

THE SABBATH BY ELIHU.

[THIS little work was placed in the hands of ELD. JAMES WHITE, in 1853, in tract form, without date, bearing simply the signature of "ELIHU." Since that time he has published and distributed 20,000 copies of the work. And such has been its acceptance with the friends of the Sabbath, that the Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association now issue the present edition of 4,000 copies, August, 1862.]

IN reviewing the subject of "the Sabbath," I design not to follow any previous writer; but simply, plainly, and briefly to convince sinners of sin, let their profession be what it may. And this I hope and pray may be done without giving offense to those who love the truth more than error; for God has many servants on earth, who would gladly exchange error for truth, and many who do exchange their former traditions for the precious and everlasting truths of God as contained in his word.

Now the New Testament witnesses to the law and to the prophets; and that book is said to have been written thus: Matthew's gospel six years after the resurrection of Christ. Mark's gospel, ten years after the church commenced. Luke's gospel, twenty-eight years after. John's gospel, sixty-three years after. The Acts of the Apostles, thirty years after. The epistle to Romans, and two to the Corinthians and Galatians, twenty-four years after. Ephesians, Colossians, and Hebrews, twenty-nine years. To Timothy, Titus, and the second epistle of Peter, thirty years. The Revelation of John, sixty-one years.

His three epistles about sixty-five years after the resurrection, and after the church had properly commenced. And it is easy for us to understand how these apostles understood and practiced, with regard to the Sabbath; and they are the "foundation" next after Christ himself. Therefore if there was any such institution known and frequently spoken of in the church as "Sabbath," in those different ages of the church, we can easily know what was then meant by it. Some say if we keep the seventh day of the week, we shall keep a "Jewish Sabbath!" Well, we have no Saviour to trust in but Jesus Christ, who was according to the flesh a Jew—no other apostles and prophets but Jewish—no other than Jewish Scriptures, and indeed, Jesus said himself that "salvation is of the Jews." John iv, 22. And what did the writers of the New Testament mean by the words "Sabbath" and Sabbath-day?

What did Matthew mean in the sixth year of the Christian church? He certainly did not mean the first day of the week, but he meant the day before the first day of the week. See Matt. xxviii, 1. He meant what all other Jewish writers ever meant; viz., "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." But neither Matthew nor any of the apostles ever told us a word about the Sabbath being changed from the seventh to the first day of the week. Now if the Scriptures cannot be broken, but everywhere mean **one** and the same thing; viz., "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord," then if ministers contradict this, and say the seventh day is not the Sabbath of the Lord, but the first day of the week is the Sabbath, will they not in this bear witness clearly and positively against themselves, unless

they bring forward the chapter and verse where God commanded the Sabbath to be changed? What did Mark mean by the word Sabbath? He meant, also, that the Sabbath was the day before the first day of the week. Chap. xvi, 1, 2. Surely, if the Sabbath had been changed at the resurrection of Christ, Mark would have known it within ten years afterward. What did Luke mean who wrote twenty-eight years after the resurrection of Christ? He also meant that the Sabbath was the day before the first day of the week; for he says that the women who prepared the ointment, rested the Sabbath-day according to the commandment. Chap. xxiii, 56. Thus Luke understood the words "Sabbath-day" in the fifty-eighth year of the Christian era, to mean the day immediately preceding the first day of the week. How did John understand this subject in the sixty-third year of the Christian church? He not only speaks of the Sabbath-day as the others did, but he shows plainly that the first day of the week was considered a business day by the disciples after the resurrection. John xx, 1. See also Luke xxiv, 13. But what did the writer of the Acts of the Apostles mean by the words Sabbath and Sabbath-day, thirty years after the Christian church was fully commenced? In writing, he often mentions the Sabbath, and once mentions the first day of the week, as meaning quite another thing in plain distinction from the Sabbath. Acts xiii, 14, 42, 44; xx, 7. The practice of the Jews was then as it is now, to meet in the synagogue on the seventh day. And again the next Sabbath-day came almost the whole city together to hear the word of God. He does not say this was the Jewish Sabbath, but the Sabbath-day; this was the seventh day; and the

first day of the week was not known then as a Sabbath by this writer; because he says the next Sabbath-day the Jews and Gentiles most all came together again. I say there would not have been any next Sabbath in the week till the next seventh day. Again, Acts xvi, 13, "And on the Sabbath he went out of the city by a river side, where prayer was wont to be made." He does not say on the Jewish, nor on one of the Sabbaths, as though there were two Sabbaths then, but on the Sabbath, i. e., the seventh day, as understood by all Jewish writers, to this day. Again, chap. xvii, 2, Paul, as his manner was, went in among the Jews, and three Sabbath-days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures. Thus have I proved that the apostles of Christ understood that one day in the week should be called the Sabbath-day, and further, I have proved that this day was the day before the first day of the week, which is the seventh day: and you cannot deny it, nor by the Scriptures disprove it; consequently if the apostles of our Lord always called the seventh day the Sabbath-day, six, ten, twenty-eight, thirty, and sixty-three years after the church was fully commenced, then it must be the Sabbath-day now. And every one of the Lord's ministers who call any other day the Sabbath besides the one so called by the writers of the New Testament, gives it a title which is no where found in the Scriptures; for when they say the Sabbath-day, they mean something very different from what the New Testament means. It is already proved that the apostles called the seventh day of the week, the Sabbath, ~~and the~~ Sabbath-day, for many years after the church was fully commenced.

Now we are to show what sin is; and we are

not left to guess at it, or to suppose it; but we have a given rule to know with certainty what constitutes sin. "By the law," then, "is the knowledge of sin." By what law was the knowledge of sin twenty-four years after the resurrection of Christ? Ans. The very same law that was given when it was said, "Thou shalt not covet." The law, then, by which sin is known, is the ten commandments, and you cannot deny it! This law saith, 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, nor thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor the 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. xx, 10, 11. Now until this law is altered or abrogated (and Christ says he "came not to destroy the law") by the same power that enacted it—a willful transgression of it is a willful sin! let your profession be what it may; for sin is the transgression of the law. He that offends in one point, or in one of these commandments, is guilty of all; i. e., is a transgressor of the law, a sinner in the sight of God. Now a regenerated soul, a true-hearted Christian, says with Paul, "I delight in the law of God after the inward man. The law is holy, the commandment holy, and just, and good." And any person who is not willing to keep the commandments of God, when plainly understood, has still a carnal mind which is not "subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." Will you say this is judging too hard, or this is a hard saying, who can hear it? I wish to judge no man; but the word that th^e

