

A. G. Haughey

Rare

DISCUSSION

ON

THE SABBATH QUESTION,

HELD IN

Library Hall, Chelsea, Mass., Nov., 1869.

BETWEEN

ELDER MILES GRANT,

Editor "World's Crisis," Boston,

AND

ELDER M. E. CORNELL,

Of Battle Creek, Mich.

P 263
G 76
c.2

STEAM PRESS

SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION,
BATTLE CREEK, MICH.

1870.

THE REVIEW AND HERALD
EDITORIAL LIBRARY

CLASS No. P263 G 76 c.2

TITLE Discussion on the Sabbath
question

AUTHOR Grant, Miles & Cornell, M. E.

**E.M.A. - Early Public-
ations Collection**

p2619

Center for Adventist Research
Andrews University
Berrien Springs, Michigan

Alvin Lighton

P2619
LIBRARY
REVIEW AND HERALD

263
976

DISCUSSION

ON

THE SABBATH QUESTION,

HELD IN

Library Hall, Chelsea, Mass., Nov., 1888,

BETWEEN

ELDER MILES GRANT,

Editor "World's Crisis," Boston,

AND

ELDER M. E. CORNELL,

Of Battle Creek, Mich.

THE QUESTION.


"The Sabbath was binding only on the Jews and their servants after their deliverance from Egyptian bondage."

ELDER GRANT affirmed,
ELDER CORNELL denied.

STEAM PRESS

OF THE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION,
BATTLE CREEK, MICH.

1870.

 **LIBRARY
REVIEW AND HERALD**

DISCUSSION

THE SABBATH QUESTION

PREFACE.

WHILE Eld. Cornell was holding meetings in Chelsea, Mass., last summer, he was challenged to discuss the question of the Sabbath. Arrangements being made, the discussion was held in Library Hall, Chelsea, commencing Nov. 8, 1869, and continuing four evenings, in alternate speeches of twenty minutes.

A reporter was employed, who attended the first evening; but on entering the Hall the second evening, we received a note from him, stating that ill health prevented his attendance. As it was then impossible to procure another, I proceeded to note the speeches as I was able, not professing to be able to give a verbatim report. On writing out my notes, and submitting the result to the parties, they approved it, both preferring a plain, concise statement of their ideas as presented, to a lengthy and verbatim report.

In regard to the difference in length of the speeches of both parties, there are two causes for it. Both speakers increased in rapidity of speech as the discussion progressed. And, in several cases, they read at considerable length what they had previously prepared. This was the case with Eld. Cornell's argument on "the Covenants," and his "Reasons," numbered one to fif-

Vault

BV

125

G73

RH Lib

Her.

LIBRARY

RENEW AND RETAIL

teen. Also with Eld. Grant's list of "Facts," read the last evening. When they reasoned extemporaneously, I took each particular point or argument, clothing it as nearly as I was able in the language of the speakers, rejecting repetitions and redundancies, anxious that neither of them should lose anything in the report in the force and clearness of his statement. But what they read I copied verbatim from the copy furnished by the parties, and of course such speeches are of much greater length.

As Eld. Grant was obliged to leave Boston before I could write it all out, I called on him in Rochester, N. Y., at the time of the "Advent Christian National Convention," and submitted that part of the report to him which he had not previously heard read. He then, as he had already done by the other part, indorsed it as a fair, candid presentation of his arguments, and called on Eld. Sheldon, of Wisconsin, to witness to his indorsement of it. I requested him to send to me a written statement to that effect, to be published with the report, which he promised to do. As it has not yet arrived, and the printers wish to make up the first form, I make this statement in the preface.

J. H. WAGGONER.

Battle Creek, Mich., Dec. 1, 1869.

THE DISCUSSION.

First Session.

as excesses, rather than silence, and with it corruption and death." We have some worthy examples of discussion. I recollect our divine Master, at twelve years of age, was engaged disputing with the doctors. I read that Paul disputed daily in the school of Tyrannus, and sometimes had scenes quite exciting. Luther, Melanc-

teen. Also with Eld. Grant's list of "Facts," read the last evening. When they reasoned extemporaneously, I took each particular point or argument, clothing it as nearly as I was able in the language of the speakers, rejecting repetitions and redundancies, anxious that neither in the report in the

SINCE the Preface was printed, the expected "statement" has come to hand, as follows:

STATEMENT.

THIS is to certify that the following report, as taken by Eld. J. H. Waggoner, is impartial and honorable. It does not profess to be a verbatim report, but the points and ideas are well expressed and satisfactory.

MILES GRANT.

CERTIFICATE.

HAVING examined the report of the Chelsea discussion, as prepared by Eld. Waggoner, I cordially indorse it as a faithful and impartial presentation of the arguments.

M. E. CORNELL.

THE DISCUSSION.

First Session.

ELD. GRANT'S FIRST SPEECH.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: The subject that has brought us together is one of some interest, and one that has agitated the public mind in this city for some weeks and months past. We are aware that there are those who think the discussion of religious subjects is not profitable. We think otherwise, or we would not be engaged in it. I would like to just read a statement from Dr. Cummings, of London, on the point of religious discussions. He says, "The greatest blessings have been achieved by discussion. Error suffers in the ordeal; truth never does; the dross only is consumed, while the gold comes out more brilliant, more precious, more pure. Many deprecate controversy, and think it fitted for the battle-field; not for the peaceful pastures of the gospel. We think differently. In politics, agitation, in religion, stagnation, is the peril. What we have to fear in religion is, not life—that is, activity, but death, or formality. Give us life—life with its excesses, rather than silence, and with it corruption and death." We have some worthy examples of discussion. I recollect our divine Master, at twelve years of age, was engaged disputing with the doctors. I read that Paul disputed daily in the school of Tyrannus, and sometimes had scenes quite exciting. Luther, Melan-

thon, and their associates, at the Reformation, did much by discussion. It is true that discussions may be so conducted as to be unpleasant, and unprofitable. Whenever disputants say harsh things to each other—talk unkindly, it is unpleasant and unprofitable. I trust the audience will not be grieved in this way during this discussion.

The subject, I say, is somewhat important, especially, viewed from our brother's standpoint. It is thought by some that this Sabbath question is the third angel's message; and, if so, it is a very important matter; for if we turn to Revelation, we find that those who do not heed the proclamation are to receive the mark of the beast; *i. e.*, those who keep the first day instead of Saturday—the Jewish Sabbath—as a day of rest. So that the question is, whether we shall keep the present day of rest, the first day of the week, so called the Lord's day, or whether we shall keep Saturday as the Sabbath. So if it is a fact that the proclamation of this seventh day is the third angel's message, and we do not heed it, then that mark of the beast is upon us; and those with that mark are in a very sad condition. So we say, looking at it from this standpoint, it is time it is investigated.

The question, as you heard it stated, is this: "Resolved, That the Sabbath was binding only on the Jews and their servants, after their deliverance from Egyptian bondage."

We remark here at the outset that we do not find any proof from Scripture that Adam kept the Sabbath. His first day was the Creator's seventh day, but we find no evidence in Scripture, though he lived 930 years, that he ever was required to keep the Sabbath,

or seventh day. If our brother knows a passage that teaches it, he will present it in due time.

Tertullian, in his discussion with the Jews, challenges them to prove that Adam ever kept the Sabbath. If they cannot prove it, I do not know who can any better than they, for they were certainly familiar with the subject.

This is also true of Enoch, who walked with God, and was translated. There is no evidence that that good man was required to keep the Sabbath.

What was true of Adam and Enoch was true of Melchisedec, a very noted person, priest and king, standing high as an example of Christian character and virtue, but there is no intimation that he kept the seventh-day Sabbath.

With Abraham commences the circumcision; but there is no mention of a Sabbath to him. The same is true of Isaac and Jacob. These are the "fathers," so declared by the apostles. If they all, up to the time of Abraham, had no Sabbath enjoined upon them, or if they did have a Sabbath enjoined upon them, we may inquire, Why was it not mentioned somewhere? Other duties and commandments are specified clearly and positively. We say, if previous to this time a Sabbath was enjoined upon them, Why is there not some mention made of it somewhere? Let my brother tell us.

It is also true of Job; and when we come down to Job, we get down to the neighborhood of Moses. Indeed, they were cotemporaries, Job living earlier.

Now we come to the Israelites, or children of Israel, in Egypt. Thus far we have been able to find no proof that any man was required to keep the Sabbath from creation down to the children of Israel in Egypt, in the days of Moses. Had the Israelites been commanded to

keep the Sabbath before they went to Egypt, there is no reason why they would not have kept it, for after their backslidden state arrived, in the days of Antiochus, they endured great afflictions rather than break the Sabbath. So we conclude that if it had been commanded before they went there, they would have observed it in spite of Pharaoh, and taken the consequences. We think Joseph would not have failed to observe the Sabbath, had he learned of it before he went into Egypt. There is no record that they taught it to the Egyptians, or kept it when they might have kept it. If there is such a record, let it come. Now we have got down 2500 years, and there is no mention made of the Sabbath yet as a day enjoined upon man to be kept. And God's people did not observe it; and if they did, there is no record of it. Why not? Because the event had not transpired that called it forth. It is evident that Israel made no scruple of journeying on the seventh day till the law was given from Mt. Sinai, and that was the eleventh station from Egypt. In the preamble to the Sabbath, in the week before they kept it, they were commanded to gather twice as much manna as usual, on Friday, enough to last over the Sabbath. This is a sort of preamble then. The commandment had not then been given, and some of them did not understand it, and went out to gather it on the Sabbath day, and did not find it. Previous to that they were to gather only for the day; not to last on the second day; if so, it would decay, and become offensive; but when they came to this time, they were to gather enough on Friday to last over the Sabbath; and it did not decay, as on former times—a miraculous manifestation.

This resting of Israel was the first sanctification of the Sabbath mentioned in the Bible. We come to the

conclusion then that no Sabbath was observed before Moses, the time of the deliverance of Israel from Egyptian bondage; and as there is no evidence that the Gentiles kept the Sabbath, therefore we think a *part* of the resolution is established any way—that it was binding only on the Jews after they came out of Egyptian bondage.

After the going forth of the commandment, Moses says, Deut. 5:15, "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 a stretched-out arm, therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day." "Therefore," for that reason. Why? They had been in bondage as servants, making brick without straw, an oppressive bondage—work, work, work, no end. He is going to let them have a rest-day in commemoration of his taking them out of Egyptian bondage:

It may be objected that there are some other "therefores." We turn to Deut. 24:17, 18. "Thou shalt not pervert the judgment of the stranger, nor the fatherless, nor take a widow's raiment to pledge, but remember that thou wast a bondman, and the Lord thy God redeemed thee thence; *therefore*, he commanded thee to do this thing." Why? You remember you were a stranger, and in bondage.

Then again, Lev. 19:33, and onward: "And if a stranger sojourn with thee in your land, ye shall not vex him. But the stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt; I am the Lord your God. Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment, in meteyard, in weight, or in measure. Just balances, just weights, a just

ephah, and a just hin, shall ye have; I am the Lord your God, which brought you out of the land of Egypt. Therefore shall ye observe all my statutes, and all my judgments, and do them; I am the Lord." You remember you were strangers and bondmen in Egypt; keep these in mind. And the Sabbath, as a commemorative or memorial day of that deliverance, was to be kept by them. The Gentiles were never delivered out of Egyptian bondage, neither were they required to keep the day. The Jews were not required to keep it before that, for the institution could not be established before the event transpired which it was to commemorate. We say it is a memorial day to the Jews. Let me look at this once more. "Remember thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence with a mighty hand and a stretched-out arm, therefore,"—for this reason—"the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day"—the rest day. Why did he take that day? Because on that day he rested himself, and he chose the rest day that he had, and gave it to them to commemorate their deliverance out of Egyptian bondage.

Eze. 20: 10-12: "Wherefore, I caused them to go forth out of the land of Egypt, and brought them into the wilderness. And I gave them my statutes, and shewed them my judgments, which if a man do, he shall even live in them. Moreover, also I gave them my sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them." "Between me and them," not everybody, not the Gentiles. Who were "them"? The ones to whom the reasons were given: the Jews—they have that advantage.

In Ex. 31: 15, 16, we read: "Six days may work

be done, but in the seventh is the Sabbath of rest, holy to the Lord; whosoever doeth any work on the Sabbath day, he shall surely be put to death." With the law goes the penalty: the penalty is abolished, is the law still in force? Does my brother claim that the penalty is still in force? We have yet to learn that the law is in force after the penalty is abolished. "Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant." "The children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath." Does that mean the Gentiles? The Gentiles are never called Israel. To observe the Sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant. I wish to quote a statement from my brother: "When a law is once enacted by proper authority, it must—— [Time.]

ELD. CORNELL'S FIRST SPEECH.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: In engaging with my brother in the investigation of the question before us, I am happy to enter into it with this thought, that we are engaging with one who is not a novice in discussion, but one who is considered one of the ablest in the field upon any of those questions which he has investigated, and we shall with confidence look for positive proof to sustain the affirmative of this proposition, if such proof can be found.

In his first speech upon this question, the affirmative has made many negations. He has asserted that there is no proof of this, that, and the other; that is, he has based an argument on the silence of Scripture. Adam never kept the Sabbath. This is his first position. After a few preliminary remarks, he says: Did Adam ever

keep the Sabbath? No. Why not? Because the Scripture nowhere declares that he kept it; there is no account of its being enjoined upon him, no commandment there, no text that says Adam ever kept the Sabbath, and hence the inference is that he did not keep it.

Now in regard to this argument, we want to examine it a moment, and see whether it will do. That which proves too much, proves nothing. The argument, then, on this point, based upon the silence of Scripture, proves too much; for it proceeds upon the supposition that nothing was obligatory, or believed, in the period covered by the history of the book of Genesis, except that which is plainly recorded. This rule would prove that the duty of love to God and our neighbor was not obligatory during the first two thousand years, for there is not a single text in the book of Genesis to prove that such precept was in force; there is no record of any such precept. There is no *proof* that Adam was under obligations to love the Lord with all his heart, or his neighbor as himself. Shall we infer, therefore, that he was not under such obligation?

Then again, notice the matter of sacrifices. There is no mention made of sacrifices from the time of Abel till the deluge, a period of fifteen hundred years. But does that prove that they were not offered?

Then again, circumcision. We read nothing of circumcision from the death of Moses till Jeremiah, a period of eight hundred years. Was it not performed throughout this time?

Then again, the ordinance of the red heifer. It is not once noticed from the period of the Pentateuch to the close of the Old Testament; but the apostle refers to it, and argues for it, as a rite well known and in constant use. We have no account where sacrifices were

first instituted; yet no one doubts that they were instituted immediately after the fall. Why, then, deny that the Sabbath was first sanctified at the end of creation week, as we find, in Genesis, second chapter, the record of the institution of the Sabbath in the very beginning? Now, my friend will not deny that sacrifices were obligatory from the very beginning, though we have no record of their institution. But we have a record of the sabbatic institution. We have it plainly recorded in Gen. 2:3, that God rested on the seventh day, and sanctified it, because that in it he had rested. There is the account of the instituting of the Sabbath; and when we come down to the fourth commandment, it points right back to creation week for the reasons for keeping it. It rests right upon that fact: for in six days the Lord made the heavens, the earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and he rested on the seventh day, and hallowed it. The fourth commandment points right back to the creation. The reasons given on Mount Sinai, were reasons that had been in existence from creation. Taking the record of its institution and comparing it with the commandment, we find positive proof that it was instituted from the beginning of the world, though we may not have a positive statement of the matter during that history, for you know the history is exceedingly brief. What if we have not a direct mention of it? Many things we have not a direct mention of. All that we have concerning Enoch, a man worthy to be translated to Heaven, is that "Enoch walked with God; and he was not, for God took him." If he had lived now-a-days, volumes would have been written; and this shows why many things were not mentioned.

But again, the Sabbath is not mentioned after the law was given, for a long period of time; yet the affirm-

ative admits that it was binding; but it is not mentioned there for the space of several hundred years. There is no mention made of the Sabbath in Joshua, Ruth, First and Second Samuel, and First Kings, which are so much more detailed than Genesis, and yet it was during the Mosaic law, when, it is admitted, it was in full force.

Then, there is the resurrection and a future Judgment day. They are not mentioned in the book of Genesis. Shall we therefore infer that they were not believed, because they are not mentioned? Genesis is a book of history, not of law. Moreover, its history is exceedingly brief. Now, if there were no proof that the Sabbath did exist from the beginning, the silence of Genesis would be no proof that it was not in force, for there are many other things, which my friend and myself will agree were in force, that were not mentioned. But we have positive proof that the Sabbath *did* exist, and the reasons God gave when he gave the commandment on Mount Sinai, had existed from the creation; so the fourth commandment states. So much, then, for the silence of Scripture, which proves too much, and therefore does not prove anything.

Again he says, which I cannot help thinking is a mistake, that the institution of the Sabbath is not hinted at in the book of Genesis. It does not say the Sabbath, in Genesis, but says the seventh day: "And God rested the seventh day." What is the Sabbath? God says the seventh day is the Sabbath. It signifies rest. When it speaks of God's resting on the seventh day, it is the same as if it had said he rested on the Sabbath day, for that made it the Sabbath day. So the Sabbath of the Lord did exist from the end of creation week, and there it is hinted at, and also blessed and hallowed from that time. It was blessed and sanctified because that in it

he had rested from his works. First, it was a rest day. Second, he blessed and sanctified it, because that in it he had rested. Therefore you see, when you look at the commandment pointing right back to creation week, that it is certain the Sabbath had existed from creation.

But again, the affirmative says that this rest of Israel was the first sanctification of the Sabbath. But go back to the second chapter of Genesis. Has he ever read it? Does it say, "Sanctified the seventh day"? Certainly it does. Then that is not the first of its being sanctified. It was sanctified from the beginning. As much as to say, he set it apart to a holy use. To whose use? Man's use. He set apart the seventh day for man's, not for his own, use, after he had rested upon it; then he sanctifies and sets it apart to a holy, religious use. If that be the fact, he must have informed his people in regard to it. Though we have no record of the commandment, yet we have the record that such a proclamation was made. We don't need a record of the proclamation, if we have God's word that he had sanctified it. That proves that the proclamation was made to man; for in no way can it be set apart for the use of man, except by a proclamation of the fact.

Now for the argument from Deut. 5:15: "And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched-out arm; therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day," and on the strength of which my brother says the Sabbath was a memorial of deliverance from Egyptian bondage. As we have said before, that which proves too much, proves nothing. The Sabbath could not be a memorial of the departure from Egypt. These words were spoken, by Moses, forty years after

the deliverance. This was the final appeal of Moses—an appeal to a people who had so generally violated the Sabbath. Now, is it not very strange, if the Sabbath were a memorial of the deliverance from Egypt, that Moses did not tell them of it till forty years afterward, and when he did mention the coming out of Egypt, he said not a word about the Sabbath's being a memorial of it? This is purely the inference of my brother. We inquire whether it was not an appeal to their gratitude for such mercies. We may settle the matter, for we have an exact parallel to this text. He has quoted one. Deut. 24: 17, 18: "Thou shalt not pervert the judgment of the stranger, nor of the fatherless; nor take a widow's raiment to pledge: but thou shalt remember that thou wast a bondman in Egypt, and the Lord thy God redeemed thee thence: therefore I command thee to do this thing." If the first quotation proves that the Sabbath was a memorial of the coming out of Egypt, this proves that not to pervert judgment, &c., is a memorial of their departure out of Egypt, and that it was not binding before. My brother infers, because of this language, that the Sabbath was not in force before this time. The same argument will prove that this obligation was not in force before this time, for the same language precisely is used with reference to it. If one is a memorial, the other is.

