

THOUGHTS ON THE SABBATH,

AND

THE PERPETUITY

EMANUEL
MISSIONARY COLLEGE
LIBRARY

THE LAW OF GOD.

BY J. N. ANDREWS.

"Think not that I am come to destroy the law." "For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the Law."—JESUS.

"Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law."—PAUL.

PARIS, ME.

PUBLISHED BY JAMES WHITE.

1851.

JAMES WHITE LIBRARY
ANDREWS UNIVERSITY
BERRIEN SPRINGS, MICHIGAN
HERITAGE ROOM

THOUGHTS ON THE SABBATH

THE PUBLISHER

THE LAW OF GOD

BY J. M. ANDREWS

PUBLISHED BY JAMES WHITE

THOUGHTS ON THE SABBATH.

Those who observe the Sabbath of the Bible, may plead as their foundation, a *divine institution*. "GOD BLESSED THE SEVENTH DAY AND SANCTIFIED IT." In *this* consists the Sabbath institution itself. As God has never taken this blessing from the seventh day, the original institution still exists. As God has never sanctified another day of the week, much less enjoined another day as a weekly Sabbath, it is the only Sabbath institution.

Jehovah was the first who rested on the seventh day. His example was followed by the Son of God, and by the church universal, so far as the record of inspiration extends. How absurd to believe that the Great Creator observed a "carnal ordinance"!

As the seventh day was here sanctified by God, its observance is henceforward a moral duty. *But like the other precepts of the Decalogue*, it was not at first *expressly* enjoined in the written word.

When God enjoined the Sabbath on Israel, [Ex. xvi,] he pointed out the true seventh day, by a threefold weekly miracle, which continued for the space of forty years. Thenceforward the history of the Sabbath is given in the records of inspiration, so that a knowledge of the true seventh day has been preserved to the church.

When the law was given by the voice of the Almighty, we find the observance of the Sabbath enforced by the fourth commandment. The reason for its observance, as well as the date of its sanctification, is also clearly given.

The Lord made heaven and earth in six days and rested the seventh, "wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it." The Sabbath then is a standing memorial of God's

Visit
BV
125
ASA
1851
Her

Center for Adventist Research
Andrews University
Berrien Springs, Michigan

act of creation. By its observance men would have kept in memory the knowledge of the true God.

We have now considered three important points in the history of the Sabbath; first, its institution, [Gen. ii,] second, the fact that the true seventh day was pointed out to Israel, [Ex. xvi; Neh. ix,] and third, the grand law of the Sabbath, [Ex. xx.]

As we proceed in this examination, we notice three different sabbaths. First, the Sabbath of the Lord—the seventh day, [See Ex. xx,] second, the sabbaths of the Jews, the first and eighth day of their feasts, &c., [Lev. xxiii,] and third, the sabbath of the land, the seventh years. [Lev. xxv.]

As the Sabbath of the Lord had a real existence before “the law of commandments contained in ordinances” was appended, therefore, when *that* law was nailed to the cross, *the* Sabbath remained in full force. Not so with the sabbaths of the Jews, and the sabbath of the land. That law gave them their only force; and when that ceased they were abolished.

The most precious blessings are promised to those who keep God's Sabbath. See Isa. lvi and lviii. And it is worthy of note, that this prophecy pertains to a period when God's salvation is near to be revealed. The blessing is promised to “the son of the stranger,” (the Gentile,) as well as to Israel.

Mark the distinction between God's Sabbath, and those of the Jews, as presented in the prophets. Of the perpetuity of the first, let us judge after reading Isa. lxvi, where we are informed of its existence in the new earth. But God assures us by the prophet, that the latter shall “cease.” See Hosea ii, 11. The fulfillment of this prophecy may be read in Col. ii. Please compare Isa. lvi, 4, Ex. xx, 10, with Hosea ii, and Lev. xxiii, and note the language, “my sabbaths,” and “her sabbaths.”

Though the scriptures nowhere teach or authorize a change of the Sabbath, yet they contain an accurate prophecy of the power that should do this thing. Let the reader compare Dan. vii, 25 with the history of the Papal Church, and note its acts of changing “times and laws.”

We have seen the grand law of the Sabbath embodied in the

Decalogue. We come now to the New Testament. That our Lord did not destroy that law, or lessen our obligation to obey it, he clearly teaches in Matt. v, 17—19. And we may with the utmost safety affirm “that the apostles did not disturb, what their Lord left untouched.” See Rom. iii. 31; James ii. *We say, therefore, that the New Testament teaches the perpetuity of God's law, and FOR THAT REASON DOES NOT RE-ENACT IT.* Brevity forbids a more lengthy notice of this important point.

Our Lord came to “magnify the law and make it honorable.” He kept his Father's commandments; but he brushed aside the traditions of men by which they were made void. “The Sabbath,” says he, “was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath.” By which he rebuked the pharisaic observance of the Sabbath on one hand; and the views of those on the other who teach that the Lord's Sabbath is one of the things against us, which were taken out of the way at Christ's death. [Col. ii.]

The fact that those who had been with Jesus during his ministry “rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment,” after his crucifixion, and resumed labor on the first day of the week, shows clearly that they knew nothing of its change from the seventh to the first day.

The fact that God has never *sanctified* the first day of the week, shows plainly that it is not sacred time—is not a divinely instituted Sabbath.

The fact that he has never required us to rest on that day, shows that its observance in the place of the Sabbath, is a clear instance of making void the commandments of God to keep the traditions of men.

That sanctified time exists in the gospel dispensation, or in other words, that there is a day which belongs to God, is clear from Rev. i, 10. That “the Lord's day,” is the Sabbath day, is plain from Isa. lviii, 13.

As the SABBATH WAS MADE FOR MAN, we find it under all dispensations, and in every part of the Bible. Those, therefore, who profane the Sabbath, sin against God and wound their own souls.

THE PERPETUITY OF THE LAW OF GOD.

It is painful to witness the various inconsistent and self-contradictory positions, resorted to by those who reject the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. But of all the positions adopted, no other one seems equally dangerous, or fraught with such alarming consequences, as the view that the law of God by which the Sabbath is enforced, has been abolished, and that we are therefore under no obligation to "remember the Sabbath day." The question whether God has abolished his law or not, is indeed the main point at issue in the Sabbath controversy; for when it is shown that that law still exists, and that its perpetuity is clearly taught in the New Testament, it most conclusively settles the question, that the Sabbath is binding on us, and on all men.