Lord hath spoken the same shall judge you in the last day. John xii, 48. "As many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law; in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my gospel." Rom. ii, 12, 16. Then those who shall hold the truth in unrighteousness, those who pretend to keep the law differently from what God appointed it, those who, in fact, lay aside the commandments of God, (the seventh day or any other command) and teach for doctrine the commandments of men (the first day instead of the seventh), such the word says are vain worshipers. Mark vii, 7. But you say it makes no difference which day is kept or called the Sabbath-day, provided we keep one seventh part of the time! This is not correct, because God never said so. God is not to be mocked in this way! He has been very good and kind to make the Sabbath for man—to appoint the day, and the particular time of the day when the Sabbath is to commence, and when it is to end; it is the seventh day in order from the creation—the seventh day in the creation: and he said, "From even unto even shall ye celebrate your Sabbaths;" as the evening and the morning were reckoned for the day. God did not leave this subject undecided, so that his people would appoint different days, and then for every one to call his own the Sabbath-day. But God blessed and sanctified the seventh day, and proved that particular day to be designated by him, in the face and eyes of about six hundred thousand witnesses, by a miracle directly from heaven, in withholding the manna on that day, and in giving the food for that day on the day before; and you cannot deny it nor disprove it. Again, you say, How shall we know

which is the seventh day? I answer, Do you wish to know? Then ask the Jews; for God has committed the lively oracles to them, and then scattered them among all nations. Do you know when the first day of the week comes? Well, the Sabbath is always the day before the first day of the week. Matt. xxviii, 1. But you may say, Do not the majority of honest-hearted Christians keep the first day of the week? and have they not for centuries done common labor on the seventh day, and observed the first in obedience to the fourth command, and still been honest in their motives, and living Christians? I answer, What is that to us? so long as the true light of the Sabbath did not come to their minds? * * * *

Now we certainly know what sin is; not by what popular writers say—not by the popular traditions of our fathers—not altogether by our feelings; but by the law of God is this knowledge; for sin is the transgression of the law; and all who have the law of God, have an infallible and everlasting rule, to know what sin is. Art thou a willful transgressor of the law of God? then by the law is the knowledge that thou art a willful sinner before God. But if thou art an ignorant transgressor of the law of God, then by the law is the knowledge that thou art an ignorant sinner before God. To say nothing of presumptuous sins, I say, if thou hast ignorantly sinned, then repent and reform, and God will heal you. Lev. iv, 2, 13.

By the law of God then is the clear knowledge of sin. I speak to you, Protestants, who keep the Sunday, a day formerly dedicated to the worship of the sun, by the Pagans, and afterward brought into the church by Constantine and Roman Catholics, and called the Christian Sabbath, a name

never known for the first day of the week by any of the writers of the New Testament. I speak to you, Protestants, and ask you if you have any given rule to know what sin is? Have you any certain rule to know whether Roman Catholics sin or not, in bowing down to images? They say they do not sin! you say you know they do sin! but how do you know it is sin to bow down to images, when they say it is not sin? Ans. By the law, you say, you know this is sin, and you know it by no other rule; for you "had not known sin but by the law." Well, by the same rule I know what sin is. You say it is not sin to work and do common labor on the seventh day. But we know, not by your assertion, but by the law, whether you sin or not. You say you know by the law that it is sin to bow down to images. I say (by your own rule), I know by the law that it is sin to do common labor on the seventh day; and you cannot deny it! And if you know it is the duty of Roman Catholics to repent of their sins for transgressing the second command, then I know it is also your duty to repent of your sins for transgressing the fourth command. He that said, Thou shalt not kill—Thou shalt not steal—Thou shalt not bow down to images, neither serve them, &c., also said, "The seventh day is the Sabbath."

I would that you could see the weakness of your argument; viz., that one seventh part of time was meant in the law, without regard to any particular day. In this you make the commandments of God of no effect through your tradition! Yea, you make void that part of the command which says, "The *seventh day* is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." We read not that the Lord blessed the seventh part of the time, or the Sabbath institu-

tion, as you say, but the seventh day, in particular. Why do you wish to take out and make void this part of the fourth command, when Christ hath said, "Till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law." It was just as necessary that the particular day should be designated, as it was that there should be a Sabbath made for man. It would not have been according to Divine Wisdom to have said, Thou shalt keep one seventh part of time, or one day in seven, because this would have left mankind in as much confusion as your theory could have made them! One might have kept one day, and another the next, till seven sabbaths might have been kept in one family. Thus much for your seventh part of time.

Suppose a parent should command his child to do a certain piece of labor on a certain day, and the child should, without any just cause, neglect to perform the labor on the day specified, and should perform it on the next day. Would this show any respect for the authority of the parent, or would the parent approbate such conduct in his child? You must say, No. Or if a governor should command all the military to do duty two days in the year, and for each one to select his own days, there would be as much wisdom in this as in your seventh part of time for the Sabbath of the Lord. God is not the author of confusion, but of order. While your theory of one seventh part of time, or one whole day in seven, instead of the seventh day, impeaches the Divine Wisdom, and makes God the author of confusion. Thus your theory, not the law of God, leads to anarchy and confusion, and the observance of no Sabbath; and you cannot deny it. What reasonable objection

have you to the law of God? What fault can you find with it just as it stands? Have you wisdom enough to alter it for the better? "The law of the Lord is perfect converting the soul." Ps. xix, 7. Yea, it is so perfect that it has already converted the souls of many, even from the doctrines and commandments of men, to keep the Sabbath of the Lord, and I trust in God that it will convert many more. Because the statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart; the commandments of the Lord are pure, enlightening the eyes—more to be desired are they than gold, yea, than much fine gold, sweeter than honey and the honey comb. Vs. 8, 10. Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good. For I (Paul) delight in the law of God after the inward man.

Reader, dost thou delight in the law of God after the inward man? If not, thy soul should be converted, by praying for the law of God to be put into thy heart, and written in thy mind. But if the law of God is already thy delight, then why not be reconciled to it? Why not be subject to it just as it stands? Why wish to make void one jot or tittle of it? I do not present the law for justification; but as a perfect rule of right in this life; first, between man and his Creator; second, between man and his fellow man. Therefore, "Whosoever shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven. But whosoever shall do and teach them shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven."

The Westminster Divines found contradicting the writer of the Acts of the Apostles. These divines say, "From the beginning of the world to the resurrection of Christ, God appointed the sev-

enth day of the week to be the weekly Sabbath, and the first day of the week ever since, to continue to the end of world, which is the Christian Sabbath." 1. Luke (the writer of the Acts of the Apostles) says, Acts xiii, 14, Paul and his company went into a synagogue of the Jews on the Sabbath-day. This was, according to our account, A. D. 45, and twelve years after the resurrection of Christ. Luke says this was on the Sabbath-day then at that time. But the divines say this was not on the Sabbath-day at that time, but on Saturday, and that the seventh day was not then the Sabbath, neither had been for twelve years. Thus they contradict Luke plainly and pointedly.

2. Luke says, Acts xiii, 42, 44, "that when the Jews had gone out of the synagogue, the Gentiles besought that these words (of the gospel) might be preached to them the next Sabbath." And the next Sabbath-day came almost the whole city together to hear the word of God. This, Luke says, was on the Sabbath-day at that time, twelve years after the resurrection. But the divines say that it was not on the Sabbath at that time; for Sunday had been the Sabbath for twelve years.

