

Two Books
on
Galatians
IN DEBATE
BY
George I. Butler
and
Ellet J. Waggoner

A. T. Jones and E. J. Waggoner brought new emphasis and a new understanding to the doctrine of justification by faith. Some of the older ministers and laymen objected, feeling that grace was being asserted at the expense of the law.

One of these famous “debates” had to do with the book of Galatians. In addition to articles in church publications, two books were printed, “The Law in the Book of Galatians” by George I. Butler (1886), and “The Gospel in the Book of Galatians” by Ellet J. Waggoner (1888).

On April 13, 1886 O. A. Johnson wrote an article in the *Review* entitled “The Two Laws,” claiming that the law in Galatians included the ceremonial law.

E. J. Waggoner answered with a series of nine articles in *The Signs of the Times* (July 8-September 2, 1886) claiming that the law referred to in the book of Galatians was the moral law.

On February 18, 1887 Ellen G. White wrote from Basel, Switzerland to the editors (Jones / Waggoner) of *The Signs of the Times*, questioning them for airing denominational differences before the public. She stood with neither side in the debate. (See letter 37, 1887; *Counsels to Writers and Editors*, pp. 75-80).

Following her counsel, E. J. Waggoner waited until 1888 to publish his book, “The Gospel in Galatians” in which he stated his views on the subject.

We publish these two books together in an attempt to accurately present the history and issues surrounding the Minneapolis Conference of 1888.

THE LAW
IN THE
BOOK OF GALATIANS
IS IT
THE MORAL LAW,
OR DOES IT REFER TO
THAT SYSTEM OF LAWS
PECULIARLY JEWISH?

~~~~~  
BY ELD. G. I. BUTLER  
~~~~~

BATTLE CREEK, MICH.:
REVIEW AND HERALD PUBLISHING HOUSE
1886

THE LAW IN GALATIANS, INTRODUCTION.

What law is the *principle* subject of the apostle's discourse in the epistle to the Galatians? Is it the moral law? or the typical remedial system and laws peculiarly Jewish? Perhaps there has never been a theological question in all the history of our work concerning which there has been so much disagreement among our ministry and leading brethren as this. Such differences have existed more or less with varying phases, since the rise of the message, and at times have been discussed with more or less warmth. At other periods they have been tacitly left untouched. Generally, a mutual forbearance has been exercised, so that bitterness of feeling between brethren has been avoided.

Leading brethren have been on both sides of the question. In the early history of the work, it is probable that quite a majority of them accepted the view that the moral law was the main subject of Paul's consideration in the book of Galatians. But there came quite a change in this respect at a later period, when some of our leading brethren, to whom our people have ever looked as safe counselors in questions of perplexity, gave up the view that the moral law was mainly under discussion, and took the position that it was the ceremonial law. Many others who have come later to act a part in the work, have accepted the latter view with strong confidence. It would be quite difficult to ascertain the comparative strength in numbers on either side; but to the best of the writer's judgment (and his opportunities of forming a fair opinion have not been meager), he would say that at the present time at least two thirds of our ministers hold the latter opinion.

For half a score of years past, the question has lain quite dormant. Not that either of the classes referred to have

changed their opinion. By no means. But there has seemed to be an avoidance of the question quite largely, and a desire to spare the feelings of those holding an opposite view as much as possible; so that the law in Galatians has not been dwelt upon in articles coming before the public through our periodicals and publications as much as it otherwise would have been.

We say this has been the case quite largely until within a comparatively brief time. But the writer acknowledges considerable surprise that during the last year or two the subject has been made quite prominent in the instructions given to those at Healdsburg College preparing to labor in the cause; also in the lessons passing through the *Instructor*, designed for our Sabbath-schools all over the land, and in numerous argumentative articles in the *Signs of the Times*, our pioneer missionary paper, thus throwing these views largely before the reading public not acquainted with our faith. Thus, strong and repeated efforts have been made to sustain the view that the moral law is the subject of the apostle's discourse in the most prominent texts under discussion in the letter to the Galatians.

Now we are not disposed to find fault with the spirit in which the articles are written, or to say that the matter has not been managed ably on the part of those engaged in it. Indeed, we are free to admit a keen perception, yea, a degree of admiration, of the tact and ability displayed in bringing this controverted question of long standing, held in abeyance for a time, before our people in the manner mentioned. It shows a degree of shrewdness in planning to carry the views of the writers and actors which, if exerted in a better way, might be truly commendable.

But we decidedly protest against this bringing out of controverted views in the manner indicated, concerning matters upon which our people are not agreed. It violates a principle well understood in the practice of this body, which has usually been regarded with respect. It has been taught by high authority that where such differences exist, at least on the side of a minority, they should either be held without giving them much publicity, or be brought before our leading brethren and acted upon by them. Then it would be time to publish them, and not before.

But even if it were thought consistent to publish controverted views to a reasonable degree, we should still pro-

test against doing it in the manner mentioned. It seems very objectionable to us, to urgently teach views not held by a majority of our leading brethren, to our college students who are preparing to go out and labor in the cause. We do not believe our denominational institutions of learning were established for any such purpose. Our work has been noted for unity; but unity will not be increased by such methods. There are plenty of things which can be taught without going into controverted fields. We conceive that the fact that such differences have been made prominent in teaching these young minds, must tend to give them a less favorable impression of the character of our work than if an effort had been made to make our differences as small as possible.

So of the lessons going through the *Instructor*, in which those points have been presented. To our personal knowledge, and from the reports of leading ministers, in many places throughout the field a great amount of argument and controversy has been indulged in over this question of the law in Galatians, often with heat and contention. When such positions are taken on controverted points, the fact that they are published in our denominational journals, and hence are believed to be the views of *all* our people, leaves an unjust impression in the minds of those who study the lessons, concerning the larger number of those in the cause who hold opposite views. It is taking an unfair advantage. Our Sabbath-school lessons should teach *only* views held by the large body of our people.

The same principle applies to articles published in our pioneer paper. They should represent only the views of the body, and not ventilate views held by any writer, however strongly he may hold them, when he knows they are not the views of the body, or the principal portion of our people. To pursue the opposite course would be far more objectionable in our pioneer paper than in the *Review*, the organ of the church. The former was established by our people as an agency through which to introduce our views to the public, who are supposed to be unacquainted with them. Every one would have the strongest reason to suppose that articles coming from the pioneer paper of the denomination, established by the church to teach its special views, were indorsed by the body. But such is not the case with the articles in question. The application

of texts in Galatians quoted and commented upon in the *Signs*, is not the opinion of the body or a majority of our people, and has not been for years; and those writing them certainly ought to know this. The *Signs* is a paper with a large circulation. It comes under the observation of many of our ablest opponents. By this course of the managers of the *Signs*, they must become aware of the fact that there is a difference in our public teaching upon this subject; and they will doubtless use such knowledge to our detriment. Indeed, I have known it to be done years in the past by an able disputant in a debate in Iowa, who brought out the fact that we teach differently on this subject.

We claim to be a united people, and to teach but one doctrine. It has been a great cause of regret for years among our best brethren that this difference of opinion exists among us; and the course of the *Signs* must tend to make this difference far more prominent than it ever has been before; and many outside of our ranks will become acquainted with the fact who never would have known it had not the editors of the *Signs* repeatedly pressed their views of this subject through, its columns. Whatever may be, the opinion entertained concerning this subject of the law in Galatians, it seems to the writer there can be but one opinion among the careful, thoughtful believers concerning the propriety of publishing in our pioneer paper doctrines not generally held by the large majority of our people.

Believing strongly, as we do, that the law principally considered in Galatians is the typical remedial system, which passed away at the cross, and is *not* the moral law, and feeling that an unfair advantage has been taken in urgently teaching the contrary opinion to our young people preparing to labor in the cause, and in making our *Instructor* lessons and pioneer paper mediums for teaching an opposite view, and hoping to add some information which will be valuable upon the subject, we have felt it not only proper but a duty to bring the subject before the General Conference of our people, the only tribunal in our body where such controverted questions can be properly considered and passed upon.

THE SUBJECT CONSIDERED.

The question before us is one of interpretation. In the brief letter of the apostle Paul to the Galatian church, we have at the commencement some historical facts given concerning himself and his apostleship, and an argument concerning "the law," and in the latter part, practical instruction concerning various Christian duties. Running all through the epistle are expressions in which the apostle finds fault with them for their course of conduct after he left them, caused by Jewish teachers who had led them astray, so that they had really taken positions contrary to the gospel of Christ. In these censures the apostle makes constant reference to some law concerning which the Galatians had taken a wrong position. As a people, we believe that there are two laws, or systems of law : (1.) The moral law and the principles of moral duty which grow out of it; (2.) The ceremonial law, embracing the typical remedial system pointing forward to Christ, and the civil laws growing out of the special relation existing between God and the Jewish people to the cross. We hold the former to be ever binding upon man, while the latter passed away.

Our inquiry is now as to which of these laws the apostle has principally in view in the letter to the Galatians. The question is an important one, and is therefore well worthy of consideration. Truth, for its own sake, is important concerning the meaning and application of any scripture; and the truth concerning the law in Galatians is especially so, because the apostle's references to the law in this letter are used by our opponents as a strong support to their Antinomian doctrines. It is evident that the position which is a truthful exposition of the apostle's argument is in every way preferable, and will be easier to defend than one which is erroneous. It will enable us to meet our opponents more successfully, and thus the great system of truth which we hold will be strengthened. All our people ought to greatly desire that we come to a unity of position on this subject.

We hold that the letter to the Galatians was written to meet one of the greatest difficulties with which the gospel

had to contend in the apostle's days. This difficulty was the opposition of Judaizing teachers and disciples who still taught the obligation of the ceremonial law, and of circumcision and those laws connected with it which served to separate between Jews and Gentiles. These confused the minds of the disciples, and obscured the great principles of the gospel, virtually destroying it. We find constant reference to the work of this class of teachers in Paul's writings and in the Acts of the Apostles, as we shall see. Indeed, it may well be doubted whether a large portion of the early church who were Jews before conversion ever fully realized the scope and extent of the gospel in setting aside those laws peculiarly Jewish. They clung to them, and were zealous for them long after they were abolished at the cross. To Paul we are in debt, through the blessing of God, for the only full explanation of the proper relation of these laws to the plan of salvation and the gospel; and he himself was looked upon with great suspicion by many of the Hebrew converts, because he plainly taught the abrogation of many things which they continued to hold sacred.

Nor is this to be wondered at when we take a view of the past history of that people, and the special influences which had been at work for fifteen centuries. We cannot well realize the peculiar circumstances surrounding the early church, and the special influences with which they had to contend, without looking at the causes which led to them. We will briefly notice these. Because the mass of mankind had gone into idolatry, and utterly apostatized from God, the Lord chose Abraham and his descendants to be his peculiar people. They were such till the cross. He gave them the rite of circumcision—a circle cut in the flesh—as a sign of their separation from the rest of the human family. In process of time, after special experiences and training, he gave them a land peculiarly their own, and built about them, by special laws, ordinances, rites, and services, a wall of separation, which has made them a distinct people even to the present day. The sign of circumcision to the Jew implied and embraced all this. It was the one rite which separated the Jews from the Gentile world. This is shown by the fact that any Gentile could become a proselyte, and be entitled to all the privileges of the nation, by being circum-

cised and uniting with them. Without this, in the old economy no man could come under the provisions of salvation; with it, all the hopes, promises, covenants, laws, light, and privileges of the Israelite were his. Hence circumcision implies all those privileges specially Jewish. The term was used in this well-understood sense. The circumcised were God's peculiar people. The uncircumcised were all the rest of the world. Hence for a man to drop circumcision was really to cast aside all the peculiar blessings and privileges of the Jews, and to lower himself to a level with the rest of the world he so much despised; while to maintain it, was to maintain all his supposed superiority. Hence we see what was involved in the controversies over circumcision in the early gospel church.

Should we inquire into the reasons why God thus separated the descendants of Abraham from the rest of the world, as the rite of circumcision implied, we may readily discover them. Every effort of the Almighty to maintain a pure people in the earth had in length of time seemed to fail. At the flood all had gone astray save Noah and his family, and the destruction of the mass of the race thus became necessary in order to start anew. Another great defection made the destruction of the cities of the plain necessary. Scarce any but Abraham remained true to their allegiance in his time. So God now adopts a more effectual method. He takes the painful rite of circumcision as a separating sign, and builds a wall around his people, protecting them in a measure from the inundation of evil coming from the outer heathen world, thus preserving a seed, a church, till Messiah should come and inaugurate a more effective system with which to bless mankind. The object was noble, and such as was worthy of a wise, benevolent Creator.

This people, thus protected, were made the recipients of numberless blessings. God intrusted to them his holy law, with his holy Sabbath,—inestimable blessings!—which gave them an infinitely clearer view of moral duty than was possessed by the most enlightened nations around them. He made rich provisions for their temporal good in the fertile country bestowed upon them. Had they been obedient, he would have made them the highest of the nations. He gave them rich promises, instructed them by holy prophets, and caused the Messiah

to be made manifest through their race. They were indeed a most favored nation.

But these great blessings, which should have made Israel a humble, grateful people, full of love to God, they perverted, and became proud, boastful, supercilious, stiff-necked, and selfish, looking down upon all others, and feeling that they were the only ones God regarded. They filled up the measure of their iniquity by crucifying their long-promised Messiah. So selfish were they that they could not appreciate the spirit of love to all, which so overflowed from his precious life.

Then came the cross, when all their special privileges, with circumcision as their representative and sign, were swept away. They had forfeited them by disobedience and rebellion. The time and event, the limit to which they reached, had come. Their iniquity, in view of the light they had received, was even greater than that of the nations around them. There was no propriety, therefore, in still keeping up the wall of separation between them and others. They all stood now upon the same level in the sight of God. All must approach him through the Messiah who had come into the world; through him alone man could be saved.

But did the Jews take kindly to this new order of things?—Far from it. The thing that maddened them most of all was the intimation that their special privileges were taken away. These had served to exalt them in their own eyes, and they had used them for ages to exalt themselves above others. They had been very zealous in proselyting among the nations because of this superiority. And now to have this lowly Nazarene and his poor, despised followers, who had never been honored as learned or talented, place them on the same level with others, was like destroying their whole stock in trade. Their sacred privileges and special blessings were the only things they had to boast of. They were oppressed by the Romans, and despised by the Greeks as being ignorant of philosophy, and not generally liked by the nations because of their pride and vain glory. To take away their only claim of being God's peculiar people was more than they could endure.

Their hatred was especially bitter against the apostle Paul, because he, more than any other, clearly defined and

demonstrated this fact. He was the apostle to the Gentiles, which made it necessary for him to make this fact prominent. He pointed them to Christ as their only hope. They had nothing to gain from circumcision and the special privileges it represented. Hence we see the Judaizing teachers representing the various sects of zealots among the Jews and the Hebrew disciples who were not willing to accept the truth as Paul taught it, opposing him, following him from city to city, persecuting and in many instances trying to kill him. They were exceedingly zealous for circumcision and the law of the fathers. The hardest battle the great apostle had to fight was upon this very ground.

There were really two leading questions which required special attention as the gospel went among the Gentiles beyond the confines of Judaism. The special circumstances that had surrounded the Jewish people for ages in the past, made these questions prominent, now that the new order of things was introduced, and Jews and Gentiles stood alike upon the same basis. One was the binding claims of the law of God upon all mankind, and the special fact connected with it that the Jews were condemned by that law as sinners, and hence needed a Saviour just as much as others. The other was the fact already referred to—the cessation at the cross, of the types and services pointing to Christ, with the special privileges granted to Israel as God's peculiar people, symbolized by circumcision. Until these positions were well understood, and the great principles growing out of them were thoroughly comprehended, the gospel could never accomplish its destined work in the world; the Christian system would be in disorder and confusion. For Jew and Gentile alike to have a Saviour, both alike must be sinners. Thus both could come into one brotherhood, and constitute one family. But this could not be if this middle wall still stood as a separation between them. Hence it must be thoroughly understood that this was broken down.

Both of these facts were unpalatable to the Jew. He greatly disliked to be reckoned a common sinner with the hated Gentile. He strenuously contended also for circumcision and its attendant privileges. Hence it was necessary that both of these great facts should be faithfully developed, and the underlying reasons given for this new ar-

rangement. Paul was the man specially raised up of God to do this work.

We shall claim that in the epistle to the Romans he fully considers the former question, and in the letter to the Galatians, the latter. We cannot agree with some who claim that the design, scheme, or argument in the two epistles are substantially the same. We freely admit that there are expressions alike in both; but we believe that the main line of argument and the ultimate object in view are widely different, and that many of the similar expressions used are to be understood in a different sense, because the argument of the apostle demands it.

In the other epistles of Paul these facts are adverted to; but in none of them is the argument anywhere near so fully developed. It does not look reasonable on the face of it that the apostle would have principally the same object in view in two different epistles. These were written by direct inspiration of God, to be the special guidance of the Christian church. He was bringing out the great principles which should serve as the governing influence of the church for all future ages. We therefore believe it to be an unreasonable view that both have the same design.

In the epistle to the Romans, after a few preliminary remarks, Paul sets before us the condition of the heathen world, and how they came to forget God, and their terrible degradation. They certainly needed a Saviour. Yet they were amenable to the law of God; for it had originally been "written in the heart" at creation, and some remnant of the work of it still remained.

But the Jews had a great advantage, inasmuch as the "living oracles" were directly placed in their keeping. They had constant access to them, but had as constantly transgressed them. The apostle plainly proved all of them to be under sin. All had gone astray. None did good, no not one. He concludes: "What then? are we [Jews] better than they?—No, in no wise; for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin." Every mouth was stopped, and all the world became guilty before God. The law was not "made void," but "established."

The apostle proceeds in a most lucid and powerful argument to show the agency of the moral law in the plan of salvation in all its various relations to the sinner; the

necessity of faith in Christ in order that the law-breaker may be justified; its agency in the death of the old carnal man; and its necessity as a standard of right-doing which the repentant sinner alone can reach by the assistance of Christ through the Holy Spirit. To the Epistle to the Romans we ever look for the most complete and thorough exposition of the law of God in its relation to the plan of salvation and the ultimate justification of the repentant transgressor of it.

But is the scheme of the letter to the Galatians the same? Does the apostle have in view the same object? We think he had a widely different end in view. Instead of trying to impress upon Jew and Gentile alike the obligation of the moral law as his main object, he has constantly in view a class of Judaizing teachers who had troubled the disciples, and introduced doctrines which subverted the principles of the gospel. The believers had been turned away from the faith by these teachings, to “another gospel.” They had loved the great apostle when they first received the truth, with a fervency which would have prompted them to pluck out their eyes for him; but through the influence of these disturbing teachers, that love had been almost lost. Paul was greatly grieved at this sudden change in their feelings and views. Throughout the whole epistle he constantly refers to it, reproaching them for their sudden change, and appealing to them to return to their former position.

What was the change in them of which he complains so strongly? Was it that they had kept the moral law so well—had observed the Sabbath, refrained from idolatry, blasphemy, murder, lying, stealing, etc.—that they felt they were justified by their good works, and therefore needed no faith in a crucified Saviour? or was it that they had accepted circumcision, with all it implied and symbolized, the laws and services which served as a wall of separation between Jews and Gentiles, and the ordinances of the typical remedial system? We unhesitatingly affirm it was the latter. In indorsing the former remedial system of types and shadows, they virtually denied that Christ, the substance to which all these types pointed, had come. Hence the error was a fundamental one in doctrine, though they might not realize it. This was why Paul spoke so forcibly, and pointed out their error with

such strength of language. Their error involved *practices* which were subversive of the principles of the gospel. They were not merely errors of opinion.

Let us notice a few expressions of the apostle, scattered through Galatians, before we come to an examination of the epistle itself. This will serve to bring out the point more clearly:—

“I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel.” Chap. 1:6.

“O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth?” Chap. 3:1.

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

“I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain.” Chap. 4:9, 11.

“Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law.” Chap. 5:2, 3. “Ye did run well; who did hinder you that ye should not obey the truth?” Verse 7.

“As many as desire to make a fair show in the flesh, they constrain you to be circumcised; only lest they should suffer persecution for the cross of Christ.” Chap. 6:32.

It will be noticed that these texts are selected all through the epistle. Many others of similar import could also be given. They relate to the principal theme in the apostle’s mind which caused him to write this letter to the Galatians. He had one leading object in view; hence he is constantly referring to it. The errors in the Galatian church which Paul was so vigorously combating, were *not* merely the theoretical view that they were justified by their obedience to the moral law and hence needed not a Saviour; but they were *practices* which really undermined the truth of the gospel, connecting it with circumcision, the symbol of all those laws peculiarly Jewish.

We do not here quote these texts to make an argument upon them. We reserve them for their proper connection when we examine the epistle point by point. We present them now as an illustration of what was specially occupying the apostle’s thoughts from one end of the epistle to the other. He apparently could not keep out of his

mind the fundamental errors into which these children in .the faith were fallen. These errors of doctrine he had to meet wherever he met a Jew. Throughout his whole Christian life he had to fight them. Because of the bitterness of feeling entertained by the Jews in sustaining their claims to superiority because of these separating laws involved in circumcision, Paul had to endure whippings, imprisonment, insult, hatred, a long captivity, and, worst of all, see multitudes of those he desired to save, of his own kinsmen according to the flesh, lost forever. Their ears were closed against him and the precious gospel he preached. He would willingly have died to save them; but their ears were closed against the gospel because he could not sustain those separating laws which served as a line of demarcation between the Jew and the Gentile. This question with Paul, therefore, was a *live question*, one ever before him. Hence all through the book of Galatians it is constantly brought to view. Circumcision and the remedial system connected with the old dispensation are constantly in his mind from the commencement in the first chapter till his close in the last.

There are, no doubt, several references to the moral law in the epistle. Indeed, we do not see how it could well be otherwise while discussing a remedial system providing pardon in figure for violation of that law. In some places the apostle uses arguments which will embrace that and all systems of law, and which may and do refer to and include both. But we emphatically deny that the law of God is the leading subject under consideration in this letter. We now propose to examine the whole epistle consecutively, having a relation to this subject. To enable the reader to easily follow us, we will quote the language of the apostle.

Chapter 1:1: "Paul, an apostle, (not of men, neither by men, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead;)

"2. And all the brethren which are with me, unto the churches of Galatia:

"3. Grace be you, and from God the Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ,

"4. Who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God and our Father:

"5. To whom be glory forever and ever. Amen.

"6. I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel:

"7. Which is not another; but there be some that, trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ.

"8. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.

"9. As we have said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed."

These are the introductory words of the epistle. In the parenthetical clause in verse 1, Paul especially refers to his call to the apostleship, which was high and honorable. It placed him on an equality of authority with any of the other apostles. Indeed, his call was more especially marked by divine manifestations than any of them, indicating, perhaps, God's choice of him for the most important work. He dwells upon this in other places in this letter, because there was a disposition on the part of the Judaizing element to underrate the apostle, and exalt those whose special sphere of labor was among the Jews, and who had never taken such strong ground as Paul had in showing that all national distinctions were gone. Paul gives them to understand that he is fully prepared by God's appointment to instruct them in the gospel.

Before he has proceeded a dozen lines in his introduction, Paul bursts out in strong language concerning the great theme which was in his mind. "I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you ... unto another gospel." "There be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ." If angel or man "preach any other gospel, ... let him be accursed." And to make it doubly emphatic, he repeats this last statement. To be "accursed" is to be "doomed to destruction." It is a very strong term, indeed. What is it that has prompted this patient, meek, humble servant of God to pour forth so suddenly such an outburst of holy indignation. Not another letter of his can be found in which he commences with such vehemence and apparent impatience. And we may be sure he would not indulge in them here but for great provocation and a clear sense that some very dangerous doctrine, calculated to greatly mar the Christian

system, was being promulgated. The gospel was being “perverted” and undermined, and other means of salvation substituted. Would such language have been in place if these Jewish teachers had been trying to have them keep the ten commandments very strictly, and the Galatians were following such instruction closely, neither killing, lying, committing adultery, nor stealing, thinking thus to be justified by their good works? To our mind such a conclusion would be absurd. But if these teachers were trying to lead the Galatian brethren to adopt circumcision with its attendant typical remedial system, virtually doing away with the great sacrifice on Calvary, then such language would be very much in place. We must bear in mind also how Paul was constantly beset by this same class of teachers, as we shall see. They came near taking his life at Damascus, when he first believed in Christ. Multitudes in Jerusalem thirsted for his blood, and even swore they would never eat or drink till they had killed him. They met him in every city he entered, stirring up the people against him. And now in his absence, with their Jewish notions of circumcision, they had turned away his beloved children in the Lord. No wonder the righteous indignation of the apostle is aroused!

Verse 10: “For do I now persuade men, or God ? or do I seek to please men? for if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ,

“11. But I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man.

“12. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.

“13. For ye have heard of my conversation in time past in the Jews’ religion, how that beyond measure I persecuted the church of God, and wasted it:

“14. And profited in the Jews’ religion above many my equals in mine own nation, being more exceedingly zealous of the traditions of my fathers.

“15. But when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother’s womb, and called me by his grace,

“16. To reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen; immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood:

“17. Neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were apostles before me; but I went into Arabia, and returned again unto Damascus.

“18. Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter and abode with him fifteen days.

“19. But other of the apostles saw I none, save James, the Lord’s brother.

“20. Now the things which I write unto you, behold, before God, I lie not.

“21. Afterwards I came into the regions of Syria and Cilicia;

“22. And was unknown by face unto the churches of Judea which were in Christ:

“23. But they had heard only, That he which persecuted us in times past now preacheth the faith which once he destroyed.

“24. And they glorified God in me.”

In this quotation Paul begins by again referring to the proofs of his divine call to the apostleship, a fact to which he refers over and over in this letter. Evidently these Judaizing teachers had disparaged him and his position, and exalted the apostles at Jerusalem far above him, because he taught that these special Jewish distinctions were set aside.

He next refers to his former zeal in the “Jews’ religion,” or in “Judaism,” as it is translated in the Diaglott. “Ye have heard of my conversation,” or course of life, “in time past in Judaism,” and how I “persecuted the church of God, and wasted it.” He “profited in Judaism” above his equals, being” more exceedingly zealous of the traditions of his fathers.” Why does the apostle present this striking reference to his former experience in Judaism as a zealot and a persecutor, in his argument with the Galatian brethren?—Because it was wonderfully in place. These Judaizing teachers were leading the brethren back to the very doctrines Paul had discarded, telling them they must be circumcised, and keep up the wall of separation, or they could not be saved, as we shall soon see. But had not Paul been over all that ground before? Had he not profited in this kind of religion more than any in his nation? Had he not excelled them all in his zeal for these very things they were trying to sustain? Could these teachers or the brethren they were leading astray hope to practice or comprehend those doctrines as well as he had, with his great ability, erudition, and remarkable zeal?—Certainly not. But when Christ revealed himself

to Paul, on the road to Damascus, he had seen the utter unprofitableness of all these peculiar doctrines of Judaism by which they were now trying to be saved. The great light of Christianity had fully delineated the purpose and design of all those ordinances for the past. Should they now go back to those things which Paul had fully explored, understood, and discarded, and cast aside the glorious light which he had received by direct revelation from the Lord, and preached to them? Preposterous! If they should, they would be going back from light into darkness. These were considerations which Paul's reference to his former experience must have fastened upon the minds of the Galatian brethren.

But what were these doctrines of Judaism to which he refers, and for which he was so zealous before his conversion? Was it a special zeal for the doctrines of the moral law which so distinguished him, and led him to persecute the church? No Seventh-day Adventist will claim that. No doubt the disciples whom he persecuted, kept that law much better than he did or his associates. So far as we know, the Jews themselves never claim that the principles of the ten commandments are peculiar to their nation. They believe all men are morally bound to keep them, the Sabbath included. They well know there is nothing Jewish about that law. But it was the claims of another law, involving "the traditions of the fathers" and Jewish superiority and exclusiveness, circumcision, and kindred ordinances, and salvation through Judaism and its doctrines, and not through Jesus, which roused Paul to such a pitch of zeal. His leading design in writing this letter was to set before them the folly of their Judaizing defection.

In the remaining part of this quotation; the apostle continues the narration of his personal experience, presenting his course of action after his conversion. He was called of God to preach Christ "among the heathen." He had a divine call to this special work which no other apostle had to the same degree. He did not receive his knowledge of Christian doctrine from the church at Jerusalem or the apostles, but from direct revelation. And though he did spend fifteen days with Peter three years after his conversion, yet it was not through him or any human authority that he received his commission. God's providence separated Paul hugely from the leading influential men in the church,

and by special illumination prepared him to take a leading position in bringing the gospel to the heathen world. His former experience and education and thorough knowledge of Judaism had prepared his mind to comprehend all it could accomplish for humanity. And when the light of the gospel was fully revealed to him, he was thoroughly equipped to meet the opposing Judaizing teachers found in every city, and expose their weakness, and bring the light of the gospel in all its fullness to the Gentile world. No other apostle was prepared to do such a work in this direction as Paul. In this letter to the Galatian believers he refers to these things that they may understand his thorough qualification as an apostle, which these false teachers had tried to belittle.

Chapter 2:1: "Then fourteen years after I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, and took Titus with me also.

"2. And I went up by revelation, and communicated unto them that gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, but privately to them which were of reputation, lest by any means I should run, or had run, in vain.

"3. But neither Titus, who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised:

"4. And that because of false brethren unawares brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage:

"5. To whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour; that the truth of the gospel might continue with you."

We here reach a most interesting point in the consideration of the subject before us. The circumstances mentioned in this connection unmistakably identify this visit with the one mentioned in Acts 15. The questions agitating the minds of the disciples in both cases are the same. The circumstances mentioned are the same. The parties or persons referred to are substantially the same. The chronology of both is the same. And no other recorded visit of the apostle will harmonize the statements of the chronology of this visit but the one recorded in Acts 15. Conybeare and Howson, in their "Life and Epistles of the Apostle Paul," present an exhaustive argument in favor of this view, in which every objection to it ever

urged, is considered and answered. They declare that “the majority of the best critics and commentators” agree in the identity of these visits. For lack of space we cannot enter into a lengthy argument to prove this. It is not necessary. Most likely none of our brethren will question this; but those who wish to examine this point fully, we refer to the seventh chapter of Conybeare and Howson’s valuable work. Dr. Clarke and many other commentators, and Sr. White also, sustain this view.

To obtain a comprehensive view of this visit and its significance, we notice the corresponding facts in Acts 15: “And certain men which came down from Judea taught the brethren, and said, Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, *ye cannot be saved*. When therefore Paul and Barnabas had no small dissension and disputation with them, they determined that Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of them, should go up to Jerusalem unto the apostles and elders about this question.” Verses 1, 2.

After reaching Jerusalem, and giving an account of their past labors, the record continues: “But there rose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees which believed, saying, That it was needful to circumcise them, and to command them to keep the law of Moses. And the apostles and elders came together for to consider of this matter. And when there had been much disputing, Peter rose up, and said unto them, Men and brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe. And God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us; and put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith. 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? But we believe that through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ we shall be saved, even as they.” Verses 5-11.

