cor. 9 : 8. “Being fruitful in *every good work*.” Col. 1 : 10. 2 Tim. 2 : 21. Tit. 1 : 16. “Provoke unto *love* and *good works*.” Heb. 10 : 24. “Be careful to maintain *good works*.” Tit. 3 : 8. “Be rich in *good works*.” 1 Tim. 6 : 18. “That the man of God may be *perfect*, thoroughly furnished unto *all good works*.” 2 Tim. 3 : 17. “The fruit of the Spirit is in *all goodness* and *righteousness*, and *truth*.” Eph. 5 : 9. “Add to your faith *virtue* ; and to virtue *knowledge* ; and to knowledge *temperance* ; and to temperance *patience* ; and to patience *godliness* ; and to godliness brotherly *kindness* ; and to brotherly kindness *love*.” 2 Pet. 1 : 5-7. “Put on therefore as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of *mercies*, *kindness*, *humbleness* of mind, *meekness*, long suffering ; forbearing one another, and forgiving one another ; * * and above all things put on charity (LOVE) which is the bond of *perfectness*. * * Let the *word of Christ* dwell in you richly in all wisdom teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord.” Col. 3 : 12-16. “To do *good* and *communicate*, forget not ; for with *such sacrifices* God is well pleased.” Heb. 13 : 16. Provide things *honest* in the sight of all men.” Rom. 12 : 17. 2 Cor. 8 : 21. “Do that which is *honest*.” 2 Cor. 13 : 7. “Whatsoever things are *true*, *honest*, *just*, *pure*, *lovely*, of *good* report ; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on *these* things.” Phil. 4 : 8. “Honor all men ; love the brotherhood ; fear God ; honor the King.” 1 Pet. 2 : 17. “Be ye *holy* in all conversation ” 1 Pet. 1 : 15. “Be ye holy for I am holy.” “We should be holy *without blame*.” Eph. 1, 4, and 5 : 27. “Present your bodies a living *sacrifice*, *holy*, acceptable unto God.” Rom. 12 : 1. “Follow *peace* with all men, and *holiness* without which no man shall see the Lord.” Heb. 12 : 14. “I exhort therefore, that, first of *all*, supplications, prayers, interces-

sions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men; for kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in ALL godliness and honesty." 1 Tim. 2: 12.

Thus we see, that all the *moral principles* underlying the ten commandments and the entire law of Moses are embodied in the *new* law of God by Christ and the Apostles. We also see the infinite superiority of the new law. The ten commandments, so eulogized by the Sabbatarians, and indeed by Christendom in general, look exceedingly meagre, when compared with only a small portion of the new law. The old law is thrown entirely in the shade by such a comparison. Is it possible that any class of people, can be found, who can for one moment, honestly think that the *ten commandments* are the perfect unchangeable law of God, instead of the *moral principles* as now embodied in the law of Christ? It must be a befogged condition of the mind which produces so many egregious errors, and foolish positions and utterances in regard to the law, the covenants, the Sabbath, and various other biblical subjects, as we find in all the various periodicals and books, of the Sabbatarians as well as other sectarians, a few of which I have noticed.

Another writer, under the head of "morality of the Ten Commandments," speaks of those who hold that we "are not under the law" of Moses, including the ten commandments, but that we are under the superior law of Christ, (1 Cor. 9: 20, 21,) as above shown, as *Antinomians*, holding "this antinomian delusion"! Also, as follows; "therefore he only fulfils the requirement of the law who *loves* another. (Where in the ten commandments, of which he was speaking, is *love* commanded?) If the other view be taken, that love, but not obedience to the law, is required, then we should have the singular and absurd rule of duty, namely, that we may injure our neighbor in all his relations of life, of chastity, property, and reputation, if we only love him"!! This is unworthy of notice.

The law of Christ, which *does* command *love*, and forbids his "singular and absurd rule," seems to be of no account with the above writer. He does not see that *love* is *not* the old law, but the motive power of the moral principles, upon which the law and the prophets "*hang*"—the motive power of the *higher* law, embodied in the law of Christ. He has been trying to show, and thinks he has, as he says, "shown the identity of the law of the ten commandments with the golden rule." Instead of which he does not see that the golden rule, is a part of Christ's law and

is identical not with the old law itself, which has been done away, but with the spirit, the righteousness of it, which still remains in force as *before* the law was given, and which has been embodied in the new law. However, his equally befogged readers, no doubt, think his positions are sound.

I have now, I think, noticed a sufficient number of their erroneous positions, misconceptions and mistakes. And I here remark, that I do not charge these all against the Sabbatarians alone. Many erroneous positions with regard to the law, the ten commandments, and even the Sabbath, have ever been and continue to be held and promulgated by the various religious demoninations. Thousands of great minds even, assent to, accept and put forth to the world, erroneous views, and doctrines, *supposing* them to be true, without thorough investigation and examination in the light of Scripture. * Hence it is an easy matter to find, and make extracts from the writings of such men, in accord with every imaginable error, and in support of every delusive theory. But as Luther said of the Father:, "they blow *hot and cold.*" †

Therefore, let not Sabbatarians, who see so many such extracts in "The History of the Sabbath" by J. N. Andrews, "The Biblical Institute," and various other Sabbatarian Works, and in their Periodicals, all of which I have carefully examined; think that an equal number of extracts, cannot be found in the

* W. C. Long, one of the Sabbath Advocates, after quoting several extracts from the writings of some of the leading men of this character, says: "the above is the testimony of eminent authors. Their words are very authoritative. What they say is a fact, but how do they act. They keep the *first* day of the week, after showing clearly that the *seventh* day is the Sabbath of the Lord. O consistency, where art thou?"

Now, while it is true that those writers did not act consistently with what they wrote! yet what they wrote, was *not* a fact: but was the result of the same great and very strange mistake into which the Sabbatarians have fallen, namely: They did not discriminate between the ten commandments and the moral principles underlying them: between the eternal unchangeable perfect moral law, and the temporal law of Moses. They therefore *assumed* (although contrary to reason and fact) that the ten commandments were binding from creation, and will ever continue to be binding; instead of which it was the moral principles. Like the Sabbatarians they did not see that it was the *moral principles* of proper *rest* and *worship*, which were always Right and Duty and binding from creation; and that the *commandment* to rest and worship on the *seventh day* was *not* always binding—was not a moral principle—but a positive *temporary* command. Sabbatarians have therefore this advantage over the other sects, namely: the *seventh day* was *once* the Sabbath of the Lord, while the *first* day never was.

† Or, as an able Churchman and Editor well says, "Too many, (speaking of the Anglican Communion,) it is to be feared, in this as in sundry other matters, adopt without due thought, the opinions most usual among the Protestants around them."

writings of as many other D. D's., "learned Divines," "Professors and Commentators, in support of the opposite side of all their positions. I may here further remark, that the first named work, more than the others, abounds with carefully worded, specious assumptions and assertions, having no scriptural foundation; which are calculated however, to "take," with those who are ignorant of the true teaching of the scriptures on these subjects. But in the consideration of purely biblical questions, neither human extracts, nor specious assertions, avail anything whatever. "To the law and the testimony, if they speak not according to *this word*, it is because there is no light in them." That is, if they speak not according to this WORD OF GOD, spoken unto us in the last days by his Son, testified also by the Apostles; and which was, according to the Prophet Isaiah, to become "the law and the testimony among *Christ's disciples*" during the times of the Gentiles. Isa. 8 : 16, 20

The prophetic vision of Isaiah took it all in. But before closing these remarks, I will notice one more of their short-sighted erroneous positions; namely, that Christ rose on the seventh-day—Saturday—instead of the first day, or Sunday. H. C. Duvallon in reviewing the Editor of the "*Stumbling Stone*," in the "*Sabbath Advocate*" of 20th Oct. 1882; says, "Christ rose on the seventh-day of the week, on Saturday, so the blessed bible says, and we are just foolish enough to believe it!" He then quotes some scriptures, which, instead of sustaining his position, prove the reverse. They read as follows: "In the *end* of the Sabbath, (*after* the Sabbath, Dia. Dr. Clark and others,) as it began to dawn toward the *first* day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary, to see the sepulchre." Mat. 28 : 1. Mark says, "when the Sabbath was *past*, very early in the morning the *first* day of the week," "they came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun." Luke says, "upon the *first* day of the week very early in the morning." John says, "The *first* day of the week." It will be observed that they all say it was on the *first* day of the week, when they went to the sepulchre; therefore, it was *after* the Sabbath or seventh day was *past*. Now, that first day commenced when the seventh day ended, that is, at *sunset* the *night before*, according to Jewish reckoning; or at midnight, according to our reckoning. Hence there was a plenty of time for the resurrection of Christ on the *first* day, before they arrived at the sepulchre. Therefore, to say that "the blessed bible says that Christ rose on the seventh

day of the week," is an untruthful and presumptuous statement ; and those who are "just *foolish* enough to believe it," are in much need of enlightenment. But taking into consideration the combined circumstances as narrated by all the evangelists, it is evident that the resurrection of Christ took place about the time of the rising of the sun, on the morning of the first day of the week. It is evident that those women, left their houses, and set out for the sepulchre "very early in the morning," "while it was yet dark," and arrived at "the sepulchre at the rising of sun," (Mark 16 : 1, 2,) and when Mary had "stooped down and looked in," and saw the "two angels in white sitting the one at the head and the other at the feet where the body of Jesus had lain," "she turned herself back and *saw Jesus standing*, and knew not that it was Jesus," until after he had spoken to her. John 20 : 1-16. He had evidently *just risen* and stepped out, and was standing near by ; for we are told that "when Jesus was *risen early* the FIRST day of the week, he appeared *first* to Mary Magdalene." Mark 16 : 9. Is it not astonishing that any person who professes to be an honest bible student, can, in the face of this last passage, and all the above circumstances, make such a statement as the following ? "You seem to *infer* that Christ rose on the *first* day of the week, but you do not give us any scripture to prove it!" such statements are really unworthy of notice. The same article contains many other equally ridiculous statements, not only with reference to the day of Christ's resurrection, but also with reference to the day of his crucifixion. But they are altogether unworthy of notice.

We now come to the brief consideration of "the *first* day of the week, or

SUNDAY.

There can be no question as to the wisdom and importance of a rest-day. It is altogether unnecessary to take time or space to argue the utility of the observance of the first day of the week, or Sunday for that purpose, as a *civil institution*. The great benefits and necessity of a periodical rest from labor in order to health, and for the purpose of social, moral and religious culture, have been abundantly demonstrated.

On that point all good people are substantially and cordially agreed. Hence, because of these great benefits, and because of its observance as a day of physical rest from the

daily toils of life, being the law of the land ; our duty is too apparant to require more than mention.

But the idea that Sunday is required by the scriptures to be observed as a "*holy day*," as one of the religious duties, in order to salvation ; is a great mistake, fraught with grave and evil consequences. As I have shown, the time has long since passed away for such a rest-day as God's purpose once required for his typical people. That rest-day—that "*holy day*"—with its shadow, its ordinance and sacrifices, having filled its design in the purpose of God, has therefore like all the rest of the law of Moses, ceased to be the law of God.

As before shown all days are now alike as to their sacredness. One day is as holy as another. Therefore while a periodical rest-day is right and necessary for the purpose of rest and worship, for relaxation from the strain of business, for mental and social culture, recreation and pleasure : yet there is no command or requirement in the Scriptures that the first day of the week, or any other day, should be observed as a *holy day*, more than another. According to the scriptures no Christian is justified in doing anything *unholy* on any day. A *holy life* is required on *all* days alike. Nothing can be found in the scriptures showing it to be wrong or sinful to do or say anything on Sunday, that is right to be done or said on any other day. Nothing can be found requiring either believers or unbelievers to refrain from any recreation or enjoyment on Sunday, which would be right on any other day. Hence all that is said and written about "desecration of the Sabbath" "the holy Sabbath," "Sabbath-breaking," and the like, as applied to either the first day, or the seventh day ; is mere shilly-shally stuff, founded either in misapprehension of the true teachings of scripture, or in superstition, or both. But this view does not conflict with the necessity and great benefits of Sunday as a rest-day for the observance of proper and necessary rest and worship, and other very important, and indispensable requirements and duties enjoined in the scriptures : such as "the assembling of ourselves together," Heb. 10 : 25 ; to "exhort one another," Heb. 3 : 13 ; to "examine ourselves whether we be in the faith," 2 Cor. 13 : 5 ; to "search the scriptures ;" "making supplications, prayers, intercessions, giving thanks in behalf of all men," 1 Tim. 1 : 2 ; to "observe the breaking of bread, and prayers—partaking of the Lord's supper : " and for visiting the sick,— "to visit the fatherless and

widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world"—duties which constitute "*pure religion*," James 1 : 27 ; that is, when performed in connection with, and obedience to, the "one faith ;" not otherwise.

According to the record, the *first* assembling or meeting of the Disciples on the first day of the week, or *Sunday*, took place on the very day that Christ rose from the dead. "Then the *same day* at evening, being the *first day* of the week, when the doors were shut where the Disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you." John 20 : 19. This appears to have been the *beginning* of the assembling together of the followers of Christ on the first day of the week : which first day had for many centuries before that, been called *Sunday* by the heathen world in honor of their chief god, the sun. By verse 26, we are informed that "after *eight days*, again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them : then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you," &c. This was evidently the next Sunday ; as it does not say after eight days were *past* ; and probably means eight days inclusive of the first Sunday. Then in Acts 20 : 7, we are informed as follows : "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." And again, 1 Cor. 16 : 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." Now these four passages, contain *ALL that is said in the Scriptures*, about the disciples and followers of Christ meeting on the first day of the week or Sunday. Outside of these passages *and their parallels*, the Scriptures are *entirely SILENT* concerning the observance of the first day of the week, called Sunday. What then do we learn from this one only reliable source of information—our only authority ? First ; although Sunday had for hundreds of years previous to this been a feast day among the heathen nations, in honor of their chief god, the sun ; yet, here is the origin—the beginning—of the observance of Sunday by the followers of Christ, as a day to assemble together for the breaking of bread, preaching, &c. Second ; there is nothing in these Scriptures or any other, to show that they called it or considered it a *holy* day. Third ; there is nothing in these Scriptures or any other, to show, or even indicate that Christ ever commanded them to observe it in any way, nor that they themselves ever required it to be observed as

a holy day by those they taught during all their subsequent travels and preaching of the word, in obedience to the great commission; "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe *all things* whatsoever I have commanded you."

It seems that the first meeting was in the afternoon or evening," after the return of the two disciples and Christ from the "village called Emmaus, which was from Jerusalem about three score furlongs—" $7\frac{1}{2}$ miles. Luke 24: 13, 29. It is not likely that Christ and these two disciples would have spent the day in this way, had they considered it a *holy* day. After their return, it is said, "then came Jesus, *the doors being shut*, and stood in the midst." &c. From this, it has been foolishly supposed and asserted that Jesus went in without opening the door, and that he on several occasions appeared and vanished in an instant, in a supernatural manner or as if his resurrected body were only a phantom instead of substantial spiritized "flesh and bone," and that he appeared in different bodies, as occasion required. But the solution of all this is found in Luke 24: 16. "But their eyes were holden that they should not know him." See also, John 20: 14, and 21: 4, and Luke 24: 31. All that Christ had to do, in order that they might not know him, or see him open the door and go in or out, or appear and disappear, was to use his power to "hold their eyes," as he did do.

Having referred to and examined *all the testimony contained in the scriptures*, and found no command by either Christ or the Apostles, to observe or keep Sunday, nor any evidence that they considered it a *holy* day, nor of any change from the seventh to the first day; we come to the following unavoidable conclusion,* namely: That if the disciples had understood

* If it be necessary to keep Sunday as the Jews were required to keep Saturday by the law of Moses, then those who make so much ado about Sabbath breaking, are themselves as guilty as those they denounce for the unholy and profane. * * They light fires in their dwellings and meeting houses, they entertain their friends at comfortable warm dinners, drive to church in splendid equipages, annoy the sick and distract the sober-minded with noisy bells, bury the dead, speak their own words, &c.—all of which is a violation of the divine law which saith, "thou shalt not do *any work*, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle;" "and thou shalt not speak *thine own words*." * * It is not only ridiculous, but downright pharisaism, the *fuss* that is made about breaking the Sabbath. Let the zealots "first cast the beam out of their own eyes; and then will they see clearly to cast out the mote from the eyes of others." If they would keep the day to the Lord, let them believe and obey the gospel of the kingdom and the name of Jesus; and then continue steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship and in breaking of bread and in prayers, * * and cease from the works of sinful flesh *every day* of the week." *Elpis Israel*, page 21.

that the seventh day, or Saturday was still God's *holy* day—was still “the Sabbath of the Lord”—that the old law of Moses, or law of God was still obligatory—that therefore they were still bound to keep Saturday as a *holy* day, for rest and worship as long as they lived ; and had been in the habit of thus observing and keeping it ; they certainly would not have changed off to the first day or Sunday, as they did. But knowing as they did, that the Sabbath spiritual-Rest-shadow, had reached its body or substance and end, in Christ ; and that as a physical rest day, and holy day, it had ceased with all other holy days of the law of Moses ; Christ having shown them that it was now right to carry burdens, pluck corn, and to do *anything* that could be called “well” or “good,” and not evil, on the Sabbath ; and that he himself was “Lord of the Sabbath,” and therefore had the right and the power to say how it should be used and understood : and knowing also, that he had never said anything about any *change* from the *seventh* day Sabbath to a *first* day Sabbath, nor ever given them any command to keep the Seventh day or *any* day, as a *holy* day ; nor said anything to them about one day being any more holy or sacred than another ; knowing all this, and being almost or quite *compelled* “for fear of the Jews,” to assemble together in an “upper room,” with “doors shut,” on the day Christ rose ; it looks, therefore, as if they naturally, or instinctively, fell at once into the observance of the first day of the week—the day of Christ's resurrection—as the proper day to assemble together for the purpose of doing what he had commanded them to do *in remembrance of him*, that is, to “eat the Lord's supper” according to his command, “this do in remembrance of me ;” Luke 22 : 19 ; and for preaching, and the worship of God. And Paul subsequently adds, “For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death *till he come* ;” (1 Cor. 11 : 20 : 34 ;) thus showing that the ordinance was to be perpetual during Christ's absence ; and points both backward and forward, as an important reminder not only of his death, as the antitype of the paschal lamb, but also of his return, as the Life-Giver, to bestow upon his brethren, the bread of life, and immortality ; that they may thus be saved from the “everlasting destruction” which awaits all whose hearts will be found not to have been sprinkled with the “precious blood,” of “Christ our Passover.”

It is possible that the fact, that Sunday was a feast day among the Gentiles, in their worship of the sun ; may have been

an additional reason for the disciples selecting the same day to worship the true God.*

It is also possible that they may have been influenced and directed by the spirit of God,"—that they may have been "moved by the Holy Spirit," to select that day and take the course they did. Indeed it is not only possible but quite probable. But if that were the case, and it had been intended that the day thus selected should be a *holy* day, or a new "Sabbath day," or "the Lord's day," and its observance as such, to be obligatory upon the children of God, through the gospel dispensation, such an important feature could not possibly have been omitted by the Holy Spirit. Neither would the Apostle Paul have made use of the language he did, namely: "One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." Rom. 14: 5. But he would certainly have referred to Sunday, as the divinely appointed holy day, Sabbath day, or Lord's day, if such had been the case.†

Those who call Sunday "the Lord's day" do so without the least particle of evidence in the Scriptures. That phrase occurs only once in the entire Bible; that is in Rev. 1: 10, and refers not to the first day of the week, but to "*the day of the Lord*," about which much is said in the scriptures, and has reference to that great day in the future, upon the events of which, John the Revelator, was being enlightened through or "in the spirit," as in chapters 4: 2, and 17: 3, and 21: 10. Hence the Revelator

* J. N. Andrews says in his "Sabbath History," "The reasons which induced the church to adopt the ancient festival of the heathen as something made ready to hand, are thus stated by Morer:—

"Sunday being the day on which the Gentiles solemnly adored that planet (the Sun) and called it Sunday, * * the Christians thought fit to keep the same day, and the same name of it, that they might not appear causelessly peevish, and by that means hinder the conversion of the Gentiles, and bring a greater prejudice than might be otherwise taken against the gospel."

† That eminent and devout student and critic of the scriptures, Dean Alford, remarks on this passage as follows: "Now the question is, supposing the divine obligation of one day in seven to have been recognized by him in any form, could he have thus spoken? The obvious inference from his strain of arguing is, that he knew of no such obligation, but believed all times and days to be to the Christian strong in faith *alike*." He also says in his commentary, on Gal. 4: 10: "Notice here how utterly such a verse is at variance with any and every theory of a Christian Sabbath, cutting at the root as it does of all obligatory observance of times as such. In the same spirit the apostle, in Col. 2: 16, vindicates the freedom of Christians from any obligation to observe what was *typical* in the old Testament service, and in this class he places the Sabbath, which things, he says, "are a *shadow* of things to come, but the *body* is Christ."

“was in the spirit on the Lord’s day,”—being enlightened by or in the spirit’s revelations concerning the events of the still future Lord’s day, or great day of the Lord.*

I will now give a few quotations from various authors, about the origin, history and character of Sunday. Rev. Dr. S. M. Hopkins, of the “Auburn Theological Seminary,” says: “*Without any command* so far as appears—without any consultation or public resolve, the Apostles fell at once into the observance of the first day of the week as the day for Christian worship.” Again, he says: “The doctrine thus laid down by the early fathers was subject to this modification; that without any command, either in the law of Moses or the law of Christ, but by universal consent as a matter of *convenience* and *propriety*, the first day of the week was selected as the day for public Christian worship. The septenary division of time was, of course, founded on precedent usage; but neither as respects the day to be observed, the reasons for observing it, or the manner of the observance, was any reference whatever made to the fourth commandment. The reasons for the selection of the time were the joyful bursting forth of light on the first day of the week from the gloom of chaos and the darkness of the sepulchre. The observance was not as a day of mortification, but as a day of festival. There was no hesitation as to the kindling of a fire in Christian habitations on the first day of the week. There was no question of a Sabbath day’s journey or gathering of sticks. Agricultural labor, marketing, and all other necessary buying and selling went on upon Sunday as upon any other day, that amount of time only being reserved which was necessary for attendance upon worship. From the church Christians went forth to their ordinary occupations. No *ecclesiastical* legislation abridging this freedom occurs before the *fourth century*, (Con. Laod. A. D. 364,) and the earliest *State-Church* legislation, that of *Constantine*, (A. D. 321, Encyc. Am. Art Sabbath,) merely forbidding military parades, theatrical shows and the sitting of courts on Sunday, but expressly reserves the right to labor in the fields. From this time no marked or important change in the Sabbatical usage of the

* It was not until A. D. 194 that Sunday was called “*the Lord’s day*,” for the *first time*, by Clement of Alexandria. In A. D. 200, Tertullian used the term “*Lord’s day*” and defined his meaning, fixing the name upon the day of Christ’s resurrection. Kitto says, this is “the earliest authentic instance” in which the name is thus applied, and J. N. Andrews says “we have proved this true by actual examination of every writer, unless the reader can discover some reference to Sunday in Clement’s mystical eighth day.”

Church occurred till the outbreak of Puritanism in England," (in the 16th century). He says, "The observance of the Sabbath (he should have said *Sunday*) as a day of worship, is not promoted by legislative enactments interfering with individual action. Even laws of an unquestionably moral nature, as those against blasphemy are not strengthened by adopting them into the *criminal* code. Men will not be brought to honor the Lord's name or the Lord's day (he should have said *Sunday*) by fear of arrest or fines. The attempt to enforce the observance of Sunday as a Sabbath, on the individual conscience, *by the terms of the fourth commandment*, labors under insuperable difficulties." (What could be more absurd than the idea, that, simply because of God's command to the Israelites to keep *Saturday* as a *holy* day, therefore we are under obligation to keep *Sunday* as a *holy* day!) The above are extracts from an address on the "Sabbath question" by Dr. Hopkins delivered at the "Bi-ennial Meeting of the Evangelical Alliance," held in the First Presbyterian Church, Pittsburgh, Penna.

"The people in the reign of Edward VI. were taught that to abstain from gathering in the harvest on Sundays would be a grievous sin, and in the whole English liturgy and rubrics, the word Sabbath, never once occurs." (Whately on the writings of St. Paul; essay 5, note B)

"You Jews, (says Justin Martyr,) keep holy *one* day, and think you are religious, not considering why that commandment was given you. The *new law* bids you keep a *perpetual* Sabbath"

The author of the Apostolic constitution says, "He who formerly commanded to keep holy the Sabbath by resting thereon for the sake of meditating on His laws, has now commanded us to consider the work of creation and Providence *every day*, and return thanks to God."

Ignatius discarded the idea of an *obligatory* resting from work on *any* day of the week.

Dr. Hopkins further says, in the address above named, "In no instance, as already observed, is the term "Sabbath" applied to the day of Christian assemblies; a circumstance to which Protestants, who find their religion in the Bible, might be expected to pay some attention. The existing Evangelical usage in this particular, contrary to the unvarying example of New Testament language, is of the nature of an unconscious or (as the case may be) *ignorant fraud*; insinuating a legal sanction

for a "Christian Sabbath" which neither Christ nor Paul ever suggested!"

We are informed by Mosheim that as late as A. D. 1530, only 353 years ago, "the Augsburg Confession was adopted as a public standard of faith, by the whole body of Protestants. The style is Philip Melancthon's. The contents or matter, it is certain, was supplied principally by *Luther*." The following is a part of the twenty-eighth article of the Augsburg Confession. "Those who take it that Sunday was substituted for the Sabbath, *err greatly*: for holy Scripture hath *done away the Sabbath*, and teacheth that all ceremonies of the old covenant may be dispensed with after the opening of the gospel. And yet because it was found necessary to fix upon a day certain, in order that the community might know when they should meet; the Church of Christ, has ordered Sunday to be observed for that purpose; and made this change more willingly and with pleasure, to show an example of Christian liberty, and that it might be known, that *neither the Sabbath nor any other day needs to be kept*."

S. Athanasius of Alexandria, said, "We keep no Sabbath day, but look forward to the Sabbath of Sabbath's in Heaven."

S. Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, (A. D. 345,) said, "Turn not thou unto Samaritanism or Judaism. For Jesus Christ hath redeemed thee henceforth. *Reject all observance of Sabbaths*: and call not meats common or unclean." (Catech. 4 : 37)

S. Augustine, A. D. 354, 430 Bishop of Hippo, near Carthage, said, "In Christianity the observation of that kind of Sabbath which consists in the rest of a single day, is no longer a duty for the faithful."

S. Jerom, the recluse of Palestine, and translator of the Scriptures into a Latin version (the Vulgate) said, "All days are same to a Christian."

John Calvin, in his "Institutes of the Christian Religion," says, "the Sabbath is abrogated," and that "Christians ought to depart from all superstitious observance of days."

Bucer, another eminent Protestant Reformer, and Professor of Theology, A. D. 1491—1550, a friend of Luther, said; "To think that working on the Lord's day (he should have said *Sunday*) is in itself a sin, is a superstition, and a denying of the grace of Christ."

The following extract is from Barclay's "Apology for the Quakers." Speaking of the tenets of the Society of Friends,

he says : “ We, not seeing any ground for it in Scripture, cannot be so superstitious as to believe, either that the Jewish Sabbath now continues, or that the *first day of the week* is the antitype thereof, or the Christian Sabbath ; which, with Calvin, we believe to have a more spiritual sense ; and therefore we know no moral obligation by the fourth command or elsewhere, to keep *the first day of the week* more than any other ; or any *holiness* inherent in it.”

A very able writer and editor of a work entitled, “ Is there a Christian Sabbath ? ” and who adds to the work, “ copious notes and two supplementary chapters ; ” in speaking of the eucharistic liturgy of the Anglican Communion of this country, of which he himself is, I understand, a member—“ a Churchman of Northern Ohio ”—says, the clergy of that Church are required in its liturgy to read (among others) the *fourth commandment*, which is followed by the responsive prayer, * * “ incline our hearts to keep *this* law.” He then asks, “ what is more absurd than to make a law that Jews were not to work on Saturdays, to mean that Christians are to be duly religious on Church holy days ? We think, therefore, (he adds,) that by its improper use of this command, the Anglican body is guilty of teaching a doctrine which is as *truly a false addition* to the Christian faith, as any addition ever made by the *Church of Rome*.

The able Author of the last named work, says : The Protestant churches in Germany, and indeed, through the whole continent of Europe, deny their obligation to keep the first day of the week as *holy* time.”

The Rev. Henry Dwight, son of the former president of Yale College, in one of his “ Letters from Germany,” says ; “ In every part of Germany that I have seen, the Sabbath is *not regarded as holy*, in our acceptation of the term ” In another letter written after a long residence in the country, he says : “ The belief of the Sabbath, as an institution binding upon us in the sense in which it is generally viewed in the United States, is universally rejected. They say that *every day* should be a Sabbath to a Christian ; but that as we are required to assemble together for religious worship, it is necessary to select a particular day. As Government has determined upon the day, it is our duty to observe that in preference to any other.”

Dr. Edward Robinson, the eminent theologian and ori-

ental traveler, who resided several years in Europe, says, after speaking at length, in reference to Sunday which he calls "the Sabbath;" as follows: "The Protestants of the Continent therefore, while they hold that a portion of the day should be devoted to the duties of public and private worship and meditation, do not suppose it necessary during the remaining portion, to withdraw from the cares and duties of the world. But, although they hold that labor and the occupations of business are not unlawful, yet they more generally spend the afternoon in walking abroad in the fields or public gardens, in riding or dining out, or generally in the pleasures of social intercourse." He further says, "This is the fact, that the same view of the Sabbath was held and taught by the Reformers themselves, and have been taught throughout the Protestant Church (on the Continent) ever since. It has been universally held and practiced upon even in the times of the greatest religious excitement, and by *the most pious, devoted, and active Christians*, both of former days and of the present; by Luther and Melancthon, by Spencer and Francke, and many others of a standing little inferior to theirs."

The above quoted able Author of "Is there a Christian Sabbath," further says; thus we see, that to say nothing of the ninety-eight millions of Roman Catholics, and the fifty millions belonging to the Greek church, no less than forty-four millions of Protestant Christians on the continent of Europe, believe the Sabbath to have been abrogated by the coming of Christ."

The earliest traces of abstinence from labor on Sunday are found in the writings of Tertullian at the close of the second century.

Brerewood says, "The name of the Sabbath remained appropriated to the old Sabbath; and was never attributed to the Lord's day, not for many hundred years after our Saviour's time."

The earliest mention of Sunday as a Christian *Sabbath* is thus noted by Heylyn:—"The first who ever used it to denote "*the Lord's day*" (the first I have met with in all this search) is one Petrus Alfonsus—he lived about the time that Rupertus did—(which was the beginning of the twelfth century) who calls the Lord's day by the name of Christian Sabbath."

Of labor on Sunday, in the Eastern Church, Heylyn says, "It was near nine hundred years from our Saviour's birth if not quite so much, before *restraint from husbandry on this day* had been first *thought* of in the east: and probably being thus

restrained did find no more obedience there than it had done before in the western parts."

"The Encyclopedia Britannica, in its article concerning the Sabbath, undertakes to prove that the "religious observance of the first day of the week is of Apostolic appointment." After citing and commenting upon all the passages that could be found in proof of the point, it makes the following candid acknowledgement: "Still, however, it *must be owned* that these passages are *not sufficient* to prove the apostolical institution of the Lord's day, or even the actual observation of it." He means as a *holy* day.

The following is Constantine's edict regarding Sunday, A.D. 321. "Let all the judges and townspeople, and the occupations of all trades, rest on the venerable day of the Sun, (*die solis*), but let those who are situated in the country, freely and at full liberty, attend to the business of agriculture; because it often happens that no other day is so fit for sowing corn and planting vines; lest the critical moment being let slip, men should lose the commodities granted them by the PROVIDENCE OF HEAVEN."

This was the first Sunday law. But of course this was only a pagan edict. Constantine had not become even a nominal Christian. Later than this, Sylvester, Bishop of Rome, now reckoned in the line of Popes, made use of the Emperor Constantine's edict to enforce Sunday observance as a *Christian* institution; but not altogether as a *holy* day yet. But the papacy was not fully established until 538, more than 200 years after Constantine's law: and in the American Law Register for March 1880, we are told that the Roman Empire, after Constantine's edict above given, from time to time enacted new laws, more and more comprehensive in scope, against labor on the first day of the week or Sunday: which *shows the origin* of the prohibition of labor on that day. But the sanctity or *holy* feature of Sunday did not attain its full development, until the rise of Puritanism in the sixteenth century. It will therefore be observed, that the idea had its origin or source in the *Jus Civile* or law of the Roman Empire, and the Church of Rome; and its full development with the Puritans, who, we are informed by the Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, were, the greater part Presbyterians.

Hence, in a *Catholic* work, called the "Abridgment of Christian Doctrine," will be found the following:

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

“*Ans.* We have for it the authority of the Catholic Church, and Apostolic tradition.”

“*Ques.* Does the Scripture anywhere command Sunday to be kept for the Sabbath?”

“*Ans.* The Scripture commands us to hear the church, and to hold fast the traditions of the Apostles” But the Scriptures do not in particular mention this change of the Sabbath.”

“*Ques.* How prove you that the church hath power to command feasts and holy days?”

Ans. By the very act of changing the Sabbath into Sunday, which *Protestants allow of.*”

In the “Catholic Catechism of Christian Religion,” we have the following:

“*Ques.* What is this day of rest?”

“*Ans.* The seventh day of the week, or Saturday; for he employed six days in creation, and rested on the seventh.”

“*Ques.* Is it then Saturday we should sanctify in order to obey the ordinance of 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; so now *we* sanctify the first, not the seventh day. Sunday means, and now is, the day of the Lord.” * * “Those who pretend to be so religious of the Sunday, whilst they take no notice of other festivals ordained by the *same church authority*, show that they act by humor, and not reason and religion; since Sundays and holy days *all* stand upon the same foundation, viz., *the ordinance of the church.*” Cath. Chris. Instructed, pp. 209-211.

The “Doctrinal Catechism,” contains the following. “*Ques.* Have you any other way of proving that the church has power to institute festivals of precept?” *Ans.* Had she not 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.*”

In another Roman Catholic work, entitled, “The Shortest Way to End Disputes about Religion,” p. 19, we find the following:—

“As zealous as Protestants are against the church’s infallibility, they are forced to depend wholly upon her authority *in*

many articles that cannot be evidently proved from any text of Scripture ; yet are of very great importance. 1. The lawfulness for Christians to work upon Saturday, contrary, in appearance, to the *express command* of God, who bids us keep the Sabbath holy ; and tells us that the seventh day of the week is that day. 2. The lawfulness and validity of *infant baptism*, whereof there is no example in Scripture."

In a Catholic tract under the title, "A question for all bible Christians," will be found the following.

"You are a Protestant, and profess to go by the Bible, and the Bible only ; and yet in so important a matter as the observance of one day in seven as a *holy* day, you go against the plain letter of the Bible, and put another day in the place of that day which the Bible has commanded. The command to keep holy the seventh day is one of the ten commandments ; you believe that the other nine are still binding ; who gave you authority to tamper with the fourth ? If you are consistent with your own principles, if you really follow the Bible, and the Bible only, you ought to be able to produce some portion of the New Testament, in which this fourth commandment is expressly altered." * * "We Catholics, then, have precisely the same authority for keeping Sunday *holy*, instead of Saturday, as we have for every other article of our creed, namely, the authority of 'the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth ;' 1 Tim. 3 : 15 ; whereas you Protestants have really no authority for it whatever ; for there is no authority for it in the Bible, and you will not allow there can be authority for it anywhere else."