3. Luke says, Acts xvi, 13, And on the Sabbath we went out of the city, by the river side, where prayer was wont to be made; A. D. 53, twenty years after the resurrection, and ten years before the Acts of the Apostles was written. This, Luke says, was actually on the Sabbath-day at that time—but the divines contradict him in saying this was not on the Sabbath at that time, but on Saturday; for the seventh day was not then the Sabbath, neither had been for twenty years—never since the resurrection of Christ! Thus they contradict Luke again, for all admit that Luke al-

ways called the seventh day, the day the Jews met in their synagogue, the Sabbath, in the Acts of the Apostles.

4. Luke says, Acts xvii, 2-4, Paul at Thessalonica, "as his manner was," went into a synagogue of the Jews, and so preached Christ and the resurrection three Sabbath-days, that some Jews and a great multitude of Gentiles believed. This was twenty years after the resurrection of Christ. This, Luke says, was on three Sabbath-days then at that time. But the divines deny this also, because they say that the Sabbath had been changed from the seventh to the first day of the week, twenty years before. Thus they give Luke the lie.

5. Luke says, Acts xviii, 3, 4, At Corinth Paul labored with his hands, as tent-maker (on the other days as we should understand), but "reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks." This was A. D. 54, twenty-one years after the resurrection of Christ, and nine years before the Acts of the Apostles was written. This, Luke said or wrote, A. D. 63, the thirtieth year after the resurrection, and the thirtieth year of the Christian church, that this preaching of Paul was on every Sabbath; that is, on every seventh day, the same days that the Jews always met in their synagogue for worship. This is plain, pointed, and positive proof that the seventh day was the Sabbath, at least, thirty years after the resurrection of Christ; for Luke testified again and again that those meetings of the Jews and Gentiles were held on the Sabbath, and if Luke was a Christian, then the seventh day was the Christian Sabbath thirty years after the resurrection, the Westminster divines to the contrary notwithstanding. And if the seventh day was the

Sabbath thirty years after the resurrection of Christ, as Luke says it was, then it is the Sabbath now. For you will admit that no man or body of men have had any lawful right to alter or change this command of God since A. D. 63. But we find not one word in favor of the idea, nor even the least hint or allusion in all the New Testament that the first day of the week was ever so much as thought of as a Christian Sabbath by any of the apostles while they lived. And you must give it up, yea, and you will give it up, if you search the Scriptures carefully and prayerfully on this subject, and if you have a spirit of discernment, and are willing to forsake error for truth, and if you are an honest Christian in the sight of God.

Now if the Scriptures are able to make one wise unto salvation, through faith in Jesus Christ, then why need I stop to examine all the various doctrines of popes, councils, and fathers, when in searching I should find pope against pope, council against council, and fathers against fathers! This would be like two companies fighting at a great distance, with small arms. But if we wish to come at close action, let us take the armor of truth, which will most assuredly prevail; and the closer the action, the sooner the victory will be won on the side of truth. Now, my dear reader, if you will take the Scriptures and search them as above requested, then you will find the following valuable treasures of knowledge among the many therein contained:

1. You will find Christ himself saying, "The Sabbath was made for man," and that it was made when the first seven days were made, before man had sinned. The Sabbath was thus made, not for the Jews in particular, but as a gift of God to

man, i. e., mankind universally, of all nations and all ages of the world.

2. You will find that before the law was given at mount Sinai, this was a law and a commandment, Ex. xvi, that it was also written by the finger of God, with the "lively oracles," which God committed to the Jews, to give to us: that this law, by which is the clear knowledge of sin, is an infallible and everlasting rule by which to know what is sin, and what is not sin; that sin is the transgression of the law; and that to act against it, or to do things contrary to it, is sin; but "where no law is, there is no transgression;" that this law Christ came not to destroy, abrogate, or make void; that the law is holy, and just, and good; and that Christians delight in it. And as Paul "had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet," so we had not known which day of the week was the Sabbath, except the law had said, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." Now we know by the law that this is the Sabbath without the help of commentators.

3. You can find that the resurrection of our Saviour has nothing to do with changing the Sabbath, any more than his birth, his death, or his ascension. Whether he was risen near the end of the Sabbath, or some time before the common time of commencing the first-day Sabbath, so called, has nothing to do with altering one jot or one tittle of the law of God.

4. You can find that the common reasonings of men, that Christ frequently met with his disciples on the first day of the week, after his resurrection, any more than on other days, are false and without foundation; that he went with two

of them to Emmaus, about seven and a half miles, and returned to Jerusalem, which would plainly show that he did not regard that day as a Sabbath; that he met with his disciples in the evening, which must have been after the commencement of the second day of the week, see Gen. i, 8, when they were met, but not to celebrate the resurrection, as false reasoners pretend; that he met with them again "after eight days," i. e., near the middle of the next week, and again when they were together fishing, so that the fishing-day would prove a Sabbath, as much as either of the two first visits.

5. You can find that Luke had not forgotten the distinction between the "first day of the week" and "the Sabbath-day," Acts xx, 7, in his recording the meeting of the disciples to break bread on that day, and that this is the only time the first day of the week is mentioned in all the Acts of the Apostles: and it is the only notice of Paul's preaching on that particular day, or rather, evening, and that on a particular occasion, viz., in order to be "ready to depart on the morrow:" that this one instance of the first day's being mentioned, proves that it was not on the Sabbath, and that the many meetings of the Jews and Gentiles, believers and unbelievers, where Paul preached "every Sabbath," did not mean on the first day of the week.

6. You may find that Paul, in giving orders to some of the churches to "lay by themselves in store something, according as God had prospered them," on the first day of the week, for the poor saints at Jerusalem, 1 Cor. xvi, 2, does not prove that to be the Sabbath-day, but that it was not the Sabbath day, nor suitable to a Sabbath-day's work; but rather as an offering to the

Lord, of "the first ripe fruits of their increase;" to be the first business attended to in the week, to reckon up their earnings or incomes, and devote a part of the same, and lay it by itself, so that it would be ready when Paul came. This was a good calculation, for the first business of the week.

7. You can find that as there is no law of God against doing common labor on the first day of the week, so it is no sin, nor transgression of any law other than the laws and commandments of men.

8. You can find that the Saviour said to his disciples, "If ye love me, keep my commandments." Again, "He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me; and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father; and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him." Again, "Jesus answered and said unto him, If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him."

Now, my dear readers, if you neglect or refuse to obey this fourth command of the decalogue, you are left without excuse, and you can plead nothing in extenuation of your neglect. "For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil.

SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION.

Battle Creek, Mich.

Price \$2 per hundred. Address Eld. James White.

VINDICATION
OF
THE TRUE SABBATH;
IN TWO PARTS:

PART FIRST,
Narrative of Recent Events;

PART SECOND,
Divine Appointment of the Seventh Day.

By J. W. MORTON,
LATE MISSIONARY OF THE REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

BATTLE CREEK, MICH.:
PUBLISHED AT THE REVIEW AND HERALD OFFICE.
1860.

P R E F A C E .

