

19

# JOHNSON'S SERMONS

ON

# THE TWO COVENANTS

BY ASHLEY S. JOHNSON

Stenographically Reported

*50th Anniversary Edition—1949*  
(First Printed in 1899)

PRICE PREPAID: \$2.50

OLD PATHS BOOK CLUB  
600 North Rossmore Ave.  
HOLLYWOOD, CALIFORNIA

## DEDICATION

"TO JESUS, THE MEDIATOR OF THE NEW COVENANT,"  
AND TO MY SONS IN THE GOSPEL IN THE SCHOOL  
OF THE EVANGELISTS, WHO BY GOD'S GRACE ARE WORK-  
ING WITH THEIR HANDS TO EARN AN EDUCATION IN  
ORDER TO PREACH THE GOSPEL OF GOD'S LOVE, AND TO  
ALL WHO MAY BECOME MEMBERS OF OUR FAMILY HERE-  
AFTER, THIS BOOK—ALL IT MAY BRING TOWARD THE  
WORK—IS REVERENTLY AND AFFECTIONATELY INSCRIBED  
BY

THE AUTHOR.



## INTRODUCTION

### *To Fiftieth Anniversary Edition*

*The author, Ashley S. Johnson, said that this book was born under peculiar circumstances. It was further his judgment that this book was the best one he had ever put in print and he was a prolific writer, this being his twelfth book. Time has proven the wisdom of his choice of subjects and leads us to believe that providence guided his selection at that time.*

*We say this because in this year of 1949, fifty years after the original writing of the book the subject discussed is a live one about which more questions are asked than any other. We are therefore glad to give this worthy book a further circulation among those who earnestly seek the will of the Lord today.*

*The author was especially well prepared to deal with this subject as he was with most religious subjects. He was president of the College of the Evangelists at Kimberlin Heights, Tennessee and thus was constantly in work that called for detailed knowledge on all Bible subjects. Further he had held a debate upon this subject twenty years before the issuance of this book and for the intervening years had continued to study the subject.*

*Therefore we give this book to the public of this generation with the assurance that it is a worthwhile work upon a living topic and commend it to all for the closest of study.*

---

# SERMONS ON THE TWO COVENANTS

Friday, February 10, 1899; 10:30 a. m.

## SERMON NO. 1—THE FIRST COVENANT (PART I).

*Text: "In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away (Heb. 9:13)."*

I believe you will agree with me that these are very remarkable words: and when we duly weigh the last half of this statement they appear more remarkable, and in the light of other scriptures more remarkable still. We should bear in mind that Paul is speaking, and that he has in his mind's eye something that has done its work, filled its mission, and is now passing.

In the ninth chapter of Hebrews and first verse he brings out the same thought by declaring that the First Covenant had ordinances of a divine service and a worldly sanctuary. The ordinary reader of the Bible who reads with any degree of care and with the spirit of prayerfulness desiring to find out the will of God that he may do it, will come to this conclusion: Either there are two rival law-givers, Moses on the one hand, and Christ on the other, or else that these law-givers are harmonious, or else that the law-giver Christ has fully superceded the law-giver Moses. With these thoughts before us we are prepared to see another thing, and that is the name of Moses is associated with a covenant; also that the name of Jesus is associated with a covenant; and that the name of Moses is associated with a law, that the name of Jesus is associated with a law. That the name of Moses is associated with the Old Covenant, or the First Covenant; that the name of Jesus is associated with the New Covenant or the Second Covenant; that the name of Moses is associated with the law or the Law of Moses; that the name of Jesus is associated with the law of the spirit of life in Him, or the Law of Liberty, or the Perfect Law of Liberty.

It is my intention in this series of sermons to give all honor to Moses in his place and all honor and glory and power and dominion to Jesus, not only as Lord and Master, but as Law-Giver and



King. But standing on the threshold of this investigation, let us for a moment determine one thing. We have in the Bible, especially in the New Testament, two words, the meaning of which will determine largely the results of this investigation. In the passage here we have the word "covenant." In other passages we have the word "testament." And we have also the phrase "everlasting covenant." What is the meaning of these two words? I will say simply this in general terms as I expect to be more specific as I advance, that the words have the same meaning. Indeed they are translated from the same Greek word and we might with propriety and without violence to the word of God have "testament" all the time or "covenant" all the time and so use the words as synonyms, as interchangeable, throughout this entire investigation. When I say "covenant," therefore, I shall mean "testament"; when I say "testament" I shall mean "covenant." When I use "covenant" and "testament" I shall mean, in everyday usage "will"; God's testament; God's covenant; God's will concerning us; and I want you to understand that I shall feel at liberty to use them interchangeably because they are so used in the word of God. Allow me further to add that the word "covenant" is used in the Bible exactly as it is used in ordinary literature. We make a very serious blunder when we give to the words of the Bible extraordinary significance, that is when we lift them out of the place that they would occupy in history, in literature or anywhere else. When I say "covenant" I shall simply mean a contract: a contract between God and a man, or between God and a tribe of men, or a nation of men, or between God and all men. And I shall give this word "covenant" all of the sanctity, all of the seriousness that will be given to it in the ordinary courts of justice, and I will say that when a covenant is made that each party to that covenant is obligated up to the limit of that to which he places his name. If there are two covenants, and it is positively asserted so in the word of God, in the ordinary line of thought and investigation, it will be right to investigate the First Covenant first. Therefore I address myself to the task of determining what Paul had in mind when he declared that a certain covenant or the First Covenant was then ready to vanish away. That is to say, that it had finished its work, that it was no more considered obligatory on any who understood its principles, precepts and provisions, and that it was vanishing even then and there from the hearts, from the lives, from the thoughts and from the experiences of men.

In order that we may have a knowledge of this subject in detail it will be necessary for us to go back to the beginning and trace

the hand of God from the time that man sinned, through all of the ages, naming each step and principle as best we can, the power of God, the desire of God, the plan of God, the purpose of God and the will of God. I now turn to the testimony of Moses and read it to you word for word. In passing sentence upon the serpent the Lord said: "And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel (Gen. 3:15)."

A careful survey of this statement will convince anybody that it is very general. God only intimated in this sentence of doom what he intended ultimately to do unto the serpent and his seed. There is nothing exclusive about it. I should say rather that it is inclusive and all-embracing. That like the arms of God in tenderness and love it is big enough to take in the whole human family. And for century after century the only assurance that any human being had that God would ever bring man back to his primeval state was in this sentence. Some people call this a promise but it was not even that. However, after many centuries had passed, after man had been experimenting I may say with sin and with himself and with his own possibilities, God called Abraham, called him out of Ur of Chaldees and gave him a promise, yes, He gave him two promises. I will read from the testimony of the Book as I want to develop above everything else what the Bible teaches on this subject: "Now the Lord had said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will show thee: And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing; and I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed (Gen. 12:1-3)."

I respectfully assert that while the intimation in the sentence pronounced on the serpent was inclusive, all-embracing, world-embracing, that this promise was narrow and restricted; so long as the Deliverer comes from any descendant of the woman of whatever type or tribe the intimation to Eve in the doom pronounced on the serpent would be fulfilled. But now God has confined Himself to a single man and to a single family. In Abram's seed were all families of the earth to be blessed. I take it that God had a philanthropic purpose in beginning here. Man had but little knowledge of God and knew but little of His faithfulness, and in calling this family and in dealing with this family God was not only demonstrating the possibilities of a man, but He was demonstrating the possibilities of his God. In order that the promise



might be fulfilled Abram must have some place to stay. The promise could not be fulfilled without some preliminaries, without some arrangement; therefore when Abram, in obedience to this divine voice, after a long and perilous journey, encamped in the land that he knew nothing about, a voice came to him and here is what the voice said: "And the Lord appeared unto Abram, and said, Unto thy seed will I give this land: and there builded he an altar unto the Lord, who appeared unto him (Gen. 12:7)."

But in order to carry out this assurance, or this promise it was not only necessary that Abram have a land or a home, but it was necessary that he should also have offspring. He was an old man. His wife was old, and they were without children, but God promised him a family. Abram having an idea that the benevolence of God was all embracing, thought that an illegitimate son of his would be included in the promise. Therefore he prayed that Ishmael might live before the Lord (Gen. 17:18). God rejected that prayer because of the fact that the covenant with Abram was to be an exclusive covenant. To sum up thus far we have the promise, land of promise, the promise of an heir, excluding every other promise, every other land, every other heir or every other man. It was God's object to demonstrate His faithfulness here, and therefore in order that He might demonstrate to the world that He would do what He said, it was necessary also in some way to mark that family. The Lord appeared to Abram when he was ninety and nine years old, commanding him to walk before Him and be perfect, and assured him that His covenant should be in his flesh—in other words made a covenant with him. If I make a covenant with you, you are a party to the covenant, and I am a party to the covenant. God made a covenant with Abram. Abram was one party; God was the other. The conditions of membership are laid down, positively, clearly, unequivocally, and in detail. I call your attention particularly to them: "And when Abram was ninety years old and nine, the Lord appeared to Abram, and said unto him, *I am* the Almighty God; walk before me, and be thou perfect. And I will make my covenant between me and thee, and will multiply thee exceedingly. And Abram fell on his face: and God talked with him, saying, As for me, behold, my covenant *is* with thee, and thou shalt be a father of many nations. Neither shall thy name any more be called Abram, but thy name shall be Abraham; for a father of many nations have I made thee. And I will make thee exceeding fruitful, and I will make nations of thee, and kings shall come out of thee. And I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an



everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee. And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God. And God said unto Abraham, Thou shalt keep my covenant therefore, thou, and thy seed after thee in their generations. This is my covenant, which ye shall keep, between me and you and thy seed after thee; Every man-child among you shall be circumcised. And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you. And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man-child in your generations, he that is born in the house, or bought with money of any stranger, which is not of thy seed. He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised: and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant (Gen. 17:1-13)."

I call your attention to this one thought that this covenant was not built upon the heart, it was not built upon conscience, it was not built upon the mind, it was not even built upon human experience, but it was built upon the flesh of Abraham—the seed of Abraham. I want you to study that just a minute because I shall constantly refer and revert to these statements as I proceed. God provided that all who were born in Abraham's house were members of that covenant, and that all who should subsequently be bought with Abraham's money should be made members of the covenant by the act of purchase. So I should say that the two conditions of membership in this covenant were birth in Abraham's house, of his own family, of his own seed, and by purchase from any stranger. Circumcision was not a necessity to make them members, but as a proof of previously existing membership. A common illustration of that is this: A man buys a thoroughbred cow of another man. The act of purchase makes her his property. He marks her not in order to make her his but because she is his, and the offspring of that cow is marked because the mother is in the possession of the purchaser, and the mark on the offspring therefore becomes evidence of ownership.

There are many erroneous ideas touching this covenant of circumcision. It was, like the promise, an act of exclusion. I am going to carry this idea of exclusiveness and inclusiveness through this entire series of sermons. Whom did it exclude? What did it exclude? How did it exclude them? It excluded every man not born in Abraham's house, and every man not bought with his money, and it did it by the very terms of the covenant which pro-

vided that a man could not be a member of the covenant except by birth and purchase. You will note as a matter of fact that it provided for the exclusion of Abraham unless he would immediately submit to its terms. They were to be circumcised in the flesh and that mark in the flesh was to be a proof of membership. The covenant was made but it was not sealed, and Abraham had no proof of his membership until in his old age he submitted to the requirement of God. The covenant, however, provided that as the children were born when they were eight days old they were to immediately have the mark of the covenant, and being born in the covenant, they were after the expiration of eight days, if not circumcised, cast out. Hear the word of God on the subject: "And the uncircumcised man-child, whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken my covenant (Gen. 17:14)."

I respectfully assert that a man can not be cut off from a covenant unless he is a member of it, that a man cannot be cut off from a contract unless he is voluntarily or involuntarily a part of it. If the child had not been made a member of this covenant by coming into the world, by birth, it could not be said that it had broken the covenant and it could not, therefore, be turned out of the covenant or cut off from the covenant by that act. God's promises are now confined to one man, Abraham; to one family, Abraham and his descendants; and that in order that God may demonstrate His faithfulness to His promise and to His covenant they are marked so that the mark in the flesh could be used to determine that question as long as that covenant should be observed even to the remotest generation in Israel.

As a further proof of the exclusiveness of this covenant I refer you to the fact that Isaac succeeded Abraham, "In Isaac shall thy seed be called (Gen. 21:12)," was the Lord's declaration. Before Rebekah, Isaac's wife who had conceived and brought forth her two sons it was necessary for God to make a choice, and he established the promise in Jacob and renewed the promise to Jacob as he had previously done to his father Isaac (Gen. 25:19-23). But as time flew Jacob's family grew and the promise was then vested in all the tribes and they were all members of this covenant, except those who on account of a failure to comply with the requirement of placing the sign upon the flesh of the male-child were thereby excluded from its provisions. I should like to devote considerable time to the history of these people in Egypt and the long years of education they had in that wondrous land. But I want to say to you that the very act of going down into Egypt was also an



exclusive act. When Jacob took his small family, consisting of about seventy-five souls and left the land that God had promised unto him and his father Isaac and his grandfather Abraham, and went into Egypt, the family was maintained—its identity was never lost. God was dealing with that family. All other families, all other tribes, all other kindreds, all other nations, all other peoples were for the moment apparently forgotten, and after about two hundred and fifteen years God brought them out. To the Bible reader who is patient in his investigations, it will not be necessary for me to sketch the mighty deliverance that God wrought for them. But He brought them out and the family had grown from one, and then two, and then fourteen to a mighty nation; a nation within a nation; they had in a sense forgotten their fathers and even their God, yet the nation had maintained its purity and its power to a remarkable degree. So great had that nation become before the deliverance, that the king of Egypt had expressed a fear that in time of war they would join with the enemy and be a mighty force against him. God delivered them. I call your attention particularly to a statement to be found in the writings of Moses: "And it came to pass in process of time, that the king of Egypt died: and the children of Israel sighed by reason of the bondage, and they cried and their cry came up unto God by reason of the bondage. And God heard their groaning, and God remembered his covenant with Abraham, with Isaac, and with Jacob. And God looked upon the children of Israel, and God had respect unto *them* (Ex. 2:23-25)."

It was the thought of what He had started out to do, it was the thought of His oath to Abraham, it was the thought of His dealings with Isaac and of Jacob that when their children—His own children by adoption—cried unto Him in the land of Egypt, when their burdens became so great that they could bear them no longer. And so He brought them out of the land of Egypt with a mighty hand and by an out-stretched arm through the Red Sea, through the wilderness of Sin until finally about forty-eight days after they left Egypt they were encamped at the base of Sinai. I raise a question here, an important question for every Bible student. Did God make a covenant with Israel at Sinai? and I answer that question by turning to the Galatian letter, and reading: "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. 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 (Gal. 3: 16,17)."

Notice that passage a moment. It is here asserted that there was a law given four hundred and thirty years after the promise. We know when the promise was given. The promise was given when Abraham was in Ur of Chaldees. If I can show you that it was four hundred and thirty years from the giving of the promise to the giving of the law, I think I can show you also that a covenant was made with Israel at Sinai, and that is a very important thing to show. I turn to Moses: "Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, *was* four hundred and thirty years. And it came to pass at the end of the four hundred and thirty years, even the self-same day it came to pass, that all the hosts of the Lord went out from the land of Egypt (Ex. 12:40,41)."

The Septuagint version of the Scriptures, which was a translation out of the original Hebrew into Greek, makes the statement this way: "Now the sojourning of the children of Israel in Egypt and in Canaan which they sojourned was four hundred and thirty years." We know as a matter of fact that the children of Israel did not sojourn four hundred and thirty years in Egypt, but we know that sojourn beginning with Ur of Chaldees and ending at Sinai at the giving of the law, was four hundred and thirty years.

Again: In answer to the question: Did God make a covenant with Israel at Sinai? I answer that the mighty occurrences on that occasion indicate to an unerring certainty that something out of the ordinary order, out of the ordinary course and constitution of things occurred. There is one thing that occurred there that never had been known before in the history of the world. Hear me: "And the Lord said unto Moses, Go unto the people, and sanctify them today and tomorrow, and let them wash their clothes, and be ready against the third day: for the third day the Lord will come down in the sight of all the people upon mount Sinai (Ex. 19: 10,11)."

Men had heard occasionally the voice of God before this. Abraham heard it in Ur of Chaldees. He heard it a number of times in the land that God promised him; particularly did he hear that voice on mount Moriah when he was in the act of taking the life of his son. Isaac heard that voice, Jacob heard that voice a few times, but never before in the history of the world had it been said or had an hour been set when God said that He would come down in the sight of men. Moses tells more on this same subject farther on, and I will give it to you in his exact words: "And he said, 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; from his right hand *went* a fiery law for them (Deut. 33:2)."

Putting these two passages together we have this: God came down; His saints came with Him—who they were I know not—and from His own voice, from His own hand there went forth a law that can only be comparable to blazing fire.

Again: I have the testimony of one of the prophets of God, and I will give it to you in his exact words: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah; Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day *that* I took them by the hand, to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord (Jer. 31:31,32)."

He said, He made a covenant with their fathers when He brought them out of Egypt. Paul says that it was four hundred and thirty years after the promise.

Again: I have the words of Paul endorsing this very statement from Jeremiah. It is not necessary to quote it, but I will give you the reference and you can make a comparison for yourself (Heb. 8:7-9).

And again on this point I have two witnesses, the testimony of either of whom ought to settle the point beyond a doubt: First Moses: "And Moses called all Israel, and said unto them, Hear, O Israel, the statutes and judgments which I speak in your ears this day, that ye may learn them, and keep and do them. The Lord our God made a covenant with us in Horeb. The Lord made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, *even* us, who *are* all of us here alive this day (Deut. 5:1-3)."

Horeb is another name for Sinai. The Lord made not this covenant with their fathers; He had only promised it to them. They were assured in the promise to Isaac, in the promise to Jacob, and the last promise to Jacob when he went down to Egypt was looking into the future—I will do so and so: "The Lord made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, *even* us, who *are* all of us here alive this day (Deut. 5:3)."

Again and finally, I will introduce the testimony of Paul. Speaking of Abraham's private affairs, his family, he says: "Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants; the one



from mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children (Gal. 4: 24, 25)."

It may appear to you that I am devoting unnecessary time to this point, but the settlement of this question beyond all doubt, beyond all cavil, beyond all dispute, will settle a myriad of questions that arise or shall arise as we advance, and I think I may modestly say that if anything is proven or can be proven it is that I have demonstrated that God made a covenant at Sinai.

But I raise another question here that is akin to this: If God made a covenant at Sinai, and I have proved that He did, with whom did He make it? To ask that question is to answer it. Had He not for four hundred and thirty years been dealing with Abraham, with Isaac, with Jacob, and with the twelve tribes their descendants? Is it not a fact beyond all dispute that this covenant was just as exclusive as the promise? Did it not simply include that family that had grown up from one head, Abraham our father? As proof of this, however, as I want to make it clear from the Scriptures as I advance, I will read from the testimony of Moses again: "In the third month, when the children of Israel were gone forth out of the land of Egypt, the same day came they *into* the wilderness of Sinai. For they were departed from Rephidim, and were come *to* the desert of Sinai, and had pitched in the wilderness: and there Israel camped before the mount. And Moses went up unto God and the Lord called unto him out of the mountain, saying, Thus shalt thou say to the house of Jacob, and tell the children of Israel;"

I pause here in my quotation to say that He did not say for Moses to tell the sons of Ham and Japheth, He did not say for him to tell all nations, kindreds, tribes and tongues. He did not make any suggestion that was world-inclusive and age-embracing, but He narrowed it down to the little family with which he was dealing and told Moses to go and talk to the house of Jacob and the children of Israel: "Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and *how* I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto myself. Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth *is* mine. And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation. These *are* the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel. And Moses came and called for the elders of the people, and laid before their faces all

these words which the Lord commanded him. And all the people answered together, and said, All that the Lord hath spoken we will do. And Moses returned the words of the people unto the Lord (Ex. 19:1-8)."

Let us notice this for a moment. God had borne them out from the nation where they had been nourished and enslaved for two hundred and fifteen years, borne them unto Himself, excluded all others, brought them out on eagles' wings and said, if they would be true to Him that they should continue to be His people above all other people. I want to make the point here brethren that when God made a covenant with these people that by that act He excluded all others, and that no man or no set of men, or no nation of men will, in the administration of that covenant, be under any obligations to keep it unless we can find some place where the door of the covenant was opened to let them in. It was an exclusive covenant. With whom did He make this covenant? I repeat the question, and I turn to the testimony of Malachi. A thousand years, fully a thousand years after this event, looking back over all the years that had passed, what did he say? Let him answer for himself: "Remember ye the law of Moses my servant, which I commanded upon him in Horeb for all Israel, *with* the statutes and judgments (Mal. 4:4)."

And by way of refreshing your minds I only repeat the statement from Jeremiah endorsed by Paul, that God made a covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah when He took them by the hand and brought them out of the land of Egypt—then He did not make a covenant with the Gentile world. It is a fact that by the very act of making a contract with any man to do a certain thing that I exclude from the doing of that thing every other man. Here is a simple illustration, and it is right at hand. Brother Bolton sweeps this chapel and some other parts of this building for his education. By the very act of giving him that job in order to earn his education I exclude every other student in this school from that job. And as a man, as long as that boy does his duty as he has done it in the past, I stand obligated to him. You are not a member of the covenant between Johnson and Bolton by which it is guaranteed that this building shall be swept clean, and you are under no obligations to sweep it. And by the very act of making a covenant with Israel, with Jacob's children, with Abraham's descendants, God excluded every nation, every kindred, every tribe, every tongue from doing anything that is commanded to be done by the provisions of that covenant, and no Gentile has



ever been under any obligation to do it. That is what I have started out to prove.

I hear you say that when they came up out of Egypt there was a mixed multitude that came along and they were the descendants of Ham, and that they were incorporated as parties to this covenant. That may be so and it may not be so, but that we may have the matter clearly before us I will turn and read the testimony on the subject and let you see just how it is. Speaking of the departure from Egypt, here is what he said, and it is remarkable in this that from that one parental head had sprung a mighty nation. Hear him: "And the children of Israel journeyed from Rameses to Succoth, about six hundred thousand on foot *that were* men, besides children. And a mixed multitude went up also with them; and flocks and herds, *even* very much cattle (Ex. 12:37,38)."

The margin says "a great mixture." Then I should say that there were men of different nationalities that went up; but if the very act of following the army of God made them members of the covenant, by the very same act all the sheep and all the goats and all the cows and everything else about the camp were incorporated into the covenant! It is well enough to go back and assert a few fundamental facts. Here they are: God had said to Abraham that if a man were born in his house or bought with his money, he should be circumcised as a proof of his membership in the covenant, and he could not get in any other way, the camp followers to the contrary notwithstanding. As a proof that this "mixed multitude," Egyptians, cattle and other things were not incorporated into the covenant, I will refer you to a plain statement of Scripture: "And Moses went up unto God, and the Lord called unto him out of the mountain, saying, Thus shalt thou say to the house of Jacob, and tell the children of Israel (Ex. 19:3)."

In order that all of these people might be incorporated into the covenant it would be necessary to read: "Thus shalt thou say unto the house of Egypt, the children of Israel, their sheep, their cattle, their goats, and all of the passengers that came up out of Egypt with them." But it does not say it. That covenant was the most exclusive covenant that was ever made and ratified between God and mortal man. You will see where I am driving by and by if you will stand by me. As a further proof that these people were not members of the covenant by the act of coming up I want to show you that God provided that under certain contingencies an Egyptian might become a member of the covenant, but he could not do it by simply following along with the camp. It took a long



time to get in. Allow me to give you the proof, and I think it is very clear and very conclusive: "Thou shalt not abhor an Edomite; for he is thy brother: thou shalt not abhor an Egyptian, because thou wast a stranger in his land. The children that are begotten of them shall enter into the congregation of the Lord in their third generation (Deut. 23:7,8)."

A generation then was much longer than it is now. But I will say, bringing the thing down to our present conception, that according to a generation of today, say thirty-three and one third years, that even the descendants of those camp followers could not be made members of that covenant for one hundred years after the law went forth from Sinai. Therefore there were no Egyptians, no Hamites, no Japhethites or any other "ites" in the covenant at Sinai. It was a question of blood. It was a question of Abraham's blood. "My covenant shall be in your flesh;" these are the exact words of Jehovah. And here they are encamped around mount Sinai in the development of the purpose, and the power, and the word, and in the manifestation of the strength of the mighty Jehovah. What was the covenant? Paul says the covenant was made four hundred and thirty years after the promise. Moses says it was four hundred and thirty years from the beginning of the sojourn until the exodus, and we know as a matter of fact it was only fifty days from the exodus to the giving of the law. That is proof enough for a man who wants to have a thing proven to him. What was the covenant? If God made an exclusive covenant which was based on the blood and on the descendants of Abraham only, what was it? Every prophet, Jesus Christ the Lord of Glory Himself and all of the apostles unite in looking back to Sinai as the real beginning of the nation. The promise was placed in the blood of Abraham, the covenant cut them off from others and marked them, but the nation was born and tied together at Sinai. Let us see what that covenant was. To go back to the scenes around Sinai requires but a moment. Allow me to call your attention to this fact: Moses had brought them out, they were encamped around the mount and Moses went up to the Lord and had a conversation with Him and then went back and told the people what the Lord had said, and they said all that the Lord had said they would do, and then Moses went back and took their words unto the Lord. That was a contract. I go to my brother here, and I say that I want a certain piece of work done, and I want him to do it, and I will pay him so much. He agrees to do it. We seal that testament with the seal of the court—the contract stands! Then I say that the covenant at mount Sinai was this: Primarily, or in gen-



eral terms, it embraced what God told them to do and what they said they would do for God. I want you to notice that there were not any Egyptians in that, that there were no Hamites in that, there were no Japhethites in that, only what God told Israel to do and what Israel said in return: "All that the Lord hath spoken we will do (Ex. 19:8)." These were only preliminaries. I start to make a covenant with a man and I discuss the question with him somewhat. I tell him what I want done and when I want it done, and he tells me something about his experiences, something about his previous opportunities, something about his strength, something about his present disposition. I say, Is this satisfactory? He says it is. Our minds come together, and this is, therefore, a covenant. Then I go to work and develop the thing and put it in writing. He puts his name to it, and I put mine to it.

The question arises: What did God say? That is the great question that is before us now. I emphasize the first words of the twentieth chapter of Exodus. They were still encamped around Sinai. All of the preliminary exercises had been attended to. The third day, the most momentous day in Israel's history had come. The very foundation of the earth was quaking. The mighty summit of Sinai was blazing and echoing the foot-steps of its creator. The children of Israel were in expectancy. Paul said of it—and it is well for us to remember his words: so great was the sight that it caused Moses greatly to fear and tremble (Heb. 12:21). If the man who had already heard the voice of Jehovah in Horeb, if the man who had already gone up into the sacred presence of Him who said "*I am that I am*" should fear and quake and tremble, what must have been the condition of Israel at that time? God was about to make a covenant with them. It was a serious matter, a solemn matter, a matter that involved the issues of present happiness, of present prosperity and of death; therefore the children of Israel must have quaked. Suddenly, unexpectedly possibly to many, as with the awfulness that comes with the word of Jehovah, out of His own Personality, out of His own Omnipotence, out of His own Eternity comes this word, and then we have what the Lord said: "And the Lord spake all these words." I shall not quote the chapter because you are very familiar with it. God spoke from the summit of the mountain the Ten Commandments. We are finding out now what the covenant is. I want you to write that down in your memories in majestic capitals. God made a covenant with Israel at mount Sinai. The covenant that God made with Israel at mount Sinai consisted of what God said and of what Israel said, of what God commanded to be done and what Israel



promised to do. I call your attention to a comment of Moses, the man of God, on this very subject. Allow me to read his words. Reverting to the Ten Commandments, he says: "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: and he wrote them in two tables of stone, and delivered them unto me (Deut. 5:22)."

That was the covenant. That was the constitution. That was the foundation. God in that covenant, or in that foundation, or in that law detailed to them their duty, their duty to one another, their duty unto themselves. Moses declares emphatically that this closed the scene, and the curtain dropped and God said no more. But this is only, as the lawyers would say, circumstantial evidence. I want to go just a little bit farther and discuss the question at length because the settling of the question of what that covenant was, is like settling the question of whether or not God made a covenant there. If we can settle what the covenant was, or determine what the covenant was, we will know exactly how to deal with it in all of its phases throughout history in the olden times and in the new times, and in our times. Spoken words are often referred to as "testimony." We say that testimony in a certain case was for, or against the defendant. And the word testimony is used by Moses frequently along this line, and it has reference to the very same thing that we have under consideration. Allow me again to turn to the Book. Speaking of the ark: "And thou shalt put into the ark the testimony which I shall give thee (Ex. 25:16)." That seems to indicate that God had said something of very grave importance, that it had been reduced to writing, and that they put it into the sacred ark that it might be kept sacredly and securely unto all generations. Again, on this same point: "And he gave unto Moses, when he had made an end of communing with him upon mount Sinai, two tables of testimony, tables of stone, written with the finger of God (Ex. 31:18)." Bear in mind if you please that I said that the covenant was what God said to them and what they said to God, what God commanded and what they said they would do. Moses said God added no more. And I add that God made it with them, and He did not add anybody else.

Again: I affirm, as we are advancing in the argument, that what God said was the covenant when they accepted it, simply on the ground that the tables on which the covenant or on which the words of the covenant were written, were called the tables of the covenant. Allow me to read Hebrews ninth chapter, beginning at the first verse: "Then verily the first *covenant* had also ordi-

nances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary. For there was a tabernacle made; the first, wherein *was* the candlestick, and the table, and the shewbread; which is called the Sanctuary. And after the second veil, the tabernacle which is called the Holiest of all; Which had the golden censer, and the ark of the covenant overlaid round about with gold, wherein *was* the golden pot that had manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of the covenant (Heb. 9:1-4)."

He does not say the tables of the covenants. He does not say the table of a covenant. But he says the tables of the covenant, meaning definite tables and meaning a definite covenant. You keep that in mind.

Again: On this point I urged the same thought on the ground that the Ten Commandments—now we are coming to it—are designated as the words of the covenant. You will remember that when Moses was absent in the mount receiving the statutes of Israel for the enforcement of the covenant or the words of the covenant, that they fell into idolatry and that he broke the stones against the side of the mountain as he came down. God told him to hew out other tables and go up and he would give him another copy, and Moses did so. I want to give you the report as confirming what I have already said: "And the Lord said unto Moses, Write thou these words: for after the tenor of these words I have made a covenant with thee and with Israel. And he was there with the Lord forty days and forty nights; he did neither eat bread, nor drink water. And he wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the ten commandments (Ex. 34:27,28)." When did God make that covenant with Israel? In the day that He took them by the hand and brought them out of Egypt. Paul, what do you say about that? Paul says: "In the days when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt (Heb. 8:9)." He was there with the Lord forty days and forty nights, "And he wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the ten commandments (Ex. 34:28)!" I think you see what I am driving at. Study that passage for a moment. Already the covenant had been made. Already God had submitted His proposition and the people had accepted it. But in order that God might keep this before them perpetually, He reduced it to writing. And Moses said that he made the covenant. But here is something stronger than that, something irresistibly, undeniably and indisputably stronger. This is Moses talking again: "And the Lord spake unto you out of the midst of the fire." Where was that? On mount Sinai. He came down in fire, and Moses says: "And God spake all these words (Ex. 20:1)."



"Ye heard the voice of the words, but saw no similitude; only ye *heard* a voice. And he declared unto you his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, *even* ten commandments; and he wrote them upon two tables of stone (Deut. 4:12,13)."

Here is the conclusion, plain, positive, indisputable, convincing, irresistible, that the covenant that God made with Israel at mount Sinai was this: The Ten Commandments that He uttered from His blazing summit. And so certain is this conclusion, so clear is it stated in the word of God, that all Israel reverted to this time, and so considered these commandments. They were the covenant. Why was the ark called the ark of the covenant? Did you ever think about that? Moses, I think, gives us a very fair exposition of the subject, or at least makes it so clear that we may infer for ourselves. Not only was there a covenant or a constitution, but there were statutes. Just as we have our legislation, so they had theirs. Listen: "And it came to pass, when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book, until they were finished, That Moses commanded the Levites, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, saying, Take this book of the law, and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of the Lord your God, that it may be there for a witness against thee (Deut. 31:24-26)."

Again: This is in a subsequent period of the history of Israel, looking back when Solomon's mighty temple was done and when the old furniture was brought out of the old tabernacle and placed in the temple, we have this statement: "*There was nothing in the ark save the two tables of stone, which Moses put there at Horeb, when the Lord made a covenant with the children of Israel, when they came out of the land of Egypt (I Kings 8:9).*" He did not make any covenant with the Japhethites, He did not make any covenant with the descendants of Ham, but He made that covenant with Israel at mount Sinai. We have His own word for it that that covenant, or the basis of that covenant, the quintessence of that covenant, was written on tables of stone. I want to keep that in your mind. Why? For this reason: I will demonstrate by the grace of God that this covenant, with all that pertained to it, according to the testimony of Paul, even in his day was decaying, waxing old and vanishing from the hearts and experiences of men. And in order that I may keep the matter clearly before you I want to lay down a proposition again. To that I challenge your attention, unto it I invite your investigation and your patient thought. Hear me: The covenant consummated at mount Sinai was in pursuance of the promise made to Abraham, and like the promise, like the covenant of circumcision, like everything that God did

for and unto that family down to that day was absolutely exclusive so far as every other nation of men was concerned, and that the covenant itself embraced primarily the Ten Commandments, then the statutes of Israel, then the entire order of worship and all that pertained to Israel was absolutely exclusive in that it left out every other thing. Or, to put the matter in another form: The covenant made at mount Sinai was to Abraham's children and them alone, absolutely, excluding every drop of blood on earth save that which could be traced back to Abraham in person or purchase, and that the laws there laid down by Jehovah excluded every other law from man or God so far as that generation and that nation was concerned.

May the Lord our God lead us, and may He open to us the storehouse of His wisdom that we may enter into the knowledge of His own power, of His own glory; and may we remember that as God spoke to Israel, so doth He now speak to us.



Friday, February 10, 1899; 7 p. m.

SERMON NO. II.—THE FIRST COVENANT (PART 2).

*Text: "Moses commanded us a law, even the inheritance of the congregation of Jacob (Deut. 33:4)."*

As I am to speak on one subject throughout this entire effort rather than to deliver a series of lectures on different themes, I think it will be wise to refresh your minds somewhat along the line of the discussion this morning. There are some things that I shall undertake to enlarge somewhat, because, if it is possible, and I think it is, I want to exhaust the subject. I intimated this morning that a certain portion of the Bible is associated always with the name of Moses. Moses was a mighty man of God; and I shall continue to give him full credit. I would not throw any discredit upon him in anything. But I think the best tribute that I can pay to him is to find out his exact position in the Bible and let him stand there. I think there are many who admire Moses, honor Moses, revere Moses, who do not know where his place in history is. I think I do. And I want Moses to stand out for himself, and I want Jesus to stand out for Himself. Then I shall be able to challenge your attention and ask: To whom shall I pay tribute, unto whom shall I render my life, Moses or Christ? It is a fact that Moses is honored on almost every page of the Bible. He was a deliverer. He was a law-giver. He was a mighty toiler and a mighty man. I honor him for all this. I might say that I can only reflect or emphasize his honor because no mortal man, according to my judgment, has even been so conspicuously honored of God. We may, therefore, hear him with profit tonight as he unfolds to us God's ideas, God's ways, God's purposes and God's plans concerning us.

In my sermon this morning I had a little to say about the promise that God made to Abraham. It is my intention to go over that ground and enter rather more into the details tonight. I am aware of the fact that to many this is familiar ground; but let us lay a foundation deep and broad and comprehensive and then, at least, we shall be able to have just and right views of the things of God. Just why God singled Abraham out and gave him the promises, I cannot tell. But I venture to say that He saw in him what He



wanted, because God knows man. There was something in the surroundings of this man that God did not want, and therefore He told him to get away from his native land. That I may be able to discuss the subject intelligently, I will repeat the promise again: "Now the Lord had said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will show thee: And I will make of thee a great nation and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing: And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed (Gen. 12:1-3)." You will observe that with the exception of the last sentence that these promises are of a material character; that they pertain to this life. Allow me to go over this carefully. First, He said He would make of him a great nation; second, that He would bless him; third, He would make his name great; fourth, he should be a blessing; fifth, He would bless those that would bless him, and sixth, He would curse those who would curse him. You can see in a moment that all of this might have been fulfilled in this world and in material things with regard to mind, without regard to conscience, without regard to life, without regard to anything spiritual, without regard to anything after death. The final statement, however, is of a different character. It is deeper, it is wider, and it is more sweeping in that which it embraces. He declared here that in him all families of the earth should be blessed. There must have been, therefore, in the mind of God a present, or immediate and a remote object. But enough of this.

When Abram had grown to be a very old man and God had given him a son in order that He might make of him a great nation and bless his name and make him a blessing, God told him to take his son and offer him as a burnt offering; He did that as a test of Abraham's faith, and he did as he was commanded. And just as he was about to plunge the knife into the heart of his son, he was called by an angel out of heaven and the promises were renewed. I will give you the exact words. "And the angel of the Lord called unto Abraham out of heaven the second time. And said, By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord; for because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son; That in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies; And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice (Gen. 22:15-18)." This is the renewal of the two promises. And God adds by way of emphasis

His reason for doing this, saying it was because Abraham had obeyed His voice. Today I showed you that Isaac became the heir of Abraham to the exclusion of Ishmael and to the exclusion of all others, therefore it was appropriate that the promises should be renewed to Isaac. When Isaac was a man the Lord appeared to him as he was about to go down into Egypt and He said to him: "Sojourn in this land, and I will be with thee and will bless thee: for unto thee, and unto thy seed, I will give all these countries; and I will perform the oath which I sware unto Abraham thy father; And I will make thy seed to multiply as the stars of heaven, and I will give unto thy seed all these countries; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed (Gen. 26:3,4)."

That left out every other family. Again: I intimated this morning that God renewed this promise or this covenant or this plan to Isaac and that therefore He excluded Ishmael and all others from the privilege of participating in the development of this covenant idea. It was, therefore, appropriate that the promises should be renewed to Jacob, Isaac's son, and they were. When trouble came upon him by reason of appropriating by deception the birth-right of his brother, he fled, and when the night came down upon him, with a stone under his head and with the starry heavens above him, he dreamed, and God there spake to him. It is appropriate that I should give you the exact words: "And he lighted upon a certain place, and tarried there all night, because the sun was set; and he took of the stones of that place, and put *them* for his pillows, and lay down in that place to sleep. And he dreamed, and behold a ladder set up on the earth, and the top of it reached to heaven: and behold the angels of God ascending and descending on it. And, behold, the Lord stood above it, and said, I *am* the Lord God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac; the land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed; And thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth; and thou shalt spread abroad to the west, and to the east, and to the north, and to the south; and in thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed (Gen. 28:11-14)."

It would be appropriate here if time would allow, to go into details in the discussion of these promises, but I want to say this much, that the material side of the promise made to Abraham in Ur of Chaldees, renewed to him on mount Moriah, renewed to Isaac, and renewed to Jacob, was fulfilled in their seed at the development, at the consummation, and at the dedication of the law with them at mount Sinai. We might properly ask: Why these promises? Why did not God just send the Deliverer without say-



ing anything about it? I answer: Because men knew so little about God that they were not prepared to receive Him, and two things were absolutely necessary. One was that God might demonstrate His faithfulness; the other was that man might learn his need of the Redeemer. The Lord, therefore, I might say, experimented with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and the twelve tribes and the nation of Israel, and the first covenant dedicated by the blood of goats and calves at Sinai was in pursuance of this work. As to the faithfulness of God we have two things: We have the Word and the Oath of God. Abraham had the word and the oath of God, and so had his children. But the word of a man does not go far unless you know him, the oath of a man does not go far unless you know him, and the word and the oath of God were not sufficient, because man being naturally incredulous had to put the word and put the oath to a test. In after years looking over the way the human race had come we can know of the power and the love of God. These things are essential, absolutely essential to our faith, to ourselves and to our experience in the Christian life. Right here I want you to notice the testimony of Paul. I intimated that Abraham had the word of God or the promise of God, and the oath of God. Now I read: "For when God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he swear by himself, saying, Surely blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee. And so, after he had patiently endured, he obtained the promise. For men verily swear by the greater; and an oath for confirmation *is* to them an end of all strife. Wherein God, willingly more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed *it* by an oath: That by two immutable things, in which *it was* impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us (Heb. 6:13-18)."

Not only was it necessary that God should demonstrate His faithfulness, but it was necessary to demonstrate that man might be faithful too. In this world it is a big undertaking to do right sometimes, and God, our Father has not only showed that He can do the right thing but that men can do the right thing, and that therefore Abraham has always lived in history as a man who in the darkness of his times, in the degeneracy of his days, could honor and obey God and do it in a manner pleasing to Him, and this has caused Abraham's name to be written on almost every page of the Bible. It has caused Isaac's name to be written on almost every page of the Bible not because of his own life, but particularly of his relationship to Abraham. Jacob's name to be

written on almost every page of the Bible, not so much because of what he did but particularly because Abraham was his grandfather. The point I make is this: God has shown by His own faithfulness, and God through His servants has demonstrated what a man can do. I want to call your attention to a statement that was made long centuries after Abraham. They are important words. These are the words of one of the kings of Judea in the olden times: "*Art* not thou our God, *who* didst drive out the inhabitants of this land before thy people Israel, and gavest it to the seed of Abraham thy friend forever (II Chron. 20:7)?" Abraham is designated the friend of God forever. May you not be the friends of God forever, and may not God be your friend? This is the idea exactly. Again: In the prophecy of Isaiah we have a thought along this same line: "But thou, Israel, *art* my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham, my friend (Isa. 41:8)."

Again, and this is the New Testament, to show that His name is kept forever fragrant and green in the annals of time: "Therefore *it is* of faith, that *it might be* by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham; who is the father of us all, (As it is written, I have made thee a father of many nations), before him whom he believed, *even* God, who quickeneth the dead and calleth those things which be not as though they were. Who, against hope believed in hope, that he might become the father of many nations, according to that which was spoken, So shall thy seed be. And being not weak in faith, he considered not his own body now dead, when he was about an hundred years old, neither yet the deadness of Sara's womb; He staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief; but was strong in faith, giving glory to God; and being fully persuaded that what he had promised he was able also to perform (Rom. 4: 16-21)." Enough of this.

Why the covenant of circumcision? I discussed the covenant this morning, but I did not answer that question in full. I answer there was a two-fold reason. Read the 17th chapter of Genesis. One was, as declared this morning, to mark the seed of Abraham; the other was that He might test the faithfulness of Abraham. Abraham was an old man and God Almighty put a test to him in which He might demonstrate whether he wanted to remain in the covenant, or contract, or not (Gen. 17:23-27). It became a test of faith to every Hebrew when a male child arrived in his house.



I raise another question: Why the covenant at Sinai? Let us run briefly over the ground: The promise of Abraham, promise of the land, promise of an heir, covenant of circumcision, covenant at Sinai. Why was it necessary to add that covenant or submit all those wonderful statutes to these people? I said that God gave the promise in order that He might demonstrate His own faithfulness and that man can be faithful; that He gave Abraham the land that he might have some place while He was experimenting with him; that He gave him His seed because He did not expect to fulfill the promise in that generation; that He gave him the mark of circumcision that he might always know his children by that mark in the flesh. I assert that there was an object. As long as it was only Abraham, Abraham would behave himself without any law particularly; Isaac would behave himself without any law particularly; Jacob would behave himself without any law particularly, and Jacob could, in a degree control his family. God said Abraham could do it, but Jacob did not succeed very well. It was on the old principle that one boy is a boy, two boys are half a boy, and three boys are no boy at all. As the family grew, and when there were only twelve, they began to give Jacob trouble. Those who are familiar with the history at all know there was trouble in the family. At last they sold the younger brother into slavery into Egypt. I might theorize here half an hour as to why that covenant was made at Sinai, but the question is answered in the Word of God. Paul in looking back at this covenant from his standpoint, wondering why it was that there were certain disciples in that generation who desired to live under and keep this covenant, raised this question and then answered it: "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 (Gal. 3:19)."

I call your attention to this fact: The law was added to the promise and to the covenant of circumcision because of transgression. That the great family that had grown up as a result of the promise to Abraham concerning a great nation out of his own flesh might be kept in, might be kept under, might be schooled, might be managed, might be made more upright, clean and pure. And there is another reason. It lies in that second promise. In every case where the promise was made and renewed we have substantially these words: "In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed (Gen. 12:3)." I want you to study that a moment. God looked beyond Abraham, beyond Isaac, beyond Jacob, beyond the twelve



tribes, beyond the covenant at Sinai, beyond the nation as numerous as the sands of the sea shore and the stars of heaven, and intimated that the time would come when the blessing of God should be on all men. I declare here, and I am indebted to the immortal Alexander Campbell for this thought, that the development of the first promise culminated in the covenant at Sinai; and that the development of the second promise culminated in the covenant of the Lord Jesus Christ for which He stands security unto every generation. God had an ultimate object in view; an object that was not very clear to Abraham, because the thought of raising a big family was about the only great thought at that time. I doubt if he comprehended in any very remarkable degree the meaning of the statement in relation to every nation and tongue. God was committing unto this family certain things. Paul brings out the thought in the Roman letter and to it I call your attention: "What advantage then hath the Jew? or what profit *is there* of circumcision? Much every way: chiefly, because that unto them was committed the oracles of God (Rom. 3:1,2)." The oracles of God were the promises of God, the laws of God, the statutes of God. And so God was schooling them at Sinai. Paul brings out the thought in much greater fulness, so I will just turn and read it to you. Looking back at the time of the beginning of the law, and coming on down to the time in which he lived, he said: "But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the law was our school-master *to bring us* unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith (Gal. 3:23,24)." God was trying to impress on Abraham and his progeny that while He was blessing them in material things that there was a higher, a grander, a nobler mission for them. He was keeping before them constantly the thought that God was talking to them for their benefit and for the benefit of ages unborn. This brings us down to about the point where I closed this morning, and we raise a new question briefly. Moses was their Emancipator, their Leader, their Law-Giver, and in an important sense their Mediator.