✓ If such an appeal proves that the Sabbath was not obligatory upon them until they were delivered from Egypt, it proves the same in the other case, that justice, mercy, &c., were not. But if we take the fact that they were an appeal to the gratitude of a rebellious people, all is consistent. God had shown them great favors, and now he required them to show that

they remembered what he had done for them, by obeying him in all things.

We inquire, How did they come out of Egypt? The first-born of the Egyptians were slain, and there was great excitement. Ex. 12: 33: "And the Egyptians were urgent upon the people, that they might send them out of the land in haste; for they said, We be all dead men."

Thus they came out of Egypt with their stock and luggage at midnight, with one grand rush; and so he makes the Sabbath, a day of quiet and rest, a memorial of a great rush! [Time.]

ELD. GRANT'S SECOND SPEECH.

Touching the last point: the Sabbath is not to commemorate the travel from Egypt, but the labor and the tasks they had to endure there. Not because they came out in a hurry, but because ye were bondmen in Egypt, therefore, I commanded you to keep the seventh day.

The silence of the Scriptures is thought not to prove anything. Well, really, that is new theology to me. I supposed that what the Scriptures did not enjoin, was not binding upon any body. And I think so still, Mr. Chairman.

"Nothing obligatory not commanded." "We are not commanded to love God before we come to Mt. Sinai." Perhaps he knows, certainly he does, that there was nothing written of that book before you come to Sinai. Moses was the first writer, so there could not be anything written about loving God before there was anything written.

"There was no mention of sacrifice." Of course

not. Nobody wrote in that till you come to Moses, 2500 years from creation.

He refers back to Gen. 2:3. God rested on the seventh day, blessed it and sanctified it. It does not say he sanctified all the seventh days, from that time. He sanctified *it*; he blessed *it*.

"The reason for keeping the Sabbath exists from creation." Let us see, and look it over again. Deut. 5:15. "Remember"—observe, this is right in connection with the reading of the ten commandments, the preceding verses reading, "Six days thou shalt labor, and do all thy work," &c. "And remember"—he puts it right in there in connection with that fourth commandment, right by its side, that they might understand and remember the object of it—"and remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched-out arm; therefore"—*therefore*; for that reason—"the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day." Not Adam. Adam was not brought out of Egypt with a high hand, neither was Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Enoch, nor Job. "Therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day."

Turn now to our friend's position—the text which he thinks proves too much. We cannot see but that it is in perfect harmony. Let us read it once more. Deut. 24:17, 18: "Thou shalt not pervert the judgment of the stranger"—mark the point, a *stranger*—"nor of the fatherless, nor take a widow's raiment to pledge; but thou shalt remember that thou wast a bondman in Egypt." Go right back, in harmony with this, to Deut. 5. "Remember that thou wast a servant;" therefore he hath commanded you to do this thing; be-

cause you were bondmen in Egypt, therefore hath he given you a day to commemorate that wonderful deliverance, when he brought you through the Red Sea and the wilderness, to Mt. Sinai, to the eleventh station; and I want you to remember what he has been doing for you. Look where you were some weeks or months ago. No wonder God instituted a day to have them remember it—one of the mightiest works God has ever done for his people on this planet. If there are other days to commemorate events of less importance, it seems that this ought to be observed.

Again, in Lev. 19:33-37: "And if a stranger sojourn with thee in your land, ye shall not vex him; but the stranger that dwelleth with you shall be as one born amongst you, and thou shalt love him as thyself; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt. I am the Lord your God. . . . Therefore shall ye observe all my statutes, and all my judgments, and do them."

Here is a reminder of their condition in Egypt. Therefore I want you to remember other strangers, and keep this day to commemorate your deliverance. All is in perfect harmony; there is no proving too much about it; it only adds to the proof, because it is a fact the Sabbath is not commanded nor enjoined on a single man from Adam's first day down to Moses, 2500 years; and yet our brother claims the silence of Scripture as no proof in this matter.

He says the resurrection is not taught; Christ found it in the writings of Moses, where the angel declared at the bush a certain thing.

He says there is positive proof that the Sabbath did exist, and that we remarked that there was no proof. Perhaps he misunderstood us. We meant to say that there was no proof that any man was required to keep

the Sabbath. We do not dispute that the seventh day was mentioned.

"The Sabbath not hinted at for 2500 years." I did not mean that. I meant, not hinted at as an ordinance, or a day to be kept by man. That is the point. My brother has not brought it yet.

"The first sanctification of the Sabbath at Mt. Sinai." I said it was the first time it was sanctified for man. He misunderstood again; for he seems to think I ignore the sanctification of the Sabbath at creation. I mean as a rest-day for man, as when in the wilderness they gathered twice as much manna on Friday as on Thursday.

"No record of such a command." He says, "Such a proclamation was made to man." Mr. Chairman, there is no proof. The assertion is made that such a proclamation was made to man; the proof is wanted. Where is the proof? 2500 years afterward is the first mention that he had sanctified it. Is this certain proof that he proclaimed it to one man before Moses wrote it?

"The Sabbath is not a memorial of their deliverance." Why, here we have it—"Remember." I think it is equivalent to a memorial in the case. Moses said nothing about a memorial; he said, Remember.

These are the points, so far as I have noted them; and I must confess I do not feel there is any special weight in them. And I may as well remark that on this question my brother is emphatically posted. Probably no man in the United States is better; so it is pleasant to know that the one on the opposite side is well posted; and if he cannot make it plain, no one can. And so it is pleasant; and I think we shall have a pleasant talk about the matter.

Now we will come down to where we left off before. Ex. 16: "Six days ye shall gather it; but on the seventh day, which is the Sabbath, in it there shall be none."

Also Ex. 31:15: "Six days may work be done; but in the seventh is the Sabbath of rest, holy to the Lord. Whosoever doeth any work in the Sabbath day, he shall surely be put to death." I think there is no man that is keeping the Sabbath day in the United States now. Not a man. What constitutes keeping it? Keeping it in harmony with all the requirements. That is what constitutes the keeping of it. And so, I doubt most seriously, whether there is a man or women keeping the seventh-day Sabbath in harmony with God's requirements. "Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations for a perpetual covenant."

I want to turn to that statement from my brother again: "When a law is once enacted by proper authority, it must remain in force till the same authority repeals it; and the repeal must be as plainly stated as the original enactment." Keep that in mind.

Turn now to Ex. 12:11, 14: "And thus shall ye eat it" (the passover), &c. "And this day shall be unto you for a memorial, and ye shall keep it a feast to the Lord throughout your generations; ye shall keep it a feast by an ordinance forever." I wish now an express repeal of that, somewhere, as positive as that statement. Otherwise, according to that law laid down by my brother, it is in force now. I ask my brother if he keeps the passover? Did it ever belong to the Gentiles to keep it? Did he *pass over* the Gentiles when he destroyed the first-born? No. It was a feast for the Jews, or a feast day, a memorial day just like the Sab-

bath. This only teaches another event in their deliverance. Where is it stated that the passover is repealed as plainly as here now enacted?

Lev. 23:1: "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, Concerning the feasts of the Lord, which ye shall proclaim to be holy convocations, even these are my feasts"—like the one just referred to, the passover, which ye shall proclaim to be holy convocations—"Six days shall work be done,"—there comes the first, pre-eminent as indicating the great deliverance—"Six days shall work be done, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of rest, a holy convocation; ye shall do no work therein; it is the Sabbath of the Lord in all your dwellings. These are the feasts of the Lord, even holy convocations, which ye shall proclaim in their seasons." Now comes the proclamation: "In the fourteenth day of the first month, at even, is the Lord's passover." That is one. The same is true of pentecost. That is perpetual also.

Verses 15-17: "And ye shall count unto you from the morrow after the Sabbath, from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the wave offering; seven Sabbaths shall be complete: even unto the morrow after the seventh Sabbath shall ye number fifty days; and ye shall offer a new meat offering unto the Lord. Ye shall bring out of your habitations two wave loaves of two tenth deals: they shall be of fine flour; they shall be baked with leaven; they are the first fruits unto the Lord." Verse 21: "And ye shall proclaim on the selfsame day, that it may be a holy convocation unto you: ye shall do no servile work therein; it shall be a statute forever in all your dwellings throughout your generations."

Where is it said the feast of pentecost was done away,

or abolished, in as plain language as here stated? Does my brother keep this feast? Where is there one positive declaration that it is abolished?

26th verse, and onward: "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Also on the tenth day of this seventh month there shall be a day of atonement: it shall be a holy convocation unto you; and ye shall afflict your souls, and offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord. And ye shall do no work in that same day: for it is a day of atonement, to make an atonement for you before the Lord your God; for whatsoever soul it be that shall not be afflicted in that same day, he shall be cut off from among his people. And whatsoever soul it be that doeth any work in that same day, the same soul will I destroy from among his people. Ye shall do no manner of work: it shall be a statute forever throughout your generations in all your dwellings."

Perpetual again. Does my brother observe this feast? Where, let me ask, is an express annulling, or abolishing, of that law? So with the feast of tabernacles, Verses 33-41:

"And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, saying, The fifteenth day of this seventh month shall be the feast of tabernacles for seven days unto the Lord. On the first day shall be a holy convocation: ye shall do no servile work therein. Seven days ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord; on the eighth day shall be a holy convocation unto you, and ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord: it is a solemn assembly; and ye shall do no servile work therein. These are the feasts of the Lord, which ye shall proclaim to be holy convocations, to offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord, a burnt offering, and a meat offering, a sacrifice, and drink offerings, every thing upon his day; beside the Sabbaths of the Lord, and beside your gifts, and beside all your vows, and beside all your freewill offerings, which ye

give unto the Lord. Also in the fifteenth day of the seventh month, when ye have gathered in the fruit of the land, ye shall keep a feast unto the Lord seven days: on the first day shall be a Sabbath, and on the eighth day shall be a Sabbath. And ye shall take you on the first day the boughs of goodly trees, branches of palm trees, and the boughs of thick trees, and willows of the brook; and ye shall rejoice before the Lord your God seven days. And ye shall keep it a feast unto the Lord seven days in the year: it shall be a statute forever in your generations."

I would remark that the word rendered perpetual, is the same as the word rendered forever. When it is applied to the Sabbath and to all the feasts, it means the same thing. Does my brother observe the feast of tabernacles?

[Time.]

ELD. CORNELL'S SECOND SPEECH.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: We have a question before us, and it is well enough for us to understand when we are arguing to the point. "Resolved, That the Sabbath was binding only on the Jews and their servants, after their deliverance from Egyptian bondage." This is what must be proved. It does not devolve upon us to prove anything, unless we choose. We are to examine the proof that is offered by the affirmative. If he fails to prove this, the question is lost.

There are two points in the question. First, that the Sabbath was binding only on the Jews and their servants; second, that it was binding only after their deliverance from Egyptian bondage. If he fails in proving either one of these, he has lost the question. These two points we are to keep before our minds. Has there been any proof yet offered that the Sabbath was binding

only on the Jews? Where is the text that says the Sabbath was binding only on the Jews? Have any of these texts quoted said that the Sabbath was binding only on the Jews? He has quoted texts to prove it was binding on the Jews. I admit that. Of course it was; but where is the proof that it was not binding on some one else? If he has brought such proofs, we have failed to see it. We will try and keep the point to be proved before us.

He has read a great many passages of Scripture; but what does it amount to? He must show that the Sabbath was not binding on any one else but the Jews; but to show that it was binding on the Jews does not prove anything. That is not the question. The proposition is, it was not binding on any one else.

Now my brother explains his position in regard to the memorial day: he did not mean to be understood that it was a memorial of their travel, but a memorial of their work, their burden, their tasks, in Egypt, before they came out. Worse and worse! A Sabbath of rest a memorial of their work! Is n't that strange—rest a memorial of work and labor? It seems to me that is exactly as far from the point as it can be. Now the Sabbath we understand to be a memorial of God's rest; our rest on the Sabbath from our labors, a memorial of God's rest; a rest to commemorate a rest. The Sabbath day is God's rest day, and he sanctified the rest day to a holy use, and commands us to keep his rest—a memorial, not of his work, but, of his rest from all his works.

He says there was nothing binding that is not commanded. But I suppose a great many things were binding on the people in the time covered by the history of Genesis, that we have no record of being com-

manded. We have said there is no record that men were then to love the Lord with all their heart, or their neighbor as themselves. We do not deny that the obligation was on the people. My brother believes it was the duty of Adam to love God and his neighbor; but he cannot show a record of it. If the argument that we have no record of the enforcing of the Sabbath upon man, proves that it was binding upon man, it proves too much; it proves that it was not a duty to love God either.

But again, he says it could not be a commandment given till the time came to give it. How does he know God did not command Adam to keep the Sabbath? He must find the text that says there was no such thing, or else he proves nothing at all. To call on me to prove there was such a commandment, proves nothing. It was instituted there at creation; we have the record; and then 2500 years afterward, in the commandment, God points right back, for a reason for keeping it, to what he did in Eden. My brother quotes the specific reason why they were to keep it: "Remember that thou wast a bondman in Egypt," &c., therefore keep the Sabbath day. They ought to do it from love to God, in gratitude to him for what he had done for them; and not only that, but everything else. In another place they were commanded to have just balances and just weights, &c., because they had been bondmen in Egypt. Don't you see that *all* God's commandments are required to be kept for the same reason, because he brought them out of Egypt? Are all memorials of coming out of Egypt? If the Sabbath was a memorial, these words would prove that all his statutes were memorials of coming out of Egypt. Are the first second, third, fourth, fifth, and all the rest, memo-

rials of coming out of Egypt? One just as much as the other. That which proves too much, we say, proves nothing at all.

My brother says Christ found the resurrection revealed in the time of Moses, when the Lord appeared to him in the bush. What I said was, that there was no account that the people believed in the resurrection. I suppose they did; but there is no record of it.

Again he says, "God sanctified the day for the first time after they came out of Egypt." I cannot help thinking he has made a mistake; for I go to Genesis, and I find it was sanctified the seventh day. Now if it was sanctified after they came out of Egypt, I want the proof. Give us the chapter and verse.

Now my brother says that no man in the United States can keep the Sabbath, or does, for he has to keep everything pertaining to it. If no man can keep it now, could anybody at any time? Could anybody ever, or did they ever, keep the Sabbath? Will he tell us if anybody ever did keep the Sabbath, and point out the reason why we cannot keep the Sabbath now as well as then.

Now we come to positive proof. I call your attention to some positive proofs in regard to this matter, to show that the law of God was binding on the Gentiles. The question turns upon this proposition: Did the Gentiles have the chance, as individuals or nations, if they would, to form characters of holiness by obedience to law? and if so, what law did they have? One of three things must be true in the case: First, they were not subjects of law; or, secondly, they had a law specially provided for them different from that given to the Jews; or, thirdly, they were under obligations to obey the same law that was given to the Jews. We

will pass by the first two propositions, and proceed to established the third; for, in establishing the third, we disprove the other two. - Now if we prove this point, that both Jews and Gentiles were subjects of the same law, and under obligations to keep the same law, then my friend on the affirmative has lost his question.

Ex. 12:48, 49: "And when a stranger shall sojourn with thee, and will keep the passover to the Lord, let all his males be circumcised, and then let him come near and keep it; and he shall be as one that is born in the land; for no uncircumcised person shall eat thereof. One law shall be to him that is home-born, and unto the stranger that sojourneth among you."

✓ The Gentiles that lived among the tribes of Israel, not servants, but who sojourned and lived there—there should be one law for both classes.

Lev. 17:8-10: "And thou shalt say unto them, Whatsoever man there be of the house of Israel, or of the strangers which sojourn among you, that offereth a burnt offering or sacrifice, and bringeth it not unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, to offer it unto the Lord; even that man shall be cut off from among his people. And whatsoever man there be of the house of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among you, that eateth any manner of blood; I will even set my face against that soul that eateth blood, and will cut him off from among his people."

The same with the Gentiles that it was with the Jews.

Num. 15:14-16: "And if a stranger sojourn with you, or whosoever be among you in your generations, and will offer an offering made by fire, of a sweet savor unto the Lord; as ye do, so he shall do. One ordinance shall be both for you of the congregation, and also for the stranger that sojourneth with you, an or-

dinance forever in your generations: as ye are, so shall the stranger be before the Lord. One law and one manner shall be for you, and for the stranger that sojourneth with you."

This proves my position, that the same law that was binding upon the Jews, was binding upon the Gentiles.

I will now bring another testimony from Jeremiah, that the Gentiles were required to learn and keep the ways of Israel. Mark the proposition. My brother says the Sabbath was binding only on the Jews, and never was binding on the Gentiles before or since, nor on the Jews before they came out of Egypt. I will now disprove this proposition from this text:

Jer. 12:14-17: "Thus saith the Lord, against all mine evil neighbors [the Gentiles around] that touch the inheritance which I have caused my people Israel to inherit; Behold, I will pluck them out of their land, and pluck out the house of Judah from among them. And it shall come to pass, after that I have plucked them out, I will return, and have compassion on them, and will bring them again, every man to his heritage, and every man to his land. And it shall come to pass, if they will diligently learn the ways of my people, to swear by my name, The Lord liveth; as they taught my people to swear by Baal; then shall they be built in the midst of my people. But if they will not obey, I will utterly pluck up and destroy that nation, saith the Lord."

This text proves this, as we understand it: that God said to the nations around Israel, if they would learn the ways of his people and obey them, then he would build them up in the midst of his people; but if they would not obey him, then he would pluck them out, and would utterly destroy that nation. This text we regard as a triumphant disproof of the affirmation made

to-night, that the Sabbath was binding *only* upon the Jews and their servants. The Sabbath was a part of the "ways" of the Jewish people, and God calls upon the Gentiles as nations, that if they will learn these ways and keep these commandments, "then shall they be built up in the midst of my people."

I will introduce one more argument: Jesus says, "The Sabbath was made for man;" not the Jews alone, but for *man*. My brother dare not deny that it was binding upon all for whom it was *made*. If it was made for the Jews, it was binding only upon the Jews. "The Sabbath was made for man;" or, as the article is in the Greek, "The Sabbath was made for *the* man." If we leave it out, it is just as plain. And so, in order for my brother to prove that the Sabbath was not made for the Gentiles, he must prove that they were not men.

[*Time.*]

ELD. GRANT'S THIRD SPEECH.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: We do not think the Sabbath was made for beasts or animals, certainly; but the proof is wanting that it was binding on any but the Jews and their servants.

Our brother thinks that Jer. 12:14-17, proves positively that it was binding upon the Gentiles.

"Thus saith the Lord against all mine evil neighbors, that touch the inheritance which I have caused my people Israel to inherit; Behold, I will pluck them out of their land, and pluck out the house of Judah from among them. And it shall come to pass, after that I have plucked them out I will return, and have compassion on them, and will bring them again, every man to his heritage, and every man to his land. And it shall

come to pass, if they will diligently learn the ways of my people," &c.

It does not say a word about keeping his commandments, that I can find, though my brother said, "Obey them;" but I do not find it here. It is, "Swear by my name, the Lord liveth" (as they taught my people to swear by Baal), if they will stop that, and acknowledge me, I will let them live around there where they did before; but if they will not obey, I will utterly pluck them up. Learn what? This point, Swear by the Lord, instead of Baal.

Lev. 17:10, and Num. 15:14, refer to strangers sojourning with Israel, which is in keeping with the resolution,—while sojourning with, them as servants, they must keep the regulations.

He says we must find an express commandment that the Sabbath was not made for all men. That is asking a little too much. We are not to prove both a negative and an affirmative. Let him bring a negative commandment. The Sabbath was not binding till they came out of Egypt. We think that is settled till the negative prove that the seventh-day Sabbath was required to be kept by those living before Moses' time.