Matt. v. The first testimony on this point was borne by the Lord Jesus in his sermon on the Mount. He says, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets." We believe therefore that he did not destroy them; consequently they are yet in force. He adds that not "one jot or tittle shall pass from the law till all be fulfilled." Hence no one of its precepts will cease before the rest. And that shall not be "till heaven and earth pass." Hence we say that the law of God extends down through the Gospel dispensation to the end. He testifies that he came not to destroy, but to fulfill; and that he might stop the mouths of those who teach that his obedience to the law annulled it, he adds that "WHOSOEVER shall break one of these commandments," &c., "shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven." Campbell renders it, "shall be of no esteem in the reign of heaven." And, that we might not mistake the commandments referred to, he proceeds to quote and comment on the law of the Decalogue, the ten commandments. This is a nail fastened by the Master of assemblies "in a sure place," and it

is a clear proof that the mission of Jesus was not to destroy, but to "magnify the law and make it honorable."—Isa. xlii, 21.

Matt. xxii. Jesus teaches that on two precepts, viz., *to love God with all the heart*, and *to love our neighbor as ourselves*, "hang all the law and the prophets." These two great commandments from their nature can never cease to exist, consequently, the law and the prophets, which hang on them, can never fall,—can never be abolished. The law of commandments contained in ordinances has been abolished, that the ordinances of the Jewish church might make way for those of the Christian church. But that the ten commandments are comprehended in these two precepts, and are therefore inseparable from them, is clearly taught in James ii, 8—11; Rom. xiii, 9; 1 John v, 3.

It is a fact of much importance, that the ten commandments, though often quoted by our Lord, are never introduced upon a new account, but stand on their original basis, viz., as the law of God. It may be said, indeed, that the law of God had not expired before Christ's death, and that we should look to the writings of the apostles for the re-enactment of that part of it which is embraced in the New Testament. It is a sufficient answer to this, to reply that there is but "ONE LAW-GIVER," and if he has abolished his law, the apostles themselves, could not re-enact the smallest part of it. Therefore those who teach that the law of God was destroyed at the death of Christ, must, to carry out the sentiment, teach also, that we may violate any, or even all of its precepts, and be blameless.

The second chapter of Romans [verses 11—16] shows that all men are amenable to the law of God, whether they possess that law written in his word, or only on their hearts. To this point Paul testifies again, when he says, "that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them *who are under the law*;" [to how many does the law speak?] "THAT EVERY MOUTH MAY BE STOPPED, AND ALL THE WORLD MAY BECOME GUILTY BEFORE GOD." Moses wrote the first books of the Bible; hence it appears, that previous to his time, the world was without a written revelation of

God's will. But that the law of God written in the heart, as expressed in this text existed from the beginning, is evident from these considerations. 1. "Until the law, sin was in the world, but sin is not imputed where there is no law."—Rom. v, 13.—Now if the work of the law had not been written in the heart before the giving of the written word, how could God have counted men sinners? For they would have had no law to transgress. Again, "Sin is the transgression of the law."—1 John iii, 4.—"Where no law is, there is no transgression."—Rom. iv, 15.—As the transgression of the law has existed from the beginning, it follows that its requirements have also existed from the same point. To conclude the argument from this chapter, we say that if the doctrine that the law of God was abolished at Christ's death, be carried out, its advocates must also teach that sin has not existed in the world since that point; for it cannot be shown that he has ever re-enacted one of its precepts. If therefore the world has been "without law to God," since the death of Christ, it has also been without "transgression of the law," for "where no law is, there is no transgression."

Rom. iii, 9—31. The Apostle in this chapter, has stated more fully the argument noticed in chapter second. "We have before proved," says he, "both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin." He did this by showing that those who had not the law written in the oracles of God, had at least the work of the law written in their hearts; and as all men have transgressed the law, all are by the law convinced of sin as transgressors. He proceeds to sustain this doctrine by various quotations from the Old Testament, showing the fearful state of fallen man, viewed in the light of God's holy law. [Verses 10—18.] "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."—If man had not fallen, "a better covenant" would not have been needed, than,—"This do, and thou shalt live." But by the fall, man lost the only principle

from which true and acceptable obedience can spring, viz., pure love to God. After the fall man was left with "the work of the law" written on his heart to show him what God required; and with the promise of a Savior, somewhat obscurely expressed, through whom he could hope for pardon. Salvation by faith in Jesus, was more clearly revealed to Abraham. After four hundred and thirty years, the written law was given to Israel, as the basis of a covenant, which should last "till the seed should come to whom the promise was made." Gal. iii, 19; Heb. x, 9, 10. Thus in the Providence of God, man has had a fair trial of his ability to live by a covenant of works, [see Gal. iii, 12, 21,] and of himself, to render acceptable obedience to God's holy law. It need not be added, that he has fallen under its fearful curse. "For it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them." Gal. iii, 10. Christ was "made under the law," and he, only, of all the sons of Adam, kept its requirements perfectly, then died to atone for our transgressions, and to redeem us from its curse. Our hope of salvation then is through faith in Jesus Christ, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation for our sins. Thus God is just and yet the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus. That we can be justified by Christ, and yet live in violation of God's law, no one can maintain; but to teach that our present obedience can justify, or atone for our past offences, would be an equal absurdity.—Hence we conclude that our justification in the sight of God, is solely on account of faith, and not on account of works. By faith in the atonement of the Savior our hearts are cleansed from sin, and we receive the "renewing of the Holy Ghost." Then with that perfect love to God, restored to us, which Adam lost at his fall, we are prepared to render acceptable obedience to God, and thus to fulfill "the righteousness of the law." Rom. viii, 3, 4, 7.

"The Law reveals and makes us know
What duties to our God we owe;
But 'tis the Gospel must reveal
Where lies our strength to do his will."

Verse 31. "Do we then make void the law through faith? GOD FORBID: YEA WE ESTABLISH THE LAW."