W. L. Lockhart, B. A. of Oxford, in the Toronto (Cath.) *Mirror*, offered the following "challenge" to all the Protestants of Ireland ; He says :—"I do, therefore, solemnly challenge the Protestants of Ireland to prove, by plain texts of scripture, the questions concerning the obligation of the Christian Sabbath. 1. That Christians may work on Saturday, the old seventh day. 2. That they are bound to keep *holy* the first day, namely, Sunday. 3. That they are not bound to keep the seventh day also."

It will therefore be seen that the papal power claims to have changed the seventh day Sabbath to the first day Sabbath. Catholics plainly and unblushingly acknowledge, that there is *no scriptural authority* for the change which they claim to have had the effrontery and presumption to make.

But I think we have plainly and distinctly shown, that the

first day of the week, or Sunday was observed by the heathen or Gentiles in honor of the Sun, long before the papal power existed ; and also, that the same day was selected and observed by the disciples of Christ (before they became *apostles*) for *their* day to assemble and worship God. I have also shown just as plainly and distinctly, that the obligation to observe the seventh day Sabbath, which they think they have *changed*; ceased and totally expired at the cross of Christ together with the entire law of Moses; and was so understood and taught by the Apostles: and therefore, since that, there has been no Sacred Sabbath or *holy* day to be changed," or to observe.

But what the Catholics together with the various Protestant Denominations clear down to and including the Puritans; *did do*, through superstition and fanaticism, which have more or less characterized all; was to change the proper, reasonable, necessary, Scriptural use of Sunday, to a popular so-called "*holy-day*," which has no foundation in the scriptures, as a necessity for this dispensation. Under such circumstances, for the various Denominations to hold and teach the necessity of such an observance of Sunday—that it is a requirement of the Scriptures &c, is to do violence to reason and right. It is wrong to accept and disseminate false teaching, thinking to make men more moral. It is a great mistake to conceal the truth, or fear to declare it freely, for any purpose, or under any circumstances. In the language of a learned professor at Harvard College, "Allegiance to truth is the highest obligation that can rest on a human being." It has long since been discovered, and is being discovered and better known every day, by many wise sound thinking minds, that the teaching and positions of the popular Denominations, are not scriptural, and therefore not sound nor reasonable. Such lame theological logic as the following, has little weight with many: namely:—"It is wrong to work on Sunday because God forbade the Hebrews to work on a *different* day" !

Sunday is a *holy* day because, under the law of Moses Saturday was !

Sunday is a *holy* day because the Apostles assembled on that day for worship !

Although not called a *holy* day in the Scriptures, nor any command to keep it, yet it is a *holy* day because a corrupt Church and the civil law say so !

We have always been taught that Sunday is a *holy* day, therefore it must be so !

Such reasoning as that causes reasonable men to scorn both the reasoner and his reasoning.

There are many, who with the writer, have the most implicit and unwavering confidence in the Scriptures, as being the revealed will of God, and therefore the most profound respect and reverence for the Bible, and an intense hate for all superstition, religious cant and error; who firmly believe that the foolish, absurd doctrines, and the silly twaddle, put forth as the teachings of the Scriptures on *various* subjects, have done more to bring disrespect upon the Bible, and dishonor upon its Author, and made more skeptics and infidels, than all other things put together.

What person of candid thinking mind, and honest heart, free from prejudice, can take in, as being all right, and sound, such teaching as the following, as being Bible, namely: that "*death*" means eternal life, in misery!" That "life in the Bible does not mean life, but something else; and that death signifies separation from God in a state of sin and misery forever!" That "everlasting punishment" must necessarily be, and is, everlasting *suffering*, when the Bible so distinctly defines it "everlasting *destruction*;" simply "*death*"—"the second death." "The wages of sin is death." Their talking and singing such poetic trash as "a *never dying* soul to save and fit it for the sky;" when the Bible distinctly says "the *soul* that sinneth it *shall die*." "If ye live after the flesh ye shall *die*"; not suffer forever. Again; "There is a heaven o'er yonder sky," where they are going when they die: although Christ said, "whither I go ye cannot come," and Peter said "*David* is not ascended into the heavens;" and that "HE is both *dead* and *buried*;" and Paul says the righteous are "*asleep* in Christ" and when he returns, they are to be raised," made alive," "caught up to *meet* him," *return* with him and so "ever be with the Lord." In the entire Bible, not one word about their going to heaven when they die; nor about going "*beyond* the bounds of time and *space*."

They constantly talk about "the *death* that *never* dies!" The "immortal soul;" "The deathless spirit," &c., &c., as if those terms were found on every page of the Scriptures; and yet *not once* therein named!

They talk about an immortal soul having been breathed or put into Adam at his creation. But when we turn to the record, we find no such thing there taught: but, that, God formed *man*

of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and MAN became a living *soul*:" and when man dies, that the breath, or "spirit of life," "returns to God who gave it," the great source of all life; and the man—the whole man—is then "*dead*." If he was a *righteous* man, then, "dead in Christ," or "*asleep* in Christ," who when he returns, will raise him—the whole man—from the grave, to incorruptibility of nature, and eternal life. Not once in the Bible, is incorruptibility or immortality applied to man, in this state—not once, until after the change from mortal to immortality at the resurrection. Not once is man called immortal; but he *is* called "*mortal* man."

They talk about the soul being an entity, independent of the body, the real man, going to heaven at the death of the *body* (not the death of the man; for, say they, the MAN *shall not surely die*;" and so said the serpent in Eden) and the body into the grave: and at the resurrection the soul to leave heaven and come back to be re-united to the body, then to be judged to see whether it is to go back to heaven, or go to hell! The soul of the wicked, say they, goes to hell at death, comes back at the resurrection of the body, to be judged, and if found that its deeds had been evil while in the body before death, then it goes back to hell taking its body along too. There in hell to burn and writhe in terrible and indescribable torment forevermore!

This is the kind of "stuff" popular theologians have been asking us to take with closed eyes and open mouths, as the teaching of the Scriptures, the revelations of an infinitely wise and good God!

At this point we quote the words of Rev. Edward White of London, England: pastor of a Congregational Church. At the beginning of this long siege against the *fortress of ancient error* the plight of children as to their instruction in the ways of God was pitiable indeed. Practically, little was said in detail, or by way of application to individuals, of the theory then prevailing in the ministry. But thoughtful children knew very well what doctrines underlay the surface-teaching in families, schools and churches. It was this,—that they were all born immortal beings, born with souls that must live forever, in happiness or in torment; and born with souls so degenerate and prone to sin that there was no escape from the doom of fire in hell for ever, except by regeneration either by baptism, or, without baptism, by

truth. Arminians, such as the Methodists, taught their children that all might escape this doom by faith and repentance. Calvinists (and the Independents and Baptists were mostly Calvinists then) taught their children that only a certain number of them born could be saved, because only a certain number were predestinated by God to be saved; all the rest born in sin, and not elected from eternity to salvation, must *suffer torment* in hell *throughout the eternity* to come. This was the creed taught in a quiet and respectable way, under which I was myself educated among the Independents. It was not worked out in detail by the pious preacher, the younger and more thoughtful hearers were left to work it out in their own reflections. Mr. Robert Browning, then a boy with marvelous countenance and black and flashing eyes, listened to this doctrine in the corner of the gallery, close to the reverend preacher's right hand, and I listened to it in the same church, on the floor. What effect it had on Mr. Robert Browning I can only guess from his poems. For myself, it nearly drove me mad with secret misery of mind, in thinking of such a God. Our young souls were enmeshed in the most perplexing tangle of contradictory ideas. We were taught that God was good and just; all the Bible and all the hymns said that, and Nature confirmed the lesson. But, what could we make of this Omnipotent Being, who "so loved the world" as to determine on the birth of an immense multitude of non-elect children—who must suffer for ever—while we ourselves might be amongst the fated number. Well, it did not quite make infidels of us, for better influences were at work, but it did so very nearly. It poisoned the fountains of youthful joy, and rendered it the most dreadful task on earth to think steadily of our Creator. From fourteen years old and upwards our faith depended very much on the art of not thinking on the hateful mystery. Such was the youth out of which sprang *my own* subsequent history; and to-day I praise, and extol, and honor the King of Heaven, who has shaken this old and frightful system of theology almost to the ground, and is strengthening a great company to protest, year after year, against such teaching of the young, until at length, this year, *even* the *Methodist* Conference has silently withdrawn its ancient catechism of *horrors*, for not teaching which, they three years ago expelled Mr. Impey, forty years missionary in South Africa. No single indirect influence has done so much to promote European infidelity, no single influence has indirectly done so much

to root out the very belief of God from the minds of the European nations—as that doctrine of a torment that shall never, never end—that notion of eternal evil resulting from the anti-Christian doctrine of the immortality of the soul. The common people and the educated people of Europe, generally speaking, literally hate the very idea of the God of orthodoxy ; and all their literature, high and low, will tell you why. It is the result of what they regard as the unjust, and therefore incredible, doctrine taught for so many ages by that church which permits none of its ministers to be either a husband or a father—the doctrine of the endless torment of the unsaved members of a race born in sin, brought up in ignorance, sorely tempted, and despotically ruled by priests and kings. The very first principle of that terrible Russian Nihilism, as taught by its chief apostle, as he says, is “to get rid of the very idea of God as the root of all evil—a God who is capable of tormenting mankind for ever and ever.” This doctrine has simply exploded popular faith in Christianity throughout Europe. No religion offers any support to morality unless the God whom it makes known is a moral being, whose attributes commend themselves to the unsophisticated conscience. No unsophisticated human conscience accepts the idea of the God who, creating men immortal, predestinates some to eternal bliss, and condemns the non-elect to endless misery. Such a creed produces everywhere, sooner or later, popular atheism.

No man's conduct is practically governed by that which his judgment and conscience pronounce to be incredible. And the doctrine of endless torment, as applied to the masses of mankind, seemed just as incredible to John Foster as it does to Paul Bert or Charles Bradlaugh. Now, what we assert is that the orthodox church-Christianity is indirectly guilty of assisting into atheism these horrible blasphemers.

Next; the effect of this teaching among scientific men has corresponded with its result among the multitude. I speak with great humility of scientific men, but I say that which I know to be the truth, when I affirm that the doctrine of Life in Christ is now preventing numbers of scientific and professional people from joining the ranks of infidelity and atheism ; and is holding them fast in the faith of Christianity. Not a few of these have with warm acknowledgment assured us that the pathway to faith has been made clear by the doctrine of Immortal Life through the Incarnation ; and it is a doctrine which is

spreading among religiously-disposed scientific men of all ranks every day. It corresponds with the honest conclusions of real science, physical and metaphysical, and affords that solid hope of immortality which nature does not afford.

Throughout England children to-day are taught the true character of God as never before. Few teachers dare to repeat to them the mediæval tales of dread under which our own earlier years were so deeply oppressed. Even Mr. Moody, in his recent Edinburgh addresses to the young, never once told any of them the old Church of Scotland story,—that they were liable, through the sin of Adam, to endless misery.

John Locke, in his Reasonableness of Christianity and in his Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles, says:—"By death threatened to Adam, some men understand *endless torments* in hell-fire; but it seems a strange way of understanding a law which requires the plainest and directest words, that by *death* should be meant *eternal life* in misery. Can any one be supposed to intend by a law which says, 'For felony thou shalt surely die,' not that he should lose his life, but be kept alive in exquisite and perpetual torments; and would any one think himself fairly dealt with that was so used?"

It would be easy to read a long catalogue of names of scholars and divines of every rank, and of almost every country; theologians, linguists, critics, philosophers, missionaries, who, having carefully studied these disputed doctrines on human nature and destiny, now openly and earnestly avow the conviction of their truth.

EPITOME

Of man, his creation, fall, redemption and SALVATION ; as revealed in the Scriptures.

We are informed that "God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him ; male and female created he them." Gen. 1 : 27. "And the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden ; and there he put the man whom he had formed. And out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight and good for food ; THE TREE OF LIFE also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil." Gen. 2 : 8, 9. Man was there and then put on trial as to whether he would obey God and keep his law. His allegiance to the Supreme Ruler of the Universe, was to be tested by the law relative to "the tree of knowledge of good and evil." God said to him, "thou shalt not eat of it ; for in the day thou eatest thereof ; thou shalt surely die." (Margin, "dying thou shalt die.") Gen. 2 : 17. But Adam and Eve listened to the subtle voice of the Serpent, although it gave their Creator the lie ! It tried to make out that he, their Creator, had told them a direct lie ! God had said, if you transgress you shall surely die. The Serpent said "Ye *shall not* surely die." God told them the TRUTH. The Serpent told them a *lie*. Now in order to understand what God meant by "dying," or *death*, let us examine as to the man's origin—his "living" or *life*. "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. 2 : 7. We see by this, that after the *entire man* was formed of dust, he was made to *live*, by a breath of "*life*"—by the inhalation of breath or air which contains, or is the medium of, the wonderful principle of "*life*." Or, in other words, which contains that which set in motion the entire machinery of the body of dust-organization, "man," and caused him to become "a *living* soul." It is clear then, that, in order for the man to *die*, the breathing process simply required to be stopped. Let the breathing, or respiration be stopped, and the living soul becomes what he was

before God's breath inflated his lungs—a soul without life. That this was what God meant by dying, and the punishment which he threatened, can be clearly seen by the penalty so distinctly pronounced on Adam as soon as he had disobeyed the law. “Because thou hast harkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree which I commanded thee saying, ‘Thou shalt not eat of it; cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; * * * In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till *thou return unto the ground*; for out of it wast *thou* taken: for *dust thou art*, and unto *dust shalt thou return.*” Gen. 3: 17-19. “Thou,” was the “*man*” who was made of the dust, and *became* a “*living soul*” by the inhalation of the breath, and the same “*thou*” was to die and *return to dust*, because he disregarded God's law, or command, in consequence of believing the Serpent's lie.

The penalty or punishment amounted to this. You are mortal; that is, you have been made or created of the dust of the ground, with a nature that can *die*—a nature and constitution that will come to maturity, decay and die; unless the seeds of dissolution, which form one of the elements, of your nature, shall be continually counteracted by the fruit of the “*TREE OF LIFE*,” access to which and to “*every tree*,” I grant you, so long as you obey and keep my law, that is, so long as you refrain from eating of the tree of knowledge of good and evil.” I set *life* and *death* before you—eternal life—eternal death. If you are obedient your mortal dying nature shall ultimately be changed, to an immortal undying nature. If you disobey, you shall be immediately driven out of the garden, and the tree of life guarded, lest you continue to put forth your hand and take also of the tree of life, and eat and live forever.” Being thus prevented from eating the fruit of the tree of life, for the rest of your time of trial, the *chance* of obtaining an immortal nature and eternal life, will have been forever forfeited and lost, and you will hopelessly *die* and return to dust—become “as though you had not been.” But although God told them what would be the terrible consequences, of disobedience, yet they disregarded God's TRUTH and believed the Serpent's *lie*!! They were therefore expelled from the garden—cut off from the tree of life; the fruit of which, had they been allowed continual access to it, would probably have ultimately, changed their nature from mortal to immortal, and they would have lived forever. But in consequence of their expulsion, the seeds of dissolution began that very day

to work, and ultimately ended in death, after years of toil and suffering: for we read, "all the days that Adam lived were nine hundred and thirty years: *and he died.*"

Thus we see that Adam was a mortal being, as a living Soul. The phrases, "immortal soul," "neverdying soul," "deathless spirit," are not contained in the entire scriptures. There is not one passage in the whole Bible, which says that man is, or has, an *immortal soul*. But the very opposite is there taught. It tells us of "*mortal man*," (Job 4: 17) of "*dead souls*," (Num. 19: 11) of "*living souls*," that "the soul that sinneth it shall *die.*" (Ezk. 18: 20.) "I have set before you *life and death.*" (Deut. 30: 15, 19.) "Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return;" &c. &c. But not one word in all the Bible about man (either as a dead soul, or living soul,) going either to hell or heaven when he dies! But we are expressly told that "*no man* hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven." John 3: 13. That even "David is not ascended into the heavens" *—* but "that he is both *dead and buried.*" Acts 2: 34, 29. "*He,*" whatever constituted the man, David, (not merely his *body*) but "*he,*" is both *dead and buried*. So that all who think that David, and all the good who have died, are *not* dead but alive, up in heaven, think very much like the Devil when he said, "ye shall *not* surely *die,*" * * * but "ye shall be as Gods.*"

The Scriptures inform us, that, if we would become immortal, so as to live forever—have "eternal life,"—we must "*seek for immortality by patient continuance in well doing*"

* This scripture contains, what may be properly termed "*the serpent's sugar-coated pill*" He first made up the pill, every ingredient of which, and every item, is palpable falsehood; and therefore in its totality, a malicious out-and-out LIE: namely: "*thou shalt not surely die.*" But in order to make it a *sure* thing for Eve to swallow, and induce Adam to do so too, and thus accomplish his wicked purpose—the ruin of Adam and all their posterity—he sugar-coated the lie with a little *very palatable truth*; namely: "*your eyes shall be opened and ye shall be as Gods, (Elohim,) knowing good and evil.*" By that means the woman was beguiled and induced to eat the forbidden fruit: for we are informed, that when she understood that it was "to be *desired to make one wise*, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat. And the eyes of them both were opened" "And the Lord (the Elohim) said, behold, the man is become as *one of us to know good and evil.*" Hence the sugar-coating of the *lie* with a little *truth*, was what "beguiled" her. That lie, sugar-coated or *mixed with* a little truth has been iterated and reiterated ever since, until the literature of all Christendom has become thoroughly permeated and poisoned by its fatal virus, and the entire biblical teachings of popular theology, have become impregnated and contaminated by it. In fact, that *untruth*, in the shape of the "*natural immortality of the soul,*" has *unwillingly* been accepted as the *fundamental principle* of all popular Theology!!!

and that to such, "God will render eternal life." Rev. 2 : 5-7. The father of lies invented the doctrine of man's natural immortality, in the words just quoted, "Ye shall not surely die," (Gen. 3 : 4,) and the lie has been reiterated by thousands ever since; although that lie, being believed by Adam and Eve, was the cause of death and all the ills of life entailed upon Adam's posterity. We are not informed by the record of man's origin as many suppose, that God breathed an immortal soul into man, but simply the breath of life. The (*nephesh*) breath contained the (*rauch*) spirit of (*chai*) life.* Hence we read, "All in whose nostrils was the breath of life;" that is, "the breath of the *spirit* of life." (margin) Gen. 7 : 22. "There is no man that hath power over the (*rauch*) spirit, to retain the (*rauch*) spirit in the day of death." Eccl. 3 : 8. "In whose hand is the (*nephesh*) soul, that is, breath of "life" (margin) of every living thing, and the (*rauch*) spirit of the breath of all mankind." Job. 12 : 10. "If he gather unto himself his *spirit*

* The Hebrew word *nephesh*, which is found in the Hebrew text of the Old Testament seven hundred and fifty-two times, is like other Hebrew nouns, derived from a verb. It is derived from a verb which signifies "to breathe," "to respire;" and is rendered "Soul" four hundred and seventy-five times.

Parkhurst, a distinguished Hebrew lexicographer, says, "As a noun, *nephesh* hath been supposed to signify the *spiritual part* of man, or what WE commonly call his *soul*: I must for myself confess, that I can find *no passage* where it hath *undoubtedly* this meaning."

Dr. Clarke says, when commenting on Gen. 1 : 24, "*nephesh chayah* is a general term to express *all* creatures endued with animal life, in *any* of its infinitely varied gradations."

McCulloch says, in his able work on the Credibility of the Scriptures, "There is no word in the Hebrew language, that signifies either *soul* or *spirit*, in the technical sense in which WE use the terms, as implying something distinct from the body." Vol. 2, P. 471.

Kitto, in his "Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature," renders Gen 2 : 7, as follows: "And Jehovah formed the man (Heb. the Adam) of dust from the ground, and blew into his nostrils the breath of life, and *the man* become a *living animal* and he remarks, "We should be acting unfaithfully, if we were to affirm, an *immortal spirit* is contained or implied in this passage." Vol. 1, P. 59.

Bishop Tillotson says, "The *immortality of the soul* is rather *supposed* or taken for *granted*, than expressly revealed in the Bible."

Martin Luther said, the "immortality of the soul is one of the monstrous opinions accumulated on the papal dung-hill." Opp. II., Wittenberg, folio 113

Rev. Edward White of London, Eng., says, "Christ says the wicked will be "killed with death," be "destroyed body and soul in Gehenna," and it is to follow the universal law of interpretation, when we say that this does not signify any form of *living forever*." I ask, is it not a singular coincidence that the leading tenet of modern Christendon viz: natural immortality that is, that the real man cannot die, that only his *body* dies, should happen to be just what the serpent of old said to Eve, "ye shall *not* surely die." And is it not the more strange that such should be the case in view of the fact that the Scriptures, continually say, "man became a living soul." "The *soul* that sinneth it shall die." "If ye live after the flesh ye shall die." "The wages of sin is death."

and his *breath*; all flesh shall perish together, and *man shall turn again to dust.*" Job. 35 : 14, 15. Solomon the wisest man, in speaking of man and beasts *in death*, said, "As the one dieth *so* dieth the other: yea they have all *one breath*; so that (in death) a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast; for all is vanity; all go unto one place; all are of *the dust*, and *all turn to dust again.*" The spirit of life and the breath are often identical, because the breath or air *contains* the spirit of life. They are inseparably connected. Job said, "All the while my breath is in me, and the *spirit* of God is in my nostrils," "that is, the *breath* which God gave him," (margin) ch. 27 : 3. Thus the breath is the *vehicle* of the *spirit* of lives" (*ruach chayim* Gen 6 : 17.) by which all creatures live—the one common universal principal of *all* lives, contained in the air, wind, breath. In other words, *ruach* is *spirit* or *life* contained in the air.

Man is therefore not the possessor of a soul, but he himself is a SOUL, and will continue to be, until he is changed to a spirit by being begotten and born by the spirit through the incorruptible seed, the WORD OF LIFE;" or goes down to death and oblivion forever. This is the position of the entire human Race: for we are told that in Adam all die; "By one man sin entered into the world and death by sin; so death passed upon all men." Rom. 5 : 12.

But this condition of things is not to last forever. There is hope: for it is written, "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." A redemption has been vouchsafed: not only a redemption from all the terrible consequences of Adam's sin—death and the grave; but also the *forfeited chance* of perpetuating our existence, of obtaining immortality, eternal life, and the full complement of Salvation in the kingdom—much more than mere redemption—has been restored in and through Christ. "For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ hath *abounded* unto many.* * * That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness, unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom. 5 : 15, 21. While God has thus vouchsafed and promised "so great a Salvation" by his Anointed; it is predicated upon the condition of faith—"faith which *worketh* by love"—(Gal. 5 : 6)—FAITH AND OBEDIENCE. Faith in what? He requires man to believe what he has promised: to believe in the promised

Salvation: the glad tidings concerning the kingdom, the gospel—the message of Jesus the Saviour. “And he said unto them Go ye into all the world and preach *the gospel* to every creature. He that *believeth* and is *baptized* shall be *saved*; but he that believeth not shall be damned.” Mark 16 : 15, 16. “Go ye therefore and *teach* all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit: teaching them to observe *all things whatsoever I have commanded you.*” Mat. 28 : 19, 20. “For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the *power of God* unto *Salvation* to every one that believeth” Rom. 1 : 16. “Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the *word of God*, which liveth and abideth forever: and this is the *word* which by the *gospel* is preached unto you.” 1 Pet. 1 : 23, 25. ‘The gospel of Christ then, is God’s appointed means or “power” by which alone man can be saved: and which must be believed, and obeyed, for without *faith* it is *impossible* to please God. Heb. 11 : 6. Paul wrote to Timothy that the holy Scriptures “are able to make thee wise unto *salvation*, through *faith* which is in Christ Jesus.” 2 Tim. 3:15. No doubt Paul referred to the Old Testament Scriptures, *the writings of Moses and the Prophets*; for the New Testament was not then in existence: consequently the old testament Scriptures, must contain the saving truth, the gospel; at least in its germ or less developed form. Christ said to the unbelieving Jews,” “Had ye believed Moses ye would have believed me: for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings how shall ye believe my words? John 5 : 46, 47. This clearly proves that a man cannot believe the words of the great Teacher—cannot be a believer in Christ—while refusing to believe the writings of Moses.

Paul said, “I continue unto this day, witnessing both to small and great, saying, *none other things* than those which the *prophets* and *Moses* did say should come.” Acts 26 : 22. Also, “After the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing *all things* which are *written in the law and in the prophets.*” Acts 24 : 14. And when he had called together the Jews, at Rome, “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. And Christ himself, after his resurrection, during an interview with some of his disciples, “beginning at **MOSES AND ALL THE PROPHETS**, expounded unto them *in all the Scriptures*, the things concerning himself.”

We conclude therefore, that those who abandon or neglect the writings of Moses and the prophets make a fearful mistake ; and that if we would find saving truth, if we would apprehend the purpose of Jehovah as to man and this planet, we must "search the Scriptures"—the Old Testament as well as the New Testament. Let us therefore proceed to do so.

After Adam and Eve were expelled from the garden, and their access to the tree of life thus cut off, words of consolation and hope were made known. "I will put enmity between thee (the serpent) and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed ; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." Gen. 3 : 15. The great "truth" contained in the above prediction, seems at first sight a little obscure, but it is in it, as the oak is in the acorn ; as may be seen by the following. "For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil." 1 John 4 : 8. "He also himself likewise took part of the same ; (flesh and blood ;) that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil." Heb. 2 : 14. The Son of God is the Seed promised to the woman, and as he was to "*put away Sin* by the sacrifice of himself" and destroy the *cause* of sin ; as the sin power was to be bruised or crushed, by the seed of the woman, (Christ), it was more than an intimation that the breach made by sin should be repaired. It amounted to a promise of redemption. The seed of the woman, and the seed of the serpent, represent the two classes of the human race, which are antagonistic to each other because of the "enmity." One having "*the truth*," and their characters being developed and formed by it : the other being actuated by error—the thinkings of "sinful flesh," or the flesh of sin. All sinners are therefore the serpent's seed. They can become the woman's seed, "the good seed," "the children of the kingdom," (Mat. 13 : 38,) identified with the "one seed," (Gal. 3 : 16,) "the seed of Abraham," and "the seed of David," only through *faith*.

Again, we have further light as to redemption and salvation, even "the gospel," in God's promise to Abraham. God said to Abraham that he would give to him and his seed all the land of Canaan "for an *everlasting* possession ;" and that "in him and in his seed should *all nations* be blessed." Gen. 12 : 1-7, and 13 : 15, 16, and 17 : 1-8. And Paul says this was THE GOSPEL. "And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen (the Gentiles R. V.) through faith, preached before,

the gospel unto Abraham, saying, in thee shall all nations be blessed." Gal. 3 : 8.

God elected Abraham to be the founder of an elect nation, to be called God's nation, and David to be the founder of the Royal House of that Nation, from whence the Seed was to spring, when the nation should be constituted as a kingdom under David in the land promised. For God said by the mouth of his Prophet, "Ought ye not to know that the Lord God of Israel gave the kingdom over Israel to David forever, even to him and his sons. * * And now ye think to withstand *the kingdom of the Lord*, in the hands of the sons of David." 2 Chron. 13 : 5, 8. No other nation was called by the Name of Jehovah but the Hebrew Nation. Paul speaking of this promise to Abraham and his seed, said, "He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, *which is Christ*." Gal. 3 : 16. The promise has only in part been fulfilled, for neither Abraham nor his Seed—the Christ—have ever inherited the land. That part of the promise is therefore still to be fulfilled in the future. Stephen, "full of faith and power," said, a few minutes before he was stoned to death, "God gave Abraham none inheritance in it, no not so much as to set his foot on. yet he promised that he would give it to him for a possession and to his seed after him." Acts 7 : 5. Abraham must therefore be raised from the dead in order to inherit the promises. If it be said "Abraham is in heaven; and that is the Holy land or what God *meant* by the promise;" such a statement is a direct contradiction of the word of God by Paul; for he says Abraham died, NOT HAVING RECEIVED THE PROMISES, but died in the faith and hope of receiving them in the future. Heb 11 : 13. Not only so, but God told Abraham to "*Arise walk through the land* in the length of it and in the breadth of it; for I will give it unto thee." It was the land of Palestine, the land of Canaan. God said to him, "look northward, and southward, and eastward and westward: for all the land which thou *seest*, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed *forever*." Gen. 13 : 14-17. Not a word about looking *upward* to heaven! Abraham afterwards lived in the land, and so did Isaac, and Jacob, to whom also the same promises were made, but not as inheritors, only as pilgrims and strangers. Abraham "*sojourned* in the land of promise, as in a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles, with Isaac and Jacob, the *heirs* with him of the same promise:" and confessed that they were *strangers* and *pilgrims* on the earth." Heb 11 : 9, 13.

The nations of the earth are to be blessed in Abraham and his Seed Christ, who is also called "the Son of David" and "the Son of God;" we see therefore, the wisdom of the Divine arrangement in covenanting the land of Palestine to Abraham and his seed forever, for it is well situated for the seat of government over the whole earth.

God promised to make of Abraham a GREAT NATION. He said "And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great, and thou shalt be a blessing." Gen. 12 : 2. Accordingly, a great nation did come out of Abraham; and was called God's nation, and God's kingdom, and out of that nation a Great Ruler, or King was to arise, who would rule Israel and the whole earth. God spoke to David of this great personage as follows: "I will settle him in mine house, and *in MY kingdom forever.*" 1 Chron. 17 : 14-14, and 2 Sam. 7 : 12-16.

God also covenanted to David as follows: "Thine house and thy kingdom shall be established forever BEFORE thee, thy throne shall be established forever." David must therefore be raised from the dead, for his kingdom, in the person of his seed, is to be "established forever *before* him," or *in his presence*. David said that the things promised or ordered by God in this everlasting covenant with him, were *sure* and constituted "all his SALVATION and DESIRE." 2 Sam. 23 : 5.

Now this kingdom, vouchsafed to David and his sons forever, in that land covenanted to Abraham and his seed, and which God called "*my* kingdom" and "the kingdom of the Lord," was to exist first in type, that is, in a *typical* form, which appears to have been God's method as to various things connected with his great Salvation. Hence, about eight hundred years after the covenant was made with Abraham, the founder of the elect Nation; which at that time numbered more than two millions, "the elders of Israel gathered themselves together and came to Samuel unto Ramah, and said unto him, behold thou art old, and thy Sons (who were then *Judges* over Israel) walk not in thy ways: now make us a KING to Judge us like all the nations."

The Lord told Samuel to comply with their request, and said to him, "they have not rejected thee but they have rejected *me*, that I should not reign over them." 1 Sam. 8 : 5-7. By God's direction Saul was selected as their first King, and subsequently David was chosen as their second King. Thus the Kingdom continued to exist in that form for more than five hundred

years, until the time of Zedekiah, who was the last Hebrew King that sat on David's throne; unto whom God by his prophet Ezekiel addressed these words: "Remove the diadem, and take off the Crown: this shall not be the same: exalt him that is low (Jesus) abase him that is high (Zedekiah). I will overturn, overturn, overturn it (the throne of David, or Kingdom of Israel) and it shall be no more, until he come whose right it is; and I will give it to him." Ezk. 21 : 26, 27,

The Kingdom of Israel—Kingdom of God—has therefore never yet existed according to the terms of the promise made to Abraham and his seed, and to David and his seed. Neither Abraham nor David, nor Christ have inherited the land forever. They have all lived and died without the fulfillment of the promise. The seed, Christ, has never yet "possessed the *gate* of his enemies," (Gen. 22 : 17,) that is, "all the Kingdoms of this world" are not yet become the Kingdoms of our Lord and his Christ, and he reigning over them forever and ever." Rev. 11 : 15. "The Kingdom and dominion and the greatness of the Kingdom under the whole heaven," have not yet been given to him and the saints Daniel 7 : 27. The Kingdom has existed only in an imperfect and typical form. Hence Abraham and David must rise from the dead, and the seed (Christ) having gone like a Nobleman "into a far country to receive for himself a Kingdom," (Luke 19 : 12,) must return to establish his Kingdom, and reign over the Nations of the coming Age.

The kingdom of Israel—kingdom of God—was overturned and became no more for the time being, because of the disobedience of the people—God's chosen people. That is, on account of their persistent disobedience, the scepter has departed from Judah and a lawgiver from between his feet, (Gen. 49 : 10,) for the time being, yet, it is not *utterly* departed; (Amos 9 : 8. and Ps. 89 : 33, 34;) it is to be restored. The kingdom existed and flourished long enough to subserve the purpose of Jehovah as a system of most important *types* and *shadows*, and then because of their perverseness and great wickedness, its subjects were scattered throughout the nations of the earth, as God had threatened. Deut. 28. But, although their sceptre thus departed, and their kingdom was overturned and became no more, and themselves scattered on "all the face of the earth," for so many centuries, yet it was not to be an *utter* destruction of their kingdom. God will not forget his *covenant* with them; for it is written, "And yet for all that, when they be in the land of

their enemies, I will not cast them away, neither will I abhor them to destroy them *utterly*, and to break my *covenant* with them." Lev. 26 : 41. "Though I make a full end of all nations whither I have scattered thee, yet will I *not* make a *full end* of thee ; but I will correct thee in measure." Jer. 30 : 11. Their kingdom was to be " no more *until* he come whose right it is," and then to be given *him*. Ezk. 21 : 27. " He shall be great and shall be called the son of the Highest : and the Lord God shall give unto *him* the throne of his father David : and he shall *reign over the house of Jacob* forever ; and of his *kingdom* there shall be *no end*." Luke 1 : 32, 33. Before this can take place " the house of Jacob," that is, the *twelve tribes*, must be re-gathered. The God that scattered them, hath *promised* to gather them into their own land again never more to be driven out ; to become the *subjects* of the kingdom proper, with the once rejected and crucified Jesus for their King. The kingdom to be established under a better constitution, in a perfect and permanent form : its rule, its dominion, over all nations, and all lands, to the uttermost parts of the earth. " Ask of me and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." Ps. 2 : 8. " He shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth." Ps. 72 : 8. " And the kingdom and dominion and the greatness of the kingdom UNDER THE WHOLE HEAVEN (not up in heaven above the stars, nor " beyond the bounds of time and space," nor in the " heaven o'er yonder skies ") shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom ; and all dominions shall serve and obey him." Dan. 7 : 27. " And the Lord shall be King over *all the earth*." Zech. 14 : 9. " The kingdoms of *this world* are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and his Christ ; and he shall reign for ever and ever." Rev. 11 : 15. See also Jer. 23 : 5, Joel 3 : 19-21, Micah 4 : 1-8, Zech. 14 : 16-19, Rev. 5 : 8-10.

The Holy Land will be the locality or territory, and Jerusalem the Capital of the kingdom proper. " For out of *Zion* shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from *Jerusalem*." Isa. 2 : 3. " Then the moon shall be confounded, and the sun ashamed when the Lord of Hosts shall reign *in Mount Zion*, and in *Jerusalem*." Isa. 24 : 23. See also Micah 4 : 1-8, and Joel 3 : 16-21.