I emphasized the fact this morning that Moses said that when the Lord proclaimed the ten commandments that He added no more. If the remaining part of the law is the law of God it seems truly remarkable that He should go to the trouble of coming down and setting His foot on that mountain and uttering only those ten commandments and then making it possible for Moses to declare and tell the truth: "*He added no more.*" But there is a reason for this, and I wish to make that as clear to you as I can. Here is a



description of mount Sinai at the time: "And mount Sinai was altogether on a smoke, because the Lord descended upon it in fire: and the smoke thereof ascended as the smoke of a furnace, and the whole mount quaked greatly (Ex. 19:18)." That voice that came from Sinai shook the very earth. It must have been terrible. These people were not schooled to it. They had never heard the voice of God before and therefore they were not prepared to hear it, and they were in terror as a result of it. Here is a description, however, in the exact language of scripture: "And all the people saw the thunderings, and the lightnings, and the noise of the trumpet, and the mountain smoking: and when the people saw *it* they removed, and stood afar off. And they said unto Moses, Speak thou with us, and we will hear: but let not God speak with us, lest we die. And Moses said unto the people, Fear not, for God is come to prove you, and that his fear may be before your faces, that ye sin not. And the people stood afar off: and Moses drew near unto the thick darkness where God *was* (Ex. 20:18-21)." The mediatorial position of Moses becomes more apparent here. The people had fallen back begging that the word of God should not be spoken unto them any more. Moses adds something of importance on this line of thought, and I will give it to you in his own words: "Behold, I have taught you statutes and judgments, even as the Lord my God commanded me, that ye should do so in the land whither ye go to possess it (Deut. 4:5)." It is apparent from these scriptures, I think that if the pleadings of the terror stricken people had not prevailed, if God had not heard their prayers, that the entire law would have been proclaimed from mount Sinai. But Moses went up unto God and He revealed the remainder of the law to him. I wish to demonstrate to you tonight that God made a covenant with Israel there and that the Ten Commandments are first called the Covenant and that all that God spake to Israel through Moses became as much a part of that covenant as the words that God uttered from Sinai in their hearing. I think it is very important to you that you remember this. Moses was a mighty man of God. God Almighty honored him above all other men of his day and time, and we have an account here of how the Lord spoke to him. Hear the words: "And he said, Hear now my words: If there be a prophet among you, *I* the Lord will make myself known unto him in a vision, *and* will speak unto him in a dream. My servant Moses *is* not so, who *is* faithful in all mine house (Num. 12:6,7)." As a matter of fact Moses went up into the mountain, drew nigh unto God and was with Him a long time. It is not necessary that I go into details. We know that not only



did he spend eighty days and nights with the Lord in mount Sinai, but he made repeated visits up to that blazing summit where at the feet of the great Law-Giver and Judge Himself, he heard His will concerning himself and His will concerning His people. When he came down from the mountain having heard the word of God he gave a report, and he puts it very succinctly and clearly, and as the people were always willing, they always answered that they were willing to do the will of God, and doubtless they were: "And when Aaron and all the children of Israel saw Moses, behold the skin of his face shone; and they were afraid to come nigh him. And Moses called unto them; and Aaron and all the rulers of the congregation returned unto him: and Moses talked with them. And afterward all the children of Israel came nigh: and he gave them in commandment all that the Lord had spoken with him in mount Sinai. And *till* Moses had done speaking with them, he put a veil on his face (Ex. 34:30-33)." Again, we have a statement on this subject that I think is appropriate: "And Moses came and told the people all the words of the Lord, and all the judgments; and all the people answered with one voice, and said, All the words which the Lord hath said we will do (Ex. 24:3)." Let us go over this ground just a little. A contract requires two or more parties. It requires a consideration. The minds of the parties must come together. There cannot be a contract without it. Neither can there be a covenant unless two or more minds are agreed. When God was speaking His covenant unto the people, in terror they said they were not willing to hear it. They could not bear that voice—they fell back. They told Moses if he would get the word of God for them they would listen to him. And Moses got the word of God and came down and announced it law for law, word for word, thought for thought, and commandment for commandment. What was the result? The result was that the mind of God and the minds of men came together and the covenant was consummated because God gave His will and they declared that all that God had said they would do. But Moses did not stop there. He wrote the law down; and I call your attention here to a very important fact. I noted this morning that there were a great many considerations tending to prove that the Ten Commandments were the basis or the foundation of the covenant. I want you to understand that the laws revealed unto Moses, and from Moses unto the children of Israel, were as much a part of the covenant as if they had been spoken by Jehovah Himself directly to the people. I will give you the proof of this: Moses declares: "And he took the book of the Covenant, and read in the audience of the people: And they



said, All that the Lord hath said we will do and be obedient (Ex. 24:7)." There is another point here to which I call your attention. It is very important. Not only was it important to them, but it is important unto us. If he wrote all the word of God to them there was no necessity for adding anything more: "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish *ought* from it, that ye might keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you (Deut. 4:2)." I emphasize that point before you this night. He did not write part of the law, but he wrote all the word, or *all* the words of God. Not only did he do this, but he told them plainly what he wanted them to do with it. I will give it to you in his own words: "And Moses wrote this law, and delivered it unto the priests, the sons of Levi, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, and unto all the elders of Israel. And Moses commanded them, saying, At the end of *every* seven years, in the solemnity of the year of release, in the feast of tabernacles. When all Israel is come to appear before the Lord thy God in the place which He shall choose, thou shalt read this law before all Israel in their hearing. Gather the people together, men, and women, and children, and thy stranger that is within thy gates, that they may hear, and that they may learn, and fear the Lord your God, and observe to do all the words of this law: And *that* their children which have not known *anything*, may hear, and learn to fear the Lord your God as long as ye live in the land whither ye go over Jordan to possess it (Deut. 31:9-13)." After Moses had revealed the law, acting as the spokesman of God, the mediator between God and men, then there came a solemn time of dedication. A covenant is not in force without a dedication or a seal. A contract in this State or in your State does not amount to anything without the seal of the court upon it. Therefore as the testator could not die in order to the ratification of this covenant, God provided a substitute, and that substitute was slain at its dedication. Allow me to turn and read two accounts—and I want to call your attention to the fact that these accounts afford the best illustration of what I said this morning that covenant and testament are used interchangeably. Here we have the word covenant in the first quotation and in the second you will see that the word testament appears, meaning the same thing: "And Moses took the blood, and sprinkled *it* on the people, and said, Behold the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words (Ex. 24:8)." Considering what these words reveal, it is remarkable that the Ten Commandments were not read there. I account for it on the ground that they had been

burned by the Lord into the very warp and woof of their mental constitutions when they heard the awful voice from Sinai's blazing height. But it is said that this was the covenant that God had made with them concerning those words. God made but one covenant. There were not two covenants at Sinai, but one, and the covenant was not completed until Moses heard all the words of God and rehearsed them to the people and they endorsed all the words of God. But we have an account of that in the New Testament that is well worthy of our attention, and so I will turn to that: We are looking at things through the eyes of Paul: "Whereupon neither the first *testament* was dedicated without blood. For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and all the people, saying, This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you. Moreover he sprinkled likewise with blood both the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry, And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission (Heb. 9: 18-22)." Let us study this for awhile. Says Moses: "Behold the blood of the covenant which God hath made with you concerning all these words." Says Paul: "This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you." I call your attention, brethren, to one important thing here: The whole idea and character of the covenant is emphasized in its dedication. Let us review the ground: God said if they would do certain things He would do certain things for them; and that they should be unto Him a peculiar people above all other people. And the people said that all that the Lord had said they would do. Then the Lord started in to tell just what He wanted them to do. They heard the voice, the mountain quaked and the knees of Moses knocked together, and the people ran in terror from the blazing mountain and besought Moses that they might not hear that voice again. And Moses, brave heart that he was, unselfish heart that he was, patriot, friend of man, lover of God, consented to brave the awful danger and go up and hear the word of God and tell it to them. He did this. He came down, reported all the words of the Lord, and they said they would do it. And blood was shed, and the red stains of the blood upon the Book of the law and upon the people themselves—not of water—but blood, was an announcement to them that the covenant had been made and ratified between them and God. Notice this. What is the character of this covenant? It is called in the New Testament the first covenant, or the old covenant. Or it is designated plainly as the Law of Moses: "The



law came by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ (John 1:17)." How may we determine the character of this covenant, the radical power or the want of radical power in this covenant? I say that volumes might be written, but Paul and Moses have compressed all the volumes into one sentence. Look at it: "This is the blood of the covenant." What kind of blood? The blood of goats and calves; the covenant that you have made with God; the contract that you have made with God; the contract unto which the mind of Israel and the mind of Jehovah came together. It is a covenant dedicated by the blood of a goat or a calf. I say that this emphasizes the character of the institution as nothing in this world ever could do. Its power to cleanse, its power to uplift, its power to revolutionize, its power to ennoble, its power to sanctify, its power to save, may be measured by the kind of blood used to dedicate it at its inauguration. Do you comprehend this? This is the blood of the covenant, the testament that you have made with God. It must have been that God had an object beyond this covenant. It must have been that the covenant was to be educational in its character, lifting men up and preparing them for better things. I call your attention to what may seem like a fanciful exegesis. I will risk my reputation on it, however. It is not much, but I will leave it for you and future generations who shall learn more about it than we know, to determine whether or not it is right. In the seventeenth chapter of Genesis we have a graphic account of the institution known as the covenant of Circumcision. And God gave Abraham a promise there—but I will give it to you in the exact words: "And my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant (Gen. 17:13)." God did not design that the covenant of Circumcision, the covenant inaugurated at Sinai, dedicated at Sinai, unfolded at Sinai, stained with the blood of goats and calves at Sinai, was to be everlasting. Surely not. What did He mean when He said that covenant should be in Abraham's flesh for an everlasting covenant? He did not say this is an everlasting covenant, but the everlasting covenant should be in Abraham's flesh. I say that in your generation, sometime, somewhere, in some event, I will establish a covenant in your flesh which shall be everlasting. Reflect on that. Does not that go right along with the promise? Let us see if it does not. I will just read it because it is right here before mine eyes: "And in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed (Gen. 12:3)." Paul said the oracles of God were given unto them, the promise of God was given unto them, the covenant was in the flesh of Israel, in the flesh of every generation right along down the line, and every message He had to



give, He gave to them, and every assurance that God had to give, He gave to them. Therefore I come to this conclusion and to this climax tonight: That God had a remote object in the promise unto Abraham, in the covenant of circumcision, in the covenant at Sinai including the Ten Commandments and the Book of the Law, and all that God commanded Moses in the mountain or elsewhere, and that that ultimate purpose ripened into the grander, better, sweeter day of the Messiah on earth and in His present glory.

Let us now briefly view the fundamental principles of this institution. I intimated this morning that I desired you to view the Ten Commandments as the constitution, and that the law was the statutes to explain the constitution, to enforce the constitution. Let us look just a moment or two at these commandments. Here is a commandment aimed at idolatry. God declared that they should not have any other god save Himself, that they should not make unto themselves any images of anything above or below. Why? Idolatry is the last infirmity, the last weakness of mortal man. Therefore He prohibited it. These people had, in a degree, become tainted with idolatry in Egypt, and the forms of Egyptian idolatry were extremely low. So God Almighty declared that they should not in any event give their thoughts to any god but the one true God, and that they should not have any image or likeness of God at all. Here is a commandment with reference to the name of God. There is no name like His. Names stand for things. All knowledge, all learning, all information is identified by the name that is given to it, and the name of Jehovah means, what? It means all power. It means all knowledge. It means everything present at one time—a thought that a human being cannot grasp. We can only have a faint, glimmering conception of God. One of the greatest orators of our time said something to this effect: We try in searching to find out God. The little mind of man soaring away in the contemplation of the Original Cause, loses itself and in fear comes back into its temple of clay, bolts the door and attempts to hide itself forever. How true that is! That they might be imbued with reverence, God said they should not take His name in vain; and it is recorded to the everlasting credit of these people that in their better days when the Scriptures were read in the presence of Israel at the mention of the name of Jehovah the reader instead of naming Him, reverently bowed his head and every member of his audience reverently did the same. May that God imbue us with a just conception of His Eternity, of His Glory, of His Majesty, of His Awfulness, of His Power, and may His name be proclaimed before us, and may we feel as Moses felt when he went



up into the mountain and talked with God. After the Ten Commandments or the stones on which they were placed had been broken, the Lord descended in the cloud and stood with them there and proclaimed unto Moses the name of the Lord: "And the Lord descended in the cloud and stood with him there, and proclaimed the name of the Lord. And the Lord passed by before him, and proclaimed The Lord, The Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, Keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear *the guilty*; visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children's children unto the third and to the fourth *generation* (Ex. 34:5-7)." And may it be said of us as was said of Moses: "And Moses made haste and bowed his head toward the earth, and worshipped (Ex. 24:8)."

Again: We have a commandment here that is of great importance or was to His people, and that was with reference to the Sabbath day. So important did the observance of that day seem unto God that a special commandment was laid down in order to enforce it. I will just give you that. I have already said that the Lord gave the additional laws to Moses, that the Ten Commandments might be enforced. So I read: "Six days shall work be done, but on the seventh day there shall be to you an holy day, a Sabbath of rest to the Lord: whosoever doeth work therein shall be put to death. Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitations upon the Sabbath day (Ex. 35:2,3)."

But there are other commands, and I briefly call your attention to them. Here we have the command to honor father and mother, and in the New Testament we are assured that this is the first commandment with promise (Eph. 6:2,3). Again: The commandment not to kill: Human life was precious to God. Then the commandment not to commit adultery. Personal purity was always precious in the sight of God. And we have the commandment not to steal. There is enough in this world for every man and he can get his part without taking anything unjustly. Then we have the commandment not to bear false witness, or covet that which is another's.

I beg of you brethren to contemplate the laws that were written in the Book of the Covenant, as God's statutes for the enforcement of what was said from the blazing summit of mount Sinai by Jehovah Himself.

Saturday, February 11, 1899; 10:30 a. m.

SERMON NO. III.—THE TABERNACLE AND WORSHIP  
UNDER THE FIRST COVENANT.

*Text: "And let them make me a sanctuary; that I may dwell among them (25:8)."*

It is understood that these are the words of the Lord unto Moses His servant, the law-giver of Israel. The covenant had already been made. The statutes of Israel were then being added as an enlargement of the idea of the covenant. God knew that in order to keep these people in subjection that it would be necessary to manifest His glory, His power, and His literal presence from time to time. There is one important lesson here for us. God commanded the people to make the tabernacle. He could have made it for them, but they had the power to make it for themselves. Therefore He laid the obligation upon them, or rather I should say granted unto them the privilege. This principle has been true in all the ages. God does for us what we cannot do for ourselves. What we can do for ourselves He requires us to do, and holds us accountable if we fail to do it. The object of this tabernacle was that God might dwell among them. It was the bringing of the power, the glory and the presence of God down to man. Not in the great and glorious and exalted sense that God dwells with us now, but in the sense of His visible presence and the visible glory. But more of this farther on.

If God had simply commanded the tabernacle to be made there doubtless would have arisen much discussion and dissension in Israel about the plans. But as He had particular designs in the form, in the manner, in the architecture of this building, He gave unto Moses the plans. And just here I will quote a number of passages bearing on it because I think they are important. First, the words of the Lord to Moses: "And look that thou make *them* after the pattern, which was showed thee in the mount (Ex. 25:40)." Again, we have the words of Luke in the Book of Acts: "Our fathers had the tabernacle of witness in the wilderness, as he had appointed, speaking unto Moses, that he should make it according to the fashion that he had seen (Acts 7:44)." Again, we have on this subject the words of the great apostle Paul: "Who



serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle: for, See, saith he, *that* thou make all things according to the pattern showed to thee in the mount (Heb. 8:5)." That this pattern was given unto Moses in the mount, and that the tabernacle was built according to this pattern or according to these plans and specifications, I submit the words of Moses himself: "According to all that the Lord commanded Moses, so the children of Israel made all the work. And Moses did look upon all the work, and, behold they had done it as the Lord had commanded, even so had they done it: and Moses blessed them (Ex. 39:42,43)." I raise an important question: Why was this building called the tabernacle, or the tabernacle of witness, or the tent of the congregation? I answer that the meaning of the word indicates two very important things: First, that it was temporary and movable and therefore liable to decay or to pass away. I might further add here that all earthly buildings are of this character; that God has never in any age had a permanent resting or dwelling place in the world save in the hearts of His children. Second, that the service of this tabernacle and all that pertained to it were to fill their places and vanish away.

The material for this tabernacle. If the people were to build it, it follows that it was their business to furnish the material. Therefore they were called upon to do this, and in very specific terms. It was to be a free will offering, an offering out of the heart, and they were to give gold, silver, brass, blue, purple, scarlet, fine linen, goat's hair, ram's skins dyed red, badger skins, shittim wood, oil, spices, onyx stones, and they were to do this because they loved God. I pause here long enough to say that there is one thing very remarkable in this connection. This vast amount of material had been given unto them by the Lord on their departure from Egypt that they might have some compensation for the long night of bondage and for the long night of service they had endured, and we may add without doing violence to the text that the free will offering was an offering out of their poverty, for they were poor. You can very well imagine that a people who had been in that strange land for two hundred and fifteen years, and many of them in the most cruel bondage, would not be possessed of much. And they were to carry their compensation out with them by the will of God and were inside of a few days with but little opportunity to learn, with but little of what we would call spiritual culture, to practically lay down all they had at the feet of their Deliverer and their Lord. What an example for this generation! And here comes



a remarkable thing, and it is so remarkable that I prefer to submit it in the exact words of Scripture without note or comment: "And they spake unto Moses, saying, The people bring much more than enough for the service of the work which the Lord commanded to make. And Moses gave commandment, and they caused it to be proclaimed throughout the camp, saying, Let neither man nor woman make any more work for the offering of the sanctuary. So the people were restrained from bringing. For the stuff they had was sufficient for all the work to make it, and too much (Ex. 36:5-7)." Oh that the day will come when it can be said that we have enough for the service of God! Oh that the day may come when those who are rich and those who are poor shall pour of their treasures great and small into the service of the Lord! They were to make the tabernacle. Therefore God did not send an angel to superintend the work. The Lord has a great deal of confidence in the judgment and the good common practical sense of His creatures. He knows just what we are for He made us. Therefore Aholiab and Bezaleel were called unto the superintendence of this work, God being the supreme architect, Moses being the secondary architect. These men were the practical architects, and they were assisted in the service by every wise-hearted man who had wisdom in his heart from the Lord, and every one whose heart was stirred up to help (Ex. 36:1,2).

I should like to discuss fully the subject of the preparation of the material and of the putting together of the material for this building, but time will not allow. Therefore I hasten on and present a brief description of the court and the tabernacle. This court was, to come right down to plain language, a fence around the building of God. In my figures I shall allow eighteen inches to the cubit, although a cubit was somewhat longer than that, but it is an easy measurement and easy to remember. The court was, therefore, one hundred and fifty feet long, seventy-five feet wide and seven and one half feet high, and it was supported by, or consisted, rather, of sixty pillars of brass, on which curtains were hung. I think it is named the court, not because of the fence, but rather because of the open space inside of the fence and around the tabernacle itself (Ex. 27:9-18).

The tabernacle. The tabernacle itself was a far more substantial building. It had under it one hundred silver sockets made of the redemption money, and we may say, therefore, the structure rested on the idea or the thought of redeeming some one or some nation or the world. The walls of the tabernacle were solid. That is to say they were made of boards of shittim wood setting one against the



other that the light of day was excluded from the sides, and west end. The walls were made more substantial by boards or pieces that extended from one end to the other, five of them, the center one shooting through the boards: that is to say, the boards were morticed and this piece of timber was placed through. The walls were overlaid with gold; the bars were also overlaid with gold. The tabernacle had four coverings. There was an inner covering of elaborate workmanship called the cherub covering. Over this was a covering of goats' hair, and over this still a covering of rams' skins dyed red, and over this still a covering of badger skins. My idea of the tabernacle is that these coverings were thrown on without any support above and that the surplusage extended over the west end and over the sides and that these curtains were drawn tight and therefore rain and light were excluded. Some people have an idea that there was a ridge pole, but no one has ever found to my knowledge any proof of the fact. Indeed it strikes me that it would have been very difficult to have a ridge pole and at the same time to exclude the light of the sun, and all light of any artificial character whatever was to be excluded, particularly from the Holy of Holies (Ex. 26:1-14).

The tabernacle was divided into two compartments. The first was fifteen feet wide, fifteen feet high, thirty feet long; the second was fifteen by fifteen by fifteen, or an exact cube. The first compartment was called the holy place, the second was called the most holy place, the holiest of all, or the holy of holies.

Furniture of the court and tabernacle. It is only by the contemplation of the furnishings, and of the uses of the furnishings, that we may be able to grasp in a degree what the tabernacle was, and what the worship of God was, as long as this tabernacle and its successors stood. Permit me to say, however, before advancing another step, that the whole structure, including the court around it, faced the east, and that in my remarks this morning I shall imagine that we enter at the eastern door or gate of the court and that we proceed westward in our investigations. After having passed in through the door of the court the first object to attract our attention or the attention of anyone who was curious, and who had the authority in that day, was the altar of burnt sacrifices. The dimensions of this altar were seven and one-half by seven and one-half feet by four and one-half feet. It was made strong, with horns, with rings, with staves and with grates and with ash pans and with all the implements necessary to do the work that God designed to have done. Hear Moses concerning the kindling of the

fire on this altar: "And there came a fire out from before the Lord, and consumed upon the altar the burnt offering and the fat: *which* when all the people saw, they shouted, and fell on their faces (Lev. 9:24)." Proceeding in the journey the next object would be the laver. We know very little about it. We do not know anything of its size and we do not know anything of the style of it. All we do know is that it was made of the looking glasses contributed by the women of the congregation (Ex. 30:18). It stood between the altar of burnt sacrifices and the door of the tabernacle of the congregation. I have no doubt that it was of polished brass and that it was kept clean always because our God delights in magnificence, in glory, and in cleanliness. Passing on we come to the door of the tabernacle itself (Ex. 26: 36,37). The door was not like a door in an ordinary building in our time. The fact is that the entire end of the building was open. There was a curtain fifteen by fifteen by fifteen feet hanging over this front entrance in order that light of the day might be excluded, and in order that the idle might not under any circumstances be in their curiosity permitted to gaze in. Proceeding in our journey, passing in over the threshold into the mysterious building of God, we discover on our left to the south, the golden candlestick (Ex. 25:31-40). This candlestick consisted of a single shaft and three branches on a side. It was of solid gold. It was elaborately and beautifully wrought, and by it and by it only was the holy place or the first apartment of the tabernacle lighted. But on the north side there was a table, the table of the shewbread or the table of the bread of the priests (Ex. 25:23-30). The table was three and one-half feet by one and one-half feet by two feet, three inches. It was a beautiful piece of furniture, elaborately wrought and decorated in gold, showing as already intimated that our Father delights in the best that His children can give. These people had gold and they gave gold, and their God and Father delighted in it by accepting it at their hands. Proceeding on our journey forward we discover a small chest or altar (Ex. 30:1-5). It was one and one-half feet by one and one-half feet by three feet. It is called the altar of incense. Its position was just before the second veil, that is, in the first apartment and near the dividing line of a partition, or the veil that separated the holy place from the holy of holies. We next come to the second veil (Ex. 26:33,34). It was far more elaborate and more beautiful than the veil that hung over the front end of the tabernacle. The cunning hands of those who loved the Lord had wrought it beautifully, wrought it elaborately, thus showing again that God delights in the best that our hands can do. Did He not make us? Did



He not imbue us with the possibilities that are in us? Does not He delight in us when we do the very best we can by the presence and by the power of God? And with solemn, with deliberate and with reverent tread we pull aside the curtain separating the holy place from the holiest of all, and pass in; and there before us we find what is by far the most elaborate, the most beautiful and the most wonderful piece of furniture connected with this wonderful building (Ex. 25:10-20).

The ark of the covenant was three feet, nine inches by one and one-half feet, by two feet, three inches. I call your attention to this fact that in this ark of the covenant, in the solemn recesses of total darkness, save when the glory of God shone there, were deposited the tables of the covenant, the book of law, the pot of manna, and Aaron's rod that budded. Here was the covenant in reality. Here was the covenant in symbolism, here was the covenant arising in the glory, in essence, and power, and the light of the Creator shining Himself. This ark was a kind of box overlaid with gold inside and out and decorated beautifully, and the lid of the ark was called the mercy seat. On either end of this mercy seat there was a cherub. Their faces were turned toward each other and downward while their wings spread on high, as if even the angels might take delight in contemplating the awful mystery of God shining there. There is a thought, which while it does not belong to this connection, I want to emphasize, and that is that the mercy seat was above the law, the law was in the ark, and God's mercies are over His law; but for His mercies even though we do the best we can our chances for salvation would be but small. Let us contemplate this just a little more, and I prefer to give it to you in the exact words of Scripture: "And thou shalt put the mercy seat above upon the ark; and in the ark thou shalt put the testimony that I shall give thee. And there I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy seat, from between the two cherubim which *are* upon the ark of the testimony, of all *things* which I will give thee in commandment unto the children of Israel (Ex. 25:21,22)." It appears here to my mind that when any difficulty arose that they could not settle as to the interpretation or the meaning of the word of God, that their God said He would reveal Himself unto them. And I find one lesson right here for us, that in the holy of holies of our own closets, upon bended knee and with reverential heart where only God can see, we may expect Him to shine into our hearts as His glory shone into the faces of Moses and Jesus. When the tabernacle was finished Moses inspected it and blessed the builders because they



built it according to the plan which they had seen in the mount. Every article of furniture was placed in its own appropriate position, and: "Then a cloud covered the tent of the congregation, and the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle. And Moses was not able to enter into the tent of the congregation, because the cloud abode thereon, and the glory of God filled the tabernacle. And when the cloud was taken up from over the tabernacle, the children of Israel went onward in all their journeys: But if the cloud was not taken up, then they journeyed not till the day that it was taken up. For the cloud of the Lord *was* upon the tabernacle by day, and fire was on it by night, in the sight of all the house of Israel, throughout all their journeys (Ex. 40:34-38)."

Mark the road to God under the first testament—covenant! First the gate of the court—born into the world; Second, burnt sacrifices—offering blood; Third, cleansing—the laver; Fourth, the veil of separation between the court and the holy place; Fifth, light; Sixth, bread; Seventh, incense, prayer, praise; Eighth, the mysterious veil between the flesh and the spiritual realm; Ninth, the ark of the covenant, the mercy seat, the angels, the presence of God!

It is a fact, I think beyond a doubt, that the Israelites had some ideas of God. But the question of knowing God, brethren, while it is a question of revelation, is a question also of education. God our Father revealed Himself but it took these people a long time to learn. I might publish a book and reveal all I have in my heart touching you, touching this work, touching the worship of the Master and you might read it and accept it, and yet at the same time it would take you four or five years, it may be twenty years, before you realize all there is in this effort for you and for the extension of the kingdom of God. And although God had manifested Himself on Sinai, although they had heard His voice, although they had been terror-stricken by that voice, although they had fallen back and said they did not want to hear that voice any more, it is still a fact that they knew but little about the character of God, about His mercy, about His love, about His eternity, about His omnipotence. They knew so little; they were like little children. And so God was educating them out of weakness into strength, out of ignorance into knowledge, out of self-dependence into dependence upon Him, out of rebellion into obedience, out of darkness into the marvelous light. It took a long time to do this. They were young in understanding, and though He bound them down to the strictest covenant perhaps in the world's history, and although in the enthusiasm of the moment they said they would do



all that the Lord commanded, yet at the very first temptation they fell. They were weak. Although the priest could see the glow of the presence of God shining above the mercy seat, the common people did not see it and at last and after all they had to take it on his statement. They knew not the law of God save as it came from others to them, and therefore we ought not to be surprised at the very remarkable, at the very wonderful, at the very material idea that seems to pervade the worship of Israel under the first tabernacle. And I am going to say something here that may sound a little irreverent, but I say it with the deepest reverence. I want you to understand it fully. The door of the tabernacle of the congregation of Israel under the first testament as they worshipped God according to His commandments and according to their conceptions, was from our standpoint nothing more nor less than a slaughter house. We cannot understand that save as we remember that in reality they were in their childhood and God was leading them, teaching them the alphabet of obedience and there was not anything in it perhaps to the majority of them save the fact that God said to do it and a man had to learn obedience and faithfulness, and that God was faithful and that God would hold them to strict accountability. For convenience sake, I will enumerate some of the personal and some of the national offerings that you may know just what I mean.

The burnt offering (Lev. 1:1-17). This was an offering that any Israelite, at any time, when he desired, might bring. And we can well imagine that every pious Israelite felt called upon to often go to the door of the tabernacle of the congregation in obedience to the command of God and present to Him there an offering by fire from Jehovah. Therefore we conclude, and it is reasonable to do it, that thousands upon thousands of animals were burned every year.

The meat offering (Lev. 2:1-16). This was an offering consisting of the products of the earth. There was no stated time for this offering, but any pious Israelite might offer it when the circumstances in his case required or permitted.

The peace offering (Lev. 3:1-17). It required the infliction of death upon a victim unoffending and defenseless; therefore the times and circumstances oft recurring and oft required him when this offering should and could be presented to God. We may righteously and rightly and appropriately conclude, therefore, that many peace offerings were presented at the brazen altar near the door of the tabernacle of the congregation of Israel.



The trespass offering. If any man trespassed against God or against man, an offering was required at his hands; and as men then were like men now, it is reasonable to suppose that there was scarcely a day or an hour that some one was not present at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation with his trespass offering that he might honor God, obey God, or reconcile his neighbor (Lev. 5:1-19).

The sin offering was more important and doubtless more frequent, because all were sinners and the law was designed to give them a knowledge of sin. And all of these little statutes given in detail were given for the purpose of defining and exhibiting and showing sin to them, therefore the sin offering. There are four different classes for sin offerings described here. Some of them are for the purpose of settling the question with the priest, some with the common people, some with the congregation. Under certain circumstances the blood was carried into the tabernacle of the congregation and there God's name was honored in the doing of what He commanded. It will not be necessary for me to go into particulars because I only want to show that the blood of the covenant that God enjoined on them was the blood of goats and calves, and that it flowed constantly, and we might say that there is a red stream of blood from the summit of Calvary flowing down to meet it there and that every sin that was committed from that time back that had been sincerely repented of, was washed out in the blood of Him (Lev. 4:1-35).

National offerings—the daily offerings (Ex. 29:38-42; Num. 28:9). There was required at the hands of Israel an offering every morning and evening. The offering was doubled on the Sabbath day which made in the neighborhood of eight hundred animals in a year put to death at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation. Blood flowed every day in the history of Israel as long as they lived up to the commandments of God. Indeed I may say that the warm blood was constantly flowing. God said to them that He gave them blood to make an atonement for their souls, and I believe that I will be just and safe in saying that the blood around that altar never got cold (Lev. 17:11).

The feast of the passover and the unleavened bread (Ex. 12:43-49). No stranger was allowed to partake of that feast. It was inclusive for Israel, exclusive for all others. And during all the seven days they honored God in remembering the great deliverance that He wrought for them when He brought them out of the land of Egypt. They were required the first time, and presumably



always after that, to take a lamb of the first year for each family provided the family was large enough to consume it, and the presumption is that when all the males of Israel came to appear before God at the place where the tabernacle sat, that thousands upon thousands of lambs were slain and these lambs were typical of the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world. At the feast, however, a number of special offerings were made: fully eleven. These were made, understand, in addition to the morning and evening sacrifices and the special sacrifices of the Sabbath, the daily sacrifice was doubled on the Sabbath day, and were peculiar to the feast of the passover kept in memory of the last night and of the passing of the angel over the homes of Israel in Egypt.

The feast of weeks (Lev. 23:16-21). This was the feast kept in recognition of the beginning of the harvest. Thirteen animals were sacrificed at this feast.

The feast of tabernacles (Lev. 23:34-44). In my judgment one of the most remarkable institutions in Israel. It was kept in order that they might remember their sojourn of forty long years when they were in temporary habitations, and at each recurring annual feast of the tabernacles they took the boughs of trees and made temporary dwelling places to keep in memory that they had once no better place than that, and that God had delivered them. Including the special offerings on the eighth day of the feast of tabernacles, one hundred and ninety-nine animals were slain.

Feast of trumpets (Num. 29:1-5). Blowing of trumpets, honoring God with a joyful sound! It was a musical feast; and at that feast ten animals were sacrificed to God.

Feast of new moons (Num. 28:11-15). Eleven animals were sacrificed. Whenever a new moon appeared all Israel, that is all Israel that tried to know God piously, turned their eyes to the altar of God. All of us like to see the new moon come back, and we call it "new" though it is not. It is the same old moon, but it is new to us. There is always a feeling of gratification that we have lived to see the moon come back again and so they celebrated it with a feast unto God.

The feast of the annual atonement. As this is very important, I shall go rather more into particulars. As a preparation for this annual festival, if I may so call it, certain offerings were presented. After the ordinary morning sacrifice was presented (Ex. 28:38-42), a special offering was made, consisting of one young bullock, seven lambs, one ram, one kid of the goats, accompanied by

meat offerings of flour mingled with oil (Num. 29:7-11). In the sixteenth chapter of Leviticus we have a full and graphic account of the transactions of this day. On this day about fifteen animals were sacrificed to God. I will read again. Speaking of the priest: "He shall put on the holy linen coat, and he shall have the linen breeches upon his flesh, and shall be girded with a linen girdle, and with the linen mitre shall he be attired: these *are* holy garments; therefore shall he wash his flesh in water, and *so* put them on. And he shall take of the congregation of the children of Israel two kids of the goats for a sin offering, and one ram for a burnt offering. And Aaron shall offer his bullock of the sin offering which *is* for himself, and make an atonement for himself, and for his house. And he shall take the two goats, and present them before the Lord *at* the door of the tabernacle of the congregation (Lev. 16:4-7)." On that day the priest not only slew the animals but the blood was carried into the holy place and into the holy of holies and there the solemn act of making an atonement for their souls was consummated. I want to keep before you brethren this thought—that the word "atonement" was the word of "at-one-ment," or reconciliation, for bringing conflicting parties into harmony again. And the idea of the covenant of God, of the tabernacle of God, of the worship of God, of the knowledge of God, that existed in that day may again be seen in the thought that this is the blood of the covenant which the Lord had enjoined upon them. What blood was it? The blood that they carried into that tabernacle to make an atonement for their souls was the blood of a goat, or of a bull, or of an ox. I call your attention to another striking thing. You have read it many a time no doubt, but I think I can give you a lesson from it this morning that you never have had. I have urged the material idea in this service, the sacrifice of animals, the pouring out of the hot blood of a defenseless and sinless and innocent victim. Now I submit this proposition: The blood would soon putrefy, the animal itself would soon go back to dust, and as a striking proof of the temporary character and of the inefficiency of these offerings, of the want of absolute cleansing power, every sacrifice presented on that altar was salted with salt. "The salt of the covenant of thy God (Lev. 2:13)." Why? The priest may not have seen the reason; the worshipper may not have seen it, but it was there. That by the very act of salting the sacrifice it was established and proclaimed that the power of that covenant was of so fleeting a character, so ephemeral a character, so weak in its nature, that the very sacrifice of the altar would smell of putrefaction in a little while; and therefore they placed the salt upon it. When



I announced my theme as the tabernacle and the worship of Israel I had in my mind the disposition to emphasize their temporary character. The tabernacle could be taken down and borne on the shoulders of men; and the worship itself smelled of blood, smelled of the remains of an unoffending victim. And so transitory was it that only the salt could preserve it from putrefaction under the blazing sun of the wilderness. I think I have made my point. I think I may justly return to the text of yesterday's discussion and reach my climax in this argument in the words of Paul: "Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away (Heb. 8:13)." Brethren, as a matter of fact, but for the power of God the covenant would have vanished in the very hands of Moses. There are things known to chemists which on exposure to light and heat, evaporate forever. So passing, so transitory was the very character of the sacrifices of Israel that it looked as though the very thing itself would pass away, would putrefy in the hands of the priests, and hence the covering of the sacrifice with salt as an emblem of the fact that the covenant and the law themselves, and the worship and the administration were nothing and would pass eternally away. But I am not done with this. For a few years after the tabernacle was built it was carried from place to place in the wilderness. It was the center of the camp. All eyes were turned to it, because there Jehovah manifested His glory when He manifested it at all. And finally after Moses the man of God had died, after Joshua had succeeded him, after they had crossed the Jordan and gone into the land of Canaan, they set it up at Shiloh (Josh. 18:1). There the tribes went in obedience to the word of God three times a year to the Feast of the Passover and Unleavened Bread, the Feast of Pentecost, the Feast of Tabernacles and any other feast to which they chose to go, and at any time they chose to go with their burnt offerings, their trespass offerings, their peace offerings or their sin offerings. The fortunes of the tabernacle I shall not trace. We are only interested in the building as it gives us an idea of the transitory character of the institution under which it was set up. Finally, however, when the promise was fulfilled and when Israel's domain extended from the river of Egypt to the Euphrates, David desired to build a house for God, but He forbade him. At last Solomon builded the house (I Kings 6:1-10). And lo, it was a house builded elaborately, costly, beautifully, grandly. And although its cost could scarcely be estimated it, too, was transitory. It was a reproduction of the tabernacle in many respects, larger in dimensions, more elaborate in design, more costly in execution; it was still the house of God. But as an



evidence of its temporary character the house was torn down. It was ravaged and the vessels of the Lord were carried by the hands of Gentile sinners into Babylon. This temple was rebuilt later. I call your attention to the time of the return from the day of the captivity. I want to impress the thought that from Sinai to the Cross of Jesus the First Covenant was the covenant of God with His people. Listen! I repeat: From Sinai to the Cross there was one covenant. That covenant was made at Sinai. There was one priesthood. That priesthood was Levi's priesthood. There was one law. That was the Law of Moses. There was one order of worship. That was the Order of the Tabernacle merged into the first temple, the second temple, the third temple. I turn now to the testimony of this writer here and let you see what is said of that rebuilt temple. We do not know very much about it. We do know the fact that it was not on the scale of grandeur that characterized the first, but I will read to you this much: "In the first year of Cyrus the king, *the same* Cyrus the king made a decree *concerning* the house of God at Jerusalem. Let the house be builded, the place where they offered sacrifices, and let the foundations thereof be strongly laid; the height thereof threescore cubits, *and* the breadth thereof threescore cubits (Ezra 6:3)." Let it be noticed here that this temple was to be built on the same old site on Moriah where Abraham had offered his son Isaac unto God, at the same place where sacrifices had been previously presented. This temple passed away, and the temple that is so often mentioned in the time of the Messiah was the temple of Herod. It was built by a foreigner. I have never been able to discover any adequate motive in this man for doing this. Perhaps some better historian may. That was the temple we read about in the New Testament. I want to repeat: First, the tabernacle at Sinai; Second, the temple of Solomon; Third, the temple rebuilt in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah; Fourth, the temple of Herod. The last temple was perhaps more magnificent than any of the others. I want to talk about that just a little. This is the temple and the service of the temple that perpetuated the same old tabernacle worship. A great many people seem to lose sight of the fact that the first testament or covenant was in force during the entire life of Jesus on earth. Listen! Write this down, underscore it, emphasize it: That from the inauguration of the tabernacle worship at mount Sinai to the cross of Jesus the first testament or first covenant was in force and no other covenant, no other testament, no other law was in force; that it was inclusive so far as Israel was concerned, and exclusive so far as others were concerned; the law or covenant and the



sacrifices were kept to the front all the way, and therefore when I talk to you about the temple I am showing you that during the life of Jesus and during all the years from Sinai to the death of Jesus, this first covenant was in force. Many lose sight of this fact and think that the Gospel began when John began to preach, or that it began in its fulness when Jesus began to preach. Jesus was a Hebrew and lived and died as a Hebrew under that testament. In the first chapter of Luke mention is made of this temple. Zacharias, a priest of the course of Abia, was ministering in the temple and the angel of God came and told him of the birth of John. You see at the very time that John's name is first mentioned the law was still being enforced, the administration was still going on, there had been no change, and it is the very same temple in which Anna abode (Luke 2:36,37). She was a godly woman, a widow old in years, and she stayed in the temple day and night and served God. It was not the temple of Solomon—it was the temple of Herod; but the idea and the worship were the same as the worship in the wilderness. They had perhaps added some elaborateness to it in the way of music and ceremony, but in reality the facts are exactly the same. It is the same temple in which Jesus our Master argued and disputed with the doctors of law (Luke 2:46). You remember the story. A very interesting one it is. That He tarried behind when He had gone up with His parents to worship according to the law, and they went on thinking He was with the company, and then discovering that He was not, went back and found Him in the temple asking and answering questions, sitting with the lawyers. And His parents wanted to know why He had done this, and He said, He was about His Father's business. From this very temple Jesus our Master drove the speculators (John 2:12-16). They had gone in there and were buying and selling. All men are naturally speculators in one way or another. It was all right to buy and sell animals for sacrifices, but these men had taken possession of the house of God and were speculating, and the Lord made a whip of cords and ran them out of the house of God. He told them it was wrong; that His house should be a house of prayer, but they had made it a den of thieves. Speculation I suppose is all right, but they had gone too far, and in the estimation of Christ, the man who does that is a thief. It was the same temple that the disciples exhibited to Jesus (Matt. 24:1, 2). It is a fact that these people were proud of the temple. It was a grand, glorious, beautiful and costly structure, and so they asked the Master to behold the magnificence there, to behold the wonderful building. The idea is that it is our building! He said to



them that not a stone should be left one on top of another that should not be torn down. This is the very same temple in which Jesus the Master taught (Matt. 26:55). He declared that He had been with them daily in the temple teaching, showing that the temple was standing, that the annual sacrifices or feasts were going on during the entire life of Jesus. Did He not go up to the pass-over? Was not one of the very last acts of His life to keep the Passover with His disciples because He wanted to obey the law? Does not that prove my contention that the covenant inaugurated at Sinai was in full force in the days of Moses, in the days of Joshua, in the days of Samuel, Saul and David, and Isaiah and Jeremiah, and all the prophets, and in the days of John, and in the days of Jesus Himself? Yesterday I was very particular to establish the fact that God made a covenant with Israel, that He made it with Israel alone and that that covenant consisted of what God said and what they said they would do, and you wondered why I was so particular. I wanted to establish one point from which we could survey the revelation of God. I will establish another. It was the very temple the veil of which—O that I could ring the thought from one end of this broad land to the other—was rent in twain from the top to the bottom when Jesus dropped His head upon His blood-stained and heaving breast and from the depths of His broken heart cried: "It is finished." What does that prove? It proves, if it proves anything, if anything is capable of demonstration, that the law, that the covenant, that the administration inaugurated at mount Sinai did not end until Jesus Christ the Master shed His blood. I said the stream of blood that flowed at the altar marking the way through the wilderness, marking all the history of Israel, of the tabernacle, and in all the temples, flowed down until it touched the foot of Calvary's hill, that the blood of Jesus ran down and thus it was that He died for the transgressions under the first testament. I believe, brethren, that the most important discovery that any man can make in the word of God is to find out the one thing that this first covenant, this old covenant, extended right down to the Cross. What is the significance of the rending of the veil of the temple? I will tell you. It is very important that you should know. Why was it rent? I asserted that the ark of the covenant was kept in total darkness. It was considered so sacred that when a man honestly thought he was doing God a service and laid his hand on it, he died (II Sam. 6:6,7). Why was it that the people who out of curiosity looking into it died (I Sam. 6:19)? There were thousands of them. Because it was a sacred thing. No human eye save the eye of the priest, and he only



then with blood in his hands—for blood is life!—was permitted to look down and see the sacred spark that flashed and burned and scintillated over the mercy seat. It was sacred. It was wrapped in total darkness. Not one ray from the golden candlestick shone in there, not one ray from the sun, the king of day, penetrated the awful, the profound, the death-like stillness of that Inscrutable Mystery. No human being unauthorized could look on it and live. But when Jesus Christ our Lord and Master suspended on the cross, dying for the sins of the world, came down to the end, and when His heart broke, it broke the secrecy of that covenant, for the breaking of His heart was the breaking of the covenant dedicated at Sinai. The veil of the temple was rent. The hand of God rent the very veil. He had ordered it put up and the ark of the covenant and the mercy seat and the shekinah were sacred no more. That is what it means. It means that the covenant is sacred no more. It means that the veil of the mystery is sacred no more. It means that now all these things are taken out of the way and that He who is on the cross is shedding blood that will seal another covenant, and the very act of the rending of that veil was equivalent to saying from the depths of Calvary's excruciating agony as the blood ran down on the sin-cursed earth: Behold ye dying sinner! This is the blood of the covenant that God hath enjoined on you, and on you, and on you, until the last echo of history, until the last syllable of recorded thought!

Sunday, February 12, 1899; 10:30 a. m.

SERMON NO. IV.—THE WEAKNESSES OF THE FIRST  
COVENANT.

*Text: "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: That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit (Rom. 8:3,4)."*

The first thought that appears in this passage is the reemphasizing of the contention of the sermons already delivered: that the covenant was in the flesh of men. The apostle here asserts that the law could not do certain things because of the weakness of the human flesh or the weakness of those to whom it was given. It is my desire this morning to discuss in detail as much as I can the weakness of this institution. I would not have you think that I am irreverent or disposed to be irreverent, for this is only along the line of God's work in every department. Old forms pass away and new forms appear. Old ideas pass away and new ideas appear. Therefore when I discuss the weaknesses of this covenant I shall not be disposed to reflect on our Father but rather to emphasize His love, His power, His knowledge in the gradual elevation of men from that which is low to that which is high, from that which is fleshly to that which is mental, from that which is natural to that which is spiritual. In order that men might know and honor and obey His Son, God saw that it was necessary to school them up to the point of realizing their need of Him. It took time to do this. And He took these men just where He found them and led them out gradually. Just as He led the children of Israel out of Egypt literally, He led Abraham out of his old life, Isaac out of his old life, Jacob out of his old life, Israel out of its old life into a better life; but owing to the weaknesses of the human flesh and to the ignorance of human beings the law could not accomplish much, and therefore the apostle tells us that in view of the fact that the law was weak and could not do what God designed it to do, that His Son came to earth that the intent of the law concerning those who meant to do right and to be right might be fulfilled in us.



The limited application of the law or of the administration of the law or of the covenant is very important for us to understand. I have contended from the beginning that the promise, the covenant of circumcision, the law of Moses, the tabernacle worship were all exclusive. That these things pertained only to one man, to two men, to three men, to a family of men, and to a nation of men and to no one else; and to my mind that was one of the weaknesses of the institution. Any one who has even an elementary knowledge of the character of God ought to know that that which would only include an individual, a family or a nation, could only serve His purpose and desire for a time, because there is a broadness in God's mercy, broad as the whole human race. Hence we ought to reflect and ought to see that our Father had a design that could be served in a few generations in thus limiting His law, His covenant, His benevolence to a small part of the human race. But I regard this as of extreme importance and so I shall give you a number of Scriptural proofs on the subject. At the base of Sinai He said to these very people: "Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and *how* I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto myself. Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth *is* mine. And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation. These *are* the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel (Ex. 19:4-6)." This was the real cutting-off from all others, and they were not to be like anybody else. God was to honor them, love them, provide for them, care for them, seek their good in a peculiar sense. Again: "But the Lord hath taken you, and brought you forth out of the iron furnace, *even* out of Egypt, to be unto Him a people of inheritance, as *ye are* this day (Deut. 4:20)." In a broad sense all the earth was the Lord's, all men were the Lord's. But He took this little family, this little people, this little nation comparatively, and declared that He would recognize it as His peculiar inheritance or as His peculiar people. Again: "For thou *art* an holy people unto the Lord thy God: The Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that *are* upon the face of the earth (Deut. 7:6)." How clear that! Not only had God chosen them but He had chosen them to be a special people unto Himself, and not only a special people unto Himself, but a special people unto Himself above all other peoples on the face of the earth. Again: "For thou *art* an holy people unto the Lord thy God, and the Lord hath chosen thee to be a peculiar people unto himself, above all the nations that *are* upon the earth



(Deut. 14:2)." Again: "And the Lord hath avouched thee this day to be his peculiar people, as he hath promised thee, and that *thou* shouldst keep all his commandments; And to make thee high above all nations which he hath made, in praise, and in name, and in honour; and that thou mayest be an holy people unto the Lord thy God, as he hath spoken (Deut. 26:18,19)." Notice this a moment. Not only were they chosen to the exclusion of other nations but they were to be above other nations, not only above other nations but be to Him above other nations. Not only these, but they were to be to Him above the nations in praise, in fame, in honor, because God had chosen them for this purpose and had avowed that He would do this thing unto them. Again: "Seek the Lord, and his strength; seek his face evermore. Remember his marvelous works that he hath done; his wonders, and the judgments of his mouth; O ye seed of Abraham his servant, ye children of Jacob his chosen (Psalms 105:4-6)." I put emphasis on that word "chosen." He had chosen them out from among the nations, made them His own in a peculiar sense, thus limiting the application of the promise, of the covenant, of the law, of the administration to them and to them alone. And I say that in the very nature of things, knowing the broadness of God's love and mercy, we are forced irresistibly to the conclusion that a covenant that included only a very small part of the human race, only a handful, relatively speaking, could not in the nature of things always last.

This covenant was a broken covenant from the beginning. When a covenant is made in the coming together of two minds, the party breaking that covenant may release the other party but he does not release himself. And I affirm before you this morning that practically from the day of the inauguration of this covenant it was broken by the second parties to it, and that it was always broken and that so far as the covenant was concerned from that day to the end of its history it was administered on the hypothesis that it had already been broken. I take this as a very important proposition having a bearing of almost infinite importance on the destinies of the people of the covenant, and on the destinies of the world and on the destinies of the effort that we make to show that we are not under the old covenant, that we are not under the law, that we are not under Moses. Let us go back to Sinai. There God made a covenant with them. I have proven that to you conclusively, abundantly and irresistibly, and the very first proposition in that covenant which they accepted was that they should have no God save the Lord; that they should not make unto themselves any graven image or any likeness of anything in heaven above, or in



the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth. And yet in a few days after that when they had given up the thought through fear of hearing the law directly from God, Moses went up into the mountain to hear the word of God in their behalf and to talk to Him that he might teach it to them, and they became disappointed and disgusted and disheartened and dissatisfied, and they called on Aaron to make them a god (Ex. 32:1-35). Here is what they said to him: "Up, make us gods, which shall go before us." And the echoes of that voice that had shaken Sinai in its very foundations had scarcely died away when Aaron listened to the clamor of the mob, and they contributed of their ornaments one kind and another, and Aaron fashioned a calf after the model of the images or the gods of Egypt, no doubt, and then he said: "These be thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt." He built an altar and sent out a great proclamation and said: "Tomorrow is a feast to the Lord." Paul the apostle throws light on this and I call your attention to his words. It gives us an idea of the character of the people with whom God was dealing. "Neither be ye idolaters, as *were* some of them; as it is written, The people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play (I Cor. 10:7)." After this image was set up in open violation of the covenant they had made with God, after they had exposed themselves to the ridicule of their enemies, Moses went down from the mountain and very naturally supposed that the covenant was broken because he knew what was going on in the camp. He had the tables of the covenant in his hands, and perhaps on account of his indignation but more on account of the recognition of the fact that the covenant had been broken and he expected no more of the Lord, he dashed the tables of stone against the rocky slope and broke them to fragments. Thus was the covenant broken at the very start. I regard the comprehension of this as extremely important to a proper understanding and appreciation of the word of God, and of the power of God, and of the truth of God, and of the covenant of God. Therefore I shall give you a number of passages bearing on it. Some may have the idea that it was not possible for men to break the covenant. That is a serious mistake. God deals with us as we deal with one another. Hear Moses: "But if ye will not hearken unto me, and will not do all these commandments; And if ye shall despise my statutes, or if your soul abhor my judgments, so that ye will not do all my commandments, *but* that ye break my covenant: I also will do this unto you; I will even appoint over you terror, consumption, and the burning ague, that shall consume the eyes, and cause sorrow of heart: and ye shall



sow your seed in vain, for your enemies shall eat it (Lev. 26:14-16)." Hear me: Many argue that God made with Abraham an everlasting covenant. He said to him: "My covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant (Gen. 17:13)." I believe that I can demonstrate beyond the possibility of a doubt that the covenant was never intended to be everlasting, that it was only to be everlasting or perpetual in their generations. But to show you the utter fallacy of such a position I will give you the testimony of the prophet of God. Here is a picture of Israel in the days of Isaiah, long after they had come under the administration of the law and of the administration of the principles that developed in the sacrifices at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation: "The earth also is defiled under the inhabitants thereof; because they have transgressed the laws, changed the ordinance, broken the everlasting covenant (Isa. 24:5)." If I make a contract with you and tell you that it shall last forever, it does not mean that it shall last forever if you break it. It is so with this covenant, even on the hypothesis that God intended that it should last through all the ages unto the very end. The people broke it, and therefore released Him. The people trampled it under their feet, and therefore rendered it null and void in His sight. Again: "The highways lie waste, the warfaring man ceaseth: he hath broken the covenant, he hath despised the cities, he regardeth no man (Isa. 33:8)." Again: "They are turned back to the iniquities of their forefathers which refused to hear my words; and they went after other gods to serve them: the house of Israel and the house of Judah have broken my covenant which I made with their fathers (Jer. 11:10)." Notice this: He here accuses them of having gone after the iniquities of their fathers in serving other gods, and this they did in Egypt and at mount Sinai while Moses was absent in the mount. And notice also particularly how emphatic He is on this line and not only had Israel broken it, but Judah had broken it, and when we say Israel and Judah that means all. Again: "And thou shalt say to the rebellious, *even* to the house of Israel, Thus saith the Lord God; O ye house of Israel, let it suffice you of all your abominations, In that ye have brought *into* my sanctuary strangers, uncircumcised in heart, and uncircumcised in flesh, to be in my sanctuary, to pollute it, *even* my house, when ye offer my bread, the fat and the blood, and they have broken my covenant because of all your abominations (Ezek. 44:6,7)." Right here I think I have the strongest argument possible confirming what I declared the other day relative to the exclusiveness of the covenant, in the prophetic writings. You remember I de-



clared over and over that all others were excluded, Egyptians, Edomites, Japhethites and all other "ites," and here we find that Israel broke the covenant of God because they brought into the sanctuary of God the strangers, uncircumcised in heart, and uncircumcised in flesh. About eighteen years ago, possibly longer than that, I had a discussion with a man on this very subject affirming that the Scriptures teach the abolishment of the first covenant, the law; and he brought out a rebuttal of my argument on these passages, and I want to show you the utter fallacy and the utter weakness of the argument. This was his strongest proof: "Remember his marvelous works that he hath done; his wonders, and the judgments of his mouth; O ye seed of Abraham his servant, ye children of Jacob his chosen. He is the Lord our God: his judgments *are* in all the earth. He hath remembered his covenant forever, the word *which* he commanded to a thousand generations: Which *covenant* he made with Abraham, and his oath unto Isaac; And confirmed the same unto Jacob for a law, *and* to Israel *for* an everlasting covenant; Saying, Unto thee will I give the land of Canaan, the lot of your inheritance (Psalms 105:5-11)." He declared that the covenant still stands and I am a member of that covenant and every other Christian is a member of that covenant. I turned to the prophecy of Isaiah: "The earth also is defiled under the inhabitants thereof; because they have transgressed the laws, changed the ordinance, broken the everlasting covenant (Isa. 24:5)." Their conduct released God. Moses recognized that the covenant had been broken, that the contract had been destroyed, that the understanding between God and His children had been vitiated, and He went up unto God in the mountain and pleaded with God that He would still take them for His inheritance. The primary class in Biblical learning knows that this is a fact. And he went so far as to say unto his Lord that if He would not forgive the sins of the people, and if He intended to blot them out, to let him go with his people. The Lord said that He would make a covenant with them but it was only of a very restricted character, and while He Himself in His mercy and kindness carried out the covenant it was a matter of mercy and not a matter of obligation, for when they broke it God was no longer under any obligations to carry out His part if He had not desired to do it. In response to the earnest entreaty and pleading of Moses, the Lord said this to him: "And he said, if now I have found grace in thy sight, O Lord, let my Lord, I pray thee, go among us; for it is a stiff-necked people; and pardon our iniquities and our sin, and take us for thine inheritance. And he said, Behold, I make a cov-



enant: before all thy people I will do marvels, such as have not been done in all the earth, nor in any nation: and all the people among which thou *art* shall see the work of the Lord: for it is a terrible thing that I will do with thee (Ex. 34:9,10)." Did He forgive them? No. Moses prayed and Moses pleaded, but did the people repent? The subsequent history of that nation proves that they did not, for they were a stiff-necked people. Here is what God said He was going to do with the people for breaking the covenant. Talking to Moses: "Therefore now go, lead the people unto *the place* of which I have spoken unto thee: behold, mine Angel shall go before thee: nevertheless in the day when I visit I will visit their sin upon them. And the Lord plagued the people, because they made the calf which Aaron made (Ex. 32:34,35)."