Rom. vii. This chapter opens with the assertion that the law claims obedience through life. This fact is illustrated by the marriage covenant. As that cannot cease but with the death of one of the parties, no more could the first covenant with the people of God. Now as this covenant did end at Christ's death, yet could cease only with the death of one of the parties, the question arises, which of the parties died? The fourth verse answers, not the law, but ourselves. As Christ died to atone for our sins, we are, in the sense of this portion of the Scripture, represented as dying with him. [See Rom. vi, 6.] Then mark, THE LAW STILL LIVES. The dissolution of the first covenant, does not abolish the law of God, as we shall hereafter show. The sixth verse may be adduced as proof that the law is also dead. But the marginal reading shows that this text refers not to the law but to ourselves. The translations of Macknight and Whiting both render it thus. It is further evident from the fourth verse, which, as we have already seen, states the fact as it is given in the margin of this text. [See also Gal. ii, 19, 20.] And it is still more evident from the fact that the death of one party, only, is required in order to dissolve the covenant. In verses 4—6, the fruit of the two covenants is contrasted. By the first covenant we bring forth fruit unto death; by the second we bring forth "the fruit of the Spirit" unto God. The first points out our duty, but leaves us unable to perform it; the second points us to the same holy, just, and spiritual law, as the sum of our duty, and at the same time reveals the source of our strength to keep its requirements, viz., the grace of God, through faith in Jesus. Thus we "serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter." In proof of this, contrast the remainder of this chapter from verse 7, with chapter viii. The manner in which the law convinces of sin is shown in verse 7. In proof that the term law, here refers particularly to the ten commandments, see the close of the verse where the tenth commandment is quoted. Paul has elsewhere said, that the law was "our

school-master to bring us to Christ." The remainder of this chapter gives us his experience in that school. Verses 8—11, show Paul's efforts to live by the law, and also his utter failure to keep its precepts, and satisfy its demands. Verse 12. He acknowledges the holiness, justice, and goodness of the law. Verse 13. But through his inability to keep the law, sin works in him death by its means. Verses 14—25. He wills that which is good, and even delights in the law of God, but how to perform that which is good he finds not. The "school-master" sets before him the righteous requirements of God's law, and with unrelenting severity, as he is not able to keep it, compels him to exclaim, "O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death"! He is now convinced that he cannot be justified by the deeds of the law, and in his despair, he flies to Jesus Christ. The next chapter shows him delivered from "the carnal mind" by the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, and having obtained power to obey, as well as forgiveness for past offences, he exclaims, "There is therefore, now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus; for what the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and by a sacrifice of sin, [margin,] condemned sin in the flesh; that THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF THE LAW MIGHT BE FULFILLED IN US." Rom. viii, 1—7.

II Cor. iii. The testimony of this chapter has an important bearing on the subject. As those who teach the abrogation of God's law regard it as their most important evidence, we will briefly state and examine their position. It is as follows:—"1. The law of God written on tables of stone constituted the first covenant.—2. This covenant is here called "the ministration of death" or "ministration of condemnation," and is abolished or done away in Christ. Verses 7, 13, 14.—3. The abrogation of this covenant annulled the law of God."

To the first point we answer, that a covenant is a mutual agreement between two parties; or, according to its second definition, it is a writing containing the terms of agreement.—[Noah Webster.] The first covenant, according to the first defi-

ation of the word, may be read in Ex. xix. The proposition on the part of God stands thus: "If ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then shall ye be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people." Verses 3—7. The answer of the people is as follows: "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." Verse 8. This completed the mutual agreement. Its stipulation was obedience on the part of the people. Then follows what may, according to the second definition of the word, be called the covenant, viz., the ten commandments as the terms of the mutual agreement already entered into. The covenant or mutual agreement is one thing, the terms of that agreement, though closely connected with it, are quite another. We say then that the first covenant was strictly speaking the mutual agreement entered into by God and his people, the ten commandments being its terms of agreement. Mark this.

To the second point we answer that the word ministration signifies "the act of performing service," or "service" itself; consequently it is not the words "written and engraven in stones" to which the Apostle refers, but to "the ministration" or service of those words. [Please note the use of the word where it occurs. Luke i, 23; Acts vi, 1; II Cor. ix, 13.] The careful reading of this chapter shows that its subject is a comparison of the ministrations of the two covenants. A full account of the ministrations of the first and second covenants may be read in Heb. vii, viii, ix, x. The Levitical priesthood with its ordinances of divine service, performed the ministration of the first covenant. The "more excellent ministry" of Christ, including all its branches, fulfills the ministration of the second. And it is a fact of much importance, that the ark of God's testament is found in the heavenly tabernacle, where Christ is ministering, [Rev. xi, 19,] as well as in the earthly tabernacle; that it is clear that the tables of the testament are still the foundation of the divine government. Then the law of God given to Israel as the basis of the first covenant, is clearly shown to be distinct from

its "ministration" as given in "the hand-writing of ordinances." As the services of the first covenant meet their antitype in Christ's ministration, how natural the language, that the ministration of condemnation had no glory by reason of the glory that excelleth; the glory of the shadow being swallowed up in that of the substance. Then it is clear that the vail which is on the children of Israel, denotes the typical service or ministration of condemnation, which was abolished, or done away in Christ. If you say that it is God's law which was abolished or done away in Christ, then you teach that Christ destroyed the law. [Matt. v, 17—19.] Deny this, who can.

To the third point, we answer, that the first covenant ceased because its conditions were not kept. We have already shown that the law of God was given to Israel, as the conditions of the covenant between God and his people. The terms of agreement having been broken, the covenant based on them must of necessity cease. But to teach that the abrogation of the covenant, annulled the law of God also, would in reality be saying that God abolished his law because men would transgress it!—Our opponents teach that the law of God is abolished, and that those precepts which are not re-enacted in the New Testament, are not binding on us. The force of this blow is aimed at the Sabbath, but if carried out, its effect would be to overturn the whole law of God. "The law," say they, "was abolished at Christ's death." We know that the New Testament dates from the death of the testator, the precise point where the first covenant ceased. [Heb. ix, 16, 17; x, 9, 10.] Now if God abolished his law at Christ's death, how could he afterwards write it in the hearts and minds of his people according to the promise, as given in Heb. viii, 10? How could this be done unless he first re-enacted it? And we challenge you to show that God has ever abolished a law, and then re-enacted it. The word of God is not yea and nay after this manner. Nay, further. As the new covenant begins at the precise point where the first one ceased, your position requires you to believe that God abolished the ten commandments, and IN THE SAME MOMENT re-enacted

nine of them to write on the hearts of his people. Deny this if you can. Do you say that it is the law of the New Testament, or law of grace, which God writes on the hearts of his people? We answer that you cannot show the existence of such a law, distinct from the precepts of the decalogue. Besides, if the precepts of the Decalogue are abolished, even its principles cannot now exist without a re-enactment. If you could carry out this sentiment you would show that the ten commandments are all abolished; hence the law of God is destroyed: hence also the moral government of God is destroyed, and men are left without prohibition against any species of wickedness. Do you say that God abolished his law, and then re-enacted all of its precepts save the Sabbath commandment? We answer that such an unwillingness on your part to submit to the law of God, shows that you possess "the carnal mind," which is "enmity against God," WHICH "IS NOT SUBJECT TO THE LAW OF GOD, neither indeed can be." Jesus has said that "NOT ONE JOT OR TITTLE SHALL PASS FROM THE LAW till all be fulfilled;" but you, to avoid the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, teach us that that commandment has been struck out of the law. Such then is your absurd and dangerous position. Will you still cling to it?