Perhaps there never was a greater crisis in the early church than this. The cloud had been gathering for years. Questions concerning the obligation of the law of Moses had been constantly arising. The gospel was now spreading far and wide. Multitudes of Gentiles were becoming interested in it, and man had embraced it. These Juda-

izing teachers were everywhere stirring up trouble. Paul and Barnabas had great “dissension and disputation” with them. They followed on the track of these apostles who were preaching specially to the Gentiles, disturbing those converted, and unsettling their faith in that which these apostles preached. They crept in “privily to spy out the liberty” which the disciples had in Christ, constantly thrusting in their Jewish notions. They were determined to bring the believers “into bondage” to their notions of the obligation of Jewish laws and customs. The extent to which they carried their teachings is clearly set forth in these scriptures. They said: “Except ye be circumcised,” and keep the law of Moses, “ye cannot be saved.” All the Gentile world, then, must be circumcised and really become Jews. All those rites, services, and customs in Moses’ law must be obeyed. In this case the glorious light and freedom of the gospel must be circumscribed to the narrow bounds of Jewish bondage.

It is no wonder Paul declares, “We gave place by subjection” to them, “no, not for an hour.” He, saw, at a glance that the integrity of the whole gospel system was at stake. If these Jewish positions were to stand, and be generally accepted, Christ could not be the promised Messiah, and his death was in vain. Faith in him was not the saving principle. They were to be saved by circumcision and the services of the law of Moses. The well-being of the Christian church demanded, and the system of faith in Christ which he taught required, that this question should be settled once and forever. It was the turning-point in the history of the Christian church, between liberty and bondage, Jewish narrowness and exclusiveness and the freedom which is in Christ Jesus. The gospel never could accomplish its mission to the ends of the earth with such a burden placed upon it. The circumstances of the case required, and a special revelation from the Lord directed, that this momentous question be brought before the highest tribunal of the church for settlement,—a general conference of the believers at Jerusalem.

Paul and Barnabas, the special apostles to the Gentiles, and a company of the brethren went up from Antioch to attend it. They took Titus with them. He was an example and an illustration of the whole question, an uncir-

cumcised Greek, but a devoted Christian. What would the brethren do with him? Would they receive him as a brother in the common faith? or would they cast him aside, and refuse to own him as one of them until he should receive this old test of Jewish discipleship—circumcision? Was the test of Christianity to be the same as that of Judaism? or was a heart made pure by faith in a crucified Saviour to be the test? Paul could not, in any possible way, have brought the matter home more forcibly than he did by taking the devoted Titus with him.

It is impossible for us, after eighteen centuries of Gentile freedom, to realize the intense interest which centered in this contest which was to be decided by the Council. It seemed to the Hebrew converts, who had been strict Pharisees, that everything which they had held sacred in their past experience was now to be swept away. For centuries subsequent to the captivity, scattered as they were among the Gentiles; they had struggled to maintain their distinctive national characteristics under great difficulties. They had been hated for it, and often persecuted. And now these were all to be swept aside, and they be placed on a level with the Gentiles, against whom they had guarded themselves so strictly. The reason of their blindness was because they failed to discern the vast importance of the death of Christ. Had they realized this as Paul did, all would have been plain.

No wonder there was much “disputation” and heat manifested as they approached the solution of this great question. Paul, like a wise manager, had held private consultations with the apostles and leading brethren. When they came to consider the subject they could not fail to see that his position was the only sound one, the only possible one to take. Peter in the Council rehearsed the facts connected with the conversion of Cornelius, the first plain instance of Gentile conversion. .In this case God had given the witness of the Spirit as a divine evidence of acceptance without circumcision. What testimony could have been stronger than this? And large numbers of others had been converted, and received the same evidence. Should they now go backward, and impose a yoke of bondage upon these disciples after God had given them the same Spirit the Hebrew disciples had received? This would be highly absurd.

Then Paul and Barnabas recounted the wonderful instances of divine power attending their ministry among the Gentiles. Many had received the gospel, and mighty miracles had been wrought, giving evidence that God was with them in their work; no apostle had performed greater miracles. They had not required these Gentiles to be circumcised. Would it now be reasonable to set aside all these evidences of divine sanction and refuse to accept them as disciples by erecting the old wall of separation? Preposterous!

These were arguments which the Jewish disciples, zealous for Moses’ law, found it hard to answer. Finally James, the brother of our Lord, arose, a man of venerable appearance and great sanctity, usually called “James the Just.” He was acting as the presiding officer on this occasion. He presents other strong reasons in behalf of the position of Paul and Barnabas, and then the decision of the Council is rendered: “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: it seemed good unto us, being assembled with one accord, to send chosen men unto you, with our beloved Barnabas and Paul, men that have hazarded their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. We have sent therefore Judas and Silas, who shall also tell you the same things by mouth. For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things; that ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication: from which if ye keep yourselves, ye shall do well. Fare ye well.” Verses 24-29.

Thus this momentous question was settled, and gospel liberty gained a great victory. The Gentile believers could become members of the family of Christ Jesus without obedience to the ritual law. Circumcision, the badge of Jewish exclusiveness, was set aside. Titus was not “compelled to be circumcised,” and the Jewish zealots were decidedly snubbed. What a vast load this Council lifted off from the church! What a terrible incubus would have fallen upon it had the decision gone the other way! Paul must have returned to Antioch with a light heart.

But what have this Council and its decision to do with

the question we are considering—the law in Galatians? It has everything to do with it. The very same question precisely which came before the Council is the main subject of the apostles letter to this church. If the moral law is the main subject of the epistle, why did Paul bring in the work of the Council at Jerusalem? Will any Seventh-day Adventist claim that the moral law was the subject considered by that Council? Was it the moral law which Peter characterizes as “a yoke ... which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear?” Were the moral and ceremonial laws all mixed up and confounded in the Council? Did the decision of that body set aside the laws against stealing, lying, Sabbath-breaking, and murder? We all know better. The Council took no cognizance whatever of the ten commandments. There was no dispute about their universal obligation. But not so concerning the Jewish law. That was in dispute. Paul, then, in Galatians, making the subject of Moses’ law prominent, brings in this Council at Jerusalem as a most forcible evidence of the wrong position of the Galatian church. It is the ceremonial and not the moral law that he has in view. To take any other position concerning his reference to this Council would be to claim that Paul had no proper ideas of a logical argument; for assuredly if he was trying to prove to the Galatians the binding obligation of the moral law, and their justification through faith for its transgression, there would be no force whatever in prominently referring to the decision of a council which limited its consideration to an entirely different law. The view we advocate makes Paul’s argument perfectly logical and consistent throughout. The opposite view breaks it up, and renders it illogical.

Verse 6: “But of those who seemed to be somewhat, whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to me: God accepteth no man’s person: for they who seemed to be somewhat in conference added nothing to me:

“7. But contrarywise, when they saw that the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me, as the gospel of the circumcision was unto Peter;

“8. (For he that wrought effectually in Peter to the apostleship of circumcision, the same was mighty in me toward the Gentiles;)

“9. And when James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to

be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship; that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision.

“10. Only they would that we should remember the poor; the same which I also was forward to do.”

In this quotation an interesting fact is presented, which had an important bearing upon the question Paul was discussing with the Galatian brethren. It would seem from this description that the position of Paul’s apostleship, as to its relative importance in the work of the gospel, was here defined and settled as never before. Paul’s experience had been peculiar and striking. First a bitter persecutor, the worst one the disciples had to meet, carrying terror and dismay wherever he went: then, after his remarkable conversion, which many might not have been aware of, he became, after a season, a laborer in the gospel. After his conversion, he disappeared in Arabia for about three years. Many may have thought he had apostatized. From several scriptures it appears there was much suspicion in the church concerning the genuineness of his change; till Barnabas sought him out. When he began to labor, it was for the Gentiles; and the doctrines he taught were very unpalatable to the Hebrew converts. Until this meeting at Jerusalem, he seems not to have been generally acknowledged as having an independent mission. But it seems likely some thought him “antagonistic to the apostles at Jerusalem; others, that he was entirely dependent upon them.” Such is Conybeare and Howson’s view.

But all was changed at this Council. They fully discerned his mission, and saw that the Holy Spirit had placed this work of reaching the Gentile world especially under his charge. The views he had taught were now fully accepted by the apostles and the church at large, at least in theory. Paul and Barnabas’ now received the right hand of fellowship, signifying that their course was fully approbated. They were sent on their mission to “the heathen,” while Peter still continued to act a leading part among the Hebrew portion of the church. A wonderful victory had been gained for the cause of truth taught by Paul in this great crisis. The prominence of this question in the apostolic church may be discovered from the fact that no other general Council of like character ever oc-

curred in the early church. From this time onward, the whole burden of the work of the gospel, as its history is given in the book of Acts, seems to have been among the Gentiles. This Council gave great encouragement to the work among the heathen. The main interest of the history of the church centers in Paul's labors from this point. These facts, as cited by the apostle in his letter, must have had great force with the Galatian brethren, who had now fallen under the influence of these same Judaizing teachers.

We do not see how his argument could be more forcible. Paul substantially said to them, Are you going back to the ceremonial law and circumcision, after the great Council at Jerusalem has decided against them, and after the doctrines I have taught and my special mission to the Gentile world have been fully approbated by the apostles at Jerusalem and the whole church of believers? Will you follow these false teachers rather than the whole church? It must have been a most convincing appeal.

Verse 11: "But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed.

"12. For before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles: but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision.

"13. And the other Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation.

"14. But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?

"15. We who are Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles,

"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: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified.

"17. But if, while we seek to be justified by Christ, we ourselves also are found sinners, is therefore Christ the minister of sin? God forbid.

"18. For if build again the things which I destroyed, I make myself a transgressor.

"19. For I through the law am dead to the law, that I might live unto God.

"20. I am crucified with Christ; nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.

"21. I do not frustrate the grace of God: for if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain."

We have here the third historical reference to facts in Paul's experience having a special bearing upon the subject discussed in his letter, being his public reproof of the apostle Peter in the presence of others, and the substance of the remarks made on this occasion. It seems Peter came down to Antioch soon after the great Council, before Paul and Barnabas left on their next tour of labor. At first he lived as Paul did, eating with the Gentiles, and paying no attention to the Jewish laws and customs. But when some of the disciples from Jerusalem came down to Antioch, who were still zealous for all the requirements of Moses' law, Peter withdrew, and no longer acted as before. The current became so strong in that direction that even Barnabas, Paul's companion, was carried away with the rest. It took a man of great nerve and stamina and intelligent, conscientious convictions, like Paul, to withstand the pressure of influence brought to bear on this occasion. This shows how strong the feeling was in behalf of the customs of Judaism in the early church. It is astonishing that after the decisions of the Council such an eminent man as Peter was in the church, and one who had acted in the Council with Paul in behalf of the same positions concerning Moses' law which Paul had held, should be so soon swept under this influence. And still more so that Barnabas, the companion of Paul, who had participated with him in his experience among the Gentiles, and strongly contended for the same positions, should also fall under the influence of these Judaizing teachers. These wonderful inconsistencies, however, only show the pressure of influence brought to bear in behalf of these national distinctions at that time in the church, which centered at Jerusalem. This influence made the call of a great council necessary. And though the decision had been wholly in favor of the truth as Paul held it, yet the spirit of national caste still remained. Such influences are the very

hardest to overcome of any with which poor human nature has to contend.

We have illustrations of the same principle, in a measure at least, in our day, in the feelings of many white people toward those who have been in slavery in the past; and in India in the distinctions of caste. When parties from both sides are converted to Christ, it seems impossible even then to get those in the higher position to associate socially with those from the lower classes. This was even more the fact in the case of Jewish and Gentile converts, and was especially the case in regard to eating together. Says Conybeare and Howson, p. 178: "The peculiar character of the religion which isolated the Jews was such as to place insuperable obstacles in the way of social union with other men. Their ceremonial observances precluded the possibility of their eating with the Gentiles." As Peter said to Cornelius it is "an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to keep company, or come unto one of another nation." Acts 10:28. The great charge against him upon his return to Jerusalem was, "Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised, and didst eat with them." Acts 11: 3. And though the principles on which the decisions of the Council were based, would overthrow such views theoretically, yet the feeling still existed, and even Peter and Barnabas had not strength at all times to stand before it.

It may well be doubted if the churches of Judea and Jerusalem ever fully recovered from this feeling; for in Paul's last visit the same feelings existed so strongly that he, with James' advice, gave up to it in a measure, and participated in some of the services of the ceremonial law, and in consequence was captured in the temple, and suffered a long imprisonment. Acts 21. The obligation of the ceremonial law was really involved in this eating question just as truly as in the questions concerning circumcision, which came before the Council; only it was a little different phase of it.

That Paul should have rebuked the apostle Peter in such a public manner as he did on this occasion, shows that he must have considered the issue an exceedingly important one, involving the integrity of the system of gospel teaching which he preached. Simon Peter had long been among the foremost of the apostles. Taught by the Saviour himself, the "gospel of the circumcision" had

been specially "committed" to him, as that of the uncircumcision had to Paul. Great miracles had been wrought by him. The whole Christian church looked up to him as rather the leading man in it. Christ had greatly honored him. He was doubtless an older man than Paul; yet Paul, the junior laborer, usually a very meek and humble man, publicly reproved this eminent apostle to his face. We may be sure this never would have been done had not Paul felt very deeply in his soul that the occasion demanded it because a great principle was to be vindicated.

Peter "was to be blamed." It was at an important crisis, just as the great principle of gospel liberty was struggling for the supremacy in the church against the desperate, persistent efforts of those who were determined to impose the yoke of Jewish ritual bondage upon the necks of the Gentile converts. Peter, through fear of man, permitted himself to be placed on the wrong side of this question, dragging Barnabas and nearly all the Jews present along with him. Paul was forced by his regard for truth to speak out, even to reprove his brethren of great influence older than himself. Paul well knew that if such examples as these were to be followed, the cause of God would be hindered. If Jew and Gentile Christians could not eat together, how could they ever make one body, one family in Christ? It would be impossible. This rebuke was deserved. God sustained Paul's reproof, and has permitted this historical fact to stand on the page of inspiration, showing the weakness of one of his most eminent servants. Peter never attempted to answer, for he well knew no answer could be given.

Why does Paul bring up this circumstance in his letter to the Galatian brethren?—Because it was a case exactly in point. They were going back to the same principles and practices for which Peter had been justly rebuked. Their course had been condemned, even in one so high as the great apostle Peter; and he had submitted to the reproof as just. Should they now, under the influence of a similar troublesome class of Judaizing teachers, continue in a wrong course which had demanded and received such a rebuke?—Certainly not.

Question: Did this course of Peter involve the question of the ten commandments? Had it the slightest reference to them? Were they under consideration in any sense

whatever in this transaction?—By no means. The whole matter related to the law of types and uncleanness, the obligation of the law of Moses. The moral law was not involved.

Let us now consider Paul's remarks to Peter and those who had followed him. "If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles [as he had been doing before certain came from Jerusalem] and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?" This, of course, was a wonderful inconsistency, caused solely by Peter's fear of man, lest his influence among the Jewish disciples should be lessened. He knew he would likely be called in question for his course when he returned to Jerusalem. "We who are Jews by, nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles [such as Peter, Barnabas, and Paul], 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: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified."

We must remember, of course, that these words were spoken in reproof to those who recognized the Jewish laws of uncleanness as still in force. These were intimately associated with, and really a part of, that great typical remedial system which passed away at the cross.

Peter and Barnabas well knew that though all their earlier lives they had regarded and obeyed them, yet that fact did not afford salvation. They themselves, all of them strict Jews in the past, had to be saved by faith in Christ. How preposterous, then, to set up this old typical standard of ceremonies and "divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation," for the Gentiles to obey, as in effect they had been doing at Antioch in refusing to eat with Gentiles! If these old provisions of Moses' law would not save such devout men as Peter, Barnabas, and Paul had been, could they be any benefit to the Gentiles who had never regarded them?—Certainly not. "But if, while we seek to be justified by Christ, we ourselves also are found sinners, is Christ the minister of sin? God forbid. For if I build again the things which I destroyed, I make myself a transgressor. For I through the law am dead to the law, that I might live unto God. I am crucified with Christ:

nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God," etc.

That our explanation of verses 15, 16 is correct, these quotations clearly prove. Paul in his reproof is referring directly to the wrong course of Peter and Barnabas, who virtually acknowledged the requirements of the laws of eating and drinking in refusing to eat with the Gentiles. "If I build again the things which I destroyed, I make myself a transgressor." Peter and Paul both had shown that those laws were destroyed, by eating with the Gentile converts on terms of equality. But Peter and Barnabas, in refusing to eat with the Gentiles, had now recognized them as *still being in force*. Therefore by their own acts they made themselves "transgressors," literally "violators of law" (original Greek), *i.e.*, sinners. What effect, then, had their faith in Christ had upon them? According to their course of conduct, they had first recognized the insufficiency of these ceremonial laws to save them by believing in Christ, no longer regarding those laws which had passed away. But now Peter had gone back and recognized those laws as binding, and commenced to observe them again. What effect, then, had his faith in Christ had upon him? It had simply led him to violate a law he now acknowledged. Hence this would make Christ the minister of sin; he would not be sufficient for salvation. Christ had led him to break a law he now felt obliged to keep. This old law concerning uncleanness must be kept in order to salvation. Against such a false position Paul utters an emphatic, *God forbid!* It is evident from this that those Jewish converts felt that they must keep those laws which were abolished at the cross, in order to be justified; while Christ was the only source of Paul's justification.

We cannot admit that in these words addressed to Peter, showing him the folly and inconsistency of the position he had assumed in refusing to eat with the Gentile Christians, there is the slightest reference to the moral law. Though there are expressions which are similar to those used in Romans and other scriptures which in those places refer to the moral law, yet that proves nothing certain. We are perfectly free to admit that if some of these expressions were used where the premises of the apostle's

argument had been considering the moral law, they might properly enough apply to that. But such is not the case here, and hence similarity of expression proves nothing. To get the sense of a writer's thought, the connection must be considered, the facts upon which the argument is based, and the objective point of it. We have had here nearly two entire chapters in this letter, about one third of the whole epistle, and hitherto we have not had a single reference to the moral law; but through it all constant reference is made to the other law, that of Moses. And immediately preceding these expressions are the plainest references to the subject in his reproof to Peter on the question of defilement in eating. Does the moral law cover such ground? Had Peter destroyed that and then built it up again? Which of the ten commandments would have been violated in eating with the Gentiles? Were these Jewish disciples forcing such a pressure to oblige the Gentiles to keep the laws of the decalogue? We all know that such conclusions are perfectly absurd.

To suppose, then, that Paul had reference to the moral law in the expressions, "not justified by the works of the law," and "I through the law am dead to the law," etc., is to pervert the whole argument of the apostle, implying that while all through the Galatian letter thus far he had been referring to the ceremonial law, and reproving Peter for sustaining it by example, he suddenly turned away from the subject in hand, and brought in an entirely different law, which had no relation to the subject before him. Such a violent assumption is entirely inadmissible. It is wholly unnecessary. The argument of the apostle as we have presented it, is entirely consistent with itself, with all the facts thus far brought to view in the letter, and with his main object in writing to that church. Paul was strenuously contending for the liberty of the Christian church against Judaizing teachers who wanted to again impose the yoke of bondage which neither he nor his fathers were able to bear.

"I do not frustrate the grace of God: for if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain." These teachers did frustrate the grace (favor) of God which came through the death of Christ and his pardoning love. No law could be given through which weak, sinful man could reach that standard of righteousness which God required.

It must be attained through the help of Christ. How foolish, then, were Peter and Barnabas and these Jewish disciples under a pressure to go back and recognize this old yoke of bondage, which they themselves had once destroyed? It had always been "weak," "unprofitable," "carnal." It could never "take away sin." Why, then, should these men revive it. Paul's argument was triumphant for the occasion, and Peter made, no reply.

A word further concerning "justification." We fully believe the Epistle to the Galatians, as well as the Epistle to the Romans, proves the necessity of being justified by faith for our transgressions of the moral law, and the absolute impossibility of being justified by future obedience to any law for our sins of the past. But in that age there were *two laws* supposed by some to be in force; and there were even more who looked to obedience to the ceremonial law, with its circumcision, types, shadows, and multitude of observances, for justification, than to the moral law. And this was natural, for in it had been contained the typical *remedial system* of the past dispensation. All the virtue it possessed was the fact that it pointed to Christ. Most likely many did not discern this, and thought obedience to its provisions alone would take away sins. After Christ came, and it lost *all* its virtue, they still looked to it for justification. To correct this error was the main object of Paul's letter to the Galatians.

The mistake of our brethren is in trying to prove that the Galatians were seeking justification through obedience to the moral law, whereas they were really seeking it through obedience to the Mosaic law. We believe the term "works of the law" refers to the ceremonial law in almost if not every instance where it is used,

CHAPTER 3:1: "O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you?"

"2. This only would I learn of you, Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?"

"3. Are ye so foolish? having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?"

"4. Have ye suffered so many things in vain? if it be yet in vain.

"5. He therefore that ministereth to you the Spirit, and

worketh miracles among you, doeth he it by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?

“6. Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness.

“7. Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham.

“8. And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed.

“9. So then they which are of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham.”

We now reach the commencement of a special argument of the apostle on the subject in hand. There are three general divisions in this epistle. The first two chapters are mainly occupied with historical references to facts in Paul’s experience which, as we have seen, have an important bearing on the subject. Then follows an argument of the apostle, comprised in the next two chapters and a little more, while nearly a remaining third of the letter is given to precious practical instruction in various Christian duties, interspersed with a few references concerning the main subject of the epistle.

We claim that the historical facts which we have thus far noticed, and the argument which follows in chapters three and four, are intimately and logically connected; are really parts of Paul’s special effort to correct the errors into which the Galatian church had fallen, and an answer once and forever to the persistent efforts of these Judaizing teachers to bind the yoke of ceremonial observances upon the Gentile church. As one proof of this we here adduce the conclusion of Paul’s argument in the beginning of chapter five: “Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace,” etc. Here we have the leading conclusion of Paul’s lengthy argument in chapters three and four.

We have quite carefully noticed the first division of his letter, with three historical references: (1.) His account

of his own religious experience in Judaism—how weak and unprofitable it was, though he excelled all others in zeal for and proficiency in it; (2.) His reference to the Council at Jerusalem, and its decisions against the position the Galatian brethren had taken in regard to circumcision; (3.) His public reproof of Peter for weakly going back to the ceremonial law. All these refer wholly to that law. Then follow his argument and the conclusion reached. This last, we see, relates to precisely the same subject. “If ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing.” “Every man that is circumcised . . . is a debtor to do the whole law.” “Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage.” Can we conclude, with the *premises* of the argument relating to circumcision and the ceremonial law, and the *conclusion* of it relating to the same things, that the argument itself relates to a wholly different law? That would be very absurd. Therefore as we enter upon the argument itself, we have every reason to expect it will be found in perfect harmony with its premises and conclusion.

The revised version renders the first verse as follows: “O foolish Galatians, who did bewitch you, before whose eyes Jesus Christ was openly set forth crucified?” the clause “that ye should not obey the truth,” being omitted. The Diaglott is substantially the same, there being nothing in the literal Greek text to answer to that expression. “Foolish Galatians, who hath *bewitched you?*” literal Greek, “misled by delusive pretenses.” Here wrong *practices* seem to be intended. It is not likely Paul would have used such an expression, and spoken in such cutting language, if these Galatians had been making a special point of keeping the ten commandments very strictly, thinking that by so doing they would be justified by their good works. He would have spoken in milder language if their practice had been right, and simply their views of doctrine wrong. But how natural such an expression after his threefold reference to the ceremonial law in reproofing them for going back to those “weak and beggarly elements.” Paul had preached a crucified Saviour to them as their only hope. He made known unto all nothing but “Christ and him crucified.” What folly, to go back to the yoke of bondage again!

In the second verse and onward, the apostle proceeds to contrast the work of faith in Christ which had been preached to them, with the “works of the law.” Did you receive the Spirit by the works of the law, or the hearing of faith? Are ye so foolish, having begun in the Spirit, as to now seek to be made perfect by the flesh? Have all your sufferings from persecution been in vain, if it be yet in vain? Does he that works miracles among you do it by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? Those were all very pertinent questions. What does the apostle mean by the term “works of the law”? Does he mean keeping the Sabbath, and refraining from swearing, lying, stealing, murder, and adultery? or does he mean acts of obedience to the ceremonial law, which had been abolished? We all believe there are two separate, distinct laws brought to view in the Bible. Paul must have had one or the other in view. Both had “works” connected with them. The law of rites had an immense amount of these, so that they constituted a “yoke of bondage” grievous to be borne, which Paul claimed had passed away.

Much turns on the meaning we attach to this expression “works of the law,” in the discussion of the law in Galatians. The sense in which it is used in any given scripture, must be determined from the connection and the subject of discourse. None of us can deny that there are two laws, and that both of them have “works” connected with them; and this same apostle in different places discourses upon each of them. It will not do, therefore, to conclude that in every case where the term “works of the law” occurs, it must needs refer to obedience to the law of God. We claim that it usually refers to the other. Which class of works are referred to in these verses? Our reasons for understanding it to refer to circumcision, etc., are as follows: 1. This has been Paul’s subject thus far in this letter. 2. He has not spoken of the moral law previous to this, but has spoken many times of the ceremonial law. 3. He uses the same term in chap. 2:16, in reproving Peter, “because he was to be blamed,” when he recognized the laws of defilement, a few verses previous to this. There the reference to the works of the ritual law are unmistakable. He must use the term here in the same sense, to be consistent with his own argument. 4. In

the question, “Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law?” the language would imply that when they did receive the Spirit, they did not perform the works of the law. This would be an absurd conclusion if applied to the moral law; for they would not have received the Spirit had they not kept it. But the language is perfectly appropriate when applied to the ritual law. 5. It is evident that the term being “made perfect by the flesh,” in verse 3, is an expression meaning the same as the term doing the “works of the law,” found in verse 2. But this would be improper language when speaking of obedience to the moral law. The ten commandments are not fleshly. With our view, the argument is connected and logical throughout. In verse 4 he speaks of their persecutions for the gospel’s sake. In chap. 6:12 we see they could have avoided this by obedience to this ceremonial law. Then the offense of the cross would have ceased. In that case, if circumcision was accepted, all their persecutions had been for naught, and their embracing the gospel was useless. Circumcision and the ceremonial law were the saving ordinances. Christ’s death could not save them without these. Such conclusions Paul shows were the result reached, if the positions assumed by the Galatian brethren were right.

He next refers to the case of Abraham, and how faith saved him. He did not obtain his righteousness by obedience to any such laws ; but through faith. The gospel was preached to him, and he believed in the coming Seed. We become the children of Abraham by imitating his course. He believed in Him that was to come. We believe in Him that has come. In doing this, God will bless us as he did faithful Abraham. How foolish, then, the course of these Galatians, who were “bewitched” by these Judaizing teachers, to go back to circumcision, and virtually cast aside their faith in Christ!

Verse 10 : “For as many as are of the works of the law are under the 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.

“11. But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident: for, The just shall live by faith.

“12. And the law is not of faith: but, The man that doeth them shall live in them.

“13. Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.

“14. That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith.”

“For as many as are of the law [that is, as many as look to the works of the law concerning which he is speaking, for their justification, as these Galatians were doing by accepting circumcision and all that it implied] are under the 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.” This curse is found in Deuteronomy only 27:26. The “book of the law ” which was placed “in the side of the ark,” or at the side of it, contained both the moral and ceremonial laws. The language is not, Cursed be he that continueth not in all things written in the ten commandments to do them, as it doubtless would have been, had Paul had only the moral law in view. But the curse applied to any and all violations of the ceremonial law as well; for that was written in the book. Indeed a very large part of the “book of the law” was devoted to the ceremonial portion and to the civil law of the Jews. It is impossible to circumscribe this language to the transgressions of the moral law alone; for we know the “book of the law” contained more. We have no objection to the claim that the heaviest part of the curse would fall upon the violator of the moral law. But while the *whole* “book of the law ” remained in force, the curse would also apply to violations of that. Therefore it was proper for Paul to refer to this in his argument. If these Galatians were going to reestablish the whole Jewish system, which would be the logical result of their action in adopting circumcision, they must thereby bring themselves under a curse. They well knew they had not always continued “in all things ... written in the book of the law to do them.” Instead of obtaining a blessing in their new departure from the faith of the gospel, they were bringing upon themselves a curse by going back to that ritual law.

“But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident: for, The just shall live by faith” Justification by the law is here used in the sale sense as in chap. 2:16, where Paul is reproving Peter for not eating

with the Gentiles, thus raising up again what he had formerly thrown down. Also in chap. 5:3, 4: “For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace.” The connection in both these cases shows what law he was talking about. These Galatians were going back to the old, abolished remedial system for justification. The Judaizing teachers had told them they could not be saved by Christ without it. They virtually cast aside Christ as their Saviour. They were “fallen from grace.” But Paul taught the folly of this. There was no law in the universe ever given which would justify the breaker of it. “The law is not of faith: but, The man that doeth them shall live in them.” Any law enacted by competent authority, demands perfect obedience while it remains in force. This principle is true of moral, ceremonial, and civil laws alike. But as this has never been fully done, another provision must be made. God has provided it in *justification by faith*. The ceremonial law and the remedial system connected with it never did present adequate provisions for pardon and justification. The blood of bulls and goats could never take away sin. All the multitude of services, ceremonies, “divers washings, and carnal ordinances” were imposed only “ until the time of reformation.” How foolish, then, for these Galatians to go back again and set up that abolished law by which to obtain justification! This seems to be the reasoning of the apostle.

“*Christ* hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.” The original word rendered “*redeem*,” means to “buy from, redeem, or set free.”—*Greenfield*. (He quotes this text as an illustration.) We accept this statement to its fullest extent. Our friends who claim that the moral law is the subject of Paul’s discussion in this epistle, make their strongest argument, we think, upon this text. We wish to go with them as far as we can consistently. We are perfectly willing to admit that the curse brought to view in this text, from which Christ redeems his people, principally includes transgressions of the moral law; and that the words, “ Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire” (Matt. 26:41) refer to the time when the curse of God will fall upon the sin-

ner who fails to exercise faith in Christ and be thus “redeemed” from this curse. But how far does this go in setting aside our position upon the law in Galatians?—Not far, we think.

In order to have a clear, connected view of the apostle’s argument, we must keep before us all the circumstances of time and place. He stood at the time of transition from the old dispensation to the new. But very few up to this time had realized that there was any great transition. They did not comprehend that those laws which had distinguished God’s people for nearly two thousand years were to pass out of existence. Their feelings revolted at the thought. It took a long time for the bulk of the Hebrew church to take in this thought. They supposed these laws were still biding. They did not comprehend all that was contained in the death of Christ. God had to raise up Paul as a special instrument, and inspire him especially with light to make this subject clear. To them Paul’s argument sounded very different than it does to us, after eighteen centuries of Gentile influences. They would be likely to understand that the curse of the law would also apply to those who did not obey the law of Moses. And who will dare say that the curse would not apply to violators of the law of Moses contained in the “*book,*” *while that law was in force?* It most assuredly would. But “Christ hath redeemed us [literally, *set us free*] from the curse of the law” by being made a curse himself by hanging “on a tree.” What force would this have to the Galatian church?—Very great force. They, were trying to remove the curse of condemnation from themselves, so they could be “saved ” by being circumcised, and going back to the abolished law of Moses for their justification. Paul told them, and proved it, too, from the Scriptures, that the death of Christ alone furnishes redemption. They were entirely wrong in their anticipations. This conclusion is in perfect harmony with Paul’s whole argument.

Vem14. Abraham received a great blessing through his faith in the promised Seed. We receive the same blessing by imitating his conduct; by believing on Him that has come, who demonstrated his Messiahship by fulfilling all the conditions set before him in the Scriptures. We receive the Spirit by accepting him. The Galatians did not obtain the Spirit through their obedience to the law of

Moses. They received it when faith in Christ as their only Saviour was cherished.