"There is no proof that it was *not* binding on any one else." Let him prove, I say, the negative.

He says we have quoted a great many passages of Scripture. That is encouraging. We cannot bring half of them.

"The Sabbath a memorial of work." How differently people look at the same thing. The Declaration of Independence to represent bondage and servitude. The Sabbath day a memorial of work; a rest day the opposite of work; independence the opposite of bondage. Memorials are opposites.

"Nothing binding except commanded." I might suppose they were, and I might suppose they were not; but it will hardly be taken as evidence in the case. There may have been commandments, but proof, proof! If he can bring such a passage, then it would be proof. He says there were no commandments to love God. I repeat there were none given. How could they be given before one was written?

Each commandment a memorial? No. The commandment to keep the Sabbath is a memorial. "Therefore" he commanded them to keep the Sabbath.

He says we suppose there was a belief in the resurrection before Moses' time. There is no proof of it needed.

Again, there seems to be a misunderstanding in reference to the Sabbath's being sanctified for the first time. I said that the first time it was set apart for the keeping of the children of Israel was at the time they first gathered manna—the first time it was set apart to be kept by any man, that we have any record of.

"No one can keep the Sabbath." I said no one is keeping it, according to what constitutes the keeping of it. I do not know a man who keeps it in harmony with the way the Jews kept it.

Then comes the point, the law of God binding on the Gentiles—Jews and Gentiles subject to the same law. We looked over that first. And also, "The Sabbath was made for man."

We will go on with these feast days, including the Sabbath, which was to be a perpetual covenant, then the passover, then the feast of pentecost, then the feast of atonement, then the feast of tabernacles, and all of them in that list of feast days, or memorial days, are to be perpetual, or forever; the same word in the original,

rendered perpetual and forever. We will read it once more: "And ye shall take you on the first day the boughs of goodly trees, branches of palm trees, and the boughs of thick trees, and willows of the brook; and ye shall rejoice before the Lord your God seven days. And ye shall keep it a feast unto the Lord seven days in the year. It shall be a statute forever in your generations." It was a perpetual covenant. Then if they all are perpetual, there must be an express command annulling, or abolishing, them, or they are still binding. Let my brother bring one express command to show that they are abolished, otherwise they run out by limitation. When is that? When we get down to the new covenant, when the Jews should be married to another, and divorced from the law. I will remark in conclusion on this point, the Sabbath is never enjoined on the Gentiles, unless servants, or sojourning and stopping in their families. We come to the point where these run out by limitation, and that is at the new covenant—two covenants like two constitutions. There may be a constitution of your State, and another constitution be formed afterwards, and the last one is binding. But two constitutions could not properly exist together in the same State.

Heb. 8:7: "For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second." What first covenant?

Gal. 4:2: "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bond-maid, the other by a free-woman. But he who was of the bond-woman was born after the flesh; but he of the free-woman was by promise. Which things are an allegory"—

allegorized is a better expression of the original—"for these are the two covenants; the one from the Mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar."

1 Kings 8:9: "There was nothing in the ark save the two tables of stone"—look now for the first covenant—"which Moses put there at Horeb"—that is in connection with Mt. Sinai—"when the Lord made a covenant with the children of Israel, when they came out of the land of Egypt." That seems to be definite. That is Israel, not the Gentiles; not Abraham, not Isaac, nor Jacob, nor Melchisedec, nor any of those worthies back there. 21st verse: "And I have set there a place for the ark, wherein is the covenant of the Lord, which he made with our fathers when he brought them out of the land of Egypt." That is the time he made it; he did not make it before. At Horeb is the spot. Deut. 5:2: "The Lord our God made a covenant with us in Horeb. The Lord made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive *this day*." He did not make it before the time of those then living and standing there. That is the covenant of Horeb. That is one. Paul says it genders to bondage. That is the covenant to which he refers, we think, when he says, "If it had been faultless," &c.

Deut. 5:4-6: "The Lord talked with you face to face in the mount, out of the midst of the fire"—that is where he gave the covenant—" (I stood between the Lord and you at that time, to show you the word of the Lord; for ye were afraid by reason of the fire, and went not up into the mount,) saying, I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt." There is the point brought to view again. Then he gave them the commandments. And in the 15th verse he says,

"Therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day"—because he brought thee out of Egypt.

In the 22d verse of the same chapter we read, "These words"—referring to the ten commandments—"the Lord spake unto all your assembly in the mount, out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness, with a great voice; and he added no more. And he wrote them in two tables of stone, and delivered them unto me."

Again, in Deut. 4:13: "He declared unto you his covenant which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments; and he wrote them upon two tables of stone." The ten commandments were the covenant. This looks very plain. But Paul says one of these covenants genders to bondage. "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law?"—the same expression—*law*—"for it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bond-maid, the other by a free-woman. But he who was of the bond-woman was born after the flesh; but he of the free-woman was by promise. Which things are an allegory; for these are the two covenants; the one from the Mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar." That is the whole. Deut. 9:9-11: "When I was gone up into the mount to receive the tables of stone, even the tables of the covenant which the Lord made with you, then I abode in the mount forty days and forty nights."

I will take that up again.

[Time.]

ELD. CORNELL'S THIRD SPEECH.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: We will notice a moment now what has been said in the last speech of the affirmative. An attempt was made to answer our positive proof that the Gentiles were required to learn the ways of Israel, and that blessings were pronounced upon them if they did them. Of course, they were not asked to believe a mere theory; for he never blesses anybody except in obedience. To learn what is right, is one thing; to do it acceptably to God, is another. It is equivalent for them to learn and to obey. Then they should be built up in the midst of Israel; but if they would not, he would utterly destroy that nation from among them. Now we will bring a parallel. The Gentiles and strangers were to learn the ways of Israel, and we will now bring proof to show that the Sabbath was a part of the ways of Israel.

Isa. 56:1: "Thus saith the Lord, Keep ye judgment, and do justice; for my salvation is near to come, and my righteousness to be revealed. Blessed is the man—not blessed is the *Jew* that doeth this, but blessed is the *man*—that doeth this, and the son of man that layeth hold on it; that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and keepeth his hand from doing any evil." But, says my friend, that means only the Jew.

Verses 3 and 4: "Neither let the son of the stranger, that hath joined himself to the Lord, speak, saying, The Lord hath utterly separated me from his people: neither let the eunuch say, Behold, I am a dry tree. For thus saith the Lord unto the eunuchs that keep my Sabbaths, and choose the things that please me, and take hold of my covenant," &c.

Here we have positive proof that the Gentiles are

meant—the strangers—he will not deny that the strangers are the Gentiles (see Eph. 2). First, his people, then, "neither the strangers"—they are not utterly cut off; for he says if they will join themselves to the Lord to serve the Lord, if they keep the Sabbath from polluting it, then he will bring them in and bless them. If this is not positive proof that the Gentiles are required to keep the Sabbath, then I do not know what would be proof. It does not say, The strangers that are servants in Jewish families, but, The strangers that join themselves to the Lord, not to Jewish families: to serve the Lord; to be obedient; every one that keeps the Sabbath, he will "give in mine house, and within my walls, a place and a name better than of sons and of daughters." We have it now positively: these are the ways of the children of Israel. What were the ways of his people? The ways they walked in. They walked in the ways of God—the ways of God were their ways. If they came in and learned the ways of the people, he would build them up. The Sabbath was one of these ways; so we read in Isa. 56. He there mentions the Sabbath as one of the things that the Gentiles were to do, that they might serve the Lord and receive his blessing.

"How could there be a command to love God, till Moses wrote?" He does not deny the duty; but there is no record of it till Moses. Of course not. Then my brother will admit that the duty to love God was obligatory. Still, there is no record of it in the book of Genesis. So there is no record of a command to keep the Sabbath, yet there might have been a command. He admits one; but what is true of one, is true of the other also.

But one thing he fails to notice, though I have called his attention to it, that the Sabbath was instituted at

the end of creation week, and that the fourth commandment, where it gives the reason for the obligation, points right back to what God did at the end of creation. He sanctified the day, and hallowed it, because that in it he rested when he made the world. That is the reason. The reason had existed from creation. Did not the obligation exist? Most certainly, it must have existed from creation.

I will now read an extract from the *Crisis*, inserted, as stated in that paper, with a slight variation of a few words, to suit the occasion:

"The following is from the London 'Quarterly Journal of Prophecy,' as quoted by the *Advent Herald*, April 1, 1854, with a slight variation of a few words and phrases, in order to meet our present needs:

"*Reasons for the observance of a Sabbath.* These reasons are, 1. *Man's need of rest.* Is this reason gone? Does man need rest no longer? Is the world now so calm a scene, and earth so serene a region, that no seventh-day's rest is needed? If not—if *the reason still exists*—must not *the day still remain?*"

Now I call that good. It came from the *World's Crisis*. There are a good many good things in the *World's Crisis*. Long may it live. Now, if the reason still exists, and the day of rest remains because of the reason, the obligation must still remain. If the reason existed from creation, the obligation existed from creation. God says it did exist from creation.

Now we come to three points. First, I said that Christ taught that the Sabbath was made for man. My brother replied that it was made for *man*, not for *beasts*. That is no answer at all. The argument was this: Jesus said the Sabbath was made for *man*, not for the *Jews*. What does it mean? It covers the whole race

of mankind. The Gentiles are men. Christians are men. Therefore, it was made for the Gentiles. In order to evade our argument, our brother must prove that the Gentiles are not men. Who is right?

The second point: The disciples rested on the seventh day according to the commandment. That points right back to Sinai; now go to Mt. Sinai, and that points right back to creation. The whole arch is spanned. If this does not prove it is a world-wide institution, what would prove it? The disciples in the New Testament rested on the seventh day according to the commandment. The commandment points right back to what he did at the end of creation week. So we have a connected chain down to this time. He will have to notice it in order to evade the conclusion. If he says it means only the Jew, and not the Gentile, we will take another scripture: "The woman was made for the man." If the Sabbath being made for man, meant only for the Jew, then woman being made for man, meant only for the Jew. But this proves too much. My brother would rebel against that in a moment. The Sabbath was made for all. The woman was made for the man—all men. The Gentiles have as good a right to the marriage institution as the Jews, exactly. On this point, we have a very interesting article from the *Crisis*, by T. M. Preble, one who has had the most to say in regard to the Sabbath of any one, perhaps, in the country, except those who believe in keeping the seventh day. This is published in the *Crisis*, and approved by the editor, I suppose:

"And that the Sabbath is *still binding on all mankind*, is proved by the fact that Christ "is Lord also of the Sabbath." And can a thing, of which he is

Lord, for the benefit of mankind, ever cease to be while he is Lord? And we have his divine sanction that "the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath." Yes; the Sabbath, or rest-day, was made "for man"—for the good of man. And in the same way, the apostle speaks of another institution—the institution of marriage. He says, "Neither was the man created for the woman, but the woman for the man." As, therefore, the woman was created for the good, or benefit, of man—all mankind—so was the Sabbath made for the good, or benefit, of man—all mankind. When, therefore, the institution of marriage shall cease by divine authority, then, also, let the institution of the Sabbath cease, and not until then."

I say, Amen, to that. This is very good. I will read on:

"Why is it that men, who are such close students of the Bible on other points, are so indifferent to the all-important subject of the Lord's Sabbath, in these days of peril, corruption, and sin? Until more regard is paid to the sacredness of the Sabbath, we need not be surprised at the increase of crime in the land. Oh! how Christ, the Lord of the Sabbath, is dishonored by the desecrations of this holy institution which "was made for man."

I might go on and introduce several other arguments, but the time is nearly up, and I prefer to release the congregation, and not introduce another argument. We shall have something of interest and point to-morrow evening. And we bespeak for the discussion to-morrow, the hearing of all; for the tug of war is coming, and we will try to find out to-morrow evening whether the Sabbath is binding on the Gentiles, as well as the Jews.

Second Session.

ELD. GRANT'S FOURTH SPEECH.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: I will proceed to notice some points made by our brother. He argues that the Gentiles were under the same law that the Jews were, and read some passages to sustain that position. In regard to sojourners, I will read some passages: Isa. 60:10: "And the sons of strangers shall build up thy walls." A sojourner is a temporary resident, not a permanent dweller; they resided among them as servants. Isa. 61:5: "And strangers shall stand and feed your flocks, and the sons of the alien shall be your ploughmen and your vinedressers." Isa. 56:1-6, was noticed: The eunuchs were a particular class of servants, "also the sons of the stranger that join themselves to the Lord, to serve him, and to love the name of the Lord, to be his servants, every one that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it," &c. Strangers and their sons associated with families of Israel. You see they were servants, and therefore this text is in keeping with our resolution—all their servants were to keep it. Nothing here against the resolution.

He refers to the *Crisis*. I remark that Bro. Preble did not refer to the seventh day, but the first. But he asks, Might not the obligation exist before Moses? The next thing is to prove it.

Now for his three points: Mark 2:27: It was made for man. He did not make man on purpose to keep the Sabbath. The Greek says "the" man. 1 Cor. 10:4, 5: "And did all drink the same spiritual drink; for

"for man," not "for the man."

they drank of that spiritual rock that followed them, and that rock was Christ." I read this for the purpose of reading a remark of Dr. Geo. Campbell on this subject: "*The Son of Man* in this [28th] verse must be equivalent to *man* in the preceding; otherwise, a term is introduced into the conclusion, which is not in the premises."

He says the New Testament points back to Sinai. Luke 23:56: They "rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment." This was before the resurrection of Christ. They were yet waiting for the resurrection, as the Jews in Egypt were waiting for deliverance. Next, he says the commandment points back to creation, but it does not reach there. See Deut. 5:15: "And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched-out arm; therefore"—not for something back, not to creation therefore—"the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day."

Now for his syllogism: He says, 1. The Sabbath was made for man. 2. Every Gentile is a man. 3. Therefore the Sabbath was made for every Gentile. This syllogism is good for nothing; because it is false in fact. I may state one thus: 1. The passover was made for man. 2. The Gentiles were men. Therefore the passover was made for Gentiles. This is also false, in fact, but is as good as his.

But were not the Gentiles under the same law? No; Rom. 2:14: "For when the Gentiles which have not the law." There it is: they have not the law.

"The woman was made for the man," not for the Jew. But this points back to creation, to the origin of

the marriage institution, and the Saviour referred back to that time when questioned on that subject.

One thought: If the Jews kept the first day they would acknowledge the resurrection of Christ, for it is kept in memory of that. But they will not do it. Now I wish to ask him, Of what law did Christ pay the penalty. I wish him to consider this.

Is not a particular day to be kept as a Sabbath? No, it is after six days' labor, then a day of rest. Peter says a day with the Lord is as a thousand years. The Sabbath looks forward to the rest remaining for the people of God after six thousand years of toil in this world. Is there any proof that God ever sanctified any day but that one on which he rested? I throw out these things for him to think of. A particular day cannot be kept on account of the difference of time.

If a *particular day* of twenty-four hours was sanctified to be observed as the Sabbath, closing at sunset, then it is not kept in the United States. Let us look at facts. Every fifteen miles east or west of a given meridian makes one minute's difference in time. Every degree, or sixty miles, four minutes; every fifteen degrees, one hour, and three hundred and sixty degrees, the entire circle of the earth, twenty-four hours. Suppose two travelers start from the same point, and go in opposite directions around the earth; the one going west will lose a day, and the one traveling east will gain one. To illustrate, we will take a Turk, Jew, and Christian. The Turk observes Friday for his Sabbath, the Jew, Saturday, the Christian, Sunday. Now let the Turk go around the earth in a westerly direction, the Christian in an easterly, and let the Jew remain at home. When they arrive at the end of their journey, the *same day* will be a Friday, to the Turk, Saturday,

to the Jew, and Sunday, to the Christian. Who is right? The same day cannot be in fact three different days. Let the Turk remain at home, the Christian go west, and the Jew east; then the Jew's Sabbath is on Friday, the same as the Turk's; and the Christian's rest-day is Monday. Who is right?

Or, let the Christian remain at home, the Jew go west, the Turk east; then the Jew's Sabbath will be the Christian's Sunday, and the Turk's will be on Thursday. Who is right, if a *particular day* was sanctified to be kept as the Sabbath?

This is a fact; I have talked with sailors. If a particular day is to be kept, how is it with these three parties? Those on the other side of the earth would have to keep it at midnight. Sometimes in some places the days are several weeks long; what is to be done there? Let the Sabbath fall after six day's labor, and then rest, and all can be harmonized. Let him consider these facts.

I now come to the historical argument for the Lord's day, showing that Christians did not keep the seventh day. Ignatius speaks of the Lord's day— [Time.]

ELD. CORNELL'S FOURTH SPEECH.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: We have a resolution to discuss, but my brother seems to have wandered very far from it. The resolution says the Sabbath was binding only on the Jews and their servants. What has this to do with the first day of the week? As near the question as to talk about the Fourth of July. Let him find a text of Scripture that says the first day of the week is the Sabbath, and then it will be time to talk on it. Till then, I object.

Last evening, he complained that I wanted him to prove a negative. It is his own question, of his own making; it has two negatives, "only" for the Jews, and "only" after they came out of Egypt. This excludes all others. If he proves *anything* he has got to prove a negative. If he fails to prove the Gentiles were *not* to keep the Sabbath, his question is lost.

Who are the servants? this is an important question. I quoted texts to show the blessings of God were promised to strangers or sojourners. He admits that the strangers were Gentiles. But he tries to show that a sojourner had no residence except in the families of Jews. Abraham was a sojourner in the land where he spent his life after the Lord called him. For testimony on this point read Deut. 23:15, 16. "Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee." Now he is escaped from his master, and is not to be returned. He is not a servant, but free. "He shall dwell with thee, even among you, in that place which he shall choose, in one of thy gates where it liketh him best." He would then be a free man, and a stranger dwelling among them. Such, the Lord says, should keep the Sabbath. Now compare Eze. 47:22: "And it shall come to pass that ye shall divide it by lot for an inheritance unto you, and to the strangers that sojourn among you, which shall beget children among you, and they shall be unto you as born in the country among the children of Israel; they shall have inheritance with you among the tribes of Israel." Now he admits that the strangers sojourning among them were Gentiles, and should keep the Sabbath, only he says they were all servants, temporary residents. But here it is proved they were sometimes freemen, having a permanent residence, and

✓ inheritance among the children of Israel. This must satisfy everybody they were not servants, but men treated as equals. And Jer. 12, shows that the nations, as nations, had this same privilege. The Lord would build them up if they did as his people did; if not, he would cut them off. And just so he said to Israel. One condition for both. This is positive proof.

Further in reference to the Gentiles. His proposition is, that none but Jews and their servants were to keep the Sabbath. See the case of Ruth: she was a Moabitess, but by her determination that Israel's God should be her God, she was accepted and became the grandmother of King David. Was she a servant? and would she have received these blessings if she had not been a keeper of the Sabbath? Joseph's wife was an Egyptian woman, but not a servant. She was accepted of God and became the mother of two tribes of Israel. Israel were God's church, and as many as would be converted to the ways of his people, or church, were accepted of God, not as mere servants in Jewish families. ✓ And they were to keep the same laws with Israel. God had not two laws, one for Jews, and another for Gentiles.

He says the Sabbath was not sanctified "for men to keep" till after the Jews came out of Egypt. Let him prove that the Sabbath was sanctified at, or after, that time. He has affirmed it, and once before I called his attention to it. Let him touch it if he dare, and try to ✓ prove his assertion. The only time the Sabbath was sanctified, was when it was made for man, at the creation of the world.