We invite the attention of the candid reader to "a more excellent way."—We have shown the existence of God's law from the beginning, and that its observance constituted the conditions, or terms of agreement, on which the first covenant was based. The first covenant ceased because its conditions were not kept. Heb. viii, 9. But the dissolution of this covenant could not abolish "the royal law" which had existed from the beginning; hence we believe that the law of God did not cease with the first covenant, but that it continued in full force, ready to be written by the Spirit in the hearts of God's people. See the promise, Jer. xxxi, 33; Heb. viii, 10. There is therefore no such absurdity in our faith, as in that of our opponents, who would have us believe that God abolished his law, and at the same moment re-enacted a part of its precepts. Our faith may be expressed in a single sentence: GOD'S LAW COVERS ALL TIME, and under all

dispensations it stands out before men as the rule of their lives and the sum of their duty to God. The fall of man left "the work of the law" written in his heart, though faintly indeed: then at Mount Sinai, it was written in tables of stone by the finger of God: then, under the new covenant, it is written in the hearts of God's people even as it was before the fall. We appeal to men of candor and reason. Are not these things so?

Gal. iii. The great doctrine of justification by faith having been lost sight of by the Galatian church, the Apostle argues the point with them, and with great clearness shows that it is our only hope of salvation. Hence, the different covenants which God has made with his people are here examined and contrasted. The covenant made with Abraham, which was based on the righteousness of faith, is first introduced. This covenant secured to himself, and to his seed, the inheritance of the earth. Rom. iv, 13. Four hundred and thirty years after this, that law, the principles of which have existed from creation, "was added" to the covenant which already existed. The question now arises, Why does the Apostle say that the law could not disannul the promise made to Abraham? Is there any thing in the law, which is against the promise of God? No, verily. See verse 21. For the law of God which embodies his requirements, and man's duty, cannot be contrary to his own promise. Why then is it said, that if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise? We answer, that God made perfect obedience to his law, the condition on which he took Israel, the literal seed of Abraham, to be his people. Jer. xi, 3, 4; Ex. xix, 58; xx. This covenant made the works of the law the condition on which they should receive the inheritance, instead of the righteousness of faith, which was the condition of the promise made to Abraham. But it is plain, that if the deeds of the law be made the ground of justification, then is justification by faith made void. And as it is evident that fallen guilty man cannot be justified by a law which already condemns him, he could then have no hope of salvation. Is it asked, How then could Israel hope for salvation, while the law of God stood out before them? We an-

MISSIONARY
LIBRARY

swer, that beside "the royal law," [James ii, 8—12,] another law was given to Israel, viz. "the law of commandments contained in ordinances."—Eph. ii, 15; Col. ii, 14—17. In all its sacrifices and offerings, this law pointed them forward to the one offering of Jesus Christ, as the great atonement for their transgressions. Why then, it may be asked, did God give to Israel a covenant which recognized perfect obedience as its only condition? We reply, he did it that he might exclude all appearance of heirship from the natural seed, except such as should walk in the faith of their father Abraham. Hear the Apostle: "For if there had been a law given, which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law. *But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.*" Such are the only heirs. But the literal seed of Jacob were the apparent heirs till the coming of the seed, to whom the promise was made, even as Ishmael was the apparent heir of Abraham till the birth of Isaac. God made promise to Abraham and to his seed, that they should inherit the world.—Rom. iv. He, who is thus designated as the seed of Abraham, is no less a personage than Jesus Christ. Verse 16. He was "made under the law," kept the covenant which requires perfect obedience, then died for our transgressions, and bequeathed to us his own inheritance.—Gal. iv, 4; 1 John iii, 4, 5; Heb. ix, 15—17; Luke xxii, 20. But as this chapter is considered an important proof that the law of God is abolished, we will state this view in its strength, and examine it.—"1. The law had no existence prior to its being given from Mount Sinai.—2. It was only binding on literal Israel.—3. It was to last only till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; hence, it expired by limitation at that point."—We answer to the first position, that men, though destitute of the written law of God until the days of Moses, were counted sinners by God. And "sin is the transgression of the law."—1 John iii, 4. Again, if by the term the law was "added," we are to understand that it had no existence prior to that time, the inquiry arises, How are we to understand the next clause, which

reads "because of transgressions?" The Apostle has told us that where there is no law, there is no transgression.—Rom. iv, 15. This point may be fairly settled in Romans ii, where Paul shows that in the judgment, all will be left without excuse; for those who have not had the written law, have had at least the work of the law written in their hearts.

To the next position we answer, that such a view would make the Apostle contradict himself. He testifies, [Gal. iii, 22,] "But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin." Again, Rom. iii, 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.*

To the third point we reply, that God made his law the condition of the covenant into which he entered with the literal seed of Abraham. Thus was an addition made to the Abrahamic covenant, to continue till the seed should come, to whom God made promise. But to teach that the law itself expired at that point, would be a plain contradiction of clear testimony. Matt. v. 17—19; Think not that I am come to destroy the law. Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled. Rom. iii, 31; Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law. Rom. vii, 7; I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet. We here inquire, how an abolished law could convict a man of transgression? And further, how could the Apostle hold such a struggle with the law as he describes in Rom. vii, when that law had ceased to exist? Further, how can the royal law convince men of sin as transgressors, after God has abolished it? See James ii, 8—11. A law, embodying the moral perfections of the infinite Jehovah, must from its nature be unchangeable and immutable like its author.

The sum of our opponents position may be fairly reduced to this proposition:—The Jews were the only people amenable to the law of God. Hence, we say that our opponents show them to be the only transgressors. For it is clear that those only, who have the law, can be capable of transgressing it. To carry this point further, we say that not only does this view make the

Jews the only sinners, but it would show them to be the only persons redeemed by Christ. For he died *to redeem them that were under the law*.—Gal. iv, 5; iii, 13. But the question, "Who has abolished the law" becomes deeply interesting. We ask, who? Surely not the apostles. Such power was never delegated to men. Not the Son of God. He was "made under the law," and himself informs us that he did not come to destroy it. Gal. iv; Matt. v, 17—19. There is but one being in the universe who can be supposed to possess this power; we mean the great "Law-giver."—James iv. And it would be well for our opponents to show how the Most High can take back a law which is perfect, spiritual, holy, just, and good? How can he abolish a law, which says, Thou shalt have no other Gods before me? How can he take back the statute, which forbids the worship of idols? How can he say to man, I repeal the law which forbids you to take my name in vain? How give men the license to profane the day, which he has sanctified as a memorial of himself? Or, which is the substance of the whole matter, How can he abolish the great commandment, which says, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind?" For on this great commandment hang those precepts which contain our duty to God.

