

# Both Sides

*R. F. Cottrell*

1853

Published at the Advent Review Office, Rochester, N. Y.

This Tract contains a friendly *letter* by E. Miller Jr., and a candid *reply* by R. F. Cottrell. The former thinks that Christians should not observe the Sabbath; the latter teaches that the Sabbath was "made for man" to observe in all dispensations.

The *letter* and the *reply* were both published in the Review, Vol. IV. No. 10. One reason why we give them in this form for much wider circulation, is this: The *Advent Harbinger* for Sept. 24th, 1853, copied from the Review the *letter* without giving the *reply* with it, or even stating that it had been replied to. A singular course this, we think, for that paper which has made such high professions of *free investigation!*

The *Harbinger* states (see its rules of discussion) that "it is open for the free investigation of all Bible doctrines." Then why give one side and suppress the other, as in the case of the *letter* and the *reply*? If it be said that the Sabbath is not a "Bible question." then we ask, why give one side of it? Does not common honesty say, in a case like this, Give both sides or none? The Review gave *both* the *letter* and the *reply* that its readers might compare them, and decide for themselves. The *Harbinger* gives but one side, with the following note, calculated to deceive its readers relative to the Lord's Sabbath, and prejudice them against the Review and its conductors. Let the candid judge whether acts of this kind are not more worthy a Catholic Priest, than a Protestant Editor, who has for years been talking of *free investigation?*

"We have repeatodly published that if the advocates of the Jewish Sabbath would present one plain declaration from the Bible that Christians are required to keep that day, we would believe. By the equivocating course the conductors of the *Review* have taken in the matter, by asking us to produce the same kind of evidence on other subjects, they have tacitly acknowledged that the *Bible* does not furnish *one* plain declaration that it is the duty of Christians, or any body under the Gospel dispensation to keep the Jewish or Seventh Day Sabbath. We have considered their evasive offset to our unanswerable request unworthy of notice. Bro. E. Miller, Jr., however, has given the following able article in reply to their quibbles. It may subserve the cause of truth, and we therefore copy it from the *Review* of September 13."

In reply to this note we would say that the *Review* teaches the weekly Sabbath mentioned in both Testaments, which is certainly binding on Christians, unless it has been abolished. The *Harbinger* affirms that the Sabbath has been abolished. *This* it should prove. The *Review* has justly called for proof in the following request.

A Request.-Those who teach that there is no Sabbath for the gospel dispensation, are requested to give us on plain text from the New Testament that teaches that the seventh-day Sabbath has been abolished. When any one will do this, we will notice it in the *Review*.

This request has been repeated in eight or ten numbers of the *Review*, the last four months, yet no one has presented the text or texts that declare the seventh-day Sabbath abolished.

But the *Harbinger* says that if the advocates of the Sabbath would "present one plain declaration from the Bible that Christians are required to keep that day, we would believe." The mocking priests said of Jesus, "Let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe him." Jesus did not come down from the cross to remove their doubts; neither has the great God repeated the fourth commandment a second time in the New Testament, for fear the cavalier might have a chance to cavil. Why should a

second edition of the Sabbath law be given, unless the first were abolished? The request of the *Harbinger* is unjust. When it will prove by plain testimony the first edition of the fourth commandment abolished, then we will either show a second edition from the New Testament, or give up the Sabbath. We teach the Sabbath of the Bible. Let those who assert that it is abolished, produce one plain text to prove their assertion. This is a reasonable request. Will they produce the text?

We want none of their inferences from 2 Cor. iii; Rom. xiv; Col. ii, 14-17, which have been a hundred times repeated. They should not be allowed in a case like this. God gave the Sabbath law in the plainest language possible; and no man should be convinced that it has been abolished, unless he can find testimony as positive and plain, coming from as high authority.