He says Eld. Preble has reference to the first day of the week, but he forgot how the article reads from which I quoted. It says the Sabbath was "binding

from creation." Now I ask Eld. Grant, Does Eld. Preble believe that the first day was the Sabbath from creation? ✓

Again he reads Deut. 5:15. But what is the use of taking up time to show that they ought to obey God because they were brought out of Egypt? It proves too much for his purpose; it proves that all moral obligation grew out of that fact, if it proves anything to the point. He asks, Is there proof that any particular day should be kept? That depends on another question, Did God rest on any particular day?

No other day sanctified but that one on which God rested. But he sanctified the day after he rested. He did not set apart that day that was past, but its successors: seventh-day in its succession. See the commandment. [Time.]

ELD. GRANT'S FIFTH SPEECH.

The fact that I stated in regard to the particular day is fatal to his position. No one in the United States keeps it unless he keeps it at midnight. He must keep just that space of time or else he does not keep it. The facts are clear on that point. None were to keep it except in Palestine. There they could keep it; but not all round the world.

I am not aware of wandering from the subject. No- ✓ body claims that the Bible says the first day is the Sabbath. Who are the servants? Those that serve. Deut. 23:15, 16. If the servant escaped, he was not to be returned, but to be taken in and cared for. Nothing here to disprove our position. Eze. 47:22. The servants were allowed to own the land; they were permitted to live there, but nothing there about keeping the Sab-

bath; if they chose to abide there, they were permitted to, but not a word about the Sabbath.

✓ Jer. 12:16: "If they will diligently learn the ways of my people, to swear by my name, The Lord liveth; as they taught my people to swear by Baal; then shall they be built in the midst of my people." I fail to see any evidence in this; it does not say, If they keep the Sabbath, but if they confess God, if they say, You have got a living God, and we admit it, then they were to be built up. But that does not settle the question. There is nothing here against the resolution.

Ruth was a Jewish proselyte, of course she was included. All the proselytes were to keep it. If my brother objects to their being included in the resolution, I will meet him on that issue. The wife of Joseph was also a proselyte. But as Gentiles, they were without the law, says Paul.

He seems to misunderstand us in regard to the sanctification of the Sabbath, after they came out of Egypt. That was the first time man sanctified it, and kept it. I admit that God sanctified it at creation. Does ✓ Eld. Preble mean Saturday, when he says Sabbath? I say, No.

Deut. 5, is referred to again. "Therefore." This is so plain that it does not need more notice. Why should they keep it? Here is a reason why. In commemoration of their deliverance from Egypt. The most wonderful manifestation of God's power. Deut. 24:17, 18, is just the same. It refers back to that event. They were to treat strangers well for that very reason; they were strangers in Egypt, and the Lord brought them out. And so Lev. 19:33, 34: "And if a stranger sojourn with thee in your land, ye shall not vex him. But the stranger that dwelleth with you, shall be unto

you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt: I am the Lord your God." They were to remember their bondage and deliverance. These are all the points we think of to notice now.

Again I call attention to the law. All the commandments are called the law of God. All, anything, and everything, to anybody, are called the law. Law, statutes, testimonies, commandments, are used indiscriminately. The ten commandments are no more the law than any other. Luke 10:26. Written in the law. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, &c. But it is not in *that* law [pointing to the chart]. Jesus says, "In the law." It is found in Deut. 6, but not in the decalogue. The word rendered law, is used both before and after Moses. I have heard people say: "Not my Sabbath; the Lord's Sabbath." My Sabbath—your Sabbath, all the same. John 9:16: "This man is not of God, because he keepeth not the Sabbath day." ✓ This was a charge by the Pharisees against Christ. I can show that the Hebrew words rendered law, commandments, &c., were used before the ten commandments were given. See again the New Testament on this point. Matt. 12:5: "Have ye not read in the law how that on the Sabbath day the priests in the temple profane the Sabbath, and are blameless." But it is not there [on the chart]. Matt. 22:36, 37: "Master, which is the great commandment in the law? Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart," &c. This is not in the decalogue. No commandment there to love God. There is a promise to such as do love him, but no commandment to love him. Luke 2:23: "As it is written in the law of the Lord, every male that openeth the womb shall be called

holy to the Lord." Verse 27: "And when the parents brought in the child Jesus, to do for him after the custom of the law." Verse 39: "And when they had performed all things according to the law of the Lord, they returned into Galilee, to their own city Nazareth." The law of the Lord, but not in the decalogue. Acts 15:24: "Forasmuch as we have heard, that certain which went out from us, have troubled you with words, subverting your souls, saying, ye must be circumcised, and keep the law; to whom we gave no such commandment." What law was that? The law of God. Rom. 3:19: "Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law;" and chap. 6:14, tells us who are, and who are not, under the law. "For sin shall not have dominion over you, for ye are not under the law, but under grace." Is that so? [Cries of, Amen.] Now see Rom. 7:1-7: "Know ye not, brethren (for I speak to them that know the law), how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth? For the woman which hath an husband, is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband." Here you see he talks of being loosed from the law. "So then if while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress; but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law." Free from the law. Now Paul makes the application: "Wherefore, my brethren, ye are also become dead to the law."

[Time.]

ELD. CORNELL'S FIFTH SPEECH.

I will notice a few points made. Some of his arguments have no bearing on the subject. The resolution says the Sabbath is not binding on any but Jews. In regard to what is the law, or what is called the law of God, we can understand, by the connection, what law is meant. The New Testament speaks of a law done away, and one that is not done away. One law as being binding, another not binding, cannot be the same law. We must distinguish between them.

Rom. 2:14, is quoted, but it is fatal to his position. It does prove positively that the law is binding on the Gentiles. They have not the law as the Jew had; they did not hear the voice of God as the Jews did. But by the connection, we learn that they had a knowledge of it. Mark, the doers of the law shall be justified, and not the hearers who do not keep it. "For when the Gentiles, which have not the law," did not hear the voice of God, nor have a written copy of the law given to them on stone, "do by nature the things contained in the law." Who are the hearers? the Jews; and who are the doers of whom Paul speaks? The Gentiles—they do by nature the things contained in the law. They are justified for obeying, not the Jew for hearing. So the Gentiles "show the work of the law written in their hearts," the same law the Jews heard. Paul is not talking of two different laws in this passage. This shows that it is binding on the Gentiles. I challenge him to take hold of that issue. He left out all that related to the Gentiles' keeping the law. I call his attention to it.

He says the world is round, and no particular day can be kept. He claims that there is difficulty and con-

fusion with that view. But he goes on to show that Sunday should be kept. Of course that can be kept all over. The seventh day can't be kept because the world is round, but the world flats right out when Sunday comes! [Laughter.] The Lord made the world round, and made the Sabbath for a round world, and commanded that it be kept on the round world.

He admits that the proselytes were not servants, but that admission is fatal to his resolution; for in that he admits the Sabbath was binding on *somebody* besides the Jews and their servants. Before he said, *only* those who came out of Egypt; but these proselytes were not brought out of Egypt. So now he admits all that he has heretofore denied.

He asks, "Does Bro. Preble keep the seventh day?" No; if he did, I would not quote him. Pres. Mahan says, "Admissions in favor of truth from the ranks of its enemies constitute the highest kind of evidence." Eld. Preble is opposed to us, but his arguments sustain our position. Eld. Preble says the Sabbath was binding from creation; Eld. Grant denies it. He and Preble for it. They are both strong men. I propose they have a hitch on it.

Who are under the law? He says Christians are not. But how about the Gentiles? The resolution concerns them. If Christians are not under the law because they are Christians, then everybody unconverted is under the law. But does he mean that we are not under the law in the sense that we are not to keep it? Let us see. Rom. 6:15: "Shall we sin?"—sin is transgression of the law—"because we are not under the law but under grace? God forbid." I say, Amen; and let Bro. Grant say, Amen; and let all the people say, Amen. We are under the grace or favor of God; now

let us obey him, and keep his law, and sin no more.

I will now prove that the Sabbath was binding before the Sinaiatic covenant. He hangs all upon that covenant; says the Sabbath owed its obligation to that covenant. But destroying that covenant made with Israel at Sinai cannot affect the Sabbath, as it was not dependent on it; it was a prior obligation. Ex. 16:27-29: "And it came to pass, that there went out some of the people on the seventh day for to gather, and they found none. And the Lord said unto Moses, How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws? See, for that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath." He *hath* given—not, is going to give it; he *hath*—he gave it in the past. If they could not keep it in Egyptian bondage, they had no excuse now; they were free. And he asks, "*How long refuse ye to keep my commandments?*" Then they had broken the Sabbath before, a long time. He did n't say, I now make a Sabbath; nor did he then make a law to observe it. He had given them the Sabbath before, and the law had "long" existed. There is no commandment recorded here, nor does it say when the commandment was given. It only states that a law had been previously given. No enactment after they came out of Egypt; no account of the giving of the Sabbath, except in Gen. ii, where it was sanctified, or set apart, "for man." There is no law given in Ex. 16: but the fact is stated that there was such a law.

[Time.]

ELD. GRANT'S SIXTH SPEECH.

He speaks of the law in Rom. 2:14, as binding on the Gentiles. I am as much surprised that men should look so differently at the same thing, as that two plants growing out of the same soil should be so different—one

bearing good fruit, the other being poisonous. The Gentiles had not the law. He says they did not have it as the Jews did. One had it on stone; the other, in their hearts—quite a difference. "Do by nature"—did not learn it of the Jews. "Law unto themselves"—not of Sinai. There is a contrast on the stone and on the hearts; not the same law. The Gentiles had not got it. If he can see proof in this in his favor, he can see further than I can.

The world is round. I do not claim the identical day the Lord began creation, but the seventh after six of labor. But why keep it? He objects to my historical evidence on that point, so I waive it for the present; another time will answer just as well. Proselytes who were converted to Judaism virtually became Jews, and then, of course, they were to keep it. So Christians all come under one condition, law, or regulation. All proselytes were reckoned among them.

The old covenant was made at Sinai—the old covenant was done away. Well, I am glad we have come together at last. But the Sabbath was kept before the law, or covenant, made at Sinai. Yes, preliminary; but its observance began at Ex. 16. Had they been keeping it, they would not have gone out on the seventh day to get manna. They had not kept it.

Now the real tug on the law has not come yet. Rom. 7:4: "Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ, that ye should be married to another, even to Him who is raised from the dead." And verse 6: "But now we are delivered from the law;" the margin says, "Being dead to that," or, as it is in our version, "That being dead wherein we were held." If a man gets hold of me, he cannot hold me after he is dead. "What shall we say then? Is

the law sin?" Is the law wrong? Oh, no! he had not known sin but by the law. What law? He is talking about that law now [points to the chart]. "I had not known lust except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." That is the law—the tenth commandment. Was the woman under condemnation of the law as long as her husband was alive? If Paul were here, he would talk as we do. Gal. 2:16: "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law." Won't works of the law save us? "For by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified." But hear further: chap. 3:11, 12: "But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident; for, The just shall live by faith. And the law is not of faith; but, The man that doeth them shall live in them." Also verse 17: "And this I say that the covenant [to Abraham] that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect." The law was four hundred and thirty years after that promise, which just brings us to Mount Sinai; it was not before. "Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator." Added till—not forever, but till—the seed should come. He talks just as I want to talk to prove my point.

Verses 23–25: "But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterward be revealed. Wherefore the law was our school-

master to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster." I have heard it remarked that it is a strange schoolmaster who teaches mathematics and never speaks of mathematics. So it would be, if that were his specialty. It points us to Christ—not bring us to Christ. A guide-board pointing to Boston is quite different from the cars which bring us to Boston. It was good before Christ, but not after. If Christ said, Keep the seventh day, I will keep it. Are we under Moses or Christ?

Gal. 4: 21: "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a free-woman. But he who was of the bond-woman was born after the flesh; but he of the free-woman was by promise. Which things are an allegory"—or rather allegorized—"for these are the two covenants, the one from the Mt. Sinai"—there it is, the ten commandments—"which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar." I will prove next session that this Agar, or Sinai covenant, is the law of ten commandments. "So then we, brethren, are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free." Chap. 5: 1: "Stand fast, therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage." That law or covenant genders to bondage. We are free; we are not under it. Verse 4: "Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace." See also Heb. 7: 12: "For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law." Verses 18, 19: "For there is verily a disannulling of the commandment going before for the weakness and unprofita-

bleness thereof. For the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did; by the which we draw nigh unto God." If Paul had written for this discussion for me, he would have written just as he did.

Now to conclude, we have examined from Adam to Enoch, Abraham, Melchisedec, &c., and not a trace of the Sabbath. Moses wrote after the Sabbath was given. Before that, not a word was said about keeping or breaking the Sabbath. [Time.]

ELD. CORNELL'S SIXTH SPEECH.

I am getting more interested in this discussion, and glad we have so many witnesses. Beside meeting his arguments, I have brought some proof every time; though I am not obliged to do anything more than to show that he does not prove his position. All his arguments against the Sabbath weigh just as much against the other nine commandments. They all stand or go down together.

He does not claim a particular day. How, then, does he keep the first day of the week? Is not the first day a particular day, as well as the seventh? Did not Christ rise on a particular day? In this, he gives up all; for, if no particular day can or need be kept, why find fault with us for keeping the seventh day? Are we not as near right as he is, even if his own position is correct?

But he says if it had been their custom to keep the Sabbath, they would not have gone out after manna on that day. True, if they had kept it. I did not say it proves they kept it; but it does prove that they ought to have kept it, even of a "long" time. Here is positive testimony that the Sabbath was enjoined by

law before the old covenant was made. Why kill time to show the old covenant is done away, when it has no bearing on the subject.

In Rom. vii, he makes the law the first husband. Let us see who are the parties. "The law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth," not as long as the law liveth. "For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth." Let me illustrate this: My three fingers here may represent the parties; the first, the husband; second, the woman; third, the law. Now the law, the third party, binds the first to the second as long as he lives. But he dies; the first is taken away, and what is left? The woman and the law. And if married to another man, what binds them together? The law. She can only be judged whether she be an adulteress or not, by the law. But he is mistaken in regard to Paul's conclusion. We will see which side Paul comes out on. "What shall we say then?" That is the question. Now, Bro. Grant, what shall we say? Let us see. "Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin but by the law." Paul was proved a sinner; but it was by the law. "For I was alive without the law once; but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died." It took a living law to slay Paul. Bro. Grant says a dead man could not hold him; a dead man could not kill Paul. A living law could slay and convert him. Which side is Paul on? Let us hear him further. "Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good." That is just our faith. But if it was abolished several years before, it could not have killed Paul, or convinced him of sin; for by the law is the knowledge of sin.

Now on Gal. 2:16; and 3:11, 12. No sinner can

be justified by law, nor ever could since the world was created. The eighth commandment does not justify him who steals. Was it different before Christ? Would the law justify a sinner then? No; only justified by pardon. It is forgiveness, pardon, the sinner must look to for justification. We get it through Christ, on condition of repentance and reform.

Gal. 4. Covenant from Sinai genders to bondage; but what law relates to this bondage? There is more than one law. Types, pointing to Christ. Agar is the old covenant; is it the ten commandments? No. Why? It answers to Jerusalem that now is. Yes; those offerings had to be all offered at Jerusalem; the ten commandments can be kept anywhere.

He says, "Let us hear Christ." If Christ said, Keep the seventh day, he would keep it. Well, did Christ say, Keep the first day? He will not keep the day God commanded, because Christ did not command it over again. But he will keep the first day that never was commanded at all. [Time.]

Third Session.

ELD. GRANT'S SEVENTH SPEECH.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: Glad to see you again, and to enter upon an investigation of this subject. There is one question I wish to repeat: Of what law did Christ pay the penalty? Was it the ten-commandment law?

Now I come to the last point in my brother's speech. He says, on Gal. 3, the law that was added was the

ceremonial law. Proof is what is wanting. Four hundred and thirty years after brings us to the giving of the law on Mt. Sinai. There is not a word in the Bible about a ceremonial law. The word "ceremonial" is not in the Bible, and the word ceremony only once; Num. 9:2, 3: "Let the children of Israel also keep the passover at his appointed season. In the fourteenth day of this month, at even, ye shall keep it in his appointed season; according to all the rites of it, and according to all the ceremonies thereof, shall ye keep it." This is all we find in the Bible about ceremonies. The manner of keeping it constitutes the keeping of it. So of the Sabbath; no fire was to be kindled; manservant, and maid-servant, and strangers, were all to rest; no man was to go out of his place on the seventh day. Does any one keep it now?

Again, I call up Gal. 3:16, and onward, and inquire, what scripture has he for saying it is ceremonial law? "The law which was four hundred and thirty years after cannot disannul [the Abrahamic covenant] that it should make the promise of none effect." It is the law. What law? According to him, what is not in the decalogue is ceremonial? What law is this in Luke 10:25-27? "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." What law is that? It is not ceremonial law, nor is it in the decalogue. Where shall it be classed?

Rom. 13:8: "He that loveth another hath fulfilled the law." What law is that? Not ceremonial. The fact is, the word law covers all that was given in the

old dispensation. Let us read on, "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;" these are in the decalogue. If there is anything of more consequence than these, I should think he would say it now. But he goes on, "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." But he does not mention the Sabbath.

He remarked that Christians are not under the law; good. And the old covenant was made at Sinai; very good. And the old covenant is abolished; better still. We are together. And I propose to show what the old covenant is. The old is gone, and the new is made.

He says there is nothing in the ten commandments referring to Jerusalem. There is no reason why there should be. Let us see about that law again. Gal. 4:21: "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law?" Verses 24, 25: "For these are the two covenants; the one from Mount Sinai;—there it is again—"which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. For this Agar is Mount Sinai in Arabia;" this gives the place where the law was given. That gendered to bondage, and the Sabbath was a part of that old covenant; but that is done away, and we are under the new.

Now I come to the remark that Israel had long been breaking the Sabbath. I cannot see it so. Nor does it appear that it was kept thirty days before they came to Sinai. They came to the wilderness of Sin on the fifteenth day of the second month, and some time elapsed before the Sabbath arrived after the falling of

the manna. In the third month they were at Sinai. But that is not essential; I let it pass.

Another remark: the wife of Joseph was not a Jew. But she was taken into the family, and she was married over two hundred years before the old covenant was made. Ruth was of Moab, a descendant of Abraham's family, a relative.

Now to the day: he says the identical day must be kept. Then he don't keep it, unless he sits up all night to keep it. He asks why find fault with him for keeping the seventh day if no particular day is indicated? I do not find fault with him for keeping it; but I do find fault that I must be made to receive the "mark of the beast" if I do not keep it. I find no fault with any for keeping it; but that covenant gendered to bondage, and I would rather be free.

He said I required the keeping of the first day. No; I do not. On Ex. 16, he said "how long" referred to their breaking the Sabbath. It does not read so; but "How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws?"

Now I come to that interesting text, Rom. 7. I thank him for his illustration. He says Paul was slain by the law several years after it was abolished, according to my position. Not so; but he kept it while persecuting the church. See Phil. 3:6: "Concerning zeal, persecuting the church; touching the righteousness which is in the law, blameless." He continued to keep it until he was made alive by Christ. Now let us look at Rom. 7 again. Let this inkstand represent the law, this the man, and that the woman. Put these together; when married they become one flesh. The man died; here he is dead, taken away; and now the woman is loosed from the law of her husband. Not

loosed from moral obligation; but from the law of her husband—to obey him. Now for the application: "Ye, brethren, are become dead to the law." What law? That one. Before he is married to another, he is married to the law, is he not? [Time.]

ELD. CORNELL'S SEVENTH SPEECH.

I have a few points to notice from last evening. He says there is no love in the ten commandments. There is nothing but love in them. I will read what he left out. When the Saviour spoke of the two commandments, "Love God with all thy heart, and thy neighbor as thyself," he said, "On these two hang all the law."