THE following able treatise on the divine appointment of the Sabbath of the Bible, has been before the public about ten years. With the kind permission of the Author, we now send forth this re-print of a truly valuable work. Though the writer makes use of an argument or two which we might not employ, its present republication will evince our high appreciation of the work.

We now commend it to the public, especially to those who have been, and still are, misinformed in regard to a very plain, important, and ancient institution of JEHOVAH. And we do this the more earnestly as we are assured that the reader will find in the personal narrative of its Author a noble instance of self-sacrifice and devotion to truth for the truth's sake; that he will see in the action of the Synod the unbecoming resorts to which error is obliged to have recourse in

its own defense; that he will find breathed throughout these pages a mild and Christian spirit, worthy the imitation of controversialists of every name; and that he will find in the candid, convincing and logical character of the work, an argument that challenges refutation.

PUBLISHERS.

March 21st, 1860.

PART I.

NARRATIVE OF RECENT EVENTS.

CHAPTER I.

ON the 13th of December, 1847, I landed with my family in Port-au-Prince, Hayti, the first Foreign Missionary of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in the United States. I began my labors soon afterwards, and continued them, without serious interruption, till the 21st of April, 1849, when a train of circumstances, to which I am about to advert, made it necessary that I should return home.

In the latter part of December, 1848, I was unexpectedly called upon to defend the practice of keeping holy the first day of the week, in place of the seventh. I had been taught from my infancy, that the moral law, "summarily comprehended in the ten commandments," is the only rule of moral conduct; and I had supposed, that it required me and everybody else, to keep the "Christian Sabbath" on the first day of the week. On examination, however, I was forced to the conclusion, that the fourth commandment enjoins nothing else than the sanctification of the seventh day. Of course, then, I must either renounce this precept, as a part of the rule of my

life, or endeavor to keep holy the seventh day of the week. The former I might not dare to do; the latter I knew I might *attempt*, without offending God, or insulting the majesty of his law.

The question then came up, Is there any scripture authority for keeping holy the first day? Does God require it? I knew very well, that if God does *not* require it, I could not, as a Reformed Presbyterian, bind my conscience to it. I took up the Bible, and resolved on a prayerful and thorough search. I wished to assure myself of the divine authority of the first day, even after I was satisfied that the claims of the seventh are indisputable. But how was it possible to gain this object? Every text to which I was referred for proof seemed to lack the very thing that I most wanted, *a certain testimony to the institution of a Christian Sabbath*. I reasoned thus:—The fact that Christ appeared once or twice to his disciples on the first day of the week, and the fact that the disciples met *once* on that day to break bread, and the fact that Paul commanded the Corinthians and Galatians to “lay by them in store” on that day, as God had prospered them—these facts, with a few others, *might* shed light on the *institution*, if *one single text* could be found, to prove its *existence*. But if this cannot be found, they do not touch the question at issue. And how I did long for that *one text*! How I chided with the Apostles for not having made known more clearly what I had determined to be the will of God! Never did Rachel mourn for her children, as I mourned for that *one text*: but, like her, I could not be comforted, because *it was not*!

I was thus driven to the conclusion, that, should I make conscience of keeping holy the first day of the week, I would offer to God a service that he did not require, and could not accept at my hands.

But what was I to do? This was the great *practical* question. Could I, with my then present views, continue to preach the gospel, as I had done before, in that "land of darkness, and of the shadow of death?" Could I teach the children in the school, as I had taught them before, that God had changed the Sabbath to the first day of the week? Could I proclaim to the benighted heathen, that they might habitually break the fourth commandment with impunity? Could I, as a Protestant missionary, become the partizan of him who thought "to change times and laws,"* by assuring his blinded devotees, that his changes had been made by divine authority? Or, on the other hand, could I carry out my convictions of truth and duty, declaring the whole counsel of God, as I then understood it, and retain, at the same time, my connection with my brethren at home? Would they grant me this privilege, and, if they would, could I accept it?

A little reflection served to convince me, that all these questions must be answered in the negative. It was no small matter, to resolve upon breaking those bonds of ecclesiastical fellowship

* I believe, that the prophecy in Dan. vii, 25, refers mainly to the change of Sabbath-time, and Sabbath-law. What time, of divine appointment, it may be asked, was ever changed, except the time of the Sabbath?

that had so sweetly bound me to the Reformed Presbyterian Church. A struggle, painful indeed, but not protracted, ensued. I resolved at once to keep the Sabbath in my family, though I feared it would not be honest to make any *public* exhibition of my views, while I continued to minister by the authority of the Synod. I know not what I should have done, had not my change of sentiments brought with it the needed consolations. Whatever were the "vexing thoughts" with which my heart was oppressed, during the first six days of the week, I found invariably, in the quiet retreat of my little family, on the seventh, that "peace of God that passeth all understanding." Yes, Hayti, when the recollection of thy brilliant skies, thy evergreen mountains, and thy sweet clear rivers, shall have ceased to awaken joy in my bosom, the memory of thy Sabbaths shall be "my songs in the house of my pilgrimage!"

CHAPTER II.

Convinced as I was, that something must be done immediately to bring the subject of my change to the attention of the rulers of our church, before the next meeting of the Synod, I prepared the following Circular Letter, which I transmitted to more than seventy ministers and elders, in different parts of the United States.

C I R C U L A R :

PORT-AU-PRINCE, HAYTI, JAN. 17, 1849.

MY DEAR BROTHER: The mutual relation existing between us, as members of the same Synod, the glory of our common Lord, the interests of our Mission, and a sacred regard for personal character, all require, that the following statement be transmitted to you and my other co-presbyters, with as little delay as possible. If I am not actuated herein by a desire to promote God's glory and the salvation of men, may the Lord rebuke and forgive me, and "let the righteous smite me, it shall be a kindness!" May the Head of the Church grant to you, and to all other members of the Synod, a disposition to hear, with patience and candor, a narration of my recent experience, in which perhaps you *may* find things both "new and old."

My sentiments in relation to the "Sabbath of the Lord our God," have undergone an important change; to which I now wish to call your attention. Our Confession of Faith, Catechisms, and Testimony, all teach that the first day of the week is, and has been ever since the resurrection of Christ, the Christian Sabbath. This doctrine *alone*, of all those contained in our Standards, though I did believe it till lately, I can no longer receive. As to the *manner* of sanctifying the Sabbath, I believe all that you and I have always contended for; but, for the present, I am constrained to believe that the seventh day of the week is the only weekly Sabbath that God has ever appointed.

My attention was first called to this subject by Rev. W. M. Jones, Missionary of the Baptist Church, who has recently abandoned his earlier views and practice in regard to the Sabbath. He not only argued the question with me at length, but gave me some publications of the American Sabbath Tract Society, which, as they seemed to breathe a spirit of ardent piety and zeal for God's law, I read with attention. Both in my discussion with him, and in the reading of those tracts, I struggled with all my might to convince myself, from the Scriptures, of the divine appointment of the first day, or Christian Sabbath. But though I did not then doubt it, I was astonished to find how hard it is to prove it.