The first covenant, the law of Moses, the daily administration of this institution worked chiefly on the outside, from without toward the heart instead of from the heart out into the life. I will give you the proof of this. Here is a commandment of the Lord: "And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart (Deut. 6:5,6)." I respectfully and reverently declare that the law of Moses with all of its promises—for it did have many promises pertaining to this life—did not furnish an adequate or a sufficient motive to these people to love God as He desired to be loved. The law was not written on the heart. It was principally on the outside. There was an effort constantly to remind them of the law of God. Now, if the law of God is hidden away in a man's heart, he does not need to be always reminded of it. He knows of it himself. And so I affirm without hesitation that the law was chiefly from without toward within. I will give you some proof of this: "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and bid them that they make them fringes in the borders of their garments, throughout their generations, and that they put upon the fringe of the borders a ribband of blue: And it shall be unto you for a fringe, that ye may look upon it, and remember all the commandments of the Lord, and do them; and that ye seek not after your own heart and your own eyes, after which we used to go a whoring (Num. 15:37-39)." The thought here is this: They were so profane, they were so disposed to go away, so uncertain was the influence of the law upon the heart that they had to put borders on their garments that they might be reminded of the word of the Lord. It is a good deal like sticking up a sign to a man to "keep off the grass" when down in his heart he defies



authority and despises government. Again, speaking of the words of God: "And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand, and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes. And thou shalt write them upon the posts of thy house, on thy gates (Deut. 6: 8,9)." Imagine, if you please, passages of Scripture of necessity sticking up everywhere to remind a man who professes to love and honor God of his duty to God and of his duty to man! Again, after they had passed over Jordan, or in anticipation of their passing over Jordan, Moses told them something that He wanted them to do, and that was that they should set up stone pillars and plaster them over with plaster and write upon them all the words of the law very plainly (Deut. 27:1-8) that they might be reminded of the will of God. Imagine a country in which everywhere you went there were great pillars plastered over with plaster and on these pillars the word of God! The law was on the outside and it worked to get in, but not often did it succeed. We come down to the administration and I will show you more along this very peculiar line, and it is one of the striking, one of the most striking proofs of the weakness of this institution. The water of purification or separation, how was it made? They took a red heifer, scarlet wool, hyssop, cedar wood, burned them together, gathered up the ashes, put them in a clean place and mixed them with living water and applied the combination to the man who had defiled himself by touching the dead or a bone or a grave (Num. 19:1-22). It was on the outside. Those things could not cleanse. Indeed from our standpoint the very thing that was used to cleanse under the law would be a defilement now. Take it on your own heart for a moment. Suppose I had required every man who comes to the School of the Evangelists to cleanse himself, to take a bath, by using the ashes of a red heifer, scarlet wool, and hyssop burned together and mixed with spring water! It was one of the glaring and one of the alarming weaknesses of the institution. It worked on the outside. We have some New Testament comments on this subject, and very remarkable comments they are. I call your attention particularly to them. Reviewing the administration, looking over the time when these things had been—they were no more then—Paul said: "*Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation (Heb. 9:10).*" Here we have the very quintessence of the administration. Meats, the flesh of animals, drinks, washings, ordinances or a carnal character were imposed on them until the time of reformation. Not forever, not everlast-

ingly, not eternally, not perpetually, but until the time of reformation.

Another proof of the weakness of this institution was that it was one continual line of law—cold, inexorable punishment—death. The curses of the law were numerous and terrible. I call your attention particularly to them. A man who made any graven image or molten image was cursed. A man who treated his father or mother disrespectfully was cursed. A man who removed his neighbor's land-mark was cursed. A man who made the blind to wander out of the way was cursed. A man who perverted the judgment of any one was cursed. A man who committed adultery with his father's wife—his step-mother—was cursed. A man who defiled himself with a beast was cursed. A man who defiled himself with a near relative was cursed. A man who defiled himself with his mother-in-law was cursed. A man who smote his neighbor secretly was cursed. A man who took reward for slaying an innocent person was cursed. And finally, to use the exact words of Scripture: "Cursed *be* he that confirmeth not *all* the words to this law to do them. And all the people shall say, Amen (Deut. 27:14-26)." Here we have something on the subject throwing a flood of luminous and glorious light on the old institution from the pen of the immortal Paul. Hear him: "For if they which are of the law *be* heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect: Because the law worketh wrath: for where no law is, *there is* no transgression (Rom. 4:14,15)." It is fact beyond any cavil, beyond any doubt, beyond any contradiction, beyond any controversy or argument that—and I want to burn it down into the very depths of all your hearts—that this institution was of a character that held a sword or a menace over the people from the day that they were born until the day that they died. Under this administration, to show you its awful severity, there were about thirty crimes punishable with death or expulsion from the congregation of Israel. People were fearfully wicked in those days. They are called uncircumcised, stiff-necked, rebellious—from the day of Moses unto the day of Messiah on earth. Here is a remarkable fact that at the inauguration of the institution, at the very time when the covenant was broken, that the sword was unsheathed and with gleaming and exulting vengeance driven to the heart of the transgressors. Three thousand paid the penalty on that day (Ex. 32:1-28). Well may the apostle tell us what kind of an institution it was, but I will let him tell it in his own words: "But if the ministration of death, written *and* engraven in stone, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold



the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which *glory* was to be done away (II Cor. 3:7)." You cannot go back on it and say that it only refers to the ceremonial law. He did not mention the ceremonial law. You cannot reject this interpretation and say that it only refers to the statutes of Israel received by Moses. It does not say anything about that. It says the administration of death written and engraven on stones. Finally, and as a fitting and as a mighty climax to this, I present the testimony of Paul again: "Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God. (Rom. 3:19)."

Another weakness of this institution was that it had no Christ in it. The best they had was a faint and uncertain and mysterious and inscrutable statement that in some remote time one of the descendants of Abraham should be a blessing to everybody. I have two passages on this subject that I desire to present, because they will give us a little better conception of the whole subject. Speaking of redemption Peter says that: "But with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot: Who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for you (I Peter, 1:19,20)."

Again, I give you a similar statement from John: "The Lamb slain from the foundation of the world (Rev. 13:8)." But how much did the Jew know about that? When he went up with his burnt sacrifice, his peace offering, his trespass offering, his sin offering, or when he went up to the passover, or to the feast of the harvest, or to the feast of the tabernacles, how much did he know about the love and sympathy and tenderness and the care and the saving power of Jesus the Christ? Not much. And brethren I want to emphasize this, that Christ was not revealed in the law. There is no mention of Him in the law. Begin with the ten commandments, take all the statutes of Israel as they come through Moses, take the entire administration and he is never named or hinted at. They did not know Christ, they could not know Christ under that institution because Christ had not been revealed. I will give His own words: "All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and *he* to whomsoever the Son will reveal *Him* (Matt. 11:27)."

Another weakness of the old institution was that it had no Holy Spirit in it. Under the new institution it is affirmed that the Spirit "Helpeth our infirmities (Rom. 8:26,27)." But under that institu-

tion, take it from the first word that came from Sinai's blazing summit, till Moses the man of God closed the record and from Pisgah's heights viewed the land of promise, closed his eyes on earthly scenes, and you cannot find a mention of the Holy Spirit one time. Surely if the Spirit helps our infirmities, if He reveals the Christ to us, if He comforts us, that institution was lacking and weak.

Another weakness of the institution was that it had no living Mediator in God's presence. The best they knew of God was the physical manifestations that they had seen at Sinai. They had seen fire, they had heard a voice, they had trembled at the thought of the earthquake that seemed to plough the very bowels of nature, and the best in the administration that they knew was that the priest would go into the darkness before the ark, would come out and tell them that He had seen a light shining there. That is all they had. Aaron only a few days before he became the high priest of Israel, the head of the house of a long and illustrious line, and I may say in some respects notorious line, was the leader of the most disgraceful lapse into idolatry that is detailed in the Old Testament, as having been practiced in the days of Moses. How weak the priest, how weak the service was, how weak the administration was when a man who a few days before had made a graven image and then tried to get out of it by saying that he put the material in the fire and the calf came out—how weak such a priest as that was, the first priest to stand before the mercy seat! And all the priests were weak like him. Here is an illustration of it in the life of Aaron himself: "And Miriam and Aaron spake against Moses because of the Ethiopian woman whom he had married: for he had married an Ethiopian woman (Num. 12:1)." Think of it! The first high priest of Israel, the only man in the nation at liberty to go in before the ark of the covenant where the darkness was and where God's glory shone, so narrow, so contemptible, so mean as to criticise his own brother and his brother's wife. The only mediator they had in those days was the priest. How weak, how infirm, how much out of the way he must have been in much of his life! It demonstrates the weakness of the institution and the utter foolishness and futility of saying that a man can find salvation through it now. But I want to give you something from the New Testament on this line. I do love to look through Paul's eyes. O he had a mighty vision, a glorious vision! When I look through his eyes I always see something and I see it clearly. Let him talk: "For every high priest taken from among men is ordained for men in things *pertaining* to God, that he may



offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins: Who can have compassion on the ignorant, and on them that are out of the way; for that he himself also is compassed with infirmity. And by reason hereof he ought, as for the people, so also for himself, to offer for sins, And no man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that is called of God as *was* Aaron. So also Christ glorified not himself to be made high priest; but he that said unto him, Thou art my Son, today have I begotten thee; as he saith also in another *place*, Thou *art* a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec (Heb. 5:1-6)." A sinner himself, realizing his own sins, his own weakness, his own need of salvation, trying to carry on his shoulders and on his breast the names of his people in before the glorious fire that burned between the cherubim over the ark of the covenant. It was the best the institution had. Again: I am not done with this, and I want to make it clearer still, speaking of these priests and comparing them to Jesus, Paul says: "Who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's: for this he did once, when he offered up himself. For the law maketh men high priests which have infirmity; but the word of the oath, which was since the law, *maketh* the Son, who is consecrated for evermore (Heb. 7:27,28)."

Another weakness of this institution was that it could not take away sin. Why could it not take away sin? Because the very act of commanding a man does not take the motive out of his heart. As long as the love of sin is in the heart there will be rebellion in the life. And it is with the whole human race as it is with you my brethren. I do not expect your lives to be what I desire, what you desire, what the Master desires, until I can or we can by the grace and power of God intensify your purpose and the conviction of what you ought to do. And the law did not furnish any motive like that. There was not anything in the law so far as I know to make men hate sin with an intense, with a deadly, and with a perpetual hatred. Therefore it could not take away sin. No, no. Sin cannot be forgiven until the love of it, until the desire for it is extracted from the heart. And the law could not do that. I will give you the proof of it. Moses gives a detailed account of the annual atonement and then he adds some very remarkable words, and I give them to you just as he stated them: "And this shall be an everlasting statute unto you, to make an atonement for the children of Israel, for all their sins, once a year. And he did as the Lord commanded Moses (Lev. 16:1-34)." There was a remembrance of sin every year. That institution was weak. It could not take away sin. There was no radical power, no cleaning power, no



heart-searching power in it, and if you want to remove sins from a man's life and from a man's record you must first take them out of his heart, and the law could not do it. There is no man yet born who can lay his finger on any passage beginning with the first word of the ten commandments and extending to the end of the law of Moses that proves that it ever did take a single sin out of any man's heart. By menace, by threat, by fright, by punishment—capital punishment at that!—it held the people in. It restricted to some extent the evil that they would do, but so far as extracting this thing from the heart it could not be done. Here is a fair illustration: A man has the tooth-ache. The tooth has lost its usefulness, and he may doctor it until dooms-day and it will ache on if he lives that long. And you may take a sinner's heart and doctor it, you may poultice it, you may whisper to it, you may cry to it in thunder tones, but unless you put an adequate motive in that individual—and there never has been but one—and that is the power of Jesus Christ—he will sin until he dies. So the law could not keep a man from loving sin or from sinning. It could not forgive sin. There is no remedial scheme ever thought of in the mind of man or God that looked to the forgiveness of sin that did not look also to the removal of the cause. As long as the cause is there the effect will be there, and you need not try to wipe out the effect unless you forever eradicate the cause. Now I will give you the proof of it positive and unequivocal: "And almost all things are by the law purged with blood: and without shedding of blood is no remission (Heb. 9:22)." Not even temporary remission, not even the rolling back of the sins for a year at a time could be brought about without the shedding of blood. But listen: "But in those *sacrifices* there is a remembrance again *made* of sins every year. For *it* is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins (Heb. 10:3,4)." It could not be done. Why could not the blood of goats and calves and bulls take away sin? Because the application of that blood could not take away the love of sin. You cannot wash out sins by an external application. And that is one of the reasons above all others why I never did, and no man who understands the Bible ever will, believe in baptismal regeneration.

Another weakness of this institution was it could not justify. That is to say a man could not be justified by it even if he kept it. I take the position that it was utterly impossible for a man to keep the law. The adequate motive was not there, and therefore he could not keep it fully. Take a man who comes here. He is expected to keep the regulations of this school. But if he does not have



it in his heart, you cannot make him do it. If the matter is not between himself and his God it cannot be between himself and the authorities of the school. And so no man could be justified by the law: "Be it known unto you therefore, men *and* brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins: And by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses (Acts 13: 38,39)." Again: "Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law *is* the knowledge of all sin (Rom. 3:20)." Look at that. By deeds of the law, by obedience to the law; that is to the law of Moses; that is to the covenant; that is to the administration, no man could be or can be justified; for in seeking justification, instead of finding it he found that he was a sinner. Sin was defined by the law of Moses, with its limitation, its bounds, its heights, its depths, and the man who sought to find justification from his sins by the law only discovered that he was a great sinner without an adequate, a radical, a sufficient, a successful remedy. Again: "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law (Rom. 3:28)." Again and finally on this point: "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 (Gal. 2:16)."

It could not give life. The sentence of death was passed on man at the beginning and death reigned in high carnival from the portals of Eden to the cross of the Messiah with but little hope that anything better was to come. Hear the apostle: "*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 (Gal. 3:21)." Therefore the institution was weak. And the very thing that man wanted, the very thing that man sought, to live after this life is over, the law could not give. In the fight for the better life the poor sinner and the mighty man searched but none could find it; it was not there. If it was possible to legislate a man into eternal life righteousness would have come by the law.

Another weakness of the institution was that it could not give righteousness; that is a state of righteousness. Of course as long as a man did right he was right, but without the motive, without the adequate motive, without the power in him to live better he could not do it. So there could not be righteousness in a high, and glorious, and exalted sense by the law. Hear Paul again: "I do



not frustrate the grace of God: for if righteousness *come* by the law, then Christ is dead in vain (Gal. 2:21)." If by the covenant at Sinai, if by the law of Moses, if by the tabernacle service, if by the temple administration, if by any form or ceremony or any law lying back of it, man could find righteousness, then the scenes of Calvary are a farce, the agonies of Gethsemane are but a thrice-told tale.

Again, it did not make anything perfect. This institution was therefore weak. I believe you will agree with me that all things in God's creation tend to a perfect end. That in God's administration, while the fittest does not always appear to survive, yet in reality it does survive, and that in the grand climax when the Lord shall come from heaven again we shall reach the glorious perfections and glorious achievements that God designed for His children before the worlds were born. But the law made nothing perfect. Why not? Because the law itself was imperfect. It did not furnish the motive that man needed to do right because the law-giver Moses was imperfect, because the priests were imperfect, because men were imperfect: "For the law made nothing perfect; but the bringing in of a better hope *did*: by the which we draw nigh unto God (Heb. 7:19)."

Another weakness of the institution was that it could not bring peace to the conscience. If there is anything in this world that I want above every other thing for myself it is a good conscience. I can get along with a little to eat and to wear, and some sort of a place to stay, but God being my helper I will never consent to live without a good conscience before God and before men. And it matters not with how much interest, how much intensity, how much persistence, how much nerve and force and fire they sought a good conscience, it was not there. Why was it not there? Why could not a man have a good conscience by the law of Moses? Because he could not keep the law. He was constantly breaking it. It aimed at the outside. If it could have started in the heart of an Israelite with a power that would have held his eye on God he could have sought and found, but it was not there, and he did not seek it with very much intensity and he did not find it. I will give you some proof. Speaking of the whole administration, Paul says: "Which *was* a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience (Heb. 9:9)." Again: "For the law having a shadow of good things to come, *and* not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually make the comers there-



unto perfect. For then would they not have ceased to be offered? because that the worshippers once purged should have had no more conscience of sins (Heb. 10:1,2)." The point is this: That if the law had purged the man of sin, had wiped out his old record and given him a new chance there would have been no necessity for requiring an annual atonement on the tenth day of the seventh month of each year. But there was a remembrance of sin once a year. There was a difficulty in this remembrance of sin which was that he did not know how to get rid of it, and the best he could look forward to was that his sins would be rolled back for a year when the high priest took the blood of the animals and went in before the ark of the covenant. How weak an institution that could not give to its devotees a good conscience: The grandest and best heritage that any man can have was denied these people even when they did the best they could. They were weak; the institution was weak. Praise God that the things that the law could not do in that it was weak, being weak itself, and being based on mortal flesh, He sent His son and opened a way by which we can find life and by which we can find a good conscience.

Its promises were chiefly concerning the things of this world—this was a weakness: "And it shall come to pass if ye shall hearken diligently unto my commandments which I command you this day, to love the Lord your God, and to serve him with all your heart and with all your soul, That I will give *you* the rain of your land in his due season, the first rain and the latter rain, that thou mayest gather in thy corn, and thy wine, and thine oil. And I will send grass in thy fields for thy cattle, that thou mayest eat and be full. Take heed to yourselves, that your heart be not deceived, and ye turn aside, and serve other gods, and worship them: And *then* the Lord's wrath be kindled against you, and he shut up the heaven, that there be no rain, and that the land yield not her fruit; and *lest* ye perish quickly from off the good land which the Lord giveth you (Deut. 11:13-17)." In the twenty-eighth chapter of Deuteronomy are many of the blessings and curses of the law—they were all temporal and earthly in their character.

Another weakness of the institution lies in this: That God found fault with it. He ought to have known its weakness! He did know them. The people broke the covenant, they trampled it under their feet. Doubtless He knew from the beginning what it would do, and what His people would do, but He is represented here as finding fault with it. Hear the apostle: "For if that first *covenant* had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second. For, finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the days

come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah (Heb. 8:7,8)." If God found fault with it, where is the man who will undertake to put life into this dying skeleton and bring it back and impose it as a burden on the children of God? If God found fault with it, where is the man who will attempt to revive any statute, any command, or any ordinance pertaining to that institution? I say stilled be the tongue and perished be the pen that would try to bring back and impose on the disciples that which has finished its course, filled its mission and passed forever away!



Saturday, February 18, 1899; 7 p. m.

SERMON NO. V.—THE ABOLISHMENT OF THE FIRST  
COVENANT (PART 1).

*Text: "He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second (Heb. 10:9)."*

This is the testimony of the last man who with mortal eyes beheld the Son of God. These are the words of the man who declared that when he became a preacher he did not go up to Jerusalem to consult those who were preachers or apostles before him, but that what he knew and what he preached he received from God (Gal. 1:16,17). Therefore these words come to us with all the solemnity and all the authority and all the accountability of the words of God Himself. In the light of much of the theology of our times these are very remarkable words. I may go a step further and say that they are extraordinary words. I ask you to look at them carefully, to analyze them, to weigh them with deliberation and see whether or not you have in the past fully grasped and weighed and comprehended their significance. The introductory word "he" evidently has reference to Jesus Christ. Because the first half of the verse attributes these words to him: "Then said he, Lo I come to do thy will, O God." This notice is followed by the declaration that He who came to do the will of God took away something that He might establish something. If you will reflect on it I am sure that you will see that it is no light matter that we are discussing this night. Whether or not we shall be able to find out what these words mean in their fulness we must unanimously concede that whatever they may mean or whatever they do mean that Jesus is responsible for them. He it was who took something away. He it was who established something else. As to why He took this away, as to why He established something else I shall not pause to discuss. I shall emphasize the fact that what is here represented as having been done was done by Divine authority, by Divine sanction, by Divine power, and therefore whether it suits our ideas or not, must be accepted as conclusive in every sense of the term.

Let us try to get at the meaning of the text. Notice the numerical order here: First, Second. The first has been removed; the second has been established. It is my desire tonight to go into the

details of the proof relative to the taking away or the abolishment of the first. Here is my associate text, if you will allow me the statement: "Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away (Heb. 8:13)." I should be glad if you would reflect seriously on the thought suggested by the numerical order here. First, second; old, new. Reflect, as already intimated, that these are the words of the last man who in this world with these eyes or mortal eyes beheld the Lord in His glory. We can well afford to hear a man like that. We cannot under any consideration or any circumstances afford to turn away from a man like that. Two other questions naturally arise here. How much of the first was taken away? How much of the second was established? I wonder if it is possible to torture the first part of the statement into meaning that only part of the first was taken away, was abrogated, was abolished, was fulfilled, was ended? To my mind his declaration is just as full, just as broad, just as elaborate, just as sweeping as the other. When Paul declares that the Lord Jesus took away the first I understand him to mean that He took away all of the first, and when he declares that He established the second I understand him to mean that He established all of the second. It will be doing violence to the meaning, and I may say to the honesty, and to the position of Paul to attempt to make it appear that after having said that God took away the first that he really meant that God took away only a part of the first. It would, I repeat, be treating him with disrespect to say that he did not select his words or weigh his words, and that he therefore spoke at random when he said that the Lord had taken away the first. Taking this view of it I may ask, What was the first? I answer as I have answered already positively, unequivocally, unhesitatingly, that by the first is meant the fleshly promise, the covenant of circumcision, the covenant at Sinai, or the ten commandments, the statutes of Israel, the tabernacle service, the priestly functions and all that pertained unto them; or to put it in other words: Every law, every statute, every priest, every service, every word, every phrase, every jot, every tittle of the old institution is forever done away. I do not hesitate to affirm that by the first he meant all of the first, that which was fundamental, that which was secondary, that which was in their commands, that which was in their service, that which was in their ceremonies, all or nothing. I am aware of the fact that a statement like this would meet with opposition. If by taking away the first is meant only a part of the first is taken away, who is to determine what part remains? I want you to look that statement clearly in the face.



Granted for argument's sake that Paul did not mean what he says, and that in reality he only meant that part of the law, a little part or a big part, a small part or a great part was taken away, I raise the question in the fear of God and in the expectation of the judgment, who is in the light of the Scriptures and in the light of accountability to God to determine what part was abolished and what part remains? I think I hear somebody say that he only means the ceremonial law. Granted for argument's sake that that is true. Then all the statutes received by Moses on Sinai and proclaimed by him in the ears of the people, and written by him in a book, and by him deposited in the ark of the covenant are obligatory on the church unto this day. Are you prepared for such a statement as that? If it only means that the ceremonial law is taken away then we are forced to the conclusion that all the males of the church of God everywhere must three times a year; at the feast of the passover and unleavened bread, at the feast of weeks, and at the feast of the tabernacles, appear before the Lord in the place where in the ancient days He recorded His name. If it means that only the ceremonial law is done away then we can only sow our fields six years and the seventh must be a Sabbath unto the Lord our God and the land shall rest. If it means only the ceremonial law then the man, whose brother dies and leaves a widow but no children, must take her and raise up children unto his brother. But I hear some one say that it means the ceremonial law and the statutes of Israel embodied in the book of Exodus and followed by Leviticus and Numbers and repeated in Deuteronomy, but it does not mean the ten commandments, that it does not mean the covenant of Sinai. My friends, the covenant of Sinai I have proven to you comprehends all, all the ten commands and all the laws received through Moses, all the administration, all the sacrifices, all the service. If by the first is not meant or is only meant the ceremonial law pertaining to beasts and sacrifices and altars and the statutes of Israel, and if the covenant or the ten commandments stand, what follows then? It follows that either Paul has made a grave mistake in writing or we have made a grave mistake in exegesis. In the natural order—and here comes a very important point—we have first, the ten commandments, second, the statutes of Israel, third, the tabernacle and priesthood, fourth, the service. If by the first is not meant the entire law then as the ten commandments came first, by "first" Paul means the ten commandments and he does not mean the statutes of Israel and he does not mean the ceremonial law. If by "first" he means precedence in the sense of numerical



order, then the ten commandments having come first are taken away and all the statutes of Moses and all the ceremonies at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation stand until this day. How much better, how much more in harmony with the general tenor and drift of the word of God it is for us just to take Paul as he puts it and say that by the first he meant the first, that by the first he meant all of the first, that by the first he meant the ten commandments, the statutes of Israel, the tabernacle, the priests, the altar, the sacrifices, the service, every word and sentence and every jot and every tittle? There I take my stand! God help me, I cannot do otherwise! Amen!

In advancing into this argument I want to settle one question. In one sense it is a very long question. It was born when God made the promise unto Abraham and it has been a question since that memorable day. You will remember that my arguments all along the line have been to show that the old covenant which Paul now declares is taken away was inclusive when applied to Israel, and exclusive when applied to everybody else, and I intend to keep that before you until the end. When I discuss the abolishment of this covenant I shall discuss it only as it relates to Israel, only as it affected Israel, because nobody except Israel was even under the provisions of the covenant in any age. Hear the apostle Paul: "For not the hearers of the law *are* just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified. For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: Which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and *their* thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another; In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel (Rom. 2: 13-16)." Notice here that he declares emphatically that the Gentiles had not the law of Moses. The law was not given to the Gentiles. The covenant was not made with the Gentiles. It was made with Israel and it was not made with anybody else. Again: "What shall we say then? That the Gentiles, which followed not after righteousness, have attained to righteousness, even the righteousness which is of faith (Rom. 9:30)." I am right in my contention. Moses and the New Testament bear me out in the deliberate declaration that the covenant at Sinai excluded all other nations save Abraham's descendants and that as the Gentiles never had the law they were never under the law and I affirm here this night that no mortal man, no mortal association of men can prove either by the Scriptures of the Old Testament, or by the Scriptures of



the New, that the Gentiles were ever under any obligations to keep that law or under any accountability for having failed to keep it. You may call that radical but it is not any more radical than the facts in the case. Further: "I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Spirit, That I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart. For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh: Who are Israelites; to whom *pertaineth* the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; Whose *are* the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ *came*, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen. (Rom. 9:1-5)." Let me sum up these declarations: Paul was a Jew. He had great sorrow in his heart on account of Israel. He declared that they were his kinsmen according to the flesh and that unto them pertained the adoption, the glory, the covenants, the promises, and the fathers, but he did not intimate that the covenants and the glory and the promises and the fathers pertained to any other nation, kindred people, tribe, or tongue.

Doubtless in reading the New Testament you have often found in Paul's arguments that he uses the personal pronouns "you," "us" and "we" a great many times, and I want to call your attention to this because a great many people are in error on this line. There are Gentiles, many of them professed Christians, who talk about the law being "our" schoolmaster to bring "us" to Christ. I affirm here brethren that the law never did or never can bring any Gentile to Christ. God never designed that it should. No Gentile has ever lived under the law in any age or any time unless he was incorporated into the body of Israel by the covenant of circumcision: blood or purchase, and the mark in the flesh as proof of it. I will give you two illustrations of this so that you can carry it out for yourself. Allow me to read. Notice carefully the pronouns. Paul is addressing not promiscuously Gentiles and Hebrew Christians but particularly Christians who had originally been members of that covenant and had recognized that fact and had come out and become members of the second, but wanted to go back to the other. Hear him: "But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster *to bring us* unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a school-master. For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus (Gal. 3:23-26)." Observe, he does not say that the law "is," present tense, our school-master.



The day of the present tense applicable to the law had passed even then. He declares that the law *was* "our" school-master, that is the law was the school-master of Israel, but he did not say that the law was the school-master of Israel then, of Israel now or of the Gentile world now. Observe he did not say that the law was the school-master of every nation, kindred, tribe, people, tongue and generation, but was their school-master; the school-master of Israel. I might say that Noah Webster was the school-master of this republic. He has been so considered but he is no longer. He is out of date, he has passed away and the old blue-back spelling book is no more. Paul had the same thought in mind when he uses the pronouns "we," "I," "us." Referring only to himself and to his brethren in Israel, who, with longing eye had beheld as the smoke of the sacrifices at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation arose to God, the promise of better things. Again: "Now I say, *That* the heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all; But 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: But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, To redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father (Gal. 4:1-6)." Summarizing, all Israel was under the law as children are under their tutors and governors. When the fulness of time came God sent His Son, under the law. The design of God in sending His son was that He might redeem those that were under the law and bring them out from under it. I think with these suggestions you can read Paul with more interest, with a better understanding, and with a better devotion unto Christ, for Christ hath removed the first which was bondage, and has brought in the day of the second, which is liberty.

Why was the first taken away? There must be some reason for it. Paul gives us a very graphic idea I think in his Hebrew letter. Why do we take a dead man away? Because he is dead. There is no other reason for it. And he declares that the first was taken away because it had waxed old and was ready to vanish. Did God intend that this covenant should last all the way through to the end? I think not. I think I can demonstrate beyond a doubt that He only intended that it should last for a time, filling a mission, filling a place in the great educational system that God had inaugurated by the call of Abraham, perpetuated in Moses, elab-



orated in the prophets and in the sweet singer of Israel, to bring on the day when men should realize that the kingdom of God is in them. There are two very strong statements relative to God's object in giving the law. Hear the apostle Paul: "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 (Gal. 3:19)." Analyze that passage. These Galatian brethren desired still to be under the law, to observe the law, to observe the days, and the feasts, and the sacrifices. He turned to them with all the authority of an apostle, telling them that he had received his information direct from heaven. Then he said, Brethren, why do you serve the law? He then proceeds to tell them why the law was given: that it was added to the promise doubtless because men were sinners, and ordained of angels in the hand of a mediator but only ordained and only given and only administered until the seed should come. Again: We have a more elaborate argument on this subject. After declaring that the first covenant had ordinances of a divine service and a worldly sanctuary, after going into particulars and details and carrying us as on the very crest of the wave of his mighty argument, the apostles comes down and gives us a graphic and a beautiful review of the institution that I am now undertaking to prove to you has forever passed away: "The Holy Spirit this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing: Which *was* a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience; Which *stood* only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances imposed *on them* until the time of reformation (Heb. 9:8-10)." Question, When were these things imposed on them? At Sinai. Question, By whom were these things imposed on them? By the law through Moses. Question, How long were these things to be imposed upon them? Until the time of reformation. When is that time of reformation or when was that time of reformation? I will let the Bible answer: "But Christ being come an High Priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption *for us* (Heb. 9:11,12)." The time of preparation or the time for which the law was added Paul said was until the seed should come. And here he says that when the seed came and



shed His blood and became a priest in a more perfect tabernacle that the time of reformation was attained, and I think that is true beyond a doubt.

Before proceeding with the argument I desire to refresh your minds somewhat along the line of the ground we have gone over. I do not want you to forget that God's object in calling Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and Israel and in the giving of the law, and the giving of the tabernacle, and in the giving of the service, and in the giving of the prophets was that He might prepare a nation for Himself, that men by experimenting with Him and with His promises might learn His faithfulness, His power, to know Him and be able to testify of His power and faithfulness in the world. The law was an educator, a school-master. While it was limited in its application to one nation or one tribe, or one people, and while it was imperfect in many ways and wholly inadequate to meet their wants in the removal of sin, yet it is a fact that under that institution there lived some of the mightiest men, some of the grandest men, some of the most glorious and self-sacrificing men, that have ever walked through the valleys and shadows of time. They are witnesses of God. Abraham is a witness for God; Isaac is a witness for God; Jacob is a witness for God; Moses is a witness for God; Joshua is a witness for God; Samuel is a witness for God; David who has tuned his harp to a greater variety of song and sentiment and glory than any men before or after him is a witness for God, and all the prophets who lived and died in the old dispensation were witnesses for Him, and therefore the Scriptures of the Old Testament come to us sanctified by the experiences and by the testimonies of those who tried these things for themselves. You say if there is so much good in it why is it taken away? I answer because it had filled its purpose. Why is it that the young man who has finished his course in the academy does not go back and take the course again? Because his ambition leads him to the college, or to the university, or to the post-graduate course in the university. Why is it that the sun arises in the morning and sends his flood of light into the world, why is it that the moon seems to hide in the very azure depths? I answer not because the academy is imperfect or does not meet the wants of the young man at that time, not because the moon is not glorious in her place as she marches along the battlements of heaven; and I answer that the law was taken away not because it failed to do absolutely what it did do but because it did what God said and what God designed, and prepared Israel and thence the world for something better.



Is the first covenant abolished? Is the law ended? Has the tabernacle service passed away? Have all the things in the law of Moses filled their places and passed into the eternal record? These are questions that I want to answer and by your indulgence, and by your attention, and by your prayers and by the grace of God I will. The first witness I call is one whose testimony ought to settle and really does forever settle this question. But before I call my witness I want to repeat my proposition again. I do not propose to be at all of a hesitating character on this subject. I want to come right out, fully, freely, radically, and state my position: The old covenant, the law of Moses including the ten commandments, including the tabernacle, including the priesthood, including the service, including the temple of Solomon, including the rebuilt temple, including the last temple that was here when Jesus was here; the whole thing every jot and tittle and every sentence is done away. Certainly that is plain enough. No man can misunderstand that—no man can dispute that I have made it clear and that I am honest in coming out fully and freely. To the proof: The text ought to be proof enough. Hear the apostle: "He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second." If Jesus were here we would interrogate Him but He is gone, He is beyond the reach of mortal vision but we cannot ask Him save as He has left it on record. But he called men to bear witness to what He wanted done, and how He wanted it done, and under whom He wanted it done, and I will call these witnesses, some of them tonight. Let us have the testimony of Peter first, or rather of Jesus concerning Peter. I could give you a kind of synopsis but I prefer to give it to you in the exact words of Scripture: "When Jesus came into the coasts of Cesarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, saying, Whom do men say that I the Son of man am? And they said, Some say *that thou art* John the Baptist; some, Elias; and others, Jeremias, or one of the prophets. He saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed *it* unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven (Matt. 16:13-16)."

What does this mean? It means that Peter confessed that Jesus

Christ is the Son of God, and that Jesus said on that confession He would build His church—a church that should stand against the assaults of death and hell. It means that Peter in a pre-eminent sense—while all the other apostles had power to bind or unloose—had the keys of the kingdom with the assurance that whatever he bound or unloosed on earth should be ratified in heaven. Never was such honor, such authority, before given to mortal man. If you want to know what Moses meant, or what Moses taught, or whether or not Moses belongs to the new institution, or the new covenant, or the gospel, surely Peter is the man to settle the question forever. I want you to look at that. Jesus said He would give Peter the keys of the kingdom and if the kingdom of Christ and the law of Moses, or the old covenant and the new are the same, Peter should make it all plain to us beyond a single doubt. When did Peter begin to use the keys of the kingdom? Not during the life of Jesus because he did not understand what was meant by the keys of the kingdom up until the last day of the Lord's sojourn on earth. Well I think I hear you say I do not know whether that is so or not. Listen. Just after the Lord said He would give him the keys of the kingdom He told him that He was going to Jerusalem and that they would put Him to death: "Then Peter took him, and began to rebuke him, saying, Be it far from thee, Lord: this shall not be unto thee. But he turned, and said unto Peter, Get thee behind me, Satan: thou art an offence unto me; for thou savourest not of the things that be of God, but those that be of men (Matt. 16:22,23)." Peter did not understand the nature of His kingdom right down until the very last, because he wanted to fight. He took out his sword and cut off a poor man's ear (John 18:10). Peter did not understand the keys of the kingdom even when the Master was on trial, for he said repeatedly he did not know Him, and then he swore that he did not, and went out from under the piercing eye of Jesus and poured out his soul in bitterness and tears (Mark 14:66-72). Peter did not understand what was meant by the keys of the kingdom or how to use them, because in one of the very last interviews when he came with the others unto Jesus he propounded this question: "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom unto Israel (Acts 1:6)?" Remember this was after Jesus arose from the dead. Remember that it was just before Jesus went up on high. Where did Peter use the keys of the kingdom? Hear me! On the day of Pentecost, in the city of Jerusalem. Again: Where did Peter use the keys of the kingdom? I answer at the house of Cornelius, the Gentile (Acts 10:1-48), in obedience to the commission of God, and in



pursuance of the command of the angel of the Lord to Cornelius to send for Peter to come and open unto him the words of life—"He hath taken away the first that he may establish the second!" What did Peter say about the First Covenant or about the Law, or about the Ten Commandments, or about the keeping of the Sabbath day? What did he say about it at Pentecost or at the house of Cornelius? Not one single word. Did he not have the assurance that whatever he would bind upon the people of God on Pentecost or anywhere else should be bound in heaven? Yes. Did he bind the ten commandments? No, sir. Did he bind the statutes of Israel? No, sir. Did he bind the tabernacle service? No, sir. Again: Peter not only spoke on Pentecost, he not only spoke at the house of Cornelius, but he wrote the Epistles, First Peter and Second Peter, we call them. And here is a broad proposition and I challenge your investigation and your attention: You may take Peter's sermon on Pentecost, Peter's sermon at the house of Cornelius, take the Epistles of Peter from the first word to the last "amen" and you cannot prove that such a man as Moses ever lived or ever gave the law, or that such a thing ever existed as the administration of the first covenant. Conclusion: If Peter did not bind that institution on the church no other mortal man had the authority to do it. Conclusion number two: If Peter did not bind the ten commands and the administration of the first institution on the church they never have yet been bound and they never will be bound until the end of time. You thought when I laid down the proposition a while ago and made it so positive, so unequivocal, so radical and so sweeping, that it was very strong. The reason I did it was I had a strong argument to come and I have only begun. Peter was the man. He was an apostle of the Lord. He had the command to do it if any one had. He had the authority to do it if any one had. He had the responsibility to do it if any had. And you may read his sermon on Pentecost, and his sermon at the house of Cornelius and read his Epistles, and all you can get out of them is this that we have a new law-giver even Jesus, that there are life and salvation and hope and remission of sins in Him and in no one else under heaven, above the heavens, or under the earth. I do not like to dismiss Peter. Oh, I love Peter! I love him because he was a man of courage. Oh, he was an undaunted hero, an undaunted believer in God and in Christ, willing to go at any length, any time, in the name of the Lord. It is recorded by tradition of him that when he came down to die they were going to crucify him like his Lord and Master, and he said: "I am not worthy, crucify me with my head down." Oh he was a good

man, a glorious man, and he unlocked and he locked, and he bound and he loosed, but he did not bind the ten commandments or the old covenant. Here is a peculiar thing: Beginning with the first chapter of Acts and closing with Paul's ministry in Rome, we have a period of history of many years covering apostolic labor, just how many I cannot say. The Gospel was preached with earnestness, with power, with fire, with love, with the Holy Spirit and there is not an intimation for a long time concerning the law or any part of the law, no discussion of the question. Do you know how that arose? It did not arise by the agitation of a number of good men like it is carried on now. The agitation began in the hearts of wicked men. They were men who were so in love with tradition that even in the days of Messiah on earth they invalidated the word of God with their traditions and they were not satisfied with the simple gospel. The way was too easy! There was too much liberty in it and therefore they were not satisfied. Peter preached with power. Three thousand were converted. Peter preached again and thousands more were converted and the word of God grew and the name of the Lord was glorified and they could not endure it. Then there was another mighty preacher whose name was Stephen. He was filled with the spirit of God. Every muscle, every bone, every nerve, every sinew was afire with love for God and man and he preached with such power that they could not withstand him and hence the agitation on this very subject that makes the necessity of these lectures apparent, the agitation began with wicked men and culminated in this good man's death. I will just call your attention to it as it is in the Book: "Then there arose certain of the synagogue, which is called *the synagogue* of the Libertines, and Cyrenians, and Alexandrians, and of them of Cilicia and of Asia, disputing with Stephen. And they were not able to resist the wisdom and the spirit by which he spake. Then they suborned men, which said, We have heard him speak blasphemous words against Moses, and *against* God. And they stirred up the people, and the elders, and the scribes, and came upon *him*, and caught him, and brought *him* to the council. And set up false witnesses, which said, This man ceaseth not to speak blasphemous words against this holy place, and the law: For we have heard him say, that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered us. And all that sat in council, looking steadfastly on him, saw his face as it had been the face of an angel (Acts 6:9-15)." Hear me! Stephen was doubtless a disciple of Peter. Peter had the keys of the kingdom. We know what Stephen preached. We know that he preached



Christ, and the accusation that they brought against him was that they had heard him preach that Christ would change the customs delivered unto them by Moses. Not only this, but He was going to sweep that mighty temple from the face of the earth and all of the ritual, and all that pertained to it, from the minds and hearts of the children of men. Notice this, that in order that they might overturn Stephen, that they might resist Stephen, that they might vanquish Stephen, they actually employed dishonest and rascally men to swear that Stephen had preached against Moses and the law. It is a truth beyond a doubt, but they did not have the convenient witnesses to establish the fact.

The agitation that started then, a short time after Pentecost, after the introduction of the Gospel, after the setting up of the church, went on; and the Pharisees, the friends of Judaism, took a hand and the agitation went on and on for a number of years until after the Gentiles were converted and then they began, not only to affirm that the converts from Judaism, but also that all Gentile converts should also be circumcised and keep the law. That was the idea, that was the doctrine, that was the contention. Listen: The greatest enemies to the apostolic church were Judaizing Christians. There was only one great convention of Christians held in apostolic times and it was held for the very purpose of discussing the very question that I am discussing tonight, over eighteen hundred years after that convention met. I will give you a statement concerning it from the testimony of Luke: "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 dissention 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 (Acts 15: 1,2)." These heretics were going about teaching that the Gentile Christians should be circumcised and keep the law of Moses. How did Paul take that? Luke says that Paul had no small contention and disputation with them on the subject. Does that mean that Paul endorsed their doctrine, their tradition, their speculation, their heresy? No. It means that like the man of God he was he stood up and fought it, and fought it from the shoulder, for he was that sort of a man. Again, I will read at length: "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 (Acts 15:6,7).” Allow me to break my quotation long enough to say that Peter here recognized the fact that he had the keys of the kingdom. “And God which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Spirit, 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 (Acts 15:8-11).” I have declared that by Peter’s sermon on Pentecost, at the house of Cornelius, and in his Epistles we could not prove that the law ever existed. Here he comes forward to testify that having the keys of the kingdom of God had made it possible for him to declare that all of these teachings by these men who had come down from Judea were heresies of the rankest type. Notice: Here they are now, Paul, Peter and the other apostles and the elders of Jerusalem considering the very question of whether or not Christianity is engrafted on Judaism, to consider the very question of whether the new covenant is the outgrowth of the old, or whether it has its roots struck down into the depth of the living God. Here it is: “Then all the multitude kept silence, and gave audience to Barnabas and Paul, declaring what miracles and wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles by them. And after they had held their peace, James answered, saying, Men *and* brethren, hearken unto me: Simon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name. And to this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written, After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up; That the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things. Known unto God are all His works from the beginning of the world. Wherefore my sentence is, that we trouble not them which from among the Gentiles are turned to God; but that we write unto them, that they abstain from pollutions of idols, and *from* fornication, and *from* things strangled, and *from* blood. For Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every sabbath day (Acts 15:12-21).” What is the testimony of Paul? His idea was that the law of Moses had no place in the Gospel. The testimony of James; what was his idea? That the law of Moses has no place in the Gospel. And here are the apostles many of them and the elders, the men of age, and



the men of experience in the great and only church that ever was at Jerusalem that was apostolic, and here is the letter they wrote: "And they wrote *letters* by them after this manner; The apostles and elders and brethren *send* greeting unto the brethren which are of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia: 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 Spirit, 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 (Acts 15:23-29)." Notice this, that they declare that they gave no such commandment as that the law of Moses should be kept. The Gentiles were never under it and they were determined that they never should be under it, and in order that they might have further assurance they sent chosen men with Paul and Barnabas to carry the news among the Christians everywhere. Oh well, says one, I see where you are mistaken; that was the ceremonial law. You can not find such a statement inside the lids of the Bible. We might as well pull the thing up root and branch. Oh, you say, the idea is there. Well, if the idea is there the words ought to be there. But for argument's sake I will grant it and I will take the thing up by the roots still. Hear me! Hear the word rather: "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 (Acts 15:24)." He did not tell them to be circumcised, he did not tell them to keep the law and let us see what we can make out of that. Beside that I will lay Paul's statement about keeping the law and circumcision. Then we will know because Paul said he did not learn it from Peter or the other apostles, he learned it from God: "This only would I learn of you, Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? Are ye so foolish? having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh? Have ye suffered so many things in vain? if it be yet in vain. 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? Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness (Gal. 3:2-6)." Further: "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 (Gal. 5:2,3)." "Again!" What does he say "again" for? Because from Jerusalem to the regions round about Illyricum he preached the Gospel of Christ and testified that they were not under Moses but under Jesus. It could not be the ceremonial law simply that they were contending had passed away. It could not mean the statutes of Israel simply, it could not mean the ten commandments merely, because Paul says if a man is circumcised he is in debt to do the whole law. That means every word in the ritualistic or ceremonial law if you are bound to put it that way and also the ten commandments and the statutes. There is no way out of it. All or none. Every word, every jot, every tittle, every sentence, every statute or none. Which will you take? The roads are before you and you are a free moral agent. You can take your choice. God help you! God gave new commands. Where is the man since Pentecost who has had the authority that Peter had? He had the keys of the kingdom. Where is the man since Paul who had the authority that he had? He is the last man on earth who beheld and heard Jesus. They agree that the First Covenant is no part of the new.



Sunday, February 19, 1899; 10:30 a. m.

SERMON NO. VI.—THE ABOLISHMENT OF THE FIRST  
COVENANT (PART 2).

*Text: "And the commandment, which WAS ORDAINED to life, I found TO BE unto death. For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew ME (Rom. 7: 10,11)."*

That I may keep before you what I have undertaken to do I repeat the proposition that I submitted last night: The old covenant including the law or the ten commandments, the statutes of Israel, the tabernacle, the priesthood, the ministration—every sentence of it, every phrase of it, every word of it, every jot of it, every tittle of it, is done away. I am sure there is not anything evasive or ambiguous about that. If I can prove it, well and good. If I cannot prove it, well and good. I think the passages which I have just read to you are at least a very strong argument tending to show that if the old covenant is not abolished it should be. Paul doubtless puts himself in the place of the Hebrew nation when he declares that the commandment was ordained to life but took advantage of him and he found it to be unto death. I shall give you the exact words of Moses on this point: "Ye shall do my judgments, and keep mine ordinances, to walk therein: I *am* the Lord your God. Ye shall therefore keep my statutes, and my judgments; which if a man do, he shall live in them: I *am* the Lord (Lev. 18: 4,5)." Israel, however, found that instead of life there was death, because in the very nature of things on account of man's weakness it was utterly impossible for any human being absolutely to keep the law. Hence the commandment which, if it had been kept, would have brought life, being broken, brought on death. It is well for us to study a little the connection in which these passages are found. They are a part of a very long and a very conclusive argument by the apostle Paul on the very question that we have under consideration. He declares that Israel had become dead to the law by the body of Christ. He declares that having become dead to the law by the body of Christ, they were married unto one who was raised from the dead. He declares that they were delivered from the law. He declares that he would have had no lust if the law

had not commanded him not to covet. He declares that sin took occasion by reason of the commandment and slew him. Then he comes down to the statement: "And the commandment which was ordained to life I found to be unto death." What a strange, what a remarkable conclusion this! What does it mean? This and nothing more: That the Law-giver held them to strict accountability and therefore when a man broke the law he had to suffer. And he teaches the lesson that instead of bringing life the law spread punishment, suffering, death, everywhere. Hear Paul again: "Because the law worketh wrath: for where no law is, *there is* no transgression (Rom. 4:15)." The law was added because of transgression, amplified because of transgression, administered because of transgression, perpetuated because of transgression; the penalty was executed because of transgression until the Lord should come, until the Lord should die and bring in, not law in the sense of Moses' law, but in the day of liberty. I think this will bring your minds up fairly and squarely to the issue that we have before us, and I therefore resume my argument where I left off last night. The entire system was the ministration of death. Let us go back to Sinai and review the situation and assert a few elementary facts. At the inauguration of the law thousands suffered the penalty for its wilful infraction. At the very dawn, at the very first day I may say, of the administration, the character of the law is shown fully, freely, conclusively in the fact that the dead and dying lay everywhere throughout the camp of Israel because they had trampled under foot the commandment of God. In reality the law was the ministration of death. It is so designated in the New Testament. Hear Paul again: "For I was alive without the law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died (Rom. 7:9)." What was true of Paul was true of myriads—true of all Israel from Sinai to the Cross. Men heard the law, accepted the law, promised to obey the law, but failing, the penalty of the law was swift and absolutely sure.