These are not all the law, but all the law grows out of these. In the second commandment the Lord said he would show mercy to them that love him and keep his commandments; and John said, "This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments." 1 John 5:3. We cannot separate the love of God from the keeping of his commandments; for our Saviour placed them all on love. Now look at the commandments, and see if it is not so. Love to God leads us to honor him alone; to avoid idolatry; to reverence his name. There are two sacred things to be guarded by the law; God's holy name, and his holy day—his memorial. Love to God leads us to regard his honor and his claims. And love to man leads us to honor our parents; then to regard our neighbor's life—not to kill; the chastity of his family—not to commit adultery; and his property—not to steal; and his reputation—not to bear false witness; to avoid impure desire—not to covet. This covers all our duty to man. This law, founded on love, grows right out of our relations to God, our creator, and our

fellow-creatures. It is a law of love, and "love is the fulfilling of the law."

He replies to my argument, that the Sabbath was made for the race of man, by another syllogism. But there is no parallel; his syllogism is defective. Where is the scripture saying that the passover was made for man? He is a stickler for Scripture on the Sabbath. Let him show his proof to sustain his syllogism. The Sabbath was made for man, for the race; for it was made at creation. Again, it was made in Eden, in Paradise; the passover was not. The Sabbath was placed in the moral law, spoken by the voice of God; the passover was in a law of types and shadows. He does not deny the morality of the other nine. Did God make a mistake, and get it in the wrong code? God spoke the ten commandments, and no more. The laws given to the people through Moses, were different. After speaking these, with a voice that shook the earth, God wrote them in the stone. There the Sabbath was engraved by the finger of God. Was the passover there? No; that was temporary, and related only to that people. We are to make a difference where God does. My opponent jumbles all together, and regards no distinction in their nature. This will not do.

He asks what law it was of which Christ bore the penalty. I answer, The law that condemned man. He says that no fire was to be kindled on the Sabbath. The commandment does not say so. The priests offered more offerings on that day than any other, but it was not their own work. While in Arabia, under peculiar circumstances, they were to build no fire; but the connection shows that it referred to cooking, &c. After they came into Palestine, where it is often very cold, Dr. Clarke says people have even frozen to death, in

some parts of it; they were never prohibited from having fires for their comfort. But how does he regard God's commandments? Does he think God laid a duty on them which would subject them to continual suffering? Works of mercy and necessity were always lawful on the Sabbath.

"No such thing as ceremonial law." Well, there are two distinct laws, as the Scriptures plainly show: The moral law on tables of stone, put in the ark, 1 Kings 8:9: "There was nothing in the ark save the two tables of stone, which Moses put there at Horeb;" the ceremonial law, put *beside* the ark, Deut. 31:26: "Take this book of the law and put it in the side of the ark." "Not in the ark, but in another box by the side of the ark." Comp. Com. "Laid up by side of the ark." Dr. Clarke. The moral, proclaimed and written by God in person; the ceremonial, given through Moses. One, the royal law, Jas. 2:8; the other, the handwriting of ordinances, Col. 2:14. One, to break which is enmity to God, Rom. 8:7, and the keeping of which is the love of God, 1 John 5:3; the other, which is itself called enmity, Eph. 2:15. One law is spiritual, Rom. 7:14; the other, the law of a carnal commandment, Heb. 7:16. One, from which one jot or tittle shall in no wise pass, Matt. 5:18; the other, of which there is made of necessity a change, Heb. 7:12. One, the law of liberty, Ps. 119:45; Jas. 2:12; the other, a yoke of bondage, Gal. 5:1. One, which Christ magnified and made honorable, Isa. 42:21; the other, he blotted out, Col. 2:14. One law is holy, just, and good, Neh. 9:13; Rom. 7:12; the other, statutes that were not good, Eze. 20:25. One, which, if a man do, he shall live, Lev. 18:5; Eze. 20:21; the other, of judg-

P2619

LIBRARY
REVIEW AND HERALD

ments whereby they shall not live, Eze. 20 : 25. One, in keeping of which is great reward, Ps. 19 : 11; the other, weak and unprofitable, Heb. 7 : 18. One, in which the apostle delighted, Rom. 7 : 22; the other, a yoke which they were not able to bear, Acts 15 : 10. One, that is perfect, converting the soul, Ps. 19 : 7; the other, which could never make the comers thereunto perfect, Heb. 7 : 18. One, that is not made void by faith, Rom. 3 : 31; the other is abolished by Christ, Eph. 2 : 15. Now, by mixing this all up, and making it refer to one and the same law, the Scriptures are made to appear contradictory and unreasonable. I object to such a use of the Bible. But to apply them to the two different laws, all is plain and consistent.

He says, The old covenant was made with the Jews; but the new covenant is made with the Gentiles, as well as the Jews. I deny it, and call upon him to prove it. See Jer. 31 : 31; Heb. 8 : 8: "I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah."

But he says, Paul kept the law till he was converted. Indeed! Will he tell us how many of the ten commandments he broke after he was converted? Is that the mark of a Christian, a converted man, to break the law of God?

He says, Paul was not converted by the law; that no one can be converted by the law. But Ps. 19 : 7, says that the law is perfect, converting the soul. No one can be converted without knowing that he is a sinner; but Paul was convinced of sin by the law, for by the law is the knowledge of sin. No one is converted without the law.

[Time.]

ELD. GRANT'S EIGHTH SPEECH.

How did Paul find himself a sinner? touching the law he was blameless. He learned it of the Lord on the way to Damascus, not in the commandments.

He says there is love in the commandments. I admit all God's commandments are given in love. But Christ says, A new commandment I give unto you that ye love one another. This is not in the old, else why call it new. And he says, if we love God, we will keep the commandments. I love God, but, I don't keep Saturday. Many say they began to go astray when they began to break the Sabbath, meaning the first day of the week. Now if Saturday was right, they would feel condemned for not keeping it. Now I don't feel condemned, and the great body of Christians do not keep it, nor do they feel condemned.

He notices my syllogism, but I cannot see that he helped himself any. Let that go; but was not the passover made for man? He says the Sabbath was not a memorial of their deliverance from Egypt. We will read it once more; it could not be plainer. Deut. 5 : 15: "And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched-out arm; therefore"—here is the reason given; therefore—"the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day." And when we find the feasts described in Lev. 23, we find it there with the feasts or memorial days: "Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them concerning the feasts of the Lord, which ye shall proclaim to be holy convocations, even these are my feasts. Six days shall work be done; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of rest, a holy

convocation; ye shall do no work therein; it is the Sabbath of the Lord in all your dwellings." Here the seventh-day Sabbath is one of the feasts. Next comes the passover. Verses 4-8: "These are the feasts of the Lord, even holy convocations, which ye shall proclaim in their seasons. In the fourteenth day of the first month at even is the Lord's passover, and on the fifteenth day of the same month is the feast of unleavened bread unto the Lord; seven days ye must eat unleavened bread. In the first day ye shall have a holy convocation; ye shall do no servile work therein. But ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord seven days; in the seventh day is a holy convocation; ye shall do no servile work therein." This is enjoined just as much as the Sabbath. It is put in there among the feast days, and I shall show they are all abolished. Does the Lord abolish moral precepts? But he has abolished the Sabbath.

I ask him to tell us what law it was that condemned man. He says the ceremonial law came by Moses. It came from the Lord just as much as the other. How did Moses know about them if the Lord did not tell him. He refers to the royal law. Well, what is it? James 2:8: "If ye fulfill the royal law according to the scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, ye do well." There is the royal law; but it is not in the decalogue. The Lord told Moses that they should love God and their neighbor, but it is not in the decalogue. He admits there is a law abolished. Agreed, and we shall find it as we proceed in the investigation. And he says the law converts the soul; but it did not convert Paul.

He denies the covenant was made with the Gentiles, and says it was made with the Jews. Does he deny

that the Gentiles have the privileges of the new covenant? When was it made with Israel? Let him tell us when the law was put into the hearts of Israel.

He still holds to the particular day. If I were in Paris, I should, with other Americans, celebrate the Fourth of July, but not at the same time they do here. If the same latitude is allowed on the Sabbath it overthrows all he says.

Now to the marriage. This represents the law; the brethren are married to the law before they are married to Christ. Here I want to say when we are dead to anything it has no control over us. We are dead to sin; it has no more dominion over us. And Gal. 5:24: "They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh, with the affections and lusts." They no longer control them. 1 Peter 2:24: "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness."

Now let us go back again to the marriage. "Ye also are become dead to the law." Now they are removed—no longer under its control. But, then, we have no law now. Wait for a moment till we see. We are married to Christ, which we could not be if married to the law. And Paul says we are married to another, that we should bring forth fruit unto God, that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter. [Loud shouts of, Amen, and laughter.] Now look a little further: Col. 2:16, 17; holy days, new moons, and sabbath days, are shadows of things to come; but the body is of Christ. We have got up to the body now. Don't go back to the bondage. Now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held. Christ is our lawgiver. We do not go to the law. That was not sin. It was good

as far as it went; but it does not make people live as good as Christ does. Hear him; we have got to the great Teacher now. The law took hold only of the outward acts, this of the thoughts and intents of the heart. It is better than that. [Cries of, Amen.] We are dead to that wherein we were held, and now serve in newness of spirit. It is inside—in the heart. If a man sinned in his heart, the law did not touch him; must have the act first. What are we free from? The law says, Thou shalt not covet. That is the law Paul was talking about. If we are married to Christ, let the union stand. [Cries of, Amen.] If ye keep my commandments. John 15:10. This is my commandment that ye love one another. Verse 12. That is, the new one. Now we will come to the covenant and see what it was.

[Time.]

ELD. CORNELL'S EIGHTH SPEECH.

We are now ready to advance in our argument. But first I will notice the fallacy of his positions taken, and then proceed to show, by direct proof, that his view is not right.

He says there was no love in the old covenant, but is in the new, and then quotes Deut. 6:5; and Lev. 19:18, the great commandments to love God and our neighbor. Was the new covenant made before this? I assert there is just as much love there as here. He said the law did not convert Paul; but Paul did not say so. Rom. 7:7: "I had not known sin but by the law; for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." Now read on. Verse 9: "For I was alive without the law once; but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died." And in

verse 11: "For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me." Then the law was living. He was slain by that law which said, "Thou shalt not covet;" and the Sabbath also was in that law.

Deut. 5:15. He cannot see the difference between a specific reason why they were called upon to keep the Sabbath, and a general reason reaching to all mankind. There is no reason for the institution in their coming out of Egypt. They were to keep *all* His statutes and judgments because they came out of Egypt; yet that was not the ground of the obligation. See Deut. 24:17, 18; not to pervert judgment, for the same reason; and Lev. 19:35-37; do no unrighteousness in judgment, have just weights, balances, &c., because they were bondmen in Egypt; and he delivered them, *therefore* they were to do this. But would not this have been duty for them if they had remained in Egypt? or was it not binding on others who never came out of Egypt? So of the Sabbath; there was a general reason dating back to creation, as stated in the commandment, applying to all men; for all are alike interested in creation.

But he says he cannot tell how to keep the Sabbath by the fourth commandment. Well, I am astonished. They knew how to keep it at the time of the crucifixion. Luke 23:56: They "rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment." Let us read the commandment. "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." Now for the directions how: "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." Abstain from all thy work, from common labor. Is not this plain enough? At least, if we

were quick to take a hint, we might learn something from it.

He says the royal law is not the ten commandments. Let us see what James says: "If ye fulfill the royal law according to the Scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, ye do well." The "royal law" is one thing, and "the scripture" "according to" which the royal law is kept, is another thing. Now let us read on and see if it is identified: "For he that said, [or that which said—that law] Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law." There it is; the ten-commandment law.

Married to Christ, and now delivered from the law. Amen, cried a dozen voices. He denies my construction of being delivered from the law. Well, what does he mean by it? Is he delivered so as not to keep it? Do you claim a right to break it? Do Christians break the ten commandments? What does he mean by being delivered from the law? Will the affirmative tell us? The apostle shows, verse 5, that before we died to the law, "we were in the flesh," obeying "the motions of sins." Of course the law holds every one under condemnation who is in the flesh—in sin. But from that hold we are delivered when pardoned; and it holds the sinner *now* till he is pardoned; therefore the law is not dead. Suppose a man is sentenced to the penitentiary for five years. The law puts him there and keeps him three. But after he has been there three years, a man comes to him with a pardon. See him spring up with delight. As he leaves the walls, he says, "Now I am delivered from the law; I am a free man; free as any of you who have not broken the law; now I rejoice in the pardon of the Governor."

But is he therefore free to break the law? if he breaks it again he puts himself right back there again, under condemnation. But when we get free from the law, by pardon from its condemnation, and free from sin so as to break the law, or sin no more, then we can shout Amen! [Loud applause.] Hear Christ? Yes, we will hear him. He says, Matt. 5:17, 18: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, *Till heaven and earth pass*, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled." [Applause.]

But he says there is nothing in the law against false speaking. See the ninth commandment. "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor." This pretty closely relates to that subject, certainly.

A few words about the covenants. In Rom. 9:4, 5, Paul says: "Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came." Here are eight distinct honors or blessings to the Jewish people. Among these are the covenants—plural, the old and the new. Again I call upon him to show his Gentile covenant. The Gentiles have nothing but what they get through the Jews. Why should the Sabbath be despised because it was given to the Jews? It had divine honor before it was given to them. What else did they have? Christ came of them. It is a mistake—the Sabbath is not Jewish; it is never called the Sabbath of the Jews, but always the Sabbath of the Lord. First, it was made two thousand years before there were any Jews. Second, it was based on reasons not at all peculiar to

the Jews. Third, It was separate from Jewish rites, and part of that law which is established by the faith of Christ; but my brother says it was abolished. God was the God of Israel; is he therefore the God of the Jews only? Paul says he is the God of the Gentiles also.

[Time.]

ELD. GRANT'S NINTH SPEECH.

All the commandments are of the Lord; they did not any of them originate with the Jews. Lev. 19:8, says, Love thy neighbor as thyself, and Deut. 6:5, Love God with all thy heart; but are they in the decalogue? No. They are in the Old Testament, but not in the decalogue. He says there is as much love in the old covenant as in the new. True; but not in the ten commandments. Paul did not keep the ten commandments; he was dead to them. Where does he find ceremonial law? he has got a kind of whip-row, so to speak; he can have it moral law or ceremonial law, just as he wants it.

Rom. 7:7: "Thou shalt not covet." That was in the law; and the law was living then, so far as he knew, but in regard to it he was blameless.

He says the Sabbath was instituted for another reason. Do n't know as I got the idea.

I do n't know but I was too strong in saying we could not tell by the fourth commandment how to keep the Sabbath. It says, "Keep it holy," yet I do not know what that means.

He says there is an hour's difference in time in Palestine. It may be so, but I do n't know about it. But, can time be cut up, and passed round to different parts of the earth? When he admits that we do not begin

as soon as they in the East, he gives up his claim on the same time. But are we not under obligation to keep law now? Oh yes; let us have the marriage back again. "That being dead wherein we were held." That is the law; you can't get away from that. This shows we are delivered from the law: it is dead. Are we delivered when pardoned? That does not make the law dead. If the law is binding, then we are cursed if we do not keep it *all*. Then I am cursed, for I do not keep it. I was pardoned twenty-six years ago, without keeping it; and I have had many good times and blessings of the Lord since, not keeping it. Some who have kept it say they are out of bondage when they leave it. See the dream in the last *Crisis*. If keeping another day is the mark of the beast, then all should feel condemned who do not keep it. But nobody keeps it, yet they are not cursed on that account.

Now we come again to the covenants. A number of covenants were made with his people, but two special. First, the definition of covenant: "Any disposition, arrangement, institution, or dispensation; hence, a testament, will; Heb. 9:16, a covenant, *i. e.*, mutual promises on mutual conditions, or promises with conditions annexed. By metonymy, a body of laws and precepts, to which certain promises are annexed." It is claimed that the first covenant is in Ex. 19:5-8: this claim was made by my brother in a former discussion. The word occurs three times in Exodus before that time. Chap. 2:24: "And God heard their groaning, and God remembered his covenant with Abraham, with Isaac, and with Jacob." And in chap. 6:2-5: "And God spake unto Moses, and said unto him, I am the Lord. And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God Almighty; but by my

name Jehovah was I not known to them. And I have also established my covenant with them, to give them the land of Canaan, the land of their pilgrimage, wherein they were strangers. And I have also heard the groaning of the children of Israel, whom the Egyptians keep in bondage; and I have remembered my covenant." My covenant. What covenant was that? It was the covenant touching the inheritance. Let us go carefully; we shall soon unravel the whole subject, and clear some minds on some passages in the New Testament. I now read the nineteenth chapter:

"In the third month, when the children of Israel were gone forth out of the land of Egypt, the same day came they into the wilderness of Sinai. For they were departed from Rephidim, and were come to the desert of Sinai, and had pitched in the wilderness; and there Israel camped before the mount. And Moses went up unto God, and the Lord called unto him out of the mountain, saying, Thus shalt thou say to the house of Jacob, and tell the children of Israel: Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto myself. Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people; for all the earth is mine; and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel."

Moses laid before them these words. The most magnificent display of divine glory was soon to come; but he would see first if they will agree to it. If they do, then he will come and make the covenant.

"And Moses came and called for the elders of the people, and laid before their faces all these words which the Lord commanded him. And all the people answered together, and said, All that the Lord hath spoken we

will do. And Moses returned the words of the people unto the Lord. And the Lord said unto Moses, Lo, I come unto thee in a thick cloud, that the people may hear when I speak with thee, and believe thee forever. And Moses told the words of the people unto the Lord. And the Lord said unto Moses, Go unto the people, and sanctify them to-day and to-morrow, and let them wash their clothes, and be ready against the third day; for the third day the Lord will come down in the sight of all the people upon mount Sinai."

He is going to do what he never did before; make a covenant with his people, with his own voice.

"And thou shalt set bounds unto the people round about, saying, Take heed to yourselves, that ye go not up into the mount, or touch the border of it; whosoever toucheth the mount shall be surely put to death; there shall not a hand touch it, but he shall surely be stoned, or shot through; whether it be beast or man, it shall not live; when the trumpet soundeth long, they shall come up to the mount. And Moses went down from the mount unto the people, and sanctified the people; and they washed their clothes. And he said unto the people, Be ready against the third day; come not at your wives. And it came to pass on the third day in the morning, that there were thunders and lightnings, and a thick cloud upon the mount, and a voice of the trumpet exceeding loud; so that all the people that was in the camp trembled."

There never was another such scene as when the Lord made this covenant.

"And Moses brought forth the people out of the camp to meet with God; and they stood at the nether part of the mount. And mount Sinai was altogether on a smoke, because the Lord descended upon it in fire; and the smoke thereof ascended as the smoke of a furnace, and the whole mount quaked greatly. And when the voice of the trumpet sounded long, and waxed louder

and louder, Moses spake, and God answered him by a voice. And the Lord came down upon mount Sinai, on the top of the mount; and the Lord called Moses up to the top of the mount; and Moses went up. And the Lord said unto Moses, Go down, charge the people, lest they break through unto the Lord to gaze, and many of them perish."

They were so anxious to see, that he gave directions to restrain them from giving way to their curiosity.

"And let the priests also which come near to the Lord, sanctify themselves, lest the Lord break forth upon them. And Moses said unto the Lord, The people cannot come up to mount Sinai; for thou chargedst us, saying, Set bounds about the mount, and sanctify it. And the Lord said unto him, Away, get thee down, and thou shalt come up, thou, and Aaron with thee; but let not the priests and the people break through, to come up unto the Lord, lest he break forth upon them. So Moses went down unto the people, and spake unto them." Chap. 20: "And God spake all these words saying, I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage."