Many passages might be quoted, to show and prove that the twelve Tribes, which are called " the house of Jacob " are to

be gathered from "the *North* country," "out of the land of the *North*," "out of the country where they sojourn," "out of all countries," from the four corners of the earth," into the holy land, as the subjects of the kingdom proper, preparatory to the setting up, or organizing and restoring the kingdom of Israel—kingdom of God,—in that land, the old consecrated territory. But a few passages will be sufficient.

"Lo the days come, saith the Lord that I will bring *again* the captivity of my people Israel and Judah, saith the Lord ; and I will cause them to *return* to the land that I gave to their fathers, and they shall possess it." "They shall serve the Lord their God, and *David* their KING, whom I will *raise up unto them.*" Jer. 30 : 3, 9. "And the Lord shall inherit Judah his portion in the HOLY LAND, and shall choose *Jerusalem* again." Zech 2 : 12. "And it shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall set his hand *the second time* to recover the remnant of his people, which shall be left, from Assyria, and from Egypt, and from Pathros, and from Cush, and from Elam, and from Shiner, and from Hamath, and from the islands of the sea And he shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and *gather together* the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth." "Thus saith the Lord God : Behold I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen, whither they be gone, and will *gather* them on every side, and bring them *into their own land* ; and I will make them *one nation*, (As yet this has never taken place since they were divided,) in the land upon the mountains of Israel ; and one king shall be king to them all ; and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all." Ezk. 37 : 21, 22. "And I will make her that halted a remnant, and her that was cast off a strong nation ; and the Lord shall reign over them in Mount Zion from henceforth, even forever. And thou, O tower of the flock, the stronghold of the daughter of Zion, unto thee shall it come, even the first dominion ; the kingdom shall come to the daughter of Jerusalem." Micah 4 : 7, 8.

That kingdom is to be the kingdom of David, the kingdom of Israel, the kingdom of God restored by the coming Messiah, the Son of David, Son of God—Jesus. The subjects of that kingdom, as we have shown by the above passages, will be the descendants of Abraham regathered to their own land. This kingdom is to rule all other kingdoms on the earth.

“For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and *the government shall be upon his shoulders*; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Father of the future age, the Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace, there shall be *no end*, upon the *throne of David*, and upon *his kingdom*, to order it, and to establish it with Judgment and with Justice from henceforth, even forever.” Isa. 9; 6, 7. “Behold the days come saith the Lord, that I will raise unto *David a righteous Branch*, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute Judgment and Justice in the earth.” (Jer. 23: 5.) “He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his Father David: and he shall *reign over the house of Jacob* forever, and of his *kingdom* there shall be *no end*.” Luke 1: 32, 33.

After Christ was crucified, and had been raised up from the dead, and taken up into heaven, Peter knew that he was to return and sit and reign on the throne of David, thus restoring the kingdom to Israel: for he testified as follows: “Therefore (David) being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, *he would raise up Christ to sit on his THRONE*.” Acts 2: 30.

Nothing could be plainer than the testimony of these Scriptures, that Jesus, God's Anointed Son, is to be King of Israel, and of the whole earth, and that his Throne and Kingdom will be as literal and real as any of the now existing kingdoms of the earth. No other kingdom of God is spoken of in the Scriptures, but this kingdom of Israel, which once existed in a typical form, and for centuries was known as and called by the Prophets the kingdom of God, in the Holy land—the land of Canaan or Palestine. It was overturned as before shown, and became no more, and is to be no more until he come whose right it is, and is then to be given him, and is to continue forever, to have “*no end*.”

The holy Prophets, since the world began, have spoken of the restoration of the kingdom of Israel, under David's Son and Lord. Acts 3: 21. Jesus himself made the “good confession,” before Pilate, that HE was king of the Jews, and that He had come into the world to bear witness to the truth. He did not come then as the one whose right it is. It was not then His right. Older heirs were then in existence. Not so

now. Not so when he comes again. He has outlived all the other heirs to the throne of David. He is now not only the oldest living Heir but He is also the only one ever qualified by the incorruptible Spirit-Nature of His Father; to be an everlasting, never dying Ruler over Israel and all nations: and therefore the one "whose *right* it is," and who has the *power*. to "restore again the kingdom to Israel, and to sit upon the throne of his father David, and reign over the House of Jacob forever."

This King has "brethren" called "saints" who are to reign *with him* as Kings and Priests during a thousand years.

"But the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom forever. And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom UNDER the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High." Dan. 7 : 18, 27.

"And Jesus said unto them (his disciples) verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed me, in the regeneration, when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging (ruling or governing) the *twelve tribes of Israel*." Mat. 19 : 28. "Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." Mat. 25 : 34.

"And if children, then heirs, heirs of God, and joint heirs with Jesus Christ." Rom. 8 : 17. "If we suffer we shall also reign with him." 2 Tim. 2 : 12.

"Whosoever doeth the will of my father in heaven is *my BROTHER*." Matt. 12 : 50. "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me on my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father on his throne." Rev. 3 : 21.

"And hast made us unto our God KINGS and PRIESTS: and we shall REIGN ON THE EARTH." Rev. 5 : 10.

"My BRETHREN are these which hear the word of God, and *do it*." Luke 8 : 21. "HE is not ashamed to call *them* BRETHREN," Heb. 2 : 11. HE is the "first born among many BRETHREN." Rom. 8 : 29. The KING has said to his brethren, "he that overcometh, and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give *power over the Nations*." Rev. 3 : 26. "The meek shall inherit the earth" Matt. 5 : 5. They together with Christ, shall compel "every knee to bow and every tongue to confess" to him, as "Lord of Lords, and King of Kings." They shall "execute

the *judgment* written. This *honor* have all his *saints*." Ps. 149 : 9. "Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world?" 1 Cor. 6 : 2.

"And he shall judge among the Nations, and shall rebuke many people : and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks ; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." Isa. 2 : 4. "All nations shall serve and obey him." "For the earth shall be *full* of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea." Isa. 11 : 9. "All the earth shall be *filled* with the glory of the Lord." Numbers 14 : 21. HE, "the first-born among many brethren," the "son of David," "Son of God," will be "a *great KING over all the earth*." Ps. 47 : 2. Then the time will have arrived when the prayer he taught his followers, his brethren, to pray, will have its fulfillment ; namely : "Thy *kingdom* come, thy *will* be done *on earth* as it is in heaven."

This will be truly a "GREAT SALVATION." It includes *more* than is signified by the word "*Redemption*." It is the "Salvation the prophets have enquired (about) and searched diligently, (into) who prophesied of the *grace* that should come." 1 Peter 1 : 10. It is "the restitution of *all* things which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." Acts 3 : 21. It includes not only a redemption from death and the grave, and all the terrible consequences of Adam's sin, the removal of the *curse*, and the destruction of the *Sin-Power*, but also immortality and eternal life, honor and glory, in the everlasting Kingdom of God ; and the "making of ALL THINGS NEW." It includes the accomplishment and full realization of all the wonderful and glorious things purposed and promised by Jehovah, and "written aforetime for *our learning* that we might have HOPE." Rom. 15 : 4.

But from the scriptures already produced, it must be obvious to every honest intelligent mind, that this Salvation will not be accepted and shared by all. How then may we become "*heirs* of Salvation" ? Heb. 1. 14 — "*heirs* according to the *hope* of *eternal life*." Titus 3 : 7. — "*heirs* of the *Kingdom* which he hath *promised* ?" James 2 : 5.

The answer is at hand, and very plain and direct. "God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain Salvation *by* our Lord Jesus Christ." 1 Thess. 5 : 9. The *gospel* is "the *power* of God unto *Salvation* to every one that *believeth*." Rom. 1 : 16. He that believeth and is baptized shall be **SAVED**." "That they may also obtain the *Salvation* which is **IN Christ Jesus**."

2 Tim. 2 : 10 .“God hath highly exalted him, and given him a NAME which is above every name ; that at the name of JESUS every knee shall bow.” Phil. 2 : 9, 10.” “Thou shalt call his name JESUS ; for he shall *save* his people.” “Neither is there *Salvation* in any other; for there is none other *name* under heaven given among men whereby we *must* be *saved*.” Acts 4 : 12, How is this, that if we are saved, it “*must* be by a NAME?” How is it that if we would become the “*heirs* of salvation,” “*heirs* of the kingdom,” it must be “*by*” and “*in*” the ONE Name, the only name given, THE name above every Name—the name JESUS ? And yet, that “the *gospel* is the *power* of God unto *Salvation*?” Let us look into this matter *just a little*.

“JESUS” is really the same name as the name of his Father, and is a *symbol*, the “*memorial*” Name, (Ex. 3 : 15 and 6 : 2, 3,) and signifies, “I shall be the powerful.” (See *Diaglott. Note* on Mat. 1 : 21,) or Hebrew, *Yahweh Elohim*, “He who will be Mighty Ones,”—One *Yahweh* manifested in a multitude of powerful Ones, or *Elohim*. This multitudinous manifestation of the one Deity was proclaimed to the Hebrew Nation, in formula, as follows: “*Hear O Israel, YAHWEH our ELOHIM is the ONE YAHWEH,*” (Deut. 6 : 4,) that is, “He who shall be our Mighty Ones, is the One who shall be.” In this formula, Mighty Ones were *promised* to Israel. This “glorious and fearful Name, YAHWEH *thy* ELOHIM,” as it is called, Deut. 28 : 58, was therefore, a *symbol* of the future Mighty Ones, a “*memorial* unto all generations,” (Ex. 3 : 14, 15,) to remind them and point them forward, down to the “one body,” the “people of God,” to the time when God would “visit the Gentiles, to take out of them *a people for his NAME,*” (Acts 15 : 14,) which people, or one body, were to be a *peculiar* people, a *chosen* generation, a *royal priesthood*, a *holy* Nation,” (1 Pet.—2 : 9,) and which people of God (*Yahweh Elohim*) were to possess HIS character, “the *first fruits* of the *spirit*” (Rom. 8 : 23) or “*Godlikeness,*” and ultimately His Nature, in their *bodies*, HIS *spirit-substance-Nature*, signified by His Name. Thus, this “one body” to become “THE NAME,” the multitude Name, One in many and many in One, many beings (*Elohim*) possessing the *One Yahweh* or Spirit Nature, which will constitute them Mighty Ones, The Name.* The promised Messiah

* It will be perceived that the “Name” sometimes refers to the Father in person; sometimes to His Son, Jesus, in person; sometimes to His Holy Spirit “which *proceedeth from the Father;*” (John 15 : 26,) and sometimes to His manifestation by his Spirit in *many*, a multitude, all the *Brethren* of Jesus, the “one body,” the “*peculiar* people of God, now being taken out of the Gentiles.

when he came, and became the Anointed "JESUS," was "The Name," the *beginning* of the name—"the beginning of the (*new*) creation of God," (Rev. 3 : 14 and 1, 5,) who, having been raised from the dead to incorruptibility or spirit nature, and thus "declared the Son of God with POWER, according to the *spirit* of holiness, *by* the *resurrection* from the dead," (Rom. 1 : 4) he is therefore "the *beginning*, the *first born* from the dead," "the *image* of the *invisible God*, the first born of every creature," (Col. 1 : 18, 15 and Heb. 1 : 3,) the *first* of the promised powerful ones—the first *Eloah*—the first or "head of the body" or NAME—"the first born among *many* BRETHREN." Rom. 8 : 29. "His *Brethren*," the peculiar people, are *now* being taken out of the Gentiles "for THE NAME." Acts 15 : 14. It has been going on for more than 1800 years, ever since Jesus the beginning and sample, in character and nature; ascended to heaven. This is emphatically the work of this dispensation. This is being accomplished by the *gospel*—God's own appointed means. It is the *gospel* that is "the *power* of God unto *Salvation*." Whenever a person hears, understands, believes, repents and obeys the gospel, the *first* step of obedience being baptism into the one great sin-covering saving Name, he by that means becomes an element, constituent, or *part* of the Name; one of the "*brethren* of Christ"—("my BRETHREN are these that hear the word of God and *do* it,") one of the members of the "one body or name," one of the "peculiar people." That person, thus becomes an "*heir* of Salvation," an "*heir* according to the *promise*," Gal. 3 : 29; and when the time shall arrive to "*inherit* eternal life," and "*inherit* the kingdom," such person having been faithful until death, shall then become an *inheritor* of the great Salvation, which will consist of eternal life, honor, and glory in the *promised* kingdom of God, as just previously set forth.

Hence it will be seen what is to be understood by being *saved* in and by a *Name*, and, that salvation includes not only redemption from death and the grave and all the consequences of Adam's sin, but also a change, a transformation, from a mortal corruptible dying nature, to an immortal, incorruptible, spirit or "Divine Nature," and everlasting inheritance in the Kingdom of God, as Joint-Rulers, Kings and Priests with the Anointed Jesus; as the members of his body—His Brethren.

It will be seen also, that salvation by this Name—by becoming a *member* or *part* of the Name, through the means of faith

in Christ, which is faith in, and obedience to his gospel, is God's only means or way of salvation—made known—the “only Name under heaven given among men, whereby *we* must MUST be saved.”

Our Saviour, who in his mind and body, his character and Nature, is the embodiment of the Name, and who is many times called “the Name;” in his memorable prayer to his Father, just before being taken by the officers to be crucified, prayed for his *brethren*, who were all *one* with him, and he and they *one* with the *Father*, that is, all were then *one* in *character* and ultimately to be *one* in nature: I say he prayed for them to the Father. He prayed in these words: “O Father, * * I have manifested *thy Name* unto the men which thou gavest me out of the world: and they have kept thy word. For I have given them the words which thou gavest me; and they have received them. I pray for them. Holy Father keep through thine *own NAME* those whom thou hast given me, that they may be *one* as, *we are*. I kept them in thy *name*. Neither pray I for these alone, but for *them also* which shall believe on me *through their word*.” (He included and prayed for *all true believers* since that time.) “That they *all* may be ONE; *as* thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be ONE *in us*. That they may be *one*, even as we are one; I in them and thou in me, that they *may* (in the future) be made PERFECT *in ONE*, (that is, one in nature—“Divine nature.”) John 17:5-23. Here we have the object and ultimatum of the development of A NAME, by “the WORD” of God—the gospel.

We will now briefly consider this gospel. What is it? It is called *the word of truth*, the gospel of your SALVATION,” Eph. 1:13; “the gospel of God;” the gospel of Christ;” “the gospel of the kingdom;” “the *glad tidings* of the kingdom of God;” “the *things* concerning the kingdom and the NAME of JESUS Anointed,” Acts 8:12. As there is no other name, so there is no other gospel. Gal. 1:7, 8. As previously shown, this gospel, the glad tidings of this great Salvation began to be made known in the garden of Eden, in the promise of the woman's *seed*. Then, some 2000 years or more afterwards, this gospel was announced to Abraham in the promise of a one and multitude seed; then 430 years afterwards, came the “memorial Name” *symbolizing* the One and Multitude Seed, previously so announced and promised to Abraham. Then about 450 years after that, came the promise and covenant to

David that the promised One Seed should be a descendant of his, a Mighty One, a King, and that his throne and kingdom should stand forever. Then we have the same glorious theme, the same glad tidings of the Great Salvation, the things concerning the Kingdom and the Name, spoken by the mouth of *all* the holy Prophets. Then, when the promised Seed, Jesus, or Emmanuel (GOD *with us*) made his appearance, and became God's *Anointed*, HE immediately "went about all the cities and villages, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the GOSPEL of the KINGDOM," Mat. 9 : 35, and Ch. 4 : 23, and Mark 1 : 14, 15, and Luke 8 : 1, "And he called his disciples and sent *them* to preach the kingdom of God." Luke 9 : 1, 2. And after he had been crucified, and was risen from the dead, and had taught the things concerning himself, called the things of the *name*, he sent forth his Apostles, saying, "go ye into all the world, and preach *the gospel* to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be **SAVED**; but he that believeth not shall be condemned" (to *death*). Mark 16 : 15, 16. Or, as Matthew words it, "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, (make disciples or Christians of all nations, *margin* and New Revision) baptizing them *into* the NAME of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit; teaching them to observe *all* things whatsoever I have commanded you." Mat. 28 : 19, 20. He also said, "This gospel of the kingdom *shall* be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come." Mat. 24 : 14. He likewise taught his Disciples the standing prayer of this dispensation, a part of which is, "*thy kingdom* come, thy will be done *on earth*, as in heaven."

We also find by the record in Acts, that the Apostles and Disciples (and others) did just what he commanded them to do: they "went *everywhere* preaching the word"—the *gospel*. Acts 8 : 14, 12, 25. "And they went forth, and preached *everywhere*, the Lord working with them and confirming the word." Mark 16 : 20. More than twenty years after the death of Christ, we find the Apostle Paul in the city of Ephesus, "disputing and persuading *the things concerning the kingdom of God*," for two years and three months, "and the NAME of the Lord Jesus was *magnified*." Acts 19 : 8 17. And it was said of him, "not alone at Ephesus, but almost throughout *all Asia*. this Paul hath persuaded and turned away much people, saying that they be no gods, which are made with hands." Verse 26. Three years after this, when at Miletus, he said, "I know that

ye all, among whom I have gone preaching *the kingdom* of God, shall see my face no more." Acts 20 : 25. And two years after this, he arrived in the city of Rome, where "he dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching *those things* which concern the Lord Jesus Christ"—that is, the things of the Name. Acts 28 : 23-31.*

Then again, we are told in Acts 8 : 12, that "when they believed Philip preaching *the things* concerning the kingdom of God, *and the name* of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women." Now it will be observed that the one gospel, is emphatically "the gospel of the kingdom," which term, is inclusive of two sets or kinds of "things," called the things of the *kingdom*, and the things of the *name*.

The things of the kingdom I have dwelt upon as the things promised which are to be fulfilled in *the future*, and which Christ preached in all the cities and villages, *before* his crucifixion, the "things *hoped for*." Heb. 11 : 1.

* The reader should not pass without noticing, and pausing to reflect on a prominent feature of Paul's teaching, brought to view here, and in chapter 24 : 14 and 26 : 22-24, and what the people thought of Paul and his teachings. From these passages, it will be seen that Paul was said to be "*beside himself*" a "madman," that *much learning* had made him *mad!* That what he taught—the gospel of the kingdom—which some called "much, learning" others called "*heresy!*" And those who held and taught those glorious truths, were called "*this sect everywhere spoken against*" ch. 28 : 22.

As it was then, so it has been ever since, and so it is at the present day. The gospel that Christ preached in all the cities and villages," and that Paul preached in all his travels for so many years, the glad tidings concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus—that is, his return to sit upon the throne of his father David, to *reign* over the house of Jacob, (the 12 tribes)—a "kingdom with *no end*", which he is to "restore again to Israel," with such great and glorious results, blessing all Nations, and ultimately filling the whole earth with his glory; as before shown by the numerous scriptures quoted: that gospel, although the *only* gospel, is still unpopular; still called "*heresy!*" not only by the people generally, but by the popular Religious Denominations, who profess to believe the Scriptures, and think they are the Churches of God; as did the Jewish Churches in the days of Christ and the Apostles.

Those who hold and teach this gospel—these glad tidings—are said to be like Paul "*beside themselves,*" "deluded" "fanatics," &c., &c. No matter if they have, like Paul, "much learning;" no matter if they have the most profound respect for, and the most unwavering confidence in, the Scriptures, and have searched them faithfully and thoroughly, and have therefore become *able in the Scriptures*; like Paul "saying none other things than those which the Prophets and Moses did say should come," elaborated and amplified by Christ and the Apostles. No matter if at the same time they maintain upright lives in all respects according to the Scriptures, and exhibit candid and sound minds: yet, if they hold and teach this only gospel, the "one faith," "one hope," "one baptism into the one and only Name under heaven given among men *whereby we must be saved!*" and will not join or affiliate

The things of the name have in part already, *been fulfilled* in the past, being the "things not seen" by us but included in the one faith. Heb. 11:1. Our Savior himself, as I have shown, is the name: hence the things concerning the name, are the things concerning *himself*. He did not preach this part of the gospel, that is, the things concerning the name, or himself, as being *in part fulfilled*, and just then about to be fulfilled; until *after* he rose from the dead. But on his way to Emmaus, with the two disciples, after he rose, "he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the *things concerning himself*" And the same night, he met with the eleven, and opened their understanding, and taught them with reference to the same things concerning himself: "and said unto them, Thus it is written and thus it behoved Christ (himself) to *suffer*, and to rise from the dead the third day: and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his *name* among all nations, beginning at Jerusa-

with the popular churches: they are invariably called "foolish," "cracked," "crankey," "fanatic," &c, and are everywhere *spoken against* "

It is true that there are *many* in the world who are cranks, fanatics, of unsound minds. But it will ultimately turn out, that those who are so ignorant and faithless in the Scriptures, and therefore know nothing of what they teach, and do not and *cannot* think in harmony with God or his word, and become overwhelmed with the scriptures produced by those who are learned and able in "the things written aforetime *for our learning*," and who when flooded with the truth, will still resist it, and continue to say, fanatic, crank, "madman," "what will this babbler say?" and in their hearts, say or think, "there is no G-d:" I say it will ultimately turn out that it is *such* people who are of unsound minds, and who are denominated by Jehovah "*the fool*."

It will be found that all people (no matter whether they belong to churches or not) who are more interested in money-making schemes, and all the paltry things of this life, than they are in the great and glorious things revealed by Jehovah in connection with the life to come—eternal life: who never search the Scriptures to learn about these all important interests because they are so engaged and immersed in their *little*, and comparatively insignificant worldly business, and money-making projects; and in studying *popularity*: who never find time, nor take interest enough, to think, or talk, or read, or hear about them; when at the same time they are compelled to admit that the things they are constantly neglecting are a thousand fold more important than the *bubbles* and *baubles* after which they follow; and when also, God, in his goodness and mercy, has carefully made known these things and caused them "to be *written aforetime for our learning* that we might have *hope*," (Rom. 15:4,) and "given his Son to die that we might not perish:" I say it will ultimately be discovered, that *these* are the people who are of *unsound mind*, who are "*beside themselves*," who are *foolish*: (which seems to include nearly everybody, and that those who make it their *chief* business in life, to *learn* and *do* the will of God, to take a deep interest in the *most important* things, the things of God, "things *promised*" as well as things fulfilled, "things hoped for," "things to come," "things of the kingdom and the name:" those who think and talk more of these things, even at the expense of *popularity*, have the "Spirit of *power*, and of *love*, and of a *sound mind*," (2 Tim. 1:7) and are "like unto a *wise man*, which built his house upon a *rock*, and not upon the sand." Mat. 7:24-26, and Verse 21.

lem. And ye are *witnesses of these things.*" Verses 44-48. He thus showed them that although the things concerning himself included "*all things written* in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms concerning him," yet, the particular things upon which he desired to enlighten them were his *death, burial and resurrection* which had now become the *fulfilled part* of the written things, the three great *facts* of the gospel, and of which they were witnesses, that these things written of him, it was necessary, or "behooved," should be fulfilled, in order that "repentance and remission of sins should be preached in (*epi*, with a view to, or *for*) his NAME among all nations." Before this could be done, *these things* written concerning the Name, must necessarily *be fulfilled* in order that their fulfillment, and importance, and place in the purpose of Jehovah, might be preached as a *part* of the gospel. *As such*, they did not form a part of the gospel until after Jesus had risen from the dead. Before his crucifixion the gospel consisted of things of the Kingdom and the *fulfilled things* written concerning Christ, that HE *in person and name*, was the Son of God, the promised Messiah, the *King* of the promised Kingdom, (which truth he "confessed before Pilate," 1 Tim. 6: 13, although his reign is not *even yet* commenced) that HE *in person* was the *Savior* of the world &c. But there were certain other things written concerning him which had not then been fulfilled, which were very important, and which when fulfilled, were to fill a very conspicuous place, and form an indispensable adjunct, in the proclamation of the gospel—the glad tidings of Salvation—"among all nations," and which were to constitute "the things of the name," together with *the other fulfilled things* written concerning him. These things which were soon *to be* fulfilled, Jesus told his disciples of, as he said, Luke 24: 44. "These are the words which I spake unto you; while I was yet with you." But at that time they did not understand them, as we shall see by reference to the occasion, as recorded Luke 18: 31-34. "And they shall scourge him, (meaning himself,) and *put him to death*; and the third day *he shall rise again*. And they *understood none of these things*; and this saying was *hid* from them, neither knew they the things which were spoken." Hence after the things were accomplished—had been fulfilled—Jesus "opened their understanding" referring them to the time he told them *before* their fulfillment. It will therefore be seen what is meant by that part of the gospel of the kingdom, called "the

things concerning the *name* of Jesus Christ," Acts 8 : 12 ; that is, the *fulfilled* things which were written of him.—the *facts* of the gospel. A *part* of the promised Salvation having become literal *facts*, we have a *pledge* of a like fulfillment of that which remains. A great Salvation having been vouchsafed to the world, through the means of a promised kingdom under the whole heaven, over the whole earth, and the Saviour of that Salvation, the King of that kingdom, having made his appearance, and having given the world ample *proof* of his divine origin, that he is the first *Eloah* of the promised *Elohim* of *Yahweh*, that he is a *powerful* One and therefore able to accomplish the work—the great Salvation ; first by his miracles, healing the sick, raising the dead, &c, and then by laying down his life and rising from the dead the third day, as he said he would do, and thus also giving proof of his great *love* for the world ; we have therefore the best possible grounds for faith and hope—"much assurance." Paul says, 1 Thess. 1 : 5, "For our *gospel* came not in word only, but in *power*, and in the Holy Spirit, and in *much assurance*." And in reference to the promised Salvation through the means of the things of the Kingdom and Name, we are told, Acts 17 : 31, that God "hath appointed a day, in which he will *Judge* (which also includes the idea of *ruling* or *governing*) the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained ; whereof he hath given *assurance unto all men*, in that he hath *raised him from the dead*." Hence, the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus, form a very important feature or adjunct of the gospel ever since their occurrence. They are the *facts* upon which we can logically predicate the truth, the sure fulfillment and realization, of *all* the promises of the *whole* gospel, of *all* "the things of the kingdom." The importance of these facts may be seen by what Paul says 1 Cor. 15 : 1-4. In writing to the Church at Corinth, about the *gospel*, which he had, on a former occasion preached to them, and by which, he says, they were *saved* if they kept in memory, he speaks as follows: "I delivered unto you *first of all* (that is, the first thing of all the things of the gospel, or, as by the Diaglott, "*among the chief things*") that which I also received, how that Christ *died* for our sins according to the scriptures ; and that he was *buried*, and that he *rose again* the third day *according to the scriptures*."

It is evident from this, that he had preached at Corinth just as he did at Thessalonica (ch. 17 : 1-3.) That is, he had

preached among the first things of the gospel, these "things concerning the *name* of Jesus "Christ"—the *facts*. "He *reasoned* with them out of the *Scriptures*, openly, and alleging, that Christ had been *crucified* and *risen* again *from the dead*, and *therefore* "this Jesus whom I preach unto you is the Christ—the promised Messiah—God's Anointed One, to reign on the throne of David, and restore again the kingdom to Israel. He is the king of that kingdom. "God had sworn with an oath" to the prophet David (as recorded in your *Scriptures*) "that he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne." He has fulfilled his word. The *facts* that this Jesus, was crucified, died for our sins, was buried, and rose again *according to the Scriptures*, are ample *proof*, *positive* proof that he is the long promised Messiah, and that although he has ascended up to heaven, yet these facts are *proof*, he will surely come again in like manner as he went up, and will raise up the tabernacle of David, and restore again the kingdom to Israel. This is evidently something like the way Paul "*reasoned*" with them. He doubtless predicated the truth and future fulfillment of the *whole* gospel, upon the fact that a *part* of it had already been fulfilled.

The death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus, were also very important, as setting forth the way that believers of the gospel were to reform, get remission of their sins, for the name, by being baptized in the "*likeness*" of his death burial and resurrection, and thus becoming a constituent or *part* of the name, or one body of "*anointed*" ones, (1 Cor. 1 : 21, 1 John 2 : 27) or rulers, as before shown.

Thus, we have very briefly set forth the outlines of the "Great Salvation," the purpose of Jehovah, as to man and this earth: and the way that we may be saved, or have a share in the great Salvation, through faith in Jesus the Saviour, which is faith in and obedience to his gospel—the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, and then by patient continuance in well doing seeking for glory honor and immortality, observing *all things* whatsoever Christ has commanded, both by himself and his Apostles; thus obtaining the great reward, ETERNAL LIFE, and THE KINGDOM.

APPENDIX.

NATURE AND CHARACTER.

Many speakers and writers do not properly distinguish between *nature* and *character*; especially in treating of man as an organized being. Man is a bundle of organs, faculties, or powers, endowed with life. The *nature* of man, I understand to be his "make-up," or constitution, which includes both the material or matter (perishable flesh and bone) of which he is composed, and the peculiar constitutional organization and construction of that material or matter, constituting his natural powers or attributes, both physical and mental.

But the *character* of man I understand to be functional—the result of the *action* or *working* of those organs, powers or attributes of his constitution or make-up. His peculiar natural constitution and functions of his organs or powers, distinguish him from all other organized beings.

Man's *nature* cannot be changed except by the power of his Creator, but man's *character* can be changed by himself through the means of moral motives and influences; by his associations, by his surroundings.

The above definitions of Nature and Character apply to both body and mind.

Although man cannot change his *nature*, he can to a certain extent develop and increase in size and power all its organs, by proper food and exercise or cultivation. That is, although man cannot change the material of which he is made, nor his peculiar constitution, giving himself either more organs, or a less number, or changing their locality, or their natural functions; yet, he has the power and means within his reach, of either increasing or restraining the activity and strength of his organs, and of restraining certain organs and developing and increasing the power of others, and thus changing and developing his *character*.

He has therefore within his reach the means of changing his mind so as to love what he once hated, and hate what he

once loved, "placing his affections on things above," thus developing a Godly *character*, and securing a Godly *nature* in the future. God has provided the means—"The gospel of Christ"—and endowed man with the natural power to make use of the means, that is, the power to understand, believe and obey the gospel, in order to develop the Godly character. Which development consists in restraining the lower or mere animal propensities, and bringing into exercise and development the higher or moral powers.

Such a change of mind—such a change in the action or *working* of the mental faculties—shows itself in the manifestation and exhibition of a Godly character: and God has promised that for every one who does so, through the means provided by his Son, he will ultimately change his *nature* from a perishable, mortal, flesh-nature, to an immortal, Godly Spirit-nature. The present nature of man is an animal nature, but of a higher order, through its superior organization, than the lower animals; an organization which resembles his Maker—being made "in the image of God." Hence, although in his nature he is an animal, yet in the organization of that nature he resembles God, and is therefore, unlike the lower animals, capable of developing a Godly character, and thus, of ultimately inheriting a Godly nature. According to the word, when a person hears, understands, believes and obeys the gospel, his past sins are remitted in the very first step or act of obedience: a change of mind and affections having preceded, a change of relationship and external character follows. He thus becomes a *begotten child* of the Deity. "The Father of the whole family in heaven and earth," thereby becomes *his* heavenly Father, whom he now more nearly resembles in mind and *character*, and whose NAME is thus called or placed upon him, and whose Divine Nature," which is signified by the Name, he is also to be made partaker of in the future.

NATURE AND CHARACTER OF CHRIST.

In the procreation of a child, conception, generation and *life*, are the result of the union of the male semen (which always contains the animalculæ, or principle of life) and the female ovum within the ovarium in the uterus. The semen; it has been ascertained, contains a brain or mind element. The ovum being thus impregnated, and after that, nourished and built up by the blood of the female, through the means of the vein and artery of the umbilical cord, soon takes the embryonic

form, and then that of the fetus. The fetus continuing to be nourished and developed by the blood of its mother, during gestation, until birth, must of course and of necessity, possess or inherit a *nature*, (that is, the *material* of which its physical structure is built) exactly like its mother—a flesh and blood nature—and which of course is also identical with its father's nature—the *common flesh and blood nature*. But as to the proportionate development of its *organic constitution*, both physical and mental, and its subsequent *character*, the offspring will *always* partake of *both* father and mother, and yet, always be more or less *different* from either. The difference of organism—the different organic structure or development of the same common nature—is the result of the union of the *two* germ-elements of the male and female originating the being of the offspring. The difference, although in one sense an organic one, does not consist in either a different number, or different kind of organs; but in a difference in the proportionate *size, power, and activity* of them. That is to say, suppose the father had the reasoning organs, “causality” and “comparison, (speaking Phrenologically) very large and active, while the mother had the same organs very small, and inactive, the offspring would, according to the natural laws, of life and being, be different from either: that is, although having the same organs, and located in the same place and for the same purpose, yet they would not be so large, powerful and active as the father's, and larger and more powerful and active than the mother's: and so of the moral organs of Benevolence, Veneration, Conscientiousness, &c.; the mother's organization might be the *more* powerful, and the father's the less; then the offspring would differ again in the same way, having more than one and less than the other. So of the intellectual and the animal organs. Then again; there might also be a difference in the “temperaments,” or *quality* of the same flesh and blood material, between the father and mother; which would be inherited by the offspring upon the same principle. Hence, the subsequent *character* also of the offspring would of necessity be somewhat different from either. But not so as to the material or substance of the *nature*: that would be identical (that is, contain the same elements) in all three—father, mother and offspring—and evidently for the above named reasons. This is the philosophy of the begettal, nature, and character, of a human being.

So, in the case of Jesus, the only begotten Son of the Father; according to the record, it is evident, that the ovum

or seed of Mary, was impregnated and vivified by the power of the Highest, the Holy Spirit, by which, the flesh and blood-nature, which was derived from Mary upon the principle above shown, became endowed with a high order of mental organization ; far superior to Mary, or any other mere *human* being.

Christ differed from us in the same way that any two persons differ from each other. That is, in the *organic* element or feature of the same nature—in the *proportionate development*, and the *working* or *exercise* of the original organs of human nature, and consequently in the external character. That is to say ; two persons have exactly the same nature, that is, the same substance, flesh and blood, organized with the same original number and location of organs, yet they differ as to the *proportionate development* or size and therefore as to the working or exercise of the organs, and consequent external character. So Christ differed from us.

This difference in the proportionate development or size, and therefore in the working of the organs, is the result of begettal by a father and mother of differently developed physical and mental organs, or under different circumstances by the *same* father and mother, as in case of two brothers.

So Christ, having been begotten of God, by the power of the Holy Spirit, was *widely* different in the above named features and consequent character, from any mere human being ; although he was of the very same original human nature—flesh and blood, constituted with the same original number and kind of organs.

The organic difference or change of proportionate development and working ; that is, the change from the original proper size, activity, and harmonious working of all the organs, to an abnormal, disproportionate, unbalanced, improper, *lustful*, condition, is the result of Adam's disobedience or sin, and constitutes the *sinful* element or feature of *degenerate* human nature, or the *diabolus* ; and is much greater or stronger in all human beings, begotten "of the will of the flesh," that is, by a human being ; than in Christ, who, although possessed of a sinful-flesh and blood nature, yet by his high begettal, he was endowed by his superior development, with a highly organized *Divine* mind, as the promised Messiah ; "who, in the days of his flesh, though being a son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered," (Heb. 5 : 7,) and in his life ever manifested a Godly or *Divine character* and who "spake as never man spake," having in "all things the pre-eminence." "GOD was manifested in the flesh." 1 Tim. 3 : 16. "The word was

with God, and the word was God." "And the word became flesh and dwelt among us," (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father," John 1 : 1, 14. 1 John 1 : 12. "The brightness of his (Father's) glory, and the express image of his *person*." Heb. 1 : 3.