I searched all the books I could find, bearing on this question, and discovered, what I had never noticed before, that the early French and Genevan Reformers, with Calvin at their head, had taught the abrogation of the fourth commandment, as a ceremonial institution; and that they contended for a Sabbath, or stated day of worship, under the gospel, only as a wise and necessary human arrangement. I found that even Turretin, at a later period, had taught that the fourth commandment is *partly* ceremonial, and that it was necessary to change the Sabbath from the seventh day, in order to put a difference between Jews and Christians. I found also, in my books, quotations, containing similar sentiments, from the celebrated Augsburg Confession. The only authors I could find who had attempted to prove, from the Scriptures, that the Sabbath had been changed from the seventh to the first day of the

week, by divine authority, were Turretin, and the framers of our Standards. These authors appeared to depend *mainly* for proof upon three texts of Scripture,—Acts xx, 7; 1 Cor. xvi, 1, 2; and Rev. i, 10. When I came to examine these texts, I was surprised and mortified, to find that they contain neither the word “Sabbath,” nor any other synonymous with it. True, I had always thought that the “Lord’s day” [Rev. i, 10], was the first day of the week; but my opponents contended that the terms refer more properly to the seventh, which God styles “my holy day” [Isa. lviii, 13], and when I remembered “his challenging a special propriety in the seventh,” I could not well deny it. Moreover, I could not find a single passage asserting that the first is holier than any other day of the week, or that Christians were, in the Apostles’ days, in the habit of holding meetings *regularly* on that day. Neither could I discover that Christ or his Apostles had ever spoken, directly or indirectly, of keeping a day holy in honor of his resurrection; nor that that event, which is always held up as the occasion of the change of the Sabbath, is even once mentioned in connection with the first day, unless where it is recorded as a historical fact. On the other hand, I observed that Christ and his Apostles *were accustomed* to enter into the synagogue on the seventh day, or Sabbath, for public worship. Luke iv, 16; Acts xvii, 2, and elsewhere.

Thus, my dear brother, I saw at this critical moment all scripture evidence forsaking me, while every inch of ground on which I could set my

foot was trembling. It seemed as if the thunders of Sinai were uttering anew their awful threatenings, while the "still small voice" of "Him that dwelt in the bush" was whispering in my ears, "The *seventh* day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." Ex. xx, 10. "I am Jehovah, I change not." Mal. iii, 6. "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. v, 18. Still I hesitated. For a moment I thought of "going down to Egypt for help." The Fathers, thought I, have fixed the interpretation of these texts in favor of the observance of the first day. But immediately I heard a voice within me, saying, "Would you then observe a holy-day, whose appointment cannot be proved from the Bible, without the aid of human tradition? Could you admit the 'testimony of the Fathers,' to set aside one of the plainest injunctions of the moral law, that law that was written upon tables of stone, 'by the finger of God,' and styled, by way of pre-eminence, '*the Testimony?*'" No! I replied, with an involuntary shudder; and another flood of Scriptures came rushing in, like "deep waters," to the very soul. "The law of the Lord is perfect." Ps. xix, 7. "Forever, O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven." Ps. cxix, 89. "Thy righteousness is an everlasting righteousness, and thy law is the truth." Ps. cxix, 142. "All his commandments are sure; they stand fast for ever and ever, and are done in truth and uprightness." Ps. cxi, 7, 8. "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to ful-

fill." Matt. v, 17. "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law." Rom. iii, 31. O my brother, "the word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword."

You have now my reasons for embracing a doctrine which is confessedly at variance with our Standards. What I entreat of you is, that you will once more examine this subject for yourself, and see whether those Standards are consistent, on this point, either with the Scriptures, or with themselves.

You perhaps think that I have forsaken the "footsteps of the flock," and that testimony which has been sealed with the blood of martyrs. But tell me candidly, was there ever a martyr who died in defense of the first-day Sabbath? Or, could *you*, my brother, collect from the Scriptures evidence of its divine appointment, clear enough, to solace your soul in the midst of the flames? From my inmost soul I pity that Covenanter who may be called to testify, at the stake, to the change of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week. Remember, too, that I am now in the path that was trodden by the saints for more than four thousand years; and it is for *you* to show that that path was ever stopped up, unless by the presumption and inexcusable neglect of man. Truly, I am "compassed about by a great cloud of witnesses." I would follow the example of Jehovah himself, who "blessed the seventh day and sanctified it," and by whom the Sabbath was made for man; the example of Adam, Enoch, and Noah; of Abraham, Isaac, Ja-

cob, and the twelve patriarchs; of Moses, Aaron, and those millions of Pilgrim Covenanters who united in its observance in the wilderness; the example of Samuel, David, and a host of other prophets; of Jesus Christ, our Divine Mediator, and "Lord of the Sabbath;" and of the Apostles of our Lord, together with the churches established and watered by them;—in one word, the example of all the saints, from Adam to the last apostle; all of whom kept and honored the seventh day as "the Sabbath of the Lord their God," and, having finished their course with joy, are entered into that heavenly rest, of which that Sabbath was, and still is, an emblem.

I intend, if the Lord will, to be present at the next meeting of our Synod, and meet my brethren face to face. I expect, of course, nothing less than to be excluded from the privileges of the church; but I rejoice that I have learned to respect the discipline of the Lord's house. I desire, therefore, with a willing heart to approach the altar, and, if the Head of the Church require it, to be "offered upon the sacrifice and service of your faith," that God may be glorified in my salvation, and not in my destruction. God forbid, that either prejudice, willful ignorance, passion, or personal resentment, should fan the flames of that altar!

In conclusion, rest assured of my continued and unabated attachment to the cause of the Reformation, in general, and to the interests of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, in particular; and allow me to repeat what I have already intimated, that with every other doctrine contained

in our Standards I am, so far as I understand my profession, entirely satisfied; nor have I abandoned *this one*, but from a firm conviction that it is not taught in God's word. I know well, that trials sore and many await me. God doth know, that my heart delighteth not in contention; but, my brother, have we not all "entered into a curse, and into an oath, to walk in God's law, which was given by Moses, the servant of God, and to observe and do all the commandments of the Lord our God?" Neh. x, 29.

Your brother in gospel bonds.

J. W. MORTON.

Missionary of the Ref. Presb. Church.

CHAPTER III.

On the 21st of April, 1849, I set sail, with my family, from Port-au-Prince, bidding farewell to Hayti and her children, whom perhaps we shall never see again in this vale of tears. We arrived at Boston, all in good health, on the first Sabbath in May.

On the evening of Tuesday, May, 22, the Synod was convened in Philadelphia; and the next morning I appeared and took my seat with the other members.

After noon, the same day, Rev. David Scott stated to Synod, that I had made known a change of views in relation to the Sabbath, and moved

that a committee of three be appointed to confer with me, and report what farther action should be taken in the case.

While this motion was pending, I stated, in substance, that, as I was alone in a Synod of more than sixty members, without a single man to plead my cause, I thought I had a right to *demand* that the proceedings should be instituted in strict accordance with the letter of the law. I was here interrupted by the Moderator, who having informed me that I had no right to dictate to the Court the method of proceeding with its own business, peremptorily ordered me to take my seat. I obeyed, of course, though I could not see what dictation there was in demanding a legal trial, according to the printed rules of Synod. The motion was carried, and the committee appointed.

