

—the prophet raised up, whom the people should “hear in all things”—that in him was to be *fulfilled* all that was written in the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms—that the Law and the Prophets were until the Reformer John, since which time Moses’ enactments and the teachings of the prophets were being superseded by the appearing and ministry of the Great Teacher, and that Pentecost was the final dividing day between Moses’ rule and Jesus’ reign. Both Stephen and Peter could tell their Jewish contemporaries, “To you, first, God having raised up his Son, *Jesus*, SENT HIM to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities,” at the same time testifying that “all the prophets from Samuel and those that follow, even as many as have spoken, have likewise foretold of these days”—these days of a better covenant and better promises embraced in it. Stephen thus witnessing, was charged with speaking blasphemously against Moses and the Law, and his testimony cost him his life.

The Jews, as it respected Moses’ law, knew well what they were doing. They knew well that Stephen did not preach Moses but Jesus—not Jesus to be heard in part, but *in all things*. This was Stephen’s special sin. Hence we are in good company when we also affirm that “a prophet like unto Moses” has been “raised up” who is to be “*heard in all things*,” by all nations, as Moses was formerly heard by one nation. And although this doctrine will not in the year of grace 1852 bring a volley of stones from the multitude, as in Stephen’s case, yet the fullest award of persecution that the civil authorities allow may always be expected by Jesus’ disciples from Moses’ disciples.

Before turning to Paul’s labors in adjusting the debates and strifes which had their origin in a desire for the continuance of the Mosaic law, let us pay respectful attention to a verse often quoted in favor of the Jewish lawgiver. The language is from the lips of Jesus himself: “Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil.” Many a sincere man reads the passage as though written thus: ‘I am not come to make an end of the law but to enforce it.’ A moment’s attention to the same discourse from which these words are taken, will show the irrelevancy of this interpretation: for does not the Great Teacher most plainly say that while the law said, ‘Thou shalt perform thine oaths to the Lord—thou shalt take an eye for an eye—thou shalt hate thine enemy;—these commandments were no longer obligatory or binding; and in direct opposition to them his hearers are commanded to Swear not at all—Resist not evil—Love and bless enemies. Of old, by