Foolish quibblers sometimes ask, how is it possible that Christ was "made like unto his brethren in all things," that he "took *part* of the *same* flesh and blood?" Heb. 2 : 14-17. How is it possible that he could have had the same flesh and blood-*nature*, when God was his father, instead of a human or flesh and blood father? For, say they, a child always partakes of his father's *nature* as well as its mother's; and therefore, as God was his Father, and God's nature is *spirit*-substance, Christ's nature must have been part spirit-substance, and part flesh and blood. But their quibbling has its origin in their misapprehension of the philosophy of procreation, and the natural laws of life, and transmission of nature and character from parents to their offspring; and thus they "*stagger*" at the word. Let them look into the matter more carefully, before they quibble, or entertain doubts. By so doing, they may make the discovery that the divine record is in perfect harmony with the natural laws, with philosophy, with reason, and with the facts of the case. They may discover that the offspring always and necessarily takes its *nature*—the *material* of its physical make-up—from its mother, as above shown, and its *mental organization* and *character* from *both* father and mother, and therefore, that Jesus, according to the natural laws of generation and gestation, must necessarily have been exactly of the same *nature* or material substance as his mother, while as to his mental organization, or *mind* and *character*, he must have been much like his Father—this was his divine side. As to his nature, his flesh and blood, the *material* of his make-up, he was produced from the substance of Mary, through the means of the blood, in the same way that any child is from its mother's substance. He was built up from materials supplied as in the case of any other child, by the same process of any other fetal development. But, having been conceived by "the power of the Highest, he was therefore in *mind* and *character* Divine. But I cannot do better on this subject, than to quote some of the words of that able writer, R. Roberts of England. He says:

"The materials made use of by the Spirit were human flesh and blood, and the result was the production of a Son of God

in the nature of the condemned man, whose representative and descendant Mary was. The purpose fulfilled by the spirit's intervention we shall presently consider. We shall find that it had to do, not with the quality of his physical nature, but with the mental quality which was the essential qualification for a successful sacrifice. We call attention to the fact that John lays emphasis on this doctrine, that Christ had come in the flesh. He makes it a test: he says if any man confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, the same is not of God, (1 John 4 : 1-3,) and he forbids the faithful to receive any who bring not this doctrine with them. * * If Jesus came in the flesh, he was under condemnation, for the nature he inherited was a condemned one. The sentence of death ran in the blood which he inherited from Adam through Mary. He was, therefore, "in the days of his flesh," as much under its power, as those he came to save. * * It is testified that he was "made sin for us." 2 Cor. 5 : 21. As he was not of sinful character this could only apply to his physical nature, which, drawn from the veins of Mary, was "made sin." Again, in Rom. 8 : 3, we are informed that "what the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh, God (hath done) in sending forth his Son in *likeness of sinful flesh*, and for (or on account of) sin, *condemned sin in the flesh*. * * By the Spirit, God took hold of the condemned nature in begetting for himself a son in the flesh of Mary. The son so begotten, was "in all points," like those he was manifested to save. He was of the same flesh and blood; was under the same condemnation, and exposed to the same temptations, but thanks be to God!—through the power derived from his high origin, he was without sin, that is, he was not a transgressor. He was obedient in all things, even unto death, and when he died the death due to our common nature, he was not given over to its perpetual dominion, but was granted a glorious liberation from its bonds, and exaltation to a position of glory beyond the angels. The supremacy of God having thus been vindicated in the condemnation of sin in its own flesh, the Father transferred to the son "power over all flesh," that he should give eternal life "to all who should make acknowledgment of their utterly lost position, by believing the truth concerning Christ, and taking his name upon them: the only means given under heaven whereby men can be saved. Acts 4 : 14."

Jesus did not partake of the flesh and blood nature, as it

was in Adam before he sinned. But he took that nature, in its degenerate condition as it was in Mary. Not that there was any change in the nature or material of flesh and blood itself, by the disobedience of Adam; but a change in the *organization*. By Adam's transgression, the entire organization was unbalanced: (*now* "the flesh lusteth against the spirit," Gal. 5 : 17,—the spiritual or higher organs; they are in *opposition*) that caused a change of *character*, and relationship to God. That is, some organs were excited and developed into an abnormal excessive activity and size, and others rendered inactive: hence inharmonious, unnatural, improper, and therefore a *sinful* condition. This condition was transmitted by Adam to his posterity, of which Mary was a representative. Human nature—flesh and blood—with its organization, and its workings, or character; when it left the hands of its Creator, as in Adam, was *all right*. No "*sin* in the flesh" then. Adam, with that nature and organization, could have been obedient, acted wisely and righteously. But he sinned, and his disobedience, his sinful act, produced a corresponding effect on his organization and its operation, or the working of his organs. It resulted in an abnormal condition, a disarrangement, a defacement of "the image of God," a degeneracy of his flesh and blood nature in its workings—a condition of things which came to be called "*sin* in the flesh:" and yet literally, sin is the *act* of transgression—"all unrighteousness is sin." 1 John 5 : 17. But I quote again from the same writer. In speaking of Adam's sin, he says:

"The impulses that lead to this, reside in the flesh, and therefore come to be called by the name of the act to which they gave birth.* In determining first principles we must be

* In a similar way, "the good seed," the word of the kingdom," "the word of life," when received into the heart, by receiving Christ, and which generates and produces righteousness, and ultimately eternal life, is called life—eternal life. Hence John says, "he that hath the Son *hath* life," and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life," John 5 : 12. Again; "He that heareth my word, and believeth, &c, hath everlasting life, and *is passed* from death unto life." John 5 : 24. He was speaking of eternal life, and to have the Son, is to have the *effects* of the truth concerning the Son, in an "honest and good heart," which leads to or produces, first righteousness, and ultimately eternal life; and to have Christ's words, is to have "the *word* of life;" and John says such a person "*hath* life," and Christ says is passed from death unto life. when, literally, he hath only the *seeds* of life, in his heart or mind—eternal life in its incipiency. So the consequences or effects of Adam's sin, being the *seeds* of sin, which lead to or produce unrighteousness, or sin, and ultimately death, are called sin and *death*—condemnation to death. Since Adam's sin the flesh strongly opposes the spirit, that is, the moral or spiritual god-like faculties. Hence, Paul said "the flesh *lusteth* against the spirit, &c. So that ye *cannot* do the things that ye would." Gal. 5 : 17.

accurate in our conceptions. The impulses that lead to sin existed in Adam before disobedience, as much as they did afterwards; else disobedience would not have occurred. These impulses are, in their own place, legitimate enough. We can judge of the matter by experience, because the human nature under discussion, is the human nature we have upon ourselves, and see in operation around us. * * There is no propensity but subserves a good purpose in its own place. * * The difficulty is to keep the impulses in the legitimate channel. This difficulty is insuperable so far as perfect righteousness is concerned. A child comes into the world with impulses, but no knowledge or experience to guide the action of them. The result is, that "folly is bound up in the heart of a child," which the judicious administration of the rod will help to take out of him. Prov. 22 : 15. For the same reason, "there liveth not a man that (at some time of his life or other) sinneth not."

In speaking further of Christ, he says: "Having God for his father, he inherited a mental type in harmony with divine things, and vital sympathy with the divine mind. * * When therefore, we realize the fact that divine power (directly wielded by the Holy Spirit) was the energy which incepted his being, we are enabled to see that the type and texture of his being, though developed from the flesh of Mary, were something far above what fall to the lot of mere children of men; and we shall find that this is one of the secrets of his sinlessness. It was the preparation of the suitable soil for the divine ideas to be implanted, which should germinate to such glorious results for this mighty globe which we inhabit. * * * When at the age of thirty, the Holy Spirit descended upon him in bodily form, and as it were, took possession of his being, the father dwelt in him, and his qualification was complete. Yet he was tempted, because he possessed the impulses common to our nature. He possessed however, that counter-balancing endowment of knowledge and superior power which enabled him to do what no man ever has done, and that is, to pass through this state of existence without sin."

In thinking and speaking of Christ, as he was in the days of his flesh, we should always bear in mind this last most important characteristic or endowment, above referred to, that is, his "*anointing with the Holy Spirit and with power,*" (Acts 10 : 38,) at his baptism: when the spirit of God descended upon him, and, as it were, "took possession of his being," Mat. 3 :

16, and Luke 4 : 18 ; when he was filled with the Holy Spirit without measure. John 3 : 34. This, in addition to his spirit-begetting, or "inception of his being," fully qualified him for the entire work of his mission while in the flesh—even the demonstration of his divine origin by raising the dead, healing the sick, and all other miracles ; and completed his *character* as the anointed of God : and when his flesh and blood nature was changed, to incorruptibility, or *spirit*—and he was "declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness *by* the resurrection from the dead," then he was perfect and fully qualified in *nature* also, as the immortal all powerful Ruler of this planet forever.

"THE LAMB OF GOD WHICH TAKETH AWAY THE SINS OF THE WORLD." John 1 : 29.

Christ was evidently the antitype of the lamb called the "scapegoat" (Lev. 16 : 10, 21,) to take away the sin of the world—the sin in which the whole world was constitutionally involved by the transgression of Adam, bringing death upon his entire posterity. Christ was the appointed antitypical Lamb or scapegoat, to take away the consequences of that sin, in which the world had no hand, but which was brought upon them unjustly by Adam. I say Christ came to "justify" or free the world, or clear them, at least all obedient ones, from the consequences of that sin, as a *free gift* ;" so that they can get out of the grave. Not only so, but he was also the antitype of "the *slain* Lamb"—appointed to die for the sins of the people—their actual personal transgressions, so that they may not only get out of the grave, but *more*—that they may have life "more abundantly," through "*abundance* of grace and of the gift of righteousness ;" (Rom. 5 : 17 ;) that they may have incorruptibility of nature, and *eternal* life, upon certain conditions. Therefore, by the death of Christ, the world has been placed in a salvable condition. Every one who avails himself of the "free gift," by believing and obeying Christ, thus complying with the conditions of *eternal* life, which is the "*gift* of God *through* Jesus Christ our Lord," (Rom. 6 : 23,) will not only be brought out of death and the grave, which will be a liberation from the consequences of Adam's sin—"Justification of life : " but he will also have his own personal sins remitted, and get *eternal* life—the sins of his flesh taken away also, by a change from mortal to immortality of nature.

• The following Scriptures, as well as many others, amply sustain this position.

“Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin ; and so death passed upon *all men*, for in that one man, Adam, all sinned. * * Therefore, as by the offence of one, Judgment came upon all men to condemnation ; even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life, (mortal life.) For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, (*constituted* sinners) so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous. Moreover the law entered, that the offence might abound. (“that sin might become exceeding sinful.” Rom 7 : 13 “For, by the law is the knowledge of sin.” Rom. 3 : 20.) But where sin abounded, grace did *much more abound*: That, as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign, through righteousness, unto *eternal* life, by Jesus Christ our Lord.” Rom. 5 : 12, 18, 19, 20, 21.

But Christ the second Adam, the Lamb of God, “*taketh away* the sin of the world.” John 1 ; 29. He says to man as follows: Adam, as your progenitor and representative, has by his transgression, constituted you a sinner; and as sin brought death, you are therefore under the condemnation of death, and must die and go into the grave, and there ever remain. Now, I have come to release you. “I am come that you might have life, and that you might have it *more abundantly*.” John 10 : 10. I have come to relieve you from the consequence of Adam's sin. I have come to *take away* the sin of the world. That is to say, if you will now believe in and obey me, all your life until you have to die: I promise and guarantee that you shall not forever remain in the grave: for “at the last day, I will raise you up, “(John 6: 44,) from the grave, and you shall live again ; not with a mortal nature and life only, but with an immortal nature and *eternal* life ; which will be life *more abundantly*: that is, when you believe in me, and take the very first step of obedience ; thus giving evidence that your faith is genuine ; I will not only justify, or free you from Adam's sin, (or vouchsafe unto you a complete deliverance from the consequences thereof, ultimately, (which is the same thing) but will also take away, or remit all *your own* actual personal “sins that are past,” (Rom. 3 : 25,) and when I raise you up from the grave, I will then take away “also, all your fleshly lusts, or “*sin in the flesh* ;” by giving you a spirit-nature, in the place of your flesh-nature ; by

changing the mortal body, to an immortal one, so you will be "like the angels, and cannot die any more." Luke 20: 36.

Thus you see, I am come to "take away the sin of the world"—as "the Saviour of all men, specially of those that believe." 1 Tim. 4: 10. First; I am come to take away the sin of Adam; that is, its consequences. Second; your own personal sins of the past; that is, all your own actual transgressions of the great moral law of right—all your "sins of unrighteousness," from your birth up to the time of your first step of "obedience to the faith." Rom. 1: 5, and 16: 26. Lastly: "sin in the flesh;" that is, all the lusts of the flesh, by the destruction of sin's flesh, or flesh-nature, and giving you in its place, a *spirit*, -nature, a "Divine nature." John 3: 6. and 2 Pe. 1: 4.

And furthermore; after you have believed, and in the first act of obedience—baptism—had your sins remitted; then during the balance of your life, if you sin again, you will have "an Advocate with the Father." 1 John 2: 1. John 14: 16 I will ever be your Advocate and helper with the Father, so long as you live and maintain the "faith which worketh by love;" even until "the last day" and the resurrection unto incorruptibility, shall have taken place, and the judgment passed.

Not only so, but at the time of the remission of your own personal sins, in that first act of obedience, you shall have the name—my Father's name, which is also my name—called or named upon you; thus becoming one of the begotten *children* of God; one of the members of "the household of faith;" one of "the whole *family* in heaven and earth." Eph. 3: 15; a member of the "one body," of which I am "the Head," "the first begotten;" one of "my brethren;" and you shall ultimately become a King and Priest—a Joint Ruler with me, over the nations of the earth forever.

Such was the mission of Christ. He entered the domains of death, bound the strong man, broke the bands of death, opened the gates, came out, having "abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." 2 Tim. 1: 10. "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!" Rom. 11: 33.

WHAT IS RELIGION?

Many who don't understand the Scriptures, talk about "getting religion," about "mourners going forward to the pen-

itent bench and *praying* for *religion*, for God to convert them and give them religion!" Thousands seem to have the idea, that if a person will go forward to the "penitent bench," as they call it, or stand up and ask for the *prayers* of good people, and get down and pray, and struggle, in just the right way; God will hear and answer their prayers, and, as it were, *pour down religion* into their immortal souls, making them very happy—thus giving them the "*evidence*" of their conversion, &c.! Thousands *imagine* they have been thus converted! Terrible and fatal delusion! Nothing of this kind of teaching in the Scriptures. "*Religion*" is not a thing to be got, to "*get*," or to have *given* to us, it is something to be *done*. "*Pure religion* and undefiled, before God and the Father, is this; to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world." James 1: 27. Dr. Clarke says, "He who speaks not according to the oracles of God, whatever pretences he makes to *religion*, only shows by his *want of Scriptural knowledge*, that his religion is *false*." It is true that there is an *impure defiled* religion spoken of in the Scriptures, called by Paul "*our religion*"* (Acts 26: 5,) and which James calls "*vain*," or as Dr. Clarke calls it, "*false*." This is the spurious. But the genuine, the "*pure and undefiled*," of which James speaks and thus defines as to its *externals*, by the use of the Greek *threskeia*, to worship; is the native result of an *internal* or *heart-work*. It is the result, the acting out, the obedience, of a "*heart purified by FAITH*." Acts 15: 9. Genuine Religion is the result of "*change of heart*," from "*natural*" to "*spiritual*." "*Religion*," as a word, is derived from the Latin *re*, intensive, and *ligio* to bind; from *religare*, which signifies to *bind again*: hence, in the words of another, "*religion is the act of binding again*, or that which *heals a breach* previously existing between two parties." Not mere outward formalities: it begins with a *heart work*. Not by something being "*got*" or *put* into the heart in answer to prayer. But by *faith*, by hearing the gospel and believing, and then being *obedient* to the faith; for "*faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God*." Rom. 10: 17. So then, St. James's good works to the fatherless and widows, which he calls pure and undefiled religion, are simply "*obedience to the faith*," (Rom. 1: 5,) the result

* There are thousands in *these* days, who like Paul belong to "the straightest sect of *our religion*," (Acts 26: 5,) who almost worship "*our religion*," and "*our Church*," and yet are total strangers to the one "*pure and undefiled religion*" of the Bible.

of a heart purified by *faith* in Christ, faith in the gospel. As he says, chap. 2 : 20, "faith, *without works*, is dead." But when a person hears, understands and *believes* the gospel, and his faith "*worketh by love*," Gal. 5 : 6, shows itself and is "made *perfect* by good works," James 2 : 22, then it is, that the breach between himself and God is healed: then it is, he has genuine religion, which *binds him again* to God. Instead of there being anything in the scriptures about "getting religion", and "salvation in answer to prayer," it is "salvation through *faith*." "He that *believeth* and is baptized shall be *saved*." We have in the Acts of the Apostles alone, at least ten illustrations, on various occasions, of God's way of salvation, the only appointed way for man to obtain remission of sins and eternal life, the one and only way made known whereby man must or can be saved; namely: by hearing, understanding, believing, and obeying, the gospel—by "*faith which worketh by love*," Gal. 5 : 6, thus producing "the fruit of the spirit," verse 22, and producing obedience to "*all things whatsoever I (Christ) have commanded you*." Matt. 28 : 20. These ten illustrations are all similar to the following. "Then they that *gladly received his word*, were *baptized*: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." "And the Lord *added* to the church, daily such as should be *saved*." Acts 2 : 38-47. Not a "word about getting religion.

"But when they *believed* Philip's preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were *baptized*, both men and women." chap. 8 : 12. Not a word about getting religion.

"And Philip opened his mouth and beginning at this scripture, preached unto him JESUS. And as they went on their way, they came to a certain water; and the eunuch saith, behold, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? And he commanded the chariot to stand still: and they both went down into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he *baptized* him." verses 35, 36, 38. R. V. Not a word about getting religion. See also ch. 8 : 13; and 10 : 47, 48; and 16 : 14, 15; and 16 : 33; and 18 : 8; and 19 : 5; and 22, 16.

If all these examples of the way the Apostles so strictly obeyed and carried out the command and great commission of Christ, as to the way they were to *save* the world by preaching the gospel and baptizing the believers into the one Name; if all these do not plainly show, and sufficiently set forth, God's way

of Salvation ; and consequently expose the erroneous idea of "getting religion," then I confess I am greatly mistaken. I cannot do better than to quote the closing remarks of the late Dr. Thomas, in writing on this subject—Religion. He says, "Religion is of two kinds; that, namely, which is invented by the thinking of sinful flesh ; and that which is revealed of God. The former is superstition ; and leads men to do a vast deal *more* than God requires of them or *less* than he has appointed.* * All the Most High requires of men, is just to *believe* what he has done, what he teaches, and what he promises ; to *obey* the law of faith ; to take care of the poor of his flock ; and to keep themselves unspotted from the world. This, is pure and undefiled religion. But alas ! where is it to be found ?

Religion being the Divine remedy for sin, it is evident that when the sin of the world is taken away, religion will be abolished. So long as sin exists in the earth, so long will there be separation between God and men: for it is sin, and that only, which interrupts man's fellowship with God and his angels, as it obtained before the fall. When sin is eradicated from the world, there will be no more death ; for death and sin are boon-companions ; as it is written, "the wages of sin is death." The abolition of death presupposes the extinction of sin in the flesh ; and consequently, that the *animal nature* of man has been transformed (not evaporated, but changed) into the *spiritual nature* of the Elohim. Man will then be no longer subject to evil. His race will have passed through its 7000 years of probation ; and all of its individuals, who have been the faithful subjects of God's religion, will become the incorruptible and perpetual inhabitants of the earth, emancipated from every curse ; God will then dwell in men by his spirit, as he now fills the Lord Jesus Christ. All distinction of church and world, saints and sinners, righteous and wicked, shall cease forever ; for there will be none of the Serpent's seed alive. They will have been utterly destroyed ; for only "the meek shall inherit the earth and delight themselves with abundance of peace." Ps 37 : 11. Religion begins in the third chapter of Genesis, and finds the record of its end in the last two chapters of the Revelation. Its abolition is expressed in these words ; "Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them as their God. And he shall wipe away all tears from their eyes : and *there shall be NO MORE DEATH*, neither

sorrow, nor crying; neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away. And he that sat upon the throne said; Behold, *I make all things new.* And *there shall be NO MORE CURSE.*" Then will the victory be complete. The sin-power and all its works will be finally abolished; and an eternal Jubilee gladden the hearts of men, in whom God will be all and in all 1 Cor. 15 : 28. Hence the conclusion is, that "Religion is that *system of means* by which the *breach* made by sin between God and man is repaired; and the wound inflicted on the latter is healed. It is a system of *faith* and *practice*. The *faith* of religion embraces what God has done, what he promises to do, and what he teaches in his word, all of which is presented for the elaboration of a godlike disposition. *Elpis Israel* P. 148.

MAN AND HIS FALL.

The progenitor and representative of the human race, although "formed of the dust of the ground," was made into a flesh and blood nature with a physical and mental organization, endowed with life. He was simply a bundle of flesh and blood organs. These organs were an absolute necessity in his creation. They constituted the *powers*, or faculties of his being. This flesh and blood constitutional organism was therefore his *nature*—himself. This bundle of flesh and blood organs or powers, were properly balanced. Each organ or faculty had its own sphere in which to act, its own legitimate functions to perform, in the great work of life. They all worked together harmoniously. The moment this being, this organism was endowed with life, every one of the organs went about its own business. That moment, every power of the entire system, began to perform its natural functions. This Adam (of the ground) man, was made with organs or powers of walking, working, eating, procreation, talking, hearing, seeing, desiring, thinking, understanding, reasoning, loving, worshiping, of being just, honest, kind, benevolent, &c., &c. His powers, were physical, animal and mental. His mental powers were, intellectual and moral. His intellectual powers consisted in his perceptive, reflective and reasoning faculties. His moral powers, consisted in his faculties of conscientiousness, veneration, benevolence, &c. "The image of God" in which he was made the reflex of his Creator, consisted in this natural mental organization, with which he was constitutionally endowed. The moral powers, aided by the

intellectual and the external senses, were intended to be the ruling element of his being. They were originally and constitutionally placed in the highest position in his nature. They were to occupy the throne of power, to be the natural light and moral guide of the man. This was the image of God—a natural, not a spiritual image. So long as these moral powers, aided by the intellectual, as well as the external senses, occupied the throne of Government, and performed their natural functions, as the leading element of his being, so long all was harmonious, and right—so long man would walk uprightly, so long his appetites, his desires, inclinations, and impulses would be properly controlled and guided, so long his animal propensities (which were all good and proper, and even necessary, in their proper legitimate place) so long, they would be properly restrained, guided and governed: so long they would be restrained from excessive or *lustful* action—confined to the simple performance of their legitimate and proper functions, or duties. But let the *moral* powers be dethroned and demoralized, and the lower or animal powers put in rule; and what would be the consequence? Why, “the image of God” would be defaced, the entire organism would be unbalanced, the harmonious operation of the natural powers of the man would be at an end, the animal powers would develop to a disproportionate size, strength, and activity, the moral organs, not being fed and sustained by the blood as usual and requisite, because of the lack of their proper exercise, would therefore diminish in size, strength, and activity; the man’s animal propensities, appetites, and desires, would at once become excessive, imperious, and *lustful*, and therefore *sinful* in character. Thus it was with Adam. Such are the results of his disobedience, so far as his nature and character, and of all his posterity, are concerned.

He was placed on trial, as a candidate for a spirit nature, to see whether this peculiarly constituted flesh and blood nature of his—this representative nature which was to transmit itself to his entire posterity, the whole human family—to see whether this human nature would stand the temptation or trial, absolutely necessary for its development; that is, whether it would continue to maintain its normal harmonious operation of all its organs, under the necessary *external* pressure of temptation or trial, and thus develop a still higher Godly character, necessary for the bestowment of the Godly nature.

The natural arrangement was, that his intellectual, including the perceptive, reflective, and reasoning faculties, in connection with his external senses, should be the *light* for all the rest ; that is, for the moral powers, and the animal propensities; and that the moral powers, thus enlightened and aided, should guide restrain and properly control the animal element of his nature. But failing to do so, Adam fell. That is, the eyes saw the fruit, and the ear heard what the serpent said, and the intellect understood it, and his organs of love of approbation and self-esteem, desired to become like Gods, and the appetite clamored for the pleasure of eating it, for "the tree was good for food, and pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make wise" ; therefore Eve "took of the fruit thereof and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her ; and he did eat. "Gen. 2 : 6. Thus his moral powers gave way, were overcome, dethroned and demoralized ; and all the sad consequences above named followed, and the unbalanced, lustful, sinful condition of the fleshly organism. was transmitted to all his posterity. Hence, as Paul said, Gal. 5 : 17, "the flesh lusteth against the spirit," that is, the spiritual or God-like faculties ; they are now in opposition. Although the intellect had informed the moral powers, that the eating of the fruit of that tree, had been prohibited— forbidden on pain of death ; yet they heeded not the voice of warning, but succumbed to the desires and cravings of the lower organs, to blind an irresponsible appetite ; which was of itself a good, wise, and necessary provision, in order that the constant wear and tear and waste of the human system might be supplied through the blood, by the partaking of food to satisfy the appetite.

The undue excitement and development of the lower organs, thus caused, destroyed the true balance, the harmonious working, and produced an abnormal condition of the entire organism of man. The consequence or effect was, that Adam was doomed to die without hope or possibility of a resurrection, or reliving, because of his actual transgression ; and his posterity unavoidably inherited the degenerated sinful condition of the flesh and blood nature. This was a great change, not in the *nature*, as to its substance or constitutional organization, but in its action, working, or *character*. The natural impulses, inclinations, or desires of the physical animal organs of the flesh, which were at first just strong enough to subserve the purposes intended, had now by excitement and development, become

too strong, excessive in their action and power, and hence *sinful*. They had become the master of the moral organs, instead of the servants. They had assumed the reins of government in the province of human nature, contrary to the original arrangement: and this sad condition of things having been transmitted to Adam's entire posterity, still remains, therefore, the same unbalanced, degenerated, lustful, sinful, condemned flesh and blood nature. Every son and daughter of Adam possesses this *condemned* nature, including even our Saviour when "in the days of his flesh." This nature endowed with life was "the living soul," or man. Having been placed under the law of "sin and death," for trial, it sinned and was condemned to death.

When, Christ came, "by the grace of God to taste death for every man," it was necessary that he should be made a little lower than the angels:" therefore "he took not on him the *nature* of angels; but "he took on him the seed of Abraham" and was made in *all things* "like unto his brethren." He was "made *sin* for us," who himself knew no sin. 2 Cor. 5: 21. God sending his own Son in the *likeness* of *sinful flesh*, and for (or on account of) sin, condemned *sin in the flesh*." Rom. 8: 3. His own flesh was therefore of necessity under the same condemnation, but not because of his own sins, for he "did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth." 1 Peter 2: 22. Although he "was in *all points* tempted like as we are, (every man is tempted, when he is drawn away *of his own lust*, James 1: 14,) yet without sin." Heb. 4: 15. But he,— "his own self, bore *our sins in his own body*." 1 Pet. 2: 24. The consequences of Adam's sin, were therefore in "his own *body*"—the body which was built up from the "seed of the *woman*," the ovum and blood of Mary's condemned common human nature. It was a condemned nature when he took it, as the seed of Abraham." Hence, although he had the same condemned sinful flesh nature, with its strong excessive animal powers in the lead, its impulses, desires, and appetites, constantly trying and tempting him—yet he restrained and controlled them all, and developed and maintained a *sinless righteous* character, living without sin all his life, as no other being with the same nature ever did; and thus, even by that alone, won a new, spirit, incorruptible nature, and eternal life.

But that did not do away with the necessity of his death. His father had sent him to carry out the condemnation of sinful *flesh*, he came to do his Father's will; he was therefore "obedi-

ent unto death." He did not therefore die for, or on account of his own actual sins, for he did not sin, but on account of the condemned sinful flesh of human nature, of which he himself also partook. His *own nature* was therefore involved in the common condemnation, but he himself, as to his own acts and character, was free. He, as well as his Father, condemned sin in the flesh, the flesh and blood nature of all of Adam's posterity, which therefore, of necessity included his own. He "died for *all*," "died for the *ungodly*," "died for *us*." "For God so loved the *world*, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life." John 3 : 16. His death was therefore, not the result of his having been begotten of the "will of the flesh," for such was not the case; neither was it because of his own disobedience; neither was it because he had a mortal dying nature for he did not die of disease, nor of old age, nor of any kind of *natural* death: but it was a *penal* death. Neither was his death necessary merely to condemn sin in the flesh, but in order to redeem and save the Race, it was necessary to deliver them from the consequences of Adam's sin, by entering the domains of death, binding the strong man, unlocking and opening the gates, and coming out: thus abolishing death and bringing life and immortality to light. It was also necessary, as the only, or at least the most effectual way of manifesting to the world his great unspeakable love, and also that of Jesus himself: who said, just as he was about to be obedient unto death, by laying down his life; "therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I may take it again." No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." John 10 : 17, 18, and 15 : 13. It is evident that one very important feature in the purpose of God, which rendered it necessary for Christ to die, was, that by such a great manifestation of love on the part of himself and his Son, both his children should thus be incited to love and obedience, which is true *worship*. Hence John said, "We love him because he first loved us." 1 John 4 : 19. God so loved the world that he has done everything that in his wisdom could possibly be done to redeem and save the world, and there is nothing left to be done, except that on the part of man, he requires "*faith which worketh by LOVE*." Gal. 5 : 6. That covers the whole ground of man's duties.

Again ; it is evident that Christ's death was necessary in order to inspire confidence, or strong faith in his promised redemption from death and the grave, and also in his promise and power to give an incorruptible nature, and eternal life. Christ's death and resurrection demonstrated all this. But he did not die *in our stead*, nor as a *substitute* to appease the fury and wrath of God. He did not die to keep man from dying and going into the grave, but to bring him out and give him an undying nature. He died on account of our sins, and "for us ;" that is, on our behalf or for our benefit, for our great advantage—that we might believe, love, obey, and live forever.

Again, it was necessary for Christ to die, in order to completely fulfill all the types, which had for so many centuries been pointing down to his death. It was necessary for him to die as the appointed victim, or sacrifice, to bring into force the new everlasting covenant. It was necessary for him to die, because without the shedding "of the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot," there could be no remission of sin. He had therefore to die, "to *put away sin* by the sacrifice of himself." Heb. 9 : 26. There were doubtless many other reasons, why, in the purpose of God, the death of Christ was absolutely necessary.

"THE IMAGE OF GOD."

We are informed that man was made "in the image of God," "in the image of God created he him." Gen. 1 : 27 and 5 : 1. This image did not consist in an immortal soul," breathed into him at his creation ; for the Bible does not so teach : nor in his being created with an immortal or spiritual nature, which was lost by the fall : for such a *nature* would have rendered him incapable of either falling or dying. But it consisted simply in the constitution and organization of his *natural* mind ; a mental constitution and organization which somewhat resembled his Creator ; a nature which both in its constitutional organization, and its functional workings, was to some extent a reflex or likeness of the attributes of his Maker.

To illustrate : God has revealed himself an intelligent All-wise Being : so man was created with powers of understanding and speech ; that is, with intellectual powers called in mental Philosophy, "intellectual faculties." Not so with the mere Animals. God is a *reasoning* Being : so man was made capable of judging from cause to effect—with mental reasoning powers or organs, called "causality and comparison." Hence God said,

“come now and let us *reason together.*” Isa. 1 : 18. Not so with animals. Another attribute of God is Omniscience : He understandeth and knoweth all things. He is the fountain of wisdom : So man was made with mental powers capable of learning, getting and treasuring up much knowledge and wisdom. Hence God said by Solomon, “Happy is the man that findeth wisdom, and the man that getteth understanding.” Prov. 3 : 13. But not so with animals. Another attribute of the Creator is Benevolence : so man was made naturally capable of being benevolent—with a mental organ of “*Benevolence.*” Not so with the animals. Another Divine Attribute is Justice : So man was made capable of understanding justice and being just ; by being endowed with a natural mental organ, called “*conscientiousness,*” or justice. Not so with animals. God has “*respect*” for right and good, (Lev. 26 : 3-9,) and is himself the only true object of supreme reverence and *worship* : so man in his mental constitution was endowed with a natural faculty called “*veneration*” or reverence, which qualifies and impels him to reverence right and good, and to worship God. Not so with animals. “*God is love.*” In all his wonderful dealings with his creatures—in all his great salvation which he has provided, he has been actuated by LOVE : so man was made capable of pure and holy love, as the moving or impelling power to obedience—obedience to right and duty.*

Again, as these moral principles, have their origin in the attributes of God and constitute his rule of action, or govern his dealings with his creatures ; so man’s higher moral organs, or similar natural attributes, were intended to be the *ruling* organs—to occupy the throne of mental power—to be the *governing* element of his nature. In all this, consists the image or likeness of God.

Man did not *lose* it by the fall—by the disobedience of his prototype and progenitor—Adam. Even the most degenerate, still have this same mental organization—the same kind, and the same number of natural organs or attributes. This image or likeness, therefore, is not lost. It is still a part of man’s nature. But it has been defaced, or degenerated by sin. It was not a change in the *substance* of the constitution or nature, nor in the number, location, or design of his organs, but a functional

* Man *naturally* feels it his *duty* to do *right*. This is because he was made in the image of God. Every person has, in the *natural* mind, an inward monitor, admonishing and impelling him to do right, to be kind, to be benevolent, to be honest, and good, and truthful, &c. This is the reflex of his Creator’s attributes—“the image of God.”

disarrangement, or *unbalancing* of the mental organs; simply a change from a normal to an abnormal *working* of them—a change of *character*, not of nature. The moral, God-like, ruling organs or faculties of the mind were simply dethroned, and the lower fleshly animal organs put in power. This is what I mean by *unbalancing* and bringing into an abnormal condition. This is a change of the character not of the nature. This is moral degeneracy, demoralization—the animal or lower element of human nature strengthened, and the moral element weakened. This degeneracy, this abnormal condition, as the result of Adam's disobedience, is the origin of what is called "sinful flesh," and "sin in the flesh." Rom. 8 : 3, and what Paul called "sin that dwelleth in me," and "the law of sin which is in my members," (or organs.) Rom. 7 : 20, 23. Before disobedience, Adam was governed by his higher, Godly, or moral organs, and was therefore a *moral* man. After disobedience, he was governed, in his actions and life, by his lower, fleshly, animal organs, and was therefore a fallen immoral man. This unbalanced, degenerate, abnormal, *sinful* condition, or character, this functional disarrangement, was by the laws of nature—the laws of procreation and being—transmitted to all his posterity. This *sinful* condition or character of the man and his fleshly nature, thus became a *law* of the flesh—the law of sin's flesh, and is the same to this day.*

But a remedy has been provided in Christ. This abnormal condition can be corrected, the original proper organic balance can be restored, the degenerated image can be "renewed" or "conformed to the image of Christ" (Rom. 8 : 29) "who is the image of the invisible God." Col. 1 : 15. This renewing of the image, or "inner man," and thus becoming a *new* man—a godly man—in *mind* and *character*, can only be done by

* I am well aware that there are those who try very hard to make it appear that Paul did not mean what he said, and therefore they *add* to it, and change it to suit what appears to me to be, their shallow understanding of the matter. They either intentionally or unintentionally misrepresent, and they call the correct understanding of Paul's words, "this physical sin delusion." But my kind advice to them is, beware! and look into the matter more thoroughly and philosophically. Human nature is so constituted that mental, moral, as well as physical acts, *do* produce effects in the flesh—physical consequences in the flesh. There is no question whatever, but that Adam's disobedience—sin—did produce physical results or consequences in his flesh. It is in perfect harmony with the laws of nature, that his sin did excite, increase and develop the tendencies or inclinations of the lower animal organs or "members" of the flesh; which inclinations or tendencies were *just strong enough*, before, *just* evenly balanced, as the Creator made and intended them; and therefore to increase and develop them by disobedience, was to render them *too* strong—lustful—and therefore *sinful* in their tendency—ever urging their possessor on *too far*. It is therefore perfectly consistent and philosophical, for the Apostle to call this condition of the flesh, "sinful," "sin in the flesh," "sin that dwelleth in me," "the law of sin in my members," &c. See, "Philosophy of man and his fall" Appendix.