Next morning, May 24, I had a conference of half an hour with this committee, and at noon another, that lasted about the same time. Their principal object seemed to be, to ascertain whether I was ready to *recant*, and to submit to censure for my past errors. I assured them, that while I had not the slightest wish to withdraw from the communion of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, I adhered to every word in my Circular, and must continue to do so, till convinced of error by the infallible Scriptures. The committee quoted several texts, and advised me to read several authors, after which our conference was closed.

After noon they presented their report, recommending that the following Libel be preferred against me by Synod :—

LIBEL PREFERRED AGAINST J. W. MORTON.

Whereas, denying that the first day of the week is the day on which the Christian Sabbath should be kept, is a heinous sin and scandal, contrary to the word of God, and the profession of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, founded thereon—[Acts xx, 7], “And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread,” &c.; *Shorter Catechism*, “From the beginning of the world to the resurrection of Christ, God appointed the seventh day of the week to be the weekly Sabbath, and the first day of the week ever since to continue to the end of the world, which is the Christian Sabbath.”

Yet true it is, that you, Rev. J. W. Morton, are guilty of the scandal above stated, in so far as you, the said J. W. Morton, at Port-au-Prince, Hayti, 17th of January, 1849, did publish a Circular, in which you oppugned and denied that the first day of the week is the Christian Sabbath, which being found relevant, and proved against you, you ought to be proceeded against by the censures of the Lord's House.

A true copy. By order of the Synod.
 [Signed.] JOHN WALLACE, Ass't Clerk.

After some discussion, the above Libel was decided to be relevant, and the Clerk was directed to serve a copy on me, with citation to appear for trial the next day, after noon.

I went to my lodgings that evening with a heavy heart. I was convinced, from the spirit of deter-

mined opposition that had been manifested by many of the brethren, when the Libel was under consideration, that the majority had already determined that I should not be permitted to "speak for myself." True, I knew very well that the Apostle Paul had once enjoyed this liberty, through the cool civility of a Roman Governor, and afterwards through that of a Roman King; but I knew just *as* well, that Felix and Agrippa were heathens, while my brethren were Christians; and that the dignity of a court, composed of "worms of the dust," has been much better understood, since the famous "Diet of Worms," than ever before.

Still, I could not forbear asking myself, Why is there now such bitter opposition to an Institution that was once the delight of both God and man? Why do men hate with such perfect hatred what Jehovah made, and blessed, and sanctified, before sin had entered into the world? Why should *this* daughter of Innocence be spurned from every door, and loaded with the damning reproach of Judaism, while her twin sister, Marriage, sucks the breasts, and is dandled upon the knees of Orthodoxy? Why should I be ranked with thieves and murderers, for believing that "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord my God?" Bitter were the tears that flowed; and more bitter still was the reflection, that "when I wept, that was to my reproach."

I was hedged in round about, and what could I do? I could only exclaim with the "sweet singer of Israel, "Let not them that wait on thee, O Lord God of hosts, be ashamed for my sake; let

not those that seek thee be confounded for my sake, O God of Israel. Because for thy sake I have borne reproach; shame hath covered my face. I am become a stranger unto my brethren, and an alien unto my mother's children. For the zeal of thy house hath eaten me up; and the reproaches of them that reproached thee are fallen upon me." Never shall I forget the sensation experienced while the last sentence was passing through my mind: "*And the reproaches of them that reproached thee are fallen upon me.*" I know not how often, during that night, I repeated these words, and compared them with the exhortation of the Apostle: "Let us go forth therefore unto him without the camp, bearing his reproach." These were the comforts, that, "in the multitude of my thoughts within me," then delighted my soul. I was then about to go forth "without the camp;" and it was indeed refreshing, in that hour of trial, to believe that I was bearing a portion of the same burden that had once bowed down the "Man of Sorrows."

CHAPTER IV.

My trial came on afternoon, May 25th. The following extract from the published Minutes of Synod is, I believe, a correct, and sufficiently full, account of the final issue; only it makes no mention of the fact that I protested against the proceedings, and appealed to the head of the Church,

for reasons to be given in afterwards. Why this fact was not recorded I have not been able to ascertain.

EXTRACT FROM MINUTES OF SYNOD.

Order of the day, viz., the case of Mr. Morton, called for. The libel was then read by the Clerk; when Mr. Morton having, in reply to the Moderator, answered that he was prepared for trial, the substance of the libel was again stated in his hearing. Mr. Morton was then called upon, according to the rule provided for in such cases, either to confess the charge, or put himself upon his trial. Mr. Morton in return acknowledged that he had denied that the day commonly called the Christian Sabbath is so by Divine appointment, and then proceeded to plead the irrelevancy of the charge by endeavoring to prove the perpetuity of the law for the observance of the seventh day. While so doing, he was arrested by the Moderator, who informed him that the charge contained in the libel was such that Mr. Morton could only prove its irrelevancy to censure by proving that the appropriation of the first day of the week, known as the Christian Sabbath, to secular employments, or teaching so to do, is not relevant to censure, which attempt the Moderator would consider disorderly, and would not allow.

From this decision J. M. Willson appealed, when the Moderator's decision was unanimously sustained. Upon this Mr. Morton declined the authority of the court.

Resolved, That Mr. Morton's appointment as missionary to Hayti be revoked.

Resolved, That inasmuch as Mr. Morton has now publicly declined the authority of this court, he be suspended from the exercise of the Christian ministry, and from the privileges of the Reformed Presbyterian Church.

The Moderator then publicly pronounced the sentence of suspension on Mr. Morton, agreeably to the above resolution.

Not long afterwards I presented to the Moderator the following Reasons of Protest and Appeal, with a request that he would allow them to be laid before the court, which he utterly refused to do.

REASONS OF PROTEST AND APPEAL.

I do respectfully protest against the action of Synod in my case, on the 24th of the present month, and appeal therefrom to the Lord Jesus Christ, the King and Head of the Church, for the following reasons :

1st. Because I was not allowed to prove the irrelevancy of the charge made against me, by an appeal to the Bible, "the only rule of faith and manners."

2d. Because I believe that the statements, on the subject of the Sabbath, set forth in our subordinate standards, are inconsistent with one another, and in part contrary to the Word of God ; yet it was by these unscriptural portions, that I was tried and condemned.

Brethren, I entertain no hard feelings towards

you. My daily prayer to God is, that you may be saved and led into all truth. I did hope that you would hear and consider the claims of the Lord's holy Sabbath, when presented in a mild and affectionate manner. But either I have failed to present the question with sufficient tenderness, or you have determined to avoid all discussions in regard to it.