Rom. xiv, does not mention the Sabbath. 2 Cor. iii, speaks of two ministrations of the law of God. That the ministration of death could be abolished, and give place to the ministration of the Spirit without affecting the law, is evident. Col. ii, 16, reads, "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon or of the sabbath-days." That these sabbath-days, or sabbaths, here associated with meat, drink, holy day and the new moon, are the annual sabbaths of the Jews, associated with the same ordinances in Lev. xxiii, is perfectly plain. The text has no reference to the Sabbath of the Lord our God. But admitting that the seventh-day Sabbath is meant, then what is gained? Verily nothing; for not a word is said about its being abolished. Men may infer that the Sabbath is included in the "hand-writing of ordinances," mentioned in verse 14, or that it is referred to in verse 16; but such inferences should not be considered of the least weight in such a case as this, in the absence of plain and direct testimony.

4

Behold the display of Divine Power at the giving of the ten commandments. The smoke ascended from Mount Sinal as the smoke of a great furnace; the lightnings flashed, and the thunders of Jehovah rolled down its base. God had descended upon it in

awful grandeur, to speak in the ears of all the people the ten precepts of his holy law. These precepts were of such a character, of such vast importance, that the great Law-giver did not leave them for man to write; but with his finger engraved them in tables of stone. Behold them placed in the beautiful ark, overlaid and inlaid with the purest gold. Mark well the victories won by Israel, when with the ark of God they crossed Jordan, marched around Jericho, and went forth to battle. See the ark put in the Most Holy of the earthly Sanctuary. It was the center of their religious system, it was the glory of Israel. The fourth commandment was in that ark; and for its violation the greatest curses are pronounced by the prophets; and for the observance of the Sabbath, the greatest blessings are promised. And how preposterous the supposition that the Almighty, through his Son Jesus Christ, should abolish his Sabbath, without giving one plain testimony to the fact in the Book of Inspiration. And how awfully presumptuous for men to go on in violation of the fourth commandment, and risk their eternal salvation upon mere inferences!! May God help the reader to feel the force of the truth we are here stating.

And we should not expect that such a momentous event as the abrogation of God's law, or even the Sabbath bath precept, would take place without being foretold by the prophets. God by the prophets has not only revealed the great events connected with his people, or in which his people have a special interest, but has by them pointed out those events which are more minute.

5

Now, if the Lord's Sabbath has been abolished, where have the prophets foretold the event? "Surely the Lord God will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets." Amos iii, 7. As none of the prophets have foretold the abolition of the Sabbath, and as none of the apostles have recorded such an event, we are certain that no such event ever occurred.

To trample underfoot the fourth commandment because it is not given a second time in the New Testament and to teach its abolition, with nothing but unwarrantable inferences from a few

texts that do not mention the Sabbath of the Lord, is the height of presumption.

## LETTER

Friend White:-Being casually thrown in contact with your paper, for June 23rd, I noticed an article from R. F. Cottrell, under the caption of "The *Harbinger's* rule of Duty." He quotes the *Harbinger*, "Give us *one plain direct* passage from either the Old or New Testament that *reads* that either Jew or Gentile *christian* is required to keep the seventh day" etc., and says, "this is the rule by which the *Harbinger* decides that it is not duty to keep the Sabbath;" and to show the invalidity of the rule, says: "Give us *one plain direct* passage that *reads* that either Jew or Gentile *christian* should not kill, or steal, or bear false witness. *One* such passage cannot be found." I wish to test this assertion, and the validity of the "rule" spoken of. In order to do this, let us state two important facts, viz:

1. The law from Mt. Sinai-or the rule of life for the people of God, as given in the law, and in the prophets and in the Psalms, is given to Israel, and forms the rule of moral obligation for that dispensation.

2. The rule of life as given by the apostles is the rule of *christian* life.

The past dispensation is familiarly called the Jewish or law dispensation; and the present, the christian or gospel dispensation. If in the past dispensation, one not of the twelve tribes would secure the favor of God, he must become a Jew

6

by being circumcised, and submit to obey the then rule of life. If one, whether Jew or Gentile, will now secure the favor of God, he must become a *Christian*, and submit to the rule of life given by the apostles.