“ putting off the old man (or character) with his deeds ; and putting on the new man (the character of Christ) which is *renewed* in knowledge, after the *image* of him that created him.” Col. 3 : 9, 10. “ And be renewed in the *spirit* (natural moral powers) of the mind, and that ye put on the *new* man, which *after God* is created in righteousness and true holiness ;” or, as rendered by the Diaglott, “ in righteousness and holiness of THE TRUTH.” Eph. 4 : 23, 24. The mind being thus spiritized by “ the truth as in Jesus,” then putting on, or being inducted *into* Christ, therefore, he is a new creature: “ if *any* man be *in* Christ he is a *new creature*.” 2 Cor. 5 : 17. When Christ was here he was the image of God in mind and character ; but now, since his resurrection, he is the “ express image of his Father’s *person*,” or, as worded in the Diaglott, he is “ an effulgence of his glory, and an exact impress of his *substance* ;” (Heb. 1 : 2.)—spirit substance or Divine Nature. So, all who are in Christ, not only have the moral image of God renewed ; but what is more, an exact counterpart of his spirit substance, or divine nature, is vouchsafed in the future, resulting in eternal life, or living forever.

PUNISHMENT OF THE WICKED.

“ The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ : who shall be *punished with everlasting destruction* from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power, when he shall come.” 1 Thess. 1 : 7-10. Everlasting destruction, is to be *destroyed* without possibility of ever existing again. The idea that everlasting punishment *must necessarily* be endless *suffering*, is simply absurd. “ The Lord preserveth all them that love him : but all the wicked will he *destroy*.” Ps. 145 : 20. Not *preserve* in endless misery. “ The transgressors shall be *destroyed* together.” Ps. 9 : 5, and 37 : 38. “ The wicked is reserved to the day of *destruction*.” Job. 21 : 30. “ These shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into *life* eternal.” Mat. 25 : 46. Everlasting punishment, is to be punished with everlasting *destruction* (as *proved* by 1 Thess. 1 : 7,-10, and which is *death* eternal, the opposite of *life* eternal) *not annihilation* of the particles of matter, or “ dust ” of which man is composed, but a total *destruction* of the being, without a possibility of ever re-living ; therefore simply “ *death*,” the exact opposite of “ *life* ”—a total, endless extinction of *life*, or an endless death. Hence, God said by

Moses, "I set before you *life* and *death*." Deut. 30 : 15, 19. "The wages of sin is *death* " but the gift of God is eternal *life*." Rom. 6 : 23. "Sin when it is finished bringeth forth *death*." James 1 : 15. "He who converteth the sinner from the error of his way, shall save a *soul* from *death*." James 5 : 20, (not from *endless misery*.) "The *soul* that sinneth it shall *die*" (not live forever in misery or torment.) "I set before you the WAY of *life* and the WAY of *death*." Jer. 21 : 8. That is, "if ye live after the flesh ye shall *die* ; (not natural or temporal death, for they would die that whether they lived after the flesh or not ; but the final or "*second death*"—(endless *death*) but if ye through the spirit do mortify the deeds of the body ye shall *live*:" (not natural life, but eternal life ;) Rom. 8 : 13. "If a man keep my sayings, he shall never see *death*." Mat. 8 : 51. Not natural or temporal death, but the "second" or eternal death. "It shall come to pass, that every *soul* which will not hear that prophet (Christ) shall be destroyed from among the people." Acts 3 : 23.

Locke, the great mental philosopher, says—"It seems a strange way of understanding a law, which requires, the plainest and directest words that by "*death*" should be meant eternal life in misery !!!

"Unbelievers and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolators, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake of fire and brimstone : which is the *second death*." Rev. 2 : 11 ; and 20 : 6, 14 ; and 21 : 8. Commentators, who endeavor to maintain popular theology, say, "in the second death, the body will die again, and the soul live on in misery." Says an able biblical expositor—J. Blain, a Baptist minister, formerly of Buffalo—"If such assumptions do not deserve ridicule instead of an answer, I know of nothing in Catholic expositions that do."

The soul is the whole man. The record of man's creation says, the "man became a living soul." God "formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of *life*," and he, the *man* became a *living soul*. Therefore, when the man—the soul—made of the dust—is cast into the lake of fire, he will be totally *destroyed*, burned to *death* ; and "then shall the dust return to the earth as it was ; and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it." Eccl. 12 : 7. That is, 'the breath of the spirit of *life*,' which was breathed into his nostrils, will return to God who gave it. (See Gen. 7 : 22 ;

margin.) Not the soul, for the man himself is the living soul. Thus he will be "burned up root and branch." Mal. 4 : 1. "Into smoke shall he consume away." Ps. 37 : 20, and 49 ; 14, 19, 20. "They shall be as though they had not been," (Obad. 1 : 16, Job 10 : 18,) for the fire will be "unquenchable fire," and therefore will completely consume, and "burn them up." God will "gather his wheat (the righteous) into the garner ; but he will *burn up* the chaff (the wicked) with *unquenchable fire.*" Matt. 3 : 12.

As criminals were sometimes executed in *Gehenna*—the valley of Hinnom on the S. E. side of Jerusalem—and their bodies left to be burned up in the fire of *Gehenna*, which was not quenched, but kept constantly burning, and where the worms devoured any bodies or parts of bodies, that were not completely consumed by the fire, and which worms "died not" until every particle was devoured ; so the wicked, at least a certain class of them, are ultimately to be punished with the "second death" by being "cast into hell (*Gehenna*) into the fire that never shall be quenched ; where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." Mark 9 : 45, 46. Hence, Christ said "fear him who is able to *destroy* both *soul* and *body* in hell." (*Gehenna*) Matt. 10 : 28. That is, to destroy both the body and its life or being so the person can never live again. "For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul ;" or as Luke words it, "and lose *himself.*" Matt. 16 : 26. Luke 9 : 25.

I cannot occupy space in this little work, for much more on this point. There are 210 passages in the Scriptures, which directly, clearly, and positively sustain, and amply prove that it is "*life* and *death* set before the world"—that "the wages of sin is *death*, but the gift of God is eternal *life* through Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom. 6 : 23.

Popular theology first assumes the immortality of the soul, that man was created with an "immortal soul" (a thing not once named in all the Scriptures) which must of necessity live forever, either in happiness or misery. They are then compelled to change and deny the true literal meaning of all these Scriptures, which teach that the wages of sin is *death*, and the soul that sinneth, it shall *die*; telling us that death means eternal life in misery ; or "the death that never dies : " and that everlasting punishment means everlasting *suffering*, or "endless torment." Then they refer to the passages which speak of "ever-

lasting fire," (It is the *fire* that is everlasting, not the *persons* cast into it,) "unquenchable fire," "Eternal damnation," "smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever," "tormented day and night forever," "he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb." Rev. 14: 11. They quote these and a few others, and by a misapprehension of their true meaning, and therefore a misapplication of them, they endeavor to bolster up the erroneous, horrible and God-dishonoring doctrine of endless torture, or "torment." The last quoted passages, all of them, and other similar ones, evidently apply to the overthrow of anti-christian *powers*, powers opposed to the Son of God, and their upholders; *previous* to the Millennium this side or *before* the day of the general Judgment, of which Peter speaks, when he says, "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of trial, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of Judgment to be punished;" 2 Pet. 2: 9; and to which Job referred when he said "that the *wicked* is reserved to the day of *destruction*, they shall be *brought forth* to the day of wrath." Job 21: 30. I say those passages Rev. 14: 8-11, above quoted; evidently refer to a special Judgment—to the soon coming destruction of Rome as the head, or geographical centre of Papal corruption, and the complete overthrow of the anti-christian powers and system, symbolized by "the beast and his image," and the destruction of a special class of mankind, defined as "the worshipers of the beast and his image," not in the popular orthodox hell, but on this earth, at the coming of Christ, and "in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb." See verse 10.

The language used is similar to, and perhaps taken from that spoken of Idumea, Isa. 34: 9, 10 "The streams thereof shall be turned into pitch, and the dust thereof into brimstone, and the land thereof shall become burning pitch. It shall *not be quenched* night nor day; the smoke thereof shall go up *for ever*: from generation to generation. it shall lie waste; none shall pass through it *for ever and ever*."

That able Biblical expositor, R. Roberts, of Birmingham, England, in his work on the Apocalypse, speaking of the above quoted passage, Rev. 14: 10, says: "We know the use that is made by the believers in popular Theology, of this verse, to uphold the orthodox idea of hell fire. They quote this high figure of the Apocalypse as the description of a literal fact. It is the

characteristic in general of the orthodox treatment of the Scriptures, to "spiritualize" literal truth, and to literalize that which is figurative and symbolic. The inapplicability of the symbol in question to the popular hell must be evident, from the place it occupies in the representation of events transpiring subsequent to the Lamb's enthronement in Mount Zion with the 144,000. Their hell is always at work: this is a torment to be inflicted at the coming of Christ. The torments of their hell are presided over by the devil; this is inflicted "in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb." Their torments are for the vile of mankind in general: this is for a special class, defined as "the worshipers of the beast and his image." He says; "It is as well, perhaps, in passing, to refer to this bearing of a strongly coloured symbolism which on the face of it, gives countenance to popular ideas of hell torment. It is, in fact, the description of the vengeance which awaits the great European apostacy at the coming of Jesus. * * To say of this tormenting outburst of Judgment in a symbolic vision, that the smoke of it will ascend up forever and ever, is to say that it will be perpetual in its triumph over those overwhelmed by it—that there will be no recovery from the catastrophe. They have no rest, day nor night when the hour for infliction of the Judgment has arrived; and its effect when consummated, is forever—after the example of Sodom and Gomorrah, "who are set forth as an example, suffering the vengeance of *eternal fire*," (Jude, verse 7,) though "overthrown as in a moment, and no hands stayed on her, "(Lam. 4: 6,) the *fire going out* in the waters of the Dead Sea."

Albert Barnes, the able Presbyterian Commentator, in his notes on this same passage, Rev. 14: 9-12, says, it "tells the final overthrow of all the upholders of that anti-christian power (papacy) ch. 15—the seven plagues are to fill up or complete the wrath of God on this persecuting power; and ch. 16 tells the execution of the purpose, by the pouring out of the seven vials on this beast. The seventh vial, vs. 17-21, tells the complete and final overthrow of the papal power, (the beast and false prophet.) ch. 19, is a further representation of the fall of powers opposed to the Son of God, and the introduction of the millennium vs. 19 21, the beast, &c.—the last enemy of the Church on earth, is destroyed, and the way is prepared for its universal triumph." I think all this sufficiently shows that the popular doctrine of endless torment in an orthodox hell, has a

very poor foundation in these Scriptures: and yet they constitute the chief and almost only support, in opposition to more than 200 passages in support of "*death*" as the doom of the wicked. However, any person not being satisfied as to the correctness of this position, and other points of doctrine as taught in this work, may become so by taking the same course the writer has followed for the last twenty five years, viz: carefully, and thoroughly examining the Scriptures, in the use of seven different versions; and in the light of Greek and English Lexicons; The Englishman's Greek Concordance; and Cruden's and Young's Complete English Concordances: Also carefully reading as helps, the following able works. H. H. Dobney on future punishment. *Elpis Israel*; being an exposition of the kingdom: by the late John Thomas, M. D. Also by the same very able author, *Eureka*: an exposition of the Apocalypse. A work entitled, *Twelve Lectures*; on the teaching of the Bible in relation to the faiths of Christendom: by Robert Roberts of England. Also by the same Author, a work entitled, *Thirteen Lectures on the Apocalypse*. A History of the corruptions of Christianity: by Joseph Priestly, LL. D., F. R. S. An enquiry into the Scriptural import of the words *Sheol, Hades, Tartarus, and Gehenna*, translated hell: by Balfour. *Bible vs. Tradition*: by Aaron Ellis. *Death not Life* by J. Blain a Baptist Minister. *The Bible vindicated against modern Theology*: by Gunn. *An Enquiry: are the wicked immortal?* by George Storrs. *The Theology of the Bible*: by O. S. Halstead, Ex-Chancellor of the State of New Jersey: besides many other similar works; and consulting various Commentators.

All these, I say, as *helps* to the study of the Scriptures; which *alone* decide every point. Any person taking a similar course, with an honest heart, earnestly and anxiously desiring to come to a knowledge of the TRUTH; *cannot avoid* arriving at about the same conclusions with the writer, as set forth in this work.

ORIGIN OF UNIVERSALISM.

The doctrine of the ultimate universal salvation of the entire human family, had its origin in two great and deplorable popular errors, namely; "eternal torment" and "immortality of the Soul." That is, popular theology teaches that man is naturally immortal—has an "immortal soul" that *cannot* die,

that must of necessity exist forever, either in a state of happiness or misery.

· · Second : that as the wicked will not be permitted to go to heaven, and exist forever there ; they must of necessity go to *hell*, which they hold is a place of indescribable misery ; and there remain in conscious " torment " — writhing in unspeakable agony forever.

Had it not been for these two errors, there never would have been any such thing as Universalism in the world : that deplorable delusion, by which so many thousands, have been and still are fatally deceived and blinded, never would have been known. It was got up for the express purpose of opposing and exposing the absurd and terrible doctrine of endless torment.

· Men of thinking minds and kind hearts, saw and felt that the idea was horrible and unreasonable : then they examined and found it unscriptural. But they took it for granted that the other error—the immortality of the soul—was scriptural, and therefore that man must of necessity exist forever, either in the orthodox hell, or heaven : hence the delusive and equally absurd and unscriptural conclusion, that all mankind, good and bad, righteous and unrighteous, the pure and the vile, are to be saved together, in the orthodox heaven ! They designated this monstrosity by the pleasing but delusive appellation, Universal Salvation !!"

They thus either ignore or try to explain away all those Scriptures which so plainly and continually teach a *conditional* salvation. They either ignore or try to explain away, all those Scriptures which teach that it is *life* and *death* set before the world, that " the soul that sinneth it shall *die* ;" that, " if ye believe not that I am he, ye shall *die* in your sins ;" that " he that *believeth not* shall be condemned " to *death* ; that " if ye live after the flesh ye shall *die*," that " all the wicked will God *destroy* ;" that " they shall be *punished with everlasting destruction*," &c., &c., &c.

They ignore the fact that the Scriptures never once even mention the " immortality of the soul ;" that there is not one word about an " immortal soul ;" not one word about man being naturally immortal and necessarily living or existing forever either in heaven or hell, or any any other place : but that on the other hand, they teach that immortality and endless life or existence, are *conditional*—that immortality is ultimately to be " *put on* " by the righteous and by them only, at the

resurrection of the just: and that "*God only* hath immortality."

They do not see that this "immortal soul" idea, is just as unscriptural, and therefore just as great an error, as "eternal torment." They do not see that while they reject and ably expose one popular delusion they are blinded by another, equally fatal. They do not see that because the wicked are not to suffer eternal torture and woe, it does not follow that they will not *die* the "second death," but be saved like the righteous:

They do not seem to see, that God is a God of *justice*, as well as a God of *love*; that "God so *loved* the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that WHOSOEVER BELIEVETH in him should not *perish*, but have ever lasting life;" that in order to be *saved*, it is necessary to comply with the *condition* of salvation, necessary to "*work* out our own salvation with fear and trembling," (Phil. 2 : 12,) and that "this is the *work* of God, that ye BELIEVE on him whom he hath sent." John 6 : 28, 29. They do not see that God is the Saviour of *all* men, by giving his Son to die for all, thus taking away the sin of the world by redeeming them from death and the grave—the consequences of Adam's sin—and thus providing a *chance* or *way* to be saved through *faith*; but that he is the "*special* Saviour of those that *believe*;" (1 Tim. 4 : 10;) that is, the household of *faith*."

But it is a common thing with them, to flippantly explain away all these scriptures, and hundreds more similar passages, and to say, "well now, see here, *all* persons are more or less *good*—they merely differ in *degree* of goodness. Please tell us where the *dividing line* is, between those who are to be saved and those who are to be lost?" They chuckle over their conceit, exultingly; apparently thinking "now I've got you." But such a foolish question only betrays and exposes their pitiable misapprehension of the Scriptures, on every page of which, the dividing line is shown to be FAITH—"faith that *worketh* by LOVE." This is the dividing line.—This is the *condition* of salvation. No matter how moral or *good* a person is, if he reject the words of Christ, if he refuse to *believe* and obey the *gospel* of Christ, he thus rejects and refuses proffered Salvation. Those who are incapable of seeing this, are simply to be pitied.

Says W. P. Strickland D. D. Editor of Universalism against itself; "Perhaps no form of error has ever been devised so perfectly adapted to deceive the lovers of sin, as the one under

consideration. It at once addresses itself to the depraved appetites and passions of men, and is so admirably adjusted to this end, that it inspires a fallacious hope, in which there is no reason, and for the support of which there is no evidence. Whenever the heart pleads the cause, the understanding is a very lenient and partial Judge. What men wish to be true, they require but little evidence to convince them of its truth; and on the other hand, what they do not wish to be true, scarcely any amount of evidence is sufficient to convince them of its falsehood."

Says R. Roberts of England the learned Author of "Twelve Lectures" etc., etc.

"This precious life and immortality, brought to light by Jesus Christ through the gospel, is not to be indiscriminately bestowed. All men will not attain to it: only a few will be counted worthy. The precious gift is freely offered to all; but but it is conditional. It is not to be given to the faithless and the impure. Perfection of character must precede perfection of nature. Moral fitness is the indispensable prerequisite, and God is the Judge and the prescriber of the peculiar moral fitness necessary in the case." He then quotes the following scriptures.

"If thou wilt enter into life, *keep the commandments.*"—
 Mat. 19 : 17. "*He that believeth on the Son, hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son, shall not see life,*"
 John 3 : 36. "*He that heareth my word and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation.*" John 5 : 24. He that believeth on me though he were dead, yet shall he live." John 11 : 25.

After quoting these and other passages, he proceeds. "These testimonies give the death-blow to Universalism. They predicate salvation upon conditions which exclude the great majority of mankind. They restrict it to a class which has always been microscopically small among men, and effectually disprove the mistaken theory of benevolence which proclaims the "universal restoration" of every human being. This may represent Christianity as a very "narrow" affair, but no narrower than its divinely-intended scope. "Straight is the gate, and narrow is the way," this is its characteristic and not without wisdom. The development of a chosen family from the sons of men is its object. * * It is only the theory of universal immortality that gives rise to the idea of universal human

salvation. When human nature is looked upon at its true standard of vanity, the difficulty vanishes; on the other hand, if we look upon mankind, as "immortal souls," it is *impossible* to exclude universalism from the *thoughtful* mind, as the ultimate of God's eternal purpose; for the mind cannot receive it that a God of wisdom and mercy should decree eternal cursing anguish as the lot of any of the creatures of His hand. Universalism, however, is clearly a fallacy. One error gives rise to another, and they both fall together." In speaking of the resurrection of those who hear the word and reject it; he says: "They rise to the shame and confusion of a divine and frowning rejection but having their "few stripes" or "many stripes" by which is probably meant differences in the duration and intensity of suffering, as justice may demand, the wicked are finally engulfed in the "second death," which obliterates their wretched existence from God's creation. Being of no use, they are put out of the way." Thus, "the wicked cease from troubling." "But, (He further says) a paganized theology delights in assigning them an endless existence of torture. This idea is based upon certain obscure New Testament expressions which are supposed to countenance it, but which when properly understood, have a very different significance. "Unquenchable fire" does not imply the eternal conscious existence of the wicked, but the opposite: for if it is not quenched, then there is no escape from consumption. The phrase is used in this sense in Jer. 17: 27, and Ezk. 20: 47. The same is true of "worm dieth not." Herod's worms died not, and the consequence was that HE died. If they had died, *he* would have recovered."

WHAT IS IT TO BELIEVE IN CHRIST?

Popular theology teaches a very contracted and fatally erroneous idea of faith in Christ: some of its representatives teaching one kind and degree and others another. The result is that in all Christendom—so-called—fatally incorrect views on this all important point prevail, and have become almost universal. To have saving faith in Christ, or, in other words to be a real believer in Christ, does not consist in merely believing that a person called Christ, and called the Son of God, once lived: was crucified and buried; and rose again; and was taken up to heaven, &c. Nearly every "bar-room loafer" would claim to believe all that, and even much more perhaps. But that would not constitute him or any one else a believer in

Christ. To believe in Christ, is to believe his doctrine, his teachings, his "sayings," (Mat. 7 : 24-26,) his "words," his "his gospel," (Mark 16 : 15, 16). To reject his "words" is to reject him. "He that *rejecteth* me, and receiveth not my *words*, hath one that judgeth him." John 12 : 48. He is called "the *messenger* of the *covenant*." To profess to believe in the messenger, while rejecting his message, through ignorance as to what the message is, or for any other cause, is folly. It is not possible to believe in the messenger without understanding and believing his message which he was sent to deliver. He himself made known his gospel message, and said, he that believeth not shall be condemned. How can one believe the word, the gospel, without first hearing it, and *understanding* it? "When any one heareth the word of the kingdom, and *understandeth it not*, then cometh the wicked one and catcheth away that which was sown in his heart." Mat. 13 : 19-23. To believe in Christ, is to believe what God has testified concerning him, that he is His Son, as well as "the son of David," that he is his promised Messiah, or Anointed King, to reign on the throne of David—"the throne of the Lord"—that he is the "seed of Abraham," who is to bless all Nations ; that he is Jesus the *Saviour* of the world ; who died for our sins, and was raised for our Justification ; that he is now in heaven, as our Mediator ; that he is coming again, as a literal King—"King of kings"—to reign on the throne of his father David ; that he is a Prophet Priest and King ; that he is the "*head* of the one body," the beginning of the promised "*Name*," "the *first* born from the *dead*" the *first* of the "Mighty Ones ;" &c., &c. But it is absolutely and indispensably necessary to hear and understand the things concerning him—the gospel—before it is *possible* to believe them, and thus to believe in Christ.

WHAT IS IT TO BE A CHRISTIAN ?

It is a common saying ; " Well, he is a very kind honest-hearted good old man. If there are any Christians, he is one " It is a very erroneous, and I may say absurd idea, that because a person is good, honest, and kind he is therefore of necessity a Christian. This confounding *natural* goodness with *Christianity* is a fatal error, fraught with the thinkings of the flesh, the lack of wisdom, the " despising of the word," and constituting " the snares of death." Prov. 13 : 13, 14 To be a Christian, is to be an obedient believer in, and an humble follower of,

Christ. And to believe in Christ, is to have an enlightend entelligent faith in his teachings and gospel, as before pointed out. "Christian" is significant of the person, doctrine, character, and relation of Christ. That is, a person is correctly called a "Christain," or Christ-one, because of his relation to Christ through faith in him and his doctrine, and likeness of character through obedience ; which of course, as any one with a moments reflection cannot fail to see ; necessitates enlightenment as to *what is* the doctrine, teaching, or gospel of Christ, before any one can possibly become a Christian. Therefore, the command and commission of Christ to his Apostles was ; "Go ye therefore *teach* all nations,—*disciple all* the nations." Diaglott. Hence there are two kinds of Christains ; nominal and real.

WHAT IS SALVATION ?

Salvation is simply, to be saved from sin, death, and the grave, unto righteousness, incorruptibility of nature, and eternal life in the kingdom of God : to be obtained by availing ourselves of the means provided by Jesus the Saviour ; which means consist in faith and obedience to his gospel ; which "is the *power* of God unto SALVATION, to every one that *believeth*." See Epitome of the great Salvation.

WHAT IS IT TO BE GOOD ?

There are two kinds of goodness, natural and spiritual. Natural goodness being the result of a good natural disposition, and a proper bringing up. Spiritual goodness the result of faith and obedience to the truth. Our Saviour recognized this fact, when he said "One there is who is good," or "God alone is good." Mat. 19 : 17, Dia. Natural goodness is of little account with God. All spiritual or genuine goodness originates only in him. Man, therefore, can be good in his sight only by obedience to his will, as expressed in his revealed law of faith. This fact is also recognized by the wisest man Solomon, in these words, "For there is not a just man upon earth, that doeth *good* (by nature) and sinneth not." Eccl. 7 : 20. "For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God ; Rom. 3 : 23. Paul tells us that goodness, that is, goodness in the sight of God, is "the *fruit* of the spirit," (Gal. 5 : 22,) "the *Spirit* of TRUTH which proceedeth from the Father," received through faith, and obeyed ; producing fruit—"the fruit of the Spirit in all *goodness* and righteousness and *truth*." Eph. 5 : 9. Noth-

ing but this "fruit"—the result of faith and obedience—amounts to genuine *goodness* in the sight of God. No matter therefore, how good a person may be by nature, or in consequence of his excellent and superior natural disposition, or how *moral* he may be, if he does not submit to become enlightened, to have his mind illuminated by the things of the spirit, to be taught or disciplined, to "learn of the Father," and become one of the "taught of God," (John 6: 44, 45,) all his morality or goodness is of no avail: he is not one that "*worketh good*," his goodness, aside from the "one faith," is simply *morality*; not Christianity: and therefore the following language will not apply to him. "But glory, honor, and peace to every man that *worketh GOOD*." "To them who by patient continuance in *well doing* SEEK for glory and honor and immortality, eternal life." Rom. 2: 6-10. "In every nation he that feareth him and *worketh* righteousness (by faith and obedience) is *accepted* with him." Acts 10: 35. All that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have *done GOOD* unto the resurrection of life." John 5: 28.

STATE OF THE DEAD.

The position set forth in this work is, that life and death are opposite terms. That the signification of death is exactly the opposite, the antithesis of life; that death is simply the total extinction of life; and therefore, that the death-state is simply the absence of life. It follows, therefore, as an unavoidable sequence, that when a person is dead he is not alive; that a person cannot be dead and alive at the same time.

Again; another position taken, is, that the popular idea and doctrine that man, at his creation had a conscious entity—an immortal soul—breathed into his nostrils, or created within him, which can live as a conscious entity, independent of the body, has no foundation in the Scriptures: but that man was made of the dust, and had the breath of life, that is, the breath which contained the spirit of lives, breathed into his nostrils, and that "*the man* became a living *soul*." "*Adam* was made a living *soul*." 1 Cor. 15: 45. It follows, therefore, that the body is not one man and the soul another; but the man endowed with life is the living soul; and when he is dead, he is dead, and not alive up in heaven, nor suffering eternal torment in hell.

The state of the dead is therefore, a state of "rest," a state of unconsciousness, a "sleep" in the grave. Hence the Scriptures teach us that "*Abraham gave up the ghost and died*, in

a good old age, an old man, and full of years, and *was gathered to his people.*" Gen. 25 : 8. That could not have been up in heaven, for his people were *idolators*—"they served other Gods," (Josh. 24 : 2,) and it certainly could not have been in hell; faithful Abraham surely cannot be there. It follows therefore, that he was gathered into the grave where, all the rest of his people that had died had been gathered.

Again; "So Joseph *died*, being an hundred and ten years old; and they embalmed *him*, and *he* was put in a coffin in Egypt." Gen. 50 : 26. And so we find in the case of Joshua, (Josh. 24 : 29.) Samuel, (1 Sam, 25 : 1.) David, (1 Kings 2 : 1-10, Acts 2 : 29-34) Solomon, (1 Kings 11 : 43,) and all others whose death we find recorded in the Scriptures: they are not said to have gone away up to heaven, but are always spoken of as having died, given up their *life* and been buried.

Again; "These all died in faith, *not having received the promises*, but having seen them *afar off.*" Heb. 11 : 13.

"He (Jesus) saith unto them, our friend Lazarus *sleepeth*, &c. Then said Jesus unto them plainly Lazarus is *dead.*" There is nothing said here about his immortal soul going to heaven, and merely his body dying, and Christ calling his soul back again from heaven!

When the martyr Stephen was stoned to death, it is said of him, that he said "Lord Jesus receive my spirit;" (life) and that "he fell *asleep.*" Not a word about his immortal soul going to heaven. But his spirit of life, returned to God who gave it, and *he* was therefore dead, or asleep.

Job said "For now shall I *sleep in the dust,*" &c. Job. 7 : 21.

The angel said to Daniel, "many of them *that sleep in the dust of the earth* shall awake," &c. Dan. 12 : 2.

Jacob said; "I will go down *into the grave* unto my son mourning." Gen. 37 : 35.

Job in his afflictions and anguish said: "Why did the knees prevent me? or why the breasts that I should suck? For now I should have *lain still* and been quiet: I should have *slept*: then had I been at *rest* * * or, as a hidden untimely birth I HAD NOT BEEN; *as infants which never saw light*; there the wicked cease from troubling, and the weary be *at rest*. There the prisoners *rest* together; they *hear not* the voice of the oppressor," &c. Job. 3 : 18, 19.

Again, he says, chap. 10 : 18; "Wherefore hast thou

brought me forth out of the womb? O, that I had given up the ghost, (spirit of life,) and no eye had seen me; *I should have been AS THOUGH I HAD NOT BEEN.*" That is, if he had died when he was an infant. Hence, Job did not believe the doctrine taught now-a-days—that infants, when they die, go right to heaven, instead of into the grave.

Again: "So man lieth down, and riseth not: till the heavens be no more, they shall not *awake* nor be raised out of their *sleep.*" Job 14: 10-12. Not a word about *the man* being *up in heaven*, and his body in the grave: but "MAN *lieth down.*"

Again; David said, Ps. 6: 5, "For in *death* there is no remembrance of thee: in the *grave* who shall give thee thanks? Again, he says; Ps. 115: 17, "*The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence.*" This is a flat contradiction to the teachings of popular theology. If the real man goes right to heaven to praise the Lord, then he is not dead.

Again; Peter fully confirms David's testimony, and equally contradicts popular theology. He says, Acts 2: 34, "For David is NOT ascended into the heavens;" and in verse 29, he says David "is both *dead and buried*, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day." Therefore, although David's Son and Lord—the Christ—has been raised from the dead and has gone to heaven, yet the Prophet David himself is *not* ascended or gone to heaven, but is still dead and buried: he is still *asleep* in his grave, until the first resurrection of them that "sleep in Christ," at his coming: to which event David referred, when he said, "I shall be satisfied when I *awake* in thy likeness." Ps. 17: 15.

Christ said, "I will come again and receive you unto myself; that where I am there ye may be also." Not a word about their being with him up in heaven, nor until he comes again. But he said to his disciples distinctly; "whither I go ye cannot come." John 13: 33. But on another occasion he said to the Jews, "The hour is coming, in the which all that are *in the graves* shall hear his voice, and come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." John 5: 28. Mark: it does not say all that are up in *heaven*, and all that are in *hell*, shall come forth, but all that are IN THE GRAVE!!!

Paul says, 1 Cor. 15: 16-18, "For if the *dead* rise not, then is not Christ raised: and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which have

fallen asleep in Christ are *perished*." How so Paul? If they are up in heaven praising God, they are NOT *perished*! In verse 32, he says, "What advantageth it me, if the dead rise not? Let us eat and drink; for to-morrow we die." Are you not mistaken Paul? Would it not be a *great* advantage to be a Christian, if when they die, they go right to heaven; even if the *body* is *never* raised?

Again; Paul in writing his 2d epistle to Timothy, Chap. 4 : 1, spoke of the *appearing* of "the Lord Jesus Christ to judge the quick and the dead, at his appearing," and to set up his kingdom: and in verses 7 and 8, he says, "I have fought a good fight, I have kept the faith: henceforth (from this time forward) there is *laid up* for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day (the day of his *appearing* to judge the living and dead) and not to me only, but unto *all* them also that love his appearing." When he wrote this, he was old and about to die, or, as he said in verse 6, "I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure (*dissolution*, Greek and Dia.) is at hand." He did not expect his "crown" or reward when he died, but at the "appearing of Christ."

This agrees with the testimony of Christ himself to John, Rev. 22 : 12. "And, behold, I come quickly; and my *reward* is with me, to give *every man* according as his work shall be." This refers to the same day that Paul said he was to receive his crown of reward—the second appearing or coming of Christ; and not to death.

So also, Christ taught the same truth, when he was here. He said, "when thou makest a feast, call the *poor*, the maimed, the lame, the blind, &c., for they cannot recompense thee: for *thou shalt be recompensed* AT THE RESURRECTION of the Just. Luke 14 : 14. Not a word about their being recompensed up in heaven when they died—about going to their reward at *death* as popular theology has it.

Neither is there *one word*, about going to heaven when we die, or *coming from* heaven with Christ, when he comes with all his saints, in the entire Bible. It is true, Paul says, "at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints," 1 Thess. 3 : 13, but in the following chapter he shows what he means. He says, verse 13, "But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are *asleep* (in the *grave* not up in heaven) that ye sorrow not even as others which have no

hope. For, if we believe that *Jesus* died and *rose* again, even *so* them also which *sleep* in *Jesus* will God *bring* (not from heaven, but from their graves where they are asleep, just as he "*brought*" Christ, when he "*rose* again," Heb. 13 : 20,) with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which were alive (the Diaglott words it, "the living who are left over, to the coming of the Lord,") and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent (*precede*, Dia.) them which are asleep. For the Lord himself (not the saints) shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of an archangel, and, with the trump of God : and the *dead* in Christ shall rise first : Then we which are alive and remain, shall be *caught up together with them* in the clouds, to MEET the Lord in the air : (the Diaglott words it, "caught away in clouds, for a meeting of the Lord in the air,") and SO shall we ever be *with the Lord*," (our *bodies* will then have been "*quicken'd together with Christ*." Eph. 2 : 5.) This Scripture teaches us, that when Christ comes, before he gets here, he raises the dead—the saints who are asleep—or "*brings*" them from death and the grave, (just as the "*Lord Jesus was brought* again from the dead," Heb. 13 : 20,) *before* the living saints are permitted to join him. That is, the living saints will not "*precede*" the dead saints in going to meet him. For, "the dead in Christ shall rise *first* : "then the living saints, "which are alive and remain, shall be caught up *together* with them, (those raised from the dead,) in clouds, to *meet* the Lord in the air." *Then* he will come "*with all his saints*," to earth. They do not come with him from heaven, for they are not there, they are asleep in their graves, until Christ comes to *awaken* and raise them, judge them, and change them together with the living saints, "*in a moment in the twinkling of an eye*"—"change our *vile body*, that it may be fashioned *like unto his* glorious body." Phil. 3 : 21.