But we leave the question, how God could take back a law which embodies his own attributes, and inquire further, Has the divine "Law-giver" abolished his own law? Our opponents affirm, we deny. Let us listen to their proof.—"1. God gave the law for a limited period, which expired at Christ's death.—Gal. iii, 19. Hence, the law expired by limitation. 2. He has abolished the law at the crucifixion. II Cor. iii." These two testimonies are the most important ones offered to sustain the position. To this view we reply, that if the law expired by limitation, then it could not be abolished. If it was abolished, then it did not expire by limitation. The language of Scripture being truth, and its statements not inconsistent with themselves, we say that that position is unscriptural, whose main proofs destroy each other. In an examination of the first of these proofs, we pointed out the distinction between a law, and the ministra-

tion of a law. With reference to the words engraven on stone, we say, that "condemnation" and "death" were there; for whilst they condemned and made guilty the whole world, they could not, without an atonement, give life to any. Rom. iii, 19, 24, 26; Gal. iii, 21. To conclude the point, we say, that if Gal. iii, 19, avails anything for our opponents, it shows that the law was not repealed, but that it expired by limitation.

Setting aside these conflicting views, we come to a point where there is, perhaps, perfect agreement. On some ground or other, all admit that none of the precepts of the Decalogue are binding on us. The sentiment stands thus: When the law expired, the Lawgiver transferred all of its precepts, save one, to the New Testament. In another place, we have pointed out the absurdity of the abolition and the re-enactment of the law of God. To make use of Gal. iii, the first position is abandoned, and the view is now presented in its stead, that the law has expired through limitation. But the difficulty still remains. For leaving the question, Whether such a law could ever be limited to a period of time, we say, that it is still necessary to show that any part of the law has been re-enacted. It is idle to talk of the transfer of a law which does not exist. For that which is not in existence cannot be transferred. A law which has been repealed, or which has expired through limitation, does not exist. Hence, the idea of the transfer of a part of the law, after the whole has been abolished, is utter folly. If the law has been abolished, no part of it can now exist without re-enactment. This leads us to inquire, Has the law of God been re-enacted? If so, by whom? Certainly not by the Son of God, for it is not claimed that the law ceased until his death. Instead of coming to give another law, he came to "fulfill," to "magnify," and to make "honorable" the law, which already existed. Isa. xlii, 21.

Not by the great Lawgiver, for leaving out of the question the fact that the abolition of the law, and its re-enactment in an amended form would be a virtual confession that his law was imperfect and needed correction, we ask, Where is the passage of Scripture which shows any such act of the Lawgiver?—where?

Another question arises, Wherein has the law been improved by the alledged amendment? Was it not already "perfect," "spiritual," "holy," "just, and good?" Wherein has it been made better? It is answered, that the Sabbath has been left out. The subject is brought to this point then: the Lord would strike the Sabbath commandment from his law. To accomplish this purpose, he abolishes his whole law, and then re-enacts all of its precepts, save the fourth commandment! If such a view does not make God altogether such an one as ourselves, we ask, what could? But we fail to discover wherein the law has been made better. If "the Sabbath was made for man," we are by this alteration deprived of one of those blessings, which had been bestowed on the human family. That which has been made for man, is certainly inseparable from his well-being. But if the Sabbath has been abolished, it has failed to fulfill the original design of God, because a part only of the human family are permitted to share in its blessings. Nay, it would seem that the great Lawgiver had already discovered that the Sabbath was not calculated to benefit man, though he made it for that purpose. Hence, he recalls his law, and having struck out the fourth commandment, gives the remainder to man as his amended will!

But the foundation, the reality, and the perpetuity of the Sabbath, may be learned from a few simple facts. It was instituted in Paradise. Gen. ii. It was guarded from profanation by the fourth commandment of "the royal law," even as marriage was by the seventh. Ex. xx. Christ testifies, that "the Sabbath was made for man;" and that "till heaven and earth pass, one jot or tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled."—We look forward to Paradise restored, and there stands the holy Sabbath. Isa. lxi, 22, 23. Think you, that the Gospel so far exceeds, in spirituality, Paradise when first created, or Paradise after its restoration, that the Sabbath is not congenial to its character, and must needs be abolished? Nay, we ask our friends who would thus destroy "the Holy of the Lord," [Isa. lviii, 13,] how they can reconcile the idea, that the Sabbath has been struck out of existence, with the fact that it existed in Paradise lost, and

that it will exist amid the glories of Paradise restored? The Sabbath was made for man; it began with the first man, and continues notwithstanding the "man of sin," inseparably connected with the history of the human family forever. Gen. ii, 2, 3; Ex. xvi, 23—28; xx, 8—11; Isa. lvi; lviii, 13, 14; Dan. vii, 25; Matt. v, 17—19; Luke xxii, 55, 56; Matt. xxiv, 20; Mark ii, 28; Rev. i, 10; Isa. lxi, 22, 23.

The Sabbath is to be in the new earth; but it has long been trodden down by the little horn of Dan. vii. The saints are about to return to Paradise from whence they have so long wandered. Is it not in place then, that the holy Sabbath should here be brought out and vindicated, that the church of the living God may carry back to Paradise the very institution which was brought from thence? We say further, that the closing struggle between the dragon and the remnant of the church, is with reference to the COMMANDMENTS OF GOD, and the testimony of *Jesus Christ*. Rev. xii, 17; xiv, 12.

But there is another strong objection existing in the minds of many, which we will now examine. It is this: "The world is under the law, but the Christian is under grace, and not under the school-master." This view admits the fact that the law of God is not abolished, but attempts to show that the Christian is not under obligation to obey it. Nay, that if he should keep its precepts he would be in danger of falling from grace! We say that this view is based on the fact that the law was not abolished at the crucifixion, for an abolished law cannot hold men under it, neither can it convince men of sin as its transgressors, after it has ceased to exist. The fact that the law is our school-master to bring us to Christ, shows conclusively that it has not been abolished. Because an abolished law can never show men that they are condemned and must perish without a Saviour. This view then, is distinct from the idea that the law was abolished at Christ's death. For if it was abolished at that time, then the world is not under it. If the world is under the law, then it has not been abolished. Let us examine the testimony on this subject.