Verse15: “Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; Though it be but a man’s covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth, or addeth thereto.

“16. Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ.

“17. And this I say, that the covenant, 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.

“18. For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise: but God gave it to Abraham by promise.

“19. 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.”

The apostle first speaks of the sacredness of a covenant, compact, or promise. Even a man’s covenant, if confirmed, is sacred, and cannot be set aside. He then refers to the promises to Abraham, and bases an argument upon the fact that in making the promise God uses the singular number instead of the plural, when he brings to view the expected seed. The promise was not to “seeds” (plural), but to his “seed” (singular), showing that the promise was not fulfilled in all of Abraham’s descendants according to the flesh, but that it was to be met in the one descendant, Christ the heir. And this promise, properly confirmed by God, cannot be set aside by a law given four hundred and thirty years after. The promise has the precedence in time and importance. And this promise of the “seed,” Christ, is the foundation of our hope of the future inheritance. Our hope of that does not originate with this law made four hundred and thirty years later. How foolish, then, that the Galatians should ignore the promise, and go back to that law for their hope of salvation, thus virtually setting aside Christ, the real foundation of their hopes for future good. The great fact that God gave the inheritance by promise to Abraham through this Seed, four hundred and thirty years before this law was given to which they looked for justification, conclusively shows their folly in basing their hopes upon this law.

“Wherefore then serveth the law?” that is, this law of which he is speaking, what was its object or purpose? What use did it serve? “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.” This verse is a great central illuminator in the apostle’s argument. He here gives us the design of that law of which he was speaking, the time when given, the point to which it extended, the agencies by which it was brought into existence, and the reasons why it was given. If these conditions *reasonably, naturally apply* to the moral law, then our friends who hold that view concerning the law in Galatians should have the benefit of the evidence. Let us examine this scripture carefully. What law is intended by these expressions?

1. It is reasonable to suppose that this reference to the law will be in harmony with Paul’s argument in the preceding part of the letter, which clearly brings to view the ceremonial law and not the moral law.

2. This law was given four hundred and thirty years after the promise to Abraham. Could it, therefore, be the same as “my commandments, my statutes, and my laws” which Abraham kept? Gen. 26:5. They were evidently the moral law; hence this is not.

3. This law was “added *because of transgressions*.” The original word signifies “to pass by or over; to transgress or violate.” This law, then, had been “added” because some other law had been “passed by,” “transgressed,” or “violated.” It was not “added” to itself because itself had been “violated.” This would be absurd if applied to the moral law; for none of us claim there was any more of the moral law really in existence after the ten commandments were spoken than there had been before. They all existed before, though Israel may have been ignorant of portions of them. If the word rendered “added” in both the old and revised versions be rendered “appointed,” as some do render it, the conclusion is equally clear. It could not properly be said that the moral law was “appointed four hundred and thirty years after Abraham, when we see that it existed and he fully kept it at that time. It would be absurd to suppose this law was “added” to itself. It does apply reasonably to another law, brought in because the one previously existing had

been “violated.” A law cannot be transgressed unless it exists; for “where no law is, there is no transgression.”!

4. The law “added because of transgressions” unmistakably points to a *remedial system*, temporary in duration, “till the seed should come.” The moral law is referred to as the one transgressed. But the “added” law, of which Paul is speaking, made provision for the forgiveness of these transgressions in figure, till the real, Sacrifice should be offered.

5. “Till the seed should come,” limits the duration of this remedial system, beyond all question. The word “till,” or “until,” ever has that signification. The “added” law, then, was to exist no longer than “till the seed should come.” This the language unmistakably declares. Did the moral law extend no farther than the full development of the Messiah? No Seventh-day Adventist will admit that. But this was precisely the case with the other law.

6. The “added” law was “ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator.” All agree that this “mediator” was Moses, who went between God and the people. The original word for “ordained” is rendered “promulgate” by Greenfield, who cites this text as an illustration. Was it true that the ten commandments were “ordained, or promulgated,” “by angels” in or by the hand of Moses? God himself spoke them with a voice that shook the earth, and wrote them with his own finger on the stone tablets. But the other law was given through angels, and written in a “book” by the “*hand of Moses*.” If the reader desires to see some of the instances where the same expression substantially is used when speaking of the “law of Moses,” we refer him to Lev. 26:46; Num. 4:37; 15:22, 23; and especially Neh. 9:13, 14, where the distinction is clearly made between the laws which God spoke and the “precepts, statutes, and laws” given “by the hand of Moses.” Many others might be cited.

These reasons seem very clearly to prove that the law concerning which the apostle is speaking, is the law of Moses written in a book, especially the typical remedial system.

Our friends who hold the view that it is the moral law, of course make every effort possible to avoid this conclusion. They claim that the typical law was also in exis-

tence long before the law was given on Sinai; that it was recognized when the patriarchs offered sacrifices, even from the time of Abel, and that it would be as proper to speak of the “ordaining” of the moral law at Sinai as of the ceremonial, since both had a previous existence; that the principles of both laws had been lost sight of through sin and the captivity in Egypt. We know this is measurably true. But there remains this difference: the language unmistakably refers to a remedial system. “It was added because of transgressions.” A previous law existed to be transgressed, and this added law was to provide a temporal remedy “till the seed should come.” This language can never reasonably apply to the moral law; but it does apply to the ceremonial. No matter whether added at Sinai or as soon as man sinned in the Garden of Eden, it remains true of the typical remedial system that it was “added because of transgressions,” but is not true of the moral law.

We also contend that the typical remedial system was not really “ordained” before Sinai and understood by the people in any such sense as the moral law was. We admit they did make offerings of beasts in sacrifice, and knew of some other services afterward incorporated into the law of Moses. But as a *system* it was *not* known to any such degree as were the principles of the ten commandments. We can find constant references to these, where persons well understood their existence. Cain knew very well he had broken God’s law and was guilty. Abraham kept these statutes, commandments, and laws. The antediluvians and Sodomites were destroyed as “sinners;” *i.e.*, transgress of them. Joseph understood as well as we the wickedness of adultery, and would not commit this “great wickedness, and sin against God.” Enoch and Noah were “perfect” men and “walked with God.” They must, therefore, have been well acquainted with the principles of the moral law.

But by far the largest portion of the typical remedial system owed its vary existence to the time of Moses. The passover, the new moons, the sanctuary services other than offerings, the day of atonement, the pentecost, the special laws concerning uncleanness, the feast. of tabernacles, various death penalties, the immense number of ordinances, etc, growing out of the priesthood work of the Levites and the civil laws of the Jewish nation, the special offerings connected with the scape-goat, and many other things

too numerous to mention here connected with that system, were never heard of, indeed had no existence, before the book of the law was given. They were “ordained” at that time, as Paul indicates.

Another argument, a very late invention, designed to avoid the conclusion that the “added” law terminated at the cross, we briefly notice. It is the claim that “the seed” has not yet come, and will not come till the second advent of Christ. It would be hard for the writer to really think that any believer in Christ would take that position, had we not read it in our own beloved *Signs of the Times*, of July 29, 1886. It is seriously argued through two or three columns that the expression “till the seed should come to whom the promise was made” cannot be fulfilled till the promises made to the Seed are fulfilled. A large number of these are cited. But does the language indicate this? The coming of the Seed is one thing, and the fulfillment of the promises made to that Seed quite another thing. If the Seed never comes till the promises made to him are fulfilled, we shall have to wait a long time for the coming of the Seed; for some of them reach through eternity. “For unto us a child is born [the birth of this child by the woman, and his development until an offering for the sins of men is provided, is the coming of the Seed], unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever.” Isa. 9:6, 7. The promises to this Seed, many of them, reach beyond the second advent,—as does this one,—even into eternity. So, according to this reasoning, we may wait to all eternity for the Seed to come. But the apostle, in the expressions used, does not say *promises*, but “promise,” referring directly to the promise made to Abraham. But in the promise made to Abraham (Gen. 12:1-7; 17:1-8; both promises are really one), he agrees to make him and his seed a blessing to all the nations of the earth, and to give him the land of Canaan, which Paul, in Rom. 4:13, enlarges to include all the “world.”

Shall we conclude that a part of this promise is not already in process of fulfillment? Are not the nations of the earth already being greatly blessed in that seed by virtue of the way of salvation being opened to them all, and because of the precious influences of the gospel? Who dare deny it? If a part of these promises are being fulfilled in this present state, then according to that writer's own reasoning the Seed has already come. If we must wait till *all* that promise made to Abraham is fulfilled before we look for the Seed, then the Seed cannot come till the end of the one thousand years; for the land is not inherited by Abraham till that time. The earth is a waste, a howling wilderness, for one thousand years after Christ comes. We can but regard such a position as this as utterly untenable and absurd.

The coming of the Seed is one thing, and the fulfillment of the promises after the Seed comes, quite another. Indeed, of necessity the Seed must come before *any* of the promises made to the Seed could be fulfilled. A portion of them are already being fulfilled; hence the Seed has already come. Paul says (verse 16), "And to thy seed, which is Christ." The "seed" and Christ, then, are one and the same. Therefore if the "seed" has not come, Christ has not come, in which case we are all in our sins, lost, without hope. To such preposterous conclusions does this position in the *Signs* lead.

Again, if the Seed does not come till the second advent, as the existence of the law was to terminate when the Seed came, if that law is the moral law, we must of necessity conclude that God's law ceases when Christ comes the second time—a conclusion but little less erroneous than the one which teaches its abrogation at the first advent. But why are such astonishing and erroneous positions as this taken?—To escape in some way the conclusion of Gal. 3:19, that this "added" law was to terminate at the cross. The Seed *has* come, born of a woman, the God-man, partaking of our nature. He can never become to all eternity any more "the seed of the woman" the promised "seed of Abraham," than he is already. We should like to have any one tell us how Christ becomes any more like the seed of Abraham" at the second advent than he was at the first? Is he to be born again of another descendant of the great patriarch? The whole idea is preposterous.

This promised Seed made his great sacrifice for the race, by which they are being blessed, and there this "added law" terminated.

Verse 20: "Now a mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is one.

"21. Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid: for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law.

"22. But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.

"23. But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed.

"24. Wherefore the law was our school-master to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith.

"25. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a school-master.

"26. For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.

"27. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.

"28. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.

"29. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."

In these verses the apostle continues to discuss this "added" law with special reference to the object it was to accomplish. It was not against the promises of God, but rather designed to provide a temporary help to the people till in the "fullness of time," when the "seed should come," and the promises through the Seed should begin to be fulfilled. During all this time preceding the coming of the Seed, this promise of the Seed was the great hope of the people. The law given four hundred and thirty years after, by the same God who made the promise, of course would not stand in the way of, or set aside, a most glorious promise given by a God who could not lie. This "added" law would conduce to the same end by preparing the minds of the people for the full fruition of the promise. The promise that all the nations of the earth shall be

blessed in this Seed the greatest hope ever vouchsafed to the race. This law was secondary to the promise, not “against” it. It was impossible, in the nature of things, for a law to be given which could give life to a race of sinners who had violated the divine law, the great moral rule which had ever been in force. The hope of the *promised Seed*, a more efficient agency than any law that could be given was provided by infinite wisdom to meet that want. Doubtless many Jews believed that “life” could be obtained by obedience to the “added” law of types, ceremonies, offered beasts, and blood streaming down the altars. But they did not see clearly the object of this law. They did not realize that it was only a temporary arrangement, shadowing forth darkly in figures, types, and allegories, the coming of the Seed and his great sacrifice. And even after Christ had come and died, many did not comprehend it who professed to believe on him. They still said, “Except ye be circumcised,” and “keep the law of Moses,” “ye cannot be saved.”

This kind of teaching followed Paul wherever he went. God had raised him up with special reference to clearly explaining this great transition from the old to the new dispensation. And now he presents the matter to these Galatian brethren who had been bewitched by this Judaizing teaching. “If there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law;” and the terrible sacrifice of the Son of God would not have been necessary. These Galatians had taken the contradictory position of believing in Christ, and at the same time going back for salvation to services which, if in force, would make his death unnecessary; looking for salvation to obedience to a law whose main object had been to point out Christ’s great sacrifice for sin.

“But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.” The revised version and the Diaglott say, “shut up” all under sin. This is the meaning of the original Greek word. All are sinners, Jew and Gentile alike. All need a Saviour. Though the Jews had kept this “added” law, and taught it to the Gentiles as necessary to salvation, yet they needed a SAaviour just as much as did the Gentiles. How inconsistent, then, for the Galatians to go back to a law which would not save those who had

kept it! “But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed.” Is this text speaking of individuals previous to conversion, under the condemnation of the moral law till faith in Christ dawns upon their hearts? or does it speak of Paul’s nation, the Jews, under guardianship as wards, under a provisional temporary system until Christ should come? Much turns upon which of these positions is the true one. We take the latter view unhesitatingly. The revised version reads: “But before faith came [*the faith*, margin], we were kept in ward under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed.” Being “in ward,” Webster defines as “the state of being under guard, or guardianship,” “the condition of a child under custody.” The Diaglott renders it, “And before the coming of *that faith*, we were guarded under law, being shut up together for the faith being about to be revealed.”

There can be no question but that the text brings to view a peculiar provisional arrangement, a “guarding” of a body of people, a “shutting them up together,” an “enclosing of them,” as the original Greek word signifies, until a certain time is reached when “*that faith*” will be revealed. We confidently assert that the word “*faith*” here is not used in the sense of a person’s individual belief in Christ as a means of personal pardon for his sins, but is used in the sense of that great system of truth devised by God for the salvation of man—the belief in a crucified Saviour and kindred truths growing out of this central fact. Jude writes of the “common salvation,” and that we “should earnestly contend for *the faith* which was once delivered unto the saints.” Verse 3. We speak of keeping “*the faith* of Jesus.” Paul, in his closing words, said he had “kept *the faith*.” And in this same epistle to the Galatians he speaks of *the faith* which he preached (chap. 1:23), and of the “household of faith.” Chap. 6:10. Indeed, in a large number of instances where the word “faith” is used in the New Testament, it has this sense, as any one can see by taking his Concordance.

The Jewish people and all proselytes who had any regard for the God of the Hebrews, were thus kept under this provisional system of the “added” law, “shut up,” hedged about by national barriers of distinction, from the rest of

the world. They could not eat with them or associate intimately with them. A “middle wall of partition” divided them from others. They were “enclosed,” guarded on the right hand and on the left, till the great system of faith in a crucified Saviour was “afterwards revealed” by the coming of the promised “seed.”

We would be much pleased to have our friends who hold that this “added” law was the ten commandments, tell us how the law against blasphemy, murder, lying, stealing, etc., “shut individuals up,” “guard” them “in ward,” in the relation of a “child to a guardian,” to a “revelation” to be made “afterwards.” But it is thought that in this verse the expression “under the law,” must refer to the sinner under the condemnation of the moral law. Lengthy arguments have been made in support of this; but we fail to see evidence to prove this position. We claim that this expression “under the law ” has two significations: (1.) Primarily meaning under the authority of the law, or under obligation to keep it; (2.) Under the condemnation of the law, with its penalty impending over us, or already suffering it. The expression itself does not decide which of these meanings is to be understood; the connection must decide that. The Greek word rendered “under,” is *hupo*. It is used a great many times in the New Testament, and in the great majority of instances is rendered. “of,” “with,” or “by,” as the reader will see by examining his Greek Concordance. Greenfield gives a variety of definitions, such as the sense in many places requires, one of which is, “Of subjection to a law,” etc. He gives no instance where it is used in the sense of being subject to the condemnation of the law; yet we are free to grant that it sometimes has that sense. But that is not the primary meaning of the term.

We read in Matt. 8:9 of “a man *under* authority, having soldiers *under*” him; i.e., authority was over him, and he was in authority over the soldiers, and each was to obey; not that he was under the condemnation of authority or the soldiers under his condemnation. “Under” in both cases is from the same word *hupo*. In Rom. 13:1 we read: “The powers that be are ordained *of* God.” “Of, is from *hupo*; i.e. under the authority of God. In Gal. 4:2 we read of the child living “under [*hupo*] tutors and governors;” i.e., they have authority over the child, not

that it is under their condemnation. Other illustrations might be given of the same sense. Indeed, the very nature of the expression itself signifies this, “under the law” simply meaning the law being above or having authority over the persons who were under it. This is the primary, simplest meaning of this term; and unless strong reasons can be adduced to the contrary, we should always give the expression this signification. Where reasons can be given to show that the sense requires us to understand it to mean the condemnation of the law, then we will so understand it, and not before. But evidently in the text we are now examining it means simply that the Jews were “shut up” under the authority of that typical remedial system, with its barriers, walls of separation, etc., till the system of faith should be revealed under which they could find salvation.

“Wherefore the law was our school-master to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith.” “Wherefore” “expresses a consequence” from his preceding reasoning. The original Greek word requires this, as Greenfield states. The law “was [revised version, *hath been*] our *paidagogos*” (literal Greek), or pedagogue. The word occurs but three times in the New Testament, twice in this connection and once where it is rendered “instructor.” Greenfield defines it as follows: “A person, usually a slave or freed man, to whom the care of the boys of a family was committed, who trained them up and formed their manners, attended them at their play, led them to and from the public school, and, when they were grown up, became their companions, *noted for their imperiousness and severity*; in the New Testament, director, governor, instructor, leader. 1 Cor. 4:15; tropically *spoken of the Mosaic law*. Gal. 3:24,25.”

We have no person in our domestic or educational system in this age answering to this term. It is not properly a “school-master” or an “instructor” in the sense in which we would understand those terms. This person led the boys to school to be instructed by others. They did not continue to occupy this relation to them after the boys were grown to manhood. They merely held a temporary position, to pass away when the boys were fully developed. They were “noted for their *imperiousness and severity*.” They had the boys especially under their charge merely for a season. Does the holy eternal law of God, the “law

of liberty,” occupy such a position as this? Is its relation to man that of a slave, an inferior, in any period of his life? Is it severe, “imperious,” because endued with a little temporary authority? Is its position merely a temporary one, lasting till the Christian is developed, and then ceasing its claims? Was it the office of the “*paidagogos*” after he got the boys to school, to then turn around and become their instructor, their supreme authority, ever after? Such views of the relation of God’s law to the sinner or any body else, would be manifestly absurd.

But this relation eminently fits if we apply it to that provisional temporary system of law in which the Jew and proselyte were “shut up,” “in ward,” till the “middle wall of partition” was “broken down.” It was a “*severe*” system, “yoke of bondage” which they could not bear, “against” them, and “contrary to” them.

Paul draws his conclusion from his reasoning in the previous verses, which we have examined. The moral law never led a man to Christ and left him. It always stays with him. We may be delivered from its condemnation; but its supreme authority must be regarded then as before. Its claims never leave us. There is nothing in that law about Christ, not a hint. All the law does, is to condemn those who break it, and justify those who keep it. It is the sense of guilt in the man’s conscience which is acted upon by the Spirit of God, which makes him go to Christ, not anything in the moral law itself. But this “added” law did lead to Christ. Every type, every sacrifice, every feast day, holy day, new moon, and annual Sabbath, and all the priestly offerings and services pointed out something in the work of Christ. They were as a body “shut up,” “guarded,” under the control of this “severe,” “imperious” pedagogue, till the great system of justification by faith was reached at the cross of Christ. Mr. Greenfield could readily see that this pedagogue must be used as an illustration of the “Mosaic law.” It is strange that all others cannot see the same. “But after *that* faith is come, we are no longer under a [pedagogue, or] school-master.” The coming of “that faith” is the full development of the great system of faith or truth growing out of the death of Christ. “We are no longer under a” “pedagogue,” *i.e.*, no longer under his authority; his authority is no longer over us, because his office ceased when the “seed” came. Then all that accept

Christ in his true character, are children of God. They are “baptized into Christ,” and hence “have put on Christ.”

What, now, does Paul conclude from these grand truths?—“There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all *one in Christ Jesus*.” All national social barriers are broken down in presence of the liberty which is in Christ Jesus; that is, all stand on a level before God. The proud Jew must come to God through Christ, the same as the despised barbarian. The females are no longer to be divided off into different worshiping assemblies by a special court because God looks upon a man with so much more favor than upon a woman. The poor slave can come to the blessed Saviour just as freely as can the lordly master who pretends to own him. All God now requires is a humble heart, repentance and confession of sin, faith in the precious blood of Christ, and a determination to serve God and obey all his requirements; and God regards one class as well as another.

This may seem to us, eighteen centuries after these national and social distinctions have been swept away, as so plain a truth that it need not be demonstrated by an argument. But when Paul proclaimed it, it stirred up a bitterness in the minds of the supercilious Jews, of which we can scarcely conceive. They followed him everywhere, thirsting for his blood. The Jew had no thought of surrendering the preeminence he had so long held. The Greeks and Romans also exalted themselves as highly favored people. This great truth needed then, and has ever since, to be made plain to keep down pride, caste, and all social exclusiveness.

This forcible statement of the equity of all before God, is clearly a conclusion of the apostle’s argument. To deny this, would be to charge the apostle with bringing in foreign matter in no wise related to his subject. But will our friends explain to us how this conclusion would grow out of his argument if it concerned the moral law? Did that law, in its relation to the sinner, create national distinctions between the Jew and Greek, bond or free, male and female?—Certainly not. But the ceremonial law did. It was the very agency which created them in circumcision and what it represented.

“If ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed, and heirs

according to the promise.” Here we have another of Paul’s important sub-conclusions, growing out of his argument. These poor Galatians had been made to believe, and myriads of others have been in the same danger, that they “*must be circumcised,*” and “keep the law of Moses,” in order to be “Abraham’s seed.” So these had been turned away to “another gospel.” But Paul had shown by this very process of reasoning that faith in Christ, the promised “seed” of Abraham, would make them heirs of Abraham such as the promise really had in view. Hence circumcision and the “law of Moses” was all unnecessary. They were no longer “under” them.

Chapter 4:1: “Now I say, That the heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all;

“2. But is under tutors and governors, until the time appointed of the father,

“3. Even so we, when we were children, were in bondage under the elements of the world;

“4. But when the fullness of time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law.

“5. To redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons.

“6. And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.

“7. Wherefore, thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ.

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

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

“10. Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years.

“11. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain.”

In the first verses of this quotation, the apostle again brings to view the provisional nature of this added law, as he did in the scriptures recently noticed. He illustrates the subject by the case of an heir, who, as long as he remaineth a child, is really in the same condition as a servant. He is under tutors and governors until he reaches the age of maturity, when he is an independent freeman,

to go forth and perform work suitable to those who have reached the stage of manhood. He “is *under* tutors and governors, until the time appointed of the father. Even so we, when we were children, were in bondage *under* the elements of the world.” This continued until a certain time was reached, “the fullness of time,” when “God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made *under* the law, to redeem them that were *under* the law.” Here are certain expressions which have a very important bearing on the argument concerning the law in Galatians. In Paul’s illustration we see the Jewish people were “under the elements of the world,” even as the minor was “under tutors and governors,” till “the fullness of time was come.” This point of time is the very same as that when Christ was made “under the law, to redeem them that were under the law” spoken of in the previous chapter. It is plain, therefore, that being under the “elements of the world,” and “under the law,” here are precisely the same thing. The use the apostle makes of the pronoun “we” is also significant, evidently referring to himself and his people previous to the coming of “the fullness of time.” When he comes to speak of the Galatians, he says “ye,” in each case. Those whom he speaks of as “we,” were in a state of minority, children, “under the elements of the world,” till “the fullness of time was come,” that “we might receive the adoption of sons.” They could not receive this full “adoption” till the promised “seed” came. Then when they became Christ’s, they were adopted as a part of Abraham’s seed.

What are these “elements” which the apostle speaks of, in which they were in bondage until God sent forth his Son made under the law? Are they the commandments of God, the law of liberty, that holy, pure law which will be the rule in the Judgment? We think this would be a conclusion most absurd. We claim with great confidence that these “elements” refer to a different system. The original word is defined by Greenfield: “Elementary instruction, first principles, the lowest rudiments in knowledge, science, etc.” The word is translated “rudiments” in the revised version and in the Diaglott. The same word occurs in Col. 2:20, where it is translated “rudiments:” “Wherefore if ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, are ye

subject to, ordinances, (Touch not; taste not; handle not),” etc. These words occur just after he had been speaking of “blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and” taking “it out of the way, nailing it to his cross;” saying also, “Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in 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.” It is very plain therefore that the apostle in Colossians, is speaking of the rudiments of the world,—the same expression precisely in the original as we have in Galatians,—refers to matters connected with the ceremonial law. He also states that their being under these “elements,” or rudiments, brought them into “bondage.”

How plain it is that these “elements ” are the same as the law of which Paul speaks in Gal. 5:1: “Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing”! Also as the law spoken of by the apostle Peter in Acts 15:10, in the famous Council: “Now therefore why tempt ye Cod, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear?” referring, as every one knows, to the law of Moses, circumcision, etc.; also to that mentioned in Col 2:14: “Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us.” In all of these scriptures, the reference is unmistakably to a law of temporary duration, onerous, burdensome, and different from the gospel of free salvation through Christ, the ritual law and not the moral.

The parallel condition under these rudiments cannot refer to the individual experience of persons but must refer to the condition in which all were placed until “the fullness of the time was come when God sent forth his Son. It would be preposterous to say of each individual person in a condition of sinfulness, under the condemnation of the moral law, that he should remain in that condition until “the fulness of the time” was reached when God should send forth his Son, made under the law. That expression refers to the full development of Christ as the Messiah; but it is eminently applicable when spoken of

the Israelites before Christ’s gospel was preached. They were in the position of children under mere rudimentary instruction, awaiting the fullness of time when God should send forth his Son with great effulgence of light. Their instruction was in shadows and ceremonies, all pointing forward to the time when God should send forth his Son.

This scripture we understand to be parallel in many respects with the statement in the preceding chapter, where the added law is spoken of, which was to last “till the seed should come;” and with that statement in verse 23 of chapter 3, where they were “shut up [kept in ward] unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed.” When these temporary provisions had reached their consummation, and the fullness of time had come, then the temporary gave place to the permanent, the shadowy to the substance, the condition of childhood to that of manhood; and the middle wall of partition passing away, all could now become one in Christ Jesus, a child of God of the seed of Abraham, who had received the adoption of sons of God, God giving them special witness in the pouring out of his Spirit. They were no longer servants under a temporary arrangement, but heirs of God through Christ.

In verse 4, where Paul speaks of God’s sending forth his Son, made of a woman, we have the expression “made under the law.” We have already considered the meaning of this term, “under the law,” and have clearly shown that it does not always mean under the condemnation of the law, but rather under the authority of the law, or under obligation to keep it. The term evidently has this meaning here. Both the revised version and the Diaglott translate “made under the law,” “*born* under the law.” Greenfield, in the definition of the original word, which has a great variety of significations, quotes its use in this fourth verse with the definition, “subject to the law.” This evidently is the correct sense in which it should be used. It is not true that our Saviour was born under the condemnation of the law of God. This would be manifestly absurd. That he did voluntarily take the sins of the world upon him in his great sacrifice upon the cross, we admit; but he was not *born* under its condemnation. Of him that was pure, and had never committed a sin in his life, it would be an astonishing perversion of all proper theology to say he was born under the condemnation of God’s law.

But how clearly and forcibly this applies to the facts in his life; if we understand it as referring to his *being subject to* the Mosaic law. He was born as a Jew, was circumcised when eight days old, and his parents went through the accustomed days of purification, according to the law of Moses. They presented the child as their firstborn, as the law required, and offered as a sacrifice a pair of turtle doves or two young pigeons. He lived under all the ceremonies and observances of the law of Moses the same as did the other Jews. Thus he was “*born under the law,*” and subject to it. All his life he was careful not to break any of its provisions, and he never permitted his disciples to do it to the day of his death. He even refused to labor especially for the Gentiles, because he was sent to “the lost sheep of the house of Israel.” How plainly we see, then, that he was “made under the law;” that is, subject to the law the same as others, that he might “redeem them that were under the law.” “He came unto his own [the Jewish people], and his own received him not.” And we cannot doubt that had they received him, a way would have been provided by which that nation would have been greatly honored, and all the Gentiles would have come to their knowledge of Christ through God’s adopted people. But they rejected him, and this made the way to the Gentiles still more free than it would have been. So we see great force in this expression of Christ’s being under the law; that is, subject to its requirements.

God had honored the Hebrew nation by separating them out from the world by those peculiar institutions of which circumcision was the sign, and ordained that the true children of Christ should come through them, and gave them the greatest light of all others, that they might have no excuse, but be honored of God, if they would accept the Messiah. His great desire was to redeem them from sin those who were under or subject to that law. This was the desire of Paul also, and he would have been willing to give even his life if he could but save his own nation. But in their stubbornness, exclusiveness, and supercilious ideas of themselves as the only people whom God could honor, they lost the blessing which they might have obtained by humbly accepting Christ. All these “elements,” or rudiments, of knowledge which they obtained by means of the typical system, pointed them forward to the precious bless-

ings which came through the knowledge and acceptance of the Son of God.

This expression “under the law” in verse 4, is evidently used in precisely the same sense as “under tutors and governors,” in verse 2. “Under tutors and governors” does not mean under their condemnation, or frown, or rod of punishment; no, not by any means; but under their protection, guidance, authority, etc. So Christ was made, or born, under the law (that is, subject to it) in the same sense that they were under tutors and governors. This is in the same sense as the word is used in chap. 3:23: “Before faith came, we were kept under the law;” that is, subject to it, shut up with it, until the time when Christ should come. The apostle’s illustration of their previous condition under the ceremonial law, as a child under tutors and governors, is a most forcible evidence that our position is correct that the law in Galatians refers to the ceremonial system, and cannot possibly refer to the moral law. The language concerning “elements of the world”—these “weak and beggarly elements” to which they desired to return, under which they had been in servitude—it is utterly inconsistent to apply to the law which is “spiritual,” “holy, just, and good.”

After having spoken in the first verse of the chapter of the condition of God’s people previous to the coming of Christ, in verse 6 he makes his argument applicable to the Galatians, to whom he was writing. They had become converted, had become “sons.” God had sent forth his Spirit into their hearts, so they could cry, “Abba Father.” Now they were no longer servants to go back to that old provisional system; hence their course in following the teachings of these Jews was all out of place. They were heirs of God through Christ when they received the gospel. In verses 3-11 we have an interesting point noticed, as follows: “Howbeit then, when ye knew not God, ye did service unto them which by nature are no gods; but now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage? Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain.” We claim this language to be a very strong evidence of the truthfulness of our position, and therefore wholly incon-

sistent with the position that our friends take that this law is the law of God. But to avoid this conclusion, they even argue that the “weak and beggarly elements” and the observance of “days, and months, and times, and years” has reference to heathen customs and not to those of the ceremonial law. We cannot accept this view of the subject; for we feel sure it is not the truth. The language clearly shows that the persons referred to had in some period of their lives been the worshipers of other gods. This we admit. We also admit that some of the Galatians were of this class. But these admissions do not by any means necessitate the conclusion our friends would draw from this scripture.