Is it not remarkable in view of the fact that the first converts to the Christian religion knew of all this, knew the law, knew the ministration—is it not remarkable I say that these very people, after having been brought into the church of Christ, should undertake to bring in also the law of Moses and declare that except the disciples of the Lord kept the law also they could not be saved? The elaborate argument of Stephen recorded in the seventh chapter of the Acts of the Apostles was really the first effort on the part of the disciples of the Lord to combat the mighty influence of the Sadducees and the Pharisees and the other people who were



zealous of the law. Stephen began with the very dawn of their history and fact by fact, argument by argument, climax by climax, conclusion by conclusion, finally drove them before him until they could not endure any longer and instead of patiently listening to him stopped their ears, ran upon him and put him to death. The agitation continued and spread not only throughout Jerusalem and unto the churches of the Gentiles, but it was intensified as the years went on and I would have you remember that not less than three of Paul's epistles were written for the purpose of counteracting that very influence. Last night I brought up the testimony of Paul who was the last to see the Lord after He had gone up on high, and the testimony of James and the testimony of the entire church at Jerusalem, going to show that those who understood the Gospel, believed it, and were willing to trust it, had no thought that they were required to go back to Moses and the law. But these Judaizing teachers were energetic, persistent, intense and almost unconquerable. They were everywhere spreading their heresy. They even went to the extreme of declaring that not only was it policy, not only was it wisdom to keep the law of Moses, but that it was indispensably necessary to salvation. Paul contended against this conclusion. His epistle to the Romans was written to counteract it. His epistle to the Galatians was written for the same purpose. His epistle to the Hebrews was also written in order to set forth in detail what the Law of Moses was, what the ministration was, what the ordinances were; what the Gospel is and the relationship of one to the other, and argument by argument, fact by fact, precept by precept, line by line, conclusion by conclusion, he came down to this last statement—triumphantly laid it down, glorious in its simplicity and absolutely effective in its results: "He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second (Heb. 10:9)." While these three epistles were written in order I may say to counteract the influences of these Judaizing teachers where their influences were most potent, the apostle recognized the fact that these agitators were everywhere. Some of them had gone to Corinth undoubtedly, because in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians Paul argued most earnestly in detail, and with effective logic and power, that the old administration was done away. This argument is recorded in the third chapter of Second Corinthians. I shall read it and expand it passage by passage. Speaking of himself and the other apostles and teachers, he says: "Who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament: not of the letter but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life. But if the ministration of death, written *and* graven in stones, was glorious,



so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face Moses for the glory of his countenance; which *glory* was to be done away; How shall not the ministration of the spirit be rather glorious? For if the ministration of condemnation *be* glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory. For even that which was made glorious had no glory in this respect, by reason of the glory that excelleth. For if that which is done away *was* glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious. Seeing then that we have such hope, we use great plainness of speech: And not as Moses, *which* put a vail over his face, that the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished (II Cor. 3:6-13)." I call your attention to some very remarkable statements here—important I may say as key-words or key-statements to the entire situation. First, the apostles were ministers of the New Testament or Covenant. Second, they were not ministers of the Old Testament or of the Law. Third, the letter—the law, killeth. Fourth, the spirit or the Gospel giveth life. Fifth, that which was written and engraven on stones was the ministration of death. Sixth, it was a ministration of condemnation. Seventh, its glory is done away, and finally its glory is no glory—it sinks into utter insignificance when compared with the glory of that which is now, the ministration of the righteousness through Jesus Christ our Lord. Notice particularly that he sums the whole thing up and says, that it is condemnation, is death, and that its glory has passed by reason of the overshadowing glory of the new and better covenant. What does he mean by the ministration of death having been written and engraven on stones? Whatever that is, he declares that it is done away. Let me raise some questions therefore: What was written upon stones? Is that ministration still in force or it is abolished? The answer is here plain, unmistakable, unequivocal: It is done away. Its glory was abolished forever, and this means that the law is abolished forever. It cannot mean anything else. If you confront any of the teachers of our times with a statement like that the answer will be that it is not a fact that the ten commandments were done away—that Paul had in mind only the carnal ordinances, the ceremonial law, the ritualistic service at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation. But he does not say that. He does not intimate that. He does not suggest that. He does not insinuate it even in the remotest degree. Let us come right down to the phraseology and to the facts in the case and let us meet the issue fairly, squarely, honestly, scripturally, or not at all. What was written and engraven on stones? Was it the ceremonial law? Every student of the Bible



knows that it was not. Was it the law regulating the service at the door of the tabernacle of Israel in the hands of Aaron and his sons? No. What was it? Certainly one thing is true and that is this: Whatever was written on tables of stone was, in Paul's estimation, the ministry of death and whatever was written and engraven on stones was, in the estimation of Paul, done away. He says it in plain words. I think it will be well to call for the testimony of Moses now and let us find out what was really written on the stones: "And he gave unto Moses, when he had made an end of communing with him upon mount Sinai, two tables of testimony, tables of stone, written with the finger of God (Ex. 31:18)." But one witness is not enough for some people and I will give you another: "And the Lord said unto Moses, Write thou these words: for after the tenor of these words I have made a covenant with thee and with Israel. And he was there with the Lord forty days and forty nights; he did neither eat bread, nor drink water. And he wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the ten commandments (Ex. 34:27,28)." Hear me: Not one single word, not one single jot, not one tittle of the law was written on the tables of stone save the ten commandments that God originally proclaimed from the summit of Sinai. As we are dealing with the question of the covenant it will be well to refresh your minds just a little on this point and prove that what was engraven on the stones was the covenant and that the covenant was therefore the ministration of death. The proof is right here at hand: "And the Lord spake unto you out of the midst of the fire: ye heard the voice of the words, but saw no similitude; only ye *heard* a voice. And he declared unto you his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, *even* ten commandments; and he wrote them upon two tables of stone (Deut. 4:12,13)."

Repetition is sometimes a profound necessity. I therefore turn and give you Paul's testimony again. I want to place his testimony and the testimony of Moses side by side and then we can draw a conclusion without doing violence to either: "But if the ministration of death, written *and* engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which *glory* was to be done away; How shall not the ministration of the spirit be rather glorious (II Cor. 3:7,8)?" Conclusion: The ten commandments engraven on stones by the finger of God constituted the covenant with Israel, and the great apostle of the Gentiles meeting the arguments of the Judaizing teachers in the early church, declared that that which was engraven on the stones was the ministration of



death, that it was done away and was succeeded and overshadowed by the ministration of the spirit of God through Jesus Christ His Son. But I raise an important question here: Why were the ten commandments, why were the statutes of Israel, why was the whole institution the ministration of death? Paul gives us a good idea in the text. He said that which was ordained unto life he found to be unto death because he broke the law and that was the experience of everybody. If all the laws of this State, or of your State had the death penalty attached to them there would be an execution every day. Suppose that all of the laws of the School of the Evangelists had the death penalty attached to them? We would only have a graveyard here now and a memory of the things that were! And so it was with Israel. The death penalty was attached to almost every law, and therefore there was death everywhere, mourning everywhere, and crying everywhere, and graves of criminals everywhere. That is what the law was. The great difficulty with the Judaizing teachers in the ancient church and in the church now is that they have undertaken to discover some method—I know not what it is, it has not been properly defined and described and surveyed, but some method by which the law can be pulled over into the church and the penalty left back with the Jews! It never did work in the apostolic church; it will not work in the church now. "The ministration of death written and engraven on stones!" And here I lay down a proposition that will probably be startling in its nature, in its scope, in its sweep, in its influences on your thought and on the thought of others: Every commandment with a single exception—and I can make out a good case on that—uttered by the voice of Jehovah from mount Sinai and written by Him on the tables of stone had attached to it the penalty of death. It is not very remarkable therefore that Paul should look back over the whole scene and say that it was the ministration of death. Suppose a man should be elected to the presidency of the United States on the platform that every man who violated any law or any part of the constitution of the government, or of any state thereof should be put to death. If anybody survived that administration, and perhaps the executioner would, if he did not die from overwork, he would look back over the whole thing and say that this was a ministration of death from the beginning. Let us see if I can establish what I have said about the ten commandments being the ministration of death. Paul, you notice, just sums it all up. Paul knew and I am going to tell you every word of it. He was a mighty lawyer educated in his own country, but failing to receive all he desired,



ne went to Jerusalem and sat at the feet of the mightiest lawyer of his day, Gamaliel, and was instructed in the principles of Moses' law. Therefore I say Paul could have made just exactly the speech that I am going to make but he covered the whole thing with one statement and said it was the ministration of death and there are thousands of people today that believe that Paul made a mistake or that he blundered or that he told something when he said that which he could not prove because they argued stoutly, persistently, earnestly, energetically, that ye are yet under Moses as well as under Christ.

I will just turn to the commandments and give them to you and refer you to the passages and the penalty. I shall treat the first two as one. The first and second commandments were against idolatry: "And God spake all these words, saying, I *am* the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have no other gods before me. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of *any thing* that *is* in heaven above, or that *is* in the earth beneath, or that *is* in the water under the earth: Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the Lord thy God *am* a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth *generation* of them that hate me; And showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments (Ex. 20:1-6)." Idol making, image making, idol worshipping, image worshipping—what was the penalty? Let Moses answer: "If thy brother, the son of thy mother, or thy son, or thy daughter, or the wife of thy bosom, or thy friend, which *is* as thine own soul, entice thee secretly, saying, Let us go and serve other gods, which thou hast not known, thou, nor thy fathers; *Namely*, of the gods of the people which *are* round about you, nigh unto thee, or far off from thee, from the *one* end of the earth even unto the *other* end of the earth; Thou shalt not consent unto him, nor hearken unto him; neither shall thine eye pity him, neither shalt thou spare, neither shalt thou conceal him: But thou shalt surely kill him; thine hand shall be first upon him to put him to death, and afterwards the hand of all the people. And thou shalt stone him with stones, that he die; because he hath sought to thrust thee away from the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, from the house of bondage. And all Israel shall hear, and fear, and shall do no more any such wickedness as this is among you (Deut. 13:6-11)." Not only this, but God declared that where idolatry was introduced into a city, that not only should the inhabitants be slain, but that the city should be



burned in order that every vestige of idolatry or of idol making and idol worshipping should be wiped from the face of the land that he loved (Deut. 13:12-17). The third commandment was against taking the name of God in vain: "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain: for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain (Ex. 20:7)." What was the penalty? Let Moses answer: "And the son of an Israelitish woman, whose father *was* an Egyptian, went out among the children of Israel: and this son of the Israelitish *woman* and a man of Israel strove together in the camp; And the Israelitish woman's son blasphemed the name *of the* Lord, and cursed. And they brought him unto Moses: (and his mother's name *was* Shemolith, the daughter of Dibri, of the tribe of Dan:) And they put him in ward, that the mind of the Lord might be showed them. And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Bring forth him that hath cursed without the camp; and let all that heard *him* lay their hands upon his head, and let all the congregation stone him. And thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel, saying, Whosoever curseth his God shall bear his sin. And he that blasphemeth the name of the Lord, he shall surely be put to death, *and* all the congregation shall certainly stone him: as well the stranger, as he that is born in the land, when he blasphemeth the name *of the* Lord, shall be put to death (Lev. 24:10-16)." The fourth commandment was that they should observe the sabbath day: "Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work: But the seventh day *is* the sabbath of the Lord thy God: *in it* thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that *is* within thy gates: For *in* six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them *is*, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it (Ex. 20:8-11)." Moses is very careful, very specific, goes very much into detail as to how God designed that this day should be kept. What was the penalty? Let Moses answer, for he was there and knows: "And Moses gathered all the congregation of the children of Israel together, and said unto them, These *are* the words which the Lord hath commanded, that *ye* should do them. Six days shall work be done, but on the seventh day there shall be to you an holy day, a sabbath of rest to the Lord: whosoever doeth work therein shall be put to death. Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitations upon the sabbath day (Ex. 35:1-3)." Again: "And while the children of Israel were in the wilderness, they found a man that gathered sticks upon the sabbath day. And they



that found him gathering sticks brought him unto Moses and Aaron, and unto all the congregation. And they put him in ward, because it was not declared what should be done to him. And the Lord said unto Moses, The man shall surely be put to death: all the congregation shall stone him without the camp. And all the congregation brought him without the camp, and stoned him with stones, and he died; as the Lord commanded Moses (Num. 15: 32-36)." Sabbath day—violation—death—no mercy! The fifth commandment was that every Israelite should honor his father and his mother: "Honor thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee (Ex. 20:12)." What was the penalty to that? Let Moses answer: "And he that smiteth his father or his mother, shall be surely put to death (Ex. 21:15)." The sixth commandment was against killing—against the unlawful taking of the life of a human being: "Thou shalt not kill (Ex. 20:13)." What was the penalty? I answer the penalty was death. Hear Moses: "He that smiteth a man so that he die, shall be surely put to death. And if a man lie not in wait, but God deliver *him* into his hand; then I will appoint thee a place whither he shall flee. But if a man come presumptuously upon his neighbor, to slay him with guile; thou shalt take him from mine altar, that he may die (Ex. 21:12-14)." Again, and the statements are even stronger than these. Let Moses speak in his own language: "Moreover ye shall take no satisfaction for the life of a murderer, which is guilty of death; but he shall surely be put to death. And ye shall take no satisfaction for him that is fled to the city of his refuge, that he should come again to dwell in the land, until the death of the priest. So ye shall not pollute the land wherein ye *are*; for blood it defileth the land: and the land cannot be cleansed of the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood of him that shed it. Defile not therefore the land which ye shall inhabit, wherein I dwell: for I the Lord dwell among the children of Israel (Num. 35:31-34)." The seventh commandment was against adultery: "Thou shalt not commit adultery (Ex. 20:14)." Penalty, death. Proof: "And the man that committeth adultery with *another* man's wife, *even he* that committeth adultery with his neighbor's wife, the adulterer and the adulteress shall surely be put to death (Lev. 20:10)." The eighth commandment was against stealing: "Thou shalt not steal (Ex. 20:15)." What was the penalty for this? Not always but often, death: "If a thief be found breaking up, and be smitten that he die, *there shall* no blood *be shed* for him (Ex. 22:2)." The ninth commandment was against false witness. What was the penalty? I answer,



under certain circumstances, and often, death. Proof: "If a false witness rise up against any man, to testify against him *that which is wrong*; Then both the men, between whom the controversy *is*, shall stand before the Lord, before the priests and the judges which shall be in those days: And the judges shall make diligent inquisition: and, behold, *if* the witness *be* a false witness, and hath testified falsely against his brother; Then shall ye do unto him as he had thought to have done unto his brother: so shalt thou put the evil away from among you. And those which remain shall hear, and fear, and shall henceforth commit no more any such evil among you. And thine eye shall not pity; *but* life *shall go* for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot (Deut. 19:16-21)." If a man sought by false witness to procure or cause to be procured the death of another man, the law said that he should surely die. The tenth commandment was against covetousness: "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his man-servant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that *is* thy neighbor's (Ex. 20:17)." I intimated at the beginning that I could not establish that in every case the penalty was death, that there was a single exception, but I thought I could make a strong case out of that. Covetousness is the unlawful desire for that which is another's. It is all right to buy, to give an honest equivalent; but to take or to desire to take, without an honest equivalent is covetousness, and therefore a sin. I will give you the proof from the New Testament. These are the words of Paul: "Covetousness, which is idolatry (Col. 3:5)." If covetousness is idolatry and if men were slain on account of idol worship, then they must have been slain on account of covetousness. I will not say that this absolutely proves it, but we have two illustrations in the Old Testament. At the siege of Ai, Achan, the son of Carmi, unlawfully coveted and unlawfully took that which was not his own (Josh. 7:20-26). Penalty, death. Ahab unlawfully coveted the vineyard of another. That covetousness led to murder (I Kings 21:1-29). Penalty, death. But I do not care if you want to say that I have not made out the case on this. If ninety per cent of the commandments had attached to them, unequivocally and positively the penalty of death, then I am justified, and Paul is justified in saying that the whole institution was a ministration of death written and engraven on stones, and instead of trying to revive the law, instead of trying to resuscitate the law, instead of trying to bring the law, or the commandments, or the covenant, or the administration, or the Aaronic priesthood into the church of God, we ought to be thank-



ful that our Father is better to us now and that it depends upon us more and more to serve Him because we love Him, not to serve Him because we fear Him. I have already intimated to you that the sword of punishment hung over the Israelites from the cradle to the grave.

I do not stop here. Not only was the penalty of death attached to nine out of the ten commandments, certainly, and probably to the tenth, but the penalty of death was attached also to many of the statutes of Israel, but I shall give you only a few illustrations. The priests of Israel, those who were supposed to be God's holy servants, were always in danger of death. The death penalty hung over them, the sword of justice hung over them, from the day of their consecration unto the day of their death. I will give you the proof of that. Allow me to read the words of Moses: "And the Lord spake unto Aaron, saying, Do not drink wine nor strong drink, thou, nor thy sons with thee, when ye go into the tabernacle of the congregation, lest ye die: *it shall be* a statute forever throughout your generations: And that ye may put difference between holy and unholy, and between unclean and clean; And that ye may teach the children of Israel all the statutes which the Lord hath spoken unto them by the hand of Moses (Lev. 10:9-11)." Again: He did not dare go into the tabernacle to serve God without a remembrance of the fact that the probable death penalty was hanging over him and that the sword of vengeance might be unsheathed at any time. Proof: "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Thou shalt also make a laver of brass, and his foot *also* of brass, to wash *withal*: and thou shalt put it between the tabernacle of the congregation and the altar, and thou shalt put water therein. For Aaron and his sons shall wash their hands and their feet thereat; When they go into the tabernacle of the congregation, they shall wash with water, that they die not; or when they come near to the altar to minister, to burn offering made by fire unto the Lord; So they shall wash their hands and their feet, that they die not: and it shall be a statute for ever to them *even* to him and to his seed throughout their generations (Ex. 30:17-21)." There was to be a carefulness, a deliberation, a solemnity about the service that certainly did bring a man's heart down low. Proof: "And Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, took either of them a censer, and put fire therein, and put incense thereon, and offered strange fire before the Lord, which he commanded them not. And there went out fire from the Lord, and devoured them; and they died before the Lord. Then Moses said unto Aaron, This *is it* that the Lord spake, saying, I will be sanctified in them that come



nigh me, and before all the people I will be glorified. And Aaron held his peace (Lev. 10:1-3)." A parallel to this: Imagine a man standing up to preach the Gospel of the Son of God, reading a hymn, reading from the prophets and from the Gospels, with a sword of vengeance hanging over his head, and you will understand the responsibility of the priesthood of Israel.

Passing from the priesthood to the people we have it recorded that the restrictions were just as strong, just as hard, and just as merciless: "Thou shalt not revile the gods, nor curse the ruler of thy people (Ex. 22:28)." The word "gods" there means the rulers. Imagine if you can a man in our day being prohibited from criticising the administration of the courts under the penalty of death, and you know about how a Hebrew had to live. He had to keep his mouth shut, he had no right to say a word about the decision of the judge. If it suited him, well and good, if it did not, well and good. But again, and here is stronger proof than that: "If there arise a matter too hard for thee in judgment, between blood and blood, between plea and plea, and between stroke and stroke, *being* matters of controversy, within thy gates; then shalt thou arise, and get thee up into the place which the Lord thy God shall choose; And thou shalt come unto the priests, the Levites, and unto the judge that shall be in those days, and inquire; and they shall show thee the sentence of judgment: And thou shalt do according to the sentence, which they of that place which the Lord shall choose shall show thee; and thou shalt observe to do according to all that they inform thee: According to the sentence of the law which they shall teach thee, and according to the judgment which they shall tell thee, thou shalt do: thou shalt not decline from the sentence which they shall show thee, *to* the right hand, nor *to* the left. And the man that will do presumptuously, and will not hearken unto the priest that standeth to minister there before the Lord thy God, or unto the judge, even that man shall die: and thou shalt put away the evil from Israel. And all the people shall hear, and fear and do no more presumptuously (Deut. 17:8-13)." Try to bring that home to you. You have a case that goes up before the Supreme Court of the State and it is decided against you and you walk out and say that you do not think you got justice. Under the law of Israel that meant death. Oh we have liberty under the Gospel, we have liberty under the laws inspired by the Gospel of Christ. If the judge does not decide it according to our opinion we transfer it from one court to another until we get to the highest. If it still goes against us we have a right to say that the judge has perjured himself and he has not done his duty, and



you can appeal from the judge of the Supreme Court to the people again. Oh the beauty, Oh the liberty, Oh the glory of the administration of law especially where the flags of Britannia and Columbia wave! Again: Under the administration of the law, the ministration of death, a man was not permitted, save he be of the proper family, to enter the house of God. How strict that was! How awful that was! How terrible that was! How merciless that was! Here is the proof right at hand: "And when the tabernacle setteth forward, the Levites shall take it down; and when the tabernacle is to be pitched, the Levites shall set it up: and the stranger that cometh nigh shall be put to death (Num. 1:51)." Imagine if you can a condition of affairs when only the preacher can go into the house of God, and that any man who approaches nigh unto the sanctuary of his God shall be put to death, and then you will know something about the ministration under which Moses and Israel lived! And again, on the day of atonement certain regulations were laid down and they were remarkably strict. If a man persists in sinning now, judgment may slumber long, but it was not so under the law. I call your attention particularly to one statement here: "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Also on the tenth day of this seventh month *there shall be* a day of atonement: it shall be an holy convocation unto you; and ye shall afflict your souls, and offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord. And ye shall do no work in that same day; for it *is* a day of atonement, to make an atonement for you before the Lord your God. For whatsoever soul *it be* that shall not be afflicted in that same day, he shall be cut off from among his people (Lev. 23:26-29)." Imagine if you can a state of affairs in our time when a sinner, refusing to hear the Gospel call, thrust out of his neighborhood, thrust out of his State, is thrust out of his country to wander forever in exile. That was the law of Moses! Let me tell you brethren: The shortest road and the best schedule to the understanding of the New Testament is to comprehend what is meant by the ministration of death. We talk about Apostolic New Testament Christianity. Brethren listen to me! It means that it is a new institution, that the day of the law has passed, that the day of earthly vengeance is gone, and that although the world stands in guilt before God, that Jesus Christ on His throne holdeth out the scepter of mercy to every ransomed sinner, to you, to me!

Sunday, February 19, 1899; 7 p. m.

SERMON NO. VII.—THE ABOLISHMENT OF THE FIRST  
COVENANT (PART 3).

*Text: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach THEM, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven (Matt. 5: 17-19)."*

Before entering upon the discussion of this very striking Scripture I desire to clear up some things by way of definition over which we have already passed. I heard a young man say this morning that he was in the school a long time before he fully understood the difference between a Jew and a Gentile, and I presume there are a great many like him everywhere. It is important that you shall be able to understand these terms because they are key-words. If you know what they mean you can turn them and unlock the storehouse of revelation, of knowledge, and of wisdom. We have quite a long array of words that are important and that I have been using promiscuously and freely throughout this series of sermons. On the one hand we have Hebrew, Israelite, children of Israel, the circumcision, chosen or chosen people, or Jew; on the other hand we have Gentile, stranger, barbarian, heathen, uncircumcision, dogs. If you will keep these names and their relation to one another in mind I am sure that the Bible will not appear to you so difficult a book. I will advance another step and say that these distinctions belong to the First Testament or First Covenant rather than the second; although they are frequently used in discussing the subject of the old institution in the new. The ancient Greeks it is said did not have any word for foreigner; that is to say a word meaning a citizen of another country. The word they had was barbarian, signifying that all men from their standpoint who were not Greeks were barbarians. It was about like that with the ancient Hebrews. If a man was not a Hebrew the best they



could say for him was that he was a Gentile or a stranger, or a barbarian, or a heathen, or an uncircumcised man, or a dog. Please remember this. All who were in the covenant were Hebrews because Abraham was a Hebrew and they were his children. All who were in the covenant were Israelites or children of Israel because Jacob's name was Israel and they were his children. All who were in the covenant were called the circumcision because they had been circumcised. All who were in the covenant were the chosen people because God made choice of them. But all others were designated by words indicating that they were outside of the family, outside of the covenant, outside of the law, outside of the administration of the law, under Moses and under the priests. I hope I have made this matter clear. If I have not I advise you without further loss of time to study carefully and try to learn these terms, learn their meaning and their relationship to one another.

Believing, however, that the matter is clear I shall return to the text. Who uttered these words? When were they uttered? Under what circumstances were they uttered? What was the object of their utterance? What do these passages develop under close examination and analysis? I answer they were and are the words of the Son of God. They were uttered early in His ministry and are a part of the sermon on the mount. The object of their utterance was to disabuse the minds of any who had rushed to the conclusion that His object in coming was to destroy the law of Moses or to destroy the law and the prophets. Let us analyze and particularize and see what we have here. Jesus recognized the law and the prophets. He came not to destroy the law and the prophets but to fulfill, even to the jot or unto the tittle, that is unto the very smallest mark in any Hebrew letter, in any Hebrew word, in any Hebrew sentence, in any Hebrew law. He went so far in addition to this to say that any one who would break any law of the old institution should be called little in the kingdom of God. He honored Moses, He honored the Covenant, He honored the law, He honored the word of God as the word of God was then written and understood and revealed. Just here it will be well for me to call your attention to something that I presented to you before, and that is this: Jesus was born and lived and died under the law. I will simply give you the reference for this (Gal. 4:1-4). There is another subject corresponding to the subject that possibly puts the Saviour's language more forcibly still. Hear Him: "And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail (Luke 16:17)." Move carefully here my brother, you are lia-

ble to get into trouble. You are liable to rush to an unwarranted conclusion. The thought that He had in mind, and that is tersely, effectively, and beautifully brought out by Luke was, that it would be easier for the heavens to fall and for the earth to pass than it would be for any part of the law to fail or fall until it had finished its work. Or as Matthew puts it: "Till all be fulfilled." There is one more point that appears on the very surface of Matthew's statement: it is this—that beyond any cavil, beyond any doubt, beyond any contradiction, our Lord had in mind a time when the law would be fulfilled, when the law would fill its mission, when the law would fill the place which was ordained of God in its proclamation, and I may add without violence to the text or any irreverence to the Redeemer, pass into eternal record having finished its work. I think I may safely say on this point that we have here very strong evidence of two things: First, either that the law has been abolished some time in the past, or that at some time in the future it will fill its place and be abolished. I will take the first proposition and declare that, having done its work, having filled its mission, having finished its course, it is already abolished—forever done away. An argument that I presented the other day has an extremely important relation to the subject tonight. It is this: That the old covenant was based on the flesh of Abraham. That I proved beyond a doubt. I assert in connection with this tonight that whatever is based on flesh, on mortal man, must in the nature of things pass away. The whole history of the past is pregnant with proof of this statement. Proud cities are buried in the dust, proud families have perished from the pages of history because all flesh is as the grass, or as the flowers of the field—that must fade, must perish, must sink into the embrace of eternal oblivion. This institution was based on flesh, on blood, on Abraham's flesh, on Abraham's blood, and that was one of the weaknesses of it and one of the reasons for its abrogation. I present to you a very forcible proof: "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: That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit (Rom. 8:3,4)." Again, and this is the testimony of Paul also: "Seeing that many glory after the flesh, I will glory also (II Cor. 11:18)." By glorying in the flesh he meant glorying in his family, in his antecedents, in his pedigree, in his genealogy, that Abraham was his father. Again: "Finally, my brethren, rejoice in the Lord. To write the same things to you, to me indeed is not grievous, but for you *it is safe*.



Beware of dogs, beware of evil workers, beware of the concision. For we are the circumcision, which worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh. Though I might also have confidence in the flesh. If any other man thinketh that he hath whereof he might trust in the flesh, I more: Circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, an Hebrew of the Hebrews; as touching the law, a Pharisee; Concerning zeal, persecuting the church; touching the righteousness which is in the law, blameless. But what things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ. Yea doubtless, and I count all thing *but* loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord; for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them *but* dung, that I may win Christ (Phil. 3:1-8)." What have we here? There were Christians in the apostolic church who tried to adhere to the law and boasted of their pedigrees, of their relation to Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and Moses and Samuel and Isaiah and Jeremiah and David. Paul said if any man had a right to do that he had. His pedigree was all right. He was a Hebrew of the Hebrews—he was bred a Hebrew on both sides of his family. So far as the righteousness of the law was concerned he was blameless and yet he said he counted all of them, family, pedigree, law, covenant, blamelessness or righteousness according to the law—counted all these things as dross that he might gain Christ. Then from Paul's standpoint there was not anything for a Christian in the observance of the law of Moses; from Paul's standpoint the Christian was free from the law and under no obligations to observe it either as to its ritual or otherwise, that is, because it was law. He might have done some of the things contained in the law, not because of the law, but because they were right and because Christ who is righteousness was enthroned in his heart.

I come now to what I regard as probably the most forcible argument in all of the New Testament on this subject. By way of introduction let me refresh your minds with a few of the things that have been affirmed, argued, and I may modestly say abundantly demonstrated by the Scriptures in previous sermons. I refer you to the agitation that began in the minds of wicked men some time after Pentecost against the apostles on the ground that they argued that Jesus Christ would change the law and the customs of Moses, and destroy the temple; therefore these men could not endure it. I called your attention last night to the great council at Jerusalem where Apostles and Elders and Christians came together and declared that they were not under the law but under grace or that



they were not under obligation to lay on themselves any greater burden than to do the necessary things of the gospel. I declared also that the books of Romans and Galatians and Hebrews had been written for the purpose of counteracting and antagonizing and destroying the influence of these Judaizing teachers, and the argument that I am to present now is the climax I may say of the argument in the Galatian letter. They desired to be under the law. Paul went so far as to criticise them and reprove them because of their desire to be under it, and now that I am to discuss this line by line, passage by passage, argument by argument, I will give it all to you: "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a freewoman. But he *who was* of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the free-woman *was* by promise. Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants; the one from the mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all. For it is written, Rejoice *thou* barren that barest not; break forth and cry, thou that travailest not: for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath an husband. Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise. But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him *that was born* after the spirit, even so *it is* now. 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 freewoman. So then, brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free (Gal. 4:21-31)." "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law?" If this does not mean all of the law of Moses it does not mean any part of the law of Moses. Look at that statement, "the law." It is just as we have the same statement in the text practically, and it is used a great many times in the New Testament, "the law." What does it mean? What does it comprehend? I answer that it means all of the law, the ten commandments, the statutes of Israel, the administration of the law at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation—it cannot mean any less. If it does not mean all the law I want to know who has the power, who has the authority, who has the knowledge, who has the wisdom to say what part is meant? It either means all absolutely, every statute and every statement, or there is nobody on earth who can determine how much it means or what it means. He demanded, "do you not hear the law?" They



understood the law, they knew what the law meant; they had been taught the Gospel, but Judaizing, heretical teachers had come among them and had bewitched them, deceived them and carried them away with their dissimulations and with their false doctrines. "For it is written, that Abraham had two sons; the one by a bond-maid, the other by a freewoman. But he *who was* of a bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the freewoman *was* by promise." What does this mean? To ask that question is to answer it before a body of men who have been reading their Bibles. Here we have in this little bit of history a glimpse of the home life of Abraham: One legitimate wife and one legitimate son, that son born after the promise or in fulfillment of the promise; a concubine and an illegitimate son, son born after the flesh. And here we have the idea that I have been trying to enforce on you during this entire series of sermons, that the first promise to Abraham was fleshly and that the mark of the covenant was in the flesh and that the covenant was perpetuated in the flesh and that the first Israel was fleshly Israel, Israel with the blood of Abraham in the nation, and I also enforced the idea that the second promise was spiritual in its significance. "By promise," says the apostle here, and this promise culminated in the birth of Jesus, in the Gospel to every nation, kindred, tribe, and tongue. What do these things mean? Why introduce Abraham and Sarah and Hagar and Ishmael into this argument? Paul answers: "Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants; the one from the mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children." How many covenants? Two. What does covenant mean? Testament. How many testaments therefore? Two. Not one as a continuation of the other, not one as an outgrowth of the other, not one grafted on another, but two! One from mount Sinai in Arabia which gendereth to bondage. Did I not prove to you that God made a covenant with Israel at the foot of Sinai? Did I not prove to you that the covenant was a covenant that required people to obey the law and that to that law there was the penalty of death? I certainly did. Mark you this expression. It did not contain a guarantee of liberty or life, but Paul says: "it gendereth to bondage." That was the old covenant, that was the first covenant, that was the law—the law of Moses, and he says that this covenant answereth or correspondeth to Jerusalem which now is in bondage with her children. "But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all." I shall not discuss that at length for I expect to call it up in



a future sermon. Only I will say this much: There are two covenants—one began at Sinai, was dedicated at Sinai. The other was dedicated at Jerusalem, it began at Jerusalem, was unfolded at Jerusalem, was administered at Jerusalem the first time in its history. "For it is written, Rejoice, *thou barren that bearest not: for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath an husband.*" This is a quotation from the prophet indicative of the fact that the barren Sarah, the mother of Isaac, was to become the mother of an innumerable company, not simply by the flesh but by the spirit (Isa. 54:1). Brethren we are as Isaac was, the children of promise; not the children of the law, not the children of the flesh, not the children of the old covenant, but the children of promise. What promise? "In thee and thy seed shall all families of the earth be blessed (Gen. 12:3)." Hear me: "But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him *that was born* after the Spirit, even so *it is* now." Here we come to a most interesting incident in the life of Abraham our father. Polygamy has always brought trouble in the family and in the nation and I think it always will. Abraham tried to hasten the fulfillment of the promise of God. His ideas were all right but his methods were wrong. He had two sons, one born after the flesh, the other after the promise or by the Spirit of God. Isaac grew, Ishmael grew, but there was jealousy there. There never has been and I do not think there ever will be, a house big enough to hold two families very long. Sarah knew she was the head of the house and she knew that by the promise of God Isaac was Abraham's heir, and the heir of God. Here comes the interesting point. I want to give it to you. I intimated to you that there was trouble in the family. When Isaac was weaned—I do not know how old he was but he was a lad of some years perhaps, Ishmael was older and he mocked Isaac. The heir after the flesh mocked the heir of promise. That was more than Sarah could stand or more than any other woman who has pluck could stand. She made up her mind that she would not endure it any longer and here is what she said to Abraham: "Wherefore she said unto Abraham, Cast out this bondwoman and her son: for the son of this bondwoman shall not be heir with my son, *even* with Isaac (Gen. 21:10)." What does this mean? It means that up that time Sarah and Hagar and Isaac and Ishmael had lived in this house on terms of perfect equality. It means that if things had gone on without friction, humanly speaking, Ishmael would have been an heir of Abraham's property along with Isaac. But Sarah said that Ishmael and Hagar should be cast out and Abraham did as she demanded, and they were cast out. That means



this, that he who was an illegitimate son was no longer a member of that family or an heir to the property of Abraham his father. Paul brings a beautiful lesson out of that for us, and I have gone into the particulars that I might make it forcible. But before I present it as Paul presents it I want to sum up just a little: Here were these brethren desiring to be under the law. He referred to the fact that Abraham had two sons, one born after the flesh, one born after the spirit or by promise; that these represented the two covenants, one from Sinai, the other from Jerusalem, one representing liberty, the other representing bondage; one persecuting the other, and step by step he comes down to this climax: "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 freewoman." What does that mean? Hear me: It means this—that just as Ishmael was cast out, just as Ishmael was disinherited, just as he was driven out of the family of Abraham and could no longer claim anything on the ground of his flesh, so the covenant of Sinai was cast out and the children of that covenant and the regulations and statutes of that covenant were cast out. "So then, brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free." The bondwoman was cast out, the illegitimate son was cast out, fleshly Israel was cast out, the first covenant was cast out, and—"So then, brethren, we"—Paul himself had been a member of that old covenant and many of these Galatians, perhaps a majority of them, had been members of that covenant at one time but he says: "So then, brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free." Not children of Sinai but children of Jerusalem; not children of the fiftieth day after the departure from Egypt but children of the new Pentecost. If I had been dividing the New Testament into chapters I certainly would not have cut off the chapter there. Paul is working to a climax. He always works to the end or to the conclusion of an argument that is irresistible. So in the first verse of the fifth chapter, having demonstrated that they were not under the law any more, having demonstrated that they were not children of the bondwoman but of the free, having demonstrated that they were like Isaac children of the promise, he says: "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 (Gal. 5:1-4)." Take

the argument, weigh it, weigh it as a juror on your oath with a fearful accountability of those who are to go out to preach the Gospel and I ask you to answer this question and answer it truly as God gives us light: If a man in apostolic times could not go back and undertake to keep the law without falling from grace how can a man keep the law now without falling from grace?

Jesus our Master said that the law would last until it was fulfilled; that you might try to shake heaven, that you might try to shake earth and possibly succeed, but you could not succeed in shaking the smallest point in the law of Moses, until it had finished its work. I will call your attention to Paul's words: He was a great lawyer, not only a great preacher and teacher and apostle, but the greatest lawyer of his day. A man who in the courts of justice, a man who as the expositor of the law of Moses might have made for himself a fortune in serving his day and generation, hear him: "For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth (Rom. 10:4)." Again, I call your attention to Paul's statement. After having done what he could to prove to these Galatians that they were not under the law he uses these words: "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. 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, who loved me, and gave himself for me. I do not frustrate the grace of God: for if righteousness *come* by the law, then Christ is dead in vain (Gal. 2:17-21)." Again: "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. For neither they themselves who are circumcised keep the law; but desire to have you circumcised, that they may glory in your flesh. 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 (Gal. 6:12-14)." I raise another question and I think that the arguments already adduced justify me in doing it for if anything is capable of demonstration, I have demonstrated that the law is abrogated that even the Jews, Hebrews, Israelites, unto whom it was originally given were in apostolic times under no obligations to keep it; that it had passed into eternal record and was then vanishing from the minds of men.

Then I may raise this question: When, where, under what cir-



cumstances, by whom, was the law abrogated or by whom was the law done away? Back to the text for a moment: Our Master said it would not be done away until all things in it should fill their course. Let us see if we can find when the law filled its place or finished its course. Jesus was hanging on the cross and here are the words of John concerning Him: "After this Jesus knowing that all things were now accomplished, that the scripture might be fulfilled, saith, I thirst (John 19:28)." Take the two together. Hear me: In His ministry He said that the law had to stand until all was fulfilled. On the cross knowing that all things were fulfilled according to His own desire, according to His own plan, according to His own purpose said: "I thirst." To say the very least of it that brings us down to the cross of the Lord and we have something definite before us, positive before us, unequivocal before us. I affirm that the law—meaning by the law the ten commandments, the statutes of Israel, the law pertaining to the priesthood and the tabernacle—every jot and every tittle and every phrase and every sentence of it was abrogated at the death of Messiah on the cross. That is clear enough I am sure. Where is the proof says one? The proof is bountiful, the proof is abundant, the proof is conclusive. Hear Paul again: "Know ye not brethren, (for I speak to them that know the law) how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth? For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to *her* husband so long as he liveth: but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of *her* husband. So then if, while *her* husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man. Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God (Rom. 7:1-4)." What does this mean? It means that the Jews were under the law, obligated to the law until Christ died upon the cross and that by that act, just as a woman is freed from her husband when he dies, they were freed from the law, and that by the act of emancipation consummated by His death on the cross they were liberated from it and therefore in a position to be married unto Him that was raised from the dead. That ought to be conclusive, that ought to be enough. It is conclusive—it is enough. But I promised to make this investigation thorough, exhaustive, irresistible, so I will give you another proof. Our definitions will come in well now: On the one side Hebrews, on the other Gentile; one the one side Israelite, on



the other side stranger; on the one side chosen, on the other side barbarian; on the one side children of God or circumcision, on the other side dogs. Allow me now to introduce a fitting climax to that definition or to that contrast—the words of Paul: “For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition *between us*; Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, *even* the law of commandments *contained* in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace (Eph. 2:14,15).” The middle wall of separation was in the flesh and blood of Abraham, in the covenant, in the law, in the tabernacle, in the priesthood, in the ministration. God set it up. It fenced the Israelites in and it left the Gentiles out, and that wall of separation on the one side of which was one little family, on the other side of which was every family, on the one side of which was a tribe, on the other side of which was every tribe but one—I repeat and assert with ascending emphasis, that the middle wall of separation existed and subsisted until Jesus died on the cross! Says one, “How do you know that?” I know it because Paul says He abolished in the flesh, the enmity, even the law of commandments. But I hear you say: “He could have done that without dying—it was in His flesh and He had flesh when He was born.” We will take the next verse and see what it says: “That he might reconcile both in one body by the cross having slain the enmity thereby.” How nicely, how beautifully, how fully, and how effectively this corresponds to Paul’s statement that the Jews or Hebrews were divorced from the law by the death of Christ on the cross. Again, and here we have a stronger argument I think still. Speaking of the Master dying on the cross, to his own brethren in Christ Paul says, and I want you to mark every word of this, for there is much in it for you: “Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross; *And*, having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it. Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath *days*: Which are a shadow of things to come; but the body *is* of Christ (Col. 2:14-17).” What? He nailed to the cross with His body the ordinances of the law. What were the ordinances? Oh, you say, the ceremonies. Not by any means. Ordinances are things ordained, laws, precepts, statutes—you cannot restrict the definition, all or none! I affirm here brethren that you cannot divide it and say part was nailed to the cross and part was left out. “The handwriting of ordinances,” what does that mean? It means all that God wrote



and all that Moses wrote. Listen: "The handwriting of ordinances"—God wrote with His own finger, and Moses wrote with his own hand. What did God write? He wrote the ten commandments. What did Moses write? He wrote all the laws of Israel. What did Jesus nail to the cross? All the ordinances; all that God wrote, all that Moses wrote; therefore all there was in the law from the beginning to the end. Nothing left out, nothing omitted, nothing compromised. Just a little further on there are some peculiar statements. These things were nailed to the cross, abrogated in the body of the Lord. Just as He was crucified they were crucified and in His dying there upon the cross that institution died—passed away. Paul says that under the circumstances, these things having been nailed to the cross, he did not want his brethren at Colosse to allow any man to judge them in meat or drink. Says one, "I do not see anything in that." If you do not it means one of two things, either that your eyes need to be anointed and opened, or that you have not been looking with the eyes you have. Let us put that along with a statement in the Hebrew letter and see what you will find. Speaking of the law: "*Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation (Heb. 9:10).*" The time is passed when a man can be judged in meats or drinks or in respect to a holy day or of the coming of the moon again or of the sabbath day. I want you to nail that down and clinch it! No longer are men to be judged by the law with respect to its ordinances or with respect to anything else in it, and here we have it plainly implied that what was nailed to the cross was both the commandments and what people popularly term the "ritualistic law." Says one, "I do not see that." Look again, and perhaps you shall. Let no man judge you with reference to meats and drinks. That would undoubtedly be classed as ceremonial law. That was nailed to the cross. Says one, "I will admit that but I am not going to admit that anything else was nailed to the cross." Hear me again: Let no man judge you in reference to the sabbath day. What was the commandment? To remember the sabbath day to keep it holy! It was nailed to the cross. If you cannot see that may God have mercy on you! If you cannot see that may God deliver you from prejudice! Again, and here I want to give you a favorite thought. What was the significance of the nailing of the law to the cross? It was this: For hundreds of years, say in round numbers twenty centuries, Abraham and his children had been the favorites of God. He had been dealing with them, committing His oracles unto them, revealing Himself to them, pouring out His blessings on them, opening



the very windows of heaven to them, but when Jesus Christ was nailed to the cross and when the middle wall of separation came down in His death every relationship that had existed before that time was dissolved and every nation, kindred, tribe, and tongue stood on an equal footing before God. Says one, "I would like to see a little proof for that." Well you understand that I never say a thing unless I can prove it, and here is the proof: "Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God (Rom. 3:19)." Our Lord and Master abrogated the old institution, took it out of the way, nailed it to the cross, and the Jews were no longer God's chosen people on account of the law, and the ministration ended and the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom and the light poured into the holy of holies from which the light had been excluded from generation to generation. What then? Hear the apostle in the grandest climax in all the history of man. After laying down one argument after another showing that the law is ended, he rises to the sublimest sublimity in these words: "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male or female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus (Gal. 3:28)." Are you convinced, are you satisfied? Says one: "I am satisfied but if there is any more on the subject let us have it." The only difficulty in the matter brethren is, that I do not know where to quit, I do not know where to end; there is no end. The New Testament is full of it. A large part of the Epistles were written to get people out of the erroneous ideas that I have been combating here today. Here is a strong argument showing that Jesus abrogated the old institution when He died. I will give it to you in the exact words of Paul: "For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; How much more shall the blood of Christ who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God? And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions *that were* under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance. For where a testament *is*, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. For a testament *is* of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth (Heb. 9:3-17)." Let us briefly view these statements. The blood of animals at best could only effect temporary relief or temporary salvation, or a



temporary rolling back of sins—back for one year. If by the blood of goats and calves that much could be done surely the blood of the Son of God who offered Himself having no spot upon Him could purge even the conscience and enable men henceforward to serve the living God. Not only this, but Jesus by the act of His death and by entering in upon His Father's presence became the Mediator not only of the new covenant but in a sense of the old because by the act of His death He redeemed those who had done the best they could under the first testament that they might, with us, enter upon an eternal inheritance. A testament, or a covenant, cannot be enforced during the life of him who makes it. This is apparent in the dedication of the law. Moses did not attempt to administer the law until the animals had been sacrificed and until the blood had been spilt and until the blood had been applied according to the requirements of Jehovah. While Jesus was here He was unfolding His covenant or testament but that covenant or that testament could not be opened, could not be enforced, could not be unfolded fully, until He ratified it by His death. Again, speaking of the Gospel and contrasting it with the law of Moses, Paul brings us to this: "And to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel (Heb. 12:24)." We have not come to Sinai, we have not come to the blood of goats and calves, we have not come even to the life of the Lord on earth, but we have come to the cross, we have come to the death of the testator, we have come to the shedding of the blood, we have come to the ratification of the covenant by that act and in this act of dedicating a new institution I find an irresistible argument for the abolishment of the old. I proved to you last night that there are or were two covenants and it stands to reason that both covenants could not be enforced at the same time. The covenant of Jesus or the new covenant, or the new testament, could not be enforced until the old was taken out of the way. The old was not taken out of the way until Jesus nailed it to the cross. It was not nailed to the cross until He was nailed to the cross, and when He was nailed to the cross and shed His blood He died for the remission of transgressions that were made under that covenant, and forever took it out of the way.

Another argument tending to prove, I think, beyond a doubt, the abolishment of the first institution, with all that pertained to it, I base upon the fact that the law of Moses, using the phrase in its most comprehensive sense, was never absolutely necessary to salvation. You may count that a radical proposition but I think that it is abundantly borne out in the word of God. Statements



without proof, however, will not convince any one, therefore I turn to the proof. It is a fact that Abraham believed whatever God said to him even when the way was dark, even when he could not reason out how it was possible for God to give him an heir in his old age, he staggered not at the promise of God by unbelief but he believed in the Lord and He counted it to him for righteousness (Gen. 15:6). This is endorsed in the New Testament, quoted I may say. First: "For what saith the scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness (Rom. 4:3)." Second: "Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin. *Cometh* this blessedness then upon the circumcision *only*, or upon the uncircumcision also? for we say that faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness. How was it then reckoned? when he was in circumcision, or in uncircumcision? Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision. 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 (Rom. 4:8-11)." Mark you, he was justified by faith in God and that faith implied doing what God said, even before he had the mark of the covenant of which I have been so earnestly insisting that it is done away. Again: "For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, *was* not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith (Rom. 4:13)." Let us pause and study that a little. That Abraham would be the heir of the world no one hesitates to believe; that he was to be the father of a great family according to the flesh everybody admits, that all Jews of every age are his children according to the flesh; and that all Christians of every age are his children according to the Spirit, everybody believes. Hear the apostle, he says plainly and emphatically that this was not to Abraham through the law of Moses, not through the ten commandments, not through the statutes received by Moses, not by the tabernacle service, not by the smoking sacrifice upon the altar at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, but by faith in God, and by faith in His promised Son who has revealed Him to men—to us. Therefore all who believe in every age, in every land, can be the children of Abraham, for his real children, his best children are the children of the spirit—promise, faith! I drop a thought right here: "And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise (Gal. 3:29)." Lying back of the law, back of circumcision, Abraham believed, and God by that act on Abraham's part made him the heir of the world and so it



comes to pass in our time that every one who believes in Christ and obeys Him is a child of Abraham. Again, I want to make this very clear and I will give you further proof: "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? Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness. Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham? 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. So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham (Gal. 3:5-9)." I invite your special attention to the statement that the Scripture foresaw that God would justify the heathen by faith—that He would make all the Gentiles, all the foreigners, all the uncircumcision, all the dogs from the Jewish standpoint, heirs according to the promise—hence God preached antecedent to the Gospel. He did not preach the Gospel but prior to the Gospel, antecedent to the Gospel, before the Gospel, He preached unto Abraham telling him that in his seed all the families of the earth should be blessed. That is to say everyone who would choose or accept the blessing on the conditions laid down. If Abraham our father was justified without the works of the law, and if he became the father of all who believe without the works of the law, then it follows as light follows the sun—and I want to burn it into your very heart—that we, his children can be justified without the works of the law. Do you see that? Let me repeat and state it another way: Antecedent to the law Abraham believed God and obeyed God and was accepted of God as God's child, and he was made the father of the faithful and recognized as the friend of God. If Abraham could come to the Father without the law then it follows certainly beyond any doubt that the children of Abraham, or those who would become the children of Abraham, may also become his children or the children of God by faith and obedience without the works of the law. Stated in another way: Before the law was ever thought of Abraham was justified by faith and obedience. Eighteen hundred years after the law was nailed to the cross of Calvary, we may be justified by faith and obedience without a thought of the law. But let me put it in still another form: Abraham our father was justified, not by law, but by faith; therefore Abraham's children may be justified, not by law, but by faith. Let us have a little more proof on that: "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. 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 (Gal. 3:10-12)." Returning to that same proposition relative to Abraham and his justification even in uncircumcision, and our justification since the law in uncircumcision, and without obedience to the law, I want to make another argument or another statement that to my mind will clear it up very much. There were men who were justified by faith during the administration of the law who were not under the law, just as Abraham—by doing the will of God apart from His will expressed in the law—was justified, and just as we are justified. I want to get that clearly before you. Abraham was justified before the law—four hundred years before the law! My contention is that men are justified since the law without obedience to it, and as a further proof that a man can be justified now without obeying the law I give you the proof that men were justified without being under the law or without obeying the law even when it was in force: "For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: Which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and *their* thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another (Rom. 2:14,15)." This refers to the Gentile world while the law was in force in Israel. Men who were honest, men who were true, men who tried to do right, and, who though never having heard the law found out what was right by their experiences and did it, Paul says they were justified. What then? If Abraham our father was justified in uncircumcision, without obedience to the law, if the honest Gentile who served God and did the things that were contained in the law without having the law, were justified, then it follows irresistibly that you may be justified, that I may be justified under the Gospel without circumcision, without the law, with the tabernacle, without the Levitical priesthood.

What is the condition of matters now? If the law is done away and I think I have proven it over and over, what about the righteousness of God? How is it manifested now? Let the apostle answer: "But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets (Rom. 3:21)." "Without the law" means independent of the law, apart from the law, separate from the law, unto this age, in this time under Christ, God's righteousness is manifested, exhibited and made effectual without the law of Moses. Again hear Paul: "For



the law maketh men high priests which have infirmity; but the word of the oath, which was since the law, *maketh* the Son, who is consecrated for evermore (Heb. 7:28)."

Let us set up a few points or a few light-houses along the line of our investigation. First, Jesus declared that you could move heaven and earth easier than you could move one jot or tittle of the law until all would be fulfilled. On the cross He said that all things concerning Him were fulfilled. Paul declares that the word of the oath after the law, since the law, subsequent to the law, made the Son of God a priest forever more. He did not say under the law, he did not say at the abolishment of the law, but he said "since the law." Then from Paul's standpoint, looking back, there was a time when the law ended and there was a time when grace began and there was a time when the new Priest entered on the tabernacle not made with hands, eternal, and in the heavens. Finally I call your attention to this fact that the Gospel is the dispensation of favor. We are no longer under the law of Moses, no longer under the ministration of death. Indeed we as Gentiles were never under the law, but I will say that Israel is no longer under the law. Proof: "For the law was given by Moses, *but* grace and truth came by Jesus Christ (John 1:17)." If law and grace are identical, if the law is as good as grace, if grace is as good as the law, what follows? It follows, it seems to me, that we have an unnecessary book and that we might easily dispense with the New Testament and go back to the law. Again, these are Paul's words: "For sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under grace (Rom. 6:14)." Not under the law any more. The law is fulfilled, nailed to the cross, abolished, done away, and we are not under the law anymore—men are not under the law of Moses any more; they are under the grace of God, God's favor to the children of men. Again: "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; *it is* the gift of God: Not of works, lest any man should boast (Eph. 2:8,9)." Mark that! He says that men are justified by the favor or by the grace of God and not by works. Says one, "Do you mean to say that all obedience is excluded?" Oh, no! He is only arguing what he has argued all the time, and what I have argued all the time, that men are justified by faith without obedience to the law, without the works of the law. Let us have some proof on that point: "Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay; but by the law of faith. Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law. *Is he* not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also: Seeing *it is* one God which



shall justify the circumcision by faith, and uncircumcision through faith? Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law (Rom. 3:27-31)." How do we establish the law? We establish—not perpetuate—the law in its place in God's economy that He designed to put it in and we are not justified by the works of the law. You cannot go back and make out a list of the many animals you have used for sacrifice or presented at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation—that is works—and say: "Lord I have done that and I want to be saved." You cannot enumerate the long years that you have gone up to the Feast of the Passover and the Feast of Weeks and the Feast of Tabernacles and other feasts and say, "Lord I have done that and I want to be justified." You cannot go to your long genealogical table and trace your pedigree back to Abraham and say, "Lord I want to be justified on that." The Gospel excludes that kind of works. But not the good works, not the works of faith, but the works of the law, and we are not justified by the law or by the works of the law, and we cannot be. That is certain. Again: "For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men. Teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world (Titus 2:11,12)." Again: "For we ourselves also were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful, *and* hating one another. But after that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward men appeared. Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Spirit; Which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour; That being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life (Titus 3:3-7)." Saved, not by works, but saved by grace, saved by the mercy of God, saved on the conditions laid down by Jesus and His apostles, but not saved by the works of the law. Not only this, but he tells us that when a man goes back and by working under the law tries to find justification that he falls from the grace of God. I will give you proof of that: "Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law: ye are fallen from grace (Gal. 5:4)." I think now brethren that I may modestly claim that if anything is capable of demonstration that I have demonstrated that the old institution is done away; that it has forever finished its work and filled its place, and I may appropriately, as the cap-stone of this argument, give you the words of the apostle in his letter to the Corinthian



brethren concerning himself and the other preachers: "Who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit; for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life (II Cor. 3:6)."

