

would work on the Sabbath, the same as on any other day, and have no conscience about the matter. But when a man murders, he knows it to be an injury, and he has a conscience about it, though he never heard of God; and so with thousands of other evils. But why did the Lord place man under these peculiar circumstances? Why did He not withhold the commandment, if the partaking of the fruit, after the commandment was given, was sin? Why should there have been a commandment upon the subject at all, inasmuch as there was no evil in the nature of the thing to be perceived or understood? The Lord had a purpose in view; though He constructed this fair creation, as we have told you, subject to immortality, and capable of eternal endurance, and though He had constructed man capable of living for ever, yet He had an object in view in regard to that man, and the creation he inhabited. What was the object? And how shall this object be accomplished?

Why, the Lord wanted this intelligent being called man, to prove himself; inasmuch as he was an agent, He desired that he should show himself approved before his Creator.

How could this be done without a commandment? Can you devise any possible means? Is there any person in this congregation having wisdom sufficient to devise any means by which an intelligent being can show himself approved before a superior intelligence, unless it be by administering to that man certain laws to be kept? No. Without law, without commandment or rule, there would be no possible way of showing his integrity: it could not be said that he would keep all the laws that govern superior orders of beings, unless he had been placed in a position to be tried, and thus proven whether he would keep them or not. Then it was wisdom to try the man and the woman, so the Lord gave them

this commandment; if He had not intended the man should be tried by this commandment, He never would have planted that tree, He never would have placed it in the midst of the garden. But the very fact that He planted it where the man could have easy access to it, shows that He intended man should be tried by it, and thus prove whether he would keep His commandments or not. The penalty of disobedience to this law was death.

But could He not give a commandment, without affixing a penalty? He could not: it would be folly, even worse than folly, for God to give a law to an intelligent being, without affixing a penalty to it if it were broken. Why? Because all intelligent beings would discard the very idea of a law being given, which might be broken at pleasure, without the individuals breaking it being punished for their transgression. They would say—"Where is the principle of justice in the giver of the law? It is not there: we do not reverence Him nor His law; justice does not have an existence in His bosom; He does not regard His own laws, for He suffers them to be broken with impunity, and trampled under foot, by those whom He has made; therefore we care not for Him or His laws, nor His pretended justice; we will rebel against it." Where would have been the use of it if there had been no penalty affixed?

But what was the nature of this penalty? It was wisely ordained to be of such a nature as to instruct man. Penalties inflicted upon human beings here, by governors, kings, or rulers, are generally of such a nature as to benefit them.

Adam was appointed lord of this creation; a great governor, swaying the sceptre of power over the whole earth. When the governor, the person who was placed to reign over this fair creation, had transgressed, all in