Our position is, that these persons referred to here were proselytes. We present a brief argument on this subject to make our position clear. No intelligent student of history will deny that at the time of Christ’s advent, and for a generation preceding that event, there were most earnest efforts made by the Jewish people to proselyte Gentiles to their faith. From the time of the Babylonian captivity, they had been largely scattered among all the nations around about Palestine. They were an enterprising and commercial people, as they always have been. Scarcely any nation could have stood the persecution and hatred that have followed them, and yet maintained themselves as a distinct people, as the Jews have in almost every part of the earth. Comparatively few of the nation ever returned from captivity to Judea to make it their home. Vast multitudes would come from nearly every part of the Roman Empire on the feast days, so much so that even more than a million would often be in and encamped around the holy city. There was scarcely a nation of any importance with whom the Jews did not trade and carry on the avocations of life. Their synagogues were established in the leading cities. Any one who has read the Acts of the Apostles knows that in every prominent place where Paul went to labor, he entered the synagogue of the Jews first. These synagogues were, of course, established in the midst of an idolatrous population whose religious systems were unreasonable and absurd. Many of the more sensible people became attached to these Jewish synagogues, and attended them to learn of the true God.

This is evidently one great reason why God permitted

his people to be scattered in all these countries. He placed them in the land of Palestine, which was like a bridge, or open pathway, through which the nations of the earth traveled to and fro between Egypt, Assyria, and the other nations of the earth. This was done that his law might enlighten the people of the world. When the Israelites went into captivity, and saw that their idolatry and neglect of God’s law had brought his frown upon them, they became more zealous, so they never lapsed into idolatry again; and, being scattered throughout the nations of the world, they prepared the way for the advent of the Messiah.

That the Jews had a disposition to proselyte, there can be no question. Our Saviour said of them, “Ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte.” Matt. 23:15. This language shows the intense interest they had in the work of making people favorable to their views. The reason of this can be seen at a glance, when we consider that they were scattered among the different nations, and their vocations in life were at the mercy of the heathen around them; they would naturally desire to have them take a favorable view of their religion, and be interested in it. Some of them might proselyte for the purpose of saving their souls; but selfish motives evidently actuated these of whom our Saviour speaks, for they made them even more the children of hell than themselves. Their success in proselyting is evident from many scriptures; even some eminent persons like the queen of Sheba in the Old Testament, and Candace in the New Testament (Acts 8:27), and King Izates, with his queen, Helena, as mentioned by Josephus, are royal representatives. Conybeare and Howson, in their “Life and Epistles of the Apostle Paul,” speak concerning the extent of this work of proselyting, as follows:—

“During the time of the Maccabees, some alien tribes were forcibly incorporated with the Jews. This was the case with the Itureans, and probably with the Moabites, and, above all, with the Edomites, with whose name that of the Herodian family is historically connected. How far Judaism extended among the vague collection of tribes called Arabians, we can only conjecture from the curious history of the Homerites, and from the actions of such chieftains as Aretas (2 Cor. 11:32). But as we travel toward the west and north, into countries better known, we

find no lack of evidence of the moral effect of the synagogues, with their worship of Jehovah and their prophecies of the Messiah.” There are numerous instances in the Acts of the Apostles where we see that these views are indicated.

Nicholas of Antioch, one of the seven deacons, was a proselyte. Acts 6:5. There were vast multitudes of Greeks attending worship at Jerusalem, many of whom were evidently proselytes. In Acts 13:50 we read: “But the Jews stirred up the devout and honorable women, and the chief men of the city, and raised persecution against Paul and Barnabas.” These were evidently of the same class. Timothy was really a proselyte, and it cannot be doubted that the way the apostle gained access to the Gentiles, was largely through the interest many of them had in the worship of the synagogues. This was the case in nearly every city into which they entered. These proselytes were of two classes, as any one may see by examining the Dictionaries, or Cruden’s large Concordance. One class, called the “proselytes of justice,” were those who *fully* accepted the teachings of the Jews, being circumcised, offering sacrifices, etc., according to the law of Moses. But a far larger class were called “proselytes of the gate;” that is, those who regarded God and the Bible, and obeyed the moral principles of its teachings, separating themselves from the Gentile heathen customs, and worshiping the true God. Such men as Cornelius, the centurion, and vast numbers of others in all parts of the Gentile world where the Jewish religion was known, were of this class.

Smith, his Unabridged Dictionary of the Bible, Conybeare and Howson, Barnes, in his Notes, and others all agree that a large number of Jews settled in Galatia a century or two earlier than Paul’s time, so that the whole country became familiar with Jewish ideas and the Bible religion. Having the same disposition to proselyte as their brethren in other parts of the country, we cannot doubt, therefore, but that a large number of this class were “proselytes of the gate,” and were ready for the labors of Paul, and were of that number who received the gospel with great joy. They had been, as verse 8 indicates, at one time those who “did service unto them which by nature are no gods;” that is, had known something of the true God, but had not fully identified themselves with

the Jewish customs. They had regarded their rites and ceremonies with respect, and had in a measure separated themselves from idolatry. Conybeare and Howson state that there were large numbers of this class of proselytes scattered all through the Roman Empire, especially in the countries around Syria, etc. They say: “Under this term we include at present all those who were attracted in various degrees of intensity toward Judaism—from those who by circumcision had obtained full access to all the privileges of the temple worship, to those who, only professed a general respect for the Mosaic religion, and attended as hearers in the synagogues. Many proselytes were attached to the Jewish communities wherever they were dispersed.”—*Page 28*. Dr. Clarke, in his comments on Galatians, in several places speaks of there being many proselytes among the disciples. He says: “The Jewish religion was general in the region of Galatia, and it was respected, as it appears that the principal inhabitants were either Jews or proselytes.” Again, “Judaism was popular, and the more converts the false teachers could make, the more occasion for glorying they had. They wished to get these Christian converts who had been before *proselytes of the gate*, to receive circumcision that they might glory in their flesh. ‘Behold my converts!’ Thus they gloried or boasted, not that the people were converted to God, but that they were circumcised.” Large numbers of these proselytes no doubt received the gospel from Paul, and enjoyed its liberty, and the Spirit of God enabled them to cry, “Abba, Father.”

But after he went away, those Judaizing teachers came with their usual burden—“Except ye be circumcised,” and “keep the law of Moses,” “ye cannot be saved.” This filled Paul’s heart with great sadness; for, as we, have seen, he had met this thing ever since his conversion, and nearly lost his life several times because of this bitter, exclusive spirit. So he writes this letter to the Galatians; and calling their attention to these facts, he says: “How turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage?”

Our friends will struggle hard to escape the conclusion that these “weak and beggarly elements” refer to the ceremonial law; but in reason we can come to no other conclusion. They are evidently the same as the “rudiments”

under which God's people were held, mentioned in the third verse. They brought them into the same bondage, as brought to view in the fifth chapter, where the apostle pleads with them not to be "entangled again with the yoke of bondage," as they would be if they were circumcised, in which case Christ would profit them nothing.

This is evidently the same "yoke" which Peter speaks of in the 15th chapter of Acts, when the same subject was under consideration. In this epistle the apostle had not been saying one word about Gentile customs, or Gentile observances, or heathen, worship or services, or anything of the sort; he had simply made reference in the verse above to the fact that they had been at a certain time heathen. This, of course, was true in their case, seeing they had become proselytes. But he constantly refers, from the beginning to the end of this epistle, to the Mosaic system, circumcision, etc.; and we cannot believe that Paul was so poor a logician that he would strike off here on something entirely foreign to the subject he was bringing before the Galatians.

The identification of these "elements of the world"—these "I weak and beggarly elements" into which the Galatians desired to return into bondage—with the ceremonial law, is an important link in this argument. There can be no question but that our position on this point is correct. Dr. Schaff, in his comments on these "*rudiments*," says: "According to my view, the expression applies in any case only to Judaism, especially to the law (an apostle Paul could not possibly comprehend heathenism and Judaism under one idea, regarding them thus as virtually equivalent)." We trust our friends who sometimes endeavor to apply these "rudiments" partially to heathenism, will consider this well.

Dr. Clarke says, "On rudiments of the world," "the rudiments or principles of the Jewish religion." He says, also, that the "weak and beggarly elements were the ceremonies of the Mosaic law." Dr. Scott takes the same position. It would certainly be little better than blasphemy to apply such terms to that law which God has said is "perfect," "spiritual," "holy, just, and good." And by no consistent reasoning can they be made to apply to the Gentile idolatry, as that is not the subject of the apostle's reasoning in this epistle. But these expressions are every

way consistent with his language when speaking of the ceremonial law.

"Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years." These are precisely the things Paul refers to in Col. 2:16, just before he speaks of the "rudiments," in verse 20. "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days," etc. These Galatians under their Judaizing teachers were becoming all absorbed in these old shadows pointing forward to Christ, after the substance had come, thus really denying Christ; for if the shadow was to be observed, certainly the substance had not come. No wonder he says, "I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain." We claim that this is the only logical, reasonable view of this argument of Paul's.

But how could we apply these expressions to the moral law? Could we say that these days which they observed were seventh-day Sabbaths, which made the apostle fearful of them. This would be excellent for our Antinomian friends; for it is just such texts as these that they try to refer to the ten commandments. Our friends would thus give them great aid and comfort. Are the "weak and beggarly elements" here presented the terms by which Paul describes the moral law? It is evident that the Galatians desired to go back into obedience to something, and thus place themselves under bondage. Was it obedience to the law of God? They observed something, that is, rendered obedience to it—"days, and months, and times, and years." Surely this does not refer to the moral law. We know our friends will undertake to apply these to the heathen rites and ceremonies, and thus throw the apostle's argument all out of connection with his whole theme; but this we have seen is inadmissible. He complains of these persons for *obedience* to something which they ought not to obey. He is not speaking about their being justified by their good works because they did not lie, steal, murder, etc.; that is not his subject at all; but it certainly is about going back to a law which was abolished.

Verse 12: "Brethren, I beseech you, be as I am; for I am as ye are: ye have not injured me at all.

"13. Ye know how through infirmity of the flesh I preached the gospel unto you at the first.

“14. And my temptation which was in my flesh ye despised not, nor rejected; but received me as an angel of God, even as Christ Jesus.

“15. Where is then the blessedness ye spake of? for I bear you record, that, if it had been possible, ye would have plucked out your own eyes, and have given them to me.

“16. Am I therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?

“17. They zealously affect you, but not well; yea, they would exclude you, that ye might affect them.

“18. But it is good to be zealously affected always in a good thing, and not only when I am present with you.

“19. My little children, of whom I travail in birth again until Christ be formed in you,

“20. I desire to be present with you now, and to change my voice; for I stand in doubt of you.”

Paul now gives an affectionate turn to his argument, setting before them his infirmities, temptations, devotion to their interests, and faithfulness in laboring in their behalf. He talks to them from a personal stand-point, pleading with them affectionately, to obtain once more their sympathies against those Judaizing teachers who were perverting the truth in their midst. They had once loved him so that they would have even plucked out their eyes for him; but through these teachers they had lost their interest for him. He refers to these Judaizing teachers in verse 17: “They zealously affect you, but not well;” or, as the Diaglott has it, “They show affection toward you, but not honorably.” The thought is plainly this, that these teachers by making a great show of love by flattery and pretense, wished to draw the affections of the disciples toward themselves, and shut Paul out of their affections; and evidently they had succeeded. But Paul reasoned with them to show them how much he had suffered for them, and endeavored to call them back again to the truth—all those whom he had brought out with great self-sacrifice. They had once been willing to pluck out their eyes for him; but now they almost regarded him as an enemy, through the miserable influence of these Judaizing teachers, who had followed Paul everywhere with the same object, and added bitterness to his life. Can we believe that these hypocritical teachers were intensely

interested to get these Galatians to refrain, from murder, Sabbath-breaking, adultery, covetousness, etc.? This conclusion, of course, is too preposterous for any one to believe; but they evidently were trying to get them to do, something. It was not merely to have a mental view that they were justified by obeying the ten commandments that they were teaching them about. There is no hint in any part of the Bible that these teachers had any such a purpose as this. But they were trying to exalt that exclusive Mosaic system that had made them a peculiar people, that yoke of bondage which had passed away at the cross. Paul was in great perplexity in regard to these Galatian disciples, to know what they were going to do. His soul travailed with an anxious burden in their behalf, until Christ should be again fully accepted, and the shadowy system of types be left behind.

Verse 21: “Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law?”

“22. For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bond maid, the other by a free woman.

“23. But he who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the free woman was by promise.

“24. Which things are an allegory; for these are the two covenants: the one from the Mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar.

“25. For this Agar is Mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children.

“26. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all.

“27. For it is written, Rejoice, thou barren that bearest not; break forth and cry, thou that travailest not: for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath a husband.

“28. Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise.

“29. But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now.

“30. Nevertheless what saith the Scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the free woman.

“31. So then, brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free.”

Chapter 5:1 “Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage.

“2. Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing.

“3. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law.

“4. Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace.

“5. For we through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith.”

“Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law?” Here we have the expression “under the law” repeated once more. We have already dwelt at some length upon this phrase, and have claimed that its uses in the letter to the Galatians referred to being subject to the law, under its authority. But one of our friends who is enthusiastic in his devotion to the view that the law in Galatians is the moral law, goes so far as to claim that in *every* case where this expression is used, it signifies “being in a state of sin or condemnation;” *i.e.*, in a position where the penalty of the law hangs over one’s head. That penalty is the “second death” in “the lake of fire.” We have, then., according to that view, these Galatian brethren desiring to be in a state of guilt, which would expose them to the lake of fire. “Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law,” with this equivalent expression substituted, would read, Tell me, ye that desire to be under the condemnation of the law—Tell me, ye that desire the condemnation of the second death. We have known men to desire many strange things, but we never before knew one to desire the second death. But if that view of the subject is correct, and this law is the moral law, and all these expressions “under the law” mean under its condemnation, then we have no possible escape from this conclusion. But to think of these new, zealous converts to Christianity desiring to go into a state of condemnation exposed to such a doom is too preposterous for a moment’s consideration. But to such absurdities do these positions drive us.

The true position, that these Galatians desired to go back and place themselves under obligation to keep the ceremonial law, involves no such conclusion. It is manifestly in harmony with all the apostle’s reasoning.

“Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law?” Having noticed the first part of the expression, we also notice the latter part—“do ye not hear the law?” He then quotes from the book of Genesis the story of Abraham, Sarah, and Hagar as an allegory. Here the word “law” is used to include the book of Genesis. Certainly this could not mean the moral law, but must include that book of the law containing all the requirements of the Mosaic dispensation. The original law of circumcision constantly referred to in this epistle, stands in close connection with this story of Hagar in this book of Genesis. The term “the law” among the Jews generally included the five books of Moses, thus including the whole system, moral, ritual, typical, and civil. This *system* these Judaizing teachers desired to maintain. Circumcision was a sign of the whole. We believe that so far as being obligatory upon Christians, all was abolished except the ten commandments and the principles which grew out of them. When Paul says, “Ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law?” is not the law they were to *hear* the same as the one they desired to be *under*? But the law they were to “hear” was not the ten commandments, but that which embraced the whole Mosaic system. The law here referred to cannot therefore be the moral law.

As another illustration of his argument, he now calls attention to the facts connected with Abraham’s two marriages with Sarah and Hagar. He tells us this history is an “allegory,” *i.e.*, as Clarke says, “more being intended, in the account than meets the eye.” The original word has just this meaning. What, then, is this hidden meaning which the inspired apostle has discovered in this simple narrative?—That Hagar and Sarah spiritually represented the two covenants. “The one from Mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar.” This “ answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children.” This covenant must embrace all those peculiar separating ordinances embraced in the middle wall of partition. It must have special reference to the “added” law concerning which he has been all the time speaking, else he would entirely diverge from his line of argument, and his conclusions be illogical, disconnected from his premises. “ Tell me, ye that desire to be under

the law, do ye not hear the law?" Then immediately he introduces this illustration of the two covenants. It has direct reference to the conclusion in the first verses of chapter 5. Those in that covenant were "in bondage" with their children. The covenant itself "gendereth to bondage," *i.e.*, "bringing forth" or "bearing children for servitude or bondage" (revised version and Diaglott). Hence the conclusion of his argument, "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage,"— the "yoke" which Peter says "neither our fathers nor *we* were able to bear." We can but conclude, then, that this covenant which brings forth children to bondage embraces the law of circumcision and all it represented. The services connected with this covenant centered at Jerusalem. All its sacrifices must be made there. Its feasts were observed there. Every Jew constantly prayed with his face toward that city, and his wailings and longings, pilgrimages and devotions, all pivot on old Jerusalem, even until this day. All this is shadowed forth in the covenant represented in Hagar. But Sarah, the true wife, represents the glorious freedom and precious blessings of the new covenant. The New Jerusalem is our holy city. This is "above," and it is "the mother of us all." We are the children of the "promise" if we have come under the new covenant even as Isaac was.

The promise of the "seed" was through Israel. Some of our good brethren think the promise of the "seed" is still future, that the "seed" has not come yet. If the promise of the "seed" is not fulfilled yet, then the covenant of liberty represented by Sarah, which this promised "seed" was to make, has certainly not yet gone into force. So our friends, we suppose, are still under the old covenant of bondage, represented by Hagar. We should pity them greatly if their own theory was true. But we are thankful we have glad tidings for them. The Seed *has* come. We, and we trust they, are the children of the New Jerusalem. We hope to save them in spite of their theories. Is it possible anyone can believe that this covenant which is represented by Hagar, and "gendereth to bondage," is a proper illustration God's holy law? Does it "answer to Jerusalem" which is in bondage with her children?

Then comes the grand conclusion of the argument of the apostle, not only of the immediate connection, but of all he has said in the whole epistle thus far. We have referred to it several times, but we are sure it will be in place again. "Stand fast *therefore* in the *liberty* wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. Behold, I Paul say unto you, that *if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing*. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that, he is a debtor *to do the whole law*. Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; *ye are fallen from grace*." These are strong, emphatic, most powerful words. They would never have been called out from the meek apostle except a great crisis existed. The very foundation of the gospel system was involved in this question of circumcision. If they were circumcised, they were debtors "to do the *whole law*." Circumcision was the sign of the whole Mosaic system. They must offer sacrifices, regard the special laws concerning uncleanness, maintain the old wall of separation between themselves and all the rest of mankind, making the progress of the gospel in its beneficent mission of blessing all the nations of the earth excessively hard, and virtually denying the gospel itself. For when they did all these things, they virtually said: "Christ has not come;" for it would be impossible to do, the work prophecy had said his coming would accomplish, if this fearful dead weight were hung to the gospel. And above all, if salvation was to be obtained through these old abrogated laws, then the death of Christ was *not sufficient* to save men who might repent and believe on him. These false teachers said: "Ye cannot be saved " "except ye be circumcised" and "keep the law of Moses." So circumcision and the law of Moses was the real saviour, and not the death of Christ.

It is not to be supposed that these proselytes in Galatia realized all the consequences of their action until Paul explained it to them, nor did thousands of others to whom these Judaizing teachers had access. This made it necessary for God to raise up Paul, whose education, early life, thorough understanding of Judaism, conversion, and wonderful spiritual illumination fully equipped him to be an apostle to the Gentiles. Years passed after Christ's death

before the gospel had made much impression on the heathen world. The influences centering in Jerusalem seemed to stand in the way of the Gentile branch of the work. Such large numbers of Jewish converts seem to have been affected with Jewish prejudices, that it required a clear-headed, strong man to undertake this gigantic task. They followed him in every place to introduce their exclusive notions. Christians in that age could see and feel these things as we cannot now.

The reason why our brethren err in their application of the law in Galatians, is because they fail to grasp the tremendous importance of the issue involved in apostolic times in Judaism and the questions growing out of it. They reason from the standpoint of certain questions of the present day: But these concluding words of the apostle's argument show how important he regarded this question. The language unmistakably refers to the Mosaic law, and cannot by any possibility be twisted to refer to the moral law. "If ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing." Ye are debtors "to do the whole law." "Be *not* entangled again with the yoke of *bondage*." "Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; *ye are fallen from grace*."

The apostle's intense interest in this question, is not only shown by these expressions, but by others in the epistle, as we have seen, referring to the same subject: "I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel." Those that "trouble" you "would *pervert* the gospel of Christ." "Oh foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you?" "Are ye so foolish?" "Are ye now made perfect by the flesh?" "I would they were *even cut off* which trouble you." Some try to make this expression mean something very mild, and fail to sense the intense feelings of the apostle in view of the evil they were doing. They were "false brethren," who "came in *privily*," in a secret, under-handed manner, to destroy their liberty and bring the whole gospel system into "bondage." Paul says of those who preach another gospel, Let them "be accursed." Their course was ruinous to souls, destroying the very way of salvation through Christ, putting aside God's merciful provisions for the blessing of the nations of

the earth, to hold them in their narrow, exclusive circle, and exalt the selfish, supercilious Jewish spirit to bring all men to acknowledge the superiority of these Jews who in their selfish egotism had forfeited God's favor by stubbornness, rebellion, and putting to death his Son.

Paul found many evils to complain of in the different churches. Among the Corinthians he found great immoralities and various forms of error which were very serious. So of other churches. But not one of them calls forth such words of condemnation as this, and so many of them in the same space. Why is this?—Because, though the evils in the other churches were serious, yet, they did not so fully undermine the very principles of the gospel as did the positions which Paul here combated. These were radical, fundamental errors.

Paul's grand conclusion of his argument in these verses must have maddened the whole force of Judaizing teachers, and made their work much more difficult. Wherever these words were read, these teachers would not be able to influence the Gentile disciples as before. We believe this Epistle to the Galatians was a grand turning-point in this whole controversy which had so long affected the church, making the call of a great Council necessary, and constantly interfering with the apostle's work among the Gentiles. The whole question was now elucidated. We further notice a few points before proceeding to other scriptures.

"Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace." This verse is often separated from its connection, and used as having a bearing upon our personal justification by faith for our transgressions of the moral law. Now justification by faith is one of the grandest and most glorious doctrines of the gospel of Christ. We love, delight, and rejoice in that precious truth second to none. We know Paul has explained it as no other writer in all the Bible has, in Romans and other epistles. No man can be saved by his good works alone. "All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." We are weak and utterly helpless of ourselves, covered with pollution, and never can remove our guilt and uncleanness by present or future efforts of obedience. Indeed, we are utterly weak and helpless;

and if our sins *have* been forgiven, we must have constant faith in and help from a crucified Saviour, constant access to his unfailing fountain of strength, in order to obtain any real help or accomplish anything whatever that will meet God's favor in the line of good works. All this and vastly more we cheerfully acknowledge and most fully believe. Yet the most careless reader ought to see that the apostle in speaking of being "justified by the law" in this connection, is not speaking of being justified through obedience to the *moral* law. Such a view would make the statement utterly foreign to the words in its immediate connection, both before and after. He has just said that if they be circumcised, Christ shall profit them nothing: that they are in that case debtors "to do the whole law." Christ becomes of no effect. "Ye are fallen from grace." They plainly looked to their obedience to these dead, lifeless ceremonies connected with circumcision as that which would make them just or justified; that is, bring them to a savable condition; whereas they could only be made such by faith in Christ. For this reason, looking away from the only fountain opened for uncleanness, away from the only name that could save, to that law of bondage, they had "fallen from" the grace of Christ.

We see, therefore, that in the expression "justified by the law," it is as necessary here to know of what law he is speaking as it is anywhere in the New Testament when speaking of a law that is binding or abolished. The same expression "justified by the works of the law," is evidently used in the same sense in chap. 2:16, as the connection shows. Indeed, it is evident that for forgiveness and justification for their transgressions of the moral law, many of the Jews had always looked to the works required by the typical law. It was for this purpose that it was added, because of transgression. Only the few, the spiritual-minded, saw its true design. Hence they were even more in danger of looking to obedience to its requirements for their justification than to obedience to the ten commandments. So Paul exposes its utter worthlessness now that Christ had come and died.

Another point: Who will dare say that the law Paul speaks of in chapter 4 is not the same as the one he reasons upon in chapter 3? They must be the same. Will any

dare claim that the conclusions presented in the first verses of chapter 5 are not the consequence of his argument drawn from the words preceding, in chapter 4? Then they must also have reference to the same law in chapter 3. But the moral law cannot possibly be the one considered in chapter 4; therefore the law in chapter 3 cannot be the moral law.

Verse 6: "For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love.

"7. Ye did run well; who did hinder you that ye should not obey the truth?

"8. This persuasion cometh not of him that calleth you.

"9. A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump.

"10. I have confidence in you through the Lord, that ye will be none otherwise minded: but he that troubleth you shall bear his judgment, whosoever he be.

"11. And I, brethren, if I yet preach circumcision, why do I yet suffer persecution? then is the offense of the cross ceased.

"12. I would they were even cut off which trouble you.

"13. For, brethren, ye have been called unto liberty; only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another.

"14. For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

CHAPTER 6:12: "As many as desire to make a fair show in the flesh, they constrain you to be circumcised; only lest they should suffer persecution for the cross of Christ.

"13. For neither they themselves who are circumcised keep the law; but desire to have you circumcised, that they may glory in your flesh.

"14. But God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world.

"15. For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature."

We omit the remaining portion of the Galatian letter, as it wholly refers to practical Christian duties, and does not relate to the subject we are considering. In chap. 5:6 Paul states the utter uselessness of circumcision so far as the religion of Christ Jesus is concerned. It alone con-

sidered would make no difference. A man would need to repent and believe on Christ just the same, whether he was circumcised or not. It was only when these Judaizing teachers were trying to bring in circumcision and all it represented as necessary to salvation, that Paul felt stirred up to vigorously combat it. In verse 7 he refers to the zeal with which they received the gospel, and to the fact that some one had hindered them, driven them back (margin), so now they did not obey the truth as before. These were unauthorized, self-appointed teachers, who had no real connection with him who had called them; that is, Christ. They were not really the friends of Christ. The whole church was in danger; for a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump. But Paul had still hopes of the Galatian church, that they would return to their allegiance to the truth. In verse 13 he speaks of the liberty in Christ to which the brethren had been called, and cautions them to use this liberty not for an occasion of the flesh, but “by love” to “serve one another.” The Christian, liberty never leads to fleshly gratifications. “For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.” Having just shown by the most incontrovertible argument that the ceremonial and typical system of the Mosaic service was abolished, all that remained of the law relating to our fellow-men was simply fulfilled in this: “Thou shalt ‘love thy neighbor as thyself’—the substance of our obedience to the law of God so far as it relates to our fellow-men.

In verses 11, 12, we have a very interesting point again forcibly presented, to which we have referred several times in this argument; viz., the malice with which disciples affected by the Judaizing doctrines, and the Jews themselves, followed Paul. And it would seem from this language that the whole reason of the special bitterness of the Jewish people toward him was because he did not preach circumcision or give it any countenance. If he had done that, they would have let him comparatively alone. But when they saw that he took the course he did, they followed him from city to city, making his life bitter. And of these pretended brethren, who claimed to be disciples, who thus misled the Galatian church, he said that he would that they were “even cut off” because they undermined the gospel system. This cutting off can refer to nothing less than ex-

communication, and it may signify utter destruction, judging from past references, as we have seen in the first chapter a solemn curse pronounced upon those who were, perverting the gospel. This shows how weighty a question the apostle considered this whole subject to be.

Before we close this argument, we wish to impress this point more fully, to convince our friends, if possible, who hold the opposite view, that this question of circumcision in the apostolic church was not one of minor importance but in its effects upon the progress of Christianity and the presentation of gospel truth, was equal in the apostle’s mind to even the much-vaunted doctrine of justification by faith. As we have said, we hold the latter to be a very important doctrine. But the special thing with which the apostle had to contend in his work among the Gentiles, was to show the proper relation between his work and the old system that was passing away.

Let us trace this subject to show how bitterly the Jews contended against the idea of an equality before God of the Gentiles with themselves, which was the great point involved. If circumcision passed away, all could see that they stood on the same level; for circumcision represented that whole system, and was the wall of separation dividing between the Jews and the Gentiles.

We will commence with the case of Cornelius, a devout man who feared God. Evidently God saw that Peter would not dare to go to preach to Cornelius unless he gave him, special light to open the way, even though he was a man of good repute. So he gave Cornelius a vision to send for Peter, and Peter a vision to prepare him to go, letting down the various kinds of unclean beasts in a sheet, and telling him to rise, slay, and eat. We know God poured out his Spirit upon Cornelius and the Gentiles, even before hands were laid upon them in this case. Peter had hardly returned to Jerusalem before he was taken to task for doing thus. Acts 11:2: “And when Peter was come up to Jerusalem, they that were of the circumcision contended with him, saying, Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised, and did eat with them.” This occurred quite, a number of years after the crucifixion of Christ and the abolition of the ceremonial law; so it must be evident that neither Peter nor any of the other apostles had been accustomed to do such a thing as this up to this point. They had not realized

that the Gentiles were to receive light on the same terms as they. They had not laid aside their Jewish prejudices, or God would not have found it necessary to give this vision to open Peter's eyes. They had not yet comprehended the real breadth of the gospel. When Peter rehearsed his experience with Cornelius, all had to submit to it, as God's direction was so manifest in it.

We do not discern any special bitterness on the part of the Jews shown to the apostles at Jerusalem, except among the leading men; and Herod's persecution seems to have been prompted by them. But as soon as Paul and Barnabas went among the Gentiles, then they were followed at every step by a dogged determination of the Jews to destroy them and break up their work. When they came to Antioch in Pisidia (Acts 13), after speaking at length to the Jews, the Gentiles, doubtless most of them being proselytes, came and desired to hear from them the next Sabbath. And the whole city came together. But the Jews, when they saw that the Gentiles were receiving light, and that they were attracted to this new teaching of the gospel, were exceedingly mad, as expressed in verse 45: "They were filled with envy, and spake against those things which were spoken by Paul, contradicting and blaspheming." The apostle did not make it necessary for these Gentiles to be circumcised, and thus failed to acknowledge the Jewish superiority. Nothing could have stirred the Jews more than this. When Paul finally told them that they would turn to the Gentiles, and labor for them, their anger knew no bounds. They stirred up devout women (verse 50), and the chief men, and raised a fearful persecution against Paul and Barnabas, and expelled them from their coast. The apostles fled to another city, Iconium (chapter 14), but the Jews followed them with such bitterness that they had to flee to Lystra and Derbe. But the Jews of Antioch and Iconium came after them, and persuaded the people, who stoned Paul, and left him for dead.

Then follows that Council at Jerusalem to consider this subject, which, having noticed carefully, we pass, simply reminding the reader that this question was raised in the church itself, showing that Paul's work among the Gentiles had not only affected the Jews, but also the Jewish believers, who said, "Except ye be circumcised" and "keep the law of Moses," "ye cannot be saved." But

God helped his servant to bring the matter around in such a way that a great triumph for the spread of the gospel was the result. After this, when Paul preached in Thessalonica (chapter 17), the Jews still followed him, mingling with the baser elements of the people, and set the whole city in an uproar. Paul had to flee again, and went unto Berea; but the Jews from Thessalonica immediately followed him to this place, and Paul again had to flee from them. After passing through Athens, and coming to Corinth, he labored with his usual energy in behalf of the gospel, and continued there some time. But here again he met that bitter hatred of the Jews, and through their influence was summoned to appear before Gallio, the deputy of Achaia. What was the charge against the great apostle? In chap. 18:13, we find this accusation: "This fellow persuadeth men to worship God contrary to the law." They even undertook to try him before the Roman deputy for his course in not sustaining the ceremonial law, as though it was a great crime. This reveals the special burden of the Jews against the apostle. After laboring a long time at Corinth, where the Jews did not have power because of their fear of the deputy, and did not dare molest him, he had great success. But as soon as he again appeared in Greece (chapter 20), the Jews lay in wait for him, and tried to kill him, but did not succeed. Paul expresses the situation in his talk with the elders of the church at Ephesus (chap. 20:19), and gives as the greatest cause of his persecution and difficulties which he had to meet, "the lying in wait of the Jews," who were constantly dogging his steps at every turn because he did not preach the ceremonial law.