Now let us see whether we have any direct prohibition of killing, stealing, etc. 1 Pet. iv. 15. "But let none of you suffer as a murderer, or as a thief." I John iii, 15. "And ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him" Rev. xxi, 8. "And murderers . . . shall

have their part in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone." Gal. v, 21. "Murderers' are reckoned among the "works of the flesh," and such shall not inherit the kingdom of God.

Eph. iv, 28. "Let him that stole steal no more." Ver. 25. "Wherefore putting away lying, speak every man truth with his neighbor." Col. iii, 9. "Lie not one to another." Here is the prohibition of the things specified in various language; more examples of which might be brought, besides, some instances where the apostles have quoted the ancient commands touching these things, in form, as in Rom xiii, 9. Let not your correspondent try (as appears from his short article he will) to maintain his assertion by saying the word *christian* is not found in one of these passages. The apostles were each writing to *christians*, hence the passages do without note or comment, prohibit *christians* doing the things specified. If your correspondent thought that the *Harbinger* demanded that the passage enjoining the Sabbath should contain the word *christian*, his argument is excusable otherwise, it is an unworthy cavil. I will say, when you will produce the passage, addressed to the people of God since the establishment of the order of this dispensation, either enjoining the Sabbath in direct language, or reproving its violation, *I* will keep it. Doubtless this was the intention of the *Harbinger*.

Yourself, Friend Editor, quote in reply to the same passage from the *Harbinger*, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy," and "the Seventh day is the Sabbath," and refer us to the law for the passages. No one disputes that the people of God in that dispensation were required to keep the Sabbath; but it devolves upon you to show that it is required of them in this. Bring the requirement as addressed to *christians*.

Both you and Friend Cottrell, quote, "The Sabbath was made for man," and *infer* that it was made for all men's observance: but to give any force to this inference you have to assume that man cannot be profited by the Sabbath except by his individual observance of it. This you should prove. I

conceive that man as a race can be abundantly profited by it, while its observance was only enjoined upon one dispensation.

Please receive this as a friendly note from one who has not a shadow of a doubt but you are in error in your views of the Sabbath. Give it a place in your *Review* if you please, and if it is *reviewed* fairly, the writer will be happy to read and profit thereby.

Yours in hope of the Kingdom of God,  
E. Miller, Jr.  
*Middlebury, Elkhart Co., Ind., July 29th, 1853.*

## REPLY

Friend Miller:-I feel a pleasure in replying to your kind epistle arising from the hope that my labor will not be in vain. Cheerfully would I devote my time to converse with one who has not "a shadow of a doubt" of my being in error on the Sabbath question. This perfect freedom from doubt is evidence, to my mind, that you have not carefully examined the evidences in favor of the Sabbath. Perhaps you might, in truth, adopt the language of Bro. A. J. Richmond as follows: "But from reading the *Harbinger*, and hearing but one side of the subject, and neglecting to examine it closely for myself, I had concluded that it was a 'yoke of bondage' and 'done away.'" But if you have carefully read the article in the *Review* of Aug. 11th, to which your attention was invited, perhaps you are not so free from doubts as you were.

In stating what you call "two important facts," you admit that the law from Sinai was the "rule of moral obligation for that dispensation." Bear with me, for I *must* exclaim, Who hath bewitched you, that you should think that the rule of moral obligation can be changed, without a change in the relation existing between man and his Maker! Is God changeable?-Could he make a better moral rule at the commencement

of the gospel dispensation, than he could when he formed the first man? Can he improve his original law, which the inspired Psalmist pronounced "perfect," by abolishing one tenth part of it? And

would he make known through the agency of man that he had changed that law which he spoke with his own mouth, in the hearing of all Israel; or that he had abolished it and given a new "rule of moral obligation" in its stead.