First, the proposition, and then he speaks the ten commandments. After they were given, he goes on to say:

"And all the people saw the thunders, and the lightnings, and the noise of the trumpet, and the mountain smoking: and when the people saw it, they removed, and stood afar off. And they said unto Moses, Speak thou with us, and we will hear; but let not God speak with us, lest we die. And Moses said unto the people, Fear not; for God is come to prove you, and that his fear may be before your faces, that ye sin not. And the people stood afar off, and Moses drew near unto the thick darkness where God was. And the Lord said unto Moses, Thus thou shalt say unto the children of Israel, Ye have seen that I have talked with you from

Heaven. Ye shall not make with me gods of silver, neither shall ye make unto you gods of gold. An altar of earth shalt thou make unto me, and shalt sacrifice thereon thy burnt offerings, and thy peace offerings, thy sheep, and thine oxen: in all places where I record my name I will come unto thee, and I will bless thee."

Another point: The first covenant had offerings and sacrifices connected with it, and they will continue with it till its close. [Time.]

ELD. CORNELL'S NINTH SPEECH.

We have now come to the gist of the matter. The covenant is an important point in our investigation. Much depends upon a correct understanding of it.

Again, he says, There is no love required in the dialogue. I wonder if he ever read the second commandment. It is as plain as in the New Testament. He ridicules the idea that time, or the day, passes around. But is it not a fact that time does pass around? Wiser men than he and I, have spoken of the rolling round of time; and the poet said,

"—he is but a dunce
Who thinks the day begins all 'round at once."

Christians enjoy as much that don't keep the Sabbath, as they that do. Wonderful! Bro. Grant was converted believing in the immortality of the soul, and endless misery; Wesley was blessed of God, teaching that which we could not teach and be innocent. God accepts people if they are honestly conscientious by living up to the light they have, and accepting further light and truth as it comes to them. [Cries of, Amen.]

He quotes the scripture where Christ was charged with Sabbath-breaking. Does he mean to say that Christ

broke the Sabbath? If not, why does he quote it? He will confess that it was binding at that time; and if he broke it, we have only the sacrifice of a sinner. But he says, "I have kept my Father's commandments." John 15:10. Why accuse the Saviour of sin, to place disrespect on the Sabbath? There was no law which forbade what Christ did; it was always lawful.

Now, in regard to the covenants: Both were made with Israel. See Jer. 31:31-34: He has read the description of the making of the first covenant. Moses was the mediator between God and the people for this covenant. Both the old and new covenants were made with Israel. No chance for men now to say, "We accept the new covenant because it pertains to the Gentiles, whereas the first covenant was to the Jews."

We find that the new covenant was made with the same people that were the subjects of the old covenant. Thus Jeremiah declares, in the name of the Lord, "I will make a new covenant *with the house of Israel*, and with the house of Judah." "Not according to the covenant that I made with *their fathers*, &c. Again, "This shall be the covenant that I will make with the *house of Israel*," &c.

Paul, in the eighth chapter of Hebrews, quotes this entire statement of Jeremiah concerning both covenants' being made with the Hebrews; and, as if he would have no mistake in the point, he makes the following sweeping statement in Rom. 9:4, 5: "Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the *giving of the law*, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever."

Thus we see that everything valuable comes to the

world through the seed of Abraham, or by the means of the Hebrew people. As a nation they were adopted, because they were the only nation that served the true God. And, for this reason, the oracles of God were intrusted to their hands. Shall we scorn the law because given to the Hebrews? Shall we despise the new covenant as Jewish, because, like the old covenant, it is made with Israel? Is it best to reject Jesus as the Messiah, because he pertained to that despised race? And shall we desire another God than the God of Israel? And, finally, shall we neglect salvation, and choose to be lost, because Christ said, "Salvation is of the Jews"? John 4:22.

We have seen what the advantages of the Jews were, and we will now inquire, What was the condition of the Gentiles before they were grafted into the stock of Israel? Eph. 2:11-13: "Wherefore, remember, that ye being in *time past Gentiles* in the flesh, who are called Uncircumcision by that which is called the Circumcision in the flesh made by hands; that at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and *strangers from the covenants of promise*, having *no hope*, and *without God in the world*: but now, in Christ Jesus, ye who sometime were far off, are *made nigh* by the blood of Christ."

They were Gentiles "in time past," but now they are Israelites. They are adopted, and now share in the name and advantages of Israel. The apostle illustrates the change by the figure of grafting. Rom. 11:17-20: "And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree, wert grafted in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree; boast not against the branches. But if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee. Thou

wilt say then, The branches were broken off, that I might be grafted in. Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not high-minded, but fear."

What is a covenant? In the books of the New Testament, covenant and testament are used interchangeably, meaning the same thing. They are from the same Greek word, *diatheke*.

Webster defines covenant: "1. A mutual consent or agreement of two or more persons, to do, or to forbear, some act or thing; a contract; stipulation. 2. A writing containing the terms of agreement or contract between parties."

The old covenant must be according to one of these definitions. It is clearly stated that the two contracting, covenanting parties were God and Israel, and that it was made when God took Israel by the hand to bring them out of Egypt.

Let us now trace the several steps of making the covenant according to the first definition above. Ex. 19:5-8: "Now, therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people; for all the earth is mine: and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel. And Moses came and called for the elders of the people, and laid before their faces all these words which the Lord commanded him. And all the people answered together, and said, All that the Lord hath spoken we will do. And Moses returned the words of the people unto the Lord."

Now, the people having agreed to obey God's voice, the Lord proceeds to speak the ten commandments;

and then, before the covenant is ratified and sealed, he gives the people another chance to say whether they will accept it. Having heard the voice of God, will they now stand to their pledge to obey it? Now, that they may have a chance to refuse to close the contract if they see cause for so doing, Moses repeats in their hearing the words of the voice of God, the ten commandments. This being done, observe the final answer of the people, Ex. 24:3: "And Moses came and told the people all the words of the Lord, and all the judgments: and all the people answered with one voice, and said, All the words which the Lord hath said will we do."

Next, all is committed to writing, and a sacrifice made to God *by* the people. Verses 4 and 5: "And Moses wrote all the words of the Lord, and rose up early in the morning, and builded an altar under the hill, and twelve pillars, according to the twelve tribes of Israel. And he sent young men of the children of Israel, which offered burnt offerings, and sacrificed peace offerings of oxen unto the Lord."

Now comes the final dedication or sealing of the covenant. But before that is done, the people must hear a rehearsal of the whole transaction from the first. Verses 6-8: "And Moses took half of the blood, and put it in basins; and half of the blood he sprinkled on the altar. 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. And Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it on the people, and said, Behold the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words."

Now, that this agreement between God and Israel concerning the ten commandments, is the first, or old,

covenant, is proved by Paul in Heb. 9 : 18-20 : "Whereupon neither the first testament was dedicated without blood. For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and all the people, saying, This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you."

Now, with these facts before him, no man can say that the ten commandments constitute the old covenant. The words of Moses, at the dedication of the old covenant, settle the question : "Behold the blood of the covenant, which the Lord made with you, CONCERNING ALL THESE WORDS."

The ten commandments were the thing concerning which a covenant was made. All must agree that Moses uses the word covenant, in this text, not as signifying the ten commandments, but the agreement made concerning them. The ten commandments, containing no contract, can be called a covenant only by virtue of the fact that contracting parties enter into agreement concerning them. Between the opening and closing acts of making said covenant, God proclaimed his law of ten commandments, which, by metonymy, are called his covenant, because the parties covenant together concerning them.

In whatever sense the ten commandments are called a "covenant," they are a complete covenant in that sense. But this cannot be identical with the "old covenant" of Jeremiah and of Paul, for that consisted in acts of covenanting, whereby God became their husband, and espoused the people to himself as his peculiar treasure. Proof: Jer. 31 : 32 : "Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day that I

took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was a husband unto them, saith the Lord." The words, "married" and "espoused," are used to show this covenant relation. Jer. 2 : 2 ; 3 : 14. All this shows clearly that the first covenant was such in the sense of a contract.

But the Apostle Paul makes a distinction between the covenants and the law. In enumerating the advantages conferred on Israel, he says, "To whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, *and the covenants, and the giving of the law,*" &c. Rom. 9 : 4. Here is proof positive that the law was distinct from the covenant.

Again, the first covenant was weakened, waxed old, and was finally null and void, because the people failed on their part to keep it. But could the disobedience of man weaken the ten commandments, or render them null and void? The idea is absurd. The law of God does not depend upon the obedience of the people for its strength, but upon the authority of the Lawgiver. When it is disobeyed, it still makes known sin. Says the apostle, "The strength of sin is the law." 1 Cor. 15 : 56.

Again, that the old covenant and the law of God are not identical, is seen in the fact that, when the old covenant is dissolved and vanished away, the law of God still remains, to sustain under the new covenant even a more important relation than it did under the old. See Jer. 31 : 33 : "But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel: After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts." Observe, he does not say that he will make a new law and write it on the heart, but the same law that under the old covenant was upon

tables of stone, is under the new written upon the fleshly tables of the heart.

What, then, is the relation of the new covenant to the law of God, or how does the making of the new covenant affect the law? What is the promise respecting the law? Is it, "I will abolish my law"? No. Is it, "I will change my law"? No. Is it, "I will supersede my law by a better code"? Verily not. It is entirely different from such as these. Mark the promise: "I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts."

The law of God remains, under the new covenant, more binding than before. It is magnified and made honorable. Instead of being done away, it is exalted more than ever. With this view agree all the Scriptures. Rom. 3:31: "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid! Yea, we establish the law."

[Time called—*Loud Applause.*]

Fourth Session.

ELD. GRANT'S TENTH SPEECH.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: We regret that we have not more time. We need another evening to notice all the points before us, but we will do the best we can. A few points we must notice in last evening's speech. He said there was an hour's difference in time in Palestine. I find by examining the matter that there could not be over eight minutes. The general difference from east to west would be about four minutes; but the extreme points would not be over eight minutes. Here

I will present a thought for him to consider. In the time of Joshua, the day was prolonged so that sunset was twelve hours later than it had been before. Now if the identical twenty-four hours must be kept, the Sabbath has never been kept since the days of Joshua.

In regard to love in the old covenant, it is not in the decalogue. Lev. 19:18: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself;" and Deut. 6: "And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might." Here is love with the heart—a law on the heart, not on tables of stone. These are the great leading commandments in the New Testament; but they are not in the decalogue. But if they are not in the law of ten commandments, they must be ceremonial, according to his position. He says the Sabbath is in the midst of the decalogue. Well, it is a good place for the memorial day. It commemorated their deliverance, and was put in the midst of that law, as we would put records in the corner-stone of a building.

I repeat again the question, to get a full answer, What law was that of which Christ paid the penalty?

He says there are two laws; one abolished, and one that is not. But there is no account of a ceremonial law in Scripture. I think the jumbling consists in confounding the old law with the law of faith. That was a national law, and if they lived up to that law, they were accepted as a nation. A man might keep it then, or keep it now, and be lost. I repeat it, A man might keep that law and be lost. If we indulge in witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, drunkenness, revellings, and such like, Gal. 5:20, 21, we shall be lost; but not one of these is in the decalogue.

Whoever assumes that the royal law is the ten commandments, gets into a jumble. Ps. 19:7: "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul." This may refer to the law of faith. What law converted Saul? the ten commandments? No; he was blameless concerning that law. See Acts 9. He was on his way to Damascus, and saw a great light, and the Lord sent Ananias to tell him what to do. Ananias did n't say a word about the Sabbath, but told him to be baptized.

My brother says time rolls on. Watts says, "Fly swiftly round, ye wheels of time;" but there are no actual wheels of time. It is a figure.

I was converted, breaking the seventh-day Sabbath, and was not condemned. But he says I was converted believing in the immortality of the soul, and other errors. There is a difference; these are mere doctrinal points, not concerning moral obligation. He claims the Sabbath to be a moral precept. When I was converted I found a commandment to prove all things, and so I did. I proved the doctrines of the immortality of the soul and endless misery, and found them errors. So I have proved the Sabbath. I have got great light in this discussion. While studying this subject, the light has so shone out that I have had to stop and praise God.

The covenant—*diatheke*—is again referred to. It means, "Any disposition, arrangement, institution, or dispensation; hence, a testament, will, Heb. 9:16, a covenant, *i. e.*, mutual promises on mutual conditions, or promises with conditions annexed. By metonymy, a body of laws and precepts, to which certain promises are annexed." Just the case with the covenant at Horeb; mutual promises with conditions annexed.

This first covenant is referred to in Hebrews 9:

18-20: "Whereupon neither the first testament was dedicated without blood. For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people, according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and all the people, saying, This is the blood of the testament [or covenant] which God hath enjoined unto you." He says this is the old covenant. Glad to come together again. He omitted to read that part where it says, "Enjoined unto you." What does that mean? Webster says, "To lay upon, as an order, or command; to put an injunction on; to give a command to; to direct with authority; to order." Does God command to make an agreement? No! they were covenanted to keep that which he enjoined unto them—the ten commandments. But he says the ten commandments are not the first, or old, covenant. Let us see. I cannot agree with him. Here may come the tug of war, as he promised. Deut. 5:2-6: "The Lord our God made a covenant with us in Horeb. The Lord made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day. The Lord talked with you face to face, in the mount, out of the midst of the fire (I stood between the Lord and you at that time, to show you the word of the Lord; for ye were afraid by reason of the fire, and went not up into the mount), saying, I am the Lord thy God which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage." Here begins the covenant, or ten commandments. See again, Deut. 4:12, 13: "And the Lord spake unto you out of the midst of the fire; ye heard the voice of the words, but saw no similitude, only ye heard a voice. 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." They heard the voice; that is, the covenant; no language could be plainer. Again, Deut. 9:11: "And it came to pass at the end of forty days and forty nights, that the Lord gave me the two tables of stone, even the tables of the covenant." Will he deny the plain language, and say the ten commandments are not the old covenant? Further, in Ex. 34, he was with the Lord forty days, received the tables of stone, and when he came down from the mount, his face shone so that he had to put a vail on it.

Paul takes up this in 2 Cor. 3:7: "But if the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away; how shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious? For if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory." One was condemnation; the other of righteousness. He is comparing the two. "For even that which was made glorious had no glory in this respect by reason of the glory that excelleth. For if that which is done away was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious. Seeing then that we have such hope, we use great plainness of speech: and not as Moses, which put a vail over his face, that the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished." There you see it has run out—it expired by limitation. Now see Heb. 8:7-10. The Lord promised to make a new covenant, not according to the covenant he made with their fathers. In this he says he will put his law in their hearts; in the other, it was only on tables of stone. That was

a national covenant, and did not reach the heart. All moral men could keep it, and yet not be saved. I repeat it: A merely moral man could keep it, and not be even nominally a Christian. Not a word in it in regard to evil speaking, impure thoughts, or evil desires. The law made no one perfect; and the old covenant and the law are identical. Rom. 7:7. Paul says the law said, Thou shalt not covet. This is the law of the decalogue. It is done away.

Now we come to where we left off. We were last examining Ex. 20, near the close—24th verse and onward: "An altar of earth thou shalt make unto me, and shalt sacrifice thereon thy burnt offerings, and thy peace offerings," &c. Here is the first mention of sacrifices and offerings in Exodus; they were in connection with the old covenant, and they remained together till its close. And so he goes on through the 21st, 22d, 23d, and 24th chapters, wherein I read last evening. "Come up unto the Lord, thou, and Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, and seventy of the elders." [Time.]

ELD. CORNELL'S TENTH SPEECH.

Mr. Chairmen, and the audience: This is the last evening of our discussion, and I regret that it is so soon to close. There are many points I shall not be able to bring out for want of time. I will briefly notice a few of his positions, which, in looking over my notes, I find in his former speeches.

He quotes Rom. 7:6, to prove that the law is dead. The marginal reading is correct, which refers the death to the brethren, not to the law, because it agrees with the connection, and because the original of "being dead" is in the plural, and cannot refer to the law.

All his argument on the law's being dead is groundless.

He says the Sabbath is a shadow, and quotes Col. 2, to prove it. But the Sabbath is not a shadow of anything to come. It is a memorial, and points back to creation, instituted before the fall, where no types were given; therefore Col. 2, cannot refer to the weekly Sabbath.

He includes the seventh-day Sabbath among the feasts of Lev. 23. There were but three feasts in the Jewish law, as we learn in Deut. 16:16: "Three times in a year shall all thy males appear before the Lord thy God in the place which he shall choose; in the feast of unleavened bread, and in the feast of weeks, and in the feast of tabernacles." These, with the new moons, were feasts and sabbaths peculiar to that people; they were the sabbaths of Israel; but the seventh day of the week is the Lord's Sabbath. And the Lord distinguishes between them in Lev. 23:37, 38: "These are the feasts of the Lord, which ye shall proclaim to be holy convocations, to offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord, a burnt offering, and a meat offering, a sacrifice, and drink offerings, every thing upon his day; beside the Sabbaths of the Lord."

He tried to prove the Sabbath was not a moral precept, by saying God does not abolish moral precepts, but he has abolished the Sabbath. But he also says he abolished the ten commandments. Now, of course, he must say the other nine commandments are not moral or else he contradicts himself. Will he accept his own argument that the other nine commandments are not moral?

He admitted last evening that there was love in the old covenant, but said there was not in the ten commandments. But he also says the ten commandments

were the old covenant. Here he contradicts himself as well as the Bible. But error cannot go in a straight line. [Applause.]

He says if he were in Paris he would celebrate the Fourth of July, but not the same time we do here. Now I ask him if it would therefore be the Fourth of July, or some other day? If it were not the same day he would not celebrate the Fourth of July at all. If it would be the same day, there is no difficulty about the time of the Sabbath.

He has several times said the ten commandments only noticed outward acts. How do persons covet? Is it an outward act? Is not a heart-work recognized there?

I will notice the difference of time in Palestine. He is probably correct in saying there are only eight minutes' variation. I had my mind upon the fact that Israel kept the Sabbath when they were scattered abroad, so there was an hour's difference. But that does not alter the case; the principle is there, all the same. If they could keep the same day, beginning eight minutes apart, they could ten minutes, or thirty minutes, or one hour, or twelve hours, by the same rule.

Again, he said, Ananias did not say a word about the Sabbath to Paul, but only to be baptized; therefore the Sabbath was not binding on him. But he did n't say a word about the third commandment; therefore he could take God's name in vain. He did not say a word about the fifth, seventh, or eighth commandments; therefore they are not binding, and he was at liberty to kill, commit adultery, and steal, by Bro. Grant's rule. That is the way they get into trouble opposing the Sabbath. Every argument they make against it strikes against every other commandment, and destroys all moral obligation.

Notwithstanding the positive evidence I have brought in favor of the original obligation of the Sabbath, he still claims that it depends on the old covenant for its obligation. But he admits, as he must, that it was in force before that covenant was made, and it makes no difference whether it was thirty days, or ten days. If it was binding five minutes before that covenant was made, it does not then depend on that covenant. His position is therefore wrong, but he don't notice this. Proving that the old covenant is done away does not prove anything; it does not touch the point.

Deut. 1:1-5, is quoted, which says, Moses stood between God and the people, when the Lord made the covenant with them, to show them the word of the Lord. But Moses did not stand between God and the people when the ten commandments were given; they all heard it directly from God himself. Moses did stand between God and the people when the covenant or agreement was made between them, as we have read in Ex. 19. This again proves that that agreement was the old covenant made with the house of Israel, and that the ten commandments were not.