In his final, closing visit to Jerusalem, we have quite a vivid picture presented before us of the effect of this feeling, even in that church. No doubt Paul's anxiety to go to Jerusalem was prompted by his great desire to have a better state of feeling exist between the Jewish and Gentile Christians. He carried large gifts to them from his Gentile converts, hoping to appease their distrust and dislike by thus showing his regard for the poor. We can readily see that, this was a great crisis in the apostle's life. And what a source of sadness it must have been to a man like him,—who had given his life unreservedly to his Master, suffering every indignity, pain, imprisonment, and finally death

itself,—to be forced to see that his labors were not appreciated, and that he himself was looked upon with distrust, even among excellent members at Jerusalem, the point from which the gospel had started. But he felt that if it was possible, this union between the two must be strengthened, and these feelings of distrust and dislike removed; so he made this trip to Jerusalem. He presented his gifts to show his love for them, and walked circumspectly in their midst. They received his gifts gladly at first, yet these feelings of dislike were not removed from their heart; for in chap. 21:20, 21 we see these feelings quite manifest: “Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are which believe; *and they are all zealous of the law*; and they are informed of thee, that thou teachst all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, saying that *they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs.*”

Here we see the same old bitterness again, even in the church. Now they give some advice, that he should treat these customs which he had really discarded, with respect, by performing some of these services according to the law, and thus appear to recognize it. We fully believe that this was an inconsistent course for the apostle to take, and that these brethren in giving this advice yielded to the pressure that was brought to bear against Paul on account of the doctrines which he preached. This very advice to Paul was the cause of his long imprisonment, which deprived the church of his labors; and it was thus brought about by the advice of the disciples themselves. Paul, willing to give way to the very utmost extent consistent with principle if he could bring about peace between them, accepted their advice, and went into the temple to purify himself, and at quite a heavy expense paid the money required for four others who had vowed.

It would have been better if Paul had kept away from this temple service; but God turned even this to good account, and made his servant useful even in prison. While performing this service, some Jews who had seen him elsewhere, stirred up the people against him, “crying out, Men of Israel, help; this is the man, that teacheth all men everywhere against the people, and the law, and this place,” etc. So we see that the great cause of their hatred most prominent again was that he did not teach the

ceremonial law. We all know what followed, how Paul was captured from the mob by the authorities, and finally permitted to make a speech to the people; and when they heard him speak in Hebrew, we learn from chapter 22 that they listened patiently until he reached the troublesome point: “And he said unto me, Depart; for I will send thee far hence unto the Gentiles. And they gave him audience unto this word, and then lifted up their voices, and said, Away with such a fellow from the earth; for it is not fit that he should live.” Verses 21, 22. They then threw dust into the air, and acted like mad men.

How plain it must be to any candid mind that this question of making the Gentiles equal to them by breaking down the ceremonial law, was the leading question in the whole matter of sending the gospel in the apostolic age outside of the Jews. It was not simply an insignificant question, though it may be considered as such today, when everything is changed from what it was centuries ago, at the very beginning of the gospel work. It was a question which was worthy of calling out an epistle from this great champion in the gospel.

Sister White, in her “Sketches from the Life of Saint Paul” also dwells considerably upon this subject. On page 64 she says: “The Jews had prided themselves upon their divinely-appointed services; and they concluded that as God once specified the Hebrew manner of worship, it was impossible that he should ever authorize a change in any of its specifications. They decided that Christianity must connect itself with the Jewish laws and ceremonies. They were slow to discern to the end of that which had been abolished by the death of Christ, and perceive that all their sacrificial offerings had but prefigured the death of the Son of God, in which type had met its antitype, rendering valueless the divinely-appointed ceremonies and sacrifices of the Jewish religion.”

In speaking of the causes which led to the Council at Jerusalem (Acts 15) in which she agrees with the position we have taken, that it was the same as the visits brought to view in Gal. 2, she says (page 64) they felt “that if the restrictions and ceremonies of the Jewish law were not made obligatory upon their accepting the faith of Christ, the national peculiarities of the Jews, which kept them distinct from all other people, would finally disappear

from among those who embraced the gospel truths.” Here we see the true cause of their feelings again as we have many times stated. On page 195 she shows how this same feeling existed: “Paul in his preaching at Corinth, presented the same arguments which he urged so forcibly in his epistles. His strong statement, ‘There is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision,’ was regarded by his enemies as daring blasphemy. They determined that his voice should be silenced.”

(A similar expression occurs in this very epistle to the Galatians.)

On page 210, in speaking of his standing before the brethren at Jerusalem when he presented his gifts, and made his remarks, she says: “He could not recount his experience in Galatia without stating the difficulties he had encountered from those Judaizing teachers, who had attempted to misrepresent his teachings and pervert his converts.” Here she evidently has in view the epistle to the Galatians. This she indicates caused some feelings. On page 212 she says that the advice given by James to recognize the ceremonial law by going before the priests, as we have stated, “was not consistent with that decision [of the Council of Acts 15] which had also been sanctioned by the Holy Spirit. The Spirit of God did not prompt this advice. It was the fruit of cowardice. By non-conformity to the, ceremonial law, Christians would bring upon themselves the hatred of the unbelieving Jews, and expose themselves to severe persecution.”

Page 213: “The disciples themselves yet cherished a regard for the ceremonial law, and were too willing to make concessions, hoping by so doing to gain the confidence of their countrymen, remove their prejudice, and win them to faith in Christ as the world’s Redeemer. Paul’s great object in visiting Jerusalem was to conciliate the church of Palestine. So long as they continued to cherish prejudice, they were constantly working to counteract his influence. He felt that if he could by any lawful concession on his part win them to the truth, he would remove a very great obstacle to the success of the gospel in other places. But he was not authorized of God to concede so much as they had asked. This concession was not in harmony with his teachings, nor with the firm integrity of his character.”

Page 214: “When we consider Paul’s great desire to be

in harmony with his brethren, his tenderness of spirit toward the weak in faith, his reverence for the apostles, who had been with Christ, and for James the brother of the Lord, and his purpose to become all things to all men as far as he could do this and not sacrifice principle,—when we consider all this, it is less surprising that he was constrained to deviate from his firm, decided course of action. But instead of accomplishing the desired object, these efforts to conciliation only precipitated the crisis, hastened the predicted sufferings of Paul, separated him from his brethren in his labors, deprived the church of one of its strongest pillars, and brought sorrow to Christian hearts in every land.” Many other expressions could be quoted to the same effect; but we should despair of being able to show how important this subject was regarded among the early church, if what we have presented does not clearly prove it.

We will only notice the remaining references to circumcision in the sixth chapter. Evidently Paul had finished his long argument, and was now giving the most precious Christian instruction for the benefit of the believers: but it seems that he cannot get this subject out of his mind. “As many as desire to make a fair show in the flesh, they constrain you to be circumcised; only lest they should suffer persecution for the cross of Christ.” There he shows how preaching the gospel *with* circumcision released one from persecution; but to preach the gospel without circumcision, not acknowledging its claim, brought persecuting elements upon him from every quarter. But *he* would rather preach the truth of God in its purity, whether persecuted or not. Circumcision saved no one, and uncircumcision saved no one; but there must be a new creature in Christ Jesus. Thus we see, from the beginning of the epistle to the end, this is the great theme that the apostle has in mind.

We now leave the subject with the reader, claiming for our view that it makes one connected, consistent, harmonious argument throughout. The conclusions are all consistent with the premises. We have shown that there was a sufficient issue to demand such an argument; hence we conclude that the apostle has the ceremonial law mainly in view throughout this letter. Our brethren, with their position, though they may present quite an argument upon

some detached passages of scripture, utterly fail to present that harmonious, systematic view of the whole epistle found in the position we have herein advocated, while there are many references throughout the epistle which utterly forbid their application of it to the moral law.

This question which has long been in agitation among us is most unfortunate. As our brethren have presented their views in such a public manner, in a way which we cannot think is proper or consistent, we have felt it duty to present our view of the subject before our leading brethren. Yet we feel the same brotherly feeling as ever toward those who differ with us, believing they have been misled in regard to their duty. We ask our leading brethren to consider the points of this argument carefully, and weigh it well. We leave the result with them and God.

BATTLE CREEK, Mich.

Nov. 18, 1886

EXPLANATORY NOTE

This letter was written at the date indicated, but for certain reasons it was thought best to delay sending it out. Chief among these reasons was the fear of seeming to act precipitately in the matter, and the desire to counsel with others of larger experience. The delay of nearly two years has given ample time to carefully review the subject again and again, and to avoid any appearance of heated controversy. It is thought best, even at this late day, to send the matter out in the form of a letter, as originally written. It will be understood, of course, that this does not purport to be an explanation of the book of Galatians; that would require a book many times the size of this. I have here endeavored merely to correct some erroneous views, so that those who read may be prepared to study the epistle to the Galatians with more profit than heretofore.

It should also be stated that this little book is not published for general circulation. It is designed only for those in whose hands Elder Butler's pamphlet on Galatians was placed, and perhaps a few others whose minds have been specially exercised on the subject. No one can be more anxious than the writer, to avoid everything of a controversial nature in matters intended for the general public. That this letter may tend to allay controversy, to help to bring the household of God into the unity of the faith as it is in Christ Jesus, and to hasten the time when the servants of God shall see eye to eye, is the only desire of the writer.

E. J. W

The Gospel IN THE Book of Galatians

A Review
by
E. J. Waggoner

Oakland, CAL
1888

The Gospel In Galatians

OAKLAND, Cal., February 10, 1887.

ELDER GEO. I. BUTLER, Battle Creek, Mich.—

Dear Brother:

The matter of the law in Galatians which received some attention at the late General Conference, has been upon my mind a good deal, and doubtless many have thought of it since then more than before. I very much regretted that every moment of time was so occupied that we could have no conversation upon the subject. It is true the matter was discussed to a very limited extent in the meetings of the Theological Committee, but of course the little that could be said under the circumstances was not sufficient to give any satisfaction to any party concerned. I know that you are at all times exceedingly busy, and I myself have no time to squander; but this matter is of very great importance, and has received so much attention that it cannot by any possibility be ignored now. You remember that I stated that there were some points in your pamphlet which seemed to me to indicate that you had misunderstood my position. I therefore wish to note a few of them. Before taking up any of the details, I wish to say first, that, as I assured you when in Battle Creek, I have not the slightest personal feeling in this matter. What I have written in the *Signs* has been with the sole design of doing good, by conveying instruction on an important Bible subject. I have not written in a controversial manner, but have particularly avoided anything of that nature. It has been my aim on this subject, as well as on others, to write in such a way as not to arouse combativeness in any, but to present simple Bible truth, so that the objections would be taken out of the way before the person could make them. Second, it is not possible that in noting a few of the points in your pamphlet I could properly present my

own position. To do that I should want to take up the book of Galatians without any reference to what anybody else had said upon it. In my articles in the *Signs* I have mentioned only a few points that might seem to be objections to the law, and which are often quoted as showing its abolition, to show that they are really the strongest arguments for the perpetuity of the law.

I wish to say also that I think great injustice has been done in the allusions that have been made to the *Instructor* lessons. If it were simply injustice to me, it would be a matter of small consequence. But discredit was thrown upon the lessons, which would materially weaken the influence of the important subject upon which they treated, and this too when not a text used in the lessons was given a different application from that which has been held by those at least of our people who have written upon the same subject. Every position taken in those lessons is perfectly in harmony with works published by our people, and may be read therefrom. This was proved before the committee. And I have no knowledge that any different view on any text used in those lessons was ever printed by our people before the appearance of your pamphlet. This being the case, I honestly think that justice demands that on this subject at least the impressions conveyed in your pamphlet should be as publicly corrected.

As to the propriety of publishing the matter in the *Signs* when I did, I have nothing to say. Whatever censure is due on that score, I willingly take, as I already have. But I wish to say that nothing that has been said or written has in the least degree shaken my confidence in the truthfulness of what I published in the *Signs*. Those positions I hold to and rejoice in to-day more strongly than ever. I wish also most earnestly to protest against the accusation that I have made the *Signs*, much less the *Instructor*, a medium for taking an unfair advantage of any of our people. Quotations that will appear further on, will show that I am not the one who has departed from the standard works of our people.

I will now proceed to notice a few points in the pamphlet, taking them up in the order in which they come. On page 8 you say:—

“The Lord chose Abraham and his descendants to be His peculiar people. They were such till the cross. He gave them the rite of circumcision—a circle cut in the flesh—as a sign of their separation from the rest of the human family.”

This seeming misapprehension of the nature of circumcision appears throughout your pamphlet. It seems strange that it should be so, when the apostle Paul speaks so plainly concerning it. In Romans 4:11 I read of Abraham: “And he received the sign of circumcision, *a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had* yet being uncircumcised; that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed unto them also.”

The fitness of this rite as a sign of righteousness will readily appear to anybody who understands the physical evils against which circumcision is a guard. At the present time it is often performed by physicians as a preventive of physical impurity. It was practiced for this purpose by many nations of antiquity. Herodotus (2:37) says of the Egyptians: “They practice circumcision for the sake of cleanliness, considering it better to be cleanly than comely.” Professor Von Orelli, of Basel, says in the Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia: “The custom is also found among nations which have no traceable connection with any form of ancient civilization; as for instance, among the Congo negroes and Caffrarians in Africa, the Salivas Indians in South America, the inhabitants of Otaheite and the Fiji Islands, etc.” He adds: “The Arabs of today call the operation *tutur tahir*, purification.”

I think that among the Jews as a class the rite exists today only as a preventive of physical impurity. I was present when it was performed by an eminent rabbi of San Francisco, and he said that that was all it was for. In this, as in everything else, the Jews have lost all knowledge of the spiritual meaning of their ceremonies. The veil still remains over their hearts. But that cutting off of the cause of physical impurity signified the putting off of the impurity of the heart, which was accomplished by faith in Christ. See Deuteronomy 10:16, and many other texts, for proof that circumcision had from the beginning this deeper meaning.

The question will naturally arise, If circumcision was practiced by other people, why did everybody despise the Jews because of it? I answer that the hatred was due, not to the mere fact of circumcision, but to that which it signified among the pious Jews. “The wicked plotteth against the just, and gnasheth upon him with his teeth.” Psalm 37:12. “All they that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution.” And this is true of all time. As proof that the uncircumcised heathen hated the Jews solely on account of their righteousness, and not on account of their circumcision, we have only to note how ready they were to mingle with the Jews, whenever they could seduce them into idolatry. If the Jews would relax their strictness of living, would depart from God, and serve other gods, the heathen had no objections to mingling with them, and intermarrying with them.

And this leads to the main point, namely, that the mere act of circumcision never made the Jews God’s peculiar people. They were His peculiar people only when they had that of which circumcision was the sign, namely, righteousness. When they did not have that, they were just the same as though they had never been circumcised (Romans 2:25-29; Philippians 3:3), and were cut off without mercy as readily as were the heathen. Circumcision was only a sign of the possession of righteousness; and when righteousness was wanting the circumcision amounted to nothing.

On page 10 I read of the Jews:—

“Then came the cross, when all their special privileges, with circumcision as their representative and sign, were swept away. They had forfeited them by disobedience and rebellion.”

On page 11 I also read of the Jew:—

“He greatly disliked to be reckoned a common sinner with the hated Gentile. He strenuously contended also for circumcision and its attendant privileges.”

But on page 37 I read:—

“The law of rites had an immense amount of these, so that they constituted a ‘yoke of bondage’ grievous to be borne, which Paul claimed had passed away.”

I cannot harmonize this last quotation with the first two. How can a “yoke of bondage” be considered as “special

privileges”? And why should the Jew strenuously contend for “circumcision and its attendant privileges,” if he felt it to be a “yoke of bondage grievous to be borne”? This is a minor matter, but consistency should appear in the details of truth. I will not at present take time to give my view of the yoke of bondage, but will consider it later. On page 12, concerning the books of Romans and Galatians, I read:—

“We cannot agree with some who claim that the design, scheme, or argument in the two epistles are substantially the same. We freely admit that there are expressions alike in both; but we believe that the main line of argument and the ultimate object in view are widely different, and that many of the similar expressions used are to be understood in a different sense, because the argument of the apostle demands it.

“In the other epistles of Paul these facts are adverted to; but in none of them is the argument anywhere near so fully developed. It does not look reasonable on the face of it, that the apostle would have principally the same object in view in two different epistles. These were written by direct inspiration of God, to be the special guidance of the Christian church. He was bringing out the great principles which should serve as the governing influence of the church for all future ages. We therefore believe it to be an unreasonable view that both have the same design.”

You say that it does not look reasonable that the apostle would have principally the same object in view in two different epistles. This is not an argument, but an opinion, and an opinion which I do not share. It does not seem any less reasonable to me that Paul should have principally the same object in view in two different epistles, than that the Spirit of God should inspire four men to write four different books with principally the same object in view, as is the case in the four Gospels. It seems fully as reasonable as that the prophets Daniel and John should have written two books with principally the same object in view, namely, to enlighten the church in regard to things to take place in the last days; or that the books of First and Second Chronicles should cover the ground covered in the books of Samuel and Kings; or that Paul’s epistle to Titus should contain so much that is in the epistles to Timothy; or that the book of Jude should be an almost exact reproduction, in brief, of the Second Epistle of Peter. Instead of Paul not having the same general ob-

ject in view in two epistles, I find the same points brought out in Ephesians and Colossians, though not to the extent that they are in Romans and Galatians. To me it seems very reasonable that the same things should be presented from different points of view, especially when addressed to different people, and under different circumstances. I find that things that are dwelt upon at considerable length in one of the *Testimonies for the Church*, are repeated and emphasized in others; and it seems to me very fitting and necessary that this should be done, although these are addressed to the *same* churches, and not to different ones. This is in accordance with the Bible rule of line upon line, precept upon precept.

You say that similar terms, and even identical terms, need not necessarily have the same meaning. This may be true provided they are used with reference to different subjects. But if the same subject is under consideration in two different places, and the same or similar terms are used in each place, then we are bound to admit that they have the same meaning. If we do not do this, we cannot interpret the Bible at all. It is on this basis alone that we can understand the prophecies. If you will turn to the comments on the thirteenth chapter of Daniel, in *Thoughts on the Book of Daniel and the Revelation*, you will find that similarity of statement is all that is depended on to prove that the leopard beast is identical with the little horn of Daniel 7. No one has ever thought of questioning the argument in that place, and no one has any right to.

Now let us look for a moment at the subject of the two books, Romans and Galatians. The leading thought in the book of Romans is justification by faith. The apostle shows the depraved condition of the heathen world; then he shows that the Jews are no better, but that human nature is the same in all. All have sinned, and all are guilty before God, and the only way that any can escape final condemnation is by faith in the blood of Christ. All who believe on Him are justified freely by the grace of God, and His righteousness is imputed to them although they have violated the law. This truth, which is brought out so clearly in the third chapter of Romans, is repeated and emphasized in the fourth, fifth,

sixth, and seventh chapters. And in the eighth chapter the apostle concludes that there is no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus. He has before shown that all sinners are under, or condemned by, the law, but when we come to God through faith in Christ, and are justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, we are no longer under the law, but are under grace. This condition is represented in various places as “dead to the law by the body of Christ,” “delivered from the law,” etc. Everywhere faith in Christ and justification by faith are made prominent. So we may say that justification by faith is the key-note of the book of Romans. Now how about the book of Galatians? There is no question in the mind of any but that the Galatians were being induced to submit to circumcision. Were they submitting to the demands of the Jews that they should be circumcised, because they thought it a great privilege to be circumcised? Not by any means, but because certain Jews were teaching them that if they were not circumcised they could not be saved. See Acts 15:1. They were therefore looking to circumcision as a means of justification. But since there is none other name under heaven except that of Christ whereby we can be saved, it follows that to depend on anything except Christ for justification is a rejection of Christ. It was this which called out Paul’s letter to them. Now since the Galatians were being led to trust in circumcision for justification from sin, what else could be the burden of a letter designed to correct this error, but justification by faith in Christ? That this is the burden of the epistle is seen from Galatians 2:16-21; 3:6-8, 10-14, 22, 24, 26, 27; 4:4-7; 5:5, 6; 6:14, 15, and other passages. In the book of Romans the apostle develops his argument on justification by faith in a general way, building up a general treatise; but when he wrote to the Galatians he had a special object in view, and he adapted his epistle to the necessities of the case. It is the most natural thing in the world that he should write on justification by faith to the Galatians, when they were in danger of losing their faith, even if his treatise on that subject to the Romans had been already written. The truth is, however, that the book of Galatians was written first. In

the book of Romans he expanded the book of Galatians into a general treatise.

On page 13 of your pamphlet I find a paragraph which must necessarily be misleading to those who have not read my articles. You say: —

“What was the change in them of which he complains so strongly? Was it that they had kept the moral law so well—had observed the Sabbath, refrained from idolatry, blasphemy, murder, lying, stealing, etc.—that they felt they were justified by their good works, and therefore needed no faith in a crucified Saviour? or was it that they had accepted circumcision, with all it implied and symbolized, the laws and services which served as a wall of separation between Jews and Gentiles, and the ordinances of the typical remedial system? We unhesitatingly affirm it was the latter. In indorsing the former remedial system of types and shadows, they virtually denied that Christ, the substance to which all these types pointed, had come. Hence their error was a fundamental one in doctrine, though they might not realize it. This was why Paul spoke so forcibly, and pointed out their error with such strength of language. Their error involved *practices* which were subversive of the principles of the gospel. They were not merely errors of opinion.”

Anyone who had not read my articles would naturally conclude on reading the above, that I had claimed that the Galatians were most strict in their observance of the ten commandments, and that by this means they expected to be justified from past transgression. That is the very opposite of what I taught. I made it as clear as I knew how, that the Galatians were accepting “circumcision with all it implied and symbolized,” and were accepting the Jewish error that circumcision was the only means of justification. We cannot suppose that the Jews who were thus seeking to turn the Galatians away from the faith, taught them to ignore the ten commandments, but we do know that they did not teach them to rely solely upon their observance of the moral law as a means of justification. The true *gospel* is to keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. The *perverted gospel* which the Galatians were being taught, was to keep the commandments of God, and circumcision. But since circumcision is nothing, and there is in the universe no means of justification outside of Christ, it follows that they were

practically relying upon their good works for salvation. But Christ says, "Without Me ye can do nothing;" that is, the man who rejects Christ, by accepting some other mode of justification, cannot possibly keep the commandments, "for Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." So we find that the Galatians, although they had once accepted Christ and known God, were now insensibly turning away from God, and of course going back to the heathen practices which came so naturally to them. This is shown by several expressions: First, "I marvel that ye are so soon removed from Him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel, which is not another." Galatians 1:6, 7. This shows that they were being removed from God, for God is the one who calls people unto the fellowship of His Son. 1 Corinthians 1:9. Again we read, "After that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements?" Galatians 4:9. This shows that they were turning from God. Once more we read, "Ye did run well; who did hinder you that ye should not obey the truth?" Galatians 5:7. These passages clearly show that that which made the case so urgent was the fact that the Galatians were leaving the truth of God, and going into idolatry. This was not because the Jews were teaching them to break the commandments, but because they were putting their trust in something besides Christ, and the man who does that cannot keep from sin, no matter how hard he tries. See Romans 8:7-10; Galatians 5:17. Those who attempt to build their house on anything except the rock Christ Jesus, are building for destruction. And so I believe as firmly as you can that their error was fundamental and a grave one.

I must go back to the tenth page, and notice an expression which I find concerning the relative position of the Jews and Gentiles after the passing away of the ceremonial law:—

"There was no propriety, therefore, in still keeping up the wall of separation between them and others. They all stood now upon the same level in the sight of God. All must approach Him through the Messiah who had come into the world; through Him alone man could be saved."

Do you mean to intimate by this that there was ever a time when any people could approach God except through Christ?

If not, then language means nothing. Your words seem to imply that before the first advent men approached God by means of the ceremonial law, and that after that they approached Him through the Messiah; but we shall have to go outside the Bible to find any support for the idea that anybody could ever approach God except through Christ. Amos 5:22; Micah 6:6-8, and many other texts show conclusively that the ceremonial law alone could never enable people to come to God. These points will come in again later.

I pass on to your consideration of the second chapter. I do not think there is anyone whose opinion is worth considering, who will question for a moment your statement that the visit referred to in the first verse in this chapter is the same as the one of which we have an account in Acts 15. I certainly agree with you there. If you will notice, I made a distinct point on this in my articles; in fact, I insisted upon it as a necessary foundation of my argument. I repeated several times, what I have already stated in this letter, that the epistle to the Galatians was called out by the very same thing which the certain men who came down to Antioch were teaching, namely, "Except ye be circumcised ye cannot be saved." I agree with you that "the very same question precisely which came before the council is the main subject of the apostle's letter to this church." But I do not agree with you in all that you say in the words immediately following, which I find on page 25 of your pamphlet:—

"Will any Seventh-day Adventist claim that the moral law was the subject considered by that council? Was it the moral law which Peter characterizes as 'a yoke ... which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear'? Were the moral and ceremonial laws all mixed up and confounded in the council? Did the decision of that body set aside the laws against stealing, lying, Sabbath-breaking, and murder? We all know better. The council took no cognizance whatever of the ten commandments."

Do you really believe that the council took no cognizance of the ten commandments? If so, can you tell me of what law fornication is the transgression? Fornication is one of the four things forbidden by the council. Now I have a very distinct recollection of some plain talk which you gave

on this subject at the General Conference, and of some still plainer testimony from Sister White, all of which I thought was very pertinent. You proved from Scripture that the seventh commandment may be broken by even a look, or a desire of the heart. And yet you claim that the council which forbade fornication took no cognizance whatever of the ten commandments. How you can make such a statement after reading the fifteenth chapter of Acts, is beyond my comprehension.

Again, another thing which was forbidden by the council was “pollutions of idols.” That certainly must have some connection with the first and second commandments, to say nothing of other commandments that were broken in idolatrous feasts. I should be extremely sorry to have people get the idea that we do not regard pollutions of idols, or fornication, as violations of the moral law. You claim that it is the ceremonial law alone that was under consideration in that council. Will you please cite me to that portion of the ceremonial law which forbids fornication and idolatry?

This is an important matter, and right here your whole argument falls to the ground. You very properly connect the book of Galatians with the fifteenth chapter of Acts. You justly claim that in Galatians Paul pursues the same line of argument which was pursued in the council. And you depend on the assumption that the council took no cognizance of the moral law, in order to prove that the moral law does not come into the account in Galatians. But a simple reading of the report of the council shows that the moral law *did* come in there; and therefore, according to your own argument, the moral law must be considered in the book of Galatians.

Take for a moment the supposition that the ceremonial law alone was considered by the council; then it necessarily follows, as is plainly stated in the “Two Laws,” page 31, that the council decided that four points of the ceremonial law were declared to be binding on Christians. Now let me ask:

1. Is the decision of that council as binding on us as it was on the primitive Christians? If so, then the ceremonial law was not taken away at the cross, and we are still subject to

it. 2. If the ceremonial law was a yoke of bondage, and that council decreed that a part of it was to be observed by Christians, did they not thereby deliberately place Christians under a yoke of bondage, in spite of Peter’s emphatic protest against putting a yoke upon them? 3. If those “four necessary things” were part of the ceremonial law, and were binding twenty-one years after the crucifixion, when, if ever, did they cease to be in force? We have no record that those four necessary things ever ceased to be necessary things; and therefore, according to the theory that the ceremonial law was a yoke of bondage, it is impossible for Christians ever to be perfectly free. This one thing is certain, if the ceremonial law was nailed to the cross, then the apostles, acting in harmony with the leadings of the Spirit of God, would not declare a part of it to be “necessary things.” And whoever claims that the “four necessary things” enjoined by the council at Jerusalem, were a part of the ceremonial law, thereby denies that the ceremonial law ceased at the cross. I cannot think that you would have taken the position which you have, if you had taken time to carefully consider this matter.

Now let me state, in brief, what I regard as the truth concerning the council at Jerusalem. Certain ones came down to Antioch and taught the brethren that if they were not circumcised they could not be saved. These persons, or others of the same class, had greatly troubled all the churches that Paul had raised up, the Galatians among the rest. These men who taught thus were not Christians indeed, but were “false brethren;” see Galatians 2:4. As a consequence of this teaching, many were being turned away from the gospel. In trusting to circumcision for justification, they were leaning on a broken reed which could profit them nothing. Instead of gaining righteousness by it, they were insensibly being led into wicked practices, for without faith in Christ no man can live a righteous life. Suppose now that the council had confirmed the teachings of these false brethren, and had decreed that circumcision was necessary to justification; what would have been the result? Just this; they would have turned the disciples away from Christ; for the

only object in coming to Christ is to receive justification or pardon, and if people can get it without coming to Christ, of course they have no need of Him. But whatever the apostles might have decreed, it would still have remained a fact that circumcision is nothing, and that the disciples could no more be justified by it than they could by snapping their fingers. Therefore, if they had been led to put their trust in circumcision, they would have rested satisfied in their sins; and to lead them to do that would indeed have been to put a yoke upon them. Sin is a bondage, and to teach men to put their trust in a false hope, which will cause them to rest satisfied in their sins, thinking that they are free from them, is simply to fasten them in bondage.

Peter said, "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 the fathers had the ceremonial law, and did bear it; they practiced it, and throve under it, as David said: "Those that be planted in the house of the Lord shall flourish in the courts of our God. They shall still bring forth fruit in old age; they shall be fat and flourishing." Psalm 92:13, 14. Anyone who reads the Psalms will see that David did not regard the ceremonial law as a burdensome yoke, nor think it grievous bondage to carry out its ordinances. It was a delight to him to offer the sacrifices of thanksgiving, because by it he showed faith in Christ. Faith in Christ was the soul and life of his service. Without that his worship would have been a meaningless form. But if he had been so ill-informed as to suppose that the simple mechanical performance of the ceremonial law would cleanse him from sin, then indeed he would have been in a grievous condition. There are two yokes,—the yoke of sin (Satan's yoke), and the yoke of Christ. The yoke of sin is hard to bear,—Satan is a hard master; but the yoke of Christ is easy, and His burden is light. He sets us free from sin, that we may serve Him by bearing His mild yoke. Matthew 11:29, 30.

Now what was the reason that only four things were enjoined upon these troubled converts. It was because these four things covered the danger. Compliance with Jewish ceremonies, as a means of justification, separated them from

Christ, and naturally led them to look with favor upon heathen ceremonies. They were told that no Jewish ceremonies whatever were required of them, and then were cautioned against the four things in which there was the greatest danger for them. If the converts from among the Gentiles should begin to backslide, fornication and the eating of blood would be the first things they would take up, because those were so common among the Gentiles that they were not considered sinful at all.

Thus we see that while in the council at Jerusalem the ceremonial law was under consideration, and the question was whether or not Christians should observe it, the only importance that attached to it, and the only reason why those who taught circumcision were reproved, was because such teaching necessarily led to the violation of the moral law; and this is the sum of the teaching in the book of Galatians. Paul emphatically warns the Galatians against being circumcised; not because circumcision was in itself so heinous a thing, for he himself had circumcised Timothy (and that, too, *after* the council at Jerusalem), but because they were trusting in circumcision for justification, thus cutting loose from Christ, and relapsing into idolatry.