It grieves me to the soul to bid you farewell. Both God and man will bear witness, in the day of final reckoning, that you have trampled down, by the resistless force of an overwhelming majority, one who was endeavoring with both hands, to hold up the standard of the great Covenant God of our fathers. But though for the present cast down, I am not dismayed. The Sabbath of the Lord God is a richer treasure than the richest you can either give or take away. "Rejoice not against me, O mine enemy; when I fall, I shall arise; when I sit in darkness, the Lord will be a light unto me. I will bear the indignation of the Lord, because I have sinned against him, until he plead my cause, and execute judgment for me; he will bring me forth to the light, and I shall behold his righteousness."

Brethren, I shall meet you before the judgment seat of Christ, on that day when he shall come "with ten thousand of his saints." "Behold he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him; and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him. Even so, amen."

J. W. MORTON.

PHILADELPHIA, MAY 29th, 1849.

REFLECTIONS.

I did believe, and believe yet, that, had I been sustained by twenty ministers, and as many congregations, I should have had leave to defend myself to my heart's content. But it was very evident to the Synod, that I stood alone. They knew that I could do them no harm, by fomenting discord; and—may I not add?—they knew that I was not the man to be found employed in such a work. The only loss they could sustain, in cutting me off, with all my adherents, was that of two adults, and as many little children. Indeed, many of the members *seemed* to regret the *trouble* far more than the *necessity* of executing the law; and one aged father has remarked to me since, that till then he never witnessed a trial, before a church court, in which *there was not one atom of mercy*.

Now is there not a reason for all this? Unquestionably there is. The loose and unpresbyterial doctrine, that a majority has a right to determine what *is*, and what *is not*, truth, and that the greater the majority in favor of any dogma, the more firmly its truth is established, has leavened, sadly and extensively, even the Reformed Presbyterian Church. This is the reason why one who represents a lean minority cannot be heard, even in defense of ecclesiastical life. The majority have said, that the first day is the Sabbath, and who dare call in question the assertion? A man may be denounced as a covenant-breaker; yet because he belongs to a small minority, he may not attempt to prove his innocence of the crime. Thus the right of the minority to vindicate themselves from the

Scriptures, in defense of which many of the Old Covenanters bled, is practically denied by their descendants. "O Lord, how long!"

Brethren, are you really so wedded to this *majority principle*? Know, then, that *God is a majority*; and that those that are with *me* are more than those that are with *you*. God's testimony is worth more than that of all men. What though millions *have* affirmed that the seventh day is NOT the Sabbath? *He* hath left us this imperishable testimony: "The seventh day *is* the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." And this is the testimony of the *greatest majority* that ever gave utterance to truth. But God hath not left himself without other witnesses. Where are those myriads of angels who were present when "the Sabbath was made for man?" Where are those "morning stars" who "sang together," and those "sons of God" who "shouted for joy" when our Father "laid the foundations of the earth?" They are not *now* present with us, 'tis true, to bear their testimony; but they *will be* present when you and I shall appear before the judgment seat of Christ, to hear the decision of this controversy. And do you think that you will then dare, on the authority of what is said in Acts xx, 7, to lift up your hands and swear "by Him that liveth forever and ever," that the Sabbath has been "changed into the first day of the week"—and that, too, in presence of those who saw the foundations of the ancient Sabbath, like those of the earth itself, laid and balanced upon God's eternal decree, and wrought with the very stones of the "everlasting hills?" No! No!! The Sabbath was one of

those *pillars* of the ancient earth, which Christ, the Mediator, seized with the hand of his omnipotence, and bare up, when "the earth and all its inhabitants" were sinking into nothing. I repeat it—and who dare gainsay it?—the Lord of hosts is an overwhelming *majority*!

But this is not all. There is, indeed, no *greater* witness than these; but there is *other* witness. Look into your own hearts, ye children of God, redeemed by the blood of the Lamb, and you will find recorded there: "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." "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 mind, and write them in their hearts." Here there is not the least hint of any exception. The same moral law that was written "with the finger of God" on tables of stone, is now written "by the Spirit of the living God" on the fleshly tables of *your* hearts. Yes, brethren, turn your eyes inward, and you will read, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." If you say, We have sought this law, but find it not—O brethren, you have not "sought it carefully with tears." It is hidden among the rubbish, and you will never find it, till that be removed. But I speak what I do know, when I assure you that it *is* recorded there; and in the day of the Lord Jesus, if not sooner, you will find it there, to your unspeakable joy and satisfaction. O Lord, "open thou our eyes, that we may behold wondrous things out of thy law."

PART II.

DIVINE APPOINTMENT OF THE SEVENTH DAY.

INTRODUCTION.

The following pages containing a brief discussion of a small but intensely interesting portion of the Sabbath controversy, are designed especially for the perusal of those Christians, styled orthodox, who do not keep holy the seventh day of the week.

Dear brethren, this is a subject of fearful importance. If the views herein advocated are correct, *you* are guilty both of breaking and of teaching men to break one of God's holy commandments; if they are incorrect, I am no less guilty. Need I say anything more to convince you that you ought to give this subject a candid and prayerful examination? "Ye are the light of the world;" take heed, brethren, that your light be not darkness! You know—you cannot but know—that there is much, *very much*, said in the Bible about the Sabbath, and that men are very often commanded to keep it holy. You must know, also, that God has said in the fourth commandment, "The *seventh day* is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work;" and that, for more than four thousand years, no other day of the week ever claimed to be holy. Moreover, you cannot but know, if you have read the Bible carefully, that the first day of the week, which you call "the Christian Sabbath," is *very seldom*

mentioned; that there are only six passages in which the name occurs, and that four of these may be viewed as one, being the records of the same events, by different Evangelists; and how can you have failed to notice the fact, that in not one of these six passages are we, or any of our fellow-creatures, commanded to keep the first day holy? Yet you are convinced that the first day of the week is *the very Sabbath-day*, while among all those Scripture commands, before referred to, you find nothing to sustain the claims of the seventh. O brethren, you “put darkness for light, and light for darkness.” Let us bow before the mercy-seat of Him who is the Author of life and light, and, renewing our personal covenant with him, plead his precious promise: “If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.”

I shall endeavor, in the following pages, to establish the truth of the following proposition:

That the seventh day of the week is the only weekly Sabbath of God's appointment.

I intend to present and enforce *four reasons* for believing this proposition:

First—Because the original Sabbath law requires the sanctification of no other day.

Second—Because Adam and all his posterity have solemnly covenanted to keep holy the seventh day.

Third—Because Christ and his Apostles honored this day; and did not intimate that it would ever cease to be the Sabbath, but the contrary.

Fourth—Because God has never blessed and sanctified any day of the week but the seventh.

As the discussion is limited by design to a narrow range, you will please to bear in mind, that the following points are assumed as true :

First—The Sabbath was instituted before the fall of man.

Second—Adam represented all his posterity in the covenant of works.

Third—The Sabbath law is perpetual, “binding all men in all ages.”

Fourth—The seventh day was the *only* weekly Sabbath for at least four thousand years.

Lord, sanctify us through thy truth. May the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, whom thou sendest in the name of thy Son our Lord, abide in us, and preside in this controversy. May he teach us all things, and bring all things to our remembrance. May all bitterness, and wrath, and malice, and evil-speaking, be far from us; and may we love one another with pure hearts fervently—for Christ's sake. Amen.

