

day; and you have not impinged that quotation, and John heard his Lord and Master say that he was "Lord of the Sabbath." It is then reasonable to suppose that John had in his mind's eye the Sabbath day when he said he was in the spirit on the Lord's day.

Third Point. You say "the Sabbath was instituted in honor of the first creation." Here the Lord and you are at variance; for he says that the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath, Mark ii. 27. Now as I desire to believe the Lord in all things, I am bound to believe him in this also: for if it were as you say, it is man would have been made for the Sabbath. As to your fourth and fifth Points, I see nothing disputable in them but what has already been answered.

As you invite a review of what you have said in the August and September Numbers, I will offer some remark, upon your seven propositions in Position and Principles of Disciples No. 9, on the old and new covenants; and I wish to be understood as offering no objections to what you say of the Horeb covenant, as such; but to your having mixed the old and the Horeb covenants together, or rather your considering them as one. Then the first inquiry is this, Is the old covenant and the Horeb covenant the same? If they are, there must be some analogy between them and the new covenant. The principal features of the new covenant are these:—it has in it, atonement for past and present sins, and it embraces the whole of Adam's family. Now Paul when reasoning with the Corinthians calls the Horeb covenant the ministration of death. Again, the Horeb covenant was given exclusively to the Israelites. "I have made a covenant with thee and Israel, Exo. xxxiv-27," and then it only contains ten moral precepts given to the Israelites as the covenant they were to fulfil, "and he wrote on the tables the words of the covenant the ten commandments." So then the Horeb covenant has no analogy to the new covenant. We must therefore find it elsewhere. When Adam was created he was capable of yielding perfect obedience to the laws and commandments given him, but as soon as he took of the fruit "of the tree whereof the Lord God commanded him not to eat," he was no longer capable of yielding the perfect obedience that was required of him, and must therefore have died for his first transgression, if God had not given him the old covenant, the institute of sacrifice; and it is presumable that it was given him before he committed any other sin, because the sin offering must come of his own freewill, or it could not be received. But as we have not here direct precept for the establishing the old covenant at the creation, we will therefore quote one from Paul, Heb. ix-26. The apostle reasons thus: If Christ had been an high priest on earth, and entering once every year, into the holy place, with his own blood, then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world. Thus the apostle places it beyond doubt, that the old covenant existed since the foundation of the world, and embraced the whole of Adam's family; and continued unaltered until Christ offered himself as a sacrifice for the sins of the whole world; but when the Israelites were organized as a nation, and the tabernacle set up, they received an