I pass to page 33, to your closing remarks on the second chapter, where you say:—

"We have had here nearly two entire chapters in this letter, about one-third of the whole epistle, and hitherto we have not had a single reference to the moral law; but through it all constant reference is made to the other law, that of Moses."

I think you could not have had in mind the nineteenth verse of the second chapter when you wrote the above. That verse reads, "For *I through the law am dead to the law*, that I might live unto God." The ceremonial law *never* had power to slay anyone. But even allowing that it did once have that power, it had itself died, having been nailed to the cross at least three years before Paul was converted. Now I ask, How could Paul be slain by a law that for three years had had no existence? This verse shows upon the face of it that the moral law is referred to. It is the same law to

which Paul refers when he says, "I was alive without the law once; but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died. And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death." Romans 7:9, 10. The limits of a brief review do not allow me to give an exposition of these references to the law in the second chapter of Galatians, as I hope to do sometime, but it needs very little space to show that the moral law, and no other law, is referred to in Galatians 2:19.

I see you apply Galatians 3:10 to the ceremonial law. In so doing you certainly are taking a new position. I think I have read every book published by Seventh-day Adventists, and I never read that position in any of them. On the contrary, everyone who has written upon this subject has applied this to the moral law, and I do not see how there is any chance to apply it anywhere else. I do not question the statement that "the book of the law" included both the moral law and the ceremonial law. I am glad that you admit as much, for many who have talked or written on this subject have seemed to claim that "the book of the law" refers exclusively to the ceremonial law. You will notice, however, that the book of Deuteronomy is devoted almost entirely to moral precepts, and has only one or two references to the ceremonial law, and those references are to the three annual feasts, the antitype of one of which is still in the future. That the moral law occupies the chief place in the book of Deuteronomy must be patent to everyone who carefully reads that book. See chapter 4:5-13; 5; 6; (ch. 6:25 is universally used by Seventh-day Adventists concerning the moral law); 11:8, 18-28; 13; and many others than these which I have selected at random. Deuteronomy 29:29 certainly applies to the moral law, and the expression there used (in the last clause) implies that the moral law is the prominent law under consideration in the book. And in Deuteronomy 27, where the curses are found, the twenty-sixth verse of which is quoted in Galatians 3:10, *only the moral law* is referred to.

But while it is doubtless true that the ceremonial law was included in the "book of the law," I have yet to find Scripture proof for the statement that there was any curse pro-

nounced for non-performance of the ceremonial law as an independent law. I will try to make clear what I mean. There can be no moral obligation to perform anything not required by the moral law. That is simply another way of saying that sin is the transgression of the law. Now, if at any time sin can be imputed for the performance or non-performance of any act not forbidden or enjoined in the moral law, then it necessarily follows that the moral law is not a perfect rule of action. But the moral law *is* a perfect law. It embodies all righteousness, even the righteousness of God, and nothing more can be required of any man than perfect obedience to it. That law is so broad that it covers every act and every thought, so that it is utterly impossible for a person to conceive of a sin which is not forbidden by the moral law. I do not see how this position can be questioned by one who believes in the divine origin and the perpetuity of the law; yet your position does virtually deny that the moral law is a perfect rule of conduct; for you say that the curse attaches both to the ceremonial law and to the moral law.

That the curse of the law is death, I do not suppose you will deny, and therefore will not stop here to offer extended proof, yet a few words may not be out of place. I simply note the following points: 1. The curse of the law is what Christ bore for us. See Galatians 3:13. 2. This curse consisted in being hanged on a tree. See last part of same verse. 3. This being hanged on a tree was the crucifixion of Christ, for at no other time was He ever hanged on a tree; and Peter said to the wicked Jews: "The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew and hanged on a tree." Acts 5:30. Therefore death is the curse which Christ bore for us; but death is the wages of sin, and sin is the violation of the moral law. Therefore Christ bore the curse of the moral law for us. There is no other law that has any curse attached to it. Certain it is that no curse is or can be pronounced except for sin; therefore if the curse be pronounced for failure to comply with the rites of the ceremonial law, then such failure must be in itself sin, and therefore the ceremonial law is also a standard of righteousness. I do not see how from your

position you can avoid the conclusion that the moral law is not, or at least was not, in the Jewish age, of itself a perfect standard of righteousness. The great fault which I find with the position you hold is that it depreciates the moral law, and correspondingly depreciates the gospel.

Let me repeat the argument: If the curse attaches to the ceremonial law, then violation of the ceremonial law is sin; and if violation of the ceremonial law is sin, then there is sin not forbidden by the ten commandments; and then the ten commandments are not a perfect rule of action; moreover, since the ceremonial law is done away, it follows that the standard of righteousness is not so perfect now as it was in the days of Moses. If this is not a legitimate conclusion from your premises, I must confess my ignorance of logic. Another point: No sin can remove itself, neither can it be atoned for by any subsequent good deed. So then there must be some scheme of atonement for sin. Now if sin were imputed for neglect of the ceremonial law, what remedy was provided for that sin? The ceremonial law was simply the ordinances of the gospel. If condemned sinners were still further condemned by the very remedy provided for their salvation, then indeed it must have been a yoke. A man is in a truly pitiable condition when the remedy given him for a sore disease only aggravates that disease.

But you will say, and correctly too, that those who refused to comply with the requirements of the ceremonial law were put to death. Why was this, if the curse did not attach to the ceremonial law? I will answer. The violator of the moral law justly merited death, but God had provided a pardon for all who would accept it. This pardon was on condition of faith in Christ, and it was ordained that faith in Christ should be manifested through the rites of the ceremonial law. Now if a man repented of his sins, and had faith in Christ, he would manifest it, and would receive the pardon; and then of course the penalty would not be inflicted upon him. But if he had no faith in Christ, he would not comply with the conditions of pardon, and then of course the penalty for sin *would* be inflicted. The penalty was not for failure to carry out the rites of the ceremonial law, but for the sin

which might have been remitted had he manifested faith. I think anybody can see the truthfulness of this position. Let us illustrate it. Here is a man who has committed a murder, and is under sentence of death. He is told that the Governor will pardon him if he will acknowledge his guilt, repent of his sin, and make an application for pardon; but this he refuses to do, and the law is allowed to take its course, and he is hanged. Now why is he hanged? Is it because he refuses to make the application for pardon? Not by any means. He is hanged for the murder. No particle whatever of the penalty is inflicted because he refused to sue for pardon, and yet if he *had* sued for pardon every particle of the penalty would have been remitted. So it is with the sinner in his relation to the law of God. If he despises the offer of pardon, and shows his disregard by a refusal to take the steps necessary to receive the pardon, then the curse of the law, death, is allowed to fall upon him. But refusing to receive pardon is not a sin. God *invites* men to receive pardon, but He has no law to *compel* them to be pardoned. The murderer who has been offered pardon and has rejected it, is no more guilty than another man who has committed the same crime but who has not been offered a pardon. I do not know as this can be made any clearer; I cannot see that it needs to be. The sum of it all is simply this: Sin is the transgression of the moral law, and the violation of no other law; for the moral law covers all duty. There is a curse attached to the violation of the law, and that curse is death; "for the wages of sin is death." But there is provision for the pardon of those who exercise faith in Christ. And this faith is indicated by a performance of certain rites. Before Christ, it was by the offering of sacrifices; since Christ it is by baptism and the Lord's Supper. Those who have real faith will indicate it in the prescribed manner, and will escape the penalty. Those who have not faith will receive the penalty. This is exactly what Christ meant when He Himself said to Nicodemus: "For God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through Him might be saved. He that believeth on Him is not condemned; but *he that believeth not is condemned already*, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." John 3:17, 18.

I marvel how you can read Galatians 3:11, 12, and imagine that the word law in those verses has the slightest reference to the ceremonial law. I quote them: "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." It does not seem as though any comment could make more evident the truth that the moral law alone is here referred to. You cannot escape this conclusion by saying that the statement that no one is justified by the law in the sight of God, applies with equal force to *any* law, and that therefore this *may* apply to the ceremonial law as well as to the moral. The question is not what law *may be* referred to, but what law is referred to? The law here referred to is a law of which it is said, "The man that doeth them shall live in them." Now this is emphatically true of the moral law. It is equivalent to Romans 2:13: "The doers of the law shall be justified." The sad fact that there are no doers of the law does not destroy the truth that the doers of the law shall be justified. Perfect compliance with the moral law alone is all that God can possibly require of any creature. Such service would necessarily give eternal life. But a man might perform every item of the ceremonial law with the most rigid scrupulousness and yet be condemned. The Pharisees were strict observers of the ceremonial law, yet they were cursed; therefore this text cannot have the slightest reference to the ceremonial law.

Again, the text says, "And the law is not of faith." But the ceremonial law was of *nothing else but faith*; it was a matter of faith from beginning to end. It was faith that constituted all the difference between the offering of Abel and that of Cain. See Hebrews 11:4. It was faith alone that gave to that system all the force it ever had. And this again is positive evidence that the ceremonial law is not referred to.

It does not seem possible that argument is needed to show that Galatians 3:11-13 has reference to the moral law, and to the moral law exclusively. Until the publication of your pamphlet, a contrary view was never put forth by Seventh-day Adventists. I really cannot believe that you would delib-

erately deny that the moral law is there under consideration. The limits of this review will not allow me to take up every occurrence of the word "law" in the book of Galatians, and show its application, but I wish to ask one question: Is it reasonable to suppose that the apostle would use the words, "the law," in one place, and then a few verses later, without any change in his subject, or anything to indicate a change, use the same words again, and in the two places have reference to two entirely distinct laws? You yourself say that it is not. If it were true that the apostle wrote in so indefinite a manner as that, using the term "the law" in one verse with reference to the moral law, and in the next verse with reference to the ceremonial law, then nobody could understand his writings unless he had the same degree of inspiration that the apostle had.

I turn again to your book, page 39, and read the following:—

"If these Galatians were going to re-establish the whole Jewish system, which would be the logical result of their action in adopting circumcision, they must thereby bring themselves under a curse."

In the same paragraph you say that the statement, "Cursed is every one that *continueth not* in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them," applies to the ceremonial law, and that the Galatians were bringing themselves under this curse because they *were going to re-establish the whole Jewish system!* I cannot see logic in that. If it were true, it would be a case of "You'll be damned if you do, and you'll be damned if you don't."

I pass to your argument on *Galatians* 3:17-19. On this you say:—

"This law was given four hundred and thirty years after the promise to Abraham. Could it, therefore, be the same as 'My commandments, My statutes, and My laws' which Abraham kept? Genesis 25:5. They were evidently the moral law; hence this is not."— p. 43.

This is an argument that proves too much. It is a reversal of the Campbellite view that the moral law had no existence before it was given upon Mount Sinai. Your argument claims that the moral law was not given upon Mount Sinai,

because it existed in the days of Abraham. But it is a fact that God spoke *some* law from Mount Sinai, and that this event was four hundred and thirty years after the promise to Abraham; therefore your statement that the law given four hundred and thirty years after the time of Abraham cannot be the moral law because Abraham kept the moral law, amounts to the assertion that the law given upon Mount Sinai was *not* the moral law. Your argument also, if valid, would prove that the law referred to is not the ceremonial law either, because Abraham had that in substance. He had circumcision, which you say stands for the whole ceremonial law, and he had sacrifices. I think that when you revise your book, that argument at least will have to be left out.

You next say:—

“This law was ‘added because of *transgressions*.’ The original word signifies ‘to pass by or over; to transgress or violate.’ This law, then, had been ‘added’ because some other law had been ‘passed by,’ ‘transgressed,’ or ‘violated.’ It was not ‘added’ to itself because itself had been ‘violated.’ This would be absurd if applied to the moral law; for none of us claim there was any more of the moral law really in existence after the ten commandments were spoken, than there had been before. They all existed before, though Israel may have been ignorant of portions of them.”

It seems as though your principal argument is a play upon words. It is not enough to say that a thing is absurd, in order to controvert it. Some things may seem absurd to one person which appear very reasonable to another. Paul says that the preaching of the cross is to some people foolishness, or absurd, and I have often heard people ridicule the idea that the death of one person could atone for the sins of another. They call such an idea absurd, yet to you and me it is perfectly consistent with reason. So when you say that it is absurd to apply the term “added” to the moral law, you should substantiate your assertion by proof, in order to have it of any value.

You say, “It could not properly be said that the moral law was ‘appointed’ four hundred and thirty years after Abraham, when we see that it existed and he fully kept it at that time.” This argument has been noticed already, but I will note it a little further. If the law here referred to

means the ceremonial law, and your argument just quoted is valid, then it precludes the possibility of there being any ceremonial law in the time of Abraham; but Abraham had the essential parts of the ceremonial law, although that law had not been formally given. If you deny that Abraham had the ceremonial law, and insist that that law was not given until 430 years after his time, then I would like to ask what remedial system there was before the exode? You say that the ceremonial law was added because of transgressions, that is, as a remedial system. Then why was it not added as soon as the transgression was committed, instead of 2,500 years later? I claim that the remedial system entered immediately after the fall, and for proof I cite you to the offering of Abel. Your argument would put off the remedial system until the exode. You may say that at that time the ceremonial law was given more formally and circumstantially than before; very good, but if that argument will apply to the ceremonial law, as it undeniably will, why will it not apply equally to the moral law? You cannot deny that the moral law was given at Sinai, although it had been known since the creation. Why was it given then? Because it had never been formally announced. So far as we know, no copy of it had ever been written, and the great mass of the people were almost totally ignorant in regard to it. You, yourself, say that Israel may have been ignorant of portions of the moral law, and this is undoubtedly true. Then there is abundant reason why it should have been given at that time,—because of transgressions. If all the people had known and obeyed the law, there would have been no necessity for its promulgation on Sinai; but because they were ignorant of its requirements, and had transgressed it, it was necessary that it should then be given as it was.

But you say that it is not proper to apply the term “added” to the moral law. The Bible itself must decide that matter. In the fifth chapter of Deuteronomy Moses rehearses to the children of Israel the circumstances of the giving of the law. Verses 5-21 contain the substance of the ten commandments, and of these Moses says in the twenty-second verse: “These words the Lord spake unto all your assembly in the

mount out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness, with a great voice; *and He ADDED no more.*” The term “added,” in this verse, is in the Septuagint exactly the same as that rendered “added” in Galatians 3:19. The Hebrew word is the same that is rendered “add” in Genesis 30:24. That it has unmistakable reference in Deuteronomy 5:22 to the moral law, and to that alone, no one can deny. I care not whether you render it “added,” “spoken,” or “promulgated”—it makes no difference. In Hebrews 12:18, 19 we have unmistakable reference to the voice of God speaking the law from Sinai, and the request of the people that God should not speak to them any more (Exodus 20:18, 19), in the words, “which voice they that heard entreated that the word should not be *spoken* to them any more.” Here the word rendered “spoken” is the same as that rendered “added” in Galatians 3:19 and Deuteronomy 5:22. If we chose we might render it, “they entreated that the word should not be *added* to them any more,” and then we would have a uniform rendering. Or we might render it uniformly “spoken,” and then we would read in Deuteronomy that the Lord spoke all those words in the mount, out of the midst of the fire, etc., with a great voice, “and He spoke no more;” and this would be the exact truth and a good rendering. And likewise for uniformity we might justly render Galatians 5:19, “it was *spoken* because of transgressions.” Or we might take the word in Deuteronomy 5:22 in the same sense in which it is used in Genesis 30:24, and the same idea would appear. When Rachel said, “God shall add to me another son,” it was the same as though she had said, “God will give me another son.” So the meaning in Deuteronomy 5:22 is that after the Lord had given them the commandments recorded in the preceding verses, He gave them no more. It seems to me very reasonable to apply the term “added” to the moral law; and whether it is reasonable or not I have certainly quoted two texts besides Galatians 3:19 which apply it so. But you cannot find in the Bible *a single instance* of the use of the word “added,” as applied to the ceremonial law, to substantiate your view on Galatians 3:19.

Deuteronomy 5:22 plainly says that the ten commandments were

spoken by the Lord, and that nothing but the ten commandments was spoken, or given, or “added.” Galatians 3:19 tells us why they were spoken. It was because of transgressions; that is, because people were largely ignorant, of the law. We may not play upon the word “added,” and use it in a mathematical sense, but must necessarily use it in the sense of declaring or speaking. There was no more moral law after God spoke it from Sinai than there was before, but it was certainly known a great deal better than it was before, and there was less excuse for sin than there was before. In the preceding verses the apostle has spoken of the promise to Abraham, and the covenant made to him. The statement that that covenant was confirmed in Christ shows plainly that the covenant to Abraham confirmed the forgiveness of sins through Christ. But the forgiveness of sin necessarily implies a knowledge of sin. Only the righteous can be heirs of the promise, and a knowledge of sin and righteousness can only be obtained through the moral law. Therefore the giving of the law in a more specific manner than ever before was necessary, in order that the people might be partakers of the blessings promised to Abraham.

The very same thing is stated in Romans 5:20, “Moreover, the law entered that the offense might abound;” and I never knew any Seventh-day Adventist to have any trouble in applying that to the moral law, yet it is certainly as difficult a text as Galatians 3:10. The word rendered “entered” is, literally, “came in.” The revised version has it, “came in beside.” But the moral law existed before the days of Moses, as is evident from verses 13, 14 of the same chapter, and also from the expression in the same verse, “that the offense might abound,” showing that sin—the transgression of the law—existed before the law came in. Although the law existed in all its force before the exode, yet it “came in,” “entered,” was spoken or given, or “added” at that time. And why? That the offense might abound, i.e., “that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful;” that what was sin before might the more plainly be seen to be sin. Thus it entered, or was added, “because of transgressions.” If it had not been for transgressions there would

have been no necessity for the law to enter at Sinai. Why did it enter because of transgressions? “That the offense might abound;” in order to make sin seem greater than ever before, so that men might be driven to the super-abounding grace of God as manifested in Christ. And so it became a school-master, pedagogue, to bring men to Christ, in order that they might be justified by faith, and be made the righteousness of God in Him. And so it is stated later that the law is not against the promises of God. It works in harmony with the promise, for without it the promise would be of no effect. And this most emphatically attests the perpetuity of the law.

I do not care for the opinions of commentators, except as they state in a clearer form that which has already been proved from the Bible; but as you in your pamphlet seem to have placed considerable reliance upon the opinion of commentators, it may not be profitless to quote a few here. I do it, however, not because I think they add anything to the argument, but simply as an offset to your quotations, and because they possibly state the case a little more clearly than I have done. Professor Boise, in his “*Critical Notes on the Greek text of Galatians*,” says on this text:—

“*Because of the transgressions* indicates, therefore, this idea, *to give a knowledge of transgressions, to make plainly clear and distinct what were actual transgressions of the divine requirements.*”

He also says:—

“In keeping with this idea, and perhaps implied, is the interpretation, to restrain *transgressions.*”

And he cites Erasmus, Olshausen, Neander, DeWette, Ewald, Luther, Bengel, and others, as holding the same view. If the opinions of commentators are to decide this matter, I think that the moral law will come out ahead.

Dr Barnes says on the expression “because of transgressions:—

“On account of transgressions, or with reference to them. The meaning is, that the law was given to show the true nature of transgression, or to show what was sin. It was not to reveal a way of justification, but it was to disclose the

true nature of sin; to deter men from committing it; to declare its penalty: to convince men of it, and thus to be ‘*ancillary*’ to, and preparatory to, the work of redemption through the Redeemer. This is the true account of the law of God as given to apostate men, and this use of the law still exists.”

And Dr. Clarke says:—

“It was given that we might know our sinfulness, and the need we stood in of the mercy of God. The law is the *right line*, the *straight edge* that determines the *obliquity* of our conduct. See the notes on Romans 4:15, and especially on Romans 5:20, where this subject is largely discussed and the figure explained.”

Your argument against the moral law being “added because of transgressions” will apply with equal force against the moral law having “entered that the offense might abound.” If you claim that Galatians 3:19 cannot apply to the moral law, then you must claim also that Romans 5:20 does not apply to that law.

I quote further from your pamphlet, from the paragraph ending at the top of page 44:—

“It would be absurd to suppose that this law was ‘added’ to itself. It does apply reasonably to another law, brought in because the one previously existing had been ‘violated.’ A law cannot be transgressed unless it exists; for ‘where no law is, there is no transgression.’”

I have already shown the force of the term, “added.” I have never claimed that any law was added to itself, or that any mathematical process is referred to by the word rendered, “added.” What do you mean by saying a law cannot be transgressed until it exists? You seem to imply that the moral law did not exist so that it could be transgressed before it was given upon Mount Sinai. I know you do not believe this, and yet in another paragraph it is implied still more plainly. I will again quote Romans 5:20: “Moreover the law entered, that the offense might abound. But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound.” This law unmistakably is the moral law, yet you might say it is impossible that it should be the moral law, because offenses existed before the law here spoken of entered, and where no law is there is no transgression; and that therefore the law which here entered was some other law. But you would not argue

that here. You would claim as I do, that the meaning of the text is that the law entered, or was given, in order that sin might appear in its true enormity. As Paul elsewhere says, sin by the commandment became exceeding sinful. The moral law existed from creation, and long before. The patriarchs had a knowledge of it, and also all the antediluvians and the Sodomites, because they were counted sinners; yet it did not exist in written form, and those who were not in immediate connection with God could not have that perfect knowledge of the law which would show them the full heinousness of sin. They could know that the things which they committed were wrong, but they could not realize their full enormity; and especially was this the case when the Israelites came from Egyptian bondage. But God had made a covenant with Abraham, and had promised wonderful things, but only on condition of perfect righteousness through Christ; and if men ever attain to this perfect righteousness, they must have the law in its fullest extent, and must know that many things were sinful, which they might previously have thought were harmless. So the law entered that the offense might abound; and because the offense abounded, and men saw their depravity, they found that grace super-abounded to cover their sins. The case is so plain, and the argument in Galatians 3:19 is so plainly parallel, that I marvel how anybody who has any just conception of the relation of the law and the gospel can question it for a moment.

Again on page 44 I read:—

“The moral law is referred to as the one transgressed. But the ‘added’ law, of which Paul is speaking, made provision for the forgiveness of these transgressions in figure, till the real Sacrifice should be offered.”

Your misapplication of the word “added” I have already sufficiently noticed, but there is an idea expressed in the quotation just made which I am sorry to see has of late been taught to some extent. And that is that in the so-called Jewish dispensation forgiveness of sins was only *figurative*. Your words plainly indicate that there was no real forgiveness of sins until Christ, the real Sacrifice, was offered. If that were so, I would like to inquire how Enoch and Elijah got to

Heaven. Were they taken there with their sins unforgiven? Had they been in Heaven for two or three thousand years before their sins were forgiven? The very fact that they were taken to Heaven is sufficient evidence that their sins were really pardoned. When David says, “Blessed is he whose transgressions are forgiven, whose sins are covered,” he means just what Paul did when he used the same words. David said to the Lord, “Thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin.” That was no sham forgiveness. And it was expressly declared that if a soul should sin against any of the commandments of the Lord, he should offer his sacrifice and his sins should be forgiven him. Leviticus 4:2, 3, 20, 26, 31. There was no virtue in the sacrifice, which was typical, yet the pardon was as real as any that has ever been given since the crucifixion. How could this be? Simply because Christ is the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. That He should offer Himself as a sacrifice, was promised to our first parents in Eden, and confirmed to Abraham by an oath from God, and therefore, by virtue of that promise, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and all who wished, could receive as much virtue from the blood of Christ as we can. That forgiveness was real is shown by the fact that Abel, by his offering, received witness that he was righteous. But there can be no righteousness that has not been preceded by forgiveness. If the pardon were figurative, then the righteousness must also have been figurative. But Abel and Noah and Abraham, and others, were really righteous; they had the perfect righteousness of faith; therefore they must have had actual forgiveness. This is further shown from the fact that forgiveness of sins must precede all righteousness. For there can be no righteousness without faith (Romans 6:23), and faith always brings pardon. Romans 3:24, 25; 5:1.

I quote the next paragraph of your pamphlet, page 44:—

“‘Till the seed should come,’ limits the duration of this remedial system, beyond all question. The word ‘till’ or ‘until,’ ever has that signification. The ‘added’ law, then, was to exist no longer than ‘till the seed should come.’ This the language unmistakably declares. Did the moral law extend no further than the full development of the Messiah? No Seventh-day Adventist will admit that. But this was precisely the case with the other law.”

You say that the added law was to exist no longer than till the seed should come, because the word “till,” or “until,” has *ever* the signification of a certain limited duration. Let me quote you a few texts. In Ps. 112:8, I read of the good man: “His heart is established, he shall not be afraid, *until* he see his desire upon his enemies.” Do you think that that implies that as soon as the good man has seen his desire upon his enemies he shall be afraid? Again I read of Christ in Isaiah 42:4, “He shall not fail nor be discouraged, *till* He have set judgment in the earth.” Do you think the word “till” in this instance limits the duration of the time that Christ should not be discouraged? and does it imply that as soon as He has set judgment in the earth, He shall fail and be discouraged? The question answers itself. Once more, in Daniel 1:21, I read: “And Daniel continued even *unto* the first year of King Cyrus.” Does that mean that he did not live any longer? Not by any means, for in the tenth chapter we read of a vision which was given him in the third year of Cyrus. 1 Samuel 15:35 says that “Samuel came no more to see Saul until the day of his death.” Do you think that he went to see him as soon as he died? These texts show that “till” does not necessarily limit the duration of the thing to which it is applied, and does not necessarily imply that the law ceases at the coming of the seed. The exact meaning of the term in this instance I reserve till later.

I quote again from your pamphlet:—

“The ‘added’ law was ‘ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator.’ All agree that this ‘mediator’ was Moses, who went between God and the people. The original word for ‘ordained’ is rendered ‘promulgate’ by Greenfield, who cites this text as an illustration. Was it true that the ten commandments were ‘ordained,’ or ‘promulgated,’ ‘by angels,’ ‘in’ or ‘by the hand of Moses’? God Himself spoke them with a voice that shook the earth, and wrote them with His own finger on the stone tablets. But the other law was given through angels, and written in a ‘book’ by the ‘hand of Moses.’ If the reader desires to see some of the instances where the same expression substantially is used when speaking of the ‘law of Moses,’ we refer him to Leviticus 26:49; Numbers 4~37; 15:22, 23, and especially Nehemiah 9:13, 14, where the distinction is clearly made between the laws which God spoke, and the ‘precepts, statutes, and laws’ given ‘by the hand of Moses.’”

There are several points in this paragraph, and we will note them in order. First, was the ceremonial law given by angels? Those who hold as you do, say that it was, and quote Galatians 3:19 as proof. But that is not competent testimony on this point, for it is the text under discussion; but, unfortunately for your theory, it is the only text that you can quote. And so the “proof” that the ceremonial law was given by angels is nothing but reasoning in a circle. Thus: You say that Galatians 3:19 refers to the ceremonial law, because it speaks of a law that was “ordained by angels;” then you “prove” that the ceremonial law was spoken by angels, by quoting Galatians 3:19, which you have already “proved” refers to the ceremonial law. This is not proving anything, but is simply begging the question. You started out to show that Galatians 3:19 has reference to the ceremonial law, because it speaks of a law ordained by angels. In order to make that good, you ought to cite at least *one* other text in the Bible where it is at least *implied* that the angels gave the ceremonial law; but this you cannot do.

Now, on the other hand, the connection of angels with the giving of the ten commandments from Sinai is most clearly marked. I first cite Psalms 68:17: “The chariots of God are twenty thousand, even thousands of angels; the Lord is among them, as in Sinai, in the holy place.” Again, I refer to Deuteronomy 33:2: “The Lord came from Sinai, and rose up from Seir unto them; He shined forth from Mount Paran, and He came with ten thousands of saints [holy ones,—angels]; from His right hand went a fiery law for them.” These texts show plainly that the angels of God were on Sinai when the law was spoken. They were there evidently for a purpose, though we cannot tell what. But we have a still more emphatic testimony in Stephen’s address, Acts 7:51-53: “Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost; as your fathers did, so do ye. Which of the prophets have not your fathers persecuted? and they have slain them which showed before of the coming of the Just One; of whom ye have been now the betrayers and murderers; who have received the law by the *disposition* of angels, and have not kept it.” The law which

these wicked Jews had not kept was the moral law, which Stephen said was given “by the disposition of angels,”—the very same term that in Galatians 3:19 is rendered “ordained by angels.” The word *diatasso*, rendered “ordain,” means, according to Liddell and Scott, “to range, ordain, establish, to set in order, draw up an army.” The word “disposition,” in Acts 7:53, is from *diataxis*, a noun derived from the preceding verb, and means, “disposition, arrangement, especially a drawing up of troops, order of battle.” These words have also the signification of “to decree,” to “will,” but the former signification seems to convey the idea of the words as used in the texts quoted.

The text under consideration does not say that the angels spoke the law, and we know very well that they did not speak either the moral or the ceremonial law. The Lord Himself spoke them both, the one directly to the people, and the other to Moses. But the angels were there, evidently in their regular order, as the armies of Heaven. Just what part they had to act no one can tell, for the Bible does not specify. All I claim is that the Scriptures speak of them as being intimately connected with the giving of the moral law; while there is not a text in the Bible which mentions them in connection with the giving of the ceremonial law; and the text in Acts, already quoted, plainly says of the moral law that it was given “by the disposition of angels.” The expression “ordained by angels,” is the one upon which those who argue for the ceremonial law in Galatians, have placed their principal reliance; but even that is against them.

Second, the distinction which is made between the moral and the ceremonial law, namely, that the moral law was spoken by the Lord, and the ceremonial law by Moses, will not hold. The very texts which you cite are against this distinction. I will take the first one, Leviticus 26:46. It reads: “These are the statutes and judgments and laws, which the Lord made between Him and the children of Israel in Mount Sinai by the hand of Moses.” This is the last verse of the chapter. The first two verses of the chapter read thus: “Ye shall make you no idols nor graven image, neither rear you up a

standing image, neither shall ye set up any image of stone in your land, to bow down unto it; for I am the Lord your God. Ye shall keep My Sabbaths, and reverence My sanctuary; I am the Lord.” And then the chapter goes on with instructions to keep the commandments of the Lord, to walk in His statutes, tells what judgments shall come upon them if they break the commandments, especially the Sabbath, and closes with the words first quoted. But in all the chapter there is not a shadow of a reference to the ceremonial law.

Your next reference, Numbers 4:37, has no reference to either the moral or the ceremonial law. It simply states that Moses and Aaron numbered the families of the Kohathites, “according to the commandment of the Lord by the hand of Moses.”

Your third reference, Numbers 15:22, 23, has unmistakable reference to the moral law, and to that alone, as will be seen if the twenty-fourth, twenty-fifth, and twenty-sixth verses are read in connection. I will quote them: “And if ye have erred, and not observed all these commandments, which the Lord hath spoken unto Moses, even *all that the Lord hath commanded you by the hand of Moses*, from the day that the Lord commanded Moses, and henceforward among your generations; then it shall be, if ought be committed by ignorance without the knowledge of the congregation, that all the congregation shall offer one young bullock for a burnt offering. ... And the priest shall make an atonement for all the congregation of the children of Israel, and it shall be forgiven them; for it is ignorance; and they shall bring their offering, a sacrifice made by fire unto the Lord, and their sin-offering before the Lord, for their ignorance; and it shall be forgiven all the congregation of the children of Israel.” All this atoning sacrifice was to be made on account of *sins* against what the Lord *commanded by the hand of Moses*. But nothing is sin except violation of the ten commandments.