I would not discredit Moses for he was faithful in his day and faithful in his generation. No other mortal man was ever honored in life and death as he was honored, for on the height of Pisgah he viewed the land that God promised to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. He died and He who made and governs the world buried and left him there and I say, "Noble man of God, noble toiler, self-sacrificing, self-forgetting, servant of God, rest! Thy labor is done, thy laurels are won. I will not detract from thy glory." But he to whom I pay tribute said that the day would come when God would raise up one whom men should revere in all things (Deut. 18:15,18). He has come and the angels from the mighty hosts of heaven came down to earth to sing the sweetest of lullabys in the records of time over the cradle in the manger of Bethlehem. He lived and walked and taught among men and finally the shadows of death settled down upon His pathway. He was our pilot toward the promised land; He who forgot Himself and unselfishly labored for others came down to the lowest depths that men might live. He died for them. The weight of the world's woe broke His tender heart; the sun went out in darkness and the very earth that He made by His own Omnipotent power reeled like a drunken man or like a stormtossed ship. But He came up again and He has gone to be with God; He has entered heaven by His own blood. Sleep on Moses! Reign on Messiah! On thy brow, O Moses, I press the chaplet thou didst so well and honestly win. Reign on Messiah! I press on Thy noble brow the combined diadems, the combined crowns of all the kings, of all the emperors, and of all the rulers of earth! Reign on Messiah until all the hearts of earth and heaven shall be attuned to Thy praise! Reign on Messiah until all the kingdoms of this world shall be swallowed up in Thy kingdom! Reign on Messiah until every knee shall bow and every tongue confess! Reign on Messiah until earth rises to Thee and heaven comes down to us and in Thy glory we shall behold Thy face and join with all the sanctified in every age in singing the song of Him who slept near Pisgah's height and to the Lamb that was slain! Reign on Messiah until there shall not be any rebellion, any sin, any sorrow, any graves, any funerals in all Thy vast domain, when the kingdom shall be Thine and the glory shall be Thine, and when the New Jerusalem shall come down and we shall see Thy face and go out no more. Amen.

Monday, February 20, 1899; 7:30 p. m.

SERMON NO. VIII.—THE NEW COVENANT (PART I).

*Text: "Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, Make you perfect in every good work to do his will, working in you that which is wellpleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom BE glory for ever and ever. Amen (Heb. 13:20-21)."*

I think I may say that we are now prepared for the discussion of the new covenant. I have read these introductory passages because I think they are the most appropriate ones on the subject. They emphasize particularly the thought of the blood of the everlasting covenant. What blood was that? Whose blood was it? When was that blood shed? Certainly it is not the blood that was shed when the mark of circumcision was placed upon Abraham and his children. What covenant is meant? Certainly it is not the covenant dedicated by the blood of goats and calves at mount Sinai. Certainly it is not the covenant that was broken so many times by Israel in the days of Moses and Joshua and Samuel and David and Isaiah and Jeremiah and the other prophets. I think that we may get a better understanding of these passages by reflecting a little on some of the passages discussed already. But in order that I may impress on you the thought that the blood of the everlasting covenant is the blood of Jesus I submit His own words. Matthew testifies as follows: "For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins (Matt. 26:28)." Again, I call your attention to the testimony of Paul: He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses: Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace (Heb. 10:28,29)?" Again, the testimony of the same writer: "And to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than *that of Abel*. See that ye refuse not him that speaketh: for if they escaped not who refused him that spake on earth, much more *shall not we escape*, if we turn away from him that *speaketh from*



heaven (Heb. 12:24,25)." I call your attention to this fact: We are under a new covenant or testament—the blood of that covenant or testament is the blood of Jesus, that blood was shed on Calvary and the covenant wherewith it was dedicated is the everlasting covenant or the everlasting testament.

I shall have to trust to your memories largely to establish the connection between the argument now and the argument in the past, but I shall present two of the most important passages that have been discussed already by way of refreshing your minds: "In that he saith, A new *covenant*, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old *is* ready to vanish away (Heb. 8:13)." Again: "Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once *for all* (Heb. 10:9,10)." I pause here long enough to re-emphasize two thoughts: The old covenant is taken away, the new covenant is established. In the second verse that I quote he uses another word, the word "will." He might as well have said covenant or testament but he said "will," declaring that we are sanctified by that will by the offering of the body of Jesus once for all. I think I could abundantly establish my proposition by the Scriptures of the New Testament but I want to show you that even the prophets of God under the first covenant or first testament looked forward to the establishment of the second testament or the new testament. I read from Jeremiah. His testimony came hundreds of years after the inauguration of the covenant at Sinai. It is therefore valuable not only as showing that the new covenant was to be established but in his estimation it was to take the place of the old: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day *that* I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord: But this *shall be* the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel. After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for they shall know me from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more (Jer. 31:31-34)." Let us analyze this prophecy. It was uttered fully six hundred years before the birth of Christ

and therefore nine hundred years after the inauguration of the covenant at Sinai. Understand me: This prophet was a competent witness. He was a member of the first covenant by virtue of birth, of blood, of life, of choice and I want to carefully study what he has to say. First, he declared that the day would come when God would make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah; second, that it would not be like the covenant that He made with them when He took them by the hand and brought them out of Egypt; third, that the covenant that He would make with them after those days would be that His law should be put in their inward parts—hearts; fourth, that He would be their God and they should be His people; fifth, that they should no more exhort one another to know the Lord because all of them should know Him; and sixth, He would be merciful unto their unrighteousness and remember their sins no more. This prophet who understood fully the law of Moses, or the covenant at Sinai, was doubtless impressed with the differences. Back at Sinai the law was written on tables of stone, but looking forward to the time of Jesus he said that the new covenant should be written on the hearts or the inner parts of men. A vast difference, if you please. Cold and pulseless stone; living hearts, living minds! Stone engraven by the finger of God; hearts made warm and tender under the influences of His love! But I desire to pursue the idea of the prophet and therefore I turn to the New Testament Scriptures: "Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think any thing as of ourselves; but our sufficiency *is* of God; Who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life (II Cor. 3:5,6)." Who said this? Paul. Who was he talking about? Jesus and His apostles. What was he talking about? The new covenant and its ministers. Jeremiah had said that God would make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah. Paul says here that he and his associates were ministers of a covenant. Yes of the new covenant, not of the letter, that is the law, but of the spirit which giveth life. How delightful it would be if we could call Paul back to earth and have him testify further on the subject. How I should like to sit down at his feet and take my Bible and read to him Jeremiah's prophecy and ask him to tell us just what it means! But hold, that is not necessary. He told us that and he left it on record that we might find out for ourselves. I will turn to the record and read: "But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better



promises. For if that first *covenant* had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second. For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah: Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord. For this *is* the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord! I will put my laws into their minds, and write them in their hearts; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people: And they shall not teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more (Heb. 8:6-12)." There are the words of Jeremiah quoted by Paul. Notice how he introduces them and how he closes them. In his introduction he says of Jesus that He had obtained a more excellent ministry, that is a more excellent ministry than that which existed under the old covenant, and that He is the Mediator of a better covenant or testament and that this better covenant or testament is established upon better promises; that is, better promises than the promises of the old covenant. He quotes the words of the prophet approvingly, declaring that God had found fault with them and that he no longer regarded Himself under obligation to them and finally reaches the climax in the oft-repeated words: "In that he saith, A new *covenant* he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away (Heb. 8:13)." Again: "Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once *for all*. And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins: But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God; From henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool. For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified. *Whereof* the Holy Spirit also is a witness to us: for after that he had said before, This *is* the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them; And their sins and iniquities will I remember no more. Now where remission of these *is*, *there is* no more offering



for sin. Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, By a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh; And *having* a high priest over the house of God; Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water. Let us hold fast the profession of *our* faith without wavering; for he *is* faithful that promised (Heb. 10:9-23)." Here is a perfect mine, not of precious stones, but of precious truths. Let us dig some of them out. First, Jesus came to do the will of God—He removed the old and established the new. Second, by His will, or testament, or covenant, we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus. Third, the priests and sacrifices of the old covenant can never take away sins—behold the contrast: the old "can never take away" sins; the new way sanctifies by one offering. Fourth, He who gave Himself is now at God's right hand and bringing His foes into subjection to His authority. Fifth, He is perfecting and sanctifying forever. Sixth, the Holy Spirit is witness of these things. Seventh, again the apostle quotes and confirms the prophecy of Jeremiah relative to the new covenant, its laws and the permanent removal—forgiveness of sins. Eighth, no other offering is now needed for sin, in order to the forgiveness of sins. Ninth, we have the privilege to enter into the real Holy of Holies with boldness by the blood of Jesus. Tenth, the way into the presence of God is a new way, not an old way, or a way part old and part new. Eleventh, we have a high priest over the house of God—in the presence of God. Twelfth, we may have our hearts sprinkled—delivered—from the consciousness of sin, and our bodies washed with pure water. Thirteenth, we can hold fast our profession without wavering under our faithful High Priest. Here are thirteen startling, searching, revolutionary truths, not one of which was true or could be true under Moses—under the first covenant! See: Under the first, many priests, many offerings, no real remission of sins, no good conscience! See: Under the second, one Priest, one Offering, sin forever blotted out, good conscience, all by the new way! Question: Where is the man who in view of these things, would desire to re-establish the old covenant or go back and live under its provision even if it were possible? Where is the man who would prefer the law to the Gospel? Where is the man who would prefer Aaron to Christ? Where is the man who would prefer the sacrifice of bulls and calves and goats, to the sacrifice of Jesus one for all? Where is the man who would prefer annual remission of sins to permanent



remission of sins? Where is the man who would prefer the tabernacle made by hands on earth to the tabernacle made without hands, eternal and in the heavens? Where is the man who would prefer to be represented before the mercy seat on the tenth day of the seventh month once a year, to having a high priest in the presence of God day and night, perpetually?

Now certainly these things do not and cannot mean that Christ has resuscitated or reconstructed the old—the first—or that He has grafted His way on to the old way; but that He hath by His own life, by His own death, by His own blood, by His own resurrection, by His own ascension to God, consecrated for us a new way, a living way, and in view of this we are invited to draw nigh and partake of His principles and provisions with true and honest hearts.

In view of these Scriptures I raise this question: Is the new covenant a continuation of the old? Or is the new covenant an amplification of the old? Or is the new covenant a separate, a distinct institution? As a matter of fact I have proven to you repeatedly and overwhelmingly that there are two covenants or testaments. Indeed it does not take any proof but your own eyes. Here is your Bible. On the title page of the first part of it you know how it reads: "Holy Bible." What does it embrace? The merest tyro in knowledge of the word of God would answer, the scriptures of the Old and the New Testaments. Turn to the title page of the New. Understand me, now, that these title pages were not put here by Divine authority but by somebody who did not know what he was doing, and yet the fact of the two covenants is made apparent. Here we read: "The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." It would be all right to say the testament of our Lord Jesus Christ or simply the New Testament, but to say the New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ would imply that the Old Testament came by Him but it did not come that way. The Old Testament came by Moses not by Christ. So there are two testaments—there is no doubt about that. You may not know anything about the contents of them but they are there. You are bound to concede it, you are bound to admit it, you are bound to confess it, and you are bound to act upon it. What then? Either ye have two rival testaments, rival law-givers, rival ways, or one is the continuation of the other, or the first is entirely superseded by the second. But there are two and therefore they cannot be identical. Argument after argument has been adduced to show that the covenants are identical, that the testaments are identical. Any man who can look and read knows that this is not



so. They are not identical. Two things cannot be identical in this world. Two things may be similar. They may be very much alike. There is a man in this world who looks so much like me that often people used to walk up to him on the streets and shake hands with him and call him "Brother Johnson" and my own friends used to meet me and call me by his own name. We are similar, in the estimation of our friends, but we are not identical. Suppose I admit for argument's sake that the testaments are somewhat similar, does that prove that they are one? Suppose I prove that one man is very much like another man, does that prove they are one man? Not by any means. I hold out before you two hands. They look very much alike. They are similar, they are not identical. They cannot be. They are two and you cannot make anything else but two out of them. Admitting that there are testaments and that they are identical, for argument's sake, then the weight of authority and the weight of modern ideas would be in favor of the new testament and we would discard the old testament. Admitting that both the old testament and the new came from God the very idea that one is the Old Testament and the other the New Testament would lead me to say that if I have to take one without the other, I will take the newest! Who would not? We are always anxious for the latest news, for the latest cablegram, for the latest telegram, for the latest information, and on that ground I say if the testaments are identical—but they are not—it stands to reason that we should take the second, that we should take the last, take the new. The first testament, the second testament, the old testament, the new testament; the first covenant, the second covenant, the old covenant, the new covenant, the everlasting covenant, the everlasting testament—anybody ought to be able to see the difference! Paul in the Galatian letter says that there are two covenants and instead of trying to argue that they are identical he undertakes to show that they are not and that one is not the continuation of the other, and that the new testament is the testament under which we must live and must find salvation if we find it at all. He proves that by introducing to us Abraham and Sarah and Isaac on the one side and Abraham and Hagar and Ishmael on the other. If Hagar and Sarah were identical the covenants are identical. Why, according to my knowledge of the Scriptures, along about the time Ishmael was cast out they lacked a great deal of being identical. They were not even harmonious! If it can be proven that Ishmael and Isaac were identical then it can be proven that the covenants are identical, but from my knowledge of the word about the time Ishmael was cast out, they were far from identical or even from harmony.



If it can be proven that the flesh on which the old covenant is based is in harmony with the Lord Jesus Christ, the spirit on which the new covenant is based, then I will admit that the two covenants are one. Hear the words of Paul: "He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second (Heb. 10:9)." Jeremiah said, and Paul endorses it, that the new covenant would be unlike the old. The law under the old covenant was written on stone; under the new covenant on the hearts of men. Under the old covenant there was a remembrance of sin once every year, under the new covenant God declares that He will remember our sins and our iniquities no more.

On this question of the identity of the two covenants I desire to call your attention to a startling fact. Many of the Jews who were converted to Christ had an idea that the new covenant was a continuation of the old. John the Baptist met just such an idea as that when he started his work. They gathered about him, and on the ground that they were Abraham's children, desired to be baptized and doubtless many of you remember what he said but I will turn and read it. They gathered about him desiring that they might claim the privilege of what he was doing by reason of the fact that they were Abraham's children; said he unto them: "And think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to *our* father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham (Matt. 3:9)." Nicodemus had the very same idea when he came to Jesus by night. He could not rise above the idea of flesh, Abraham's flesh, Isaac's flesh, Jacob's flesh, pedigree, lineage, genealogy—and the covenant based on these things. When the Master told him that he must be born again, the best that he could get out of it was that he could not enter his mother's womb and be born the second time. How utterly material were the ideas begotten by the old covenant! He was a member of the old covenant, had been born in it, had been circumcised when eight days old and therefore he thought to claim the privileges and precepts and blessings of the reign of the Lord by declaring that he was of Abraham's seed. This claim was all right so far as the old covenant was concerned. But the Lord swept it all from him and said unto him, touching the new covenant—His kingdom: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God. Nicodemus saith unto him, How can a man be born when he is old? can he enter the second time into his mother's womb, and be born? Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is



born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again (John 3:3-7)." The greatest controversy in apostolic times was on this very point. On one side were arrayed Stephen, Paul, Peter, James and the church at Jerusalem; on the other many Judaizing teachers who desired to bring the law of Moses into the church of Christ.

The identity of the covenants is argued from the standpoint that there is one God and one object in each covenant. I admit that, but it does not argue anything against my contention for the simple reason that God's object was served under the imperfections of the old covenant, and in the fulness of time He sent forth His Son made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that they might be adopted into a new family.

Again: in order to establish the claim that the covenants are identical, that is to say that the New Testament is a continuation of the Old Testament, that the Gospel is a continuation of the Law it is asserted that baptism comes in the room of circumcision, that circumcision is therefore taken away and that baptism taking its place in the new covenant the old covenant is perpetuated and therefore there is only one covenant and that the blood of Jesus is the blood of that everlasting covenant. But I do not think that the argument will stand the test of revelation and reason. Let us for a moment put it to the test. I will just admit for argument's sake that there are two covenants, that they are identical, and that in order that the new might continue the old, that circumcision was taken out and baptism put in, and I will submit the thing to the word of God and see if it will stand. First, circumcision was a mark in the flesh. Proof: "And Abraham took Ishmael his son, and all that were born in his house, and all that were bought with his money, every male among the men of Abraham's house; and circumcised the flesh of their foreskin in the selfsame day, as God had said unto him. And Abraham *was* ninety years old and nine, when he was circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin. And Ishmael his son *was* thirteen years old, when he was circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin (Gen. 17:23-25)." Baptism is not a mark of the flesh. Therefore baptism did not come in the room of circumcision; therefore the new covenant is not identical with the old; therefore the new covenant stands out by itself and is not engrafted on to the old. Second, circumcision was a proof of membership in the covenant: "This *is* my covenant, which ye shall keep, between me and you and thy seed after thee; Every man child among you shall be circumcised.



And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you. And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man child in your generations, he that is born in the house, or bought with money of any stranger, which is not of thy seed (Gen. 17:10-12)." Baptism is not an evidence that any man is a member of the church. While I would not say that he can be a member without it, I can say that there are thousands who have been baptized that are not fit to belong to the church. Therefore baptism did not come in the room of circumcision; therefore the new covenant is not identical with the old covenant; therefore the new covenant stands out by itself and is not engrafted on the old. Third, the law of circumcision affected only the male population. "Every man child among you shall be circumcised (Gen. 17:10)." Baptism does not come in the room of circumcision in that particular because the command was to baptize all believers, and I will give it to you in the exact words of our Lord Himself: "And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned (Mark 16:15,16)." Therefore baptism did not come in the room of circumcision; therefore the new covenant is not identical with the old; therefore the new covenant stands out by itself and is not engrafted on the old. Fourth, circumcision was administered when the child was eight days old. Proof: "And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man child in your generations, he that is born in the house, or bought with money of any stranger, which is not of thy seed (Gen. 17:12)." There is no time stated in the New Testament when a man shall be baptized. It is not a question of days, it is not a question of years; it is a question of faith in Christ. Said our Lord and Master: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned (Mark 16:15,16)." Therefore baptism did not come in the room of circumcision; therefore the new covenant is not identical with the old; therefore the new covenant stands out by itself and is not engrafted on the old. Fifth, the uncircumcised child was cast out of the covenant. Proof: "And the uncircumcised man child whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken my covenant (Gen. 17:14)." Who among the advocates of the identity of the covenants will dare believe or go so far as to affirm that of the unbaptized child? Not one. They may stoutly insist on the identity of the covenants, that the child ought to be baptized, but not one of them has ever



gone to the point of saying that the unbaptized infant is lost. They would not dare do it. Therefore baptism did not come in the room of circumcision; therefore the new covenant is not identical with the old; therefore the new covenant stands out by itself and is not engrafted on the old. Sixth, those who were circumcised were debtors to do the whole law of Moses. Let me give you the proof: "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 (Gal. 5:2,3)." Will the advocates of the identity of the covenants, the advocates of the theory that baptism comes in the room of circumcision affirm that those who are baptized are in debt to do the entire law of Moses? No sir, not one of them will so affirm. Therefore baptism did not come in the room of circumcision; therefore the new covenant is not identical with the old; therefore the new covenant stands out by itself and is not engrafted on the old. Circumcision was not even a type of baptism. It was a type of a circumcised heart and life. Proof: "For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither *is that* circumcision which is outward in the flesh; But he *is* a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision *is that* of the heart, in the spirit, *and* not in the letter; whose praise *is* not of men, but of God (Rom. 2:28,29)." Again: "And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power: In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ: Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with *him* through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead. And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses (Col. 2:10-13)." Therefore baptism does not come in the room of circumcision; therefore the new covenant is not identical with the old; therefore the new covenant stands out by itself and is not engrafted on the old; and therefore I conclude, by the very logic of the facts as they appear before us, that the argument is without foundation either in reason or revelation and that it is not endorsed by the wisdom of those who has read deepest into the word of God.

I hear somebody say: "Your argument seems forcible enough, your proof seems strong enough; but it occurs to me that if God made a covenant with Israel and Israel broke it and God made another covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah that He trifled with men. Not by any means. In making that covenant and discarding it he proceeded on the line on which



He proceeds in all of His works and on the very line that you proceed upon in all of yours. Old things are constantly passing away. The vegetation of last year is mouldering back to dust, the flowers that exhaled their delightful fragrance have long since gone forever and the songs of birds that awoke the echoes of last spring are heard no more and it is a physiological fact that every seven years, probably in less time than that, a man discards the body in which he lives and Nature blesses him with another and so God our Father discarded the old institution, found fault with it, found fault with Israel, found fault with the men who had broken it, and declared that He would make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah. I wish to call your attention further to the idea of discarding the old and accepting the new. Progressive development in the kingdom of God! The gradual unfolding of the law of love, of the purpose, of the power and of the glory of God! Hear the words of the Master Himself: "And he said, So is the kingdom of God, as if a man should cast seed into the ground; And should sleep, and rise night and day, and the seed should spring and grow up, he knoweth not how. For the earth bringeth forth fruit of herself; first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear. But when the fruit is brought forth, immediately he putteth in the sickle, because the harvest is come (Mark 4:26-29)." We know that is so. First the germ, then the little shoot appears, then the stalk, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear. So it was in the development of God's purpose. First, the intimation, then the promise, then the covenant of circumcision, then the law, then the tabernacle, then the prophecies, then the Son of Man on earth, then the story of His death, burial and resurrection told to the children of men.

Again, I hear the objector say that if my conclusions are correct he would like very much to know why it was that Jesus and the apostles endorsed the law. I am quite sure I can answer that satisfactorily and very quickly, but I want to get the matter fully before you and therefore I turn and read to you from the Scriptures: "And, behold, one came and said unto him, Good Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life? And he said unto him, Why callest thou me good? *there* is none good but one, *that is*, God: but if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments. He saith unto him, Which? Jesus said, Thou shalt do no murder, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Honor thy father and *thy* mother: and, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself (Matt. 19:16-19)." I hear a man say if the law is done away, if the old



covenant is done away, if we are under Christ and not under Moses, if we are under the New Testament and not under the Old Testament, why did Jesus our Master tell this inquiring soul to keep the commandments? Paul did the same thing in a sense. Let us turn and see just what he said: "Owe no man anything, but to love one another: for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if *there be* any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbour: therefore love *is* the fulfilling of the law (Rom. 13:8-10)." This is apostolic testimony. Again: "If ye fulfill the royal law according to the Scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself, ye do well: But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors. For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one *point*, he is guilty of all. For he that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do no kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law (James 2:8-11)." Again: "Speak not evil one of another, brethren. He that speaketh evil of *his* brother, and judgeth his brother, speaketh evil of the law, and judgeth the law: but if thou judge the law, thou are not a doer of the law, but a judge. There is one law-giver, who is able to save and to destroy: who art thou that judgest another (James 4:11,12)?" I am sure you can see I have been fair. I have given the whole subject in the exact words of Scripture—Jesus endorsed the law, Paul endorsed the law, James endorsed the law. What then? Well, I hear you say that: "I do not see but one conclusion and that is that all that you have said on the subject is an abortion and that we are under the law and there is no way of getting out from under it." I am afraid you have only given these Scriptures a very superficial investigation. But suppose I admit that Jesus taught or appeared to teach that a man must keep the law, that Paul taught or appeared to teach that a man must keep the law, that James taught or appeared to teach that a man must keep the law, what then? Only this and nothing more; we ought in view of other Scriptures be careful about the conclusion toward which we push our investigations. I lay down a rule of interpretation for your benefit here and now: When a passage of Scripture is apparently susceptible to two or more interpretations give it that interpretation that will allow everything else plainly said on the subject to be true. Or in another manner, in taking a position in



reference to any passage of the word of God take a position that will not contradict anything else said on the subject. Or to put it in another form still: take a position that will harmonize with everything else that is said on the subject because there is no doubt of one thing, and that is, if the Bible is true it is harmonious from beginning to end. If it is a fact that our Lord meant to teach, that Paul meant to teach, that James meant to teach that the law is still in force and that all men in the Church are under the law, then it follows as certainly as night follows the day that there are some things in the New Testament that cannot be true. It cannot be true that there are two covenants. It cannot be true that the law was nailed to the cross, yet Paul says it was. Here are his own words: "Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out by the way, nailing it to his cross (Col. 2:14)." It cannot be true that the Roman Christians were not under the law, yet Paul so affirms: "For sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under grace (Rom. 6:14)." It cannot be true that the ministration of death written and engraven on stones is taken away: "But if the ministration of death, written *and* engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance: which *glory* was to be done away (II Cor. 3:7)." It cannot be true that the Lord took away the first that He might establish the second: "Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second (Heb. 10:9)." It is a positive fact that the first covenant is taken away. But have you not made a mistake about what Jesus and the apostles meant in making there statements concerning the law? Suppose I turn back to the Scripture and read all Jesus said and see if we do not find another conclusion warranted. Taking up the reading where I left off: "The young man said unto him, All these things I have kept from my youth up, what lack I yet? Jesus said unto him, If thou wilt be perfect, go *and* sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come *and* follow me. But when the young man heard that saying, he went away sorrowful: for he had great possessions (Matt. 19:20-22)." But listen to me: The Lord Jesus was born under the law. He lived under the law, He was obedient to the law, He enforced the law during His natural life, and the reason that He told this young man to keep the commandments was that the law was still in force at that time. He held out a perfect life to the young man but it was not in keeping the law, but in forsaking all and follow-



ing Him! How vast and far reaching the thoughts and issues involved in this command. After this Jesus went further than this. I will give you the exact words: "Then Jesus spake to the multitude, and to his disciples, saying, The scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, *that* observe and do; but do not ye after their works: for they say, and do not (Matt. 23:1-3)." Does this involve the matter in contradiction and absurdity? not by any means. What reason can be given for His teaching? I answer: The reason Jesus did this was that the law was in force all his natural life up to the very last moment of the agony on the cross. Therefore as an obedient Son of His Father, and as an obedient Son of Abraham He was bound to honor the law and to honor Moses and to honor the observance of the ordinances of Israel. This is absolutely and irresistibly conclusive. After He arose from the dead He gave other commandments. After He arose from the dead He told the apostles to go and make disciples and never once mentioned a single ordinance of Moses or of the Law (Matt. 28:16-20). But what about Paul and James? Let us see: Paul was arguing this one thing, that all there ever was in the law of Moses from the beginning to the end might be summed up in one point, and that was that a man should love his neighbour as himself. Love does not work ill to anybody; therefore if I love my neighbour I work him no ill; therefore the conclusion of Paul that the man who lives with love in his heart fulfills every obligation laid down by Moses because he will not and cannot do things that Moses said not to do, because he cannot do it with love in his heart. What about James? I will let him talk for himself. I think he makes it harder for the advocates of the law of Moses in the church of God than any one else who has argued on the subject. He puts it this way, that if a man violated one command of the law he was guilty of the whole and therefore it would be utterly impossible for him to be anything else than a sinner, the word law covering the whole ground. If a man should steal he had violated the law, if a man should kill he had violated the law, if a man should covet he had violated the law, if a man should do anything that the law prohibited he was a sinner. He also talks about the royal law. What is that? It is the same thing that Paul presents in the Roman letter, that a man shall love his neighbour as himself, and I will say this to you brethren without hesitation, that if love burns upon your heart, love of God and love of man, there is no necessity why you should be under any law because a man who loves will never harm, and the man who loves God will not intentionally



disobey Him. Nor is that all. James had in his mind another law. Hear him in the very same connection: "So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty (James 2: 12)." This is not the law of Moses. The law of Moses was the law of sin and death: "*There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death (Rom. 8:1,2).*" The ministration of death was written and engraven on stones. The law of Jesus is the law of liberty. Again, let James testify: "But whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth *therein*, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed (James 1:25)." Here is a remarkable fact, so remarkable that it never has had a parallel in the history of man: Perfect law and perfect liberty hand in hand! There is no law in this world or in the history of this world so far as I know that can be justly designated the law of liberty—the perfect law of liberty—save the Gospel of the Son of God. So we are not living by the law of Moses, we are not to be judged by the law of Moses, we are not living in obedience to Moses, we are not to be judged by Moses in the last great day!

Again, I hear a man say that if I am not under the law—the law of Moses—then I am not in any danger of sinning for sin is the transgression of the law: "Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law; for sin is the transgression of the law (1 Jno. 3:4)." Hear me: All unrighteousness is sin. We are under the law of liberty but we are exhorted by Paul not to use or abuse that liberty. Therefore a man may be a sinner under the reign of Jesus Christ, under the law of the spirit of life in Jesus Christ.

Let me sum up the ground as I have passed over it tonight: We are sanctified by the blood of Jesus, His blood dedicated the new covenant, the new covenant is based on the heart, on the mind of man. In the new covenant God remembers our sins against us no more. In the new covenant we are not to exhort one another saying, "Know the Lord," for all of God's children are to know Him from the least unto the greatest. And while we are not under the law of Moses we are under the law of liberty, under the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus. What does this mean? Hear me! Under the law of Moses a man was kept from sin by statute if kept from it at all; such a thing as liberty was not known, not recognized, not dreamed of. Under the Gospel, under Christ—with His law written in the heart, and in the conscience—we have

liberty! Sin is also the transgression of law, but it is more: "All unrighteousness is sin (I Jno. 1:17)." But it is more: "Abstain from all appearance of evil (I Thess. 5:22)." The Christ—His covenant works on the character, on the purposes, on the desires, on the source of actions. It takes away the desire to sin and puts in the place of it a determination not to sin. Before the law was given, certain things were just and honest and right—they were not made more so by the law, for it only defined things. Now that the law is abolished these things are still right, still honest, still just. The gospel plants the truth in the heart, and the life takes care of itself. Only the Son of God can make and keep us free—in Him only is life—in Him only is liberty. He is the way, the new way, the only way. He invites you to come, to come with all your heart, just as you are, to come today, this hour, now! May God help you to come in His own appointed way!



Tuesday, February 21, 1899; 7:30 p. m.

SERMON NO. IX.—THE NEW COVENANT (PART 2).

*Text: "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 (Gal. 3:8)."*

I have introduced this passage tonight as a suggestive introduction to what I shall say because I desire to bring out very clearly some things pertaining to God's purpose that have not been brought out heretofore. One might naturally conclude that Paul means here that the Gospel was really preached to Abraham. This is not a fact. Allow me to paraphrase this passage and thus bring out Paul's idea: "Previous to the age of the gospel, the scriptures foreseeing God would justify the heathen through faith, it was announced to Abraham that in his seed all nations of the earth should be blessed." I may say that not only was this before the Gospel; it was before the covenant of circumcision; before the covenant of Sinai. As an enlargement of the same thought I read from Paul again: "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 (Gal. 3:16)." It is a fact that God made a promise to Abraham and renewed it to Isaac and to Jacob and enlarged it to Israel for their benefit primarily. Moses declared that God made a covenant with them at Horeb-Sinai (Deut. 5:2). Jeremiah said that when he took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt he made a covenant with them (Jer. 31:31-34). I have proven to you that the old covenant was an exclusive covenant, indeed without the element of exclusiveness it would not and could not be a covenant. But according to this text God had in mind the salvation not only of the Jews but also the Gentiles even before the law was given—God's eternal purpose. There is such a thing developed in the Scriptures as God's purpose. Speaking of God's plans Paul uses these words: "To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God. According to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord (Eph. 3:10-11)." While God

made an exclusive covenant with Israel at mount Sinai. He did it not simply for their benefit but that He might educate them up to the point, that He might with them at last make a covenant, the benefits of which would extend to every kindred, tribe and tongue. I think it will be well for us to go back to the prophecy of Jeremiah again: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant"—not the continuation of the old covenant—"with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: Not according to the covenant"—mark you well the distinction—"that I made with their fathers, in the day *that* I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt;"—this was at Sinai at the giving of the ten commands—"which my covenant they brake,"—Who? Israel!—"although I was a husband unto them, saith the Lord: But this *shall be* the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write in their hearts;"—in the first covenant the law was engraved on stones—"and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother,"—many children by reason of birth were members of the covenant—"saying, Know the Lord: for they shall all know me,"—you cannot become a member of the covenant without knowledge—"from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord: for I will forgive"—no full forgiveness under the old covenant—"their iniquity, and I will remember"—under the old covenant there was a remembrance of sin every year, perpetually—"their sin no more (Jer. 31:31-34)." It is a curious and interesting fact that while the old covenant was so very exclusive as a matter of fact God was planning to make with that very family a covenant that should embrace everybody and extend to the end of time. The very promise to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob proves that. The text under consideration declares that God preached unto Abraham declaring that in him all families of the earth should be blessed. You raise the question I imagine, What advantage therefore had the Jews? Paul propounds and answers the same question. I will give it to you in his own words: "What advantage then hath the Jew? or what profit is *there* of circumcision? Much every way: chiefly, because that unto them were committed the oracles"—laws, or covenants and prophecies—"of God (Rom. 3: 1,2)." That is to say God's promises, God's laws, were committed unto them, and though they may not have fully understood God's plan, or purpose, or philanthropy, it was a fact that God intended that the time should come when His law, His mercy, His kindness,



should burst the bounds of that little tribe or nation and flow to every nation of the world. As a matter of fact the prophets of God are clear and specific on this point. I give you the exact words of the prophet: "And he said, It is a light thing that thou shouldst be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel: I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth (Isa. 49:6)." Again: "And the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising (Isa. 60:3)." Again: "For Zion's sake will I not hold my peace, and for Jerusalem's sake I will not rest, until the righteousness thereof go forth as brightness, and the salvation thereof as a lamp *that* burneth. And the Gentiles shall see thy righteousness, and all kings thy glory: and thou shalt be called by a new name, which the mouth of the Lord shall name (Isa. 62:1,2)." Again, turning to the New Testament we have the words of the great apostle of the Gentiles; referring to the gospel of our Lord he says: "For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek: for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him (Rom. 10:12)." Again: "But we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumblingblock, and unto the Greeks foolishness; But unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God (I Cor. 1:23,24)." Again, and this is far more explicit than any of the others: "Whereof I was made a minister, according to the gift of the grace of God given unto me by the effectual working of his power. Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ (Eph. 3:7,8)." Paul said that the day was planned even from the day of Abraham, for God seeing or foreordaining or pre-arranging that this should be done told Abraham that in his family all nations of the earth should be blessed. Mark you this! That the covenant made with Israel or with Judah and Israel according to the prediction of the prophet Jeremiah was to be as wide as the world. Jew and Gentile, Greek, Barbarian, including everybody and in every age until the end of time. The covenant is a very radical covenant. The first covenant was in a sense superficial, limited in its application, limited in its power. It was not heart searching, heart purifying, heart uplifting, but the new covenant was to be and is very radical in its effects and its style! Jeremiah in the quotation already given says that it was the design of God to write His law in the hearts of men. If a man's heart is engaged, if his faculties are involved, it is easy enough to get him to do right, but it is very difficult to get a man



to do right simply by holding a menace, a threat, a sword, over his head. The old contention that if a man's heart is right everything else will follow does not lack much of being true. For if a man's heart is right, in the right sense, it is easy to lead that man in the way of righteousness, in the way everlasting. I desire to be very specific and enlarge this idea until you shall be able to see it fully. I turn therefore to the New Testament calling the Master as my first witness as to the radical or the revolutionary power of the new covenant: "If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you (John 15:7,8)." How utterly unlike anything in the law of Moses that statement is. Here we have the assurance of the abiding presence and power of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Again: "Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof. Neither yield ye your members *as* instruments of unrighteousness unto sin: but yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and your members *as* instruments of righteousness unto God (Rom. 6:12,13)." Under the law a man might have all sorts of lustful desires without breaking the law. The law did not in my judgment aim so much at the heart, at the mainspring, as it did at the act. So long as the overt act was not committed the man was not held to be guilty, but if the act were committed though he violated only one law he was a violator of the law and therefore as guilty as if he had broken every law. Under the Gospel, however, we are required and expected to bring all our senses and faculties into submission and subjection under the authority of Him who reigns in earth and sky. Again: "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and *that* the spirit of God dwelleth in you (I Cor. 3:16)?" Again: "What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit *which* is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own? For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your Spirit, which are God's (I Cor. 6:19,20)." Not only does the new covenant involve the heart, the conscience, the mind: not only does it involve all these senses of the body and all the faculties of the inner man, it involves also the perpetual indwelling of the Spirit of God in these mortal bodies of ours. Again, and these quotations are ascending—working up to a climax: "That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, May be able to comprehend with all saints what *is* the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; And to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God (Eph. 3:17-19)." Notice here



that under the Gospel we are not to be filled with awe, filled with fear, but to be filled with all the fulness of Christ, filled with the Holy Spirit, and to be able to comprehend its limitations under us, above us, around us! Still again: "Wherefore, my beloved, as ye have always obeyed, not as in my presence only, but now much more in my absence, work out your own salvation with fear and trembling. For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of *his* good pleasure. Do all things without murmurings and disputings: That ye may be blameless and harmless, the sons of God, without rebuke, in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation, among whom ye shine as lights in the world; Holding forth the word of life; that I may rejoice in the day of Christ, that I have not run in vain, neither laboured in vain (Phil. 2:12-16)." Again: "Whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom; that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus (Col. 1:28)." Under the law the statutes of God were written on tables of stone or on parchment and deposited in the ark of the covenant, but under the Gospel it is written in the consciences, in the hearts, in the minds, upon the lives of the children of men and we not only say that but we arise to the sublimer height of the declaration that the Spirit of God, that God Himself, and that Jesus dwell in us. How radical that, how deep that, how comprehensive that, how sweeping that, when compared to the law of Moses. The radical power of the Gospel in its effect upon the heart—that is upon the affections, upon the conscience—that is upon that power within us that decides on the testimony given whether a thing is right or wrong, upon the mind—that by which we think, is apparent throughout the entire scriptures of the New Testament, but in no place is it more apparent than in the radical contrast of the Gospel when laid down by the side of the law.

I have had a great deal to say about the ten commands and I think I have something to say tonight that will be far more interesting, far more instructive, far more helpful to you than anything that I have said heretofore. Turn to the twentieth chapter of Exodus. The first two commandments were against idolatry. I hear a man say that, "If the ten commands are not in force then if I want to worship idols I have a right to do it, if I want to make an image I have a right to do it." I want to show you what a fearful mistake that is. The point is this: We are not to refrain from making idols and worshipping idols because the Jews were commanded not to do it, but because we know God, and the desire to do such a thing is forever taken out of the heart. How utterly



foolish it would be to command a man not to do a thing which you could not force him to do it if his life were at stake. I will give you a number of passages: "That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust (Matt. 5:45)." Again: "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him (Matt. 7:11)." Again: "*There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; One Lord, one faith, one baptism (Eph. 4:4,5).*" Our Lord came to show us the Father. He has forever taken away the necessity of coercion. Did you ever ask yourself the question: Why do men make idols? I answer it is the feeble grasping of the lost soul after God. But God our Father has revealed Himself, made known His attributes: His love, His tenderness, His kindness, His salvation, and therefore all who know Him are under no necessity of living under a command that has the penalty of death attached to it. There are thousands of Christians who would lay down their lives rather than make or bow to an idol! Hence where the Spirit of Jesus dwells there is liberty. I do not refrain from idolatry because of any command but because I know the true God and His Son. The third commandment is with reference to the honoring of the name of God. Allow me to turn to the New Testament and show you what a vastly different conception it gives us of how we ought to behave ourselves not only with reference to the name of God but everything else: "Again, ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shall perform unto the Lord thine oaths: But I say unto you, Swear not at all: neither by heaven; for it is God's throne: Nor by the earth; for it is his footstool: neither by Jerusalem; for it is the city of the great King. Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black (Matt. 5:33-36)." The fourth commandment was with reference to the observance of the seventh day, and I know our Father considered that He did well to get people like these to serve Him one day in seven. Hear the word to the members of the new and better covenant: "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable, unto God *which* is your reasonable service. And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what *is* that good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God (Rom. 12:1,2)." What does that mean? If it means



anything it means that we are to serve God with our bodies, with all our senses, and with all our faculties and to do it every day. That is the Gospel, that is the new covenant, that is the everlasting testament sanctified by the blood of Jesus Christ, but so far as any special duty is concerned, hear the apostle: "One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day *alike*. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth *it* unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard *it*. He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks; and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks. For none of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself. For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; and whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's. For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living (Rom. 14:5-9)." Observe: "One man esteemeth every day alike." I belong to that class. It is not the day, it is the act. It is not the observance of the day but it is the honoring God every day. The new testament expects us to give our bodies and to give our service unto God every day. The fifth commandment required that children should honor their parents: Hear the New Testament on the subject: "Children, obey your parents in the Lord: for this is right. Honour thy father and mother; which is the first commandment with promise; That it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth. And, ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath: but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord (Eph. 6:1-4)." The decalogue favored the fathers and mothers, but the Gospel lays the obligation on them as well as it does upon the children. Not only are the children to honor their parents, but the parents are to honor their children, and bring them up in the ways of God. The sixth commandment of the old covenant written on stone prohibited murder. Turn with me to the New Testament and behold the difference, as vast as the difference between midnight's solemn hour and the blaze of a mid-summer sun: "A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. By this shall all *men* know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another (Jno. 13:34,35)." The best Moses could say was, "Thou shalt not kill. But the Gospel of the Son of God gets right down into the very depths of a man's heart and tells him that here is the new commandment and by your observance of this all those who know you shall also know that you are His disciples. Again: "This is



my commandment, That ye love one another, as I have loved you. Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends (Jno. 15:12,13)." Again: "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not *his* brother abideth in death. Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer: for ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him (I Jno. 3:14,15)." Mark this well. The law of the new covenant that is written upon the heart, is that we shall love one another, that we shall love our brethren, and that the man who hates his brother is a murderer and he abides in death. The law looked to the outside, the law said that men should not kill. The Gospel comes forward and tells you that you must love your brother. Not only this. Contrast this with the commandment given by Moses: "Thou shalt not kill?" "Submitting yourselves one to another in the fear of God (Eph. 5:21)." Again: "*Let nothing be done* through strife or vainglory; but in lowliness of mind let each esteem others better than themselves. Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others. Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus (Phil. 2:3-5)." On the sublime heights and glories and depths and circumferences of brotherly love! How utterly unlike the law, how utterly unlike anything that any man under the administration of that law ever thought or dreamed of! The seventh commandment was against adultery. How radical the Gospel is when compared with that: "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery: But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart (Matt. 5:27, 28)." Under the law a man might have lust, he might have licentious desires and not break the commands, but whoso looketh on a woman with a lustful eye, whoso looketh on a man with a lustful eye, is an adulterer or an adulteress in the sight of Christ, in the sight of God. The power of God and the indwelling Christ aim at the very root of the matter; not to antagonize us with threats, but to take forever the desire from us and to form Christ in us which is the hope of glory. The eighth commandment is against stealing. Moses said that they should not steal, that is to say they should not appropriate the possessions of another without giving an equivalent. How radical the Gospel when compared with that! Hear the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ Himself: "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do you even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets (Matt. 7:12)." A man who lives under that rule does not



need any law to tell him that he shall not steal or cheat. Still there is another strong passage on this subject, and I want to present that to you: "For, brethren, ye have been called unto liberty; only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another (Gal. 5:13)." Not only are men required to serve one another, to love one another, but they are actually required to help another. How different from that simple commandment to let other people's business alone: "Thou shalt not steal!" Again: "Let him that stole steal no more: but rather let him labour, working with *his* hands the thing which is good, that he may have to give to him that needeth (Eph. 4:28)." The ninth commandment was against bearing false witness. How radical the Gospel when compared to that! Allow me to introduce the testimony of our favorite witness, the great apostle of the Gentiles: "Recompense to no man evil for evil. Provide things honest in the sight of all men (Rom. 12:17)." Again: "Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good (Rom. 12:21)." And again: "For your obedience is come abroad unto all men. I am glad therefore on your behalf: but yet I would have you wise unto that which is good, and simple concerning evil (Rom. 16:19)." Again: "Charity suffereth long, and is kind; charity envieth not; charity vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, Doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil (I Cor. 13:4,5)." My brother that is the Gospel! And again: "See that none render evil for evil unto any *man*; but ever follow that which is good, both among yourselves, and to all *men*. Abstain from all appearance of evil (I Thess. 5:15-22)." And again and finally on this point: "Not rendering evil for evil, or railing for railing; but contrariwise blessing; knowing that ye are thereunto called, that ye should inherit a blessing. For he that will love life, and see good days, let him refrain his tongue from evil, and his lips that they speak no guile: Let him eschew evil, and do good; let him seek peace, and pursue it (I Pet. 3:9-11)." The tenth commandment was against covetousness. I want you to hear the New Testament on this subject—the testimony of the great apostle of the Gentiles again—strong, positive, unequivocal: "Now we exhort you, brethren, warn them that are unruly, comfort the feeble minded, support the weak, be patient toward all *men* (I Thess. 5:14)." Not only are we not to unlawfully desire that which is another's but we are to give of our time, our talent, our means—we are actually to support the weak! Again: "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ (Gal. 6:2)." How deep the Gospel! How wide the Gospel! How high the Gospel!

How sweeping the Gospel! How all-embracing the Gospel! How radical the Gospel! How revolutionary the Gospel of the Son of God when compared with the commandments that were hurled from Sinai.

But did you know we had a new decalogue? It is a fact that there are ten commandments under the new covenant comprehending in brief all the principles that I have enunciated before you tonight. If a man were to ask you in what chapter can the ten commandments of the new institution be found I am satisfied that you would not know how to answer. We can find a hundred commandments, yea, a thousand, but there is one chapter containing seventeen verses—the very same number of verses as in the ten commandments—that gloriously emphasizes the power and the beauty and the saving efficacy of the Gospel of God's dear Son. Allow me to read to you. I will number these commandments and when I get done reading you will understand just what Jeremiah meant and what Paul meant when they declared that the new covenant should not be like the old, just what they meant when they declared that the law shall be written in the hearts, in the conscience, in the lives, of men:

First, "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth. For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, *who is* our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory."

Second, "Mortify therefore your members which are upon the earth: fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness, which is idolatry: For which things' sake the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience: In the which ye also walked some time, when ye lived in them."

Third, "But now ye also put off all these; anger, wrath, malice, blasphemy, filthy communication out of your mouth."

Fourth, "Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds; And have put on the new *man*, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him: where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond *nor* free: but Christ *is* all, and in all."

Fifth, "Put on therefore, as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, long-suffering;"



Sixth, "Forbearing one another, and forgiving one another, if any man have a quarrel against any: even as Christ forgave you, so also *do ye*."

Seventh, "And above all these things *put on* charity, which is the bond of perfectness."

Eighth, "And let the peace of God rule in your hearts, to the which also ye are called in one body; and be ye thankful."

Ninth, "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord."

Tenth, "And whatsoever ye do in word or deed, *do* all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by him." See Col. 3:1-17.

Viewing this in the light of the ten commands from Sinai, I think it is no wonder that Paul said the ministration of death written and engraven on stones is done away and its glory hath been overshadowed by the splendor of a new covenant. Reading this in the light of the cross of Calvary it is no wonder that Paul said: "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death (Rom. 8:2)."

The way to God under the first testament—I have detailed it to you already. Sacrifice, washing, the door of the tabernacle, bread, light, incense, veil, mercy seat, God's glory! The way to God under the new institution is similar to that: "Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows; yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But he *was* wounded for our transgressions, *he was* bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace *was* upon him; and with his stripes we are healed (Isa. 53:4,5)." Again on this point: "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world (Jno. 1:29)." Again on this point: "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that ye, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed. For ye were as sheep going astray; but are now returned unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls (I Pet. 2:24,25)." Washing: "Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God (Jno. 3:15)." Again on this point: "And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned (Mark 16:15,16)." Again on this point:



"And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one (I Jno. 5:8)." Admission into the church, "Praising God, and having favour with all the people. And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved (Acts 2:47)." Again, "Wherefore receive ye one another, as Christ also received us to the glory of God (Rom. 15:7)." Again: "For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh. This is a great mystery: but I speak concerning Christ and the church (Eph. 5:31,32)." Bread and light: "And thou Bethlehem, *in* the land of Juda art not the least among the princes of Juda: for out of thee shall come a Governor, that shall rule (feed) my people Israel (Matt. 2:6)." This is a quotation from the prophet relative to the feeding of Israel. Again: "But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin (I Jno. 1:7)." Again on this point: "And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true; and we are in him that is true, *even* in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life (I Jno. 5:20)." Mercy seat: "Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities: for we know not what we should pray for as we ought: but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. And he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to *the will of God* (Rom. 8:26,27)." Again on this point: "For if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God (I Tim. 3:5)?" Again: "Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them (Heb. 7:25)." And again: "My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for *the sins* of the whole world (I Jno. 2:1,2)." Under the law the way was: Sacrifice, washing, holy place, holy of holies, mercy seat. Under the gospel the way is and shall be: Sacrifice, washing, church of the living God, holy of holies, the mercy seat where He, who with pierced hands dropping blessings from every finger, went up on high and from His Father's right hand dispenses love and tenderness, mercy and salvation to the children of men.