Gal. iii, 23—25. "But before faith came, we were kept under

the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards 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 school-master, for ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus."

Rom. vi, 14, 15. "For sin shall not have dominion over you; for ye are not under the law, but under grace. What then? Shall we sin, because we are not under the law, but under grace? God forbid." What is it to be under the law then? Hear the testimony of the Bible. Rom. iii, 19, 23. "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. For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." Then in the sight of God, the whole world is condemned and become guilty before him, as transgressors of his law. The sentence of condemnation is just and righteous, so that EVERY MOUTH IS STOPPED. Where is there hope of salvation then? Surely, man in this state is lost.

How is the law a school-master to bring us to Christ? Answer. The law shows our guilt and just condemnation, and that we are lost without a Saviour. Read Paul's account of this school in Rom. vii, 7—25. "By the law is the knowledge of sin." Rom. iii, 20. "I had not known sin but by the law." Rom. vii, 7. Then the instruction of the law is absolutely necessary, that we may know ourselves to be sinners in the sight of God. We find ourselves sinners by past offences, and unable to render present obedience. The just penalty of the law hangs over our heads; we find ourselves lost, and fly to Jesus Christ for refuge. What does he do to save us from the curse of the law? Does he abolish the law, that he may save its transgressor? He tells us that he did "not come to destroy" it; and we know that the law being holy, just, and good, cannot be taken back without destroying the government of Him who gave it. Does the Saviour modify its character, and lessen its requirements? Far from it. He testifies that not one jot or tittle shall "pass from it till all be fulfilled." Matt. v, 18; Luke xvi, 17; James ii, 10. And he shows that those who in

heart commit any act of iniquity, are transgressors of the law. Matt. v, 22, 27, 28; I John iii, 15. If the Saviour did not abolish or relax the law, how can guilty man hope for salvation? What then does the Saviour do? He gives himself to die in our stead. He offers his own "life a ransom for many." Matt. xx, 28. "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John iii, 16. We now lay hold on Jesus Christ as the great atonement for our transgressions, and receive a full and free pardon of all offence. A way has now been laid open by which man, though justly condemned by the law of God, can yet be saved without dishonoring, or making void the law. God can be just and yet "the justifier of him who believes in Jesus." Rom. iii, 25, 26.

Need we inquire further what it is to be under grace? We have already seen in what manner we are saved, notwithstanding the law condemns us, and yet the claims of the law are not made void. When we were lost and ruined by transgression, and had no way to escape the just sentence of the law, God gave his own Son to die for us. The law can then allow mercy to enter and offer pardon to all who will accept it by faith in Jesus Christ. In his person mercy and truth meet together. The law justly condemns us; Jesus bears our sins in his own body on the tree; faith in him justifies, and saves us. The law brings us to faith; faith does not make void the law, but establishes it. Those who are under sin are under the law, those who have been pardoned are under grace. Two states then are brought to view in the New Testament.—1. Under the law.—2. Under grace. Those who are under the law, are condemned: those who are under grace, are pardoned. We ask, does Christ come and die to redeem us from the just sentence of the law, that he may bring us to a state where we may at pleasure violate its precepts? Is the law of a character so sacred that it must needs have the death of the Son of God for its atonement, and when the sinner has obtained pardon, is it then "relaxed, or slacked up," so that it is at his option whether to obey it or not? Does this state of grace give us license to violate the law

MISSIONARY CO.
LIBRARY

of God? In answer to these inquiries, we are told that "that part of the law which Christ quoted is certainly binding on us. But those precepts which he did not quote, are not to be regarded, for they ceased at his death." We answer, there is an end to this part of the controversy then, for the law which brings us to Christ for salvation, must most certainly be that law which condemns us. And no part of the law can condemn us, save that which is now in existence. And if it be admitted that we are not at liberty to violate any part of that law which brings us to Christ, we leave this part of the subject, and inquire whether a part of the law was left out by Jesus. For the question we are examining turns on this point. Did our Lord re-enact a part of the law, and leave the remainder to expire, or to be abolished at his death? Let us examine the facts in the case. At no one time did our Saviour quote all the commandments. And indeed we may say that he never quoted the first, the second, or the fourth commandment. And still further, he does not re-enact those precepts which he quotes, but refers to them as a part of the law of God. But one of two views can be taken of this subject.—1. Christ meant that those commandments which he quoted were the only ones which should henceforth be binding, or, 2. He appealed to the law of God as to the highest authority, and cited those commandments which were particularly adapted to the cases of those persons with whom he conversed. If the first view be correct, then Jesus meant to teach that henceforward they were not under obligation to obey the first, second, or fourth commandment! And this in the face of the fact that they were all to continue till the crucifixion, when as some say they were all abolished. Further, it is assumed, not proved, that he re-enacted those precepts which he quoted. For, to say the least, the idea is a very strange one, that he should re-enact a law which was already in force. But if the other position be correct, viz., that by quoting a part of the law he sanctioned its high authority, and left it on its own basis, as the law of his Father, then are we correct in saying that the whole law as such brings us to Christ, and when we are justified by faith, we are by no means at liberty to violate one of its precepts. The fact

that the law is our school-master, to show us the just claims of God, and our own just condemnation, shows plainly that it has not been abolished; hence, though we have been pardoned through God's free grace, we can never violate its precepts without being "convinced" by it "as transgressors." That we are justified by grace through faith is evident, [Eph. ii, 8,] and yet faith does not "make void the law." For the whole plan of salvation is based on the justice of God's law, and the sufficiency of Christ's atonement. The law stands out before us to show us our transgressions. "The gospel of the grace of God" shows us how we may be pardoned. We are justified by grace through faith. Faith works by love. This is the love of God that we keep his commandments. Thus love is the fulfilling of the law.

Gal. iv, 21—31. Those who would reject pardon by faith in Jesus Christ, and take their own chance for salvation through a law which justly condemns them, and shuts their mouths, are here addressed. The Holy Spirit illustrates the old and new covenants by an allegory drawn from the family of Abraham. The great promise having been made to Abraham, that he and his seed should inherit the earth, he was, by virtue of this covenant, called the "father of all them that believe." Rom. iv, 11. This covenant was based on "the righteousness of faith," and contained all those blessings which the subsequent ones secured to his seed. The covenant from Sinai added another condition, viz., "the righteousness of the law." The new covenant is based on the original condition, and points us to Christ's atonement, as the source of grace, that we may fulfill the righteousness of the law." Rom. viii, 3, 4. Notice, it is not the law of God which is represented by the bond-woman, neither is it the gospel which is represented by Sarah. But Hagar represents Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children, and Sarah represents Jerusalem which is above, which is free, which is the mother of us all. The son of the bond-woman represents the children of Old Jerusalem by the first covenant, even as Isaac represents the children of the New Jerusalem, by the new covenant. The bondage of literal Israel was not because the law of God was given to them,

but because they were its transgressors,—the servants of sin. John viii, 33—36. The freedom of those who are the children of the New Jerusalem is not that the law has been abolished, but that they have been made free from sin. Rom. vi, 22.