Your last reference, Nehemiah 9:13, 14, may have reference to both the moral and the ceremonial law. I will quote the verses: “Thou camest down also upon Mount Sinai, and spakest with them from Heaven, and gavest them right judgments, and true laws, good statutes and commandments; and madest known unto them Thy holy Sabbath, and com-

mandedst them precepts, statutes, and laws, by the hand of Moses Thy servant.” This is the only text of all to which you have referred, which even by implication refers to the ceremonial law. And it is certainly a strained implication that limits “by the hand of Moses” to the last part of verse 14. All the other texts, at any rate, when they refer to any law at all, refer solely to the moral law, which is said to have been commanded “by the hand of Moses.”

You will perhaps say that I have broken down the distinction between the moral and the ceremonial law, and have opened the way for the enemies of the law to confuse the two. But I have not. I have simply quoted the texts to which you refer, and have shown their exact application. There is no chance for confusion concerning the two laws, for we have this plain distinction: The moral law was spoken by the Lord with an audible voice, from the fire and smoke of Sinai. The ten commandments are *all* that were given in this manner (Deuteronomy 5:22). and *they alone* were written on tables of stone by the finger of God. The ceremonial law was given in a more private manner. This certainly forbids any confusion. Both the moral and the ceremonial law, however, are, as we have seen in the texts quoted, said to have been given by the hand of Moses, and both were written in the book of the law. But there is still this distinction, that the ceremonial law was written *only in the book*, while the moral law was written on the tables of stone, with the finger of God, and also in a book. That the term, “the law of Moses,” does sometimes refer to the ten commandments, will be evident to anyone who will carefully read Deuteronomy 4:44 to 5:22 and onward; Joshua 23:6, 7; 1 Kings 2:3, 4; 2 Kings 23:24, 25, etc. See also *Great Controversy*, vol. 2, pp. 217, 218, beginning with last paragraph on page 217. On the other hand, the term “the law of the Lord” is applied to the ceremonial ordinances. For instance, see Luke 2:23, 24. Thus the terms, “the law of Moses,” and “the law of the Lord,” are used interchangeably of both laws.

Third, you say of the latter part of Galatians 3:19, that all agree that this mediator was Moses. I do not agree; and I do not think that the text and the context warrant such an

assumption. The apostle continues in the next verse: “Now a mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is one.” Now I turn to 1 Timothy 2:5, and read: “For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.” God is one party in the transaction, and Christ is the mediator. I suppose you will not question the statement that Christ was the One who spoke the ten commandments from Mount Sinai. In *Great Controversy*, vol. 2, page 217 (concerning the sermon on the mount), I read: “The same voice that declared the moral and the ceremonial law, which was the foundation of the whole Jewish system, uttered the words of instruction on the mount.” And this is indicated in the text under consideration, and also in Acts 7:38, where Stephen says of Moses: “This is he that was in the church in the wilderness with the angel which spake to him in the Mount Sina, and with our fathers.” That angel we all understand to be the one that spoke to Moses out of the bush, the one that went before the children of Israel, in whom was the name of God, being none other than our Lord Jesus Christ. If I thought it necessary I could give you plenty of Scripture testimony on this point. And so the text under consideration, as I have proved in noting your points, teaches that the law was given upon Mount Sinai, because of transgression, that is, that the people might know what sin was, and might appreciate the pardon that was offered in the covenant to Abraham; and that it was thus given till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and the apostle shows the dignity and the value of the law, by the statement that it was disposed, or arranged, or ordained, by angels, in the hand of our great mediator, the Lord Jesus Christ.

I will now give a little attention to the expression, “till the seed should come to whom the promise was made,” and show how it harmonizes with the other expressions in the verse as I have explained them. First, I will quote a reference which you make to that. You say:—

“Another argument, a very late invention, designed to avoid the conclusion that the ‘added’ law terminated at the cross, we briefly notice. It is the claim that ‘the seed’ has not yet come, and will not come till the second advent of Christ. It would be hard for the writer to really think

that any believer in Christ would take that position, had we not read it in our own beloved *Signs of the Times*, of July 29, 1886.— p. 46.

If this had been written by some men I should think it was deliberate misrepresentation; for it certainly does woefully misrepresent the view which I take and have published. I have carefully re-read my articles to see if by any unfortunate expression I had conveyed the idea that Christ, the promised seed, has not yet come, and I find no hint of such an idea. I have not, however, the slightest thought that you would willfully misrepresent any person, and I can only attribute your failure to state my position properly, to a too hasty perusal of it. It is not at all surprising to me that in the little time which you had to spare, burdened at the same time with a multitude of cares to distract your mind, you did not grasp the whole of the argument, especially as it was one to which your mind had not been previously directed. But although your misrepresentation was unintentional, it does none the less convey an erroneous impression of my teaching.

The argument which I put forth is not so late an invention as you think. I have held the view for several years, and it was not original with me. But even if it were entirely new, that in itself would be nothing against it; for “every scribe which is instructed into the kingdom of Heaven, is like unto a man that is an householder, which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old.” Matthew 13:52.

It is true that I held, and still hold, that the coming of the seed spoken of in Galatians 3:19, means the second coming of Christ; but that does not imply that Christ has not already come, or that He is not now the seed. You often preach that the Lord is coming, and you no doubt quote such texts of Scripture as Psalm 50:3, 4; 1 Corinthians 4:5, and scores of others. Now if a man hearing you preach such a sermon, should go off and say that you did not believe that the Lord came 1,900 years ago, he would be no more out of the way than you are in saying that I have taught that Christ has not come. In the Old Testament we have many references to the coming of Christ; some of them mean His first advent, and some His second. The only way we can distinguish between them

is by the events mentioned in connection with the references to the coming. And so we must decide here in Galatians 3:19.

There is only one ground on which you can claim that the coming of the seed *cannot* refer to the second coming of Christ, and that is by claiming that He will not be the seed then; that He is the seed only at the first advent. But such a claim cannot stand for a moment, for Christ is as surely the seed when He bruises the serpent’s head, as when He Himself was bruised. He will be the seed when the promise is fulfilled to Him. The matter, then, stands just this way: Christ is the seed; therefore to say, “till the seed should come,” is equivalent to saying, “till Christ should come.” Then the next point is, does the expression, “the coming of Christ,” necessarily apply to the first advent alone? Certainly it does not, for there are two advents, and the simple expression, “the coming of Christ,” may apply to either. Therefore, so far as the expression, “till the seed should come,” is concerned, there is no reason why it should not apply to the second advent as well as to the first. Indeed, we might say that there is an antecedent probability that it should refer to the second coming of Christ, for that is the more prominent coming of the two, and it is the one which we always think of when the expression is unqualified. But in every case of this kind, the context must decide what coming is referred to.

The application of Galatians 3:19 to the first advent of Christ arises largely, I think, from a careless reading of it. You argue as though it read, “till the seed should come *of* whom the promise was made.” But it is, “till the seed should come *to* whom the promise was made.” The apostle is not dealing with the idea that the seed was promised to *Abraham*, but he is speaking of the promise that was made to *Abraham* and *to his seed*, the seed being Christ. Now if you can find a single promise that was fulfilled to Christ at His first advent, there will be some show of reason in applying Galatians 3:19 to the first advent of Christ. But you cannot. There was absolutely nothing that Christ then received; no part of the promise was fulfilled to Him. He received only rebuffs, reproaches, mockings, poverty, weariness, scourging, and death. Moreover, the promise “to Abraham and his seed” is a joint prom-

ise; but certainly no promise was fulfilled to Abraham at the first advent of Christ, for Abraham had then been dead 2,000 years.

That the apostle connects the coming of the seed with the fulfillment of the promise to him, is evident from the simple reading of the text. A certain promise had been made to Abraham and his seed, and a certain thing was given for a special purpose, until the seed *to whom the promise was made* should come. The idea that inevitably follows from the reading of the text, letting each clause have its proper weight, is that at the coming referred to, the seed will inherit the promise. I shall give something more on this point a little further on.

But there is no need of any conjecture as to what the promise is which is referred to in this verse. The eighteenth verse reads thus: "For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise; but God gave it to Abraham by promise;" and then the nineteenth verse continues: "Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made." This shows most conclusively that the promise referred to is the inheritance. This promised inheritance is the whole world (Romans 4:13); and there is no need of presenting argument to show that the inheritance is still future. Christ has not received it, for we are joint heirs with Him; and when He receives it, Abraham and all those who are His children through faith, will likewise receive it. And this makes of no value your argument that "the promises to this seed, many of them, reach beyond the second advent,—as does this one [Isaiah 9:6, 7]—even into eternity. So, according to this reasoning, we may wait to all eternity for the seed to come." That argument, if it proved anything in this connection, would simply prove that the promise to Abraham and to his seed will never be fulfilled, which is contrary to the word of God. But, as we have seen, there are not many promises referred to in this nineteenth verse, but only the one promise, the inheritance, and that promised inheritance will be received at the second coming of Christ and not before.

But you say that even this promise is not fulfilled till the

end of the thousand years, and that therefore if the coming of the seed is not till the fulfillment of the promise, "the seed cannot come till the end of the one thousand years; for the land is not inherited by Abraham till that time." This argument might indeed be called a "late invention." I am certain it is a new one among our people. It is true that the saints do not dwell on the earth till the close of the one thousand years, but it is not true that they do not possess it, or inherit it, till that time. If they do not, then what does Christ mean in Matthew 25:31-34, where He says that when He comes in His glory and all the holy angels with Him, He shall sit upon the throne of His glory, shall separate the righteous from the wicked, and shall say to the righteous, "Come, ye blessed of My Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." The mistake into which you fall is in supposing that the saints cannot possess the earth till they dwell upon it. If that were true, it would apply equally to Christ, that He cannot possess it until He dwells upon it; but we read, in Psalm 2:8, 9, these words of the Father to the Son: "Ask of Me, and I shall give Thee the heathen for Thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for Thy possession; Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; Thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." We learn from this, as well as from Revelation 11:15-19, and other texts, that Christ receives the kingdom just before He comes to this earth. And it is not until after the uttermost parts of the earth are given to Him for His possession, that He dashes the nations in pieces like a potter's vessel. If Christ did not possess the earth, He would not have the right to do this. The wicked subjects of Satan now claim possession of the earth, which has been promised to Christ. When that promise is fulfilled, and the earth is given into His possession, then He will rid it of those who have usurped dominion. He inherits the earth while the wicked are still upon it, but He cannot dwell upon it until they are removed. We say He cannot dwell upon it, not because he has not the *power*, but because He cannot take up His abode upon it while it is so impure. The fact, however, that He does with the nations according to His will, rooting them out of the earth, shows that the earth is in His possession.

This same argument applies to the saints. They are joint heirs with Christ. This means that they receive their inheritance at the same time He does. When He comes to this earth, having received His kingdom, He calls them to inherit it with Him. They do not at once dwell upon the earth, but they dwell in its capital, the New Jerusalem, and possession of the capital of any kingdom is usually considered as evidence of the possession of the kingdom itself. Moreover, the saints during the thousand years sit upon thrones, judging the wicked, and determining the amount of punishment that shall be given to them. Thus they are sharers with Christ in the work of ridding their common possession of its incumbrances. It is just as though you and I should be joint heirs of a farm. At a certain time we are given possession, but we find that it is entirely overrun with thorns and briars; and so before we take up our abode upon it, we clear off this growth of rubbish and burn it up. The wicked are the tares that cumber the farm that is promised to Abraham and his seed; when Abraham and his seed shall be given possession, they will clear it of this foul growth, and then will dwell upon it. This brief argument shows clearly, what I thought was already established among us, namely, that Christ and the saints possess the kingdom when He comes the second time.

Having settled these points, namely, that the “promise” means the inheritance of the earth, and that this promise to Abraham and his seed is fulfilled at Christ’s second coming, we are prepared to go on. The prominent idea in this chapter is by what means the promise is to be obtained. The *promise* is the uppermost thought in this verse. The apostle is showing that the inheritance is gained solely by faith, that it is not of the law, but of faith in the promise, and then he carries us down to the time when the promise shall be fulfilled. That the “coming” that is referred to is the second coming of Christ, when the promise shall be fulfilled, is a most natural and easy conclusion, and makes harmony of the text. I think you overlooked a parallel text which I quoted in my articles. It is Ezekiel 21:26, 27: “Thus saith the Lord God: Remove the diadem, and take off the crown; this shall not be the same; exalt him that is low, and abase him that is high.

I will overturn, overturn, overturn it; and it shall be no more, until He come whose right it is; and I will give it Him.” Here we have unmistakable reference to the seed, in the words, “He whose right it is.” And it is plainly declared that when “He whose right it is” comes, the inheritance will be given Him. These words were written nearly six hundred years before Christ’s first advent, yet it is not necessary for me to enter into an argument to convince you that the first advent of Christ is not referred to here. In Galatians 3:19 Paul is speaking of the inheritance, and says, “till the seed should come to whom the promise was made;” in the text just quoted from Ezekiel, the prophet is speaking also of the inheritance, and says, “till He come whose right it is.” Now why is it any more absurd to say that the first expression refers to the second coming of Christ, than to say that the second refers to that event?

If you say that the coming of the seed has no reference to the second advent, because when the coming spoken of takes place the ceremonial law is to terminate, you beg the question entirely. If you say, as you do in your pamphlet, that applying that coming to the second advent, and the law which is spoken of to the moral law, would make the moral law terminate at the second coming of Christ, I have already answered *that*, for I have shown that “till” does not of necessity mean “termination.” I believe most emphatically that the law referred to is the moral law, and that the coming of the seed is the second advent of Christ, but I do not believe that the moral law is going to terminate when Christ comes; and Galatians 3:19 does not indicate that it will.

In order to establish your point, that the coming of the seed cannot refer to the second advent of Christ, it would be necessary for you to show that Christ was the seed only at the first advent, and that He is not the seed since then. But Genesis 3:15 says not only that the serpent should bruise the heel of the seed (at the first advent), but that the seed should bruise the serpent’s head (at the second advent). When Christ comes the second time He is still the seed. So when Paul says, “till the seed comes,” it need no more be confined to the first advent than when he says, “till the Lord comes.”

Lest it should be objected that Christ does not bruise Satan's head at His second coming, but only after the close of the 1,000 years, I will remind you that the wicked are not punished until after the close of the 1,000 years; yet they are said to be punished at the coming of the Lord. And so they are; for the second advent, like the first, covers a period of time. The first advent of Christ covered all the time of His earthly ministry; the second advent covers all the time from the appearance of "the sign of the Son of man in heaven," until the wicked are destroyed out of the earth.

The argument thus far on the coming of the seed has been negative, in order to meet some of your objections. I will now give some positive argument that the coming referred to is the second advent. In doing this I shall also proceed to consider verses 22-25, for they have an intimate connection with verse 19. Verses 24 and 25 read thus: "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." By no manner of reasoning whatever can these verses be made to apply to the ceremonial law. The reference must be to the moral law, and to that alone, as I shall show.

1. The text does not read that the law was our school-master to *point* us to Christ; if it did there might be some show of reason in applying it to the ceremonial law. But "the law was our school-master to *bring* us to Christ," or, literally, "the law was our school-master unto Christ," that is, the law was our school-master till we came to Christ. Now the ceremonial law brought no one to Christ. The performance of it was an act of faith on the part of the performer, showing the *belief he already had* in Christ.

2. Faith did not release people from the observance of the ceremonial law; on the contrary, the person did not begin the observance of the ceremonial law until he had faith in Christ.

3. The twenty-second verse says that "before faith came, we were kept under the law;" but before faith came, people did not have anything to do with the ceremonial law.

4. If the ceremonial law were referred to in this verse,

then, according to verse 25, we should conclude that as soon as people learned to have faith in Christ they had nothing more to do with the ceremonial law; but the truth is that the patriarchs and prophets were most punctual in their observance of the ceremonial law, and no one had more faith than they. Take the case of David; his writings abound with references to sacrifices and to ceremonies in the court of the Lord's house. He offered multitudes of sacrifices, yet there is no writer in the Bible who shows a more perfect knowledge of Christ, or who exhibits more faith in Him.

5. But you say that the apostle is reasoning of dispensations, and not of individual experiences, and that bringing them to Christ means bringing them to His first advent, and "to the system of faith there inaugurated." But that is the weakest position you could take, for if that were the meaning, then it would follow that the law accomplished its purpose only for the generation that lived at Christ's first advent. No other people ever came to Christ, in the sense in which you use the term. In order for the law to bring men to Christ, in the sense in which you apply it, that is, to His first advent, it would have had to lengthen their lives. Adam would have had to live at least 4,000 years. For, let me again repeat: The text does not say that the law was a school-master to *point* men to Christ, but to *bring* them to Him.

6. Again; the text says it brings men to Christ, that they may be justified by faith. Are people justified by faith in a national capacity. I have just shown that, according to the theory that the apostle is arguing of dispensations, only one generation was brought to Christ, namely, the generation that had the good fortune to live at His first advent; but even that generation was not justified by faith. Very few of them had any faith whatever. They didn't have any faith from first to last. Then they must have remained under the school-master,—the law,—and indeed they did. Justification by faith is an individual, and not a national, matter. Seventh-day Adventists often speak of the great light which "we as a people" possess. But "we as a people" will derive no benefit from that light unless we as individuals possess it in our own hearts. I repeat, justification by faith is something

that each individual must experience for himself. Thousands who lived at Christ's first advent knew nothing of this experience, while thousands who lived long before He came, were actually brought to Christ for pardon, and they received it. Abel was counted righteous through faith; Noah was heir of the righteousness which is by faith; and Abraham actually saw Christ's day, and rejoiced in it, although he died 2,000 years before the first advent. And this most positively proves that the apostle, in the third chapter of Galatians, is speaking of individual experience, and not of dispensational changes. There can be no Christian experience, no faith, no justification, no righteousness, that is not an individual matter. People are saved as individuals, and not as nations.

A word of explanation may be in place right here. The term "under the law," if it be applied to the ceremonial law, cannot have the same meaning that it does when applied to the moral law. When used with reference to the moral law, it means "condemned by the law;" but it cannot have that meaning if it should be applied to the ceremonial law, because that law condemned nobody. So with the supposition that the expression refers to the ceremonial law, we must conclude that *not to be under it* means not to be subject to it; but when we refer it to the moral law, we come to no such conclusion, because "under the law" means condemned by the law.

7. The strongest argument against the ceremonial law view is found in verse 24: "Wherefore the law was our school-master to bring us unto Christ, *that we might be justified by faith.*" Now it is an undeniable fact that the possession of faith led to the offering of sacrifices, and not the offering of sacrifices to faith. "By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain." Now I ask, How could the ceremonial law lead a man to that which he already had? Since it was faith that prompted Abel and all others to offer sacrifices, how can it be said that those sacrifices served as a school-master to lead them to Christ that they might be justified by faith?

I have already noticed your idea that the word "faith" is here synonymous with "Christ;" that the apostle means that

before Christ came we were kept under the law; that the law was our school-master to bring us unto (the first advent of) Christ, that we might be justified by Him; and that verse 25 means that after Christ is come we are no longer under a school-master. I believe that this is the position that is usually taken by those who hold the ceremonial law view, and it is the only position that can be taken if the ceremonial law is referred to. The only thing that it lacks is proof. There is no warrant whatever for making the term "faith" synonymous with Christ. Besides, if that were true, then the text would teach that no man was justified until Christ's first coming, which is preposterous and unscriptural. For this reason we must conclude that the ceremonial law is not under consideration in this verse.

It is evident that verses 19 and 24 are closely related, that is, when the law *entered*, or was *added*, it was in the capacity of a pedagogue, to bring men to Christ. Now to abolish the law before it has brought to Christ all who can be induced to come to Him, would certainly be an act of injustice. The law must retain its office of pedagogue or task-master, until all have come to Christ who will, and this will not be until probation closes and the Lord comes. In its office as pedagogue, it is not against the promise, but works in harmony with it. Thus: God made the promise to Abraham that he and his seed should inherit the earth. This promise was made to Abraham, not because of his inherent righteousness, but because of his faith, which was accounted to him for righteousness. The promise was confirmed in Christ, that is, none but those who exercised faith in Christ for the forgiveness of their sins could be heirs of the promise. But forgiveness of sins depends upon repentance of sin, and repentance of sin presupposes a knowledge of sin, and a knowledge of sin can be obtained only by the law. Therefore the law acts as a pedagogue, overseer, or task-master, to overwhelm men with a sense of their sin, that they may flee to Christ to be justified by faith. And this office it must perform until all those who can be influenced to come to Christ have come, and the promise is fulfilled. Then the law will no longer have the capacity of a task-master. God's people will all be righteous, walking in

the law, and the law will be in their hearts. They will not then need the law written in books or on tables of stone—that is, the *added law*—because they will have direct access to the throne of God, and will all be taught of God. Thus the law was added, or spoken to be a pedagogue to bring men to Christ; but when all who are worth saving have been brought to Christ, it will cease to have that capacity. But this no more implies the abolition of the law when the Lord comes, than the fact that the law *entered* at Sinai implies that there was no law before. There was just as much law before it was *spoken* upon Mount Sinai and written out for the benefit of mankind, as there is today. And when the law shall cease to be a pedagogue, because it has brought to Christ all who can be induced to come, and all earthly copies of the law shall have been destroyed with the earth, the law will still exist—the foundation of the throne of God, unchanged *to* all eternity as it has *from* all eternity.

Perhaps the following from the pen of Elder J. N. Andrews may be considered worthy of perusal. It is from his reply to H. E. Carver, in the *Review and Herald* of September 16, 1851 (vol. 2, No. 4):—

“The idea that the law is our school-master to bring us to Christ, that we may be justified by faith, is often urged as proof that the law is abolished. How is the law our school-master to bring us to Christ? We answer, It shows our guilt and just condemnation, and that we are lost without a Saviour. Here the apostle Paul, who was converted since the time when it is said the law was abolished, ‘had not known sin but by the law.’ Romans 7:7. ‘By the law is the knowledge of sin.’ Romans 3:20. Read a full account of Paul’s experience in this school, also his deliverance from the carnal mind, which ‘is not subject to the law of God.’ Romans 7:7-25; 8:1-7. The instruction of the law is absolutely necessary, for without it we can never know our guilt in the sight of God. It shows our just condemnation, its penalty hangs over our heads; we find ourselves lost, and fly to Jesus Christ. What does He do to save us from the curse of the law? Does He abolish the law that He may save its transgressors? He assures 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 demands? Far from it. He testifies that ‘one jot

or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled. Matthew 5:18; Luke 16:17; James 2:10. And He shows that those who in heart commit any act of iniquity, are transgressors of the law. Matthew 5:22, 27, 28; 1 John 3:15. If the Saviour did not abolish or relax the law, how can those who have fled to Him ‘for refuge,’ hope for salvation? What does He do to save the transgressors from the sentence of the law? He gives up Himself to die in their stead. He lays down His own ‘life a ransom for many.’ Matthew 20:28. ‘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 3:16. Man, though justly condemned, can now be pardoned without dishonoring God, or making void His law. God can be just, and yet the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus. Romans 3:25, 26. Had the law been abolished at the death of Christ, it could not have been a school-master many years afterward to bring the Galatians to Christ. Paul testifies that he ‘had not known lust except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet.’ But an abolished law could never have convinced him of sin as a transgressor. James 2:8, 9; Romans 4:15. We cannot know sin ‘but by the law,’ but if the law was abolished by the death of Christ, the world has never known its sinful state, or realized its need of a Saviour. We may state on the highest authority, that the law brings us to faith for justification, and that faith does not make void the law, but establishes it. Galatians 3:23; Romans 3:31. The fact that the law is our school-master to show us the claims of God, and our own just condemnation, is direct evidence that it has not been abolished, hence, though we have been pardoned through the death of Jesus and thus rescued from its righteous sentence, we can never violate its precepts without being convinced by it as transgressors.”

In your pamphlet (page 50) you make considerable of the words “*the faith*” or “*that faith*,” as though the word “*faith*” were used in a different sense than a personal faith in Christ. But I repeat again, (1) There can be no faith except faith in Christ. And (2) faith in Christ is a personal matter; each one must have faith for himself. Therefore the coming of faith is to each individual as an individual, and not to any people as a class. For the same reason also I cannot accept your statement that “*the faith*” refers to “*the whole system of truth devised by God for the salvation of men*,” and that its coming refers to the revelation of Christ at His first advent. If that were true, it would prove that

the system of truth devised by God for the salvation of men, was not known till Christ came, which is so evidently unscriptural as to need no comment. The theory which you hold, when traced to its conclusion, inevitably makes God have two plans of salvation, one for the people before the coming of the Lord, and another for those after. It makes the Jews judged by one standard, and the Gentiles by another. But the position which I have briefly outlined is consistent with itself, and is consistent with the plainly revealed truth of Scripture concerning the plan of salvation.

You say (page 51):—

“We would be much pleased to have our friends who hold that this ‘added’ law was the ten commandments, tell us how the law against blasphemy, murder, lying, stealing, etc., ‘shut individuals up,’ ‘guard’ them ‘in ward,’ in the relation of a ‘child to a guardian,’ to a ‘revelation’ to be made ‘afterwards.’”

This I can readily do. First, sinners are, in the Bible, represented as being in bondage, in prison. See 2 Peter 2:19; Romans 7:14; 2 Peter 3:19, 20; Zechariah 9:12; Isaiah 61:1; Psalms 68:6; 102:19, 20; Acts 8:23; Hebrews 2:14, 15. Note this last text particularly. Christ died to “deliver them who through fear of death were all their life-time subject to bondage.” It is sin that brings the fear of death, therefore it is sin that causes men to be subject to bondage. Second, whenever men are in prison, it is the law that puts them there. Only a few weeks ago I heard a Judge pronounce the death sentence upon a murderer, and I took particular note of his statement that he was compelled to pronounce the sentence; that he was simply the law’s agent; that since the man had been found guilty, the law demanded his death, and that he was simply the mouthpiece of the law. It is the law which arrests the criminal; the sheriff is simply the visible agent of the law. It is the law which locks the prisoner in his cell; the jailer, the iron walls, and heavy bars which surround the prisoner, are simply the emblems of the iron hand of the law which is upon him. If the government is just, and if the man is indeed guilty, there is no way in which he can escape the punishment, unless he has a powerful advocate who can secure his pardon from the Governor. So it is with the

sinner against God’s government. The eyes of the Lord are in every place, so that there is no possibility that he can escape arrest. As soon as he has sinned, he is seized by the law, and is at once under condemnation of death, because it has already been declared that the wages of sin is death. Now he is shut in on every side by the law. There is not one of the commandments which is not against him, because there is not a man on earth who has not broken every one of them. At first the sinner may not be conscious of his imprisonment; he has no sense of sin, and does not try to escape. But when the law is so applied to him that he can realize its claims and his failure to meet them, he is convicted. To carry out the figure, we might say that the Spirit of God causes the prison walls to close in upon him, his cell becomes narrower, and he feels oppressed; and then he makes desperate struggles to escape. He starts out in one way, but there the first commandment rises up against him and will not let him go free. He turns in another direction, but he has taken the name of God in vain, and the third commandment refuses to let him get his liberty in that direction. Again he tries, but he has committed adultery, and the seventh commandment presents an impenetrable barrier in that direction, and prevents his escape. So with all the commandments. They utterly refuse to grant him liberty, because he has violated every one of them, and only those who keep the commandments can walk at liberty. Psalm 119:45. He is completely shut in on every side. There is, however, just one avenue of escape, and that is through Christ. Christ is the door (John 10:9), and entrance through that door gives freedom (John 8:36). Since the sinner is in prison, and cannot get freedom except through faith in Christ, it is exactly the truth to say that he is “*shut up,*” *to the faith which may be revealed* to him. The translation “*kept in ward,*” affects the case for you not in the least. It is the same as saying that we were kept *in prison*. Pharaoh’s butler and baker were put “*in ward,*” in the same prison where Joseph was. Genesis 40:3.

Now it is not the Jews alone who are spoken of as “shut up.” You yourself say that the Jews were in as bad case as the Gentiles were. The twenty-second verse of this third of

Galatians also says that “the Scripture hath concluded [literally, “shut up together”] all under sin.” This shows in what the shutting up consists. They are in jail because they have sinned. So Paul says to the Jews, “What then? are we better than they? No, in no wise; for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin.” Romans 3:9. And again he says that “God hath concluded them all [margin, “shut them all up together”] in unbelief.” Romans 11:32. These statements are identical with that in Galatians. Now notice that in all places the shutting up is said to be for the same purpose. Galatians 3:22 says that the Scripture hath concluded or shut up all under sin, “that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.” In the third of Romans Paul shows that Jews and Gentiles are alike under sin, in order to prove that “the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ,” may be “unto all and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference; for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.” Verses 22-24. And in Romans 11:32 he states that God hath shut them all up together (both Jews and Gentiles) in unbelief, “that He might have mercy upon all.” All are in the same bondage—all are under the law—and none can be delivered from their prison until they come to Christ. He is the only door to freedom.

Let me ask you if you think that it is the ceremonial law that shuts men up under sin? If you do, then you hold that the ceremonial law is a rule of righteousness, and thereby you detract from the ten commandments. But if you do not hold this opinion, and I cannot believe that you do, then you admit that it is the moral law that shuts men up and acts as their task-master, to drive them to Christ; that they may be justified by faith. How anybody can hold a different view, I cannot imagine.

Again you say:—

“We claim that this expression, ‘under the law,’ has two significations: (1) Primarily meaning under the authority of the law, or under obligation to keep it; (2) under the condemnation of the law, with its penalty impending over

us, or already suffering it. The expression itself does not decide which of these meanings is to be understood; the connection must decide that.”

It would have been more to the point if you had quoted some instances outside of the one under discussion, to show that “under the law” is ever used in the sense of “subject to the law.” To be sure, you quote from Greenfield’s Lexicon, where it is stated that the word *hupo* is used with the sense “of subjection to the law.” But you should remember that it is the province of lexicons simply to give the *meaning of a word*, and not to decide upon points of doctrine. When Greenfield says that *hupo* means “under,” he states a simple truth; but when he says that it is used in the sense of “subjection to the law,” he gives merely his opinion upon a text of Scripture; and his opinion on the meaning of a text of Scripture is no better than that of any other man. Indeed, I think that if you had examined Greenfield a little more closely you would have left his opinion in this matter out entirely, for he cites Romans 6:14 as an instance of the use of the word *hupo* in the sense of “subjection to the law,” and *that is the only text that he does give as an illustration*. There is no more doubt in your mind than there is in mine that that text refers to the moral law, and to that alone. So if you accept Greenfield as a commentator, you will read that text thus: “For ye are not subject to the law, but under grace.” This would suit the enemies of the truth, but I know that you do not accept it. Your argument from Greenfield is certainly an unfortunate one for you. You say: “Greenfield gives a variety of definitions [*comments*, you should have said], such as the sense in many places requires, one of which is, ‘of subjection to law,’ etc. He gives no instance where it is used in the sense of being subject to the condemnation of the law.” That is, he gives no instance where he *thinks* it is used in the sense of under the condemnation of the law. And the instance he gives where he thinks it is used in the sense of subject to the law, is one where it does unquestionably mean condemned by the law. I have not time here to give an exposition of every text where the expression “under the law” occurs; I have done this in my

articles, and you have not noticed or attempted to overthrow a single position which I took upon those texts. I therefore repeat that (with the exception of Romans 3:19 and 1 Corinthians 9:21, where the word *hupo* is not found, and which should properly be translated “in the law”) the term “under the law,” wherever it occurs in the New Testament, means “condemned by the law.” It never has any other signification. Christians are all subject to the moral law, but they are not under it. If they were under it they would not be Christians.