Let us notice 2 Cor. 3: "But if the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away:"—what is done away?—"which glory"—of Moses' countenance—"was to be done away." But he says it was the ten commandments that are done away. Let us be careful how we read: "How shall not the ministration of the spirit be rather glorious? For if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory. For even that which was

made glorious had no glory in this respect, by reason of the glory that excelleth. For if that which is done away was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious. Seeing then that we have such hope, we use great plainness of speech. And not as Moses, which put a vail over his face, that the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished." What is that abolished? That which Moses hid with a vail put on his face. Were the ten commandments on Moses' face? No! Moses was the mediator of that covenant; and Paul is writing about the different ministrations, or priestly work under the two covenants. That did not release from condemnation; it had no sufficient offering to take away sin. This is on better promises; it grants repentance and forgiveness of sins. But the same law is now written on the heart, by the Spirit of God, that God there wrote on the stones.

He says the old covenant could not make any one perfect, and then applies it to the ten commandments, and says there is nothing in them against evil speaking or evil desires. I wonder if Bro. Grant ever read the ten commandments! See here: "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor." Does that relate to evil speaking? "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor anything that is thy neighbor's." Is there nothing about evil desires in that? The commandments of God are much broader than he seems to be aware of.

I will now offer fifteen reasons why the Sabbath is for Gentiles, as well as Jews. Remember, that is the question.

1. "The Sabbath was made for man." Mark 2:27. Gentiles are men, hence it was made for Gentiles.

There is no evading this conclusion, unless it can be proved that a Gentile is not a man.

2. It was made more than two thousand years before there were any Jews, and, therefore, must have been designed for mankind in general.

3. The reasons given in the commandment to the Jews for keeping it, apply equally to the Gentiles. It is just as true among the Gentiles that God rested upon the seventh day, and that he blessed and sanctified it. It is therefore equally binding upon the Gentiles.

4. It is declared to be a sign, or memorial, between God and his people, because in it he rested from all his work. Ex 31:17. It is, therefore, a memorial of the creation of the heavens and the earth. This again fastens it equally upon the Gentiles, because they are as much interested in the creation as the Jews.

5. One object of the Sabbath is for religious meetings and worship of the Creator of all things. Proof: Lev. 23:3: "The seventh day is the Sabbath of rest, an holy convocation." But the Gentiles need such a day for religious convocation as much as the Jews, and God has never given them any other day. No record in the Bible of any other day of rest ever being given.

6. Again, the Sabbath is a physical blessing to men, as well as to meet the demands of his mental and moral nature. It is declared to be a day of rest for man and his beast. It is universally admitted that man needs a day of rest. Do not the Gentiles and their beasts of burden need the Sabbath rest as much as the Jews? Has the Creator neglected to supply the demands of their nature? May we not inquire with Paul, "Is he not the God of the Gentiles also?"

7. The fact that the Sabbath was made for man in Paradise before the fall, is evidence of its universal ap-

plication to all men. It was not a temporary thing for some particular sect of people, but a blessing for universal man in his Eden home.

8. Another fact showing the universal application of the Sabbath to all men, both Jews and Gentiles, is that God placed it in the very heart of the moral law. None dare deny that the other nine precepts are of universal application to all men—Gentiles, as well as Jews. Let us consider these commandments.

The first, to serve God only; second, have no idols; third, honor God's holy name; fourth, remember his holy rest-day; fifth, honor parents; and to abstain from murder, adultery, theft, false witness, and covetousness. All these are duties binding on the Gentiles, as well as the Jews. They are universal, growing out of the relation of all mankind to their Creator, and of course moral.

Now God did not put the Sabbath in the midst of these moral laws by mistake; he put it there intentionally, because it was like them. And this shows his design that all men should keep it. And the Sabbath points directly to the relation that we, as creatures, sustain to him as the Creator. It grows out of those relations as surely as do any of the others. It grows out of the fact that God is creator. These facts and relations apply to all mankind alike; they have existed from the beginning of the race.

9. Another proof that the Sabbath is binding on Gentiles, is the fact that Christ and the apostles teach the perpetuity of the moral law, of which the Sabbath was a part. Matt. 5:19: "Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least," &c. The Sabbath is one of them. Rom. 3:31, Paul says,

"Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we *establish the law*." The Sabbath, being a part of the law, is established by faith.

10. The apostle Paul teaches that the Gentiles who never heard the law as did the Jews, yet have it written upon their hearts by nature. Proof: Rom. 2:14, 15. "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; which show the *work of the law written in their hearts*."

Now if the Gentiles have the law in their hearts so as to do by nature the things contained in the law, we can understand why many of the Gentile nations have an idea of the Sabbath without the Bible. Where did they get this idea, if not from nature and tradition? The God, both of nature and of the Gentiles, has stamped the Sabbath truth upon their hearts.

Mark! the law that the Jews heard, and had a copy of, is the same the Gentiles have written on their hearts.

11. When God made the Sabbath for man at the creation of the world, at that very time, he commanded them, Gen. 1:28, to "be fruitful, and multiply, and *replenish the earth*." To replenish, is to stock, to fill up completely.—*Web*. So Paul declares that God "hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth." Acts 17:26. There was no distinction of nations in the plan of God; we therefore conclude that he made the Sabbath for all nations who dwell on the face of the earth. For the Sabbath was made before any national distinction could be recognized.

[Time.]

ELD. GRANT'S ELEVENTH SPEECH.

Col. 2 says that the Sabbath days were shadows of good things to come, but the body is of Christ. Now we have come to the body, and we know the shadow always runs out when we come to the body. Does this mean the seventh-day Sabbath? Yes. How does God declare the end from the beginning? He appointed six days for labor, and one for rest. That is a type of the toil and labor of six thousand years, and the rest that remains for the people of God.

He says there were only three feasts in their law. Let us read: "Three times a year shall all thy males appear before the Lord thy God, in the place which he shall choose." These were for *all* the males; they were not all required to assemble on the seventh day at a particular place.

God does not abolish moral precepts. Before that law was given, there was a law to love God, &c. But the ten commandments were a code of precepts to them as a nation; and it is now all abolished as a covenant—it is dead. The moral precepts were enjoined before and after that covenant, but it was a special covenant for them.

The Fourth of July cannot be celebrated the same hours in Paris that it is here. If he admits that, he must give up his view of definite, particular time. So here we are agreed again.

2 Cor. 3:7: "But if the ministration of death [what one?] written and engraven on stones." That's it; that was glorious, but it was done away; and the ministration of righteousness exceeds in glory. It was the ministration, and not the glory, that was done away. That is Paul's point, if I can understand it.

"The Sabbath was made for man." We come back to his syllogism. The passover was for men also, but not for the Gentiles. No other points of weight to notice, so I go on.

Heb. 9 : 1, we read, "Then verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary." Here the ordinances and the covenant are connected together, and they remain together. When the ordinances stop, the covenant stops.

The learned Griesbach says, "Law of the commandments in ordinances;" Wakefield says, "with its ordinances." Ex. 20 : 24: "An altar of earth thou shalt make unto me, and shalt sacrifice thereon thy burnt offerings," &c. Here is the first mention of an altar in Exodus, and it was attached to the first covenant.

Heb. 9 : 6-12: "Now when these things were thus ordained, the priests went always into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service of God. But into the second went the high priest alone once every year, not without blood which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people: the Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing; which was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience; which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation [mark this, *until*—not always]. But Christ being come a high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us."

And Heb. 6 : 19, 20, says, "Which hope we have as

an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the vail; whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus, made a high priest forever after the order of Melchizedec." Jesus has entered within the vail; but some say he did not enter until 1844. Paul says he is entered.

Heb. 9 : 18-20: "Whereupon neither the first testament was dedicated without blood."—This first on Mt. Sinai was dedicated with blood.—"For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and all the people, saying, This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you." This was a solemn affair. It was sealed with blood. It is described in Ex. 24 : 3: "And Moses came and told the people all the words of the Lord, and all the judgments; and all the people answered with one voice, and said, All the words which the Lord hath said will we do." That was a covenant of works—they promised to do; but now we are under a covenant of grace. And again he submits it to the people to see if it is all right. They hear and consent to it all. Verse 7: "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." But my brother says this covenant was written in a book. Well, he never would have got it if it had not been written in a book. Moses had to write it in a book. He could not carry the tables of stone around to teach the people the words of the covenant. That this is the covenant from Horeb, there is no room for doubt.

We come now to the new covenant. Heb. 8 : 13: "In that he saith a new covenant, he hath made the

first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away." Let us look further, in Heb. 7:18, 19: "For there is verily a disannulling of the commandment going before for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof. For the law made nothing perfect"—as we said before, a man might keep every one of the ten commandments, and not be a Christian—"but the bringing in of a better hope did; by the which we draw nigh unto God." Col. 2:16, 17: "Let no man therefore judge you in meat or drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days; which are a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ." This brings us to the body again, and when we get there, the shadows cease.

Acts 3:22, 23: "For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; 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, shall be destroyed from among the people." When you get to the body, look to that; don't look back to the shadow. Hear that Prophet now. To find what that means, we turn to chap. 15:10: "Now therefore why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear." Now come back again to Heb. 8:6, 7: "But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant which was established upon better promises. For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second." A man might keep the ten commandments, and not be saved. Paul was blameless touching that law, but it did not reach to the motive of his actions.

We will take a bird's-eye view of the covenant with Israel. They were compared to a vine. Ps. 80:8: "Thou hast brought a vine out of Egypt: thou hast cast out the heathen and planted it." And in Isa. 5:1, 2, 7: "Now will I sing to my well beloved a song of my beloved touching his vineyard. My well beloved hath a vineyard in a very fruitful hill: and he fenced it, and gathered out the stones thereof, and planted it with the choicest vine, and built a tower in the midst of it, and also made a winepress therein: and he looked that it should bring forth grapes, and it brought forth wild grapes. For the vineyard of the Lord of hosts is the house of Israel, and the men of Judah his pleasant plant."

He brought it up, it grew, and he made a covenant to make a great nation of them if they would keep his covenant. The blessing was national; it did not refer to future life, but was for the present. We have looked to Enoch, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and find they knew nothing of this covenant. Now Christ is our vine—we are married to him.

Eze. 16:4-13: "And as for thy nativity, in the day that thou wast born thy navel wast not cut, neither wast thou washed in water to supple thee; thou wast not salted at all, nor swaddled at all. None eye pitied thee, to do any of these unto thee, to have compassion upon thee; but thou wast cast out in the open field, to the loathing of thy person, in the day that thou wast born. And when I passed by thee, and saw thee polluted in thine own blood, I said unto thee when thou wast in thy blood, Live; yea, I said unto thee when thou wast in thy blood, Live. I have caused thee to multiply as the bud of the field, and thou hast increased and waxen great, and thou art come to excellent ornaments: thy

breasts are fashioned, and thine hair is grown, whereas thou wast naked and bare. Now when I passed by thee, and looked upon thee, behold, thy time was the time of love; and I spread my skirt over thee, and covered thy nakedness: yea, I swear unto thee, and entered into a covenant with thee, saith the Lord God, and thou becamest mine."

Here is the covenant with Israel, and we will see what its result was to them:

"Then washed I thee with water; yea, I thoroughly washed away thy blood from thee, and I anointed thee with oil. I clothed thee also with brodered work, and shod thee with badgers' skin, and I girded thee about with fine linen, and I covered thee with silk. I decked thee also with ornaments, and I put bracelets upon thy hands, and a chain on thy neck. And I put a jewel on thy forehead, and earrings in thine ears, and a beautiful crown upon thine head. Thus wast thou decked with gold and silver; and thy raiment was of fine linen, and silk, and brodered work; thou didst eat fine flour, and honey, and oil; and thou wast exceeding beautiful, and thou didst prosper into a kingdom."

The old covenant was for that kingdom, or nation; it was national, and it could be kept by any one and yet he not be fitted for eternal life. I say, emphatically, not a precept in that law but that every moral man can keep. See here: "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image." "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain." Could not any moral man avoid all that? "Remember the Sabbath day." This they could do. "Honor thy father and thy mother." They could do this also. "Thou shalt not kill," nor commit adultery, nor steal, nor bear false witness, nor covet. Any moral man can keep all these. It did not command to love God, because then a moral man could not

keep it. It speaks of the benefits of loving God, and the evils of hating him, but does not command. Now shall we take the Sabbath, and make a test of it? Preposterous!

2 Tim. 1:9: "Who hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began." We see the new covenant is not a covenant of works.

[Time.]

ELD. CORNELL'S ELEVENTH SPEECH.

One thing has been said for mere effect, which I must notice. We do not believe that they who keep Sunday have the mark of the beast; we do not teach so. It is a misrepresentation. But we do believe that when it becomes enforced by law, the warning has been given, and the people become enlightened on the subject, if they then persist in disobedience to God by breaking his holy Sabbath for an institution of another, opposing power, they will be condemned as worshipers of that power. We cannot tell who are honest; but the truth is sent to test the people.

He says all the moral precepts are in the New Testament. Where are the first three commandments in the New Testament? When he shows these, I will show the Sabbath just as positively. Let him try this if he dare. They all stand or fall together.

Heb. 9:1: "Then verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary." But that covenant is not the ten commandments. There was no sanctuary ordered till after they came to Sinai,

but every one of the ten commandments was binding before that.

"We are not under a covenant of works." Does he mean by that that there are no works in the gospel plan? James says that faith without works is dead, being alone. Though we are not justified by works, we are not released from them. I assert there is just as much works in the New Testament as in the Old. We shall be judged according to our works; every man will be rewarded according to his works. True faith is a faith that works.

The old covenant is done away, because it was broken; but breaking the commandments would not make them void. Look at each of them: Have no other gods; make and worship no image; take not God's name in vain; keep holy the Sabbath. Are these weakened by transgression? Honor thy father and mother; thou shalt not kill, nor commit adultery, nor steal, nor bear false witness, nor covet. Does the breaking of these do them away? They do not depend on man's obedience for their obligation or perpetuity, but on God's authority. But the old covenant was the agreement made concerning God's law of ten commandments; and an agreement is made void by the failure of either party to fulfill its conditions. This is the case with the old covenant.

He says Christ is our lawgiver. If that is so, I ask, Who is our mediator? [Applause.] The Catholic will say, The pope. But what will we do who reject the pope? Who is Bro. Grant's mediator between him and his Lawgiver?

There was a promise of eternal life in the Old Testament, by faith; but they had to keep the command-

ments. And so must we; for faith is nothing without obedience.

What is it to be moral? That which is called morality in the world is no morality at all. True morality is just what is needed, and I assert that a strictly moral man will be saved. [A voice—Humbug.] There is no perfect morality without perfect obedience, and that is just what God requires.

I now resume my reasons for believing the Sabbath was for the Gentiles:

12. The law of God is declared by the apostle Paul to be universal in its jurisdiction.

Rom. 3:19: "Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to *them who are under the law*; that *every* mouth may be stopped, and *all the world* may become guilty before God."

Now we submit that a law which stops "every mouth," and proves "all the world" guilty, must be binding on all the world. 1. It condemns all to whom it speaks. 2. It speaks only to those who are under it. 3. It condemns all the world. 4. Conclusion: Then all the world must be under it.

But does not Paul say that Christians are not under the law, but under grace? Yes; because their transgressions of it are forgiven. But were they not under it till converted? And if so, is it not binding? Shall we sin now? God forbid.

13. We come now to a direct statement of the word of the Lord, pronouncing a blessing on every Gentile who will keep his Sabbath:

Isa. 56:1-8: "Thus saith the Lord, Keep ye judgment, and do justice: *for my salvation is near to come*, and my righteousness to be revealed. *Blessed is the man that doeth this*, and the son of man that *layeth hold*

on it; that *keepeth the Sabbath* from polluting it, and keepeth his hand from doing any evil. Neither let the son of the stranger that hath joined himself to the Lord, speak, saying, The Lord hath utterly separated me from his people: neither let the eunuch say, Behold, I am a dry tree. For thus saith the Lord unto the eunuchs that keep my Sabbaths, and *choose the things that please me*, and take hold of my covenant; even unto them will I give in mine house and within my walls a place, and a name better than of sons and of daughters. I will give them an everlasting name, that shall not be cut off. Also the sons of the stranger, that join themselves to the Lord, to serve him, and to love the name of the Lord, to be his servants, every one that *keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it*, and taketh hold of my covenant; even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer; their burnt offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted upon mine altar; for mine house shall be called a house of prayer for all people. The Lord God which gathereth the outcasts of Israel saith, *Yet will I gather others to him, besides those that are gathered unto him.*"

This is positive. It belongs to the past dispensation, or it is prophetic of the gathering in of the Gentiles. In either case it fastens the obligation of the Sabbath upon the Gentiles. The "*strangers*" are the Gentiles. See Eph. 2:11, 12.

It is plainly declared, then, that God requires the Gentiles to keep his Sabbath. And why not? They are men, and Jesus says it was made for them.

14. Jesus, in the New Testament, recognizes the Sabbath and the law of the Sabbath as binding in this dispensation, and hence obligatory upon the Gentiles.

Matt. 12:12: "Wherefore it is lawful to do well on the Sabbath days." 1. Then there are Sabbath days in the gospel. 2. There is a law regulating the Sabbath.

"It is lawful," means according to law. It is certain, therefore, that the Sabbath law is still in force.

Again, in Matt. 24:20, Jesus instructs the disciples to make the Sabbath a subject of prayer, during the forty years that intervened between that time and the destruction of Jerusalem, that their flight might not happen on the Sabbath day. And we find the disciples, after the crucifixion, "resting on the Sabbath according to the commandment." Luke 23:56.

15. The Sabbath will be kept in the new earth, when all flesh will meet to worship on the Sabbath, both Jews and Gentiles. Proof: Isa. 66:22, 23: "For as the new heavens and the new earth which I will make, shall remain before me, saith the Lord, so shall your seed and your name remain. And it shall come to pass, that from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord." Not one eternal Sabbath, but "from one Sabbath to another." In the restitution, the original plan that all created intelligences should keep the Sabbath will be fulfilled. We have traced the Sabbath from Paradise lost to Paradise restored. It originated in Eden.

"'T was set apart before the fall,
'T was made for man, 't was made for all."

And when the time comes that "all the earth shall be filled with the glory of God," then all the saved will keep the Sabbath together. What a glorious thought!

The Sabbath covers all time, and embraces all races of mankind. It begins with the first man, and it still exists with man as the holy and honorable of the Lord in the immortal state.

And as it was instituted to commemorate the creation

of the heavens and the earth, it will remain while heaven and earth endure. [Time.]

ELD. GRANT'S TWELFTH SPEECH.

It is claimed that the Sunday institution is the mark of the beast. On this point I will read a little history:

Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, A. D. 101, who died only about half a dozen years after the death of the apostle John, speaks of the Lord's day familiarly and without explanations, as if everybody understood it. And he gives this title to the first day of the week exactly after the manner of the apostle himself. "Let us [Christians] no more sabbatize," he says (that is, keep the seventh day, as the Jews did), "but let us keep the Lord's day." Again: "Let every one that loves Christ keep holy the Lord's day, the queen of days, the resurrection day, the highest of all days."

Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, a disciple of Polycarp, who had been the companion of the apostles, A. D. 167, says: "On the Lord's day every one of us Christians keep the Sabbath, meditating on the law, and rejoicing in the works of God."

Tertullian, who died A. D. 245, says: "The Lord's day is the holy day of the Christian church. We have nothing to do with the Sabbath (that is, the Jewish Sabbath). The Lord's day is the Christian's solemnity."

Barnabas, who, if not a companion of the apostles, lived in the apostolic age, says: "We [Christians] keep the eighth day [that is, the first day of the week] as a joyful holy day, on which day also Jesus arose from the dead."

Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, who died A. D. 397, says: "The Lord's day is sacred, or consecrated, by the resurrection of Christ."