After stating your two "facts" you speak of the different ways by which men might "secure the favor of God" in different dispensations. To *live* in favor with God, and to *secure* his favor are two things. Why is not man in favor with God? Because he is a sinner. What has made him such? Transgression of God's law; for "sin is the transgression of the law." Man is a sinner. He has lost the favor of God, and is justly exposed to the penalty of the law, which is death. There is no salvation for him unless God should abolish his law, or make another law by which he may be forgiven, and thus restored to favor. This second law is the same, in one sense, in both dispensations. That is, it consists of faith, repentance and obedience to certain rites, which are outward acts expressive of faith and repentance. In another sense it differs much in the two dispensations. In the former dispensation the faith was in a promised Messiah, and was accompanied by obedience to typical rites; in the latter, the faith is in a Messiah already come and sacrificed for sin, (transgression of the first named law,) and shown forth by corresponding obedience to commemorative rites or institutions. For example: In the Jewish dispensation the sinner must offer an animal, the blood of which must be shed; in the Christian age, he must be buried by baptism. The language of the former was, God will provide a sacrifice for sin; the latter declares that Christ died for our sins, was buried and rose again for our justification.

9

Repentance is the same in both dispensation. It consists not merely in sorrow, but in breaking off from sin (transgression of the first law) by righteousness. (Obedience to that law.) Sorrow is not repentance; but godly sorrow *worketh* repentance, or *reformation* not to be repented of.

"Repentance is to leave the sins I loved before, And show that I do truly grieve, by doing so no more."

Thus we see that, in order to save sinners, there must of necessity be a second law, or the first must be abolished. I have shown that this second law in the new dispensation, differs from the corresponding law in the old. Consequently they are distinguished from each other in the New Testament; the former being designated as "the work of the law," the latter as the hearing, or obedience of faith. Did God abolish the first law, to save all mankind *in* their sins? or did he institute a second law, to save believers *from* their sins? Does forgiveness of sins entitle the forgiven to a right to commit the same thing again? Mark! Christ did not die to redeem man from the transgression of a law given by the apostles after his death but to redeem him from sin against a law already in existence.

By moral law, or "rule of moral obligation," I understand the first, or original law, the law man would have kept had he continued in favor with God, and which he must keep, if he is restored to his favor. By ceremonial or ritual law I understand the second,-the law which recognizes man as a sinner, and is a means of restoring him to favor. Viewing it thus, I am surprised when I hear any one speak of a change in moral obligation. To my mind, it seems equivalent to a change in God himself-that he has grown wiser since making his first attempt at a perfect rule of life.

The Sabbath is a part of the original law. It was made before man sinned. And how was it made?

10

God rested upon it, and then blessed and sanctified it, *because* he had rested upon it. If you can show any other time and manner of making the Sabbath, you are requested to do so. In regard to the expression of our Saviour, that the Sabbath was made for man, the learned have informed us that in the Greek, the word *man* is qualified by an "untranslated" article. That article, when translated, is the definite article *the*. So, in the original language, the passage reads, "the Sabbath was made for *the man*;" and as there was but one pair of human beings at the time when it was made, we cannot be at a loss in regard to the man for whom it was intended. This shows that the Sabbath was not a Jewish institution; and whether

Adam could have been benefited by it without observing it, you will, of course enjoy your own opinion.

We have found a necessity for the two laws in the nature of thing as they exist-man as sinner, and God willing to save him. Now if we can find the two laws in the Bible, the testimony to me, will be sufficient. God spake ten commandments with his own voice, and wrote them with his own finger in tables of stone. Moses wrote the ordinances of the Jewish church in a book. The first is called "the law of God"-the commandments of God;" the second, "the law of Moses," and, "the law of the Lord, given by the hand of Moses." The tables are called "the tables of the covenant;" the book is called "the book of the covenant" and "the book of Moses." Ex. xxxi, 18. Deut. xxxi, 21-26; ix, 9-11. 2 Chron. xxxiv, 30. Mark xii, 26.