You say:—

“The moral law never led a man to Christ and left him. It always stays with him. We may be delivered from its condemnation; but its supreme authority must be regarded then as before. Its claims never leave us.”

I agree with that most heartily, The law does not leave the man when he comes to Christ, but the man’s relation to it is changed. Before he was “*under* the law,” now he is “*in* the law” (Psalm 119:1) and the law is in him (Psalm 37:31). He is in Christ, who is the personification of the law, and in Him he is made the righteousness of God. 2 Corinthians 5:21.

Again you say of the moral law:—

“There is nothing in that law about Christ, not a hint. All the law does, is to condemn those who break it, and justify those who keep it. It is the sense of guilt in the man’s conscience, which is acted upon by the Spirit of God, which makes him go to Christ; not anything in the moral law itself.”

This admits my whole argument. Pray tell me what makes the sense of guilt in the man’s conscience? Paul says that “*by the law* is the knowledge of sin.” Have you found something else besides the law of God, which will make a man conscious of his sinful condition? If *conscience* has the power in itself to make a man conscious of his guilt, what office, pray tell me, has the law? What is the use of the law, if the conscience alone convicts of sin? And if conscience possesses the quality of making a man conscious of his guilt, why is it that all men are not equally conscious of guilt? The reason, and the only reason that can be given, is that some men are better instructed in the law than others are. You cannot escape the conclusion that it is the law which produces the

sense of guilt in the man’s conscience, by which he is driven to Christ, unless you deny that by the law is the knowledge of sin. Since it is the sense of guilt in the man’s conscience that makes him go to Christ, and nothing but the law can produce a sense of guilt, it is emphatically the law which drives men to Christ. That is the office of the law to sinful men—to overwhelm them with a sense of guilt, and so to drive them to Christ that they may be justified by faith. True, the ten commandments say nothing about Christ, but does the sense of guilt in the man’s conscience say anything about Christ? That is, does every man have naturally a knowledge of Christ? Of course not. But *the law* begets in the man a consciousness of guilt. The law does this only by the aid of the Spirit, of course, for the word of God is the Spirit’s sword. But when the law, through the Spirit, has produced this sense of guilt, the man feels oppressed and seeks for ease from his load, and is forced to go to Christ, because there is nowhere else that he can go. In trying to avoid my conclusion, you have in the above quotation deliberately walked into it. There was nothing else that you could do.

You continue:—

“But this ‘added’ law did lead to Christ. Every type, every sacrifice, every feast day, holy day, new moon, and annual Sabbath, and all the priestly offerings and services pointed out something in the work of Christ. They were as a body ‘shut up,’ ‘guarded,’ under the control of this ‘severe,’ ‘imperious’ pedagogue, till the great system of justification by faith was reached at the cross of Christ. Mr. Greenfield could readily see that this pedagogue must be used as an illustration of the ‘Mosaic law.’ It is strange that all others cannot see the same.”

Here you yourself admit the charge which I have brought against your theory, namely, that it virtually makes two plans of salvation. If the “great system of justification by faith” was not reached till the cross of Christ, pray tell me whether anybody was ever justified before Christ came, and if so, how? My reading of the Bible convinces me that “the great system of justification by faith” was known as soon as sin entered into the world. I read that “by faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain,

by which he obtained witness that he was righteous.” Hebrews 11:4. And in Psalms 32:1, 2; 68:6, 13; Isaiah 1:18; 53:10, 11; 65:6, 7; Habakkuk 2:4, and scores of similar texts, I find the clearest reference to the great system of justification by faith. Some say that we have a better knowledge of the plan of salvation than the ancients had. Indeed, in one meeting of the Theological Committee, both you and Elder Canright claimed that the patriarchs had very limited, if any, knowledge of Christ’s real work; and you sustained Elder Canright in his assertion that Christ introduced the gospel at His first advent. I do not think that you would have taken such a stand, only that your theory drove you to it. But Christ and Paul based all their instruction concerning that great system upon the Old Testament, and I have never seen a man with so much knowledge of God that he could not study with profit the words of David and Isaiah concerning justification by faith.

In *Great Controversy*, vol. 1, in the paragraph beginning at the bottom of page 58, I read that angels held communication with Adam after his fall, and informed him of the plan of salvation. Certainly if Adam was ignorant of the great system of justification by faith, it was not because of the incompetency of his teachers.

After the battles which we have had to wage with Campbellites concerning the value of the Old Testament Scriptures, and the unity and universality of God’s plan of salvation, it seems almost incredible that anyone should be called on to defend, against Seventh-day Adventists, the idea that the well-informed Jew had a full knowledge of Christ, and was justified only through faith.

The quotation from your pamphlet which I made last, closes thus: “Mr. Greenfield could readily see that this pedagogue must be used as an illustration of the ‘Mosaic law.’ It is strange that all others cannot see the same.” I might with equal propriety say, “Mr. Greenfield could readily see that Christians ought to keep the first day of the week; it is strange that others cannot see the same.” Or again I might say, “Mr. Greenfield could readily see that the expression ‘under the law,’ in Romans 6:14, means ‘subject to the law;’ it is strange that others cannot see the same.” The

only strange thing I can see about it is that you should use such an argument as that. I care nothing for what a man says. I want to know what God says. We do not teach for doctrine the word of men, but the word of God. I am verily convinced that you would not quote Greenfield if you could find Scripture argument instead.

Again on page 64 I read:—

“All God now requires is a humble heart, repentance, and confession of sin, faith in the precious blood of Christ, and a determination to serve God and obey all His requirements.”

This you say of the time after Christ, and it still further emphasizes the charge which I bring against your theory, that it makes two plans of salvation. Can you tell me what else or more than that God required of the Jews? Were they accepted in any other way than by humility of heart, repentance, confession of sins, faith in the blood of Christ, and a determination to obey God? Nay, verily.

I will now pass to a brief notice of your comments on chapter four; and first your arguments on the “elements of the world.” You say (page 58):—

“What are these ‘elements’ which the apostle speaks of, in which they were in bondage until God sent forth His Son made under the law? Are they the commandments of God, the law of liberty, that holy, pure law which will be the rule in the Judgment? We think this would be a conclusion most absurd. We claim with great confidence that these ‘elements’ refer to a different system. The original word is defined by Greenfield: ‘Elementary instruction, first principles, the lowest rudiments in knowledge, science, etc.’ The word is translated ‘rudiments’ in the revised version and in the Diaglott. The same word occurs in Colossians 2:20, where it is translated ‘rudiments.’”

I have never been guilty of the absurdity of claiming that these “elements” are the commandments of God. I am just as confident as you are that they refer to something else. Paul tells me what they are, when he says they are the “elements of the world.” You say this means the ceremonial law. Will you please tell me what the world had to do with the ceremonial law? If the ceremonial law was the elements of the world, then the world ought to have adopted it, instead of despising the Jews because of it, for we know that

the world will love its own. And will you tell me how you reconcile the statement that the ceremonial law is the elements of the world, with your previous statement that it was “given by angels”?

It does not change the argument a particle to translate the word “rudiments.” I readily grant that the rudiments of the world in Colossians 2:20, mean the same as the “elements of the world” in Galatians 4:3. I also claim, what I think you will hardly deny, that the term “rudiments” in Colossians 2:8 has the same meaning that it has in the twentieth verse. It is precisely the same term. Now in *Testimony* No. 7, in the chapter on “Philosophy and Vain Deceit,” Sister White quotes Colossians 2:8, and says that she was shown that this verse has especial reference to Spiritualism. That is, philosophy and vain deceit, or Spiritualism, is “after the rudiments of the world.” Will you claim that there is any connection whatever between the ceremonial law and Spiritualism? Is Spiritualism according to the ceremonial law which God gave to the Jews? Impossible. But it is according to the elements of the world, to the carnal mind, which is enmity against God; it is “according to the course of this world [according to the rudiments, or elements of the world], according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience; among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind,” when “we were by nature the children of wrath.” Ephesians 2:2, 3. The “elements of the world” are “the things that are in the world,” namely, “the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life.” 1 John 2:15, 16. These are not “of the Father,” but are “of the world;” they are practiced *by those who know not God*, and to these things we were all subject before we were quickened by grace. It is not, as you say, on page 57, that “their being under these ‘elements,’ or ‘rudiments,’ brought them into ‘bondage,’” but their being under these elements *was in itself the bondage*—the bondage of corruption.

On page 58 is a paragraph which contains some points that I wish specially to notice, and so I quote it entire. It is the following:—

“In verse four, where Paul speaks of God’s sending forth His Son, made of a woman, we have the expression, ‘made under the law.’ We have already considered the meaning of this term, ‘under the law,’ and have already shown that it does not always mean under the condemnation of the law, but rather under the authority of the law, or under obligation to keep it. The term evidently has this meaning here. Both the revised version and the Diaglott translate ‘made under the law,’ ‘born under the law.’ Greenfield, in the definition of the original word, which has a great variety of significations, quotes its use in this fourth verse with the definition, ‘subject to the law.’ This evidently is the correct sense in which it should be used. It is not true that our Saviour was born under the condemnation of the law of God. This would be manifestly absurd. That he did voluntarily take the sins of the world upon Him in His great sacrifice upon the cross, we admit; but he was not *born* under its condemnation. Of Him that was pure, and had never committed a sin in His life, it would be an astonishing perversion of all proper theology to say he was born under the condemnation of God’s law.”

1. Concerning the meaning of the term, “under the law,” you say that you have shown that “it does not always mean under the condemnation of the law, but rather under the authority of the law, or under obligation to keep the law.” I have carefully reread all previous references to it, and while I find several assertions to that effect, I find not one item of proof. To be sure you quote from Greenfield, but I don’t consider his assertion as of any more value than that of any other man. I cannot take the space here to quote all the occurrences of the term, “under the law,” and show its meaning; but I wish to make this point: In Romans 6:14, 15, and Galatians 5:18, the expression occurs, and there cannot be the slightest doubt but that it means “condemned by the law.” You would not dare give it the meaning, “subject to the law,” in those places. There can be no controversy concerning its use in those texts. Now it is a fixed principle in biblical interpretation that controverted texts must be settled by appeal to texts which are uncontroverted. Moreover, consistency requires that any term should have the same meaning wherever it occurs in the Bible, unless the context shows beyond question that it must have a different meaning. Now there is no place in the Bible where it does not make good sense to interpret “under the law” as “condemned by the

law.” But in the texts which I have just referred to, it cannot possibly mean “subject to the law.” If the limits of this review would warrant it, I would show by positive evidence from Scripture, and not by quotations from commentaries; that “under the law” invariably means “condemned by the law,” and that it cannot by any possibility mean anything else. Of course I except the two places, 1 Corinthians 9:21 and Romans 3:19, where it is not found in the original.

2. I must protest once more against your dependence upon the opinion of commentators. You say: “Greenfield, in the definition of the original word, which has a great variety of significations, quotes its use in this fourth verse, with the definition, ‘subject to the law.’ This is evidently the correct sense in which it should be used.” Why is it evidently the sense in which it should be used? Because Greenfield says so? Must we accept everyone of Greenfield’s opinions as of final authority in matters of faith? I am not prepared to do this. Do not misunderstand me. I am not casting any reflections upon Greenfield as a lexicographer, but as a commentator. When Greenfield gives a simple definition of a word, it is to be accepted, provided it agrees with the definition given in the classical lexicons; for words are not used in Scripture in a special, scriptural sense, but in their ordinary acceptation. But when Greenfield, or any other man, says that a word which has several different shades of meaning is used in a certain sense in any specified text, he is simply giving his opinion, not of the meaning of the word, but of the meaning of the text. And when he does that, anybody may challenge his opinion, and demand the proof. If we are to quote the opinions of men as *authority*, on points of doctrine, we might as well turn Papists at once; for to pin one’s faith to the opinions of man is of the very essence of the Papacy. It matters not whether we adhere to the opinions of one man, or to the opinions of forty; whether we have one Pope or forty. Because a man has written a commentary on the Bible, or on any part of it, that is no reason why his opinion should pass unchallenged. He is only a man still. Seventh-day Adventists, of all people in the world, ought to be free from dependence upon the mere opinion of men.

They should be Protestants indeed, testing everything by the Bible alone.

3. Now as to the rendering of the expression “under the law,” in Galatians 4:4. I have no fault to find with the rendering, “*born* under the law,” but think that it is the correct rendering. I will go farther than you do, and will offer some Scripture evidence on this point.

John 1:1, 14: “in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.” “And the Word *was made* flesh, and dwelt among us.” The word rendered “made” is the same as that in Galatians 4:4, and evidently signifies “born.” The Word was God, yet was born flesh of the Virgin Mary. I don’t know how it could be so; I simply accept the Bible statement. Now read Romans 8:3, and you will learn the nature of the flesh which the Word was made:—

“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 for sin, condemned sin in the flesh.” Christ was born in the likeness of sinful flesh.

Philippians 2:5-7: “Have this mind in you, which was also in Christ Jesus; who, being in the form of God, counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God, but emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men.” Revised version. Now note the next verse: “And being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross.” And now compare the above with,

Hebrews 2:9: “But we see Jesus, who *was made* a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor; that He by the grace of God should taste death for every man.”

These texts show that Christ took upon Himself man’s nature, and that as a consequence He was subject to death. He came into the world on purpose to die; and so from the beginning of His earthly life He was in the same condition that the men are in whom He died to save. Now read,

Romans 1:3: The gospel of God, “concerning His Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which *was made* of the seed of David accord-

ing to the flesh.” What was the nature of David, “according to the flesh”? Sinful, was it not? David says: “Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me.” Psalm 51:5. Don’t start in horrified astonishment; I am not implying that Christ was a sinner. I shall explain more fully in a few moments. But first I wish to quote,

Hebrews 2:16, 17: “For verily He took not on Him the nature of angels; but He took on Him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things it behooved Him to be made like unto His brethren, that He might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people.”

His being made in all things like unto His brethren, is the same as His being made in the likeness of sinful flesh, “made in the likeness of men.” One of the most encouraging things in the Bible is the knowledge that Christ took on Him the nature of man; to know that His ancestors according to the flesh were sinners. When we read the record of the lives of the ancestors of Christ, and see that they had all the weaknesses and passions that we have, we find that no man has any right to excuse his sinful acts on the ground of heredity. If Christ had not been made *in all things* like unto His brethren, then His sinless life would be no encouragement to us. We might look at it with admiration, but it would be the admiration that would cause hopeless despair.

And now as another parallel to Galatians 4:4, and a further source of encouragement to us, I will quote,

2 Corinthians 5:21: “For He hath made Him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him.”

Now when was Jesus made sin for us? It must have been when He was made flesh, and began to suffer the temptations and infirmities that are incident to sinful flesh. He passed through every phase of human experience, being “in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.” He was a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief.” “He hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows” (Isaiah 53:4); and this scripture is said by Matthew to have been fulfilled long before the crucifixion. So I say that His being born under the law was

a necessary consequence of His being born in the likeness of sinful flesh, of taking upon Himself the nature of Abraham. He was made like man, in order that He might undergo the suffering of death. From the earliest childhood the cross was ever before Him.

4. You say: “That He did voluntarily take the sins of the world upon Him in His great sacrifice upon the cross, we admit; but He was not *born* under its condemnation. Of Him that was pure, and had never committed a sin in His life, it would be an astonishing perversion of all proper theology to say that He was born under the condemnation of the law.”

It may be a perversion of theology, but it is exactly in harmony with the Bible, and that is the main point. Can you not see that your objection lies as much against your position as it does against mine? You are shocked at the idea that Jesus was born under the condemnation of the law, because He never committed a sin in His life. But you admit that on the cross He was under the condemnation of the law. What! had He then committed sin? Not by any means. Well, then, if Jesus could be under the condemnation of the law at one time in His life, and be sinless, I see no reason why He could not be under the condemnation of the law at another time, and still be sinless. And Paul declares that God did make Him to be sin for us.

I simply give Scripture facts; I don’t attempt to explain them. “Without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness.” I cannot understand how God could be manifest in the flesh, and in the likeness of sinful flesh. I do not know how the pure and holy Saviour could endure all the infirmities of humanity, which are the result of sin, and be reckoned as a sinner, and suffer the death of a sinner. I simply accept the Scripture statement, that only so could He be the Saviour of men; and I rejoice in that knowledge, because since He was made sin, I may be made the righteousness of God in Him.

What a wonder! Christ had all the glory of Heaven; we had nothing; and so He “emptied Himself,” became nothing, in order that we might be glorified together with Him, and inherit all things. Christ was sinless, the very embodiment of holiness; we were vile and full of sin, having no good thing

in us; He was made sin in order that we might be partakers of His righteousness. Christ was immortal, having life in Himself; we were mortal, doomed to eternal death; He suffered death for us, in order that we might share His immortality. He went to the very lowest depths to which man had fallen, in order that He might lift man to His own exalted throne; yet He never ceased to be God, or lost a particle of His holiness.

5. Again; why was Jesus baptized? He said that it was “to fulfill all righteousness.” We may not say that it was simply as an example; for that would be really denying the vicarious nature of the atonement. It must have been for the same reason that He died, namely, for sin. Not His own sin, but ours; for as in His death, so in His life, our sins were counted as His. And thus it is that He could be all His life, even from His birth, under the condemnation of the law. It was not on His own account, but on ours.

I think that I have shown clearly, by abundance of Scripture testimony, that Christ was born under the condemnation of the law, and that this was necessarily incident to the fact that He was born of a woman; “for man that is born of woman is of few days, and full of trouble;” and this was literally true of Christ. He was in all things like His brethren, in His life of temptation and suffering, and even to length of days; for His earthly life was exactly the length of an average human life.

6. I must make one more argument, taking your standpoint. I will allow for the moment, what is not true, that “under the law” means “subject to the law,” and that the law referred to is the ceremonial law. Now the statement is that Christ was made “under the law, to redeem them that were under the law.” He redeems none who were not in the condition which He was made. And since only the Jews were subject to the ceremonial law, your theory would make it that He came to save only the Jews. I am glad that a proper interpretation does not oblige us to limit the plan of salvation in this way. Christ died for all men; all men were under the condemnation of the law of God; and so He was made under its condemnation. By the grace of God He tasted death for every man.

7. But this requires that I should show another absurdity in which your theory lands you. The ceremonies of the Mosaic ritual were simply the gospel ordinances for that time. They were the things by which the people manifested their faith in the gospel of Christ. But your theory, besides making Christ die for the sole purpose of allowing the Jews to stop offering lambs, etc., makes Him die to deliver them from the gospel. If that were true, what kind of state would they then be in? And again it makes Christ die to redeem men from that which had no power to condemn. In short, it nullifies the whole plan of salvation, and makes nonsense of it. And so it is most positively proved that Galatians 4:4, 5 cannot by any possibility refer to what is commonly called the ceremonial law. It does refer to the moral law, by which all men are condemned, and from the condemnation of which Christ redeems all who believe in Him, making them sons and heirs of God.

In your claim that these elements refer to the ceremonial law you say:—

“The language concerning ‘elements of the world’—these ‘weak and beggarly elements’ to which they desired to return, under which they had been in servitude—it is utterly inconsistent to apply to the law which is ‘spiritual,’ ‘holy, just, and good.’”—p. 60.

That is exactly the truth. Those elements of this world, those weak and beggarly elements, must be the exact opposite to the pure and holy law of God; and the opposite of that holy, just, and good law is sin. And sin, as I have already shown, is the elements of the world. It is that which worldly men practice by nature. It is that which comes naturally from the human heart (Mark 7:21-23], and which, therefore, are the first things—the elements—that people practice.

I marvel how you can read Galatians 4:3 in connection with verses 8-10, and then say that the ceremonial law is referred to. Those elements to which they had been in bondage, and to which they wished to return, were the elements which they practiced when they knew not God, and the service which they did to them that were no gods. You yourself say: “The language clearly shows that the persons referred

to had in some period of their lives been the worshipers of other gods.” Then why not frankly admit that these elements to which they had been in bondage were the sinful practices of licentious idolaters?

But I pass to your crowning argument on this point. I quote from page 65:—

“The identification of these ‘elements of the world’—these ‘weak and beggarly elements’ into which the Galatians desired to return into bondage—with the ceremonial law, is an important link in this argument. There can be no question but that our position on this point is correct. Dr. Schaff, in his comments on these ‘rudiments,’ says: ‘According to my view, the expression applies in any case only to Judaism, especially to the law (an apostle Paul could not possibly comprehend heathenism and Judaism under one idea, regarding them thus as virtually equivalent).’ We trust our friends who sometimes endeavour to apply these ‘rudiments’ partially to heathenism, will consider this well.

“Dr. Clarke says, ‘On rudiments of the world,’ ‘the rudiments or principles of the Jewish religion.’ He says, also, that the ‘weak and beggarly elements were the ceremonies of the Mosaic law.’ Dr. Scott takes the same position.”

If it were not so serious a matter, it would be amusing to see the argument which you bring to identify the elements of the world with the ceremonial law. One would think that on this point, which you say is an important link, and which is indeed the point upon which your theory must stand or fall, you would pile up the Scripture argument; and so indeed you would, if there were any to pile up; but instead we have the opinion of Dr. Schaff, Dr. Clarke, and Dr. Scott—three very good men, no doubt, but three men who are responsible for a vast amount of doctrinal error and false theology. After quoting Dr. Schaff’s view that these weak and beggarly elements apply only to Judaism, you say: “We trust our friends who sometimes endeavor to apply these ‘rudiments’ partially to heathenism, will consider this well.” Has it come to this among Seventh-day Adventists, that the mere opinion of a doctor of divinity must be accepted as final in any discussion? Is Dr. Schaff so unimpeachable an authority that when he speaks no tongue may wag dissent? Let me construct an argument from Dr. Schaff. He says:—

“The Christian Church keeps the first day of the week,

which celebrates the close of the spiritual creation, just as the last day celebrates the close of the physical creation. We have the fullest warrant for this change.”—*Bible Dictionary, art. Sabbath.*

And now having announced this dictum of the infallible Dr. Schaff, the Sunday-keeper may say, “We trust our friends who still regard Saturday as the Sabbath will consider this well.” Would you admit such an argument as worthy of a moment’s consideration? Would you say, “There can be no question but that this position is correct,” because Dr. Schaff says so? I know you would not; yet if you really regard your argument on Galatians 4:8 as of any value at all, you will be obliged to accept it.

I want to call special attention to your argument here, in order to reveal the inherent weakness of your position. You say that the “elements of the world”—those “weak and beggarly elements”—are identical with the ceremonial law. Then you add, “There can be no question but that our position on this point is correct.” If there can be no question on this point, it must be because it is so well fortified by the clearest proof as to admit of no argument. And what is the proof which you quote? The mere words of Dr. Schaff, Dr. Barnes, and Dr. Scott. Then the inevitable conclusion is that you regard the statement of those men as sufficient to establish any point of doctrine. But I do not. I don’t consider their statement as sufficient to establish any doctrine. I don’t consider their statement sufficient to help, even to the slightest degree, to establish any point of doctrine. Further, I do not consider the statement of any man on earth as of sufficient weight to help establish any point of doctrine. The word of God alone can decide what is right; it alone can establish a point of doctrine; and when it has spoken, nothing that any man can say can make the case any stronger. And when a thing cannot be proved by the Bible, it cannot be proved by what any man says, no matter how good he is.

All men understand this; all men know that the word of God is better than that of any man; and so they always appeal to the Bible instead of to man, whenever they have anything that can be sustained by the Bible. I sincerely hope that at

this late day we shall not have introduced among us the custom of quoting the opinion of doctors of divinity to support any theory. When our Sunday friends quote the opinions of commentators concerning the supposed change of the Sabbath, we all say that it is because they have no scriptural authority to bring forward. If I am wrong in arriving at the same conclusion concerning your quotation to prove the identity of the ceremonial law with the elements of the world, I trust you will pardon me, and will convince me of my error by bringing forward some Scripture evidence.

If you want the opinion of a man on this subject, I will quote one for you. It is the opinion of a man whom I regard as being as much superior to Dr. Schaff as a biblical expositor, as Dr. Schaff is superior to me in the knowledge of Greek and Latin. I refer to Elder J. N. Andrews. In his work *The History of the Sabbath*, in the foot-note on page 186 I find the following statement concerning Galatians 4:10.

“To show that Paul regarded Sabbatic observance as dangerous, Galatians 4:10 is often quoted: notwithstanding the same individuals claim that Romans 14 proves that it is a matter of perfect indifference; they not seeing that this is to make Paul contradict himself. But if the connection be read from verses 9-11, it will be seen that the Galatians before their conversion were not Jews, but heathen; and that these days, months, times, and years, were not those of the Levitical law, but those which they had regarded with superstitious reverence while heathen. Observe the stress which Paul lays on the word ‘again’ in verse 9.”

I cannot refrain from saying that I trust our friends who sometimes endeavor to apply these “rudiments” to the ceremonial law “will consider this well.”

I will add, also, the following from Elder Andrews:—

“The bondage of the Jewish church did not consist in that God had given them His law, but because they were its transgressors—the servants of sin. John 8:33-36. The freedom of the children of ‘Jerusalem which is above,’ does not consist in that the law has been abolished, but in that they have been made free from sin. Romans 6:22.”—*Review and Herald*, vol. 2, No. 4.

But I must not prolong this letter much further. I pass to a brief notice of your strictures upon my argument upon Galatians 4:21. You say:—

“Here we have the expression ‘under the law’ repeated once more. We have already dwelt at some length upon this phrase, and have claimed that its uses in the letter to the Galatians referred to being subject to the law, under its authority. But one of our friends who is enthusiastic in his devotion to the view that the law in Galatians is the moral law, goes so far as to claim that in every case where this expression is used, it signifies being in a state of sin or condemnation; i.e., in a position where the penalty of the law hangs over one’s head. That penalty is the ‘second death’ in ‘the lake of fire.’ We have, then, according to that view, these Galatian brethren desiring to be in a state of guilt, which would expose them to the lake of fire. ‘Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law,’ with this equivalent expression substituted, would read, Tell me, ye that desire to be under the condemnation of the law—Tell me, ye that desire the condemnation of the second death. We have known men to desire many strange things, but we never before knew one to desire the second death. But if that view of the subject is correct, and this law is the moral law, and all these expressions ‘under the law’ mean under its condemnation, then we have no possible escape from this conclusion. But to think of these new, zealous converts to Christianity desiring to go into a state of condemnation, exposed to such a doom, is too preposterous for a moment’s consideration.”

I gladly acknowledge that I am the identical one of your friends who has claimed that in every case where the expression “under the law” occurs in the original, it signifies “being in a state of sin or condemnation, that is, in a position where the penalty of the law hangs over one’s head.” And I trust that I shall never be counted as your enemy because I tell you this truth. You make sport of this idea, and say that you never knew anyone who desired the second death. My knowledge is not very extensive, but I have known that very thing. In the eighth chapter of Proverbs, Wisdom, which is the fear of God, is personified and in the last verse of that chapter she says, “All *them that hate me love death.*” There you have a plain Bible statement that there are some that love death. It is not to be supposed that men deliberately desire death, but they do deliberately choose and love the course which must result in death, and consequently they are said to love death. In Acts 13:45 we read that Paul and Barnabas said to the Jews who had rejected the word of God, “contradicting and blaspheming:” “Seeing ye put it from

you, and *judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life*, lo, we turn to the Gentiles.” Here we have a similar statement. The apostle did not mean to indicate that those self-conceited Jews thought that they were not fit to enter Heaven; on the contrary, they thought that they were the only ones who were worthy of that privilege. But they were unwilling to receive the only truth which could fit them for everlasting life, and so they could justly be said to be unwilling to receive everlasting life. And so Paul could say to the Galatians who were turning aside from the gospel of Christ, that they desired to be under the law. Not that they deliberately chose death, but they were seeking justification by something which could not bring them justification. They were losing their faith in Christ, and being removed from God (Galatians 1:5); and such a course, if carried out, would inevitably bring them under the condemnation of the law. I see nothing absurd in this position. If it is absurd, then you must attach absurdity to the words of Solomon in Proverbs 8:36.

Let me prove the point in another way. You will admit that a man’s own way, if followed, will always end in death. Says Solomon: “There is a way which seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death.” And this way which seems right to a man, is his own way. Now since a man’s own way is the way of death, it can truly be said that all who love their own way love death. The Galatians had turned to their own way, which is opposed to the ways of God. And so they were desirous to be under the condemnation of the law.

But I have already made this letter longer than I anticipated. I have done so only because I have a deep sense of the tremendous importance of this question, and I am morally certain that your theory is opposed to the truth. That those who have held it have not oftener been discomfited by the enemies of the truth, is due rather to the providential blindness of those enemies, than to the strength of the argument with which they have been met on this question. I have written this brief review, as I did my articles in the *Signs*, with the desire to vindicate the law of God, and to show its perpetuity, its binding claims upon all mankind, and

the beautiful harmony between it and the gospel. The law of God is the groundwork of all our faith. It may be said to be the backbone of the Third Angel’s Message. That being the case, we must expect, as we approach the end, that all the forces of the enemy will be concentrated upon it. We shall have to do more valiant service for it than we ever yet have done. Every point in our argument will have to be subjected to the test of the most rigid criticism, and we shall have to fortify every point. If there is any inconsistency in any of our arguments, we may be sure that the enemies of the truth will not always remain blind to it.

I know you will say that it will be a humiliating thing to modify our position on so vital a point as this, right in the face of the enemy. But if a general has a faulty position, I submit that it is better to correct it, even in the face of the enemy, than to run the risk of defeat because of his faulty position. But I do not see anything humiliating in the matter. If our people should today, as a body (as they will sometime), change their view on this point, it would simply be an acknowledgment that they are better informed today than they were yesterday. It would simply be taking an advance step, which is never humiliating except to those whose pride of opinion will not allow them to admit that they can be wrong. It would simply be a step nearer the faith of the great Reformers from the days of Paul to the days of Luther and Wesley. It would be a step closer to the heart of the Third Angel’s Message. I do not regard this view which I hold as a new idea at all. It is not a new theory of doctrine. Everything that I have taught is perfectly in harmony with the fundamental principles of truth which have been held not only by our people, but by all the eminent reformers. And so I do not take any credit to myself for advancing it. All I claim for the theory is, that it is consistent, because it sticks to the fundamental principles of the gospel.

Before I close, I cannot refrain from expressing my regret to see in your book (on page 78) the expression, “The much-vaunted doctrine of justification by faith.” Do you know of any other means of justification? Your words seem to intimate that you think that doctrine has been overestimated.

Of one thing I am certain, and that is, that those who have held to the theory of the law, which you are endeavoring to uphold, have not overestimated the doctrine of justification by faith; because that theory leads inevitably to the conclusion that men are justified by the law. But when I read Romans 3:28, and read also that Paul knew nothing among the Corinthians but Jesus Christ and Him crucified, and that “the just shall *live* by faith,” and that “this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith” (1 John 5:4), and that Paul wanted to be found when Christ comes, having nothing but “the righteousness which is of God by faith” (Philippians 3:9), I conclude that it is *impossible to overestimate the doctrine of justification by faith*. You may call it a “*much-vaunted*” doctrine if you please; I accept the word, and say with Paul: “God forbid that I should glory [or vaunt], save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world.”

Hoping that you will read this letter in the spirit in which it is written, and that you will believe that I have written it with only the utmost good-feeling and brotherly love for you personally, and praying that God will guide both of us and all His people to the most perfect knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus, I remain your brother in Christ,

E.J. WAGGONER.