Hence, David said, "I shall be *satisfied* when I *awake* in thy *likeness*." He well understood that when he died, he was not to ascend up to heaven (and as Peter said, "*David is not ascended into the heavens*") to be *rewarded* there, and satisfied ; but that he was to *sleep* in his grave, and be awakened and satisfied on the earth, when his Son, or Lord, returned.

Indeed, how inconsistent, yea *impossible*, that a *dead* person can be up in heaven receiving his reward, and praising God ; when the dead know not anything ! For it is written

“The *living* know that they shall die ; but THE DEAD KNOW NOT ANYTHING, neither have they any more a *reward*.”
Eccl. 9 : 5.

Much more Scripture might be adduced in support of these points—that the righteous do not go to heaven, at death, and there receive their reward, but sleep in the grave and are to be rewarded *on the earth* at the coming of Christ. But I think this quite sufficient.

Let us therefore, not be too high minded, thinking we have immortality by nature, and cannot die, and are therefore to go right to heaven when the *body* dies!!! Let us be satisfied with what God has *promised*. Let us be satisfied to “*seek* for immortality, by patient continuance in well doing, that it may be *rendered*” to us, by Jesus the Life-Giver, when he comes. Rom. 2 : 6, 7. Let us be *meek*, for Christ said “*blessed* are the *meek*, for they shall *inherit the earth*.” Mat. 5 : 5. Not go heaven, to their reward, when they die. He never once even intimated such an idea. But on the contrary, he taught distinctly that the “*blessed* of my father inherit the kingdom (the kingdom of *heaven*, which is to be *under* the whole heaven,” Dan. 7 : 27, “on the earth ;” Rev. 5 : 10 ;) when the Son of man shall come in his glory.” Mat. 25 : 31-34. David also said, of old, “the *meek* shall inherit the earth,” “and their inheritance shall be forever.” The inheritance of the earth, and the inheritance of the kingdom of heaven on the earth, under the whole heaven, are the same.

Again ; David says, “The righteous shall inherit the land and dwell therein forever.” “But the wicked shall *perish*, and the enemies of the Lord, shall be as the fat of lambs : they shall consume ; into *smoke* shall they *consume away*.” “For evil doers shall be cut off : but those that wait upon the Lord, they shall inherit the earth.” Ps. 37 : 9-34.

Those two features of God’s plan of Salvation, so plainly revealed, viz ; the unconsciousness of the dead, and the destruction of the wicked in death eternal ; by those who understand—the enlightened, or “taught of God”—are looked upon as being most conspicuous and important marks of the wisdom, goodness, and mercy of God.

Instead of writhing in most intense agony forever, the saved fathers and mothers, being conscious of the awful fact of the endless misery of their children, and children of that of their parents, husbands of their wives, and wives of their husbands ;

instead of that, the wicked are simply to be put out of the way ; to die without a possibility of ever re-living. This "everlasting punishment" does not ignore the meting out to them, a *just* retribution—a "rewarding according to their deeds"—by a regulation (if need be) of the intensity and length of time of the death-suffering. A wise and merciful provision.

Then, in the case the death, or sleep of the righteous. Being totally unconscious as though they had not been, or had never lived—they are not therefore *waiting*, are not conscious of the passing of time ; thousands of years are *exactly the same* to them, as one moment. The death state, the sleep in Christ, of the righteous is alike,—exactly the same to all—"but for a *moment*." No matter how long or how short a time they lie asleep in the grave : in *all cases* the VERY NEXT MOMENT after they cease to live, they "hear the voice of the Son of God : and they that hear shall live." John 5 : 25-29. Then, a meeting and greeting of all the righteous—relatives and friends of this life, and all who have lived in all ages ; all the "innumerable multitude of all nations, and kindreds, and people and tongues," Rev. 7 : 9, who "died in faith *not having received the promises*, (yet,) but having seen them afar off ;" but who, "having obtained a good report through faith, *received not the promise* : God having provided some better thing for us, (viz :) that they without us should not be made perfect." That is, God has provided in his plan, that all those who had died in faith in all ages, should not receive the promised reward of perfection—immortality of nature and eternal life—when they died, but that it should be received by all at the same time ; "at the resurrection of the Just," at the coming of Christ. All, both the living and dead saints, are then to get their reward together—"be made perfect" in *nature*—get the "Divine nature" and eternal life, and the kingdom. Oh glorious thought ! Oh glorious truth ! Oh glorious promises : Heb. 11 : 12, 13, 39, 40.

BAPTISM.

"In a Periodical entitled the "Nineteenth Century, Dean Stantly, called "the Queen's preacher," (but who is now dead) wrote as follows : "The *change* from immersion to sprinkling has *set aside* the larger part of Apostolic language regarding Baptism, and has altered the very meaning of the word. The reason of the change is obvious. The practice of immersion—

apostolic and primitive as it was,—was peculiarly suitable to the Southern and Eastern countries for which it was designed, and peculiarly unsuitable to the tastes, the convenience, and the feelings of the countries of the North and West. There is no one who would now wish to go back to the old practice. (!) It had *no doubt* the *sanction* of the *apostles, and of their Master*. It had the sanction of the venerable churches of the early ages, and of the sacred countries of the East. But, speaking generally, the *Christian* civilized world has *decided against it*. (!) It is a striking example of the *triumph* of common sense and convenience over the bondage of form and custom." !

Is it possible for any person who is a true child of God, who accepts the Bible as the revealed will and word of God, and therefore our only authority and rule of faith and practice, to do otherwise than to stand aghast at the wicked audacity and effrontery of such language? And yet it is the language of one who has been called the most learned theologian of the Church of England—the ecclesiastical *head*, of the *Protestant* Church throughout the world !

An able writer and author, W. Jones, in speaking of the "Dean" and commenting on his language above quoted, says: "But he ought to know that to '*change*' and '*decide against*' what Christ has ordained, and to '*set aside* the larger part of Apostolic language regarding it,' are things that pertain to the *Anti-Christian*, and not to '*the Christian world*.'" Contrast what the holy prophets have said with what this modern "Dean" says about such changing. Dan. 7 : 25 ; Isa. 24 : 5. The Episcopalian "Dean" is candid enough to admit and confess that immersion is the "*apostolic and primitive*" way, but his effort to justify "*the change*" on the grounds of "*common sense and convenience*," etc., is a piece of impious effrontery, and a "*striking example*" of "*wickedness in high places*." Eph. 6 : 12. I use this pointed language because truth requires it, and because I am trying to *save* people, not to flatter them." *Gospel of the kingdom*, p. 177. Another able writer on the same subject, A. B. Magruder, says: "Every Greek scholar knows, and every careful and candid reader of the Common Version of the Bible may know, that there can be but one mode of performing such an action. Indeed the long controversy as to this particular phase of the subject—the mode—seems to have received lately its effectual *quietus* by the hand of so eminent a scholar and so prominent a leader in the orthodox eccle-

siastical world as the late Dean Stanley, Dean of Westminster, Chaplain to Queen Victoria, and the most learned theologian of the Church of England—the ecclesiastical head, it may be said, of the Protestant Church throughout the world. His memory is revered by the Anglican and American Church in which communion he ranked as the *most eminent in learning and authority*. Here is what he said: Then, after quoting the same as above, he adds: "See article in the "*Nineteenth Century*," of Oct. 1879. Comment is unnecessary on so audacious an usurpation of divine authority."

Here we have a shameless departure from "the word of the Lord" on one important point of doctrine. It is a clear indication of the almost universal apostacy of these days, on nearly every point of Bible doctrine—a most deplorable state of things.

Strictly in consonance with the above, we are told, by Father Carroll, a Catholic Priest of England—a professedly *Christian Minister*—that "the bible as a sole rule, is both theoretically *wrong*, and a *glaring failure*" !

This, it will be observed, refers to the *whole* Bible. This is the prevailing sentiment of what is called the "*Mother Church*." Is not this the great *apostate mother*, called "the woman, drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus?" Is she not called "the mother of *harlots*?" (Rev. 17 : 5.) Who, then, are the *harlots*?" Does not the great apostacy of these days, include both the mother and her *daughters*? Who then are the daughters? Who is the *oldest* daughter? Was not the Dean of Westminster, the most learned theologian of the Church of England, whose writings we quote above, the representative of the oldest daughter? Are not his sentiments above quoted, in reference to baptism, likely to be the prevailing sentiments of the Church he represented—the Church of England,—and also, of nearly the entire Protestant Church? Has he not been called "the ecclesiastical head of the Protestant Church throughout the world?" Is this not evidence that all the daughters partake, either consciously or unconsciously, more or less of the same spirit of apostacy that characterizes the Mother? Have not even those who still adhere to the mere *mode* of baptism, ignored its sacred importance in other respects, and departed from the word of God in many other of its plain teachings?

I say *unconsciously*, for it is evident that the daughters are unconsciously, and by a slow and gradual process, drinking in

and becoming intoxicated with the same spirit of Apostacy and anti-Christ by which the old mother has become "drunken" and fitted for destruction when the Master comes. Thousands of naturally good well-meaning people belong to the popular Denominations, who, having never carefully and thoroughly examined for themselves, and *thought* over the matter, are therefore quite unconscious of the seductive and *contradictory* character of their own church creed. Their Teachers also, stand up and unconsciously contradict themselves, on various points.

To illustrate : they teach that all persons have an "immortal soul" in them, which can never die—can never cease to live ; that the soul is the real man or person ; that at death, the soul, the man, goes directly to hell, if wicked, to be tormented—to suffer misery indescribable, forever. But if righteous, then the soul, the real man, goes directly to heaven, to receive his reward—eternal life, and endless happiness. Then, before they get through they dwell on the importance of the resurrection, the goodness of God, and his great love in giving his Son to die for the world, to bring man back from death and the grave, to be rewarded according to their deeds ; thus saving man from the eternal darkness, gloom, despair, and death in the grave ! Yet the man, the immortal soul, was never in the grave ! The *man* is to be rewarded with eternal *life* if righteous say they, yet he, the man, the immortal soul, cannot die, but *must* of necessity live forever, either in heaven or hell. The man is to be raised from the dead, yet he, the real man, is not dead, only the body is dead. Hence the man will never have a resurrection, only his old body.

Such is the popular teaching, and yet, all, or nearly all, sit and hear it and swallow it down, apparently just as unconscious of its foolish and contradictory character, as the popular preacher who utters it ; thus contradicting not only himself, but contradicting also, the plain and sacred word of God ; and illustrating Christ's words, "blind leaders of the blind." The Bible always speaks of "the resurrection of the *dead*," never of the resurrection of the *body* only. Paul says "what advantage it me if the dead rise not?" But if the soul is the man and goes right to heaven at death, evermore to be happy ; would that not be a *great* "advantage," even if the old *body* were never raised?

Not only has the popular teaching of these days "set aside,"

and departed from the word, as to baptism, the resurrection, the soul, or nature of man, and the kingdom of God; and substituted contradictory thinkings of the fleshly mind; but such is the case with regard to nearly every point of Bible doctrine!

Our Saviour's last command to his disciples, and which command constituted them Apostles—sent or deputed ones—was, "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, *baptizing* them into the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, &c. Accordingly we find, as proof of their implicit confidence, and strict obedience, a record of no less than nine cases of baptism—immersion—in the "Acts of the Apostles," performed by them. In all these cases, the persons baptized, (and on one occasion there were 3000 of them,) were adults who had previously believed in the Lord Jesus Christ, by hearing and believing his gospel. Christ said "go *teach*," &c. So in all these cases, they were first taught, and when they believed, and made open profession of their faith, and confession of their sins, the Apostles then immersed them into the one name and one body. But they never baptized *infants*, nor any person incapable of understanding and believing the gospel; for baptism is the first act of obedience to the faith. Nor did they baptize until after the person had believed. First, the faith, then immersion—the *obedience* to the faith. This is the appointed order. Hence infants not being capable of understanding and believing the gospel, cannot *obey* the gospel. Hence either sprinkling or immersion of an infant would not be Christian baptism, for *Christian* baptism is the immersion of a person who **BELEIVES** in *Christ*. The person having become enlightened, convinced, changed in mind and heart, or affections, converted, or turned round, or "*dead* to sin;" is then *buried* with Christ by baptism," that like as Christ was raised up from the dead, to have a new body and life, so the believer by baptism "puts off the body of the sins of the flesh"—his old or former sinful character—and rises from the watery grave, with a *new* character to "walk in newness of life." Rom. 6 : 3-13. Or in other words, having been "*begotten* by the word of truth," the gospel," (James 1 : 18 ; Col. 1 : 5 ; Eph. 1 : 13 ;) he is "*quicken*ed" by baptism, (Col. 2 : 13 ; Eph. 2 : 1, 5, 6 ;) raised up, "alive unto God"—"*born* of water"—*as* those (or *like* unto those) that are alive from the dead" Rom. 6 : 11-13. Thus, baptism is a "*likeness* of Christ's death and resurrection;" verse 5 : and an open profession and evidence of the person's faith in the death, burial,

and resurrection of Christ, and his own future resurrection unto eternal life. It is also God's own appointed means "for the remission of past sins"—the "putting off the body of sins," or sinful character; Col. 2 : 11; and for the induction of the believer into the one body and name—putting on Christ—his character. Faith without baptism and other acts of obedience—good works—is dead, not "perfected;" James 2 : 20-22; but "faith which *worketh by love*" is perfect faith.

It will therefore be seen, that according to this, baptism is a most important institution, a most important COMMAND. Those who speak glibly and lightly of this important ordinance, and flippantly talk about its not being a "*saving* ordinance" although admitting as some do, that it is a duty, and "sinful to neglect it" &c. are very much in the dark. Why, *all* God's commands—all Christ's commands—are *saving*; obedience to which constitutes the *condition* of Salvation; beginning with *faith*; for Christ said, "This is the *work* of God, that ye *believe* on him whom he hath sent;" (John 6 : 29;) "and that *believing* ye might have life through his name." John 20 ; 31. But as before said this believing *must* show itself by *obedience* to ALL the commands of God through Christ. To profess to be a believer expecting to be saved by Christ, and yet live in open disobedience of his most important commands, is to be terribly and fatally deluded.

Again; baptism is called "that *form* of doctrine;" in the same chapter, Rom. 6 : 17, Paul says, "But God be thanked, that ye *were* the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that FORM of doctrine which was delivered unto you: being *then* made *free from sin*," &c., that is, they had been baptized *for the remission of sins*. Mark 1 : 4, 5; Acts 2 : 38; and 10 : 43-48; and 22 : 16; Titus 3 : 5; Eph. 5, 26. There is also *the FORM of sound words*," (2. Tim. 1 : 15,) by which to express the doctrine, or the faith—the things necessary to be believed previous to baptism. Both these forms—the form of sound words, and the form of obedience to them must be held fast, strictly adhered to. The form of sound words consists of things concerning the Kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ:" "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Hence, we are informed, Acts 8 : 12, that "when they believed Philip preaching "the things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were *baptized*, both men and women." Hear the celebrated John Wesley, the founder of Methodism

“By baptism, we, who were the children of wrath, are made the children of God. (But his followers say, ‘not a saving ordinance’!) And this *regeneration*, which our church in so many places ascribes to baptism, is more than barely being admitted unto the church though commonly connected therewith. Being grafted into the body of Christ’s church, we are made the children of God by adoption and grace. By water, as the means, the water of baptism, we are regenerated, or born again; (he should have said “born of water,” which is simply the completing act of the *begetting* by the spirit of truth—the gospel. The being *born* of the *spirit*, or the spirit *birth* comes at the resurrection, when the previously *begotten* children of God, will be “born from the dead” when their flesh and blood nature is changed to a *spirit* nature. “That which is born of the spirit, is SPIRIT”—no longer flesh but spirit, the “Divine nature;”) whence it is called by the Apostles, the washing of regeneration. In all ages, the outward baptism is a means of the inward. Herein we receive a title to, and an earnest of, a KINGDOM which cannot be moved. * * There is *no other means* of entering into the church, or into heaven.” That is, the Kingdom of heaven, “under the whole heaven” he should have added. Again; in speaking of “We are *buried* with him by baptism;” Rom. 6; 4; Wesley further says; alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by *immersion*.” “This passage cannot be understood unless it be borne in mind that the primitive baptism was by *immersion*,”—CONYBEARE and HOWSON. “*This* immersion being religiously observed by *all* Christians for *thirteen* centuries, * * it were to be wished that this custom might be again of General use.”—WHITBY.

BAPTISM INTO THE NAME.

Of late much has been published both in tract form and in periodicals, about the “Formula” of baptism; baptism into the three names, baptism into the name of Christ only, “trine-immersion,” etc. There appears to me to be a lack of light, and a misapprehension of the mind of the Spirit, as well as of the *words* of Christ and the apostles on these subjects, to some extent, even among some of the “ecclesias.”

As there is “*one* God and Father of all,” “*one* Lord,” “*one* Spirit,” “*one* faith,” “*one* hope,” “*one*, or not another gospel,” “*one* body,” “*one* baptism,” so there is *one* name—“*the* name.” “Neither is there salvation IN any other: for there is *none other*”

name under heaven *given* among men whereby we must be saved." Acts 4 : 12. This one name is "above every name" and was "given" to Christ, that at the name of JESUS every knee should bow." Phil. 2 : 9 "He hath by *inheritance* obtained a more excellent name than the angels"—the name of his "*Father—GOD,*" "being an exact impress of his Father's *substance.*" "Heb. 2 : 1-5. (Dia.) The Spirit also bears the same *one* name—"GOD'S Spirit" "Spirit of GOD." "*God* is a SPIRIT." John 4 : 24. God, Jesus, and Spirit are ONE in substance and name. Hence it is unscriptural and improper, so to talk of *three* names—the *names* of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Christ did not *say* baptizing them into the *names*, but "baptizing them into THE NAME." Therefore to be baptized "into (*eis*) the name of the Lord Jesus," as in Acts 8 : 16 ; 19 : 5, was, and still is, exactly the same as to be baptized into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. It was into the same *one* name.

It is evident that the writer of Acts, in his account of the baptisms by Philip in Samaria, Acts 8 : 16, did not consider it necessary to mention what Christ had stated once for all in the commission, Mat. 28 : 19, that the name of the anointed Jesus was the same one name of his Father and of the Holy Spirit. Neither did any of the apostles consider it necessary, and for reasons which will hereafter appear. But in Acts 10 : 48, we are informed that Peter "commanded them in (*en*, that is, *by the authority of*) the name of the Lord, to be baptized ;" but, in that place, he did not even say *into* any name : although it was doubtless understood by those to whom he spoke, that he, by the authority of the Lord, commanded them to be baptized into the ONE NAME, as Christ had told them to do : for Peter had previously said, as in chapter 2 : 38, "Be baptized every one of you in (*epi*, that is, *for, or with a view to*) the name of Jesus Christ." This one name signifies more than can be comprehended and expressed by any word in the human language. It includes all the eternal Spirit substance and attributes of the Supreme Being. It is called "this glorious and fearful name, THE LORD THY GOD," Deut. 38 : 58 ; (although not a correct rendering as will hereafter appear.) All the members of the "one body," like Paul, "bear" that one name. Acts 9 : 15. Having been taken out of the Gentiles "*for* his name," by the preaching of the one gospel, and the name having been called, or placed, or named upon them at baptism, by being

“baptized into the name,” (see Acts 15 : 14-17, Greek text, Diaglott; Acts 1 : 5; 2 Chron. 7 : 14 margin; Gen. 4 : 26, margin; Num. 6 : 27,) they have thus put on Christ, Gal. 3 : 27, or become constituents of his “body,” members of that “whole family in heaven and earth, Eph. 3 : 14, to whom the following language may be applied, namely, “that they might be unto me for a *people*(peculiar people,” 1 Peter 2, 9) and FOR A NAME, and for a praise and for a glory.” Jer. 13, 11.

But as to a “*formula*” of words for baptisms, there is no such thing given or taught in the Scriptures. There is a “form of *doctrine*,” Rom. 6 : 17, and a “form of *sound words*” by which to express the doctrine, 2 Tim. 1 : 13, and also a “form of godliness,” chap. 3. 5, but no such thing as a formula of induction into the one name. Our Saviour, in sending forth his disciples—his chosen ones—to save the people, and giving them their orders or commission, as recorded by Matt. 28 : 19, and Mark 16 : 16, simply commanded them to “teach or preach to all nations the gospel,” and them who heard and believed, to “baptize into the name (not *names*) being particular to show them by his language, that it was the one name of the *Father*, and of the *Son*, and of the *Holy Spirit*—the *one* and *only* name “given among men whereby we must be *saved*.” He did not tell them what *words* they must make use of to thus induct the believers into the name, nor that it was absolutely necessary to make use of any words. He told them what to do. He instructed them as to what they must teach and preach, and then what they were to *do* to them that believed. His instructions relative to baptism were as to the *act* and not as to any “formula” of words in the performance of the act. He told them that those to whom they preached, must believe and be baptized, in order to be *saved*. He told them that the thing to be *done*, the *act* to be performed by and for the believer, was *immersion* in water, in “*obedience* to the faith,” Rom. 1 : 5; and 16 : 25, which the apostles understood to be a *burial* “in the *likeness* of his death,” Rom. 4 : 4, 5, which he had suffered and just then risen from; and likewise a representation and pledge of their own resurrection in the future.

As before said, he gave them no instructions, as to what should be SAID either by the one being immersed, or by the immerser, when the act was being performed. Neither have we any thing in the writings of the apostles, requiring any “formula or words of any kind to be made use of. But we are distinctly

taught *faith* in Christ—faith in the gospel—and *confession*, must *precede* immersion, so that baptism may be “*obedience* to the faith. Rom. 1 : 5. No person can possibly obey the faith before he has the faith. Hence to talk about being “baptized into the faith,” as some both talk and write, is to talk without a proper understanding of the matter. Baptism is clearly a representation of Christ’s death, burial and resurrection, but not the act of his dying. Hence, to talk about immersing with the face downward or forward, because it is said of Jesus in the act of dying, “he bowed his head and gave up the ghost,” looks to us as betraying a lack of attention to the Word, and a consequent misapprehension of the fact that baptism does not represent Christ until he was dead—until *after* he had bowed his head and died. And so we think, the whole of “trine immersion” can be clearly shown to be destitute of Scriptural foundation.

When the “one body” of name-bearers, which are now being “taken out of the Gentiles for the name,” shall have been completed—shall have arrived “unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ,” Eph. 4. 13, then the ONE NAME, as applied to the full complement of divine joint rulers with Christ in his kingdom will also be complete.

A name is intended to be significant of the nature and constitution of the thing named, including every feature of its entire make up, and the object for which it is made or the work it is to accomplish. To illustrate: The name “Threshing Machine” at once suggests to the mind all this, the materials of which it is constructed its form and make up as a whole, the work it is to do, etc. So although no word can fully express it, yet the name of the Deity the name which is above every name embraces everything attributable to him. It is significant of his uncreated, self-existent spirit nature, and all his infinite, immaculate attributes. It includes everything attributable to the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. He has the power to cause himself, that is, his spirit substance nature, and attributes to be manifested and developed in many future beings, as in Jesus anointed; one in many and many in one; hence his name as rendered in our version, Jehovah, or more correctly as in the Hebrew, *Yahweh* and *Yahweh Elohim*, indicated and memorialized, his future manifestation in a multitude, or “one body,” of which Christ is the “beginning” and “head, which one body will comprise the “first fruits” (James 1 : 18 ; Rev. 4.) of a numberless multitude (Rev. 7. 9) a “new creation.” Rev. 3. 14.

According to the best Hebrew scholars the name "Jehovah," or more properly *Ehyeh*, or *Yahweh*, (Ex. 6: 3,) which was made known to Moses at the burning bush, and rendered in our version "I AM," and "I AM THAT I AM," (Ex. 3 : 14, 15), should be rendered, "I will be," and, "I will be who I will be," and *Yahweh*, as a noun of the third person, future tense, signifies "He who will be," of which name God said, "This is my name forever, and this is my MEMORIAL unto all generations." Ex. 3 : 15. This memorial name, reminds his people that he will be manifested in a multitude, a multitudinous manifestation of the one Deity, that his name shall become a great people in whom his own divine nature shall be manifested, who shall be in name, character and motive, the Elohim, the one *Yahweh*, in spirit manifestation—*Yahweh Elohim*—that his children, his family, shall possess his nature, signified by his name. This multitude body will be essentially one, because one in natural attributes and character. The one name of this body being significant of the spirit nature and character of all its members—the nature of "the Father, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named." Eph. 3 : 14, 15. As before said, the name means the nature. Christ now has that divine or spirit nature. When they are baptized into Christ, they become name-bearers mentally and morally and will ultimately be so physically. As a son takes the name of his father, and upon the principle of "like begets like," also the same nature, organically, and generally to a certain extent, his character too, so Christ said, "I am come in my Father's name." He and the Father are one. Not one person, but, in the words of Moses ; "one YAHWEH" —one spirit substance, one in character, purpose—name. He is the first and chief *Eloah* of the Elohim body or name. "Jesus,—Heb. *Yahva-Shua*, i. e., *Yah-Shua* or Joshua : *Yah* or *Jah*, I shall be ; and *SHUA*, Powerful—hence the name signifies, "I shall be the Powerful." "Thou shalt call his name JESUS," for this reason : "Because HE will save his PEOPLE from their sins." Dia. Matt. 1 : 21.

This NAME of Deity is now being taken out or made up of individuals out of "all nations, and kindreds, and peoples, and tongues," by the one faith in the one gospel, in order to constitute a "seed of Abraham," who become one constitutionally, by being baptized into the name. This name though essentially one, will comprise a numberless multitude. This one in many,

or multitudinous name, is the great name by which the world is to be ruled and saved in the age to come. It is to be the great Yahweh Elohistic name of the future ; in " that day when there shall be one Lord, and his name one " No person can be made a partaker of the divine nature and eternal life, who does not, by the appointed means—faith and obedience in and to the gospel—become a constituent of this one sin-covering and saving name. The heavenly Father of the divine family, has appointed that the very first step of obedience—baptism—shall introduce the believer into the name ; in that act his sins shall be remitted, he become a begotten son, and the name be placed or named upon him ; by that act he shall become an element of the great saving name, in mind and character : ultimately to become so in nature upon condition of " patient continuance in well doing, thus seeking for glory and honor and immortality." Rom. 2 : 7.

I have said that neither our Savior nor the apostles commanded the observance or use of any formula of words in performing the act of baptism ; that Christ simply taught, once for all, and the apostles doubtless understood, that the great saving name into which the believers were to be baptized, is the one name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit ; and therefore, that baptism into Christ is baptism into the name, because he is the name—the " beginning," the " Head."

This understanding on their part, accounts for the absence of anything further on the subject in their record, and for the various ways of expressing even what they did say.

We have a similar expression in these words, viz :—"I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." This does not mean *three* Gods, but *one* God. So, "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit," does not mean *three* names but *one* name. The mistake consists in not understanding *the Name* ; and therefore supposing that a person *could not* be baptized into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, without the use of those words as a formula. But it is the *act*—the thing to be *done*—that introduces or inducts the believer into the name, and not the *words said*.

However I don't see any objection to the use of the words of our Saviour, Matt. 28 : 19, in performing the act of baptism. Indeed I think it best to use them, and that uniformity be thus preserved. But the main thing is the proper understanding of

the name, and the entire subject, by both the immersed and the immerser, especially the former. It should be borne in mind that the apostles must have done just what Christ told them to do; that was, to baptize into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. But it does not appear that they used that form of words ever since, in doing so. Hence the irresistible conclusion that it is not positively necessary to do so, that Christ did not tell them to use those words in performing the act, and that baptism "into the name of the Lord Jesus" is the very same thing, and all he told them to do. The Lord Jesus being the manifestation of the Father by his Spirit, as signified by the memorial NAME, sufficiently illustrates the whole subject. But to use the words of Christ, "into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit," would seem to keep in view the supremacy of the Father as Christ always did, ("The Son can do nothing of himself," John 5 : 19 ;) and at the same time preserve uniformity.

REPENTANCE.

Repentance comes from the Greek *metanoia*, which signifies *change of mind*. But it includes the native result of such change—reform—turning around and abandonment of the old and wicked course, and the doing of "works meet for repentance." It begins with enlightenment, change of mind or conviction, faith, and a "godly sorrow that *worketh* repentance." Even a Godly *sorrow* is not repentance until it produces *reform*, until it produces works or "fruit meet for repentance, answerable to amendment of life." (Mat. 3 : 8, margin.) It is not the *fear* of "endless misery," or even of the "second death" or of any kind of threatening penalties, that causes or leads a person to repent—to change his mind and reform. For Paul says, that "the *goodness* of God leadeth thee to repentance." In his letter to the "beloved of God in Rome, chap. 2 : 4, in speaking of a very wicked class of men, he says; "Or despisest thou the *riches* of his *goodness*, and forbearance, and long suffering; not knowing that the *goodness* of God leadeth thee to repentance."

First, the person is taught, his mind enlightened as to his own lost condition, and as to the great salvation that God has provided, how God "so *loved* the world that he gave his only begotten son, that whosoever *believeth* in him should not perish but have everlasting life;" and how that son was "obedient

unto death," laying down his life for the world, to procure redemption and salvation for all who would accept it by faith, repentance and obedience. unto whom immortality, eternal life, and honor and a kingdom are to be *given freely*. This enlightenment leads to change of mind, or conviction, conviction to faith, and faith leads to a godly sorrow that "worketh repentance to *salvation*" through obedience. Hence Paul says in his second letter to "the church of God at Corinth," chap. 7 : 9, 10 ; " Now I rejoice not that ye were made sorry, but that ye sorrowed to *repentance*: for ye were made sorry after a godly manner, that ye might receive damage by us in nothing. For godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation not to be repented of: but the sorrow of the world worketh death." " God now commandeth all men everywhere to repent," Acts 17 : 30, and according to his revealed plan, he never *forgives* a person's sins until he repents—until he "repent and turn to God and do works meet for repentance." Acts 26 : 20, and 3 : 19. Mat. 3 : 9. Luke 13 : 3. Although he requires his children to love their enemies (Mat. 5 : 44) yet he does not require them to *forgive* their *brethren*, in Christ, until they *repent*. That is, if a brother wrong his brother—sin against him—just as soon as he repents, of which of course he must give evidence by proper works or amends, he is then entitled to forgiveness. And if the injured person do not forgive, then will our Heavenly Father not forgive him. Not only must he forgive once, but any number of times. Hence, Christ said to his disciples, "Take heed to yourselves: if thy brother trespass against thee, rebuke him; and *if he repent* forgive him: and if he trespass against thee seven times in a day, and seven times in a day *TURN again* to thee, saying, I repent; thou shalt forgive him." Luke 17 : 3, 4. Again, when asked by Peter, "Lord how oft shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? Till seven times? Jesus saith unto him, I say not unto thee, until seven times: but until seventy times seven." "So likewise shall my Heavenly Father do also unto you, if ye *from your hearts* forgive not everyone his *brother* their trespasses." Mat. 18 : 21, 22, 35. It will be observed from the foregoing view of repentance, that, as the result of enlightenment, in which the *goodness* of God is seen to be the most prominent feature, by the person thus enlightened; conviction or change of mind, faith, godly sorrow, and repentance, take place in quick succession, all becoming existent in the mind at once, and immediately followed by

reform—works meet for repentance—the abandonment of and hating the things once loved, and loving the things he once hated. Then the first step of obedience—baptism for remission of sins, induction into the one body, one name, one family—the household of God.” Eph. 3 : 14, and 2 : 12, 19, 22. Then the observance of *all* things whatsoever Christ and the Apostles have commanded—the patient continuance in well doing, seeking for glory, honor, immortality, eternal life, thus seeking “first the kingdom of God and his righteousness.” Mat. 6 : 33.

CHRISTIANITY AND MORALITY.

There are thousands who mistake morality for Christianity ; who do not understand the difference. This mistake is a *fatal* one. Christianity is *faith* in Christ and *obedience* to his commands through *love*. It consists in being good and doing right because of faith in and love to Christ. Morality consists in being good and doing right *without faith*: because of a good natural disposition, and because of having been so brought up, and taught that morality is necessary, in order to be a good citizen, to be respected, to be successful in business, to be influential, to be popular, and because it is right. A person may be all that, and at the same time, not take the least interest in Christ or his teachings ; and even *reject* not only Christ and his teachings, but the entire Bible as being of Divine origin. Morality aims to do what is popularly understood to be right—what the moral man *himself thinks* is right. But Christianity consists in a greater range of right, that is, Christianity consists in obeying not only all the *moral* principles and precepts of right, but also, all the commands of God through Christ and his Apostles, both moral and *positive* precepts ; such as “ baptism,” “ the Lord’s supper,” “ the assembling of ourselves together” to “ offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually,” &c., &c., and all as the result of “ *faith which worketh by love.*” Christianity is therefore always a heart-work, while morality, although consisting of doing what is moral and right, may be only external, the heart refusing to believe and obey God’s *revealed* will, and law. Christianity is obedience to God’s will through love. Morality is obedience to one’s own will, *not* through love to God, but from some other motive. A moral man is perhaps a good, kind, affectionate husband and father, and considered a respectable, worthy, useful citizen. A Christian is all that, and also a child of God through faith. A moral man thinks if he

is good, and honest in his deal, kind and charitable to the poor and needy, he will come out all right, escape the punishment of the wicked, and be saved; even if he does "*neglect so great a Salvation.*" But the Christian does not neglect those good works, nor the great Salvation neither. But he "shows his faith by his works;" James 2 : 18; knowing also, that "without *faith* it is IMPOSSIBLE to please God."

RIGHT.

Right is the *will* of God. The highest law. The law of all real Science and all true Philosophy. The opposite and cure of all wrong: the regulator of all irregularities. It is the law of the Divine mind, having its reflex in the mind of man made in the image of God. It is therefore the law of moral *sanity*, and wrong; the law of insanity. No person can be truly sane, who does not really *love* THE RIGHT and who fails to see and realize, that to do right, is man's highest and most sacred duty, and for *his own* best interests. No person can be truly sane, who disregards right, and follows after baubles and trifles, and the gratification of his own vanity and fleshly enjoyments, thinking it right to do so. No person can be truly sane, who follows after such things, and after money or wealth, and worldly honor, to the neglect of his highest and all important interests. That is to say, such a person must be *non compos mentis* to some extent. His mind must be badly warped, crooked, out of level, terribly unbalanced. If that great philosopher, instead of saying "whatever is is right," had said "whatever is right, is right," he would have spoken in harmony with the word of God; as I have amply illustrated in the preceding pages of this book. Right, is right, independent of any person's think-so. The ultimatum of all God's promises, and purpose, will be the *universal triumph* of RIGHT. Again; another characteristic and indication of moral insanity is this. We see thousands who flippantly express themselves against the Bible; answering those, who, having thoroughly examined, and who therefore believe it to be the word of God—of divine origin—and have therefore great reverence for it, with silly quibbling and sneers. Yet, when questioned they are compelled to admit that they have never carefully and thoroughly investigated the grounds of its divine authenticity—that they have never even read, or heard read, the whole of it perhaps!!! Is this *right*? Is such a course a *sane* one? The book itself, contains a very sound and

wise reproof to such people, viz: "He that answereth a matter *before he heareth it*, it is a *folly* and a *shame* unto him." Prov. 18: 13. Is it sound, is it wise, is it safe, to decide so momentous a question without a thorough personal examination? A person should always be true to the convictions of his *own* mind AFTER *mature thorough investigation*; especially as to questions of so grave and momentous importance. It is very unwise for a person to allow himself to be guided as to such an important question, by the opinion or think-so of any other man—especially such men as Payne, Darwin, Bradlaugh, Ingersoll and the like. It is possible that a thorough investigation might result in discovering evidence, if not amounting to positive proof, yet more in favor than against its divine origin; as has been the case with thousands—with the most—of the greatest and best minds. If so, what could possibly be more unwise and foolish if not insane, than to reject it; when to accept it, and carry out its teachings, in every day life, as the RIGHT, is the SAFE course, if such there be?