The term law in the New Testament sometimes means one of these laws, and sometimes the other; the context always determining which is meant. Rejecting the idea of tow laws, and claiming that the word law always means one and the same thing, will you show how to reconcile or harmonize the following scriptures.

11

The law of a *carnal commandment*. Heb. vii, 16.

We know that the law is *spiritual*. Rom. vii, 14.

The priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law. Heb. vii, 12.

Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till *all* be fulfilled. Matt. v, 18.

Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances. Eph. ii, 15.

Think not that I am come to destroy the law.-Matt. v, 14.

Thou camest down also upon mount Sinai, and spakest with them from heaven, and gavest them right judgments and true laws, (*margin*, laws of truth.) good statutes and commandments. Neh. ix, 13.

Because they had not executed my judgments, but had despised my statutes, and had polluted my sabbaths, (*had* done these things

before the giving of the law at Sinai.) and their eyes were after their father's idols; *wherefore* I gave them also statutes that were not good, and judgments whereby they should not live. Eze. xx, 24, 25.

Peter calls "the law of Moses" a yoke "which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear." Acts xv, 5, 10.

Paul says, I delight in "the law of God" after the inward man. Rom. vii, 22.

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

The doers of the law shall be justified. Rom. ii, 13.

When the priesthood was changed, from the typical to the antitypical, there was of necessity a change of the law. What law? Not the original, royal law of ten commandments, for that can never change.-The idea that the fourth commandment was fulfilled

12

by Christ, and consequently abolished, is false; for that law does not pass away by little fragments.-One jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled So if fulfilling it does it away, it will all be fulfilled, and all go together.-But the context shows that all the *prophets*, must be fulfilled before one particle of the law can pass.-James informs *Christians* that, if they fulfill the royal law, they "do well." He also tells them that "*whosoever* shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one, he is guilty of all." And lest any should mistake the law of which he speaks, he immediately quotes two of the ten commandments. James ii, 8-12. The first law then is not changed: we must therefore look to the second. The ritual law, we have seen, is changed from a typical, to a commemorative character. It is now known as "the gospel" or "the faith." Sin is still the transgression of the law, and the wages of sin is death. To escape this penalty, and "secure the favor of God" a person must be obedient to the faith." "He must become a *Christian* and submit to the rule" *submitted* to and taught "by the apostle." He must "delight in the law of God, after the inward man"-keep the whole law, and not offend in one precept lest he become guilty of all. "For there is ONE lawgiver, (not twelve) who is able to save and to destroy." James iv, 12.-"Here are they that keep the

commandments of God and the faith of Jesus." The commandments are one thing, and the faith is another. The apostles taught them both. Says Paul, Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea. we establish the law. Rom. iii, 31. In no way could the immutability of the law of God be more effectually established, than by the death of the Son of God to deem man from its penalty. If the commandments could have been abolished. Jesus need not have died; but he died for our sins-for our transgression of the

13

law! What gratitude is due to God for his exceeding love! and how can we demonstrate our gratitude better than by breaking off from our sins and keeping that holy law? Says David, The law of the Lord is *perfect* converting the soul. (Turning the soul from transgression to obedience, from sin to holiness.) Says James, 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. O how love I thy law! says David; it is my meditation all the day. I delight in the law of God after the inward man, responds Paul. Says David, all his commandments are sure, they stand fast for ever and ever. It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than for one tittle of the law to fail, says the Lord Jesus.