Augustine, who died A. D. 430, says: "The Lord's day was by the resurrection declared to Christians; and from that very time it began to be celebrated as the Christian festival."

The persecutors of these Christians were accustomed to put to them this question: "*Dominicum servasti?*" Hast thou kept the Lord's day? If they had, they were marked as Christians. This was the badge of their Christianity. And if they said they had, and would not recant, they must be put to death.

Eusebius, "one of the most learned and eloquent men of the Christian church," called the "Father of Ecclesiastical History," who died about A. D. 339, in his commentary on the Psalms, says of Psalm 92: "The Word [Christ] by the new covenant, translated and transferred the feast of the Sabbath to the morning light, and gave us the true rest; viz., the saving Lord's day; the first [day] of the light, in which the Saviour of the world, after all his labors among men, obtained the victory over death. * * * On this day which is the first of light and of the true Sun, we assemble, after an interval of six days, and celebrate holy and scriptural Sabbaths—even all nations redeemed by him throughout the world—and do those things, according to the spiritual law, which were decreed for the priests to do on the Sabbath; for we make spiritual offerings and sacrifices, which are called sacrifices of praise and rejoicing."

Theodoret, another Ecclesiastical Historian, who died about A. D. 460, speaking of the Ebionites, a party of Judaizing Christians, says: "They keep the Sabbath according to the Jewish law, and sanctify the Lord's day in like manner as we do." (Hæret. Fab. 2. 1.) "This," says Prof. Stewart, "gives a good historical view of the state of things in the early ages of the church. The zealots for the law wished the Jewish Sabbath to be observed, as well as the Lord's day; for about the

latter there appears never to have been any question among any class of Christians, so far as I have been able to discover. The early Christians, one and all of them, held the first day of the week to be sacred." (Sabbath Manual, No. 2, pp. 111, 126.)

Says Mosheim: "All Christians were unanimous in setting apart the *first day of the week* on which the triumphant Saviour arose from the dead, for the solemn celebration of public worship. This pious custom, which was derived from the example of the church of Jerusalem, was founded upon the *express appointment of the apostles*, who consecrated that day to the same sacred purpose, and was observed universally throughout all the Christian churches, as appears from the united testimony of the most credible writers." (Maclaine's Mosheim, Cent. 1, part II, c. 4, s. 4.)

My opponent said the pope changed the Sabbath. Never! Did Constantine change it? Never! He cannot bring a word of proof to sustain it. Constantine enjoined it because he embraced Christianity, and sustained the Christians who had been using that day. The old covenant had passed away before that, and all the other commandments are in the New Testament.

He quotes James to show that justification is also by works. Yes; by works and faith, but it was by works alone under the first covenant. God did not make the covenant alone—there were two parties; but they broke it, and now it is gone. He asked the people if they would agree to what he laid before them, and they replied, We will do it. Then he ordered them to make an ark, tabernacle, &c.; these belonged to the covenant, and they are all gone together,—all null and void, that they are ended, all the scriptures agree.

We have "one Lawgiver." Yes; Jesus and his Father are one.

We want proof that Abraham knew that covenant.

He has given a new definition of morality. [Loud shouts of, Amen.]

Rom. 3:19, 20: "Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law, that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God. Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight; for by the law is the knowledge of sin."

What law is that? He is speaking of that old covenant, verses 21, 22: "But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference." That is as broad as the other—"all that believe." "Where is boasting then?" Well, I do n't know; it is not in our works. Is there any works there? Without—there it stands, without—the law.

Isa. 56:1, does not touch the resolution, and I let it pass.

He speaks of the Sabbath in the new earth. Yes; there is a Sabbath or rest remaining for the people of God; but it is longer than the seventh-day Sabbath. It is an eternal Sabbath.

Now come to a few facts:

In summing up, we would express the substance of our arguments by introducing the following facts:

1. It is a fact that there is but one weekly Sabbath mentioned in the Bible.

2. It is a fact that there exists no proof that man kept, or was required to keep, a Sabbath from the creation to the exode, a period of about twenty-five hundred years.

3. It is a fact that throughout all history, we can discover no trace of a Sabbath among the Gentile nations of antiquity; hence,

4. It is a fact that no nation except the Jews have ever observed the Sabbath.

5. It is a fact that the Jews, Talmudical writers, and early fathers regard the Sabbath as only given to the Jews after their exode.

6. It is a fact that Adam's first day corresponded with God's seventh day.

7. It is a fact that Gen. 2:3, was not written until after the law was given at Sinai.

8. It is a fact that God gave (not restored) the Jews a Sabbath.

9. It is a fact that God never gave the Gentiles a Sabbath.

10. It is a fact that the Israelites never prohibited Gentiles from work on the Sabbath unless they were servants or proselytes.

11. It is a fact that the pope did not change the Sabbath.

12. It is a fact that the early fathers and reformers did not regard the fourth commandment as binding.

13. It is a fact that the only reason given in either decalogue for the Sabbath was because they had been servants in Egypt.

14. It is a fact that the only reason given elsewhere for the Jews to keep the Sabbath on the seventh day, was because God rested on a seventh day in Eden.

15. It is a fact that we can discover no trace of a Sabbath, even among the oriental nations who had the hebdominal week.

16. It is a fact that, throughout the entire range of

Grecian literature, no trace of Sabbath or Septenary institutions can be found.

17. It is a fact that no Pagan writer can be adduced who refers to the Sabbath, otherwise than a Jewish institution.

18. It is a fact that the Sabbath is a *positive* precept, not a *moral* one.

19. It is a fact that the Sabbath for the man was made, and not the man for the Sabbath. Hence, the Sabbath was a servant and subservient to man, and not *vice versa*.

20. It is a fact that the Sabbath was a feast-day, and all feast days have ceased.

21. It is a fact that a Jew could keep the ten commandments and be lost.

22. It is a fact that the decalogue has nothing to do with the motive, but only the deed.

23. It is a fact that there is no distinction between the law of Moses and law of God.

24. It is a fact that fornication, incest, bigamy, cheating, backbiting, and a multitude of other immoral and unchristian acts, are no violation of the table law.

25. It is a fact that all nations cannot keep the Sabbath.

26. It is a fact that Christ did not once sabbatize after his resurrection, a period of forty days.

27. It is a fact that the law could not give eternal life, but Christ can.

28. It is a fact that the law (decalogue) was the Sinaiatic covenant.

29. It is a fact that the Sinaiatic covenant was one of bondage, from which we are now delivered by its being cast out.

30. It is a fact that if the table law is binding, then circumcision is, also.

31. It is a fact that we are saved by faith; but the law is not of faith, hence we are not saved by keeping the law.

32. It is a fact that the early Christians, for three hundred years, did not recognize the Sabbath as binding, or hold to the sabbatical nature of Sunday.

We read in Hosea 2:11: "I will also cause all her mirth to cease, her feast days, her new moons, and her sabbaths, and all her solemn feasts." And they have ceased, since Jerusalem was overthrown by the Gentiles. Their nationality is gone, and their covenant is gone.

Gal. 3:23: "But before faith came we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith that should afterward be revealed." We were under the law, but now are divorced—we are free from it.

I hope all will read Exodus, from the 19th to the 25th chapter, and see how it all harmonizes. When the covenant was made, the altar and offerings were all connected with it; as Paul says, the first covenant had ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary—all made with that poor infant child. It was a national covenant, having no reference to future life. If they would keep it, he would build them up; if not, he would pull them down. They did not keep it, and they are pulled down. And their covenant is null and void. [Cries of, Amen. Shouts and confusion.] Now we are under the new covenant; let us not go back to Moses, but go to Christ. We have not time to go back to Moses. It is proved to a demonstration that that covenant genders to bondage.

[Time.]

ELD. CORNELL'S TWELFTH SPEECH.

He says we have no time to go back to Moses. Who goes back to Moses? We go to God. That law was before Moses; it was spoken to the people by God's own voice—not the voice of Moses. But why does he go to the "fathers"? If he has any Bible to sustain his position, why don't he give it? He has none to give. We have one Lawgiver. Where did either the Father or Son command us to keep the first day of the week?

What is the liberty in Christ of which we boast? Freedom from condemnation—freedom from sin. That I believe. Is it freedom to break the law of God? to make it void? No, says Paul. Bro. Grant says, Yes. There's where he and the apostle disagree. Rom. 6:1: "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid." Sin is the transgression of the law, and freedom from sin is freedom in keeping God's law—not in breaking it. Is Christ the minister of sin? Gal. 2:17. No. Christ does not release us from obligation, but from condemnation.

One thing I am glad to notice: he acknowledges his failure to sustain his position by the Bible, by going to history. [A voice, That's false.] If he had any Bible proof that it was right to keep the resurrection day, he could give it; but he has not offered one text. He has not got it. He quotes from the epistle of Barnabas; a letter that all critics agree is a forgery. Mosheim and Kitto condemn it. Eusebius says it is spurious. Neander says it is impossible to attribute it to that Barnabas who was a fellow-laborer with Paul. That letter says the hyena changes its kind, and is sometimes male,

and sometimes female. [Laughter.] Does he believe it? Does he indorse Barnabas as a teacher of Christian duty? He has often said, "Hear Christ." Yes, hear him. Does Christ teach what his history teaches? If so, why didn't he show it? Because he could not.

He remarked that I cannot bring proof that the Catholics changed the Sabbath. Well, you are on the affirmative, and you quote history to prove the change. Will you prove who did change it? Did Christ change it? Will you point to the least particle of evidence that Christ instituted, or commanded, the observance of the first day of the week?

We are not justified by the law; because by the law is the knowledge of sin. Look at that law. As you look, you see you are a sinner. Now if you have righteousness restored to you, it must come through Jesus Christ. And what is the righteousness he gives? Paul says, that which is witnessed by the law. Rom. 3:21. But Bro. Grant says the witness is dead! [Applause.] And what is Paul's conclusion on this argument, as presented in the last verse of this chapter? "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law." I have several times called his attention to the apostle's own conclusion, but he will not notice it. He dare not; he knows it turns the argument against him. Paul says we do not make void the law through faith; Bro. Grant says we do. Here is his mistake. So in a manner he and I are engaged in the same work; that is, tearing down—he tearing down God's law, and I tearing down him. I would much rather occupy my place than his.

He says the Sabbath on the new earth is an eternal Sabbath. Isaiah says, "From one Sabbath to another."

Will they come from one eternal Sabbath to another eternal Sabbath? It will be the Lord's Sabbath, which, I have shown, was instituted in Paradise and reaches to Paradise restored.

He says Adam's first day was God's seventh day. I deny it. Adam's first day was the sixth day. After his creation he had all the beasts pass before him and gave them names, then was put into a sleep, and had a rib taken from his side, of which a woman was made; she was then presented to Adam, and a wedding took place—all on the sixth day. Certainly a considerable part of the sixth day must have transpired after Adam's creation.

I will now sum up the arguments as presented, and our replies and the direct arguments against the resolution.

Affirmative Argument, 1st. On the silence of Genesis; no proof that Adam kept the Sabbath—not hinted at for twenty-five hundred years.

Reply. We showed that it proved too much; there is no commandment in Genesis to love God. Again, it would prove the Sabbath was not obligatory for about eight hundred years after the exode, as it is not referred to by Bible writers during that time. But we found in Gen. 2:2, 3, a plain record of its institution; and that it was sanctified, or set apart, for man.

2d. It is a memorial of their coming out of Egypt. Deut. 5:15: The Lord brought them out of Egypt, "therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day."

Reply. We find the same language used in reference to not oppressing widows and orphans, and in reference to all of God's statutes and judgments. Are all God's laws only memorials of their deliverance from Egypt?

We have a definite memorial of that event in the passover, while the Sabbath points to creation for its origin.

3d. God sanctified the Sabbath after Israel had come out of Egypt.

Reply. On this we urged him to show *when* and *where* God sanctified the day except at creation. No record that the day was sanctified for man after Israel had come out of Egypt. He asserted it, but he failed to give a particle of proof.

4th. He complained that I asked him to prove a negative; said it was unreasonable.

Reply. He must prove two negatives, or lose his question. He framed the question himself, and ought not to complain if we ask him to sustain it.

5th. He asks, Is there proof that any particular seventh day is to be kept?

Reply. Did God rest on any particular day? We are to keep holy the day of God's rest, the day he sanctified, because of his resting on it.

6th. We cannot keep any particular day, because of the variations of time east and west.

Reply. How then can they keep the first day, or day of the resurrection? Is the world flat when Sunday comes?

7th. There is no commandment in the decalogue to love God.

Reply. In the second commandment we read: "Showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments." This is equivalent to a commandment, and is enough for all who are "willing and obedient."

8th. We don't claim that we are to keep any particular day, but only the seventh after six days of labor.

Reply. Then why assert that we are wrong? Do we not keep the seventh after six of labor?

9th. He affirmed in regard to Rom. 7 that the first husband, that was dead, was the law.

Reply. But we find that Paul, in his argument, comes out on our side. He says, "I had not known sin but by the law." "Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good."

10th. We are married to Christ. Let us hear Christ. If he says, Keep the seventh day, we will keep it.

Reply. He refuses to keep the Sabbath because Christ has not commanded it over again in the New Testament. But he will keep the Sunday as a religious duty, without its ever being once commanded.

11th. To keep the Sabbath right, we must not kindle any fires on that day.

Reply. There is nothing in the commandment against building fires. Like some other laws, it was designed for the period of their sojourn in the wilderness. When they came unto Palestine where it was cold, they were never forbidden having fires. But they were required to have fires on the Sabbath to offer sacrifices.

12th. The old covenant was made with the Jews only; but the new covenant, with the Gentiles.

Reply. The new covenant was *not* made with the Gentiles. Jeremiah and Paul are the only writers who mention the new covenant, and they both say it was made with the house of Israel and Judah.

13th. Paul kept the law until he was converted.

Reply. After he was converted, was he at liberty to break it?

14th. Nothing in the fourth commandment to indicate how to keep the Sabbath.

Reply. The disciples knew how to keep it by the commandment. Proof: Luke 23:56, "And rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment." Read the commandment. It says, "Keep it holy;" "In it thou shalt not do any work."

15th. There is nothing in the decalogue against evil speaking.

Reply. See the ninth commandment: "Thou shalt not bear false witness."

And he made a fatal admission, viz., that the Gentile proselytes were not servants, and that the Sabbath was binding on them. This is fatal to his question.

Of our rebutting arguments, I notice the following:

1. The Sabbath was made for man; Gentiles are men. It was made 2000 years before there were any Jews, before that distinction was known; hence, it was for mankind in general. The affirmative has failed to show any other institution of the Sabbath. The Sabbath was obligatory before they came to Sinai, and there was a law for it long before the old covenant was made; therefore the vanishing away of that covenant could not affect the Sabbath.

2. The reasons for the sabbatic institution given in the fourth commandment apply to all.

3. It was a memorial of creation, and hence obligatory on all men from creation, and on all under obligation to the Creator.

4. The same law that the Jews kept was binding on Gentiles. "There shall be one law for you and for the stranger." If the nations would learn the ways of God's people, they should be built up. Jer 12:16. Thus we learn that the Gentiles, as nations, were under the same conditions and obligations.

5. The Sabbath has existed in all dispensations.

Luke 23:56. The disciples of Christ "rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment." And the commandment points back to creation, where it was made, as stated in Gen. 2:3. And Jesus says it "was made for man."

6. We have shown that there were two distinct laws. The Sabbath is found in the midst of the one not abolished—the moral law, spoken and written by God himself.

7. Paul says it was not made void. Rom. 3:31. Christ says, "Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of Heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of Heaven." Matt. 5:19. Again: "And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail." Luke 16:17.

But my time is nearly out. To conclude, I call your attention to the question we have had under discussion: "The Sabbath was binding only on the Jews and their servants." Now I have shown, and he has admitted, that Gentiles were called of God to serve him by joining themselves to his people, and keeping his Sabbath. These were strangers, proselyted to the faith. But, in admitting this, he admits that those who were neither Jews nor their servants were required of God to keep the Sabbath. And, therefore, he has entirely failed to sustain his proposition.

And now, respected audience, I close, with thanks for your kind and attentive hearing of this discussion, and to the chairman for the impartial manner in which he has presided over us. We hope you will remember the points, and be advanced in the knowledge of Bible truth. And I wish to say that I have the kindest feel-

ings toward my opponent in the debate. We met as good friends, and I trust we part as friends. And thus I leave the subject with you.



P2619

LIBRARY
REVIEW AND HERALD

P2619

S.D.A.-Early Publications Collection

P263
G 76

S.D.A.-Early Publications Collection

P263

G 76

AUTHOR

Grant, Miles & Cornell, M.

Discussion on the Sabbath question
TITLE c.2

DATE DUE

BORROWER'S NAME

PUBLICATIONS.

The Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, Battle Creek, Mich., issues the following periodicals:

THE ADVENT REVIEW AND SABBATH HERALD, weekly. This sheet is an earnest exponent of the Prophecies, and treats largely upon the Signs of the Times, the Second Advent of Christ, the Nature of Man, the State of the Dead, the End of the Wicked, the Saints' Inheritance, the Hope of the Gospel, the Commandments of God, and the Faith of Jesus Christ. Terms, \$2.00 a year in advance.

THE YOUTH'S INSTRUCTOR, monthly. This is a high-toned, practical little sheet, devoted to moral and religious instruction, adapted to the wants of youth and children. Terms, 25 cents a year in advance.

THE HEALTH REFORMER, monthly. This journal is devoted to an exposition of the laws of life, and the application of those laws in the preservation of health, and the treatment of disease. Terms, \$1.00 a year in advance. Also,

Books, Pamphlets and Tracts.

	Price, Post.		Price, Post.
History of the Sabbath,	\$1.00 16c	Which? Mortal or Immortal,	15 2c
Thoughts on Revelation,	1.00 12	The Kingdom of God,	15 2
Life Incidents,	1.00 12	Miraculous Powers,	15 2
Life of Eld. Joseph Bates,	1.00 12	Ministration of Angels,	15 2
Hymns and Tunes, morocco,	1.00 12	Prophecy of Daniel,	10 2
" " " " calf,	1.20 12	The Saints' Inheritance,	10 2
" " " " gilt,	1.50 12	Signs of the Times,	10 2
Spirit of Prophecy, Vol. 1,	1.00 16	Vindication of the Sabbath,	10 2
" " " " 2,	1.00 16	The Sanctuary & 2300 Days,	10 2
Moral Pollution, muslin,	50 8	The Commandment to Restore	
" " " paper,	25 2	and Build Jerusalem,	10 2
Sabbath Readings, muslin,	60 8	Key to Prophetic Chart,	10 2
" " in 5 pamph's,	50 4	Exposition of Matt. xxiv,	10 2
" " in 25 tracts,	40 4	The Seven Trumpets,	10 2
Appeal to Youth, muslin,	40 4	Sabbath of 4th Comm'dment,	10 2
" " in pamph't,	10 2	Milton on State of the Dead,	5 2
The Bible from Heaven,	30 4	Appeal to Baptists—Sabbath,	5 2
Second Advent Keepsake,	30 4	Bible Student's Assistant,	5 2
" " " " gilt,	40 4	Sixteen Answers to Sixteen	
Modern Spiritualism,	20 2	Objections to Advent Faith,	5 2
Review of Preble—Sabbath,	20 2	Also a Select Package of about	
The Atonement,	20 2	twenty Tracts, upon differ-	
Review of Obj. to Visions,	20 2	ent subjects, comprising	
The Three Messages,	15 2	300 pages, by mail postpaid, 30 cts.	

The Association furnishes Tracts at the Office, or will forward them by express or freight, 1600 pages for \$1.00.

Address, REVIEW & HERALD, Battle Creek, Mich.