I think I hear you say: "In view of all that you have said about the abolishment of the first covenant, of the establishment of the



new, of its character, of its glory, of its power, of its nature, of its influence on the human heart, the conscience, the mind, the life, the earthly and the everlasting destiny, I would like to know if we have any use for the old testament." Have I labored all these days and nights without giving you an answer to that? Did I not start out by telling you that God experimented with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and others that He might testify of His own faithfulness and of a man's power to be faithful? I think I did. Did I not tell you that we have only two things to rely on, the word of God and the oath of God? I think I did. Then what is the present use of the old testament? Let Paul answer: "But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets (Rom. 3:21)." When I stand up here preaching to sinners to rally them to the cross of Christ I can refer to all God did for other men who did what He said for them to do. Abraham though dead long centuries is a witness for God, Moses is a witness for God, Isaac is a witness for God, all the holy men of old bear witness to His faithfulness and power and to the lives of the children of men. Again: "For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope (Rom. 15:4)." Mark you the history of Abel, of Noah, of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, of Aaron, of Joshua, of Samuel, and all the holy and glorious men of God, their lives were so lived that you through patience might, by the Scriptures of eternal life, have hope in life and light in death. Again: "Now these things are our examples, to the intent that we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted. Neither be ye idolaters; as *were* some of them; as it is written. The people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play. Neither let us commit fornication, as some of them committed, and fell in one day three and twenty thousand. Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of serpents. Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples: and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come (I Cor. 10: 6-11)." What have we here? We are warned against lust, we are admonished not to follow in the steps of those who have disowned and disobeyed God. That is what the Old Testament is for. Again: "And we desire that every one of you do shew the same diligence to the full assurance of hope unto the end: That ye be not slothful, but followers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises (Heb. 6:11,12)." Again: "And what shall I more say? for the time would fail to tell me of Gideon, and of Barak,



and of Samson, and of Jephthah; of David also, and Samuel and of the prophets: Who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, Quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were made strong, waxed valiant in fight, turned to flight the armies of the aliens. Women received their dead raised to life again: and others were tortured, not accepting deliverance; that they might obtain a better resurrection: And others had trial of *cruel* mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover of bonds and imprisonment: They were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword: they wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins; being destitute, afflicted, tormented; Of whom the world was not worthy: they wandered in deserts, and *in* mountains, and *in* dens and caves of the earth. And all these, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise (Heb. 11:32-39)." There is no inspiration like the inspiration of a good example; there is no other good example comparable to the example of a good man or woman. All that is spiritual, all that is uplifting, all that is purifying, all that was world-wide and age-enduring that ever was in the Old Testament is there still. And even the violated law, and the grave of the sinner who died because he despised Moses' law—even these are warnings to us, even these are admonitions to us down unto this day.

As long as time shall last the name of Abel will be associated with the first man or with the first example in history where a man brought the first and best of all he had to God. As long as time shall last men will hear the story of Enoch who walked with God for hundreds of years. As long as time shall last the story of Noah will be new unto every generation because he went out on the promises of God when reason seemed to be against him. As long as history shall be written Abraham will be known as the father of the faithful and the friend of God. As long as men shall revere honor, bow at the shrine of virtue, exalt the name of that which is pure, laud that which is courageous; as long as men shall admire self-sacrifice, and self-forgetfulness the names of Moses and Joshua and Samuel and Isaiah and Jeremiah will live in perpetual youth. As long as men tune their harps to the praise of God and their hearts to His honor and glory, as long as men touch the springs of human hearts with the melodies of sorrow and exaltation the name of David will be honored among the children of men. As long as the morning is new, as long as the sun is bright, as long as the dew-drops hang on the trees like pearls, as long as love pervades the world, as long as Messiah reigns in the heavens,



the characters and the lives of the heroes of the old institution will stand out like mountain peaks above the clouds, above the storms, on which the immortals shall look and think—lifted into the skies of a calm, sweet, gentle, beautiful, radiance of heaven coming down and touching them there, and as long as manhood is revered, as long as truth is loved, as long as personal purity is exalted, so long will their names be sweet, their names be honored, their praise be sung. Therefore I say of the Old Testament, though the covenant itself is abolished; you cannot abolish Abel, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Samuel and the prophets. They will live as long as time lasts, yet until the sun grows cold, yes until time grows old, yes until the leaves of the Judgment Book unfold—yes and beyond, in the kingdom of God triumphant and glorious—many shall come from the east, and from the west, and the north, and the south, and sit down at the feet of the Master with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob and with Moses and the prophets. May God grant that I may be there, and that you may be there! Amen.

Wednesday, February 22, 1899; 7 p. m.

SERMON NO. X.—THE TWO COVENANTS AND THE  
PRIESTHOOD.

*Text: "For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law (Heb. 7:12)."*

The subject that we have had under discussion the last few days and nights is one of great importance. It has many relationships, many conditions, and yet it seems to me that the apostle practically sums the entire subject up in this passage in his letter to the Hebrews. I have been trying to establish three things: First, that the old covenant is done away; Second, that the new covenant is established; and Third, the new testament stands out by itself and is not in any sense a continuation of the old. The apostle seems to have had something like that in his mind when he laid down this proposition. I am willing to hang the entire issues of this discussion on this statement. I know that I represent one side of the contention in the positions that I have announced and that there are many learned and pious men on the other side who contend that the covenant was practically made in the Garden of Eden and that the covenant has never been changed from that day to this, and I put it in my own words and lay down the proposition that if it can be shown by the word of God that there never has been but one priesthood from the day man sinned down to the present time I am ready to admit that there never has been but one covenant. Or to put it in another form: If it can be proven by the word of God that there never has been but one priesthood I will admit that there never has been but one law, and that while the idea has been enlarged, extended, amplified, elaborated, that it is, and has been, and always shall be, the same. But is it a fact that there never has been but one priesthood? That is the question now. The apostle here says that there had been a change of priesthood and that the change of priesthood was followed also by a change of law and that this change in law was a necessity growing out of a change of priesthood. He does not stop there but uses this language: "For there is verily a disannulling of the commandment going before, for the weaknesses and unprofitableness thereof. For the law made nothing perfect; but the bringing in of a better hope *did*; by the which we draw nigh unto God (Heb. 7:18,



19)." Not only does he intimate here that there has been a change of priesthood but he intimates that the commandment had been disannulled or abrogated or taken out of the way in view of the fact that it made nothing perfect. Again: "For the law maketh men high priests which have infirmity; but the word of the oath, which was since the law, *maketh* the Son, who is consecrated for evermore (Heb. 7:28)." What have we here? A change of priesthood making it necessary to change the law. A change of law and to reduce it to its essence the change of the priesthood following the establishment of the law. Observe the words: "Since the law"—since the law of Moses ended, or was abolished. In other words one priesthood was abolished in the abolishment of the law; the other priesthood was established subsequent to the abolishment of the law.

Let this serve as an introduction while I undertake by your indulgence to trace the idea of the priesthood from the beginning unto the day in which we live. The idea of a priest, a sacrifice, a reconciliation or atonement, underlies all revelation. Men everywhere seem to realize that God is offended and that something must be done to set man right with his Creator. As to the origin of the priestly idea I can only say that it lies in remotest antiquity; that the shadows and the clouds and the darkness and the uncertainty of the ages lost and buried settled down upon it. We do know, however, that as soon as man sinned he began to bring offerings to God. I think I can argue successfully that he was commanded to do it, and still there is no passage in which it is so declared in so many words. However I think the circumstances are at least of a character to make it probable that man was commanded to offer a sacrifice to God. Cain and Abel brought their sacrifices to God. Cain brought of the products of the ground, Abel of the firstlings of his flock. The word "brought" here, I think, signifies that there was a place where they came in obedience to Divine command that the sacrifice might be offered unto Him and that God's name might be glorified in the doing of the service. Abel, in the New Testament is called righteous Abel. By the word "righteous" in this connection I understand that at least he was a man who did right, and if doing right is doing the will of God, it must have been the will of God that he offered his sacrifice unto Him. In another place we have the following: "By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts: and by it he being dead, yet speaketh (Heb. 11:4)." It could hardly be said that Abel's offering was more acceptable or



more excellent than Cain's if God had not made a choice. If God had not laid down the law, and it could hardly be said that day that "faith cometh by hearing," as it is now, if God had not spoken. Until we shall have better evidence we shall conclude that the idea of an altar, a priest, a sacrifice, an atonement, was a revelation from God.

In the early ages every man was his own priest. In the middle ages—using "middle" as applicable to the ages between the Patriarchal times and the Christian times—one family was set apart to the priestly functions; but in our age there is only one high priest and that is Jesus Christ the Son of God, our Lord, our Master, and our Redeemer. There is no order of priests that sets one above another—all Christians under the reign of Jesus are priests unto God (Rev. 1:6). For the want of better terms I will designate these three grand divisions as the Patriarchal Priesthood, the Levitical or Aaronic Priesthood, and the Everlasting Priesthood of Jesus Christ. Written over the entire history of priests and sacrifices from the beginning, covering every page and every century and every nation, so far as they were affected by the development of the purpose of God, we have these words: "There being a change of priesthood there is also made of necessity a change of law." And that we may have something definite before us I will say that the Patriarchal Priesthood extended from the earliest dawn of history down to the giving of the law, that the Levitical or Aaronic Priesthood extended from the beginning of the law down to the cross of Christ and that the Everlasting Priesthood extended from the day our Lord entered heaven by His own blood unto now and will extend unto the end of time.

The earth was cursed on account of man's sins. That may account for the fact that altars were reared up as if the worshipper desired to lift himself or lift his sacrifice, or lifting himself and sacrifice, lift his heart up to God. Noah built the first one that is mentioned: "And Noah builded an altar unto the Lord; and took of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl, and offered burnt offerings on the altar (Gen. 8:20)." When Abraham arrived in the land that God had promised to give him, God spoke to him and he erected an altar there doubtless as a memorial of the fact that God had again broken the silence: "And the Lord appeared unto Abram, and said, Unto thy seed will I give this land: and there builded he an altar unto the Lord, who appeared unto him (Gen. 12:7)." Again, Isaac, Abraham's son, to whom the promises were renewed, reared an altar and called upon the name of the Lord: "And the Lord appeared unto him the same night, and said, I am



the God of Abraham thy father; fear not, for I *am* with thee, and will bless thee and multiply thy seed for my servant Abraham's sake. And he builded an altar there, and called upon the name of the Lord, and pitched his tent there; and there Isaac's servants digged a well (Gen. 26:24,25)." Again, Jacob in whom the promises had been vested after Isaac by direct command, and this is the first recorded command, reared an altar unto his God and thus worshipped Him: "And God said unto Jacob, Arise, go up to Bethel, and dwell there: and make there an altar unto God, that appeared unto thee when thou fleddest from the face of Esau thy brother (Gen. 35:1)." There were other priests—priests wherever there were men. When Joseph went down into Egypt; after varied experiences there, as the result of other people's sins, he was elevated to a place of importance and honor and glory in that land and was given in marriage to a daughter of a priest. When years afterward Moses fled out of the land of Pharaoh and went to the land of Midian he found there a man who was a priest and he married his daughter. Following the same idea, there were priests among the Hebrews when they came out of Egypt. I will turn to the proof: "And let the priests also, which come near to the Lord, sanctify themselves, lest the Lord break forth upon them (Ex. 20:22)." Here it is evident that the priests occupied responsible positions. They are represented as those that draw nigh unto God. I will not pause to discuss that but I want to briefly run over the ground. At first it appears that every man was his own priest. He built his own altar, brought forth his own victim, plunged the knife, shed the blood, kindled the fire, and saw the smoke of the sacrifice arise to God. Later on it appears, in these patriarchal times, that the head of the family was the priest. It is thought by scholars that the office or the function descended with the birthright and that the eldest son therefore became priest of the family or priest of the tribe. We know as a matter of fact that Abraham as the head of the family officiated, Isaac as the head of the family officiated, Jacob as the head of the family officiated and Jethro the priest of Midian as the head of the family officiated, and we know also that before Aaron and his sons were consecrated young men offered sacrifices under the supervision of Moses, and that at the consecration of Aaron and his sons Moses officiated as priest.

But during these patriarchal times there appeared one priest, a very remarkable priest. Indeed more is said about him on this score than any other priest who appeared during these times. When Abraham was in the land of Canaan his nephew Lot got



into trouble and was taken into captivity, and Abraham, great general that he was, took his army of trained servants and followed the captives and brought the captives back. On the return he was met by a distinguished man, Melchizedek by name. But as the account is very brief and does not go much into details I prefer to give it to you in the exact language of Scripture: "And Melchizedek king of Salem brought forth bread and wine: and he *was* the priest of the most high God. And he blessed him, and said, Blessed *be* Abram of the most high God, possessor of heaven and earth: And blessed be the most high God, which hath delivered thine enemies into thine hand. And he gave him tithes of all (Gen. 14: 18-20)." It is a fact that Melchizedek here is designated the priest of the most high God. And that he was a distinguished character is proven by the fact that Abraham, God's chosen paid tithes unto him. I want to press that on you—I want you to remember that if you can because I shall call it up later and press its importance from another standpoint. There is something peculiar about this man Melchizedek. We have no record of his ancestry, we have no record of his family, only this: On this one occasion he came out to meet Abraham returning from the slaughter of kings, blessed him, fed him, honored him, and Abraham recognized his greatness by paying him a tenth of all. Let me press another thought just here, that the patriarchal form or the patriarchal idea in which every man was his own priest, and had a right to erect an altar, offer a sacrifice, pray to God whenever he chose, continued right down to the giving of the law. But at the giving of the law there was a change. I should like to go into details and trace the history and the fortunes of mankind under the times when every man did the best he could, raising his altar, raising sacrifices, raising his heart, unto God, but time would fail me. However I will say this much: that during the last year in Egypt the angel of destruction went over Egypt and the homes of the Egyptians were homes of mourning because the first born in every house was dead but the first born of the Israelites were saved and on this account God said He would take the first born of all Israel as a heritage unto Himself: "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Sanctify unto me all the firstborn, whatsoever openeth the womb among the children of Israel, *both* of man and of beast: it is mine (Ex. 13:1,2)." Later, however, He said He would take the Levites in the place of the first born of the children of Israel and their cattle in the place of the first born of the cattle of Israel: "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Take the Levites instead of all the firstborn among the children of Israel, and the



cattle of the Levites instead of their cattle; and the Levites shall be mine: I *am* the Lord (Num. 3:44,45).” The Levites were the children of Levi, the descendants of Jacob, the descendants of Isaac, the descendants of Abraham. The Levites showed their devotion to God at mount Sinai. When all Israel had gone a whoring after gods of their own hands, Moses came down and called for volunteers to put into force the law that was a ministration of death and the Levites responded to the call and went through the camp of Israel and executed the word and the command of God on those who had broken His covenant. Whether this had any influence on their fortunes in the future years I cannot, I dare not say. It is a fact, however, that is very peculiar that the idea of the priest was being narrowed down. First, it was practically the heritage of the entire human family, and every man was his own priest, every head of a tribe his own priest, every head of a family the priest of his family or of his tribe or of himself, and still another narrowing down: it was confined unto Aaron and unto his children. Let me press this thought just here that the priestly family or the priestly idea was put in the tribe of Levi, in the family of Aaron, and that the office of the high priest followed in regular succession from Aaron to his first born on down the line unto the end. And a man could not be a priest whose pedigree or genealogy was not correct. Remember that. It is very important. I will call it up farther on. Aaron and his sons were consecrated, set apart to the priestly office by very elaborate and very remarkable ceremonies. They were clothed in the beautiful garments designated by Jehovah; animals were put to death; the blood was placed on the right ear of Aaron indicative of the fact that he, as their high priest, was to hear God’s word and he was to tell it to the people; on the right thumb of the right hand indicative of the fact that his hand should be used in the service of God; on the great toe of his right foot indicative of the fact that his feet should mark the path that God desired His children to tread and that as their priest and leader and intercessor he should lead the way. Not only this, but there was a profusion of anointing oil poured on Aaron’s head and it ran down on his beard, down to the very hem of his garments. But on Aaron’s sons and on Aaron again, blood and oil were sprinkled in order that they might be set apart to the service of God. The entire tribe of Levi was set apart by elaborate ceremonies. They were brought to the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, washed, shaved, sacrifices were offered while the congregation of Israel laid their hands upon them and by that solemn act gave them to Aaron, gave them unto



God. Mark you now that the high priest's office was confined to Aaron and his successors by birth. The ordinary functions of the priestly services were confined to Aaron's sons, that is except the high priest, and the high priest could do any of the services about the tabernacle. The general work belonged to the tribe of Levi. The tribe was divided into three parts—Kohathites, Merarites and Gershonites—and during the long sojourn in the wilderness, they, by means of oxen and wagons and on their shoulders bore the sacred tabernacle and its furniture from place to place. The dress of the high priest was very elaborate, consisting of beautiful garments of eight different parts, breeches, mitre, two girdles, broidered coat, robe, ephod, breastplate, and all of these were beautiful and glorious. On his breast and on his shoulders he bore the names of the sons of Jacob and the tribes of Israel. We are told that he did this for a memorial. He did it because he was a representative (Ex. 28:1-43; 29:1-46). I call your attention however to one very striking fact. It is this: that when he went in before God to stand before the sacred flame which shone between the cherubim over the ark of the covenant, he had to lay off his beautiful garments and be dressed in white. He was a sinner and though he went into the tabernacle as a representative character, God would only accept him, when he was clothed in spotless white. The garments of Aaron's sons were far more simple; made of linen—breeches, mitre, girdle, coat, and I call your attention also to the head dress of the high priest. On it were written the words, "*Holiness unto the Lord.*" Not only were his feet, his hands, his ears, his breast, his shoulder, but his mind also was consecrated unto God. It is a remarkable fact that these things were given under the first testament and were in a sense figures of that which was to come. Let me press on you one thing: That in general terms the priestly office belonged to the tribe of Levi, but the tribe of Levi alive today would be dead tomorrow. Therefore the office passed down from one generation to another. The priestly office was confined to Aaron and his sons. But Aaron and his sons of today would be dead tomorrow and therefore the office was entailed in the family and passed down from generation to generation. It is a fact that even the garments of the high priests were passed on from father to son and from son to son until they were worn out and had to be replaced with others. The apostle caps the climax for us just here and I will give you his words. There was a line of many priests; we know the names of many of them but many of their names are not known. Why was the priestly office transferred? Mortal man cannot tarry, like the grass of the field and like the



flowers he is here today and gone eternally tomorrow: "And they truly were many priests, because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death (Heb. 7:23)." The duties of the high priest were of a peculiar character. While he was associated with the ordinary priests and could perform any act of service pertaining to the tabernacle of the congregation there were services that only the high priest of Israel could perform. Only the high priest wore the garments of glory and beauty. Only the high priest wore the names of the tribes on his breast and shoulders; only the high priest was permitted to go into the tabernacle of the congregation with the blood of animals on the tenth day of the seventh month to do what he could according to the law of God to roll back their sins for a year. The high priest only was the mouthpiece of Jehovah, and through that wonderful Urim and Thummim learned and communicated the will of God to man. The priests, Aaron's sons, did as they were commanded under the law. Paul gives us a very graphic idea of this service and I will let him speak for himself: "Now when these things were thus ordained; the priests went always into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service of God. But into the second *went* the high priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and *for* the errors of the people: The Holy Spirit this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing: Which was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience, *which stood* only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed *on them* until the time of reformation (Heb. 9:6-10)." Notice here that the priests, Aaron's sons, went always into the tabernacle, morning and evening, constantly, persistently, but the high priest went into the holy place only once each year. The time of the entering of the priest upon his office, that is the age at which he entered, is not made known in the law. Presumably the young priests were men of maturity, but we can imagine that necessity may have driven some of them to work when they were very young. The high priest entered on his post when there was a vacancy; Aaron died on mount Hor and the garments of glory and beauty were taken off of him and put on Eleazar his successor. We know that Aaron was an old man but the age of his successor we know not. We do know this however that the Kohathites and Merarites and Gershonites entered on their duties from twenty-five to thirty and continued until they were fifty, and that is all we know. I go into these per-



ticulars because I shall find application for them all in the examination of this argument when we come to the testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. The priests were supported by taxation. And we can well understand that when one tribe was supported by eleven and when the taxes amounted to from ten to twenty per cent that the office was one that men would naturally seek. Hence Korah and a company of malcontents who sympathized with him, rebelled against Aaron and against his authority and the earth opened and swallowed them up (Num. 16:1-46). But the Lord designed that the question might be settled once for all and here is the way He did it: He told Moses to speak unto the children of Israel and he told them to get a rod to represent each tribe and bring them in and lay them up before the Lord in the tabernacle of the congregation and by that method He would express His law and desire—and when they brought them forth they found that the rod representing Aaron or Levi had blossomed and borne its fruit as an attestation of the power of Jehovah and of the choice of Jehovah. And the question was settled. There was never any rebellion in Israel after that so far as we know. And the law went forth and the children of Israel in fear said: "And the children of Israel spake unto Moses, saying, Behold, we die, we perish, we all perish. Whosoever cometh any thing near unto the tabernacle of the Lord shall die: shall we be consumed with dying (Num. 17:12-13)?" Aaron's rod that budded was deposited in the ark of the covenant as a token against the rebellious: "And the Lord said unto Moses, Bring Aaron's rod again before the testimony, to be kept for a token against the rebels; and thou shalt quite take away their murmurings from me, that they die not (Num. 17:10)." Notice that the priesthood that I am discussing began at Sinai and that the law of Moses was administered by and under this priesthood. In other words, that the offerings designated and required by the law were presented by Aaron and his sons; that they were the teachers of the law, the expounders of the law and the judges of the law. Hear the apostle again: "If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood, (for under it the people received the law), what further need *was there* that another priest should rise after the order of Melchizedec, and not be called after the order of Aaron (Heb. 7:11)?" I assert that this priesthood began at Sinai and extended with all the varying and changing fortunes of Israel down to the death of our Lord and Redeemer on the cross. Let me give you a little proof. When Jesus was born his parents went to the priest with an offering designated by the law: "And when the days of her



purification according to the law of Moses were accomplished, they brought him to Jerusalem, to present *him* to the Lord; (As it is written in the law of the Lord, Every male that openeth the womb shall be called holy to the Lord); And to offer a sacrifice according to that which is said in the law of the Lord, A pair of turtledoves, or two young pigeons (Luke 2:22-24)." When He cleansed the lepers He sent them unto the priest telling them to go and present the offering designated or commanded by the law: "And it came to pass, as he went to Jerusalem, that he passed through the midst of Samaria and Galilee. And as he entered into a certian village, there met him ten men that were lepers, which stood afar off: And they lifted up *their* voice, and said, Jesus, Master, have mercy on us. Aud when he saw *them*, he said unto them, Go shew yourselves unto the priests. And it came to pass, that, as they went, they were cleansed (Luke 17:11-14)." He was tried before the high priest and condemned to death according to the law, they supposing that in claiming to be the Son of God, He had made Himself a blasphemer: "And the high priest arose, and said unto him, Answerest thou nothing? what *is it which* these witness against thee? But Jesus held his peace. And the high priest answered and said unto him, I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God. Jesus saith unto him, Thou hast said: nevertheless, I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven. Then the high priest rent his clothes, saying, He hath spoken blasphemy; what further need have we of witnesses? behold, now ye have heard his blasphemy (Matt. 26:62-66)." And again, the proof that the Levitical priesthood under which the law was received and administered continued right down to the end of the time of Jesus on earth is this: That the veil of the temple was not rent from the top to the bottom until Jesus cried with a loud voice and gave up the ghost. Hear Matthew: "Jesus, when he had cried again with a loud voice, yielded up the ghost. And, behold, the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom; and the earth did quake, and the rocks rent (Matt. 27:50,51)." I would have you survey the patriarchal priesthood, the Levitical priesthood and answer one question: What was its unending and unvarying character? You can only answer that it was infirm—weak. The father died, the son succeeded him. The head of the tribe passed and the next legitimate heir took up the work if he chose to do it or neglected it if he so chose. Under the law the office passed on down the line year after year, age after age, father after father, son after



son, as long as it was God's pleasure for that institution to last. If the law has been changed, if the priesthood has been changed, it stands to reason that we are no longer under the patriarchal service. No longer is a man expected to rear an altar, to slay an animal and burn it upon an altar and send his heart up in gratefulness or penitence to God. When the patriarchal priesthood ended at mount Sinai the law, whatever it was, under which those men offered sacrifices practically ended too, and if the law of Moses ended on the cross and I have demonstrated it beyond any doubt, beyond any cavil, beyond any contradiction, then it follows that the priesthood of Levi, or Aaron which was also infirm, ended there too. Again I would have you survey the whole situation and answer another question. It is this: What was the character of every priest from the first priest who ever offered a sacrifice down to the expiration of Jesus on the cross? You must answer, you can only answer that he was a sinner, realizing his sins, lost in the sight of God! Then I ask you another question: If every priest from Abel down through the patriarchal times, if every priest from Aaron down was himself a sinner, is it not a fact that he could do but little for himself or anybody else? It is a fact, brethren, that the great overwhelming desire, and the great unsatisfied ambition of every heart, is to have help from a power higher, stronger, better, abler, than himself. I can only lift you to the height on which I stand or drag you down to the level of the mire in which I wade. Abel was a sinner. Abraham was a sinner. Jacob was a sinner. Jethro was a sinner. Aaron was a sinner, an idolater a few days before he entered upon his office. He was a sinner, they were all sinners, and therefore they offered for themselves and for the errors of others.

I think we are prepared now to contemplate and investigate the priesthood of Jesus and I raise this question: Was He always a priest? Was He a priest on earth, is He a priest now? The question of whether or not He was always a priest is a very important one. By your prayers, by your indulgence, and by your own sympathy I will get to the bottom of it before I stop. It is asserted that the line of priestly offering or office has been unbroken from Abel down and that the line of the covenant has been unbroken from Aaron down; that the priestly office descended from Abel to Abraham and from Abraham to Aaron and from Aaron down to the end and the covenant likewise. It is asserted therefore that Jesus Christ when He came to earth entered upon the priestly office at the age of thirty by baptism at the hands of John. I have heard that asserted by prominent men, scholarly men, able men, influen-



tial men. I ask, is it a fact? It either is or is not. If it is a fact, let us know it. If it is not a fact, let us spurn it. Note this: The age at which Aaron and his sons became priests, is not designated by law; therefore the fact that Jesus was baptized at the age of thirty argues nothing whatever. I heard once in a discussion, in which I was fortunately on the right side, a gentleman assert that Jesus was baptized to initiate Him into the priesthood. On the morning of the first day of the discussion I quoted the text of tonight and I said: "I hang the issues of the entire discussion on that; if my friend will show that there never has been but one unbroken priesthood from the beginning until now I will admit that there never has been but one covenant or law. He treated it very lightly at the start, and I saw that I had my lance in a vulnerable place and I gave it a twist or two every time I had an opportunity. I kept that before him. I knew where he was forced to land; to either abandon his position or take the position that Jesus was baptized to make him a priest. And at last he took that position. How weak, how futile, how vulnerable such a position as that! Let us look at it for just a moment. Weigh it, turn it over and look at it on the other side. Is it a fact that our Lord became a priest by baptism? His idea was, or at least he wanted to make it appear so, that that was the act of consecration just as Aaron and his sons were consecrated. Now you look at the baptism of Jesus. I will just turn and read the account of it; it is too important to pass over lightly and then I will compare it for a moment with the description of the consecration of Aaron and his sons to the priestly office: "Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him. But John forbade him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me? And Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer *it to be so* now: for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness. Then he suffered him. And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water: and, lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God, descending like a dove, and lighting upon him: And lo a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased (Matt. 3:13-17)." At the consecration of Aaron and his sons they were brought forth, clothed with the garment of glory and beauty, animals were sacrificed, oil was poured on Aaron, oil and blood on Aaron and his sons, blood was put upon the ear and upon the right thumb and upon the great toe of the right foot. I say that a man who can see in the baptism of Jesus His consecration to the Levitical priesthood is either voluntarily or involuntarily ignorant. That is strong but I will tell you brethren the



time has come when we must meet the issue fairly and squarely. But I will give arguments positive, unequivocal, and unanswerable, that Jesus could not become a priest by baptism or by any other act on earth. I will give you the proof now: "For *it is* evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah; of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood (Heb. 7:14)." What was said about the tribe of Judah? I think I had better turn and read that to you: "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor the lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him *shall* the gathering of the people *be* (Gen. 49:10)." Moses says that our Lord came out of Judah. Then the prophecy of Jacob was fulfilled. But he says that no mention of Judah was made in relation to the priesthood. Therefore Jesus did not belong to the right tribe. When Aaron was called to that office, when the Levites were called to that office, the law went forth that any stranger or any member of any other tribe who drew nigh as a priest should be put to death. Therefore Jesus could not become a priest on earth at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, either high priest or low priest, except on the penalty of death. And again he had nothing to offer. Hear the apostle: "For every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore *it is* of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer (Heb. 8:3)." What did our Lord and Master have to offer when here on earth? Nothing, absolutely nothing but His life. And He did not offer that as a bloody sacrifice until He came down to the end. He offered himself, according to the testimony of Peter, while here by going about doing good (Acts 10:38)." God gave Him: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life (Jno. 3:16)." He gave Himself: "Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire; mine ears hast thou opened: burnt offering and sin offering hast thou not required. Then said I, Lo, I come: in the volume of the book *it is* written of me (Psalms 40:6,7)." Again: "Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me: In burnt offerings and *sacrifices* for sin thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book *it is* written of me), to do thy will, O God. Above when he said, Sacrifice and offering and burnt offering and *offering* for sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure *therein*; which are offered by the law; Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once *for all*



(Heb. 10:5-10)." Again: "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich (II Cor. 8:9)." Again: "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross (Phil. 2:4-8)." Again: "Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered; And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him (Heb. 5:8,9)." God loved the world and gave His Son. Jesus loved the world and gave Himself. He knew that God was tired of the offerings and with the smoke of the sacrifices that went up, and therefore it is declared that God had prepared Him a body and that He had come to do His Father's will. Study these passages. Weigh them in your heart. Bear in mind that during all of our Lord's life He was not acting as priest, he was the teacher, friend, brother, consolation, hope, desire and expectation of men. No man can lay his finger on a single syllable indicative of the fact that he ever officiated at the altar before the door of the tabernacle of the congregation or the temple or anywhere else, or in any other way, on earth. How was Jesus made priest? That is an interesting question. How was Aaron made priest? That is an interesting question. How were the patriarchs made priests? This is an interesting question. I answer the last first. The patriarchs were made priests either by the command of God and their choice, or by a recognition of their needs and their choice. Aaron and his sons were made priests by the choice of Jehovah and by the terms of the consecration laid down in the law. How was Jesus made a priest? Let David answer that. By the way of prophecy, looking far away into the day of the Lord's entrance upon his priestly functions he says: "The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou *art* a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek (Psalms 110:4)." Again: "And it is yet far more evident: for that after the similitude of Melchisedec there ariseth another priest, Who is made, not after the law of a carnal commandment,"—that is the law of Moses—"but after the power of an endless life. For he testifieth, Thou *art* a priest for ever"—no change in His priesthood—"after the order of Melchisedec (Heb. 7:15-17)." Mark you here that our Lord instead of being a priest on earth, instead of descending from Aaron and officiating as a priest

here became a priest not even after that order, but after the independent order of Melchisedec. Hear the apostle again: "Now of the things which we have spoken *this is* the sum: We have such an high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens;"—Jesus our great High Priest is in God's presence—"A minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man. For every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices:"—He presented His life on the cross and His blood in heaven—wherefore *it is* of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer. For if he were on earth, he should not be a priest,"—this settles the contention once for all and forever—"seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law (Heb. 8:1-4)." Look at that! He sums it all up and says that we have a priest at the right hand of God. That He is the minister of the true sanctuary—a sanctuary that God pitched, that man did not build—that every high priest has something to offer and that Jesus had something to offer and that if He were on earth or when He was on earth, He was not a priest because He did not belong to the proper family and there were men who did officiate in harmony with the will and the law and the commandment of God. I want to press that idea of oath or order upon you; the patriarchs and Levites were not installed by an oath, or by anything like an oath. After the order of Melchisedec, not after the order of Aaron—but before discussing what that order is I want to call your attention to something mentioned before. Abraham the father of the Hebrews paid the tithes for Levi, Paul declares, who was yet in the loins of his father and paid tithes unto Melchisedec too, that is, Abraham as the head and superior of the nation, paid tithes, honor, respect, to Melchisedec for all of his descendants. That is a remarkable statement. It means this, that as the greater includes the less and that as Abraham is the greater and Levi is less that when Abraham paid tribute to Melchisedec, Levi and Aaron paid tithes also, thus acknowledging that even the priesthood of Melchisedec was greater than the priesthood of Aaron or Levi, or all. But what was that order? Keep in mind what I have said already. The order of Aaron was a dependent order, established in the house, entailed on the father and the son and the family to the remotest generation. Then in order to be a priest a man had to have the right pedigree—he had to belong to the right tribe—his father must be a priest before him and he must have a son to succeed him in the office that there might be an unbroken line. Allow me to read: "For this Melchisedec, king of Salem, priest of the



most high God, who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings, and blessed him: To whom also Abraham gave a tenth part of all; first being by interpretation King of righteousness, and after that also King of Salem, which is, King of peace; Without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life: but made like unto the Son of God; abideth a priest continually. Now consider how great this man *was*, unto whom even the patriarch Abraham gave the tenth of the spoils. And verily they that are of the sons of Levi, who receive the office of priesthood, have a commandment to take tithes of the people according to the law, that is, of their brethren, though they come out of the loins of Abraham: But he whose descent is not counted from them receive tithes of Abraham, and blessed him that had the promises. And without all contradiction the less is blessed of the better. And here men that die"—the sons of Aaron—"receive tithes; but there he *receiveth them*, of whom it is witnessed that he liveth. And, as I may so say, Levi also, who receiveth tithes, paid tithes in Abraham. For he was yet in the loins of his father, when Melchisedec met him (Heb. 7:1-10)." Melchisedec was an official of an independent order, his father was not a priest before him, his mother was not a priest before him. He had no successor in office, and Paul is talking about his priesthood rather than his genealogy, that in the priestly office he was without father, without mother, without beginning of days or end of life, that no record was kept. How utterly unlike the record of Aaron, and the lesson he teaches is that our Lord and Master became a priest by the word of his Father's oath subsequent to the abolishment of the law as Melchisedec was, having no predecessor in office, and he will certainly have no successor.

Where is our high priest? Hear the apostle again: "Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption *for us* (Heb. 9:12)." Our high priest has gone up on high, He is in the presence of God, having entered there by His own blood. Allow me to present to you a number of passages on this subject. What kind of a priest is He? First of all He is not a sinner. He is not infirm and weak like we are and yet is the first-born of many brethren, your brother and mine. All power and authority rests upon His shoulders. Our Lord and Master knows our weakness, knows our foibles, knows our failings. He is gone on high to appear in the presence of God for us. He is not gone into temples made with hands, not into falling, crumbling buildings erected by man's hand, but He has gone beyond the limits of mortal vision



into the presence of God that God may come down to earth, that earth may be lifted up to God. Allow me to read: "Wherefore in all things it behooved him to be made like unto *his* brethren,"—He knows every weakness and temptation—"that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things *pertaining* to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted (Heb. 2:17,18)." He was made like unto us, and He walked through the vale of tears. He knows the thorny path, He knows the self-denial and therefore, having experienced all these things in the flesh, He knows how to help us in hours of need, of temptation, of care, of sorrow, of darkness, of death. Again: "Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Jesus Christ (Heb. 3:1)." Consider Him as the Emmanuel—God with us. Consider Him as Saviour, only Saviour, consider Him as the Light and Life of men, consider Him of the Good Shepherd of the sheep, consider Him as our Teacher, our Example, our Sacrifice, our Life, our King, our Master, our Judge, our Lord. Again: "Seeing then that we have a great High Priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast *our* profession. For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as *we are*, yet without sin. Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need (Heb. 4:14-16)." Study this passage. Where is He? He hath passed into the heavens. He can still be touched with the feelings of our infirmities. Let us come, not like worms of the dust, but come before Him with boldness that we may obtain mercy and find favor in time of need. Again: "For every high priest taken from among men is ordained for men in things *pertaining* to God, that he may offer gifts and sacrifices for sins: Who can have compassion on the ignorant, and on them that are out of the way; for that he himself also is compassed with infirmity. And by reason hereof he ought, as for the people, so also for himself, to offer for sins. And no man taketh this honour for himself, but he that is called of God, as *was* Aaron. So also Christ glorified not himself to be made an high priest; but he that said unto him, Thou art my Son, today have I begotten thee. As he saith also in another *place*, Thou *are* a priest for ever after the order of Medchisedec (Heb. 5:1-6)." The high priest under the law was himself infirm. While he might have had compassion on the ignorant and those that are out of the way, he himself was



ignorant, he himself was out of the way. God called Aaron and Aaron performed his duty, passed to dust and was succeeded by his son who filled his mission and passed to the great majority, and the infirm priesthood continued until Jesus died. Again: "For those priests were made without an oath; but this with an oath by him that said unto him, The Lord sware and will not repent, *Thou art* a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec; by so much was Jesus made a surety of a better testament (Heb. 7:21,22)." Again: "But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building (Heb. 9:11)." Again: "For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, *which are* the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us: Nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others; For then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself (Heb. 9:24-26)." Again: "Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, By a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh; and *having an* high priest over the house of God; Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water. Let us hold fast the profession of *our faith* without wavering; for he *is* faithful that promised (Heb. 10:19-23)." What is our High Priest doing now? Preparing a place for us: "Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me. In my Father's house are many mansions: if *it were* not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you, and if I go and prepare a place for you I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, *there* ye may be also (Jno. 14:1-3)." What is our High Priest doing now? Standing as a Mediator between God and men: "For *there is* one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; Who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time (I Tim. 2:5,6)." What is our High Priest doing now? Interceding for us according to the will of God: "Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them (Heb. 7:25)." What is our High Priest doing now? Advocating our cause in the presence of God and the angels: "My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we



have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for *the sins* of the whole world (I Jno. 2:1,2)." How long will Jesus be in His present position as Priest, Mediator, Intercessor and Advocate in the presence of God? I answer that question by saying that there He shall be until the work of redemption is done. Aaron in garments of spotless white entered into the tabernacle by the blood of animals once every year into the very presence of God and there effected, according to the law, an atonement for the children of Israel and when he came out he lifted his hands and blessed them. It was a glorious blessing, a beautiful blessing, a blessing indicative of the fact that God once more was reconciled and that though their sins had been piled mountain high God had rolled them away and that over the head of the goat they had been confessed and driven into the wilderness for another year. And so the priest raised his hands and blessed them with these words: "The Lord bless thee, and keep thee: The Lord make his face to shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee: The Lord lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace (Num. 6:24-26)." How long did Aaron stay in the holy of holies on the day of the atonement? I answer until the work whereunto he was called and appointed for that day, was done. And when he came out he blessed the people and the work of that day was done, done according to the dictates of God. How long will our Lord and Master stay where He is? I answer until the work of redemption is done. Here I want to drive the thought home that if the theory of the pre-millennial coming of Christ is true the time will come when humanity will not have a Priest, Mediator, Intercessor, Advocate in the presence of God. God forbid that I, poor sinner as I recognize myself to be, shall ever be in the condition that I can not say: "Father bless me through my great High Priest, Jesus Christ Thy Son!" When He comes He is to bless His children. Paul said He is to be admired of all the saints. On the Mediatorial Throne this night He pleads your cause and mine, pleads with an earnestness, with an eloquence, with a grandeur, with a persistence never known to mortal man. When that work is done the sign of the Son of the Man shall appear in the heavens, heaven and earth shall pass away with a great noise, myriads shall gather before Him not for salvation but for judgment. He who entered heaven by His own blood, He who prays in the presence of God for us, He who through our mortal flesh upon the throne of God sanctified, honored, ennobled, glorified, reigns in heaven and reigns in earth, shall judge me when He comes! There He shall reign until



the last enemy shall be conquered. There He shall reign until every knee shall bow and every tongue confess unto God and there He shall plead until the last sinner who will be ransomed, shall be ransomed. May God help us to realize that we are no longer under the Patriarchal, under the Levitical Priesthood, but that when our Lord and Master died on the cross He nailed to it that priesthood, that law, that covenant, and all that pertained to them. He took them forever out of the way and there was I may say an inter-regnum between the cross and the ascension that no mortal man can explain by the word of God. But Jesus went about for forty days explaining the principles of His kingdom to His disciples, doing what He could to prepare them for His departure. Now He is entered on His work, and all glory and power and majesty be unto the name of Him who has entered into His priestly function. We never had a priest before Him there; He has no assistant now. He will never have a successor in that office and when he leaves it—mark my words, weigh them well!—the work of redemption will be eternally done! May God help us to realize this while life and strength and reason and opportunity remain! And may we at His coming hear His blessing ring through earth and sky: "Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these least of my disciples, ye did it unto me;" enter into the joys that are eternal, that are perennial, in My presence and come out no more, suffer no more, fear no more, die no more! He has made us kings—He has made us priests unto God. We work with Him, suffer with Him—all glory to His name, we shall reign with Him forever!

Thursday, February 23, 1899; 7 p. m.

SERMON NO. XI—THE COVENANTS ILLUSTRATED BY THE  
PARABLE OF THE PRODIGAL SON.

*Text: "And not many days after the younger son gathered all together, and took his journey into a far country, and there wasted his substance with riotous living (Luke 15:13)."*

The story of the prodigal son is always interesting—interesting alike to the old and to the young, and interesting alike to every age and every tongue. Doubtless you have heard many sermons on this parable and have been more or less benefitted by them all. I shall re-tell the story to you tonight, believing that to say the very least of it, that it very forcibly illustrates the great subject that I have been trying to present and illustrate in clearness before you in this series of sermons. It is one of the Master's own matchless inventions. No one has ever been able to write or utter parables like His. He speaks of it as a fact; He declares that a certain man had two sons. He made use of these characters as if they were from real life. The son took a journey into a far country and there wasted what he had in riotous living. And after he had spent his inheritance a mighty famine arose in the land and he began to be hungry and he went and hired himself out to a man in that country to feed swine and he became so low that he was even disposed to eat with the hogs that he was employed to feed. On reflection he came to himself and thought of his father's servants at home—that they all had enough and he, the son, was in a land of strangers perishing with hunger. He made up his mind that he would go back to his father and acknowledge his fault, saying that he did not expect to be called his son any more but desired to be a servant and in pursuance of this he arose and went away from the country in which he had been and proceeded homeward and when he came within view of home the father went out to meet him and treated him with the greatest kindness and tenderness and love. The son acknowledged what he had done, feeling himself unworthy to be called his father's son any more but wanted to be taken back in to the household as a servant. The father saw the thing in a different light and with the greatest demonstration of joy and affection welcomed him back. Not only this, but he clothed



him, put a ring on his finger and manifested his joy in every way possible. The elder son, however, who had been at home all the time was out in the field at work and when he heard the rejoicing at home he called one of the servants and inquired what it all meant and the servant informed him that his brother who had been away had returned and that the father was making merry, that the father was rejoicing, because that he had received him back safe and sound. His anger was kindled and he refused to go in but the father came out and entreated him, reasoning with him and he answered his father by saying that he had been at home all those long weary years—that he had served him honestly, faithfully, and thoughtfully and that he had never been treated with such demonstration of kindness as this prodigal was receiving. The father assured him that the son who had gone had been to him as dead and that the elder brother had always been with him and that all that the father had was his, and therefore that it was appropriate that they should indulge in demonstrations of joy because the dead was alive and the lost was found. This is the story in brief. I remember with great distinctness the sermons I used to hear on this parable or rather on the prodigal son. The preachers with whom I came in contact have never had very much to say about the son who stayed at home. They have told about the prodigal who wandered away. I remember particularly the sermon that impressed me most was a picture of the departure of this young man, the splendor with which he went away and the poverty and rags in which he returned. That all seemed good enough but when I got old enough to inquire about it I thought that if the prodigal meant anything the elder brother who stayed at home must mean something also, and after long and serious reflection I came to the conclusion that the sermons to which I had listened had only treated a very small part of the parable and therefore had practically not treated the parable at all. I wish you would understand that I do not propose to affirm tonight that my solution is absolutely correct but I do believe that you will agree that it is far better than the popular explanation and that it at least does that which I intend that it shall do: It will forcibly illustrate the idea I have of the two covenants: the one from mount Sinai, the other from Jerusalem, the one a ministration of death, the other a ministration of life, one by Moses, the other by Jesus Christ, one dedicated by the blood of animals, the other dedicated by the precious blood of Jesus Christ as the Lamb without blemish and without spot.

Let us study this parable a little while. Certain things appear

on the surface that even the superficial student will see. There are three conditions of the family represented here. First the united family or I should say the undivided family, consisting of father, elder brother, younger brother—all at home. Second, the family divided, the elder brother at home with his father, the prodigal in a far country wasting his substance in riotous living. Third, the family re-united: Father, elder brother, younger brother, who had been a prodigal, at home again. I raise this question tonight: If the father in this parable represents the Father of the spirits of all men—and I do not think anybody denies it—if the prodigal represents the sinner, and a great many people think that he does, then what does the elder brother who remains at home represent? He must represent something or somebody. If the father here represents our Father in heaven, and I think we agree that he does, if the prodigal represents the ordinary sinner, the wanderer, the profligate, the scapegoat, the rebel in the government of God, then the elder brother who stayed at home all the time must either represent the church or an individual Christian. Understand me now, I am just carrying out legitimately the ordinary interpretation of this parable. Well, we will say for argument's sake that this elder brother represents the church, the church of the living God. Do you think the spirit that he manifested when that prodigal sinner returned was the spirit of the church of the living God? Apparently he was suspicious that something unusual had happened at home and without personal investigation called a servant and wanted to know what it was, and then the servant informed him and he would not go in. Surely he does not represent the church. Well says one he must represent the individual church member. Here is his claim: "Lo, these many years have I served thee, neither transgressed I at any time thy commandment." A man who could make such a claim as that would surely be a very good man. Therefore he represents the individual Christian. Do you think the spirit he manifested there was the spirit of a Christian? Not by any means. If this parable does not mean that the father represents our heavenly Father, the elder brother the church or the individual Christian, and the prodigal the ordinary sinner what does it mean? It evidently means something.

I have some parallel Scriptures, some scriptures that in my judgment throw light on this. Therefore I will call your attention to them before proceeding: "And he spake this parable unto them saying, What man of you, having an hundred sheep, if he lose one of them, doth not leave the ninety and nine in the wilderness, and go after that which is lost, until he find it? And when he



hath found *it*, he layeth *it* on his shoulders, rejoicing. And when he cometh home he calleth together *his* friends and neighbours, saying unto them, Rejoice with me; for I have found my sheep which was lost. I say unto you, that likewise joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons, which need no repentance (Luke 15:3-7)." Here we have exactly the same idea. Somebody at home, somebody lost. The elder brother stayed at home, the prodigal was lost. His father said he was. There were ninety and nine of the sheep that were safe in the fold, one was lost. Here is another parallel: "Either what woman having ten pieces of silver, if she lose one piece, doth not light a candle, and sweep the house, and seek diligently till she finds it? And when she hath found *it*, she calleth *her* friends and *her* neighbours together, saying, Rejoice with me; for I have found the piece which I had lost. Likewise, I say unto you, there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth (Luke 15:8-10)." Here we have the same ideas again: Something not lost, something lost. And mark you these parables are in the same connection and precede the parable of the prodigal son. Again: Taking up the same idea of the lost sheep I give you the words of the Master and they are plain and conclusive: "And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold, *and* one shepherd (Jno. 10:16)." Something of great importance is meant. Notice here: One lost sheep, one lost piece of silver, one lost prodigal. I raise the question who was the lost sheep, who was the lost piece of silver, who was the lost prodigal? Who were the "other sheep"? Now it is clear that our Master was talking to the Jews but they were not lost in the ordinary or popular sense, for they were the children of God. For generations they had been in His school, and were being educated up to higher and better things and it would be utterly out of all harmony with what God had done for them and was doing for them and expected to do for them, to say that they represented the lost. I think, however, without answering this it will be apparent to your understanding as I proceed. Let us broaden this application just a little. It is a fact beyond any doubt that God is our Father and that we are all His children in one sense. He made us, He preserves us, He has redeemed us, whether we honor Him for making us, whether we thank Him for preserving us, or whether we obey Him for redeeming us. Facts are facts and these facts stand. Originally there was only one family and even yet we talk about the human family meaning everybody.



There is a broad sense in which a man is a member of the human race without regard to color, without regard to nationality, without regard to anything under the sun save the fact that he is a man. And we speak of Jesus as a Hebrew and yet there is a deep and wide and enduring sense in which He was more than that: over and over and over again He called Himself the Son of Man. I take it that He realized that He was the Son and a member of the whole race of man. Whether or not my exegesis of this parable is correct it is a fine illustration, a beautiful illustration, a telling illustration of the very thing that I want to press on you in this series of sermons. God made man and the original pair was increased by births until there was a great family and yet there was one family. From Adam to Abraham practically we may say there was no enduring distinction except the distinction resulting from conduct. That distinction has always been maintained and always will be maintained. But the division of the family of man began with the call of Abraham in Ur of Chaldees. It was intensified at the covenant of circumcision. It was perpetuated and intensified again by the covenant of Sinai, and became absolute, and from the day of Abraham's call for two thousand years the human family was divided, divided by Divine authority, by Divine arbitrament or by Divine will. There is no doubt about that. The parable of the prodigal son may not mean it but it surely does illustrate it. It is a fact, historically that can not be denied, that cannot be overturned, that by the act of calling Abraham out of Ur of Chaldees, by cutting him off from others, by giving him promises, by making a covenant with his seed, by throwing around him the great wall of law, by giving Israel special service, that Abraham or that God by that very act made a division of the human race and just as the father said in the parable of the prodigal son to the elder brother that the elder son was always with him and that all that he had was his, just so Abraham and his children always, compared with others, stayed at home and served God while the other nations were set adrift and the majority of them absolutely forgot God. That is an historical fact. I have been insisting in this series of sermons or arguments that the promise and the covenant of circumcision and the covenant at Sinai including the law and the service at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, were inclusive so far as Abraham and his blood were concerned and absolutely exclusive so far as others were concerned. And I may say that the difference was just as positive, just as deep, just as radical as the difference in a divided family. The population of the world outside of Abraham's family was just as certainly cut apart



from God's dealing with them as was the prodigal from his own father's house when in a land of strangers he wasted his substance, indulged in all sorts of riotous living and for a time forgot his home. That is a historical fact. Now the contrast that we have here in this parable is very remarkable. The elder brother stayed at home all the years and served his father. He said he did and the father did not dispute it. The prodigal wandered away, lost all he had and came to the conclusion that he was not worthy to be a son of his father any more but still desired to be a member of his household if he could only be one of his servants. It is a fact that the Scriptures, in describing the condition of Israel and of the Gentile world during the time, from I may say, the call of Abraham, but particularly from the covenant at Sinai, down to the cross, these things I repeat, bear me out in what I have said. Proof: "For if ye shall diligently keep all these commandments which I command you, to do them, to love the Lord your God, to walk in all his ways, and to cleave unto him; Then will the Lord drive out all these nations from before you, and ye shall possess greater nations and mightier than yourselves. Every place whereon the soles of your feet shall tread shall be yours: from the wilderness and Lebanon, from the river, the river Euphrates, even unto the uttermost sea shall your coast be. There shall no man be able to stand before you: *for* the Lord your God shall lay the fear of you and the dread of you upon all the land that ye shall tread upon, as he hath said unto you (Deut. 11: 22-25)." What have we here? God talking to the Jews or to the Hebrews. What is the sum of this assurance? That if they would do the will of God He would actually favor them and drive out other nations before them and give them a goodly land. Again: "For the Lord thy God blesseth thee, as he promised thee: and thou shalt lend upon many nations, but thou shalt not borrow: and thou shalt reign over many nations, but they shall not reign over thee (Deut. 15:6)."