DOCTRINE.

Doctrine comes from the Greek *didaskalia* and means, *teaching*, (the substance.) It has come to be a very common thing now a-days, to say, "Oh I don't want to hear anything about *doctrine*, I believe in good *practical* discourses, this doctrinal preaching is of no good," &c., &c. Such people do not really understand the subject about which they speak. They do not understand what "doctrine" is, which they so readily and flippantly repudiate. They have never examined what God thinks and says in his word about doctrine. It matters not what any person *thinks*, or how any person *feels* about it, especially one who has never carefully and thoroughly examined God's word as to that point or any other. That is a question about which no person can possibly know anything or form any correct opinion, independent of what God himself *says* in his word, by Christ and the Apostles. This person may have his *think-so* and that person. But it is all of no avail. "To the law and the testimony: if they speak not according to *this word*, it is because there is *no light* in them." Our Saviour says, "*in vain* do they worship me teaching for *doctrines* the commandments of men." Thousands are doing that very thing, because they don't understand what Christ's doctrine is, but they understand "the commandments of men." It is said that

when Jesus had ended his sayings, the people were *astonished* his *doctrine*." So it seems, that *doctrine*, consists in "the SAYINGS of JESUS"!!! How now about doctrine being of use, or not agreeable? And we are further told that Jesus "on the Sabbath day entered into the synagogue and *taught*; and they were *astonished* at his *doctrine*." So even in these days there are thousands, right in so-called Christian communities who, having never examined, and having heard little else except the traditions and commandments of men, are also perfectly astonished at the *doctrine* of Christ, as found in his own sayings and teachings and those of the Apostles. Paul says "Take heed unto thyself, and unto the *doctrine*; continue in them: (in *these things*—New version;) for in doing this thou shalt both SAVE thyself, and them that hear thee." 1 Tim. 4 : 16. The doctrine is therefore necessary to *salvation*! Again; we are told that if any man "consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the *doctrine*" &c.. "he is proud, *knowing nothing*," &c. 1 Tim. 6 : 3. Again; Paul says to Titus, whom he calls "mine *own son* after the common faith," as follows: "But speak thou the things which become *sound doctrine*." And again; "Holding fast the faithful word, as he hath been taught, (that is "the *word* of the kingdom"—the *gospel*) that he may be able by *sound doctrine*, both to exhort and convince the gainsayers." Titus 1 : 9, and 2 : 1. Christ said "my *doctrine* is not mine but his that sent me. If any man will do *his* will, he shall *know* of the *doctrine*, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself." John 7 : 16, 17. Again, John says, "Whosoever transgresseth and abideth not in the *doctrine* of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the *doctrine* of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son. If there come any unto you, and bring not this *doctrine*, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed." 2 John, 9 : 10. The *doctrine* of Christ is therefore of the utmost importance. Paul says to the "beloved of God in Rome," "Now I beseech you brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the *doctrine* which ye have *learned*; and avoid them." Rom. 16 : 17. The doctrine has to be studied and "*learned*," and those who learn it, are called "the taught of God"—disciples. We are informed, Acts 2 : 41, 42, as follows: "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day were added unto them about *three thousand* souls. And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' *doctrine* and fellowship, and in break-

ing of bread, and in prayers." I think it would be difficult to find 3000 *now*, in any one place, "who continue steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine," &c. There has been a "falling away," a "departure from the faith," a great *apostacy*. Paul said, "the time will come when they will not endure *sound* DOCTRINE; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto *fables*." That time has arrived! The ears of the people now-a-days "*itch*" to hear something besides *doctrine*—the doctrine of Christ and the apostles. Their ears itch to hear a pleasing, flowery Pastor, who can entertain them in good style, with good grace, who will let *doctrine* alone. Oh horrid! Doctrine! Oh no! Pleasing stories—"fables" are much more palatable to thousands! To such people, this Book, with one-half its pages headed with BIBLE DOCTRINE, will no doubt be offensive—so much so, that it will be condemned and laid aside without ever being read. Such people will never carefully read and compare it with the Scriptures, with which it abounds, and is so amply backed on nearly every page, and at nearly every point. "The word of the Lord," commands very little respect, and carries very little weight with thousands, unless that word be *changed* from its literal real meaning, to some other mystical, figurative, or as they call it, "spiritual" sense—from what it *says* to some other sense.

THE NEW BIRTH.

Popular theological teachers, talk about the new birth, in a very improper and incorrect way, in consequence of not understanding the subject. Those who are educated, even, and who ought therefore to know better; make use of the words "born of God," as though they could be found on nearly every page in the New Testament, or at least, in many places, applied to persons in this state of existence, or before death. But they ought to know that instead of such being the case, those words, "born of God," correctly rendered from the Greek, do not *even once occur* in the scriptures; much less are they applied to persons before death. The scriptures nowhere teach that a person is ever "born again," (more correctly rendered "born from above") in this life; or until the resurrection. The scriptures distinctly teach that persons can be "*begotten* again," in this life, but not *born*. Dr. Adam Clarke, in his comments on 1 John 2 :

29, which, in our common version reads, "ye know that every one that doeth righteousness is *born* of him," says; in speaking of this term (or as he calls it *title*) "*born* of him"—born of God—among other similar terms, as follows: "I have given a copious extract (from Dr. Taylor) in my preface to the Epistle to the Romans, from the conviction that the subject had been most dangerously misapprehended: and that several of the *worst heresies which disgrace religion*, had sprung from this misapprehension. * * Those who have *too little grace, sense, and candor, to search for themselves*, may be pleased that Dr. MacKnight saves them the trouble. After having remarked that the words "*born of him*" should be translated "*hath been BEGOTTEN of him*," which is the literal signification of the word, *genero, gigno, I beget*, (BORN of God, being *nowhere found in the Scripture*) he (Dr. MacKnight) goes on to say," &c. This correction of our common version, as to the term born of God, has been made in the new versions for many, many years. The term "born of God" occurs in the rendering of our common version, as many as four or five times in 1 John, and all are corrected, even in the last new, or Revised Version. But although these corrections have been made for so many years, as before said, yet thousands seem to be unconscious of the fact, and continue to use the term, and talk and teach, and preach about the necessity of being "*born of God*," and "*born again*" now, in this life. It is true that the Scriptures plainly teach the ALL IMPORTANT truth, "except a man be born again (born from above—*margin*,—and *Dia.*—born anew—*Revised Version*) he cannot see the kingdom of God." Or the same truth in other words, viz.: "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God." 1 Cor. 15: 50. Or the same great truth in other words—the words of Jesus to Nicodemus, viz.: "Verily, verily I say unto thee, except a man be born of water and the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born (*has been* born, *Dia.*) of the flesh is FLESH, and that which is born (*has been* born, *Dia.*) of the Spirit is SPIRIT." John 3: 5, 6. We see by these scriptures that before a person can enter or *inherit* the kingdom of God, he must be born anew; that is, his flesh-nature, must be changed to Spirit-nature—he must become a "new creature," in body as well as mind. He must in some way become a *new* being with a *spirit* nature instead of a flesh and blood nature. Then he will be permitted to "*inherit*

the kingdom." That is, he must become an "*heir*" of the kingdom, now, in this life: then, when Christ comes to organize and set up the kingdom, he, together with all the other "*heirs*," will be *entitled* to "*inherit*" it. His *title* will consist in God's *promise*. (pretty safe title,) This tells it: "Hath not God *chosen* the poor of this world rich in faith, and HEIRS of the kingdom which he hath PROMISED to them that love him?" James 2: 5. They have not *got it* in their hearts, even if they do *love* God, and have become "*heirs*," but God has *promised* it, and "confirmed it by an *oath*; that by *two* immutable things, (God's promise and oath,) in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a *strong* consolation—hope." Heb. 6: 17, 18. But how is it that persons become *heirs*—how is it that a person can get the title, so as to be able ultimately to enter or inherit the kingdom? Well, Jesus told Nicodemus it is necessary to be *born* anew—that it is necessary for a flesh-man to be born of *water* and *spirit*. When he gave the Apostles their commission—how to save men by making them disciples, or *heirs*, he said they must "*teach*" them, and after their minds had become enlightened, convinced, believed and repented; they were then to be *baptized*, immersed in *water*—in the likeness of his death. They thus became "*born* of water"; ultimately (if faithful) to be "*born* of spirit." The all-important process for a flesh and blood person to become a Spirit being, as very plainly pointed out in the Scriptures, is this; in few words. The individual must first *hear* the gospel "the things concerning the kingdom and the name of Jesus," (Acts 8: 14, 12, 25,) called "the word of the kingdom," (Mat. 13: 19,) and called "the incorruptible *seed*" "or word;" by which he is *begotten* of the *spirit*, not *born*. 1 Pet. 1: 23-25. Then, if he continue faithful—"observing all things whatsoever Christ hath commanded, "by himself and his Apostles—he is ultimately to be BORN of the *Spirit*, at the resurrection out from among the dead; just as his elder brother, Christ, was; "who is the beginning the first *born* from the dead;" Col. 1: 18; "the first born among many brethren." Rom. 8: 29. It will be the same, both with those who will be dead, and those who will be living, when Jesus comes: all those having been previously *begotten* by the incorruptible seed whether dead or alive, will be raised from a *flesh* nature, ("that which is born of the Spirit, is *Spirit*,") to a *Spirit*—"changed in a moment" from mortal to immortal, from corruptible to incorruptible,

beings. This is the *birth* of the spirit. This is being born from above. This is being born anew. And this the process. Then, unto all such, it will be said by Christ, "come ye blessed of my Father, *inherit* the Kingdom." First the *begettal*, afterward the "quickenings," and, subsequently the *birth*. To talk about being born again, without the begetting is absurd. When the person is thus *begotten* by the reception of the incorruptible seed, that is, when he *hears* and *believes* the gospel; for "faith cometh by *hearing*, and hearing by the word of God"—the gospel, (Rom. 10 : 17,) and by baptism gets remission of sins, becomes *quickened*, (Col. 2 : 12, 13,) and inducted into the one body, name and family—the household of God—he is thus constituted one of the *children* of God—a *begotten* child, or son; (not yet *born*;) "and if a son, then an HEIR of God *through* Christ." Gal. 4 : 7. This is the process by which a person becomes an "*heir*" of the kingdom of God, and ultimately an *inheritor* at *his birth*. There is no other process or way given in the word. The being *born* of water by baptism, being the first act of obedience, is therefore the first evidence of the *begettal*; called the quickening, because it is the first evidence of *life*. It is the completion of the new *mind*, or new man"—new "*inner man*." It is therefore called a being *born* of water because it typifies or represents the future birth from the dead, as well as the rising of Christ from the dead, and because it is the completion or birth of the new *mental* man, as the real birth from the dead will be of the *physical* man and more especially, because the person having become dead to sin, is thus buried in water, and raised therefrom to newness of life—a new person in *mind* and *character*, having buried the old man or character in the watery grave. The being born of the spirit thus includes, being born of *water*, which is an *emblem* of spirit, and as such, quite important and instructive. Water is known and seen to take various forms; according to circumstances; which feature renders it an instructive representative of spirit. Were it not that we are constantly witnessing the fact, before our eyes, we would be almost doubtful about it. We call it water when in its most common form as a liquid: then, when heated, it takes the form we call steam or vapor; thus taking its leave of its kettle and these lower parts, to some higher and unknown region. It is even very difficult to make an iron cage or boiler, strong enough to hold it, under certain circumstances. It becomes a wonderful mammoth *power*.

Under other circumstances, it takes another form we call frost and snow ; then again, a very condensed hard form, we call ice. The same element also enters into and constitutes a large part of the make-up of the entire vegetable and animal kingdoms. So the Spirit is spoken of as in various forms of "manifestation," and administrations." Paul says there are "diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit." "To one is given the spirit of the *word* of wisdom ; to another the word of knowledge by the same spirit." Speaking of various other manifestations, adding, "But all these worketh that *one* and the *selfsame* Spirit." 1 Cor. 12 : 11. Then we have it in the form of the "Spirit of lives." Then Christ says his words are *Spirit*. Then again, it is called "the Spirit of TRUTH which proceedeth from the Father." John 14 : 17 and 15 : 20. Then we have it brought to view in the condensed form of Spirit-substance—the *Nature* of Jehovah, or Yahweh, or the "Divine Nature." "God is a Spirit." John 4 : 24. Christ is now a Being of that nature, and is therefore called a Spirit—"life-giving Spirit ;" 1 Cor. 15 : 45 ; being asbefore shown the first born from the dead with a Spirit-substance-nature—the beginning of the promised multitudinous Name, or *Elohim* : and all in Christ—his brethren—who are ultimately to be born from the dead, with the same incorruptible spirit-nature, will, together with him, their head, constitute the completed Name—the ruling body of kings and priest for the age to come, in the kingdom.

EXTRACTS.

Dr. Watson, the Methodist Commentator, writing on Mark 9 : 43-46, where Gehenna is several times mentioned in connection with the expressions, "their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched," says : "As the worm itself dies not, but destroys that it feeds upon, and as fire unquenched consumes that upon which it kindles, so when temporal judgments are expressed by this phrase ; the *utter destruction* of persons, cities, and nations, appear to be intended."

Again ; he remarks, in his *Institutes*, vol. 2 ; "Some suppose consciousness, is an essential attribute of Spirit ; and the soul is naturally immortal : the former of which cannot be proved, while the latter is *contradicted by the Bible*, which makes our immortality a *gift* dependent on the will of the giver."

Olshanson says : "The Bible knows not either the expression immortality of the soul, or the modern doctrine of

immortality. * * The *doctrine* of the immortality of the soul and the *name* are like unknown in the entire Bible."

Dr. Proudfoot remarks: "That best and brightest of revelations, * * (the Bible) announces not an immortal *soul*, but an immortal *man*," (at the resurrection.)

Martin Luther said; "I permit the Pope to make articles of faith for himself, and his faithful—such as that *the Soul is immortal*, with all those monstrous opinions found in the Roman dung-hill of decretals."

Said *William Tyndale* the translator and martyr; "In putting departed souls in heaven, hell, and purgatory, you destroy the arguments wherewith, Christ and Paul, prove the resurrection. If the souls be in heaven, tell me why they be not in as good case as the angels be? and then what cause is there of the resurrection?" *Dr. Whedon*, Methodist Commentator, says: "WAGES OF SIN—the hire which the master Sin pays to his servants is DEATH. And this *death*, the antithesis of ETERNAL LIFE, and measured in duration by it, is *eternal death*, *death* that knows no resurrection. The reverse, ETERNAL LIFE, the result of the service of Jesus Christ our Lord, is not a WAGES, but a free and bounteous GIFT."

But perhaps the reader, would like to see the contrast between the views of *Dr. Whedon* and *Dr. Benson*, another Methodist Commentator; and so get another view of "the wages of sin," or another kind of everlasting punishment," as follows: "God is present in hell in his infinite justice, and Almighty wrath, as an unfathomable sea of liquid fire, where the wicked must drink in *everlasting torture*.* * He will exert all his divine attributes to make them as wretched as the capacity of their being will admit!"

But read further, the words of one of America's most eminent divines: "Imagine yourselves to be cast into a fiery oven, all of a glowing heat, or into the midst of a glowing brick kiln, or a great furnace; imagine also that your body was to be there a quarter of an hour, full of fire, as full within as a bright coal of fire, all the while full of quick sense, how long would that quarter of an hour seem to you?* * O then, how would your heart sink if you knew you must endure it forever! That after millions of millions of ages your torment would be no nearer an end than when it began! But your torments in hell, will be *immensely greater* than this illustration represents! The woes of sinners in hell will not be a cause of grief to saints in

heaven, but of *rejoicing!* but this rejoicing will be the fruit of an *amiable disposition* and a perfect holiness and conformity to Christ.* * After your godly parents shall have seen you lie in hell millions of ages, in torment day and night, they will not begin to pity you then; they will *praise God* that his justice appears in the eternity of your misery"!!!

Again; one of Europe's most eminent divines, after writing in a similar awful strain, adds; "Again I say, they are no fictions, and as God liveth, but solid, stern truth. If God be true and this Bible be true, what I have said is the truth, and you will find it one day to be so."

Again; they not only write it, but their congregations sing it. Here is a stanza of *Dr. Watts*.

"There is a never-ending hell,
And never dying pains,
Where *children* must with demons dwell,
In darkness, fire and chains."

But although I could give volumes of similar horrible descriptions from the fruitful imagination of those who have been considered able, learned, worthy divines; and as such the leaders of the people as to the teaching of the Scriptures; I forbear by endorsing the decision of the Author of "Man not immortal," in these words; "In the terrible darkness of their ignorance have they spoken. Awful blasphemy it is, and eminently calculated to make men *abhor* the very name of God and religion. The doctrine of inherent immortality is responsible for this blasphemy."

Says the Rev. *J. Panton Ham*, Bristol, England: "A state of glorification immediately after death for the disembodied soul," obviously supersedes the doctrine of a resurrection. Let the churches of our degenerate modern christendom mark the *contrast* between the scriptural and primitive doctrine of immortality, and that doctrine as professed by themselves. Let them note the strange phenomena, that the Apostles and their contemporaries speak much of life as the gift of God by Christ, and life attainable by resurrection, and never once allude to "immortal souls," and "souls in glory," or "torment" at death."

Again, he says: "Let it be registered as the genuine-genealogy of a fundamental doctrine of modern British Christendom, (and American Christendom, he might have added,)

that the *Pagan* PLATO was *its father*, and the profligate POPE LEO its *foster father*. Born and bred by the Pagan Philosophy and the protege of Popery, this notion of the soul's immortality has become a pet dogma of Popular Protestantism."

Says *Dr. Thomas Chalmers*; "The new economy, which is to be reared for the accommodation of the blessed, there will be materialism, not merely new heavens, but also a NEW EARTH."

Dr. Stephen Tyng, said; "The covenant made by God to Abraham, remains to this day utterly unfulfilled. THE FIFTH UNIVERSAL MONARCHY remains to be established upon the earth. The king that is to rule, is the Son of Man, who will make a personal manifestation of himself."

Mathew Henry says; "Christ's second coming will be a *regeneration* (Mat. 19 : 28) when there shall be new heavens and a new earth, and a restitution of all things."

Dr. Clarke says; "We look for a new heaven and a new earth; the others being decomposed, a new system is to be formed out of their materials."

William Anderson, said; "I do not believe that the earth shall be annihilated, but that rectified, and beautified, it shall last forever as the *happy abode of the Saints*."

Dr. Wm. Channing says; "Christ is to appear visibly for the judgment of the world, and he will reign a thousand years on earth. * * History and philosophy plainly show to me *in human nature* the foundation and *promise* of a better era, and Christianity concurs with them."

Dr. Cotton Mather says; "They who expect the REST promised the Church of God, to be found anywhere but in the NEW EARTH * * do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the KINGDOM of GOD."

Baptist Confession of faith, 1660. This confession was presented to Charles II, in the above year, in the city of London, and was signed by forty-one elders, deacons, and brethren, and approved by more than 20,000 others; "for which (said they) we are not only resolved to suffer persecution to the loss of our goods, but also life itself, rather than decline from the same." I give one or two extracts only.

"We believe that the same Lord Jesus which was taken up into heaven, shall so come in like manner as he was seen to go into heaven. Acts 1 : 9-11. Concerning the KINGDOM and

reign of our Lord Jesus Christ, we do believe, that, at the time appointed of the Father, he shall come again in power and great glory, and not only raise the dead and judge and restore the world, but will also take to himself his kingdom, and will, according to the Scriptures, reign on the throne of his father David, on Mount Zion, in Jerusalem *forever*. We believe that the kingdom of our Lord will be an universal kingdom, and that the Lord Jesus Christ himself will be alone visible supreme Lord and King of the whole earth. We believe that the New Jerusalem will be the glorious place of residence of both Christ and his saints FOREVER, and will be so situated as that the kingly palace will be on Mount Zion, the holy hill of David, where his throne was." *Crosby's History of the Baptists*, vol. ii, Appendix 85.

Martin Luther said; "Some say, that before the latter days, the whole world shall become Christians. This is a falsehood, forged by Satan, that he might darken sound doctrine, that we might not rightly understand it. Beware, therefore of this delusion." Again, he said: "The word of God has become a wearisome thing to man, a thing viewed with disgust."

† Elliott says of the great Philip Melancthon, Luther's fellow-laborer in the Reformation, "he made but five universal kingdoms for the earth, the fourth being Rome, and the fifth the kingdom of Christ and his saints, and these to come in numerical order." So they have come, as everybody knows, *the fifth only remaining to come*.

Henry Dana Ward said; "The earliest creeds of ALL denominations in Christendom, from the Apostles to this day, recognize no other Millennium, than that of a glorious one on the renovated earth at the coming of the Lord and the resurrection of the dead. It must be confessed by intelligent divines, that the *popular* doctrine of the Millennium, (that is, what is called a *spiritual* Millennium *before* Christ comes,) is a modern one totally unknown to the primitive church; so modern that it has never a place in the formula of the faith in *any* church—Catholic, Greek, Roman, or Protestant, but *all* their creeds involve the contrary. This I boldly say, and challenge contradiction, that Dr. Whitby's honorable name is the first and earliest that I have seen quoted in support of the doctrine, among the writers and orators of a *spiritual* Millennium, in this world's flesh before the Lord's appearing." (Dr. Whitby died, 1726.) He then makes a remark which applies not only to the

“falling away” (2 Thess. 2 : 3,) as to the Millennium, but to the GREAT APOSTASY in regard to *nearly all Bible doctrine.*

He says ; “ And now one hundred years have barely gone by, and so firmly planted has this *new faith* become in all the Churches of America, that never a *religious* paper of high standing with its own sect, can easily be found to admit an article into their columns, boldly questioning this proud Philistine which has seized the ark of our faith, and now defies the hope of Israel. This state of things calls for *mourning*, as well as *indignation*, that in a single century an innovation so bold in *departure* from the primitive faith (in the latter times some shall *depart* from *the faith.*” 1 Tim. 4 : 1.) and confessions of all Churches should have silently entrenched itself in the heart of ALL DENOMINATIONS.”

THE BIBLE SCIENTIFICALLY IN ADVANCE OF SCIENCE.

“The Bible nowhere opposes demonstrated science, but always has been, and is yet, far in advance of man's highest attainments in scientific knowledge. For ages, man taught that the earth was created at the beginning of the Adamic creation : and centuries before science discovered that the earth had existed many thousands of years before that, the Bible had been saying that at the beginning of the Adamic creation, “the *earth was* without form, and void.” For ages scientists taught that the world was made out of nothing ; yet all the time the Bible was saying, “Unto us there is one God the Father *out of whom* are all things.” For ages scientists and philosophers taught that the earth was flat ; yet all the time the Bible was saying, “God sitteth upon the *sphere* of the earth,” thus teaching that the earth was round. For ages scientists taught that the earth was floated on water ; yet the Bible was perpetually telling man that “God had hung the earth on nothing ” For ages scientists thought the stars could be counted. Ptolemy counted 1026, yet the Bible was constantly saying to man, that they were as the sand of the sea, innumerable. For thousands of years before the great scientist, Faraday, demonstrated that fine gold may become perfectly transparent like clear glass ; the Bible was saying “pure gold like unto glass.” “*Reasons why I believe the Bible to be the word of God.*” By Dr. J. H. THOMAS, Rochester, N. Y.

From the State Sentinel, Dover, Del. 1881.

IMMORTALITY.

AN ESSAY READ BEFORE THE CHESTNUT GROVE LITERARY SOCIABLE,

By Dr. L. C. Thomas of Wyoming, Del.

Immortality comes from the Greek word *Athanasia*, and signifies or means "deathlessness"—"the quality of never ceasing to live." That is to say, a being having immortality, an immortal nature, can never die. Life is a great and invaluable blessing. All persons properly constituted and happy, have a great love of life, and naturally do not desire to think much about dying. They naturally have a dread of that great and "last enemy"—death. How desirable would it be for that person in the enjoyment of life, health, happiness and wealth, if he could manage some way to evade, or give the go-by to death, and live forever—even in as poor a world as this—this old earth, in itself beautiful and lovely, yet still under the curse and moral blight and bondage of sin and death. Could he, by parting with half his wealth purchase immortality, or trade off his mortal dying nature for an immortal one how quickly would he do it, rather than part with his "breath of life," or run the risk of dying. I speak of the "natural man," who hath not received the things of the spirit of God, because they are foolishness unto Him. Neither can he (the natural man know them, for they are spiritually discerned. (1 Cor., 2:14.) But the person who has been "taught of God," who has learned and received the things of God—the things revealed by the Spirit—things that the natural, or animal man's "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor into whose heart they have never entered:" that person whose heart or affections have become imbued with, and whose mind enlightened and spiritized by, these wonderful revelations of the Spirit, so that he has come to think and understand in harmony with God. Such a person looks at things from a quite different standpoint, in altogether a different light. He, sees that immortality is not a mere vague idea, a visionary unreal thing a something to be talked about, and greatly desired and longed for, without a possibility of ever attaining to it, but that an immortal or "Divine Nature," and the consequent inevitable result—"eternal life"—unending life, (the greatest boon that the human mind is capable of contemplating or desiring) is possible, and has actually, without doubt, been suspended within the reach of man—"mortal man"—as Job calls him, by Him, "the immortal invisible only wise God, who only hath immortality." (1 Tim., 1:17, and 6:16.) That "life—endless life—and immortality have been brought to light, through the Gospel," not to be attained to this side the grave, as the natural man would like; but, that a time has been promised and will most surely come, when "this

mortal shall put on immortality"—when this poor mortal, dying human nature, shall be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, to "the Divine nature"—this flesh substance to spirit substance. That is to say, such of the human family, as learn and comply with the conditions of immortality, and thus develop a Godly character, and only such, are to be rewarded and honored with a Godly nature; and having such a nature, can never die—will have eternal life by virtue of having been made "partakers of the divine nature," through the fulfillment of the exceeding great and precious promises, at the resurrection of the just; having, by faith in those promises, escaped the (moral) corruption now in the world. (2 Peter, 1 : 4.) After the begetting of the new life: through the reception of the incorruptible seed—the word of life—the gospel, (1 Peter, 1 : 23, 25,) then follows the development of the Godly character by the "observing of all things whatsoever I (Christ) have commanded." (Mathew 28 : 20. "By patient continuance in well doing seeking for glory, honor, and immortality to whom God will render eternal life." (Rom. 2 : 67.) Life! What is it? Who can tell? Who can describe or define it? This wonderful life principle that animates and quickens the entire animal and vegetable creation?—perhaps one and the same actuating principle in the immortal being of the future, and the mortal being of the present; the difference being only in the nature of the two beings. The one mortal, the other immortal, the one corruptible, the other incorruptible, the one flesh, the other spirit. Its author, the all-wise Creator, making use of the atmospheric air as the medium of connection, in the one case, and the pure (*ruach*) spirit, in the other. The scriptures inform us that "with thee (God) is the fountain of life," and that he breathed a breath of it into man at the creation. But in his revelation to man, he nowhere describes or defines it. Perhaps it would be difficult for us to understand it if he had. How many human beings have undertaken to define it. But alas! I fear they have all made a signal failure. Or shall we accept the "evolution" theory of the so-called atheistic scientists of the present day—Darwin, Tyndal, Huxley, Spencer & Co.—that every protoplasm, molecule, or atom of material matter, contains within itself, the wonderful principle of life, and has therefore the power, intelligence and disposition, to wheel itself around into position and union with other atoms, and so evolve and develop into organic beings and existences, and up through the monkey to a man! And that thus all beings have sprung into existence, and continue to live, move and act without and independent of a Creator: And, consequently, that what the "fool" said in his heart—"there is no God"—these scientists, publicly proclaim to be true. But it strikes me, that we had not better accept so foolish a conclusion, for two reasons. First, admitting their scientific discoveries, as to the principle of life being inherent in the protoplasm or atom. Who put it there? Who so endowed the protoplasm with life? We

think a small share of unbiased reason, would answer by pointing up to a self-existent, all-wise, all-powerful being—God. Second, This evolution theory of these great scientists, which has occupied such a threatening attitude against God and his book, for a few years, is about to collapse. A. Wilford Hall of New York, in his masterly and wonderful work—“The Problem of Human Life, Here and Hereafter,” lately published, has, it is considered by all, completely demolished, and forever consigned to oblivion, the theories of the above named scientists. We will, therefore, hold on to the great truths, that our Heavenly Father still lives, and that He is the source and fountain of all life. I have said that the Godly character is ultimately to be honored with a Godly or divine nature—immortality—and that whoever desires to perpetuate his life—to live forever—to have eternal life, must “*seek* for glory, honor, immortality,”—that immortality is to be sought for “by patient continuance in well doing,” (Rom. 2 : 7,) because, that without an immortal constitution and nature, (such as God only, through Christ, can and “will render,” (Rom. 2 : 6,) it will be impossible to live forever—to have eternal life, with all its unspeakable, and inconceivable enjoyments included in all the exceeding great and precious promises of God. How, then, shall we seek for immortality? I would not presume or dare to answer this all-important question myself, or in my own words: but I answer in the words of God, which he sent his son, Christ, to tell to the world, called “the words of eternal life;” (John 6 : 68,) “seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness;” (Mat. 6 : 33.) That is, “believe the Gospel of the kingdom;” (Mark 1 : 14, 15,) “Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved,” (Acts 16 : 31, 33 and 10 : 43-48.) To believe on Christ, is to believe he is the one the prophet said should come, and to believe his message, his teachings and commands, some of the most important parts of which, are contained in the great commission, he gave to his Apostles, as to how they, as the instruments under him and the Father, were to save the world, “Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved”—“have life,” (as rendered by the Syriac version) but he that believeth not shall be damned.” (Mark 16: 15, 16.) “Go teach all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.” (Mat. 28 : 19, 20.) These scriptures seem to me very plain, important and comprehensive, and taken in connection with the passage, before quoted, viz. “by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory, honor and immortality,” seem to cover the whole ground of how to seek, and how to develop godly character or godlikeness—“having the promise, not only of this life, that is, the promise of a hundred fold, now, in this time, houses, and brethren, and sisters, and mothers, and lands; with persecutions (however) and in the world to come eter-

nal life"—(Mark 10: 29,30)—the life and immortality brought light through the gospel, as above shown. But although these words of God by Christ, cover the whole ground, as in a nutshell, yet the way to develop Godly character, might be greatly elaborated, in perfect harmony with the above, and is so elaborated, in the teaching of both Christ and the Apostles in many places and ways. Indeed godliness—the condition upon which immortality is predicated—is developed by all right, and good, and noble acts of life, by kindness, affection, benevolence, charity, friendship and sociality. As a means to this end, not only the scriptures, but all truthful, moral, literary and scientific books; all good and properly conducted institutions of learning, and all legitimate associations for mutual improvement; and indeed, sociables properly conducted, as this appears to be, are useful and laudable, to a certain extent, for that purpose; subsequent however, to the begetting by the incorruptible seed, as above shown.

It will be observed, that in these brief and very feeble remarks on immortality, I have scrupulously avoided (as I ever desire to do) words and terms frequently used, but not found in the scriptures, such as "immortal soul," "never-dying soul," "deathless spirit," etc., etc., holding as I do, that in treating upon Bible subjects, one should use Bible terms and words, as much as possible.

THE WORD MADE FLESH; OR JESUS CHRIST, WHO IS HE?

In the first chapter of John we are told that, "In the beginning the word (Logos) was with God (Theos), and the word was God, and the word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth."

In the consideration of this subject we wish to notice first, that the Greek word "logos," translated "word," means mind, reason, speech, or word, and hence wisdom,—therefore the logos that was with God, and was God, was the mind, reason, or wisdom of God, expressed in his word of promise. But as it is contended by some that God has "neither body nor parts," but is simply "primal energy" or "creative power," we will, before considering how the word was made flesh, endeavor to show the unscripturalness of such a con-

tention. The very passage before us is a sufficient answer in itself; for the *logos* was *with* God as well as God. If there had been no God or *Theos*, there could have been no word or *logos*; there could have been no mind, reason, speech, or word, without a thinker, reasoner, and speaker; pertinent to this thought, is the passage in Isa. 1 : 18, "come now and let us *reason* together, saith the Lord!" In all creation, wherever we discover reason or intelligence we find living form or organism. The intelligence, reason, and wisdom of every man or woman, is the result of living brain formation; as you lower the scale of this brain formation you weaken the intelligence, reason and wisdom. Therefore, as we are told that man was made in the image of God we are logically bound to believe that God is a personal being. We being the image of God, we can understand that, as our words are with us, and are us, so the *logos*, word, or wisdom was with God and was God. It is a common thing to speak of a man's words as himself. How often when we hear another repeating what some dear friend had said, we remark that's Robert, or that's James, as the case may be, because we at once recognize our friend in his words.

That it is in this sense that the word or wisdom was with God and was God is very clearly revealed in Prov. 8. Speaking of wisdom it is said: "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was * * * * When he prepared the heavens I was there, when he gave to the sea his decree that the waters should not pass his commandment, when he appointed the foundations of the earth then I was by him as one brought up with him, and I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him.

As is here spoken of wisdom, so John speaks of the *logos*, or word, and says it was in the beginning with God. Peter says, "by the word of God the heavens were of old;" while Solomon says, "The Lord by wisdom hath founded the earth, by understanding hath he established the heavens." Prov. 3 : 19. It is clear, therefore, that the word, which in the beginning was with God and was God, was not a person—the second person in that conceit called trinity, nor yet the person of God, but was that which the word *logos* signifies, mind, reason, speech, hence the wisdom or purpose of God which was with him as our words or purposes are with us.

But, further, this divine person or God that John says in the beginning the word was with, is called *Theos*, a word signifying position, or place, hence to dispose or place in order, therefore a very appropriate designation for the Divine Being as the disposer or former of all things, as saith Isaiah, "I am the Lord that maketh all things; that stretched forth the heavens alone; that spreadeth abroad the earth by myself." We learn, therefore, that the eternal, uncreated, self-existent Deity is more than a mere idea—more than "primal energy," or "creative force; he is divine substance from

which all things emanate. We are told that "God is a spirit," but we are not to understand by that, that God is a mere phantom, or creation of every man's brain, but the very reverse; for Paul tells us that the last Adam, Christ, was made a Spirit—a life-giving Spirit; yet we know he was substance. If Christ, after he was made Spirit through a resurrection, was divine substance, then God, who is a Spirit, is divine substance.