With all the testimony of Jesus and the apostle to the perpetuity and immutability of Jehovah's whole law of ten commandments, who can be so stubborn, as to refuse to keep the fourth, or any other commandments, because it is not given a second time, in the New Testament? The apostles frequently quote from the commandments, as a standard law; but they never re-enacted one of them, for the very good reason, that none of them were ever abolished. Do you still ask why there is not more testimony, for the Sabbath in the New Testament? I answer in the language of Bro. White. Speaking of the fulfillment of the signs in the sun, moon and stars, he says: "God has never revealed his truth to man in a manner to compel him to believe. Those who have wished to doubt his word, have ever found a wide field in which to doubt, and a

broad road to perdition. While those who have wished to believe, have ever found everlasting rock on which to base their faith."

I feel perfectly satisfied with the evidence given for the Sabbath in the New Testament. I have no desire

14

for one word to be added to it. The Lord does all things well. He has suffered the Man of sin to exalt himself above God, and dictate laws to the world; but he will, ere long, vindicate his own truth. The Lord Jesus will be revealed from heaven, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. For two reasons the wicked are condemned. 1. They know not God. (The Father.) 2. They obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. (The Son.) How do we know that we know God? Let an Apostle answer. "And hereby do we know that we know him, if we keep his commandments. He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him." 1 John ii, 3, 4. The Sabbath, in particular, is a sign of the knowledge of the true God. "Hallow my sabbaths; and they shall be a sign between me and you that ye may know that I am the Lord your God." Eze. xx, 20. So we see, that while the "remnant" keep both the commandments and the faith, the wicked are condemned for rejecting both. Happy will he be who has a part with the remnant. "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city."

You have pronounced my argument, respecting the *Harbinger's rule*, "excusable;" for I understood him to *mean* as he *said*. The demand was, that the passage should read that either Jew or Gentile Christian is required to keep the seventh day. And lest he should be misunderstood, emphasized the words, *reads* and *Christian*, giving them in italics. Besides this, after the *Review* had quoted some texts for the Sabbath, the *Harbinger* replied, "Not a word is said or Intimated about *Christians* in the texts quoted." He did not say that these words were not *addressed* to Christians, but judges that the *Review* intended to

15

make the texts read, *Christians*, remember the Sabbath day, etc.

I admit that the apostles addressed themselves to Christians, and forbade, not only killing, stealing and lying, but the violation of every precept of that law which said, Thou shalt not kill. James ii, 10, 11, see margin. Jesus addressed himself to "his disciples" and said. 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. *Whosoever* includes *every* body. *Therefore* signifies a conclusion drawn from what he had just affirmed of the perpetuity of the entire law, and shows that the law and the commandments are one and the same thing. *These* commandments refer to the commandments existing at the time, and not to *those* commandments given by the apostles" some years afterwards. The fourth commandment of the law required the observance of the Sabbath. It was connected with "good statutes" by God himself, being written with his own finger in the midst of them. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder. Amen!

Be assured that all I have said proceeds from the kindest feelings; and if you, or any one else, can profit thereby, my object in writing will be attained.

Yours in hope of meeting all the saints in the kingdom. R. F. Cottrell.

*Mill Grove, N. Y., Aug. 18th, 1853.*

## **IT'S JEWISH**

When we present God's holy law. And arguments from Scripture draw; Objectors say, to pick a flaw, "It's Jewish."

Though at the first, Jehovah blessed, And sanctified his day of rest: The same belief is still expressed- "It's Jewish."

Though with the world this rest began, And thence through all the Scriptures ran, And Jesus said 'twas *made for man*- "It's Jewish."

Though not with Jewish rites, which passed, But with the moral law 'twas classed. Which must endure while time shall last- "It's Jewish."

If from the Bible we present The Sabbath's meaning and intent,  
This answers every argument- "It's Jewish."

Though the disciples. Luke and Paul, Continue still this rest to  
call The "Sabbath-day," this answers all- "It's Jewish."

The Gospel Teacher's plain expression. That "Sin is of the law  
transgression," Seems not to make the least impression- "It's  
Jewish."

They love the Rest of man's invention.

But if Jehovah's Day we mention.

This puts an end to all contention-

"It's Jewish."

R. F. C.