What about the Gentiles during this time? Hear Moses: "When the Lord thy God shall bring thee into the land whither thou goest to possess it, and hast cast out many nations before thee, the Hittites, and the Girgashites, and the Amorites, and the Canaanites, and the Perizzites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites, seven nations greater and mightier than thou; And when the Lord thy God shall deliver them before thee; thou shalt smite them, *and* utterly destroy them; thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor shew mercy unto them: Neither shalt thou make marriages with them; thy daughter thou shalt not give unto his son, nor his daughter shalt thou take unto thy son. For they will turn away thy son

from following me, that they may serve other gods; so will the anger of the Lord be kindled against you, and destroy thee suddenly. But thus shall ye deal with them; ye shall destroy their altars, and break down their images, and cut down their groves, and burn their graven images with fire. For thou *art* an holy people unto the Lord thy God: the Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that *are* upon the face of the earth (Deut. 7:1-6)." Here we have a glimpse of the Gentile world—God's people were not to mingle with outsiders. Originally I said there was one family and that family had the intimation that God would at some future time bruise the serpent's head. In an important sense all men knew God. When God called Abraham and began to reveal Himself to him it seems that the other nations like the prodigal son wandered away and forgot God, and idolatry, rank, terrible, awful, pervaded the world; so awful, so terrible that God gave an order at Sinai that all idolaters should be put to death, not only in Israel but that they should destroy the idols of the people of the land into which God was leading them. It is recorded of the prodigal that he wasted all he had in riotous living. Allow me to read. Referring to the Gentile world no doubt: "And even as they did not like to retain God in *their* knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient; Being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness, full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, spiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, Without understanding, covenant-breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful: Who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them (Rom. 1:28-32)." How strikingly that like the statement concerning the prodigal! They did not like to retain God in their knowledge. Hear the Saviour's own words: "And not many days after the younger son gathered all together, and took his journey into a far country, and there wasted his substance with riotous living (Luke 15:13)." Again, hear Paul: "And you *hath he quickened*, who were dead in trespasses and sins; Wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience (Eph. 2:1,2)." Hear this statement: You who are dead in trespass and in sins! The father said of the prodigal: "This is my son who was dead and is alive." Again: "which in time past *were* not a people, but



are now the children of God: which had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy. Dearly beloved, I beseech *you* as strangers and pilgrims, abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul (I Pet. 2:10,11)." Get that thought if you can. Here he asserts that in time past these Gentile Christians were not the people of God. Did not the prodigal declare that he was no more worthy to be called his father's son and was he not willing to be admitted into the household on an equality with the servants? Certainly. The Hebrews stayed at home. They were the special, the peculiar people of God. They were a kingdom of priests, a holy nation unto Him. It is a historical fact that the Gentiles wandered away, that they forgot God, that they did not like to retain God in their knowledge and God gave them over to minds devoid of judgment, to do all sorts of things, to work out the destiny that He had placed in their hands because originally they knew God, but had wilfully turned away and forgotten Him.

We can well imagine that when the younger son went and made this demand on his father to which the father acceded that the father had in mind the ultimate reunion of the family. Sometimes a father gives his son his own way that his son may learn that his own way is not the best. And so "he divided unto them his living," and the young man took his journey into a far country. The parable of the lost sheep proves this. The shepherd who had ninety and nine at home desired to bring the other back that he might have an hundred. The woman who had ten pieces of silver and lost one, hunted for the lost piece of silver in order that she might have the original ten. He who said that He had other sheep declared also that He would bring them and there should be one fold and one shepherd. And notice this, that the very promise that divided the human race had in it the seeds of its re-union. When God said that he would make of Abraham a great nation, He left out every other nation; When God said he would make of Isaac a great nation, He left out every other nation; when God said that He would make of Jacob a great nation, He left out every other nation; When God made a covenant with Israel at Sinai, He left out every other nation and every other covenant; but in that very promise to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob there was the seed of re-union for He declared that in Abraham's seed, in Isaac's seed, in Jacob's seed, in their seed all nations of the earth should be blessed: "And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee; and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed (Gen. 12:3)." Paul is a good witness: "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds,

as of many; but as of one, And of thy seed, which is Christ (Gal. 3:16)." Did God intend that the family should be re-united? He did undoubtedly. Hear the apostle: "That in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; *even* in him (Eph. 1:10)." But it is not to be wondered at that the Jew would naturally get the idea into his head that he was not only then the chosen of God but that he should always be. Here is a fair illustration: Sometimes I see a young man who needs my special care and attention and love and I for a moment forget that I have other children and I give my heart to him. I see his weaknesses, I see where he is ready to fail, and I have seen it I think in several instances where he came to the conclusion that because I helped him when he was weak and needy that he was my favorite son. But I have no favorites. And so it was with the ancient Israelites—they thought they were the favorites of God and would always be. Jesus recognized that thing Himself. For some reason, we know not what it was, He left His own country one time and went over among the people on the coast—over among the Sidonians, and there was a woman over there who had an afflicted daughter. She had heard the name of Jesus, of His great, and tender, and sympathetic heart, and she went to Him and besought Him that her daughter might be cured, and He said it was not meet to take the children's bread and give it to dogs—meaning by dogs the Gentiles—and the woman assured Him that she knew this was true but that the dogs ate the crumbs that fell from the master's table, and Jesus recognizing her faith did as she desired (Matt. 15:21-28). And again the very same thing appears in His conversation with the woman at Jacob's well. It was noon-day. Tired, hungry and thirsty, He sat down by the well to rest. The woman came up and He discoursed to her on the glories and beauties and the grandeurs of the reign of the Messiah and led her mind on up, and as He led her along the highways of knowledge, He perceived that her heart was enlisted and He said to her: "Go, call thy husband, and come hither. The woman answered and said, I have no husband. Jesus said unto her, Thou hast well said, I have no husband; For thou hast had five husbands; and he whom thou now hast is not thy husband: in that saidst thou truly. The woman saith unto him, Sir, I perceive that thou art a prophet. Our fathers worshipped in this mountain; and ye say, that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship. Jesus saith unto her, Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet in Jerusalem, worship the



Father. Ye worship ye know not what: we know what we worship; for salvation is of the Jews. But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship Him. God is a spirit: and they that worship him must worship *him* in spirit and in truth. The woman saith unto him, I know that Messiah cometh, which is called Christ; when he is come, he will tell us all things. Jesus saith unto her, I that speak unto thee am *he* (Jno. 4:16-26)." Notice here this, that the idea had grown up and was recognized that salvation was to be of the Jews and in an important sense that was a fact and how like that elder brother who stayed at home! He would not go in and join in the festivities. He knew what kind of man his brother had been; he did not want to have fellowship with him; he thought he was better than his brother. He said to his father that he had stayed at home all these years and had honored him and obeyed him and he had never given him a kid that he might make merry with his friends. The same thing you see in Peter. Peter had the keys of the kingdom and the commission came to circulate the gospel among the Gentiles, yet as a matter of fact, having the prejudice of his race, the ideas of his race, the aristocratic ideas of his race, I may say, he would not go and preach the gospel to a Gentile until the very heavens had been opened and the voice of God came down to him telling him that what God had cleansed he had no right to call common (Acts 10:1-48). But I repeat that they knew, all of them knew that in the very promise and in the very covenant there was the seed of something for the entire human race. Proof: "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a law-giver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him *shall* the gathering of the people be (Gen. 49:10)." These are the words of Jacob. He did not say that the Hebrews only should gather to him, but the people, all the people. He had a vision broader than the mere handful of his own family, a vision that reached out and in mercy included the whole race of men! Again: "And the Gentiles shall see thy righteousness, and all kings thy glory: and thou shalt be called by a new name, which the mouth of the Lord shall name. Thou shalt also be a crown of glory in the hand of the Lord, and a royal diadem in the hand of thy God (Isa. 62:2,3)." Again, away down toward the close of the prophetic writings, nearer the day of Messiah we have these words: "For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same my name *shall be* great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense *shall be* offered unto my name, and a pure offering: for my name *shall be* great

among the heathen, saith the Lord of hosts (Mal. 1:11)." Mark you well this! Abraham knew, Isaac knew, Jacob knew, all intelligent Israelites knew, that the day would come when the prodigal would come back. As a matter of fact the very parable itself teaches that the elder brother was expecting him. He knew that something unusual was going on at the house and refused to go in until he had investigated, and when he had investigated he still refused to go, and Peter refused to go to the house of Cornelius until men came with a message from the Angel of God and until the voice told him to go and until the sheet from heaven and the voice from heaven proved to him that the Gentiles were no longer to be heathen, no longer aliens, no longer dogs. But the gospel was first to be to the Jews. Hear the word on this subject: When our Lord was about to leave the earth He said: "But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Spirit is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth (Acts 1:8)." Again, Paul was preaching the Gospel and the Jews turned away from him and he and Barnabas were ready to go elsewhere and here is the record of what they said: "Then Paul and Barnabas waxed bold, and said, It was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you: but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles (Acts 13:46)." And again: "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jews first, and also to the Greek (Rom. 1:16)."

What made the division? I answer the promise, the covenant of circumcision, the law, the priesthood, the ministration. When God made a covenant with Israel that left everybody else out and I have demonstrated that a covenant that left everybody out who wanted in was incompatible with the character of God save as it served His purpose for a little while in preparing the way for Messiah and the way for all nations of the earth. Well, what took away the dividing line? I answer that the thing that made it being fulfilled, the division or the dividing line was therefore removed. If I set up a partition or a fence between myself and my neighbor it divides us. If I take it down we are no longer divided by a fence. And here is a very remarkable thing. In reality—I want you to catch this—in reality there never has been but one human family. God is the Father of the spirits of all men: "And they fell upon their faces, and said, O God, the God of the spirits of all flesh, shall one man sin, and wilt thou be wroth with all the



congregation (Num. 16:22)?" God has made of one blood every nation under the heavens: "And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation (Acts 17:26)." Therefore, when the prodigal was wasting his substance in riotous living and the other brother was at home in obedience, when the father was pleased with the son at home and saddened by the wandering son, it was still in an important sense one family. As a matter of fact the division was artificial, arbitrary and transient, and only made for a certain purpose. This is true of all the nations now. In reality there is only one race in North America though we call some Mexicans, and some Americans and some Canadians, but we are all one; as human beings we have only one God, one common ancestry and one Redeemer, and one sun shines for us all. As a matter of fact history teems with proof of what I say: That the divisions that we call political or governmental or national are only arbitrary and they soon pass. Ancient empires have long since gone to dust, ancient glories have faded from the memory of man, ancient and honorable families now sleep upon the gentle breast of eternal oblivion and the division of the human race by the promise to Abraham was arbitrary and transient and only intended to be maintained a while. Here is the proof of it: Terah had three sons Abraham, Nahor and Haran (Gen. 11:26). The blood that coursed through the veins of Nahor and Haran was just as good as Abraham's blood. The only difference was that God took Abraham out for a purpose, to serve a purpose to serve as an illustration, and when he served that purpose and that illustration, God had no more use for him than He has for any other man. And again, the Egyptians who came up as camp followers when Israel came out of bondage were, as human beings, just as good as the Jews or Hebrews, the blood that coursed in their veins was more ancient and more honorable, speaking after the manner of men, than those whose camp followers they were, but God had said that His covenant was to be in the blood of Abraham and therefore they were left out. The ancient Babylonians were God's children by creation, their blood was just as good as the blood of the Hebrews. There was no difference save in this: God was keeping Abraham and his family at home for a while that through them He might at last reach the prodigal and bring him home. That is the idea exactly. And I may lay down a proposition here that the fleshly idea permeated the covenant: "In thy flesh my covenant shall be," was the assurance of God to Abraham that was fulfilled, and so far



as I am able to judge that the best that God expected to get out of it He got out of it when Abraham's blood and flesh was assumed by Jesus his Son. Hear the apostle Paul: "For verily he took not on *him* the nature of angels; but he took on *him* the seed of Abraham (Heb. 2:16)." And Paul assures us that though we have known Jesus after the flesh as a member of the tribe of Judah, as one of the ancient and honorable family of Abraham, that even now henceforth we will know him after the flesh no more (II Cor. 5:16). How was the division obliterated, how was the middle wall of separation torn down? I will read to you and after I read I propose to analyze and apply the tests of the word of God, making the Scriptures their own interpreter. Addressing the prodigal son, addressing the Gentile, addressing those that had been heathen, the apostle says: "Wherefore remember, that ye *being* in time past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called Uncircumcision by that which is called the Circumcision in the flesh made by hands; That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenant of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world: But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ. For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition *between us*; Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, *even* the law of commandments *contained* in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, *so* making peace; And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby: And came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh. For through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father (Eph. 2:11-18)." Let us study this Scripture awhile, study it in the light of the parable of the prodigal son, in the light of the ground that we have traveled over so earnestly and persistently all these days. First, all nations, kindreds, peoples, tribes and tongues outside of Abraham's family and the covenant of Sinai, were designated or known as the Uncircumcision, as the Gentiles, as heathen, and I may say as prodigals or dogs. Their condition in relation to God and one another is emphasized throughout the Bible. This is particularly so in the Epistles of the New Testament. The apostles remind them of what they were in sin and of what they were by the grace of God as an encouragement to them to be faithful in the performance of every duty. Hear the apostle Paul: "Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers,



nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, Nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God. And such were some of you: but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God (I Cor. 6:9-11)." Before their conversion these people had been fornicators, idolaters, effeminate, sodomites, thieves, covetous, drunkards, revilers, extortioners, but they had been washed in the blood of Jesus Christ and justified by His name and Spirit. How awful the condition of the Gentile world before Christ! How awful the condition of the world now without His saving power! Again: "Ye know that ye were Gentiles, carried away unto these dumb idols, even as ye were led (I Cor. 12:2)." Again: "For they themselves shew of us what manner of entering in we had unto you, and how ye turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God (I Thess. 1:9)." Again: "For we ourselves also were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful, *and* hating one another (Titus 3:3)." Again: "For the time past of *our* life may suffice us to have wrought the will of the Gentiles, when we walked in lasciviousness, lusts, excess of wine, revellings, banquetings, and abominable idolatries: Wherein they think it strange that ye run not with *them* to the same excess of riot, speaking evil of *you* (I Pet. 4:3,4)." Keep before you the words "alien" and "stranger" and remember that these words were applicable for two thousand years to those who were not of Abraham's blood or members of the covenant made with his seed. During the period under discussion the Gentiles were without Christ. They were exactly in the condition of the prodigal as in that strange land he wasted his substance in riotous living and began to be in want. Hear the great apostle of the Gentiles: "This I say therefore, and testify in the Lord, that ye henceforth walk not as other Gentiles walk, in the vanity of their mind, Having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart (Eph. 4:17, 18)." Is not that another photograph of the prodigal son? Alienated from his father's house, a wanderer walking in the vanity of his mind, hungry, sorrowing, lost, humiliated, ruined! They were aliens from God's promises and from the covenant of Israel. Hear the Master: "And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold, *and* one shepherd (Jno. 10:16)." Is not that the same as to say, "I have some disciples or friends who are



at home and some are wanderers but I am going to bring the prodigal, the wanderer, the sinner, the Gentile, the heathen back and then there shall be one fold and one shepherd." Hear Paul: "Who are Israelites; to whom *pertaineth* the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; Whose *are* the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ *came*, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen (Rom. 9:4,5)." They were hopeless and Godless. Mark you well the expression. Hear Paul: "For we are saved by hope: but hope that is seen is not hope: for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for? But if we hope for that we see not, *then* do we with patience wait for *it* (Rom. 8:24,25)." These Gentiles were without salvation for they were without hope and without God in the world. Again: "Howbeit then, when ye knew not God, ye did service unto them which by nature are no gods (Gal. 4:8)." When they did not know God, when they did not know Christ, they served those that by nature were not gods; gods that had ears, but they could not hear; they had eyes, but they could not see; they had tongues, but they could not speak; they had feet, but they could not walk. Again, hear Paul: "But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope (I Thess. 4:13)." O the sadness of the myriads that were hopeless! for a long time the prodigal was hopeless, but when he came to himself and reflected he said that his father's hired servants had bread enough to eat and he was perishing; that he would arise and go to his father. Noble resolve that! They were afar off—the prodigal was afar off—Jesus said it, but they were made nigh by the blood of Christ. It was not by His birth, it was not by His doctrine, but by His own blood. When He presented the cup He said, "This is the new testament in my blood shed for many for the remission of sins (Matt. 26:28)." Hear Paul the great commentator on that thought: "And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission (Heb. 9:22)." By His blood He reconciled us and in Him all distinctions are blotted out. There is no Jew, no Greek, no barbarian, no heathen, no African, no Asiatic, no American in Christ. We are all one in Him. Again: There was peace by our Lord and Saviour in the breaking down of the middle wall of separation. Said Jesus the Master: "These things have I spoken unto you that in me ye might have peace (Jno. 16:33)." There was no peace in the family while it was divided. The father's yearnings were for the prodigal child, and at last when he came home and when the elder brother was



convinced by the overpowering argument of the father, he said not another word. There was an abolishment of the enmity and hatred that had grown up through the administration of the law by which the Jew and Gentile were separated. Did not the elder brother say that he had kept the commandments? Was he not self-righteous? Did he not think himself better than anybody else? Hear the apostle Paul on this same subject: "Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross . . . 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 (Col. 2:14,20)." Again, so great was the effect of the death of Jesus in the rending of the veil, in the removal of the law, the dividing line in his own body, that He fulfilled the promise for He was the seed of Abraham and on the cross He nailed the law and abrogated the law and took it away, and therefore there was a new opportunity opened for the world—the whole race! Hear the apostle Paul: "And having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, *I say*, whether *they be* things in earth, or things in heaven. And you, that were sometime alienated and enemies in *your* mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled. In the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and unblamable and unreprouvable in his sight (Col. 1:20-22)." The alienated, the wanderers, those who had forgotten God and knew Him not, and were starving and perishing while the Father had plenty and to spare! By the death of Jesus on the cross, Jew and Gentile were reconciled one to another and also reconciled to God. By the act of His birth He fulfilled the promise, and by the act of shedding His blood He took away the old covenant and ratified the new. And therefore the reconciliation took place in the family, one member toward the other, one division toward the other, and the two toward God. It is a beautiful thought. The enmity was destroyed. It took time to remove it, but it gradually melted away under the mighty triumphs of God's dear Son. Proof: "Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with *him*, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is freed from sin (Rom. 6:6,7)." Again: "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: That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit (Rom. 8:3,4)." Again: Peace was preached through Jesus Christ. Not only was recon-



ciliation effected between man and man, and between God and man, but peace was preached. I read it to you: "He came and preached peace to you which were afar off"—the prodigal was afar off—"and to them that were nigh." Let us have some Scripture on this subject. Here are the words of one of the prophets of Israel: "I create the fruit of the lips; Peace, peace to *him that is far off*, and to *him that is near*, saith the Lord; and I will heal him (Isa. 57:19)." Who is afar off? The prodigal is afar off. Well said one, "I do not believe in your interpretation of the parable." All right. Every Gentile was afar off whether my interpretation is correct or not. Again, hear the word of God: "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy King cometh unto thee: he is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass. And I will cut off the chariot from Ephraim, and the horse from Jerusalem, and the battle bow shall be cut off: and he shall speak peace unto the heathen: and his dominion *shall be* from sea *even* to sea, and from the river *even* to the ends of the earth (Zech. 9:9,10)." Again, turning to the Scriptures of the New Testament and to the first Pentecost after our Lord went up on high. These are the words of Peter: "For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, *even* as many as the Lord our God shall call (Acts 2:39)." Again: "The word which *God* sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ; (he is Lord of all:) (Acts 10:36)." Therefore let every kind and loving and tender heart, let every nation and kindred tribe and tongue bring forth the diadem of praise and honor and glory and crown Jesus King of heaven and Lord of all! And again: "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ (Rom. 5:1)." And again, and finally on this point: "And the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus (Phil. 4:7)."

Not only was there peace, but Jew and Gentile alike had access unto God. O the thought of admission to him! When the covenant was made at Sinai, when the tabernacle was set up in the wilderness the law went forth that any stranger who came nigh should die, meaning not only Gentiles but any member of any tribe save Levi, and I may narrow it down and say of the house of Aaron, but under the reign of Jesus Christ whose reign is peace, under the reign of Him who is life and light and liberty, we have access unto God! Only the high priest and he only with blood in his hand was permitted to stand in the presence of the



Glory and Light between the cherubim on the mercy seat; but any heart, broken and breaking, under the weight of sin hath access to God through the crucified Redeemer who was spit upon, trampled upon for us, but was glorified in the heavens, making intercessions for us according to his Father's will. Let us have some Scripture on this point: "By whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God (Rom. 5:2)." And again: "In whom we have boldness and access with confidence by the faith of him (Eph. 3:12)." And again: "But unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ (Eph. 4:7)." Again: "Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need (Heb. 4:16)."

Brethren, hear me: The promise to Abraham was the separation, but in it were the seeds of re-union. The birth of Jesus was the fulfillment of that promise as far as the flesh was concerned; the cross of Jesus was the dividing line and there we have reconciliation and in every nation in the world, wherever the sinner turns his eye and his heart and his soul to that cross in faith and obedience, there is salvation for him. Hear Peter at the house of Cornelius: "Then Peter opened *his* mouth, and said, Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: But in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him (Acts 10:34,35)." So the reconciliation was effected at the cross by the taking away of that which had caused the separation—by the removal of the old covenant, its sacrifices, its service, all that pertained to it. Now we come to the climax: and a glorious climax it is: To all of those who had been brought from idols to serve the living God—all the prodigals who had been brought back to the Lord's house from heathenism, to the Father's house, to all who had been united with other Christians in the bonds of Christian fellowship in the new covenant, Paul says: "Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone; In whom all the building fitly framed together groweth into an holy temple in the Lord: In whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit (Eph. 2:19-22)." And again speaking of Jew and Gentile, of Israelites and heathen, Paul says: "And put no difference between us and them purifying their hearts by faith (Acts 15:9)." And again: "But now the righteousness of God without the law is

manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; Even the righteousness of God *which is* by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference; For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God (Rom. 3:21-23)." Again: "For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek: for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him. For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved (Rom. 10:12,13)."

Again, and finally: "And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek: and his rest shall be glorious (Isa. 11:10)." I have gone over the ground: First, a united family, down to the promise to Abraham; Second, a divided family, from Abraham down to the birth and to the cross of Christ; Third, a re-united family, not in the flesh of Abraham, not in the covenant of circumcision, not in the law of Moses, not in the prophets, but in the Son of God, reunited in Him who gave His life for us, having made peace by His cross, life by His Gospel, and hope and heaven by His promise. Surely my contention that the parable of the prodigal son illustrates God's dealings with man in the old covenant and in the new is true. Brethren, as the old hath passed away, as the new hath come in, as the myriads of earth's sons and daughters who are lost stretch out their hands to implore us, may the Holy Spirit press on each heart the weight of woe of those that are lost and those who can say from the depths of their helplessness, My Father hath enough and I perish here hungry! May the Holy Spirit stir our hearts and may the Gospel and the inspiration and the presence of the risen Lord who gives us the marching orders cause us to look out for ourselves and never rest until we make peace in doing the best of which we are capable. What rejoicing there was in the family when the wanderer returned! What joy there was when the shepherd came back from the mountains with the sheep that had been lost! What joy there was when the woman found the piece of silver that had been lost! What joy there was in heaven when one sinner repented! But O, the joy! O the glory that shall ring in earth and heaven when Messiah takes His own, when all the world shall come to a knowledge of Him who died for their salvation. Then it shall be that every human heart shall be attuned to the praise of God and every tongue shall speak His glory; then it shall be that all the hearts and all the voices of earth and heaven shall ring one grand and glorious and triumphant strain that shall shake the foundations of the earth and the foundations of the New Jerusalem, saying:



Worthy is the Lamb to reign, worthy is He to receive the honor, the respect, and the admiration of every kindred, tribe and people and tongue in every age, yes, ages on ages innumerable, incalculable, inestimable, beyond the flight of any imagination, beyond the computation of any human mind!

Friday, February 24, 1899; 7 p. m.

SERMON NO. XII—THE PROVISIONS OF THE NEW  
COVENANT.

*Text: "God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect (Heb. 11:40)."*

What does the apostle mean here by "us"? What does he mean by "they"? What does he mean by "provided"? What does he mean by "better things"? I answer the first question by saying that he means by "us" himself and his contemporaries and all who were to live in the gospel dispensation from that time down to its end. By "they" he means all that had lived previous to the dispensation of grace. Those to whom he refers particularly, however, are named in this chapter, at least a large number of them. He mentions the elders without regard to name, then he gives a long line of illustrious people who had served God: Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Gideon, Barak, Sampson, Jephthae, David, Samuel and the prophets. It is a remarkable fact that according to this text God has provided better things for us than anything that the ancient patriarchs and prophets understood or saw or enjoyed. I do not dishonor Moses but I do exalt Jesus in affirming that God has developed for us a better way. This word "provided" here has the meaning that we ordinarily hear, but it has a deeper meaning than that. It means foreseen, foreknown, fore-ordained, pre-determined or predestined. Therefore God pre-arranged better things for us, and in the Gospel has provided them for us, prepared them for us, offered them to us. This passage raises an interesting question. As throwing light on it I introduce another passage. After telling of all the wonderful things that the patriarchs and prophets and saints and servants of God had done he uses these words: "These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of *them*, and embraced *them*, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth (Heb. 11:13)." Again: "And these all, having obtained a good report through faith received not the promise (Heb. 11:39)." It is evident that these men, although they lived up to the light they had, although they did the best they could although they were men of



faith, men of courage, men of self-forgetfulness; men of humility, men of devotion, men of obedience, that they died without seeing the day of the fulfillment or the realization of the promise of God to the children of men. These suggestions and explanations raise a very important and interesting question. It is this: Were these ancients, patriarchs and prophets and saints and martyrs and servants of God saved? Undoubtedly. And yet the apostle says that they died without having seen the fulfillment of the promise, that is without having received the thing promised for they had the promise—that they died before the day of its fulfillment came. Let us for a few moments discuss the salvation of these men. How were they saved? It is a fact that Abraham, though a man of faith, though the friend of God, on account of his faith had, comparatively speaking, but little knowledge of Him. He looked forward to a better day, a better time, a better way and confessed that he was a stranger and a pilgrim in the earth. And I will assert just here without any reservation that while Abraham was saved in obedience to God's commands that it would be utterly impossible for you to seek and obtain salvation as he sought it and found it for the reason that God hath prepared better things for you, a clearer, better way for us under Jesus Christ. The change that has been made is not in faith and obedience for faith and obedience have always been required. Abraham believed certain things and did certain things and was saved. If you believe the same and do the same you will be damned! The change is not in the act of believing, but in that which was believed. Abraham believed in a coming Redeemer and confessed that he was a stranger, a pilgrim in the earth but in our time we are brought face to face with a fact—with a person, with the Christ—and our Lord's own words are clear, positive, unalterable and conclusive: "I said therefore unto you, that ye shall die in your sins: for if ye believe not that I am *he*, ye shall die in your sins (John 8:24)." Abraham believed in a coming Redeemer, I believe in the Redeemer as a fact—having come and accomplished His work on earth—as a reality and therefore Paul was right when he said that God had provided better things for us—not promises simply, but a living, pleading Redeemer—and the test that I give you as applicable to Abraham, was applicable to all of the ancients, those whose heroic deeds and whose honorable names are recorded in the oracles of God. Let us look into the Scriptures a little further. I lay down a proposition for your contemplation and for my discussion, that Abraham and his contemporaries and that others before the coming of the Messiah were saved on the following plan: They believed God and



were counted righteous; they obeyed God and were justified, but their salvation was not and could not be consummated, completed, perfected, rounded out, until the Savior actually shed His blood and appeared in heaven, in God's presence, with His own blood. Let us turn to the proof: "And he believed in the Lord; and he counted it to him for righteousness (Gen. 15:6)." He did what he could and the act of believing was accepted until God told him something else to do. Hear James: "Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect? And the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness: and he was called the Friend of God (James 2:21-23)." Obedience plays a part, but hear the words of the apostle Paul: "And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission (Heb. 9:22)." But I hear one say that Abraham shed blood, he built altars, he offered sacrifices, he believed God and therefore his sins were blotted out. Abraham believed God and it was counted unto him for righteousness; he obeyed God, and he was accepted and justified. But I raise the question: Was it possible for his sins to be blotted out until Messiah's blood had been shed and until he entered heaven by that blood? Let me raise another question here and I realize that we are in deep water now, but I lay it down as a proposition rather, that if Abraham could be saved without the shedding of the Redeemer's blood, if any human being could be saved without the shedding of the Redeemer's blood, then He shed His blood in vain. Faith could not take away sin. Obedience could not take away sin. The blood of goats and calves could not take away sin. Only the blood of Jesus actually shed and actually presented in the Father's presence on high could make it possible that any sin could be blotted out. Therefore there is something else in the case of Abraham that is important to us. I proved to you that his faith was all right. Hear the apostle: "He staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief; but was strong in faith, giving glory to God; And being fully persuaded that, what he had promised, he was able also to perform. And therefore it was imputed to him for righteousness (Rom. 4:20-22)." Mark that! He was not righteous but he was counted righteous or righteousness was imputed unto him. The last part of our text fits right in here. Notice the reading: "God having provided some better things for us, that they"—that is the patriarchs—"without us should not be made perfect." I lay down this proposition that



those who believed God and were counted righteous or unto whom righteousness was imputed were not really righteous, were not perfect, until the shedding of the Redeemer's blood. Paul in discussing this question, and I will call it up again later, says to the Hebrews that they had come unto the general assembly and church of the first born which are written in heaven to God the Judge of all and to the spirits of just men made perfect (Heb. 12:23)." Abraham was a just man, Isaac was a just man, Jacob was a just man, Moses was a just man, Samuel was a just man, David was a just man, the prophets were just men; they believed, they obeyed, they did what they could, but only by the shedding of the Redeemer's blood could sin be actually wiped out forever and therefore they were not perfected until Jesus Christ expired on the cross and became a priest by His Father's oath. Let me give you some stronger proof that that. Speaking of Jesus: "And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions *that were* under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance (Heb. 9:15)." Mark you this! He not only died for those who were contemporary with Him and those who lived ages after Him but for the redemption of those who lived under the preceding testament, that they might have the promise of everlasting redemption or inheritance.

I emphasize the fact tonight that God our Father has provided certain things for us, that they are better than the things that were prepared for those who lived before the coming of the Redeemer and I lay the emphasis also on the fact that God prepared them. He did not call a council of men but out of His own sovereign will, out of His love, out of His tenderness, out of His kindness, out of His benevolence, He has provided good things for us, for the life that now is, and for that which is to come. We may very naturally therefore, ask, How did God provide these things? By whom did God provide these things? When were they opened and when were men admitted to these provisions and to the enjoyment of the same? I answer first by saying that it must have been in the life of the writer of the passage under consideration for he puts himself in with the others and says that God had provided better things for them or to use his own word "us." Evidently the time of the providing of these things had not been very far back of the time when this writer spoke. I shall tonight undertake to find out who prepared these things, when, how, by whom they were opened up and what the provisions were. I draw your attention again to one of the land-marks or one of the light-houses



along the line of the way that we have come: God's promise unto Abraham his servant. The promise was two-fold. It pertained to Abraham's flesh and unto every nation or every family in the world. So far as the flesh was concerned it was fulfilled when Jesus was born, "For verily," says Paul, "he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham (Heb. 2:16)."

But when did the blessing of God come on all nations through Abraham? Where, and under what circumstances was this promise or the way for the fulfillment of this promise unto every tribe and kindred and tongue? Hear Paul again: "So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham (Gal. 3:9)." Again: "For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world"—father of all believers in every age—"was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law"—law of Moses—"but through the righteousness of faith"—faith in the Redeemer. "For if they which are of the law"—members of the first covenant—"be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect (Rom. 4:13,14)." Here is a very important point and I shall emphasize it with all my power, that the promise that Abraham should be the heir of the world was not through the law of Moses, and that if Abraham's children by the flesh or by the law are heirs of the gospel then the promise is invalidated and the contention that there is a spiritual element in the promise falls. Again: It is evident, very evident to my mind, that if the law was added until the seed came—and Jesus is the seed—and if those who are of the law were not the heirs, then as a matter of fact, before God could provide better things than those that were enjoyed under the law, the law had to be taken out of the way. I am sure you can see that, but for fear you do not grasp it fully I will put it in another way: If those who were members of the old covenant were not to be added by virtue of that fact to the new covenant, then in order that the way might be prepared for membership in the new covenant by the provisions laid down, the first was of necessity abrogated—taken away. Paul makes that very clear without regard to time, without regard to date, without regard to circumstances—with one broad and mighty sweep he says: "He taketh away the first,"—first covenant—"that he may establish the second"—second covenant (Heb. 10:9). Mark you my contention! and it is based on the plainest possible statement of the apostle Paul: That the heirs of the law, or of the fleshly promise were not therefore and thereby eligible to membership in the new institution—then there must be another ground of membership in the new institu-



tion. Do you catch that? I repeat, that those who were members according to the law, if they were not eligible to membership in the new church or the new covenant and to the provisions of God's grace under the reign of Jesus it follows undoubtedly, that there is not only a new covenant, but new conditions of membership in the same. Let us see if we can find anything that will throw light on this subject. Hear the apostle Paul: "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:"—this is of superlative importance to us—"but, The man that doeth them shall live in them (Gal. 3:11,12)." I want you to weigh that for just a minute. Mark you this! God has provided some better things for us and they did not come by the law because by the law no flesh should be justified in His sight. Then how are they to come? Hear the apostle again: "But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe. But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed (Gal. 3:22,23)." Mark you that under the law they were shut up to the faith that should afterwards be revealed. Do you wish to go back to the law, therefore? They did not know the Christ; they did not know His power!

I raise another question: If the heirs of the law were not heirs of the gospel, if the members of the first covenant are not members by virtue of that of the second covenant, and if faith is the basis, on what is that faith based? And I will bring you down a little nearer to the time where I shall explain what are the provisions, when they were made known, who provided them, who opened them up to the children of men. I turn to the testimony of one who ought to know. Jesus had been up on a mountain with His disciples and had been transfigured before them and as they came down from the mountain He charged them that they should tell no man what they had seen: "And as they came down from the mountain, he charged them that they should tell no man what things they had seen, till the Son of man were risen from the dead. And they kept that saying with themselves, questioning one with another what the rising from the dead should mean (Mark 9:9,10)." Allow me in this connection to present the testimony of Paul: "And if Christ be not risen"—everything turned on His resurrection from the grave—"then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain (I Cor. 15:14)." Hear me: Under the law they were shut up to the faith that was afterwards to come. The ground of salvation under the gospel is faith and that faith is

based on the fact that our Lord and Master arose again from the dead. Mark you this! If the heirs of the law were not by virtue of that heirship heirs of the gospel, if the members of the first covenant were not by virtue of that membership, members of the second, if men by the law were not justified, and if men by the gospel or by faith can be justified and if that justification is by faith based on the resurrection of Christ from the dead, what follows? It follows as certainly as light follows the sun that the law must be taken away. Proof: "But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster. For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus (Gal. 3:25,26)." Contrast the law and the gospel: "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ (John 1:17)." Law, gospel; letter, spirit; death, life; Moses, Christ; temporal promises, promises spiritual and eternal. We are coming down nearer the time. Let us carefully, cautiously, deliberately weigh every word and trace if we can the relations of our Lord and Master to the law. He was born under the law: "But when the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law (Gal. 4:4)." Why? What object did He have? What work did He have? Let the apostle answer: "To redeem them that were under the law"—deliver them from the law—"that we might receive the adoption of sons (Gal. 4:5)." He knew the law from His childhood. Hear Luke: Jesus was taken by His parents to Jerusalem in obedience to the command of Moses, and they thought He was with the company on their return, and when they discovered that He was not they went back and sought Him and found Him and here is the report of it: "And it came to pass, that after three days they found him in the temple, sitting in the midst of the doctors, both hearing them, and asking them questions. And all that heard him were astonished at his understanding and answers. And when they saw him, they were amazed: and his mother said unto him, Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us? behold, thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing. And he said unto them, How is it that ye sought me? wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business? And they understood not the saying which he spake unto them (Luke 2:46-50)." He came to fulfill the law. Hear His own words: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled (Matt. 5:17, 18)." Not only did He Himself respect it, but He taught others to do the same; "Whosoever therefore shall break one of these



least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach *them*, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven (Matt. 5:19)." Again: "Then spake Jesus to the multitude, and to his disciples, saying, The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, *that* observe and do; but do not ye after their works: for they say, and do not (Matt. 23:1-3)." And again, He temporarily set the law aside that He might illustrate His own power because the Lawgiver is greater than the law. He who made the universe can stop the planets in their course, He who is the maker of man can bring him again from the dead, He who made the law, was the author of the law, and was prefigured in the law and by the law, could set it aside if He chose. Let us have some proof for that. Jesus with His disciples went through some one's field and according to the privilege given by the law they helped themselves to all they needed to eat and of course He was reproached for it and here is what He answered: "And it came to pass on the second sabbath after the first, that he went through the corn fields; and his disciples plucked the ears of corn, and did eat, rubbing *them* in *their* hands. And certain of the Pharisees said unto them, Why do ye that which is not lawful to do on the sabbath days? And Jesus answering them said, Have ye not read so much as this, what David did, when himself was an hungered, and they which were with him; How he went into the house of God, and did take and eat the shewbread, and gave also to them that were with him; which is not lawful to eat but for the priests alone? And he said unto them, That the Son of man is Lord also of the sabbath (Luke 6:1-5)." And again: A woman was taken in a crime and she was brought by tormentors unto Jesus desiring to know whether or not He was in favor of putting her to death, but He knew their sins too and therefore He proposed that the man who was without sin should cast the first stone. And He wrote on the ground and the tormentors and persecutors went out one by one. Let us have the exact words of John's account: "And the scribes and Pharisees brought unto him a woman taken in adultery; and when they had set her in the midst They say unto him, Master, this woman was taken in adultery, in the very act. Now Moses in the law commanded us that such should be stoned: but what sayest thou? This they said, tempting him, that they might have to accuse him. But Jesus stooped down, and with *his* finger wrote on the ground, *as though he heard them not*. So when they continued asking him, he lifted himself, and said unto them, He that is



without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her. And again he stooped down, and wrote on the ground. And they which heard *it*, being convinced by *their own* conscience, went out one by one, beginning at the eldest, *even* unto the last: and Jesus was left alone, and the woman standing in the midst. When Jesus had lifted up himself, and saw none but the woman, he said unto her, Woman, where are those thine accusers? hath no man condemned thee? She said, No man, Lord. And Jesus said unto her, Neither do I condemn thee: go, and sin no more (John 8:3-11)." To sum up: Jesus was born under the law, knew the law, respected the law, set it aside temporarily to illustrate His purpose and down at the end He removed it forever: "Blotting out the handwriting"—the ten commandments—"of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross (Col. 2:14)."

If the better things suggested in the text were not provided in the law or in the first covenant when and where were they provided? That they were not under the law or in the law I have demonstrated over and over again. Did Jesus unfold them so that people understood? Mark you, God contemplated in the promise to Abraham a blessing on everybody and in order to do that two things were necessary, First, He must make Himself plain and, Second, He must get the consent of those whom He would bless. I raise this question: Did Jesus our Master fully reveal the new law of God? Did He so reveal it that men could understand it? Did He come out with the facts? I will let the Bible answer: "All these things spake Jesus unto the multitude in parables; and without a parable spake he not unto them: That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet saying, I will open my mouth in parables; I will utter things which have been kept secret from the foundation of the world (Matt. 13:34,35)." How did Jesus talk? Did He come out and tell everybody that He is the Christ? No. Often He went and hid Himself from the gaze of the idle multitude. They were not ready; God was not ready; the full time had not come and so in bringing the truth to bear on the minds of men, the common people, He spoke in parables. He laid some natural object alongside of His kingdom and tried to throw light over on the kingdom, on the covenant, on the church, on the new and living way. And so He talked and yet His simplest illustrations were veiled in mystery to that generation, and to every other generation they would have been veiled in mystery had not the Holy Spirit in the apostles made their meaning clear, and so He talked of sowing, fishing, sheep-raising, mustard seed, leaven, unjust stewards.



prodigal sons, debtors, fig-trees, virgins, suppers, laborers. How little they knew of His meaning and yet how fully He identified Himself with the people of His day: He was providing for them something better than the law, better than the prophets, better than the types, better than the shadows, better than the animal sacrifices,, but they could not understand. There are three illustrations at hand and to these I call your attention. To my mind they are very forcible: First: "Then answered the Jews and said unto him, What sign shewest thou unto us, seeing that thou doest these things? Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up. Then said the Jews, Forty and six years was this temple in building, and wilt thou rear it up in three days? But he spake of the temple of his body (John 2: 18-21)." Do you know that it is a matter of fact that He so veiled His meaning here that this was one of the counts in the indictment on which He was tried for His life at the end? Proof: "Now the chief priests, and elders, and all the council, sought false witness against Jesus, to put him to death; But found none; yea, though many false witnesses came, yet found they none. At the last came two false witnesses, and said, This *fellow* said, I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it in three days. And the high priest arose, and said unto him, Answerest thou nothing? what *is it which* these witness against thee, But Jesus held his peace (Matt. 26:59-63)." Second: The antagonists of the Master came to Him: "And when he was come into the temple, the chief priests and elders of the people came unto him as he was teaching, and said, By what authority doest thou these things? and who gave thee this authority? And Jesus answered and said unto them, I also will ask you one thing, which if ye tell me, I in like wise will tell you by what authority I do these things. The baptism of John, whence was it? from heaven, or of men? And they reasoned with themselves, saying, If we shall say, From heaven; he will say unto us, Why did ye not then believe him? But if we shall say, Of men; we fear the people; for all hold John as a prophet. And they answered Jesus, and said, We cannot tell. And he said unto them, Neither tell I you by what authority I do these things (Matt. 21:23-27)." Third, They came to Him and wanted to know about the kingdom. His contemporaries had an idea that the old kingdom of David was going to be set up again. Hence they came and raised that question: "And when he was demanded of the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God should come, he answered them and said, The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: Neither shall they say, Lo, here! or, lo there! for, behold, the kingdom of



God is within you (Luke 17:20,21)." If this teaches anything it teaches that these things were not provided in the law and they were not provided so the people could grasp them, understand them, appropriate them, assimilate them, believe them, obey them, during the life of our Lord.

But to return to our question, When? I will let the Master Himself answer. When were these things provided? Listen: "The law and the prophets *were* until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it (Luke 16:16)." How is that? says one. Were they provided when John began his ministry? You might give that such an interpretation, but is it a fact? Is that what our Lord meant to teach? I think not for this reason, and the passage itself, carefully weighed and deliberately analyzed, means only this: The law of Moses and the prophets of Israel continued as the only instructors of Israel until the beginning of the ministry of John but since that event the kingdom of God was proclaimed and men pressed toward it. The kingdom was in the preaching. The preaching was largely veiled in the mystery of the parables and dark sayings. But the people understood enough of it to believe and see that something better was ahead. "Well," says one, "I take the position that the new things and the better things were provided right there." All right. You stand by it. Here is our rule: "When a passage is apparently susceptible of two or more meanings give it that which will allow everything else said on the subject to be true." Now I raise the question: If the law and the prophets ended with John and the kingdom of God began with John then here is something that cannot be true: "Joseph of Arimathaea, an honourable counsellor, which also waited for the kingdom of God, came, and went in boldly unto Pilate, and craved the body of Jesus (Mark 15:43)." When was the covenant opened? Let Paul answer: "For the law maketh men high priests which have infirmity; but the word of the oath, which was since the law, *maketh* the Son, who is consecrated for evermore (Heb. 7:28)." Let me sum it up: It was not in the law, I have proved that. It was not in the parables of Jesus fully, though they had the seed of better things in them. He nailed the law to the cross. Paul says it was since the law,—that is, after the law was abolished—following the law, subsequent to the law. Therefore it could not be of the law or in the law or through the law. In reality what is this thing that we are discussing? Says one, the New Testament. Correct. Says another, the New Covenant. Correct. Now if this is the New Testament or if this is the new covenant, I raise this question: Who is the testator? Jesus. Let Paul throw



a little light on the subject. If this is the new covenant, if Jesus is the testator, by whose blood was the covenant ratified? "For where a testament *is*, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. For a testament *is* of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth (Heb. 9: 16,17)." Then if our Lord and Master when alive unfolded His testament it could not be in force until He died. But here is an idea that this translation does not bring out, but it is there. It is asserted here that there must of necessity be the death of the testator. Paul says the death of the testator must be brought in, must be declared. Not only must the man who makes a will, die, but the witnesses of that will must bring it into court; it must be probated as we say. How was the testament dedicated or brought in? Let the apostle answer: "Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption *for us* (Heb. 9:12)." We come now to the death of the testator, to the shedding of the blood and to the dedication of the covenant by the shedding of that blood. And I have two arguments that ought to settle the question and I shall insist that they do. First, Paul in his letter to the Galatians, "But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a school master. For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus (Gal. 3:25,26)." Again, and this is by far the most elaborate argument on the subject in the New Testament: "For ye are not come unto the mount that might be touched"—this was the place where the covenant was entered into and dedicated—"and that burned with fire, nor unto blackness, and darkness, and tempest, And the sound of a trumpet, and the voice of words;"—mark you, the ten commandments—"which *voice* they that heard entreated that the word should not be spoken to them any more:"—they fled from the voice from Sinai—" (For they could not endure that which was commanded, And if so much as a beast touch the mountain, it shall be stoned, or thrust through with a dart: And so terrible was the sight, *that* Moses said, I exceedingly fear and quake;) But ye are come unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God,"—Jerusalem where the new covenant was opened—"the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, To the general assembly and church of the firstborn, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect. And to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant,"—no old covenant, no identity of the two covenants in this!—"and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than *that of* Abel. See that ye refuse not him that speaketh.



For if they escaped not who refused him that spake on earth,"—Moses—"much more *shall not we escape*, if we turn away from him that *speaketh* from heaven:"—Jesus—"Whose voice then shook the earth: but now he hath promised saying, Yet once more I shake not the earth only, but also heaven. And this *word*, Yet once more, signifieth the removing of those things that are shaken, as of things that are made, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain. Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved, let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear: For our God *is* a consuming fire (Heb. 12:18-29)." He says we are not come unto the mount that might be touched. What mount was that? Sinai. Then we have not come to mount Sinai. But he says we have come unto Jerusalem the city of the living God, and Jesus our great High Priest who cleanseth us with His blood.

But as supplemental to these arguments I will give you the testimony of David. Hear him: "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool. The Lord shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion:"—not out of Sinai, but Zion, Jerusalem—"rule thou in the midst of thine enemies. Thy people *shall be willing*"—the gospel makes men willing—"in the day of thy power in the beauties of holiness from the womb of the morning: thou hast the dew of thy youth. The Lord hath sworn and will not repent. Thou *art* a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek (Psalms 110:1-4)." Again, the prophet: "The word that Isaiah the son of Amoz saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem. And it shall come to pass in the last days, *that* the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations"—How utterly unlike the covenant ratified at Sinai which only included one nation—"shall flow unto it, and many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem (Isa. 2:1,2)." Again: "But in the last days"—gospel dispensation—"it shall come to pass, *that* the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established in the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills; and the people shall flow unto it. And many nations"—Jews and Gentiles, everybody—"shall come and say, Come, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for the law shall go forth of Zion,"—



not Sinai—"and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem (Micah 4:1,2)." Again, turning to the testimony of the Lord and Master Himself: "Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures,"—the scriptures of the first covenant—"And said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem; And ye are witnesses of these things (Luke 24:45-48)." Again: "But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Spirit is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem,"—just what David, Isaiah and Micah predicted—"and in all Judaea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth (Acts 1:8)." And again: Peter who was there at the beginning,—in harmony with the predictions of the prophets and the command of Jesus to the apostles—at the inauguration of the covenant as one of the witnesses of that covenant, defending himself after having gone in and preached to the Gentiles said that God poured out the Holy Spirit on them as on "us" at the beginning: "And as I began to speak, the Holy Spirit fell on them, as on us at the beginning (Acts 11:15)."

Let us sum up a little: God has provided better things for us; there is, there can be no doubt of this. They are not in the promise for that has been fulfilled; they are not in the law, because it is not of the law, but of faith; they are not in the parables of Jesus but in the gospel as preached by the apostles. We turn the leaves therefore until we open at the cross of Jesus. We begin at the cross on Golgotha's heights, but the cross in its symbolism and power was not set up in the hearts of men until the day of Pentecost, in the city of Jerusalem. Contemplate the scene, if you please! The law is taken away. The blood has been shed. The Priest is on high. The witnesses are present. Thousands are gathered there. Paul said we have not gathered at Sinai now but we have gathered at Jerusalem. At Sinai the people said: "All that the Lord hath said we will do (Ex. 24:3)." And here are the witnesses of the covenant, present on Pentecost ready to open its principles and provisions unto dying men. Men have a choice in the matter, they had a choice even at Sinai. Moses went up to God, came back and told the people what God proposed and they declared that they would do everything that He required, and it is none the less a matter of choice under the gospel of our Lord. The Divine side is done, for the blood has been shed, the priest has been received into His Father's own presence and consecrated evermore by the word of His Father's oath. Here I will drop an interesting point:

The prophet declared that God would write His law on the hearts of men, in their inner parts, and so here we are at the inauguration of the covenant and God is about to begin to open the covenant sealed by the blood of Jesus which is a new covenant, "since the law," to write His words, to write His will, to write His ways, upon the hearts and consciences of the children of men. How is that done? Peter was present as one of the witnesses; he had the keys of the kingdom; he was imbued with power to open and loose with the assurance that it would be ratified in heaven. Here is the way he says it was done. It was not done by miraculous power. The miracle was performed on the apostles that they might preach an infallible gospel. Now Peter, how was it done? Years afterward in the great convention at Jerusalem he got up and said: "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"—preaching and hearing!—"should hear the word of the gospel and believe (Acts 15:7)." Paul, how were the words of the new covenant written in the hearts or put in the inner parts of men? Let him answer in his own words: "But what saith it? The word is nigh thee *even* in thy mouth, and in thy heart: that is, the word of faith, which we preach (Rom. 10:8)." How was it on Pentecost? The Holy Spirit came down, took charge of the minds and of the tongues of Peter and his associates, and unfolded the covenant, brought to their minds what Jesus had said, opened up the parables, opened up the commandments, opened up the Commission, made it all plain and clear that these people might enter into a covenant with the Lord. Step by step he led them on, thought upon thought, climax upon climax, until at last here are the mighty words that rolled from the depths of his heart, and I may say from the depths of eternity: "Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ (Acts 2:36)." Through the hearing, this was written on the minds of the people just as Jeremiah had predicted. When the people heard the word of God they cried out: "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" And here is the answer: "Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:38)." This is where the covenant was opened. This is where the better things provided were unfolded to the minds and to the hearts and to the consciences and to the lives of men. Better things than Abraham enjoyed, better things than Moses enjoyed,



better things than David enjoyed, better things than Samuel enjoyed, better things than all of them together ever enjoyed!