Jesus says, "As the Father hath life in himself so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." When did the Son have life in himself? I answer, when he became, through a resurrection from the dead, "a life-giving Spirit," or divine substance like his Father, who is a fountain of life. Thus we reason, and thus saith the Scriptures—Heb. 1 : 3. Paul says of Jesus, that he was an effulgence of God's glory, and an exact impress of his substance; and again, in Rom. 1 : 3, Paul speaks of him as the "incorruptible God," or Theos; again, he is said to dwell in light unapproachable. Hence light, incorruptibility, life, wisdom and power, concentrated in one divine substance, is the great self-existing and controlling power of the universe, called a Spirit—the Creator and upholder of all things; in whom we, and all things live, move and exist, and "out of whom are all things," whose Spirit radiates the boundless universe and pervades all space—its center Divine Substance, or Deity, its circumference, who can tell! Hence says Paul to the Athenians, "He is not far from every one of us;" and David exclaims, "Whither shall I go from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven thou art there, and if I make my bed in sheol, behold thou art there."

Such is the Scripture teaching concerning God the Father of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, who only hath immortality, whom no man hath seen nor can see; whose radiant spirit pervades all things as the *ruah*, or spirit of life, and is the substratum of every existing thing, from the star of the greatest magnitude to the minutest insect of the air. By his spirit he garnished the heavens with glittering orbs, and spread out the earth beneath with lofty mountains and wide-spread plains, with rippling streams and broad oceans; he clothed the earth with beautiful flora and fitted it for the abode of man.

Such, then, was Deity before the appearance of Jesus, when the word was with God and was God. But we are told that the word was made flesh, and for a moment we may enquire, for what purpose? The answer comes, "To bruise the serpent's head;" "deliver those in bondage," bring many sons into glory." and "make all things new." Gen. 3 : 15; Heb. 2 : 9, 10, 14, 15; Rev. 21 : 4, 5. But how was the word made flesh? I answer by the logos, word, wisdom, or purpose of Deity being fulfilled, and thus manifesting Deity in the flesh. This "word" made flesh Paul calls the "mystery of godliness"—God manifested in flesh; justified (or perfected) in spirit, seen of messengers, preached unto the nations, believed on in the

world, received up in glory. Thus God was manifested in flesh by his word of promise being fulfilled, or his purpose to manifest himself being accomplished.

As an illustration of how the word, wisdom or purpose of Deity became flesh, we have but to consider how our words take form or are corporealized. Every man's words take form who builds for himself a residence if he be his own architect. The residence he builds at first in his brain as *thought*. Having perfected in his mind the kind of structure he will build in every particular he puts his thoughts into words, which are then an expression of his purpose, and which in the hands of the builder take form, and the structure is his words corporealized, and as we look at the structure we see the wisdom and peculiarities of the architect.

So the word, or logos, that was made flesh, in the beginning was with God and was God, being his wisdom and purpose to manifest himself in the woman's seed, or flesh, and when the wisdom and purpose of God was made known it was then his *word*, which in due time became corporealized in the person of the Son of Mary by the Holy Spirit vivifying the life principle in the womb of the Handmaid of God, and in set time was born, the child Jesus, as recorded by John. The word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, (when he was transfigured on the mount,) the glory of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.

That Deity would manifest himself in flesh had been the word and purpose of God from the beginning expressed in the promise that the "woman's seed should bruise the serpent's seed in the head," Gen. 3 : 15; in the promise of Shiloh from Judah, Gen. 49 : 10; in the promise of the sceptered star out of Jacob, Num. 24 : 17; in the promise of a seed to Abraham who should possess the gate of his enemies, Gen. 22 : 17; in the promise of the divine Son assured to David, 2 Sam. 7 : 14, to be born of a virgin to rule on David's throne, Isa. 9 : 6, 7; and lastly in the promise to Mary that she should bring forth a son who should be called the son of the Highest, to whom God would give the throne of David, and that he should reign over the house of Jacob forever. Luke 1 : 32 34.

Not only so, but when God would send Moses down to Egypt to bring up Israel, Moses asked what name he should give to Israel. Ex. 3 : 13-15 As rendered in King James' version it reads, "God said, I am that I am. Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I am hath sent me unto you." The Hebrew words rendered "I am that I am," are *Yahweh asher yahweh*, and according to the best critics is very improperly rendered. The passage should read, "I will be who I will be. Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, *I will be* hath sent me unto you." He further tells them in verse 15, "This is my name forever, and this is my memorial unto all generations." We see then that Israel was to remember that God would from that time be known as Yahweh, or "I will be;"

again in Ex. 6 : 3, God tells Moses that he appeared unto Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob by the name of *Ail Shaddai*—Hebrew—rendered in our version “God Almighty,” but a better rendering would read, “the strength of the Mighty Ones, but by my name Yahweh, or I will be, I was not known unto them.” It appears then that before God appeared unto Moses at the bush he was not known by the name of Yahweh, I will be: but by his name *Ail Shaddai*, the strength of the Mighty Ones; but after that time he was to be known by his name I will be. It was to be a memorial name unto all generations.

In the consideration of this memorial name given to Israel the question very naturally arises, I will be who? or what? The answer is given in Ex. 6 : 9: I will take you to me for a people, and I will be to you Elohim, or Mighty Ones, and ye shall know I am Yahweh you Elohim—literally I am he who will be your Mighty Ones.

This promise or word of Deity commenced to be fulfilled by the “word” becoming flesh in the person or substance of Jesus as the Captain, Head, Chief, or first born of the mighty Ones of Israel, in whom Deity has declared he will be manifested, and being justified or made perfect in spirit, or exalted to the high and heavenly estate of incorruptibility and life, they will constitute the rulers and governors of that new heaven and earth, or creation, of which Jesus is the Alpha and Omega.

We discover then that Jesus was not the eternal self-existent uncreated God in person, but the Son of God—the logos, or word made flesh in fulfillment of the promise made to Israel that he was known to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob as, “*Ail Shaddai*”—“Strength of the Mighty Ones,” would become Israel’s Saviors. Though God made known his memorial name to Israel through Moses at the bush, yet it was to be a long time after before the Yahweh name would be manifested. Now as Jesus was the first to manifest the name, (see John 17 : 6,) and as he was born of the Virgin Mary he could not have pre-existed as a person. Mark, it was the eternal, and self-existent God that was to become Israel’s Mighty Ones, and not a pre-existent Son. It is clear then that when the logos that was with God and was God became flesh in the person of Jesus as the Savior of Israel, the promise had commenced to be fulfilled, and the Yahweh name was made manifest by him who is the first born among many brethren; and being immersed by John in the waters of the Jordan, and anointed by the Spirit descending upon him he became Jesus Christ, that is Jesus the Anointed, and God declared him to be his only begotten Son in whom he was well pleased. Thus Jesus in his flesh bore the nature of man, in his mind the image and character of God; in other words he was human in nature but divine in character. Therefore Paul says, (Gal. 4 : 4,) “When the fullness of time was come, God sent forth his Son, *made of a woman*, made under the law” He was begotten not of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. “No man,” says John, “hath seen

God at any time, the only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him."

It being the purpose of the Deity to be manifested in persons of Adam's race, who shall be his name bearers—a multitude of Mighty Ones of whom Jesus is Chief, it follows, that whoever believes that Jesus was begotten by Joseph, or that he was a pre-existed Son, or second person in the Trinity, makes void the purpose of God, and virtually sets aside the only name under heaven whereby man can be saved--the Yahweh name, which is "the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit;" whereas those having a comprehensive knowledge of the things of the kingdom and name, and evidencing a hearty belief of the same by being immersed for the remission of sins, are thereby introduced into the all-saving name, and become like Christ their Chief; in mind and character, and name-bearers of Deity.

From what we have written it will, we think, appear clear that Jesus was not mere son of man, not the self-existent Deity, but the product of Deity—the Son of God. In the flesh he manifested the name and character of Yahweh, and being justified or perfected in spirit through a resurrection of the dead to the high and exalted estate of incorruptibility and life, or Spirit substance, he was the Yahweh or "I will be" manifestation of him whom no man hath seen nor can see, both in character and in nature. Being as said Paul, (Heb. 1 : 3—Diaglott) "An effulgence of his glory and an exact impress of his substance."

By the power of the Father Spirit the body which was of Mary's substance was transformed to Spirit. Being born of Spirit according to the words spoken to Nicodemus, he became Spirit—like his Father a life imparting Spirit, in fulfillment of his own words, as recorded by John 5 : 26; "As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself."

Such then is the Scripture teaching concerning Jesus the seed of the woman and Son of God, in whom was manifested the moral attributes of Deity, and of whom John says: "He dwelt among us, and we beheld his Glory, the Glory as of the only begotten of the Father full of grace and truth."

But as we have already seen, it was not only the purpose of Deity to manifest himself in the person of Jesus Christ but in members of Adam's race; all those who become conformed to the image of his Son, and so become sons of God, and hence bear the name of their Father, and are therefore "gods," or "mighty ones." Jesus Christ is the God-designed pattern, or image, sent forth of God, to which all must conform who would be one of the Elohim of Deity—that great company of kings and priests—called by Peter, "a royal priesthood, an holy nation," to be established at Jerusalem in fulfillment of the words of Yahweh that he will place his name there. See 1 Kings 8 : 20-29.

David also says (Psa. 132.) "The Lord hath chosen Zion: he hath desired it for his habitation. This is my rest forever; here will I dwell, for I have desired it." This company of Mighty Ones established at Jerusalem will be the bearers of the name of Deity—that name called by Moses in Deut. 28:50; "*This glorious and fearful name—YAHWEH ELOHIM*" the governors among the nations, God with man.

As Jesus was begotten by the Spirit and manifested the character of God in the flesh, so every one who would become a constituent of this all-saving name must also be begotten of the Spirit and manifest the character of God in the flesh by continuing in the apostle's doctrine and teaching that eventually he may be transformed to Spirit substance and become as Jesus is HOLY SPIRIT NATURE—the exact impress of the nature or substance of the Father's person.

To be begotten of the Spirit, one must give a willing ear to the Spirit word, or words of the Spirit which are the words of Jesus the Anointed, for Peter says: "Thou hast the words of eternal life;" and Jesus himself says, "The words I speak unto you *they* are Spirit and they are life." Again he says, "If ye continue in my word ye are my disciples indeed."

It is important then to know what are the Spirit-begetting words of Jesus. Matt. 6:33. will lead us in the right direction. "*Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and his righteousness.*" Then in accordance with this general instruction he commenced to announce the Kingdom of God, or glad tidings thereof as something to be believed. Mark informs us that, "After John was imprisoned, Jesus came into Galilee publishing the glad tidings of God, and saying, The time has been accomplished, and God's Royal Majesty has approached; reform and believe the good message." Mark 1:14, 15—Diaglott. Again Luke 8:1, we are informed that Jesus "went throughout every city and village preaching and showing the glad tidings of the Kingdom of God." Afterward he called his twelve disciples together and "sent them to preach the Kingdom of God." When the people of Nazareth constrained him to remain with them he said, "I must preach the Kingdom of God to other cities also, for therefore am I sent." From the above citations it is evident that the Gospel, or things relating to the Kingdom of God, himself as God's Royal Majesty, or King thereof, were the Spirit begetting words of Jesus, which, if a man understand and believe begets within him a new mind or character, and having complied with God's formula or way of remission of sins, he is regarded as having been begotten of the Spirit and God is manifest in him by the Godly character which results. This is still more evident from Peter's words (1 Peter 1:23-25;) "Being begotten again, not of corruptible seed, but incorruptible by the *word* of God which liveth and abideth forever * * * and this is the word which has been announced as *glad tidings* to you." —Diaglott. It is then the gospel, or glad tidings, which is the in-

corruptible seed by which a man is begotten. This agrees perfectly with the teaching of the Master himself. He tells his disciples, Matt. 13th chapter, that the Son of Man is the sower and the *word of the kingdom* the seed sown. If it falls in good ground, which Luke informs us is good and honest hearts, it brings forth fruit, or produces children of the kingdom. An individual being thus begotten of the Spirit and being immersed for the remission of sins, is introduced into the all-saving name—the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit—the one name of the one self-existent and uncreated God in multitudinous manifestation.

All such are a Yahweh manifestation in the flesh—"a new creation in Christ Jesus." When the hour of exaltation shall come and the Father Spirit that dwelleth in them shall transform their vile bodies of flesh, or if dead raise them to incorruptibility and life, they will then have been perfected in Spirit and are therefore the manifestation of Yahweh in Spirit substance, and with Christ Jesus as their head, are the beginning of the new creation of Deity, that new heavens and earth or constitution of things of which the Mosaic was a type. That having served its purpose has been abolished. The time came when according to Paul (Heb. 12 : 26) the promise that God would shake not only the earth but the heaven also was fulfilled, and the heavens and earth of that constitution of things which was founded when the Mount burned with fire and the sound of the trumpet and the voice of God caused the people to tremble and Moses to fear and quake, were shaken "once more" and passed away with a great noise, and the elements thereof melted with the fervent heat of God's judgment: "for" says Paul, "our God is a consuming fire." "Nevertheless," says Peter, "we according to his promise look for new heavens and earth wherein dwelleth righteousness." And now that the long and dreary night of Gentile darkness and Jewish stumbling has nearly passed away, we may look for the new creation of Deity to appear; then will Zion awake and put on her strength, and Jerusalem her beautiful garments; then will that great city, the new Jerusalem, the bride, the Lamb's wife—that great multitude, the name-bearers of Yahweh, who being a manifestation of Deity, having been born from above, are said to descend from God out of heaven, will be established at Jerusalem the "City of the great King," as the "new heavens," or ruling power of the new constitution of things or kingdom which Paul says "cannot be moved." Heb. 12 : 28.

Then will be fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah. (51 : 11, 15.) "The redeemed of the Lord shall return and come with singing unto Zion * * * I have put my words in thy mouth, I have covered thee in the shadow of my hand, that I may plant the heavens, and lay the foundations of the earth (new heavens and new earth) and say unto Zion, Thou art my people." This having been accomplished, Isa. 65 : 17, 18, will have been fulfilled; "Behold I create

new heavens and a new earth : and the former (Mosaic) shall not be remembered nor come into mind. But be ye glad and rejoice forever in that which I create, for behold I create Jerusalem a rejoicing and her people a joy.

Then will be accomplished the work of the Eternal in elaborating by his Spirit from Adam's race a nation of Mighty Ones—Jesus and his bride, who as the New Jerusalem, have descended from God out of heaven, a body corporate of God's kings and priests, a habitation of eternal wisdom and power. They will be the Abrahamic seed who is to possess the gate of his enemies and give the world a righteous government by which all nations of the earth will be blessed.

To this brief but Scriptural exposition of the word made flesh, and multitudinous manifestation of Deity as the beginning of the new creation, there are a few passages which by some are thought to teach otherwise by implying the pre-existence of Christ as a person. That mode of interpretation that makes a few isolated texts antagonize so prominently expressed doctrine as the "word made flesh," should have no countenance whatever. That the self-existent Eternal All-power or God should be manifested in the woman's seed by the Spirit word becoming flesh is a doctrine underlying the whole plan and purpose of God. An examination of a few of the seemingly antagonistic texts will show the harmony of the whole with the scriptural exposition we have given.

In John we are told that Christ said to Peter, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father also, and how sayest thou then show us the Father?" We cannot suppose for a moment that Jesus gave Peter to understand that by looking at him with his eyes he would see the Father, for in that case it would be equal to saying that the flesh born of Mary was the person of the uncreated God, whom no man hath seen nor can see; which would be absurd in the extreme; besides the context would not admit of such a silly conceit. The word "see" in the passage is used in the sense of discerning or seeing with the understanding, a sense in which it frequently occurs. For example, John 6 : 40, "And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth (discerneth) the Son and believeth into him may have everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day."

So in the passage before us, he that had discerned or understood the Son, had discerned or understood the Father also. A similar passage occurs in Chap. 12 : 45 : "He that seeth me seeth him that sent me." That is, he that had discerned, understood or known the one had the other. This is made very plain in the 17 : 3 : "This is eternal life, that they might *know* thee, the only true God and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent." The context shows the same sense. "If ye had *known* me, ye should have *known* my Father

also." Verse 7. "Believest thou not that I am in the Father and the Father in me?" Verse 10.

As the disciples were on the day of Pentecost filled with Holy Spirit which spoke through them as he had through the prophets, so Jesus, filled with the Father-Spirit without measure, so that the words that he spake were not simply the words of the child born of Mary, but of the Father which by his Spirit dwelt in him. Hence he said, "The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself, but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works."

Understanding this and the few otherwise obscure passages are made plain. The passage so often cited to prove the pre-existence of Christ—"Before Abraham was I am"—loses all its force to sustain that fleshly conceit. The Father-Spirit speaking through Jesus could well say, before Abraham was I am; or the child Jesus, knowing that he was the logos, word, or wisdom, in the purpose of God, made flesh, and that all things were on account of him, could well say, that before Abraham was I am; that is, I am in the purpose of God before Abraham was. So of all kindred passages.

If it be remembered that the Son said, "I can of mine own self do nothing," but affirms all the doctrine taught, and all the miracles performed of the Father, whose effluence or Spirit rested upon and filled him, it will make many of his "hard sayings" easily understood.—DR. J. H. THOMAS, *Rochester, N. Y.*

CLOSING REMARK.

The author feels, impressed in winding up this little work, to avail himself at the very last, of the opportunity of expressing his utter and unbounded astonishment, that so many intelligent and even educated young men, can be found everywhere, who, more than half, if not entirely, reject the Scriptures. Who seem, not only to have no confidence, whatever, in them, as being of divine origin, but actually sneer and ridicule them: and yet, **HAVE NEVER CAREFULLY EXAMINED THEM!!!** That is, they have never carefully and thoroughly examined for themselves, the evidence of such origin; nor even the Book itself. They have decided against it before giving it a hearing—upon the say-so of others. What I have before said, I hear repeat; that the words of Solomon, the wise man, are a proper and well-deserved rebuke to all such people; viz: "He that answereth a matter before he heareth it, it is *folly* and **SHAME** unto him." Prov. 18 : 13. The Bible claims to be a Divine revelation of the origin and ultimate destiny of this planet and its inhabitants, a revelation to "mortal man" of the way to live forever—to secure eternal life, and unending bliss. Is it not unwise to refuse the offers by thoughtless rejection of such revelation without examination? What is the *present pleasure* of a few years, in comparison to the Bible hope? Young men, **STOP AND REFLECT.**

INDEX.

THE HIGHER LAW.

The higher law of Right and duty,	7
Right includes all righteous moral principles,	7
Origin of the higher law—the Attributes of God,	7
Moral principles are axioms,	7
Moral law in harmony with natural law,	7
Moral law in harmony with Science and Philosophy,	7
The higher law—the will of God,	7, 14
Righteousness, conformity to the will of God through love,	8
Moral principles, fundamental truths,	8
Moral law in harmony with Revelation,	8
Young and other able writers on the higher law,	8
Common law <i>founded</i> on principles of justice,	9, 28
Quotations from the late Dr. Thomas and others,	9
Higher law has its reflex in man's constitution,	10, 11, 12, 13
Human faculties the origin of human rights,	10
Man's mental faculties can't be forced to obey,	10
Higher law in the "inner man,"	11
Eternal law does not conflict with temporary,	12
Man's moral organs the reflex, (Note,)	17
Sin in the world <i>before</i> revealed law,	13, 46, 189
Man created constitutionally under law, (Note,)	13
David loved God's higher eternal law,	14
Covenant with David included in Abrahamic,	15, 104
The Abrahamic covenant, <i>a lacu</i> ,	15
Sure mercies of David,	15
The Sceptre not <i>utterly</i> departed,	16, 109, 145, 245, 248
David's dying charge to Solomon,	17
The kingdom of Israel, is the kingdom of God, ...	17
The kingdom given to David and his sons,	17
David's sons failed to keep God's law,	17
David foresaw the Resurrection of Christ,	18
David said God's precepts are the RIGHT,	19
All who walk up to law of right accepted,	20
LAW OF MOSES,	
Law given 25,000 years after Creation, and 1,500 B. C.,	21
<i>Germ</i> of Law Covenant in Abrahamic.	21
Law of Circumcision, Passover and Sabbath,	22
Sabbath first made known,	22, 149 181
Moral principles, the Substrata of the 10 Com.,	23, 27, 45, 51
Difference between spirit and letter of the law,	23, 27, 38, 52
Right and Duty did not originate in the law of Moses,	23, 27, 51
Difference between moral and positive precepts, (Note,)	8, 24, 27, 32, 45, 177

The moral principles existed <i>before</i> revealed law,.....	24, 51
Fourth Com., both moral and positive,.....	24, 188, 55
Principles of the 10 Com., right and duty before the law,.....	24, 27, 46
Everyone, and many others, based on moral principles,.....	24, 27
The positive precepts expired with the law,.....	26, 27, 45
The law is the <i>letter</i> , the principles the <i>spirit</i> ,.....	27, 45
The law given to the Israelites only, (Note),.....	27, 181
The law similar to a written agreement or note,.....	28
Difference between keeping the letter and spirit,.....	27, 37, 45
A moral man not a godly one,.....	29, 32
External and internal to everything,.....	28, 29
Morality is not Christianity,.....	29, 32
Two ways of obeying law,.....	32, 44
Law of the spirit of life,.....	35
Obedience not always the result of <i>love</i> but fear,.....	33
<i>Love</i> not a command of the law,.....	33
<i>Love, Right, and Good</i> commanded 40 years after the law,.....	33
No penalty in the law for not loving God,.....	34
Model Citizen,—moral but not a christian,.....	30
Why <i>love</i> was not one of the 10 Com.,.....	34
External life an index to the internal.....	29
Purity of heart must show itself in good works,.....	32
Man can't be forced to love or believe,.....	34
Preaching hell-fire, &c., can't incite love to God,.....	35
What is walking after the Spirit?.....	35, 36
Gospel motive is love, God's goodness and promises,.....	34, 35
What is keeping the Spirit of the law?.....	36, 45
The Spirit includes <i>more</i> than the letter,.....	36, 37, 42
Obedience to <i>letter</i> can be forced, not to the <i>Spirit</i> ,.....	34, 37
Christ and Paul on the <i>Spirit</i> of the law,.....	38
How the law is <i>dead</i> . Rom. 7 : 30.....	38
Christ only, kept the law <i>perfectly</i> ,.....	39
Why the law could not give eternal life,.....	39
What the law could not do, Christ did,.....	40
How Christ kept the law,.....	40, 49, 51
How the law <i>began</i> to be fulfilled,.....	41
How Christ condemned sin in the flesh,.....	40
The law not all fulfilled till Christ's death,.....	42, 159
Transition period, old law prejudice,.....	42, 43
Thousands nowadays don't understand the law,.....	44, 214
Love never exists without faith,.....	46
What the law consisted in,.....	27, 45
Pray that your flight be not on Sabbath,.....	43
Illustration of commands based on principles,.....	38, 45
The law added to Abrahamic Covenant,.....	46
The law expired <i>Ex necessitate rei</i> ,.....	46
The law holy, just and good,.....	46, 81
The law a system of types.....	47
Christ the substance, or antitype of all types,.....	47, 102
Christ teaches and illustrates his own new law,.....	47

Illustration of the spirit and letter by Dr. Adam Clarke,..... 48
 Change in the law,..... 48, 160, 19, 178
 Christ's superior law and way of life,..... 48, 49, 51
 The law fulfilled by Christ, how?..... 49, 51
 The law added for a school master, till Christ,..... 50, 106
 Christ's words are the words of his Father, 50, 76, 141, 168, 178, 193
 Christ's new law defined,..... 51, 56, 129
 Illustration with every one of the 10 Com.,..... 52
 Doing away with the law don't affect its basis or spirit,..... 27, 52
 Principles underlying first 4 and last 6 Com,..... 53
 Moral principles not commanded in *letter* of decalogue,..... 33, 53, 120
 A certain class think *part* of letter of 4th Com. binding,..... 53
 Additions to all the 10 Com.,..... 53
 Spirit or substratum of the law imperishable,..... 28, 54, 134
 Love the only motive power of the higher law,..... 55
 Thou shalt love, &c., given to show the *Spirit*,..... 55
 Letter and Spirit of 4th Com. illustrated,..... 55, 56
 Quotation from the late Dr Thomas—letter and Spirit,..... 57
 Examination of important Scriptures,..... 58
 Succinct view of salvation—God's way of life,..... 60, 62
 The Jews to be regathered for the subjects of the kingdom,..... 62
 Return of the Jews commenced—Extracts,..... 64, 66
 Christ will restore the kingdom to Israel,..... 66
 His brethren now being taken out to be joint rulers,..... 6
 The kingdom not in the heart, nor is it yet set up,..... 67
 Some Scriptures examined,..... 67
 The gospel is the things of the kingdom and name,..... 68
 Gospel of the kingdom always persecuted,..... 69
 The territory, king, subjects and heirs in existence,..... 70
 Only one gospel, variously expressed,..... 70
 Hundreds of faiths, but one genuine,..... 71
 Character, business or duties of the heirs,..... 72
 The faith, one faith, faith of the gospel,..... 72
 Further consideration of the law—two-law theory,..... 74
 The 7th day theory, hangs on the two-law theory,..... 74
 The law of God and law of Moses one, not two laws,..... 75, 76, 77, 78
 The law and commandments of God,..... 76, 141, 178, 198
 The law and the testimony,..... 76, 80
 The righteousness of God without the law, 82, 83, 180
 Circumcision profiteth, and law good, [Note.]..... 81
 Spirit of the *ceremonial part* of the law,..... 84
 How to use the law lawfully,..... 85
THE COVENANTS CONSIDERED,..... 89
 Covenant and Testament considered and compared,..... 86
 Moses and Aaron, in life and death, types of Christ, 93, 96, 101
 Quotation from A. Andrews considered,..... 94
 New Covenant witnessed by the law,..... 97, 99
 Moses had to die "for their sakes" as well as his own,..... 97, 98
 David's great sin necessarily overlooked,..... 100
 Circumcision the token or seal of everlasting covenant,..... 103

The promise to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and David,.....	104
God made an <i>addition</i> to the everlasting covenant,.....	105
Covenant with David a development of Abrahamic,.....	15, 104
Reasons and objects of the law,.....	105
Circumcision the <i>beginning</i> of the law covenants,.....	106
Christ died, as he did all things, as God's representative,.....	108, 111, 118
The <i>completion</i> of the law covenant,.....	108
The people had to be governed by <i>fear</i> , ..	107, 108
After 40 years education in the wilderness, then by <i>love</i> ,.....	107, 108
Dedication of the law covenant,.....	108
The one and multitude seed of the Abrahamic covenant,.....	108
The old law covenant included all the law,.....	108
Germ of the kingdom in the Abrahamic covenant,.....	109
Confirmation of the Abrahamic covenant,.....	110
The sins of believers under the law, remitted at Christ's death,	112
The new covenant to be completed after Christ returns,.....	112
The law covenant illustrated by a codicil,.....	112
The conditions of new covenant under the law and now,.....	115
Why the Abrahamic covenant is <i>new</i> , and Sinaitic <i>old</i> ,.....	115
Law covenant rehearsed by Moses and made 2nd time,.....	116, 118
Moses and Christ representative testators,.....	118, 119
Love, the <i>spirit</i> of the law, commanded first time.....	33, 120
Neither faith nor love commanded by the law,.....	120
Law ordained to life, its letter to long, spirit to eternal,....	120
600,000 rebels had ample grounds for faith and love,.....	120
Their unbelief and destruction a great type,.....	123
Who believes the promises—the gospel—now?.....	123
Peculiar people, and faith and hope unpopular,.....	124
Scoffers in the last days, and falling away,.....	124
Everybody too busy,—“overcharged,”.....	125
The truth not allowed in the pulpits,.....	125
The great <i>Rest</i> begins in Christ.....	126
Antitype of the typical “Rest,”.....	127
The Sabbath the <i>beginning</i> of the typical “Rest,”.....	128
Righteousness of the law explained,.....	128
Great advantages and superiority of the new law,.....	51, 76 129
Abrahamic covenant, Israel's higher law,.....	131
Development of Abrahamic covenant—great salvation,.....	132
Typical kingdom of God, in the land under David,.....	133
Circumcision of the heart,.....	133
Allegory by Paul,.....	134
The law covenant cast out,.....	134
But the <i>Spirit</i> of it remains imperishable,.....	134
New covenant not yet completed,.....	134
How God's laws are to be put into the mind and heart,....	136
Christ the true Joseph is to make himself known,.....	137
God's way and power of turning from evil works to Him,.....	138
Christ will not force the Nations but <i>draw</i> by teaching,.....	138
The “one hope”—“hope of the <i>promise</i> ”—all others spurious,.....	139
To fulfill, does not always mean to <i>keep</i> , the law.....	140

The law of God under Moses not the law of God now,	129, 141, 168
Recapitulation of the Covenants,	142
Quotation on the Covenants, from R. Roberts,	145
THE SABBATH,	148
When Moses wrote the Pentateuch,	148
The Sabbath law given 30 days before arrival at Sinai,	149
The Sabbath, Circumcision and Passover, types,	150, 152, 176
Why three items so long before the entire law,	153
These <i>happened</i> unto them for <i>types</i> ,	153, 154
Is the Seventh day Sabbath still binding,	155
What the writer has shown,	156
Admissions of Sabbath keepers,	158
Did Christ teach the necessity of keeping the 10 Com. ?	159, 170
The writer called a dishonest man,	159
Three parallel passages considered,	159
The 10 Com. law in force till the death of Christ,	42, 159,
Transition of the law of Moses to the law of Christ,	48, 160, 191
Christ required an " <i>offering</i> " of the law to be kept,	160
Christ teaches the young ruler he must keep the <i>spirit</i> of the law,	160
Paul taught the same. Golden rule,	161, 162
Christ's <i>new</i> law of love given only to his disciples,	164
Feet washing—example of great love,	165
Case of the Lawyer trying Christ,	165
The good Samaritan,	166
The case of the Lawyer not far from the kingdom,	168
Two more parallel passages considered,	168
Must keep Christ's Com., not the 10 Com.	168
In every instance Christ pointed to love,	168, 169
Christ's mission—never commanded to keep Sabbath,	169, 170
Some think Paul kept the law the old way (Acts 21.),	170
Paul and the other Apostles " <i>wise as serpents</i> ,"	171, 172
Paul circumcised Timothy but would not Titus,	171
How Paul kept the law,	172
Not understanding the Scriptures, cause of great mistakes,	173
Some did rest on the Sabbath—did not understand,	173
Christ and the Apostles taught on Sabbath days,	174
Christ the Lord of the Sabbath,	174
Lawful to do well and good on the Sabbath,	175, 176
Sabbath made for man—Jewish man,	175
What is moral principle ?	176
What Christ's new law requires,	178
The one body and one Name,	178, 306
Sabbath given only to the Israelites,	22, 27, 181
Sabbath not given at creation,	22, 149, 181
Inconsistencies of Sabbatarian theories,	181
Sabbath made known by Moses, not on Sinai,	183
Abraham obeyed, but not by keeping Sabbath,	184
Some particular about 4th Com. but neglect Christ's,	185
Egregious error, confounding 10 Com. with the principles,	186
Difference between the Com. and the principles,	23, 27, 38, 45, 52, 186

Fossilized delusion,.....	188
Sabbath law, part moral and part positive precept,.....	24, 55, 188
No law from Adam to Moses,.....	13, 46, 189
Change of the old law for the new High Priest's law,.....	48, 160, 191
Principles have no letters, the 10 Com. have,.....	192
Christ a law-giver for his Father,.....	50, 76, 141, 178, 193
Why God "added no more" to the 10 Com.,.....	195
The royal law the motive power of Christ's law,.....	196
The old law and new law compared,.....	198
"The Com. of the Lord," include Paul's writings,.....	168, 198
Com. of decalogue compared with those not in decalogue,.....	198
"Custom" of Christ and Apostles on Sabbath,.....	201
Christ and the Apostles did not keep the Sabbath,.....	202
The Sabbath an "ordinance,".....	22, 204
Christ and Apostles kept the <i>Spirit</i> of 4th Com.,.....	205
"The royal law, not the 10 Commandments,.....	205
Sabbaths in the age to come,.....	206
Paul says not—under law of 10 Com.,.....	208
An advantage in being a Jew, if so "inwardly,".....	208
The perfect law of liberty and its motive power,.....	209
Exegesis of James, Chapters 1 and 2,.....	208, 209
Superiority of the law of Christ illustrated,.....	209, 210
Resurrection of Christ on the 7th day, a delusion.....	215
CONSIDERATION OF SUNDAY,.....	216
All Denominations misunderstand the 10 Com.,.....	44, 217, 219, 221
All Sabbaths or "holy days" prohibited by the Gospel,.....	203
A rest day as a civil institution, right and necessary,.....	216
Sunday not a <i>holy</i> day,.....	217
The beginning and object of Sunday observance,.....	218
All the Scriptures say about the first day, or Sunday,.....	218
Christ did not assume, or appear in different bodies,.....	219
Why the disciples selected Sunday to assemble on,.....	220
Unavoidable conclusion as to Saturday and Sunday,.....	119, 220
Sunday not the "Lord's Day,".....	221, 222
Extracts about Sunday,.....	222
The " <i>Holy Sabbath</i> " idea began in the 16th century,.....	223, 227
Necessity of keeping Sunday as a <i>holy</i> day an ignorant fraud,.....	223
Augsburgh Confession,.....	224
Sunday changed to <i>holy</i> day by Catholics and protestants,.....	228, 230
Absurdities taught as Bible make Skeptics and Infidels.....	231
Popular doctrines—immortal soul, endless misery, &c.,.....	232
Quotation from Rev. E. White of England,.....	232
EPITOME OF THE GREAT SALVATION,.....	236
Origin of man—a living soul,..	236
Death the penalty of disobedience,.....	237
The old serpent's sugar coated pill,.....	238
Several learned men who discard immortality of the soul,.....	239
Present state of things not to last forever,.....	240
Great mistake to ignore the Old Testament,.....	241, 242
The nations to be blest in Abraham,.....	243

The kingdom of God given to David and his sons,.....243
 The kingdom overturned but not utterly,.....245
 The 12 Tribes to be re-gathered for the subjects,.....247
 Christ and his brethren to reign jointly,.....249
 The great salvation is more than redemption,.....250
 How to become heirs,.....250
 The name—Salvation in and by the name,.....251
 The gospel,.....253
 Advocates of the gospel, always called fanatics, &c ,.....255, 256
 Things of the name—fulfilled things,.....257
APPENDIX.....260
 The image of God,.....279
 Sin in the flesh,.....281
 Punishment of the wicked,.....282
 Origin of Universalism,.....278
 What is it to believe in Christ?.....291
 What is it to be a Christian?.....292
 What is salvation?.....293
 What is it to be good?.....293
 State of the dead,.....294
 Baptism,.....300
 Baptism into the name,.....306
 Repentance,.....312
 Christianity and morality,.....314
 Right—what is it?.....315
 Doctrine—all important,.....316
 The new birth,.....318
 The spirit—water its emblem,.....321
 Extracts,.....322
 Essay on immortality,.....328
 The word made flesh,.....331
 Pre-existence of Christ.....331, 340
 Closing remark.....340