Gal. v. That the "yoke of bondage" here spoken of means "the law of commandments contained in ordinances," and not the law of God, is evident from many considerations. The ordinance of circumcision was not one of the precepts of the royal law—was not a part of the ten commandments; but it belonged to the law of Moses. John, viii, 23. The apostles [Acts xv.] in treating of circumcision, and the law of Moses in general, call it a yoke which neither they nor their fathers were able to bear. But that the law of God, so far from being a yoke of bondage, is the delight of God's saints, both testaments prove. Ps. i, 2; cxix, 174; Rom. vii, 7, 22; viii, 1-7; 1 John v, 3. And the fourth commandment is particularly pointed out as such, Isa. lviii, 13, 14. Those who observed circumcision were debtors to do the whole law of Moses; for if one of its ordinances is binding all of them must be. Then we should have to return to its offerings and atonements, and thereby reject the one offering of Jesus Christ, the only ground of justification before God. The typical service was succeeded by the antitypical, when the bond-woman was succeeded by the free-woman. "Love is the fulfilling of the law?" Why so? Answer: Because, "This is the love of God that we keep his commandments," and "love worketh no ill to his neighbor, therefore love is the fulfilling of the law." 1 John, v, 3; Rom. xiii, 10.—Love to God consists in rendering obedience to those commandments which contain our duty to Him; love to our neighbor consists in obeying those commandments which contain our duty to him. Those who love God with all their hearts, and their neighbor as themselves, render cheerful obedience to those precepts which hang on these two great commandments, not forgetting the "new commandment" of Jesus, that his people love one another EVEN AS HE LOVED US. John, xiii, 34; 1 John iii, 16, 22-24. Love then does not make void the law, but fulfills it. Charity, the perfect love of God, is then the end, the object,

the design of the commandments of God. If we are led by the Spirit we are not under the law, for AGAINST those who bring forth its fruit, there is no law. Gal. v. 18-23.

Eph. ii, 11-17. The care with which Paul has stated what was abolished at the crucifixion, will enable us to understand the subject in its true light. Does he testify that the law of God was abolished? Far from it, for in chapter vi, he enforces the duty of obedience to parents by quoting the fifth commandment. What does he say? He testifies that Christ abolished in his flesh the enmity, the law of commandments contained in ordinances. The middle wall of partition was thus broken down, and the enmity between Jews and Gentiles was slain by the cross, that through the one offering, both might be reconciled to God. The law of ordinances, which pointed forward to the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, was abolished or done away in him; because the body had been reached which cast the shadow. Col. ii, 17. To this law the Gentiles never were amenable, for it was a wall of separation between themselves and literal Israel. But that all men were under the law of God, and condemned by its precepts, is clearly shown. Rom. iii, 14-23. And this is further evident from the fact that all need a share in the atonement. Eph. ii, 16; Gal. iv, 4, 5; Heb. ii, 9. The one law pertained only to Israel, to the other law all mankind were amenable. By the one, the whole world was condemned, and shown to be guilty before God; by the other, was given a typical atonement, which pointed forward to the offering of Him who should die for the sins of the world. The one having reached its antitype, is abolished; but the other stands, if possible, on a firmer basis than ever. Rom. iii, 31. For the immutability of its character is shown in that the Son of God must lay down his life before guilty man could be rescued from its just sentence. The ordinances of the Jewish Church, ceased with that Church, being succeeded by those of the Christian Church. But the law of God pertains to men not as members of any Church, but as moral agents, amenable to the government of God; hence it is not changed, relaxed, or abolished by any dispensation.

Jesus Christ came not to destroy this law, but he did abolish

the law of ordinances, nailing it to his cross. The PRECEPTS of the one were spoken by the voice of God, and were written with his own finger in tables of stone; but the other was written by the hand of Moses in a book. The one was the "royal law" from the "King eternal;" the other is "the hand-writing of ordinances." Matt. v, 17-19; xix, 17; James ii, 8-12; Rom. vii, 7, 12, 22; Eph. ii, 15; Col. ii, 14; Acts, xv, 5.

Col. ii, 14-17. A second testimony is borne to the same point. The hand-writing of ordinances was taken out of the way by Jesus, and nailed to his cross. This law being written by the hand of Moses in a book might be blotted out, but the words engraved by the finger of God in stone, never! This law having been abolished, we are not to be judged by any of its festivals or ordinances. Mark the contrast. James introduces that part of the royal law which contains our duty to our neighbor, [compare Matt. xxii, 35-40; James ii, 8,] quotes several of its precepts, and shows us that he who violates a part, is guilty of breaking the whole law, and adds, "so speak ye, and so do, as THEY THAT SHALL BE JUDGED BY THE LAW OF LIBERTY." That we should not be judged by an abolished law is perfectly natural; that we should be judged by a law to which all men are amenable, is in the highest degree reasonable. We have before noticed other sabbaths, besides the Sabbaths of the Lord; we here contrast the laws by which they were enforced.

Heb. viii, 6-13. The promises on which the two covenants were based are here noticed. The first required perfect obedience to the law of God, [Jer. xi, 4, 5; Ex. xix; xx,] but did not contain those clear and gracious promises of pardon through Jesus Christ that were needed by fallen guilty man. Hence it was not faultless, though the law of God on which it was based as its condition is pronounced by both testaments to be *perfect, holy, just and good*. Ps. xix; Rom. vii. The covenant "waxed old," because its conditions were broken; hence the new covenant, based on better promises, was introduced. This covenant shows us the great atonement from whence we may expect pardon, reveals to us the fountain of grace, from whence we may receive strength to yield obedience, and places the law

of God in our hearts. Jer. xxxi, 33; Heb. viii, 10; x, 16. The transition from the old covenant to the new, is marked by the death of the Testator. Heb. ix, 15-17; 1 Cor. xi, 25; Gal. iii, 19. But if the law of God was abolished at that time, then no law was in existence to place in the hearts of the people of God! Nor can this point be met fairly by saying that *Christ brought forward a part of the law* by quoting it, for it would be absurd to believe that he re-enacted part of a law which was already in force, or rather that he re-enacted a part of the law, and then abolished the whole! Those who adopt this idea, are bound to explain why Christ should omit the first, second, and fourth commandments. Or rather, they are bound to prove that he re-enacted those commandments which he quoted, for their argument is mere assertion till this is done. We repeat, there is but one Law-giver, and this is not the Son, but the Father.—James iv, Ex. xx.