Taking our stand now at the beginning of the gospel or the opening up of the covenant let us survey the ground. In a previous sermon I discussed the weaknesses of the old institution but I come now to briefly call your attention to the strong, the mighty power of the everlasting covenant, sealed by the blood of Jesus Christ. First, it was for the whole race of man: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved (John 3:16,17)." It was not for Abraham only like the promise, it was not for Israel like the first covenant, but it was for every nation, every family, every tribe, every tongue. Hear Peter on that subject: "For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, *even* as many as the Lord our God shall call (Acts 2:39)." It was a covenant of which Jesus was the surety or security: "By so much was Jesus made a surety of a better testament (Heb. 7:22)." Back yonder when I raised the question that the old covenant was a broken covenant from the beginning, if you have an inquiring mind, when I said that men broke the old covenant and invalidated it, you asked yourselves: "May not men break the new?" Brethren we do break it. I have broken it so many times, that I am ashamed to enumerate them before God and man, but when I break the covenant my Surety stands! If a man goes my security on a note and I fail to meet it, he meets the demand, cancels the obligation. I have gone into a covenant with Jesus Christ and He is my security. When I break the covenant, when I fail, He meets the demand that is upon me, otherwise I would be lost, hopelessly. All praise and honor and glory to His name! Yes, they broke the first covenant but the mediator of that covenant Moses was as weak as any of them; he sinned and was left out of the promised land. He could not come up and say: "Lord I will stand for them;" the best he could say was that if Israel had to perish he wanted to go to destruction too. It is not that way now. If I sin Jesus stands as my security. If I break the covenant, the covenant stands as long, and as securely, as stands the Everlasting Throne! The new covenant is within and then without. First on the heart: "For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation (Rom. 10:10)." Second, on the mind: "I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself serve the



law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin (Rom. 7:25)." Third, on the body: "Neither yield ye your members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin: but yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God (Rom. 6:13)." Again: "I beseech you, therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable, unto God, *which is* your reasonable service. And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what *is* that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God (Rom. 12:1,2)." It begins on the inside; heart, affection, conscience, mind and then on life, works, destiny. The law was on the outside and worked to get in. The gospel is on the inside and is bound to come out! Jesus said it was like a little leaven hidden in meal and all became leavened (Matt. 13:33). The gospel in the heart, in the conscience, in the mind, leavens the mind, leavens the life, marks out the pathway, guides the hand, controls the destiny. No physical death penalty hangs over us here. On the day of Pentecost Peter preached an affirmative gospel. It was full of love, full of encouragement, full of salvation, but there was not a word said about dying if men refused it. As long as there is life there is hope. Let me give you some proof. How will it be in the end with those who finally reject the gospel: "He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses: Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace (Heb. 10:28,29)." Again: "See that ye refuse not him that speaketh. For if they escaped not who refused him that spake on earth, much more *shall not* we *escape*, if we turn away from him that *speaketh* from heaven (Heb. 12:25)." In the new institution we have an exalted Christ: "Him hath God exalted with his right hand *to be* a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins (Acts 5:31)." Again: "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of *things* in heaven, and *things* in earth, and *things* under the earth; and *that* every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ *is* Lord, to the glory of God the Father (Phil. 2:9-11)." By the Holy Spirit on Pentecost, Peter assured inquirers who wanted to get into the covenant that they should have the gift by the Holy Spirit. And again: "And we are his witnesses of these things; and *so is* also the Holy Spirit, whom



God hath given to them that obey him (Acts 5:32).” Again: “And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying Abba, Father. Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ (Gal. 4:6,7).” Again: “For this cause I bow my knee unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named, That he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man (Eph. 3:14-16).” Under the law there is no mention of the Holy Spirit but under the gospel we are to be strengthened with power by the Spirit of God in the heart, in the conscience, in the mind. We have a Brother in the presence of God for us. Hear the great apostle of the Gentiles: “Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; And deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. 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. For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted (Heb. 2:14-18).” What is our Brother doing there? Advocating our cause: “My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: And he is the propitiation for our sins: And not for ours only, but also for *the sins* of the whole world (I John 2:1,2).” Sin forever done away! “I will be merciful unto their righteousness and their sins and iniquities will I remember no more (Heb. 8:12).” Again: “And I will cleanse them from all their iniquity, whereby they have sinned against me; and I will pardon all their iniquities, whereby they have sinned, and whereby they have transgressed against me (Jer. 33:8).” Again: “Rejoice not against me, O mine enemy: when I fall, I shall arise; when I sit in darkness, the Lord *shall be* a light unto me (Micah 7:8).” Again: “Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:38).” And again: “Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord (Acts 3:19).” There never has been a power or a religion



in the world's history that could blot out, eternally wash away, sins save the new testament sanctified by the blood of the Son of God. Under this institution we may be justified: "Be it known unto you therefore, men *and* brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins: And by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses (Acts 13:38,39)." Again, hear the apostle Paul declaring emphatically that under Jesus man may be received as just: "But for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead; Who was delivered for our offenses, and was raised again for our justification (Rom. 4:24,25)." Again: "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ: . . . much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life, And not only *so*, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement (Rom. 5:9-11)." And under this institution, with our Lord on His throne, standing at Pentecost we may know that there is life for us: "The thief cometh not, but for to steal, and to kill, and to destroy: I am come that they might have life, and that they might have *it* more abundantly (John 10:10)." Again: "And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent (John 17:3)." Again: "But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name (John 20:31)." Again: "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of life; (For the life was manifested, and we have seen *it*, and bear witness, and shew unto you that eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us); That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us: and truly our fellowship *is* with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ (I John 1:1-3)." And under this institution we may have righteousness—a state of righteousness—a state unto which no man under the old institution did or could attain. Hear the apostle again: "And hereby we do know that we know him. if we keep his commandments (I John 2:3)." And again: "Little children, let no man deceive you: he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as he is righteous (I John 3:7)." Under this institution we have perfection,



liberty and transformation: "Now the Lord is that Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord *is*, there *is* liberty. But we all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, *even* as by the Spirit of the Lord (II Cor. 3:17,18)." Again: "For the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope *did*; by the which we draw nigh unto God (Heb. 7:19)." Hear me: Under this institution we have not only life and righteousness, but liberty. Where the spirit of Jesus is, there is liberty. Again we have a good conscience. The old institution could not give a good conscience because there was the ever-recurring remembrance of sin. But how is it from Pentecost on? "Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and *of* a good conscience, and *of* faith unfeigned (I Tim. 1:5)." No fault can be found with the new institution. Jesus is its foundation, Jesus is its Head, its Testator, its Mediator. By His blood was it dedicated and by His life is it secured. But God found fault with the old institution, its promises and provisions. Peter made promises on Pentecost. What were they? Remission of sins. What else? The gift of the spirit of God. What about these promises? Hear Peter: "According to his divine power hath given unto us all things that *pertain* unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that hath called us to glory and virtue: Whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises: that by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust (II Peter 1:3,4)." Hear Paul on this subject: "Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God (II Cor. 7:1)." And again under this institution, under the reign of Jesus we have God's mercy and kindness: "For we ourselves also were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful, *and* hating one another. But after that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared, Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Spirit; Which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour; That being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life (Titus 3:3-7)." And again, we have the true Life who is the light and life of men. Proof: "In him was life; and the life was the light of men. . . . *That* was the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world (John 1:4,9)." And again: "But if we walk in the

light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin (I John 1:7)." Again and finally: "*And we know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness. And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life. Little children, keep yourselves from idols. Amen (I John 5:19-21).*" Light! O how dark it was even to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. What long weary years in which they waited! Comparatively speaking they lived in the twilight of the world. But we are under the blaze of the Gospel. We have the true Light, the Light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world—unto the light of the perfect day! And again, we have a living hope: "*Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead (I Peter 1:3)*" Jesus Christ has begotten us again unto a living hope by His resurrection from the dead. We have the strong assurances of the covenant, not only for this life but also for the next. How dark, comparatively, it was when a patriarch died! How dark, comparatively, it was when a prophet died! But with the Christian at eventime there is light. The sun sinks in the west out of sight to paint a gorgeous sunset to all who are to be left behind in darkness assuring us that he has risen somewhere else. So with the gospel which by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, provides for us, sanctifies for us, makes eternal for us, these provisions! The Christian, when he dies, though he sinks to the grave leaves behind the tinted gleam on the sunset clouds, showing that his star is rising in a favored land. May God our Father help us to ponder well the things that are prepared for us, provided for us. May we appropriate them to ourselves and may we remember that those who despised Moses and refused to hear his word died an awful death under the testimony of two or three witnesses! May we remember, may we reflect, on how terrible it will be if we refuse to hear Jesus, for He speaks from heaven. He came out from God and He speaks with an authority as solemn, as deep, as awful, as omnipotent, as eternal, as God Himself: "*Hear ye him!*" Through the provisions of the new covenant He is still speaking to the children of men. O fainting, dying brother, turn Him not away!



Saturday, February 25, 1899; 3:30 p. m.

SERMON No. XIII.—THE TWO COVENANTS AND THE  
OBSERVANCE OF SABBATHS.

*Text: "Ye shall keep my sabbaths, and reverence my sanctuary: I AM the Lord (Lev. 26:2)."*

Here are two commandments backed up by the Lord Himself. First, they were to keep His sabbaths, Second, they were to reverence His sanctuary. I shall address myself particularly to the first. At the very threshold of this investigation I want to emphasize one word. The word is not sabbath, it is sabbaths; not a single sabbath but the plural of sabbath; not one sabbath but many sabbaths. Following this command there comes the statement: "I am the Lord!" This emphasizes the importance of the commands. It is a fact that while the sabbath day is defined and explained, that generally the command given in reference to the subject is in the plural number. Not only is this so in the law of Moses but it is so also in the prophetic writings and in the New Testament. Hence my theme: The observance of sabbaths under the two covenants, or of the observance of days. It seems that from the Lord's standpoint there were a number of sabbaths, and He does not discriminate by saying to the Hebrews, that they should keep this sabbath or that sabbath or that they should honor this command to keep the sabbath, and dishonor that command to keep the sabbath, but that they should keep His sabbaths, meaning all of these sabbaths. There are a number of passages to which I call your attention: "Ye shall fear every man his mother, and his father, and keep my sabbaths: I am the Lord your God (Lev. 19:3)." Again: I call your attention to the testimony of the prophet of the Lord: "Wherefore I caused them to go forth out of the land of Egypt, and brought them into the wilderness. And I gave them my statutes, and showed them my judgments, which if a man do, he shall even live in them. Moreover also I gave them my sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them (Ezek. 20:10-12)." Again, from the very same source: "Thou hast despised mine holy things, and hast profaned my sabbaths (Ezek. 22:8)." Again: "Her priests have violated my law, and have profaned mine holy things: they have put no difference between the unclean and the clean, and have

hid their eyes from my sabbaths, and I am profaned among them (Ezek. 22:26)." Again: "Moreover this they have done unto me: they have defiled my sanctuary in the same day, and have profaned my sabbaths (Ezek. 23:38)." Again: "And in controversy they shall stand in judgment; and they shall judge it according to my judgments: and they shall keep my laws and my statutes in all mine assemblies; and they shall hallow my sabbaths (Ezek. 44:24)." Again: "Likewise the people of the land shall worship at the door of this gate before the Lord in the sabbaths and in the new moons (Ezek. 46:3)." Turn with me to the New Testament: "Then said Jesus unto them, I will ask you one thing; Is it lawful on the sabbath days to do good, or to do evil? to save life, or to destroy it (Luke 6:9)?" He does not use the term sabbaths, but He uses the term of the phrase "sabbath days," which still leaves it in the plural. Again: "Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days (Col. 2:16)." On this we have the testimony of Moses, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Jesus, Paul, therefore I will not discuss the sabbath or the sabbath day, but I will discuss the sabbaths or the sabbath days. A little history: I am aware of the fact that if I demonstrate by the New Testament that the sabbath has been nailed to the cross along with the law somebody may want to go back behind the law and say that as on that account God rested on the seventh day we ought to do likewise. But more of this farther on. To the law and to the testimony: "Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made (Gen. 2:1-3)." I assert here with all reverence and deliberation that no man can prove by His statement that anybody rested on that day save God Himself. There is not the slightest intimation that any human being was commanded to or required to, or that the propriety of keeping this day was suggested to any human being in those times. There were other laws in the patriarchal times. When Noah came out of the ark God gave him a number of laws, one against eating blood, another against murder: Hear the record: "But flesh with the life thereof, *which* is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat. And surely your blood of your lives will I require; at the hand of every beast will I require it, and at the hand of man; at the hand of every man's brother will I require the life of man. Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image



of God made he man (Gen. 9:4-6)." Again, the law of circumcision: God addressing Abraham said: "And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you (Gen. 17:11)." All of these laws were re-enacted under Moses. Allow me to give you the proof in detail. First the law requiring the keeping of the seventh day. So far as man was concerned, mark you that I said, there is not any proof prior to the keeping of the sabbath in the wilderness by the special command of God that any human being ever kept it, but at the giving of the law, these are the words of Jehovah relative to it: "Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work: But the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God: *in it* thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that *is* within thy gates: For *in* six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them *is*, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it (Ex. 20:8-11)." The law against murder: "Thou shalt not kill (Ex. 20:13)." Law against eating blood: "And whatsoever man *there be* of the house of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among you, that eateth any manner of blood; I will even set my face against that soul that eateth blood, and will cut him off from among his people (Lev. 17:10)." The law of circumcision: "And in the eighth day the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised (Lev. 12:3)." And again in the very words of the Master: "Moses therefore gave you circumcision; (not because it is of Moses, but of the fathers;) and ye on the sabbath day circumcise a man (Jno. 7:22)." Proposition: The law of the sabbath, the law on the subject of eating blood, the law on the subject of murder, the law on the subject of circumcision, re-enacted from the patriarchal ages, in the law of Moses, must of necessity share its fate.

Go back to the text a moment. The Lord declared that they should keep His sabbaths. From much of the preaching and the talk and the discussion and the writings of the day you would understand that God never had but one sabbath and that was the sabbath of the decalogue or of the ten commandments. As a matter of fact that was only a small portion of what God means when He says "my sabbaths." As a matter of test I raise this question; answer it in your own mind: How many sabbaths are defined, how many sabbaths are required, in the law of Moses? The next man you meet who declares that it is the duty of every Christian to keep the seventh day because of the fact that God rested on



that day and because of the fact that it is a part of the ten commandments, ask him as a matter of fact to tell you how many sabbaths were required by the law of Moses? To my mind this is a very interesting question. I want to show you what God meant when He said that they should keep His sabbaths. It was equivalent to a demand on them for nearly thirty-three per cent of their time. I am not going to be critically exact because if I should it would make it difficult for you to understand. Therefore I shall give you a general view. I have heard of the sabbath all the days of my life; you have heard of it all your life, and even among people who ought to know better you hear people talk about the sabbath school, the sabbath day, the sabbath this, or the sabbath that, or the sabbath the other, and I say this, that while I have heard much about the sabbath day—the seventh day—I have not heard very much about the other sabbaths and God does not discriminate. He does not lay one down and say that is my sabbath and you must keep that and He does not lay another one by the side of it and say that is my sabbath and you must keep that and He does not lay another one by the side of it and say that is my sabbath also but keeping it is a matter of indifference; keep it if you want to, and let it alone if you want to, but He sums it all up again and says positively and preemptorily: “Ye shall keep my sabbaths.” I want you to follow me in the account where every sabbath day was a sabbath unto the Lord our God or unto the Lord their God. Proof: “And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, *concerning* the feasts of the Lord, which ye shall proclaim *to be* holy convocations, *even these are* my feasts. Six days shall work be done: but the seventh day *is* the sabbath of rest, an holy convocation; ye shall do no work *therein*: it *is* the sabbath of the Lord in all your dwellings (Lev. 23:1-3).” As I said I should not be critically exact, we will just go along and suppose that the year contains as many days as ours, and say that they kept fifty-two sabbath days every year. Second, two sabbaths at the feast of the passover and unleavened bread. Proof: “In the first day ye shall have an holy convocation: ye shall do no servile work therein. But ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord seven days; in the seventh day *is* an holy convocation; ye shall do no servile work *therein* (Lev. 23:7,8).” Two sabbaths every year. Third, one sabbath at the day of first fruits. Proof: “And ye shall proclaim on the selfsame day, *that* it may be an holy convocation unto you: ye shall do no servile work *therein*; it *shall be* a statute for ever in all your dwellings throughout your generations (Lev. 23:21).”



One day kept without labor unto God, a sabbath. Fourth, the day of the blowing of trumpets unto God was a sabbath in which they should not do any labor. Proof: "Speak unto the children of Israel, saying, In the seventh month, in the first *day* of the month, shall ye have a sabbath, a memorial of blowing of trumpets, an holy convocation. Ye shall do no servile work *therein*: but ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord (Lev. 23:24,25)." One day, another sabbath. Fifth, day of atonement: Proof: "It *shall be* unto you a sabbath of rest, and ye shall afflict your souls: in the ninth *day* of the month at even, from even unto even, shall ye celebrate your sabbath (Lev. 23:32)." One day in which they were not to do any work on penalty of being excommunicated from Israel. Sixth, feast of tabernacles, two sabbaths. Proof: "Also in the fifteenth day of the seventh month, when ye have gathered in the fruit of the land, ye shall keep a feast unto the Lord seven days: on the first day *shall be* a sabbath, and on the eighth day *shall be* a sabbath (Lev. 23:39)." Two days devoted unto God and no work done therein. Summary of one year: Six different periods or sabbaths aggregating fifty-nine days. Mark you: the sabbath day coming in regular order, the sabbaths of the feast of the passover and unleavened bread, the sabbath of the atonement, the sabbath of the feast of tabernacles. Seventh, the sabbath of years: Every seventh year, absolutely no work: "And the Lord spake unto Moses in mount Sinai, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, when ye come into the land which I give you, then shall the land keep a sabbath unto the Lord. Six years thou shalt sow thy field, and six years thou shalt prune thy vineyard, and gather in the fruit thereof; but in the seventh year shall be a sabbath of rest unto the land, a sabbath for the Lord: thou shalt neither sow thy field, nor prune thy vineyard (Lev. 25:1-4)." Eighth, every fiftieth year was a sabbath unto the Lord their God. Proof: "And thou shalt number seven sabbaths of years unto thee, seven times seven years; and the space of the seventh sabbaths of years shall be unto thee forty and nine years. Then shalt thou cause the trumpet of the jubilee to sound on the tenth *day* of the seventh month, in the day of atonement shall ye make the trumpet sound throughout all your land. And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout *all* the land unto all the inhabitants thereof: it shall be a jubilee unto you; and ye shall return every man unto his possession, and ye shall return every man unto his family. A jubilee shall that fiftieth year be unto you: ye shall not sow, neither reap that which groweth of itself in it, or gather *the grapes*



in it of thy vine undressed. For it is the jubilee; it shall be holy unto you: ye shall eat the increase thereof out of the field. In the year of this jubilee ye shall return every man unto his possession (Lev. 25:8-13)." Summary of fifty years, eight different sabbaths required by the law: The sabbath day, twenty-six hundred days, passover one hundred days, day of first fruits fifty days, feast of trumpets fifty days, atonement fifty days, feast of tabernacles fifty days, sabbaths of years two thousand, five hundred and twenty days, jubilee three hundred sixty days; grand total in fifty years, five thousand eight hundred thirty sabbaths, or sixteen years and seventy sabbath days. Text: "Ye shall keep my sabbaths and reverence my sanctuary. I am the Lord." Summary of sabbaths required from the giving of the law to the cross—understand me I do not say that they did it, but I do say that God required it—it was a period of fifteen hundred years or thirty jubilees aggregating the grand total of one hundred seventy-four thousand, nine hundred sabbaths, or four hundred eighty-five years and three hundred days! Text: "Ye shall keep my sabbaths and reverence my sanctuary for I am the Lord." How were these eight sabbaths kept? Every seventh day was kept by refraining from all sorts of labor and by allowing the stock to rest. The sabbaths of the feast of unleavened bread were kept in like manner; so the day of first fruits; so the blowing of trumpets; so the day of atonement; so the feast of tabernacles; so the sabbath year; so the year of jubilee—no sort of work was the idea; absolute rest on that day, resting in honor of God and in obedience to His commandments. In obedience to what law did they keep these sabbaths? The law of God. They did not know any distinction as to importance. In point of importance one was just as important as another and they were just as scrupulously exacting touching one as they were another. How was the law given, by whom was the law given? A very interesting question indeed. Let me give you the answer: "And the Lord spake unto you out of the midst of the fire: ye heard the voice of the words, but saw no similitude; only ye heard a voice. And he declared unto you his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, *even* ten commandments; and he wrote them upon two tables of stone (Deut. 4:12,13)." Again: "Moses commanded us a law, *even* the inheritance of the congregation of Jacob (Deut. 33:4)." Then the law came by the voice of God from mount Sinai, His own voice, His own words, His own commands, and by the mouth of Moses the servant of God. To whom was this law given, this law regulating the sabbaths, these laws requiring that they give nearly one-third of their time unto rest,



unto reverence and unto the remembrance of the commandments of God? Who received the law? Let Moses answer: "And Moses called all Israel, and said unto them, Hear, O Israel, the statutes and judgments which I speak in your ears this day, that ye may learn them, and keep, and do them. The Lord our God made a covenant with us in Horeb. The Lord made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, *even* us, who *are* all of us here alive this day. The Lord talked with you face to face in the mount out of the midst of the fire, (I stood between the Lord and you at that time, to show you the word of the Lord: for ye were afraid by reason of the fire, and went not up into the mount) (Deut. 5:1-5)." Notice one thing particularly here: Moses did not say Hear O Gentiles, Hear O Egyptians, Hear O Cananites, but he said "Hear, O Israel,"—and there was only one Israel—"The Lord our God made a covenant with us in Horeb." Let us see if we can find out anything about that in addition to this. Standing by the mountain just before the ten commandments were proclaimed by the voice of Jehovah, the Lord said: "For they were departed from Rephidim, and were come *to* the desert of Sinai, and had pitched in the wilderness; and there Israel escaped before the mount (Ex. 19:2)." He did not say, Thus shalt thou say to the Gentiles, or to the Egyptians, or to the Cananites but He sent His message to Israel, to Abraham's sons, to Jacob's sons according to the flesh. Again: "Ye shall keep the sabbath therefore; for it *is* holy unto you: Every one that defileth it shall surely be put to death; for whosoever doeth *any* work therein, that soul shall be cut off from among his people. Six days may work be done; but in the seventh *is* the sabbath of rest, holy to the Lord: whosoever doeth any work in the sabbath day, he shall surely be put to death. Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the sabbath to observe the sabbath throughout their generations, *for* a perpetual covenant. It *is* a sign between me and the children of Israel for ever: for *in* six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested, and was refreshed (Ex. 31:14-17)." Let me call your attention to a few elemental facts here: The penalty of death was added to the commands to remember and keep the sabbath day. Again: The children of Israel only were commanded to keep it and I lay down the proposition broad, deep and sweeping, positive, unequivocal, that no man has yet been born who can lay his finger on any command in the law in the prophets, in the Gospels, in the Acts of the Apostles or elsewhere requiring anybody else to keep it. He declared that it was a sign between Himself and Israel, not between Himself and all nations, but between Himself and His

own peculiar family, and He declared that they should keep it throughout their generations perpetually. I will admit, if something cannot be shown to the contrary, that Israel is yet under obligations to keep the sabbath, the sabbaths. But no Gentile in any age, any country, any time, anywhere, was ever required to keep that commandment unless he became a member of the covenant and submitted to circumcision, thereby receiving the sign of membership in the covenant. In their generations! What does that mean? In our generation means in our time. The time of Israel was I may say without hesitation from the time of the giving of the law to the death of Christ and to the destruction of the temple. In their generations! Proof: Speaking of these very people our Lord said: "And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled (Luke 21:24)." I am not done with the idea of the penalty. The law of Moses had its own appropriate and I may say appalling penalties. What was the penalty for sabbath desecration touching the seventh day or any other day? I will let Moses answer. What was it? Death. Proof: "And Moses gathered all the congregation of the children of Israel together, and said unto them, These *are* the words which the Lord hath commanded, that *ye* should do them. Six days shall work be done, but on the seventh day there shall be to you an holy day, a sabbath of rest to the Lord: whosoever doeth work therein shall be put to death. Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitations upon the sabbath day (Ex. 35:1-3)." Again: "And while the children of Israel were in the wilderness, they found a man that gathered sticks upon the sabbath day. And they that found him gathering sticks brought him unto Moses and Aaron, and unto all the congregation. And they put him in ward, because it was not declared what should be done to him. And the Lord said unto Moses, The man shall be surely put to death: all the congregation shall stone him with stones without the camp. And all the congregation brought him without the camp, and stoned him with stones, and he died; as the Lord commanded Moses (Num. 15:32-36)." So much for the seventh day.

Shall we keep the sabbath day or the sabbaths? I answer by asking, which? I have proven to you that there were eight under the law and if you affirm that we must keep a sabbath or the sabbath I ask you to please tell me which one, and then tell me by what authority you discard the other seven. Or if you say we must keep seven, I ask you by what authority you discard the



other one? Hear me! If there is any reason to keep one, the same reason will require us to keep all. If there is any authority to keep one the same authority will require us to keep all. If there is any scripture requiring us to keep one the same scripture will require us to keep all. If there is any reason why we should neglect one the same reason will justify us in neglecting all. If there is any scripture for neglecting one we may therefore by the word of God neglect them all. And so I answer every Judaizing teacher in our time who says that we must keep a sabbath or the sabbath, I ask which sabbath? One or all? One or all! All or none. You might as well face the issue fairly and squarely, it is unequivocal. God Almighty said: "Ye shall keep my sabbaths." If that has any application to anybody in our time it takes in all the sabbaths and if it does not take in all of them it does not take in any of them. Of that there cannot be a doubt, from this conclusion there can be no escape. I declare that we should neither keep one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, or eight, or any other number. God was addressing Israel under the law. He was not addressing Israel under the Gospel, but Israel under the law, and he never did address such a command as that to any Gentile, in any age, or any country, or any time. Well, says one, "I would like to see a little proof of that." You can just see as much proof if it as you want. Open the book with me. God said, as I have already given you proof, that it should be kept by Israel in their generations. Moses said that God proclaimed His covenant from mount Sinai to Israel or made a covenant with them. Who were the Israelites? They were Hebrews. Who were the Hebrews? Abraham's family. Who were Abraham's family? Let the book answer. Somebody might say that it was not true if I attempted to answer, but if the Bible answers let mortal men tremble, let him put his hand on his mouth and be silent: "He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised: and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant (Gen. 17:13)." Born in Abraham's house! Bought with Abraham's money! Hear me again in the exact words of Moses: "The Lord our God made a covenant with us in Horeb (Deut. 5:2)." I was not born in Abraham's house, I was not bought with his money, my great-great-great-great-grand-father was not present at mount Sinai and therefore the covenant was not made in him or with him for me. I am not a Jew, I am not a Israelite, I am not a Hebrew, I am not a slave of Abraham, I am not of his body, I am not of his blood. But I am a Jew, I am a Hebrew, I am an Israelite, in a higher, a nobler sense of kinship to Jesus Christ. Hear the apostle



Paul on the subject: "For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither *is that* circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: But he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision *is that* of the heart, in the spirit, *and* not in the letter; whose praise *is* not of men, but of God (Rom. 2:28,29)." Hear me, while I give you a startling proposition: That really, religiously there never was a Jew in the new covenant neither was there ever a Gentile in the new covenant and yet in a certain sense, in an important sense, men are still Jews and still Gentiles. But religiously the distinction Jew and Gentile is blotted out in the terms of the covenant that makes a man a Christian. Here is a fair illustration of that. A man does not lose his nationality by becoming a Christian. He is still a Canadian, still an American, still an Englishman, still a Frenchman, still a German, still a Russian, still a member of whatever nationality he was before, but he is a Christian. The idea is this: That the religious distinction in the word Jew, in the word Hebrew, Israelite, Heathen, Gentile, stranger, circumcision, uncircumcision, is blotted out in Christ. Proof: "Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise (Gal. 4:28)." Hear me! The great difficulty as I take it, in the Apostolic Church was this: You know that there were Judaizing teachers who went about trying to pull the law of Moses over into the church. Paul fought the thing from the heart, from the shoulder, and I think the difficulty with those Hebrew brethren was this; they did not fully understand the Gospel and were not fully delivered from the law and they thought if the ten commandments were done away with that the thing just licensed men to do anything that they wanted to do, and they thought also that in the abolishment of the law that the nation was abolished which was not a fact. Here is an illustration: I go to Japan with the Gospel and preach it, and the people misunderstand me and conclude that the abolishment of their religion also abolishes the empire of Japan. The Judaizing teacher had an idea that the nation would be blotted out and that if they were no longer under the law in the church, in a new covenant, that a man could commit adultery and kill, or do anything that is prohibited in the law of Moses and still be a Christian! That is where the mistake was. And there is where many a man has mistaken Paul. Paul said he had naught against his nation. He still loved his nation with an undying love, just as we love the stars and stripes, just as every loyal Briton loves the Union Jack, so Paul loved his nation. The trouble was they did not understand the Gospel. And when Paul said they were not under law but under grace they did not comprehend the fact that if a man is



really under grace he will not want to do the things prohibited in the law under Moses. They had an idea that the abolishment of the law was the abolishment of the morality of the nation. Paul says we are not under the law and in answering this argument to these good people, Philippians, many of them converted to Christ—they said in their contention which amounted to this: That if we are not under the law then in the church we can do the very things that have been prohibited for generations. That in my judgment was the ground for the contention. And Paul combated that very idea when he argued with them on the subject. I will give you some of his own words. He says: "And not as Moses, *which* put a vail over his face, that the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished: But their minds were blinded: for until this day remaineth the same vail untaken away in the reading of the old testament; *which vail* is done away in Christ. But even unto this day, when Moses is read, the vail is upon their heart. Nevertheless when it shall turn to the Lord, the vail shall be taken away (II Cor. 3:13-16)." The vail of darkness, the vail of misunderstanding was on the heart of some of these Christians. We ought not to be too hard in our judgment upon them. They did not understand the spirit, the liberty, the power, the radical or the revolutionary power of the Gospel. And when Paul said that the ten commandments were done away they thought Paul meant to say that if you want to go and worship other gods go and do so, if you want to dishonor your father and mother to do so, if you want to kill, steal, commit adultery, covet, go and indulge in them all—and we hear such expressions from ignorant men today. But under and over and in all was the idea in the Gospel that he tried to pound into their heads, that if a man is a converted man and has the Gospel written in his heart, you could not induce him to do such a thing. You do not need any law to keep him straight.

Jesus and the sabbath day. He had many contests with His countrymen on that very ground. He did good on the sabbath day. He declared that the Son of Man is Lord, even of the sabbath! "And it came to pass on the second sabbath after the first, that he went through the corn fields; and his disciples plucked the ears of corn, and did eat, rubbing *them* in *their* hands. And certain of the Pharisees said unto them, Why do ye that which is not lawful to do on the sabbath days? And Jesus answering them said, Have ye not read so much as this, what David did, when himself was an hungered, and they which were with him; How he went into the house of God, and did take and eat the shewbread, and gave



also to them that were with him; which it is not lawful to eat but for the priests alone? And he said unto them, That the Son of man is Lord also of the sabbath. And it came to pass also on another sabbath, that he entered into the synagogue and taught: and there was a man whose right hand was withered. And the scribes and Pharisees watched him, whether he would heal on the sabbath day; that they might find an accusation against him. But he knew their thoughts, and said to the man which had the withered hand. Rise up, and stand forth in the midst. And he arose and stood forth. Then said Jesus unto them, I will ask you one thing; Is it lawful on the sabbath days to do good, or to do evil? to save life, or to destroy it? And looking round about upon them all, he said unto the man, Stretch forth thy hand. And he did so: and his hand was restored whole as the other. And they were filled with madness; and communed one with another what they might do to Jesus (Luke 6:1-11)." And again He declared unto them that they circumcised a man on the seventh day and did good or obeyed the law and therefore it was not wrong to set it aside. Hear Him: "Moses therefore gave unto you circumcision, (not because it is of Moses, but of the fathers); and ye on the sabbath day circumcise a man. If a man on the sabbath day receive circumcision, that the law of Moses should not be broken; are ye angry at me, because I have made a man every whit whole on the sabbath day (John 7:22,23)?"

Apostles and the sabbath day: Before advancing another step I want to make one thing clear: The sabbath is mentioned a great many times in the New Testament. Doubtless in general terms, I may say, meaning the seventh day for the reason that that particular sabbath occurred with such frequency that it kept the matter before their minds. There were synagogues everywhere in Israel, and on that day the Hebrews, the people who were still in their minds and hearts under the law, met in the synagogues for the purpose of reading and expounding the scriptures. Keep this in mind and do not be led astray by the supposition that when Jesus went to the synagogue on the sabbath day that He meant to say that He proposed to perpetuate that day forever. Do not deceive yourself by supposing that Paul who went to a synagogue to get to speak to a crowd was by that giving his sanction to that which he declared was a part of the dispensation of death. Paul was not that sort of a man. Peter and the sabbath day—we will talk of him first. At the very starting point of the argument I want to quote the words of the Master: "And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the



gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven (Matt. 16:18,19)." Proposition: Peter opened the door of faith on Pentecost and at the house of Cornelius; First to Israel, then to the Gentiles and never so much as mentioned a sabbath day or the sabbaths of God. If Peter did not bind a sabbath or the sabbaths, one sabbath or eight sabbaths, on the church where is the mortal man that will have the audacity in the face of what Jesus said to him to declare that a man ought to keep the seventh day, or the seventh year, or the fiftieth year or any other sabbath? Paul went into the synagogue. Proof: "And the next sabbath day came almost the whole city together to hear the word of God. But when the Jews saw the multitudes, they were filled with envy, and spake against those things which were spoken by Paul, contradicting and blaspheming (Acts 13:44,45)." Again: "And he reasoned in the synagogue every sabbath, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks (Acts 18:4)." Did he go in there for the purpose of keeping the sabbath day according to the law? Certainly not. The law did not say a word about the synagogue or about reading the law on the sabbath day. He went there because there was a congregation there and he had an opportunity to preach. He was under a commission from the risen Lord to carry His name, wherever he found a crowd; he went and he would have gone just as quickly to a heathen temple as to a Jewish synagogue. Who would not under such a commission as that? Besides that Jesus broke the sabbath day in the estimation of the Jews in what He did, and He said that He was Lord of the sabbath. Days are unimportant, and Paul according to the decalogue broke the sabbath, in the very thing that he did when he went in there on the sabbath day—he preached and argued and disputed. "In it," said Moses, "thou shalt not do any work." If a man does not think it is work to stand up here and speak, let him try it. I dare say Paul put his heart, his mind, his soul into his work. He could not preach without working, he could not argue without working. I preach from the very bottom of my heart and from the very bottom of my feet. That is work, If you can call that play I would like to see a man work! It would be worth going miles to see. Mark you, as one of the steps toward the great convention that was held in Jerusalem on this point was that certain brethren from Judea who had the idea as before intimated that the abolishment of the law would turn all sorts of immorality loose in the world, went down among the churches



and said: "Except ye be circumcised and keep the law ye cannot be saved." How did Paul treat that? If he went into the synagogue for the purpose of observing the sabbath day, to honor the sabbath day, to keep the sabbath day, to reverence the sabbath day, how did he do when these brethren came around? Hear: "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 (Acts 15:2)." Oh well, says one, these men were not arguing about the sabbath day. Are you certain of that? Let me see where your argument will land you. What was the contention of these men who came down from Judea? Here it is: "Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses ye cannot be saved." My brother, circumcision was fundamental. Just as fundamental as if I were to say to you: "If you do not come to the class you cannot recite your lesson. If you do not come to the table you cannot eat. If you do not be pure you cannot see God." Oh, well, says one, that never did mean the sabbath day. Paul was not contending against that. He knew too much for that, because after that he went into the Jewish synagogue on the sabbath day. How I would just like to sit down for five minutes and talk with Paul on this subject! I am satisfied he could let a great deal of light into our darkened cranium. I admire a remark made by the brilliant Henry Watterson, who once said he thought seriously of applying for a patent on a machine for boring holes in people's heads to let the darkness out. I say if Paul were here he could let some light into our heads that would turn the darkness out. But it is not necessary for him to come back from the grave to tell us. We have his record. Therefore I will let him tell us. What was the contention of these men from Judea? Hear me: "Except ye be circumcised and keep the law you cannot be saved." Brother Paul, Will you please take the witness stand? Brother Paul, Will you answer one or two questions for me? Where did you learn the things that you preached, from Peter and the other apostles? He answers, I did not go up to Peter and the others; I learned them from God. Well, brother Paul, we would like to know what is meant by the fact that you were disputing with certain men about the law? What did that involve? They said that except a man be circumcised he could not be saved. Now we understand you had a dispute with them on the subject, and we would like to have you tell us what you meant by it. I will give you brother Paul's exact language this time: "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 (Gal. 5:2,3)." Hear me, Paul disputed with them on the fundamental proposition of circumcision and the whole law, and according to the Judaizing teachers of the present day the whole law amounts to about this: "Remember the sabbath day to keep it holy!" You hear more on that one point than you do on all the other subjects. I venture the assertion that these Judaizing teachers that go up and down in the country never intimate that God required Israel to keep seven sabbaths more. Brother Paul, we are not done with you yet. We would like to hear you answer one other question. Suppose a man refuses absolutely to keep the sabbath day as a religious duty, what will be the result? "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day"—eight sabbaths in the Law!—"or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days"—or sabbaths—"Which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ (Col. 2:16,17)." You can keep it if you want to, you can keep all of them if you want to—as a Jew, as a matter of form, as a matter of policy, or as a matter of expediency, but if you do not want to keep one of them there is not any power in heaven or earth that will make you and there is not any power in hell that can. Let no man judge you on the subject of the eight sabbaths of the Lord delivered by Moses to Israel. That is the idea exactly. But what about the observance of days under the law? I answer that we are freed from the law. Proof: "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death (Rom. 8:1,2)." Again: "For, brethren, ye have been called unto liberty; only *use* not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another (Gal. 5:13)." Again: "One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day *alike*. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth *it* unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard *it*. He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks; and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks (Rom. 14:5,6)." What does that mean? That means that on the question of days there is liberty. Oh, the liberty of the Gospel of the Son of God! One man esteems every day alike unto the Lord. I am that man. You ought to be. But here is where the trouble comes in. It was all right to keep any day, to keep the seventh day if you wanted to, the seventh year if you wanted to, but when you go to make a test of fellowship



out of it and say that a man must keep it or be damned, that is another question. The Galatian brethren had misunderstood the freedom that is in Jesus' Gospel and therefore they had tried to go back to the law, to serve the law, to honor the law, to obey the law. Hear Paul in his rebuke to them: "Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain (Gal. 4:10,11)." What does that mean? Just this: Ye observe sabbath days, the sabbath of new moons, the sabbath of years, the sabbath of Jubilees as a part of the Gospel and make it a test of fellowship, and I am afraid for you brethren that I have bestowed labor on you in vain. Hear him again: "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 (Gal. 3:19)." They had gotten Christ out and gotten the law in, and he could only compare his anxiety and pain and trouble to a woman in child-birth. Take the verse preceding this strong rebuke about day and times and months and years: "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 (Gal. 4:9)?" Liberty in Christ! Keep any day, keep every day in the year, keep every day only do not go back to the weak and beggarly elements and say that a man must be circumcised and do it. That is the idea. There is a vast difference there. Do you see it? One party contended that a man had to do it in order to be saved; the other party did it because they thought they would like to have a day occasionally in which he could sit down and rest and meditate on God and His goodness. Oh, I would like to have that sort of a day myself, a day of quiet meditation, a month of quiet meditation, a year of quiet meditation; during all the years of toil and anxiety for you and for the cause of the Master, in my heart I have cherished a hope that some time my feet would yet stand within the gates of the City of Jerusalem, that some time I might stand where Moses stood and view the landscape there and have a day of rest, a year of rest, a sabbath of rest, but I do not make it a test of fellowship and necessity to salvation. That is where the trouble comes in. Here comes a very interesting phase of the subject. Paul disowned the religion of his nation but still he loved his nation with an undying love. Paul understood when he became a Christian that he only left his nation religiously just as if a man were to be converted now, that would not make any less an American citizen of him, but a Christian citizen. Paul understood it. But many of his brethren did not



understand that. Here is a very remarkable statement from him. I want to read it to you: "For though I be free from all *men*, yet have I made myself servant unto all, that I might gain the more. And unto the Jews, I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law;"—I break my quotation here long enough to say that religiously Paul was no longer a Jew, though in his relations to God, all of his ideas, all of his thoughts had been changed, but nationally he was still a Jew, still a Hebrew of the Hebrews, but he became a Jew apparently and he went under the law apparently as a matter of expediency that he might get close to them that he might save them!—"To them that are without law, as without law, (being not without law to God, but under the law to Christ,) that I might gain them that are without law. To the weak became I as weak, that I might gain the weak: I am made all things to all *men*, that I might by all means save some. And this I do for the gospel's sake, that I might be partaker thereof with *you* (I Cor. 9:19-32)." Hear me: On this very account Paul went in with the men that had a vow and paid the expense of the time of that vow and stayed in the temple as a matter of policy to show that he was not an enemy of Israel or an enemy even to Moses. It was a matter of policy but it failed. When the things was over the mob gathered stronger than ever. On that same ground as a matter of policy he became a Jew, he circumcised Timothy as he was going to then deliver the decrees from the council at Jerusalem. Why did he circumcise Timothy? As a matter of policy, as a matter of expediency. There was no harm in the act so far as that is concerned, it would do no harm to him and no harm to you as a matter of fact and it was done therefore as a matter of policy. Paul did it as a matter of policy. It was all right. It is a matter of liberty. But many men there were who said that he had to do it in order to obtain salvation. They were the men that Paul antagonized. Here is a fair illustration of that, I think: If a man were to go to a heathen land to preach the Gospel, it would be necessary for him to be very careful about his conduct, to be always using policy and expediency to not offend anybody. Samuel enunciated that principle when he went up to Bethlehem in the days of old, and the Lord endorsed it and told him to say that he was going to offer sacrifices, but he was also going to anoint a king (I Sam. 16:1,2). It was all right. It is the making it a test of fellowship that is wrong. I say it is all right to keep the seventh day if a man wants to keep it, I have not the slightest objection but he cannot make me keep it. He makes a test



of fellowship of it when he says that the word of God requires every man to keep it. I object. But if he says that the word of God gives a man the right or the privilege to keep it, if he wants to do it I say certainly, here is my hand on it. If a man wants to keep the seventh year it is all right. He has that right. The time belongs to him and God. Let him use it as in his judgment he can best glorify God. But then when he comes and says that I must shut up my school for a whole year I respectfully protest. He can do it if he wants to but he cannot make me. Where the spirit of Jesus is there is liberty. In view of all these things I raise the question: Why not keep the sabbath day? For this reason, it was a part of the law, it was a part of the old covenant, the law and the covenant are ended, gone, abolished forever. Proof: "Know ye not, brethren, (for I speak to them that know the law,) how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth? For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to *her* husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of *her* husband. So then if, while *her* husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man. Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, *even* to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God. For when we were in the flesh, the motions of sins, which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death. But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not *in* the oldness of the letter (Rom. 7:1-6)." Let me emphasize a thought just here. Paul affirms that they had become dead to the law by the body of Christ, dead to the first sabbath, dead to the second sabbath, dead to the third sabbath, dead to the fourth sabbath, dead to the fifth sabbath, dead to the sixth sabbath, dead to the seventh sabbath, dead to the eighth sabbath, dead to all the sabbaths. I give you a little translation of that passage, the most remarkable passage on the subject to my mind in all the scriptures of everlasting truth, verse four: "Therefore, my brethren, you also were put to death by the law, through the body of the anointed one, in order that you may belong to another, —to him who was raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God." Listen! Do you know that every man without exception, under the law, was a criminal and worthy of death? Did you know that? All had sinned and come short of the glory



of God. Every mouth was stopped and all the world was guilty. Paul says that they were put to death by the law through the body of Jesus Christ. Instead of executing them one by one, Jesus bore their sins in His body; He eternally put to death sin in the flesh and brought man again to immortal life. Again: "For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth. For Moses describeth the righteousness which is of the law, That the man which doeth those things shall live by them. But the righteousness which is of faith speaketh on this wise, Say not in thine heart, Who shall ascend into heaven? (that is, to bring Christ down *from above*;) Or, Who shall descend into the deep? (that is, to bring up Christ again from the dead.) But what saith it? The word is nigh thee, *even* in thy mouth, and in thy heart: that glorious? For if the ministration of condemnation *be* glory, much again; and this is stronger still: "Who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life. But if the ministration of death, written *and* engraven in stones was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which *glory* was to be done away; How shall not the ministration of the spirit be rather is, the word of faith, which we preach (Rom. 10:4-8)." And more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory. For even that which was made glorious had no glory in this respect, by reason of the glory that excelleth. For if that which is done away *was* glorious, much more that which remaineth *is* glorious (II Cor. 3:6-11)." I want to read you a little translation of that. It only gives the facts as Paul had them in his mind. I will read several verses: "Who also qualified us to be servants of a new covenant; not of the letter, but of the spirit; for the letter kills, but the spirit makes alive. Now, if the dispensation of death, engraved in letters on stones, was attended with glory, so that the sons of Israel were unable to look steadily into the face of Moses, because of the brightness of his countenance; which (dispensation) is passing away;—how, rather, shall not the dispensation of the spirit be attended with glory? For if the ministry of condemnation be glory, much more does the ministry of righteousness abound in glory. For even that having been glorified has not been glorified in this respect, on account of the surpassing glory. For if that is being annulled through glory, far superior is this remaining in glory." Notice this: "Engraven in letters on stone." I assert before you this day that only the ten commandments were engraved in letters on stone. I have proven that to you abundantly, conclusive-



ly, overwhelmingly. Paul says that dispensation was passing, yes, passing forever. Again: "And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses; blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross (Col. 2:13,14)."

Notice that statement: "Having blotted out what was written by command in ordinances." God's finger traced the ten commandments upon the tables of stone. Moses' finger traced the statutes of Israel upon the parchment. They were all deposited in the ark of the covenant together. Again: Paul declares, Gal. 4:21-26, that the institution is cast out, not simply that Agar is cast out, but Agar and Ishmael are cast out. Not simply that the ordinances touching ceremonies are cast out but the whole institution is cast out. And again: "That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world: But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ. For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition *between* us; Having abolished in his flesh the enmity; *even* the law of commandments *contained* in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, *so* making peace; And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby (Eph. 2:12-16)." Religious Israel was abolished, the covenant was abolished, the sabbaths were abolished, all ended with the nailing of the Master to the cross. Again: "For ye are not come unto the mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire . . . *that* Moses said, I exceedingly fear and quake. Ye are come unto mount Sion; unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels. To the general assembly and church of the firstborn, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, And to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than *that of* Abel. See that ye refuse not him that speaketh. For if they escaped not who refused him that spake on earth, much more *shall not* we *escape*, if we turn away from him that *speaketh* from heaven (Heb. 12:18-25)." We have not come to Sinai but we have come to Jerusalem. Sinai was bondage, Jerusalem is freedom. Sinai said keep eight sabbaths, Jerusalem says you need not keep any if you esteem every day alike. "For ye are not under the law, but under grace (Rom. 6:14)."



Every day is sacred. God measures time out to us by particles and each before it leaves us on its flight to the court of eternal record is freighted with a weight and with a power and with an accountability of eternal meaning. Now I say the sacredness of the day is in the sacredness of the opportunity to live and to be worthy of God and man. Shall we not keep the first day of the week? We should if we so desire. Our Lord and Master arose on that day. It is appropriate to remember His coming and going to life. He gave the cup and the bread in His memory. Paul declares that as often as we remember, or as we eat and drink, we show His death. It depends on how much you love Him, as oft—as much—as you love Him do it! But there is no command which says to do it. He measured not His love but gave Himself. He asks you for no measure of your love and will accept none short of your own heart, of your own conscience, of your own life. Oh the freedom of the gospel, oh the liberty of the name of Jesus! Oh the grandeur and the permanence and the radical power of the saving blood of Jesus Christ. We are not under the law; we are under grace. Let us not abuse our privileges or lightly esteem our birth-right. The great prophet of Israel, the poet of his day, declared with an eloquence that has not been surpassed in the annals of time that eye hath not seen nor ear heard nor the heart of man conceived what God had in store for His children (Isa. 64:4).” Paul applies that to the new covenant (I Cor. 2:9,10). Prophets looked forward to the day, the poets of Israel sung of His humiliation, of His suffering, of His glory, but only those realized, realized in a small degree the good things that God had in store for His children. Oh, I do rejoice today in the knowledge of God, that the Lord hath come and hath given us light and that we know Him and that He is true, and knowing Christ, knowing that He went about doing good, that He never lost a day, an hour, or a moment, I exhort you brethren in the name of the Master before whom ye stand in judgment, consider every moment sacred. Oh the time you spend here will not be measured by the rising and setting sun, not by decades, not by jubilees, not by centuries, not by millenniums, but it will be measured by heart-throbs and in the records of the eternal day, in the archives of heaven, he lives most who thinks most, who feels the noblest, who acts the best. It is not a matter of one day in seven, of one year in seven, but it is a matter of every day in seven, every year in seven, every year in a life time. Oh the value, Oh the beauty, Oh the glory, Oh the grandeur, Oh the infinite possibilities of time; God measures it out to us. We know not what tomorrow will be. Yesterday rests in the



distance and tomorrow slumbers in the bosom of the unborn ages; yesterday is gone forever. I stand between the yesterday that was and the tomorrow that is still in the bosom of the years that may never come to me here. May God help you my brothers to realize that this day is the day of the Lord whether it be Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Saturday, or this day, this day is the day of the Lord, and that this day is the day of present and eternal salvation and that this day is pregnant with meaning deeper than the bowels of earth, wider than the circumference of infinity, higher than the summit of God's great throne and more infinite in its possibilities than the eternal years that are gone. This moment, now, is the time, and my brother it is eternity. One man esteemeth every day alike unto the Lord. I am that man. May God increase my tribe.

What shall I say in conclusion? Together we have made the journey. It has been a journey of toil. Through physical infirmity I have endeavored to open the treasure house of God and tell you things new and things old. I rejoice that we have lived to see the climax. Together brethren we have traveled the road here below. There has been many a weary mile, many a weary day—foot-sore, anxious, worried oppressed with burdens without and within, we have traveled together, touching elbow to elbow, hand to hand, and heart to heart. The weary watch will soon be over; the night of trial will soon be passed and we shall stand—Oh glorious thought! Oh grand and glorious consummation!—we shall stand in the presence of the King, transformed, glorified, made like unto Him, and may God grant that the little company that hath been so patient in this investigation, by the blood of the Lamb may join that innumerable company in the Father's house where we shall sit down together and where we will talk together. May God give us mansions close to one another in that city and may we gather up the boys that have been and those that are and those to come and our children and our children's children in the gospel unto the remotest age, and may we all take part ourselves and, while others join in the chorus, sing one grand, sweet song of triumph to Jesus who hath loved the sons of men and washed them in His blood and may live together and talk over the times when we had hardships here below, and may we see the smiling face of Him whom we believe and honor, and may we as His children from every land, sit down together in the sight of His throne and may the rest that is denied us here, sweet, deep, eternal, on Jesus' breast be ours there, ages on ages, infinite, eternal, unending—and so shall we be forever with the Lord!