James ii. The royal law is here enforced by James in an unmistakable manner. Had he believed that it was abolished, or that it was a "yoke of bondage," he would never have said, "If ye fulfill the royal law," "ye do well." Nay, he would never have asserted that if they had respect to persons they would commit sin and be convinced of the law as transgressors; for an abolished law can never convince a man of sin. Rom. iv, 15. The sixth and seventh commandments of this law are then quoted. And we are shown that the transgressor of one precept is guilty of breaking all; [Macknight;] which is not unlike the words of our Lord, that "one jot or tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled." Then if one part be in force, it is all in force. If one commandment be broken, all are broken. Such is the testimony of James. How can those, who violate the fourth commandment, meet this in the Judgment? See verse 12. But the fourth commandment is evaded thus: The Sabbath has been changed, and good men in past ages have kept the first, instead of the seventh day. Are we not safe in following them? We offer to yield the first point when one text is brought which testifies that the Sabbath has been changed, or that the first day was ever sanctified by God,

or that we are required to keep it holy. Further, we reply that every man is accountable to God for the light which shines before him. The fact that God has given us light on this subject, shows that we have no excuse for further disobedience—no cloak for our sins. Certainly we cannot plead the right to make void the “commandment of God” that we may keep “the tradition of the elders.” Mark vii, 9. The fourth commandment is definite, requiring us to keep that day holy which God himself rested upon, and sanctified. We may charge God with folly in giving this commandment, but in the day of Judgment we shall find that obedience would have been far better.

1 John iii, 3, 4, Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law; for sin is the transgression of the law. And ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins, and in him is no sin. Notice these striking thoughts. The definition of sin is “the transgression of the law.” Every sinner is a transgressor of the law. In Christ was no sin, hence no transgression of the law. Jesus was manifested to take away our sins. How does he do this? He dies for us that we may be delivered from the just sentence of the law; its execution is stayed, that mercy may be permitted to enter, and offer pardon through the blood of Christ. The refusal of pardon offered at such an immense cost, greatly enhances the guilt of the transgressors; for they have not only violated the law of God, but by this act they tread under foot his Son who died to redeem them.

From these testimonies we conclude that *the New Testament teaches the perpetuity of the law of God, and for that reason does not re-enact any part of it.*

Paris, Me., Feb., 10, 1851.

THE SABBATH.

BY H. N. STEVENS.

Now dawns through heaven and earth the Sabbath day.
Auspicious season, hail! With cheerful song
Thy glad return we celebrate below,
While, though in loftier yet symphonious strains,
Angelic choirs thy welcome chant above.

Yea, thou art welcome, for thy holy sway
Quells the wild tumult of the troubled soul,
And softly whispers *peace*. The sorrowing heart
Grows glad at thine approach, and spirits faint,
Fanned by thy hallow'd breath, revive and smile.
From the rapt vision fades the world away,

And saints in union sweet, draw near to heaven.

Thou Prince of days, expressly made for man!
O, had we seraph harps, we'd sing thy praise
In numbers worthy the exalted theme.
We'd rise superior to the angelic throng,
And their impassioned minstrelsy outvie;
Because this sacred morn for us doth shine.
(Poor pilgrims wandering 'mid earth's gloom profound.)
To us by the creating hand was given
This dear memorial of creating love;
This beacon lighted at the burning Throne,
Piercing night's deepest shades, and scattering wide
Celestial radiance on the darksome way.

We will ascribe to God the glory due;
Will honor him who sitteth on the throne,
And will rejoice before him; for his name
Is high exalted far above all gods.
Honor and might and majesty are his.
Creation bears his signature divine,
And loud attests the greatness of his power.

Ere ancient time his measured course began,
When embryo earth appeared, formless and void,
When silence reigned, and universal night
Mantled the bosom of the mighty deep:
Then went the mandate forth, th' omnific word,
Borne on the breath of Deity afar,
Traversed the echoing gloom;—nor void returned;
Nature awoke, responsive to the call,
And sprang to life in all her varied forms.
And in th' approval of the smiling God,
Exulting, her majestic course began.

Six days the Almighty labored with his word;
But now his labors ceased, and heralded
By the clear anthem of the “morning stars,”
Crowned with excessive glory, shone on high
The first Sabbatic morn. To greet its dawn
All heaven joined in univocal song;
Mellifluous voices filled the balmy air,
Accompanied by harps of sweetest note,
Hymning the praises of creating love,
And the bright glories of the day of rest.

Momentous day! its first observer, He,
 The high and lofty One, whose fearful name
 Gleams as a signet on its holy brow.
 Alone ordained and sanctified by Him,
 And with His blessing blest forevermore.

When from the sacred Mount,
 Whose cloudy top and trembling base proclaimed
 The awful grandeur of its Guest sublime,
 In thunder tones went forth the "royal law,"
 God's will to man, made known in ten commands,
 On that dread morn, while to its centre shook
 The steadfast earth, and Israel in dismay
 Turned from the fearful sight, nor could endure
 The voice of Him that spake; the great decree,
 Unchangeable, was passed on all below.
 "Six days may work be done, but on the seventh,
 Which is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God,
 Thou and all thine shalt rest; for in six days
 The Lord made heaven and earth and all therein,
 And rested on the seventh, and hallowed it."

Based on this grand foundation, stands secure
 The Sabbath of the LORD. And who art thou
 That rashly dream'st to pluck this fabric down,
 And on its ruins to erect thine own,
Thy blest, thy sanctified! Short-sighted man!
 Canst thou command unnumbered worlds from naught?
 "Or canst thou thunder with a voice like Him" ?
 Then mayest thou think to change the law divine.
 Thy weakness know, and know that God is strong,
 And jealous of his glory; and who dares
 With impious hand to touch his high renown,
 Shall his displeasure prove, and taste his ire.

Blest all-immortal day! Ah, it shall STAND
 Unmoved amid the strife of mortal tongues—
 Unmoved amid the ruin of the world;
 And while Eternity his mighty years
 Shall roll unnumbered o'er the earth made new,
 Effulgent shine in glory's noontide ray,
 By nations who are saved, observed for aye.

Paris, Me., Dec., 1850.