CHAPTER I.

PROPOSITION.

That the seventh day of the week is the only weekly Sabbath of God's appointment.

First Reason.

My first reason for believing this proposition is,

That the original Sabbath law, referred to in Gen. ii, 2, 3, and embodied in Ex. xx, 8-11, requires the sanctification of no other day.

Gen. ii, 2, 3. "And on the seventh day (*on day the seventh*) God ended his work which he had made: and he rested on the seventh day (*on day the seventh*) from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh DAY (*the day the seventh*), and sanctified it; because that in IT he had rested from all his work which God created and made."

Ex. xx, 8-11. "Remember the Sabbath-DAY (*the day of the rest, or Sabbath*) to keep it holy. six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day (*day the seventh*) is the Sabbath (*rest*) of the Lord thy God: *in it* thou shalt not do any manner of 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 (*on day the seventh*); wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-DAY; (*the day of the rest, or Sabbath*), and hallowed IT."

The only object, direct or indirect, of this commandment, is "*the day*." What are we commanded to remember? "The day." What are we required to keep holy? "The day." What did the Lord bless and hallow? "The day." In what are we forbidden to work? In "the day." Now let us inquire—

1. What day? *Not* the day of Adam's fall; nor the day Noah went into the ark; nor the day of the overthrow of Sodom; nor the day of the

Exodus; nor the day of the Provocation; nor the day of the removal of the ark; nor the day of Christ's birth; nor the day of his crucifixion; nor the day of his resurrection; nor the day of his ascension; nor the day of judgment. It may be, and certainly is, proper, that we should remember all these: but we are not told to do so in this commandment. Neither is it some one day of the week, but no day in particular; for how could we remember "*the day*," that is, no day in particular?—how could we keep holy "*the day*" that has not been specified?—and how could we say that God had blessed and hallowed "*the day*" that was no one day more than another? What day, then? God says, Remember *the Sabbath-day*, or *the day of the Sabbath*; Keep holy *the day of the Sabbath*; The Lord blessed and hallowed *the day of the Sabbath*. He also says, *The seventh day* is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; *in it* thou shalt not do any work. This day, therefore, is "*the seventh day*," or "*the day of the Sabbath*."

2. What Sabbath? Not "*a Sabbath*," or any Sabbath that man may invent, or that God may hereafter keep; for that would be "*some Sabbath*," but no one in particular. Not some institution yet undetermined, that God may require man to observe weekly; for the command is not, "*Remember the Sabbath institution*," but, "*Remember the day of the Sabbath*"; not, "*Keep holy the Sabbath institution*," but, "*Keep holy the day of the Sabbath*." The Lord did not bless and hallow "*the Sabbath institution*," but, "*the day of the Sabbath*." We are not forbidden to do

work in "the Sabbath institution," but in "the *seventh day*." In fact, the phrase, "the Sabbath," in this commandment, means neither more nor less than "the rest." It is not *here* the name of any institution at all, though it is often thus used in other parts of the Bible. Hence this Sabbath is "the Sabbath or rest of the Lord thy God."

3. Which day of the week is "the day of the Sabbath?" No other than that day on which the Lord rested; for the command refers to God's Sabbath. On which day of the week did he rest? "And he rested on the seventh day." Gen. ii, 2. Therefore, "the day of the Sabbath" is the same day of the week on which God rested from the work of creation; and as he rested on the seventh day of the first week, and on no other, the seventh and no other day of every other week must be the only "day of the Sabbath."

Let it be particularly observed, that God does not say, Remember the Sabbath, or, Remember the Sabbatic institution, though this is necessarily implied in the command: but, Remember "the day of the Sabbath"—the day on which I have ordained that the Sabbatic institution be observed. As if he had said, There is little danger, *comparatively*, that you will forget the fact of my having kept Sabbath; nor is it likely that you will altogether neglect to observe *some day* of rest from your arduous toils, for you will be driven to this by the ever returning demands of your exhausted bodies; but you are, and always will be, in especial danger of forgetting the proper day of the week for honoring me in my own institution.

Satan, who takes infinite delight in all kinds of "will-worship," while he hates with a perfect hatred every act of strict obedience to my law, will do all he can to persuade you that some other day will do just as well, or even better. Remember, therefore, the day of my Sabbath, and keep the same day holy in every week; for—mark the reason—I have myself rested on the seventh day, and on that account I have blessed and sanctified that, and no other, day of the week, that you may observe it, and keep it holy, not because it is in itself better than any other day, but because I have blessed and sanctified it.

But you say that the phrase, "the Sabbath day," or, "the day of the Sabbath," does not mean any particular day, but "one day in seven," or some one of the days of the week. You allege that "the day of the Sabbath," like "the Pope of Rome," "the Emperor of Russia," or "the King of Denmark," is a generic term, alike applicable to all the members of the same class. The phrase, "the Emperor of Russia," you say refers alike to Peter, to Alexander, and to Nicholas, though only one of them could be emperor at any given time; so "the day of the Sabbath" refers alike to the seventh and to the first day of the week, though there never was but one Sabbath at any one time. This is a very ingenious and plausible method of evading the force of the Divine testimony; but, as the reasoning by which it is sustained appears to be entirely sophistical I cannot but look upon the whole thing as a fabrication. I believe that any man, possessing the requisite qualifications, *may* become "Emperor of Russia," but deny that

any day but one *can* be the day of God's Sabbath, inasmuch as God had never kept, at that time, but one Sabbath, and that occupied only one day. There is only one day of American Independence; only one day of the Resurrection of Christ; only one day of the birth of any one man; and only one day of Judgment. And why? Because American Independence was declared on but one day; Christ rose on but one day; the same man cannot be born on two different days; and God hath appointed only one day in which he will judge the world. Now, on the same principle, there can be but one "day of the Sabbath" of the Lord our God. If I should say that the day of Christ's Resurrection is not any particular day of the week, but only "one day in seven," you would not hesitate to call me a fool, while my ignorance would excite your deepest sympathy; but when *you* say that "the day of the Sabbath" does not mean that particular day on which the Lord's Sabbath occurred, but only "one day in seven," you expect me to receive your assertion as the infallible teaching of superior wisdom. I cannot, however, so receive it, for the following reasons:

1. If God had meant "one day in seven," he would have said so. His first and great design, in writing his law on tables of stone, was to be understood by his creatures; but for more than two thousand years after he gave the law, no human being ever suspected that "the day of the Sabbath" meant anything else than the seventh day of the week, because it was commonly known that that day alone was in reality the "day of the Sabbath." Indeed, this "one-day-in-seven" doctrine

is known to have been invented within a few hundred years, with the pious design of accounting for a change of Sabbath, without the necessity of repealing a portion of the moral law. It is matter of great surprise that those pious theologians, who first substituted "one day in seven" for "the day of the Sabbath," did not shudder at the thought of presuming to mend the language of the Holy Ghost. "The words of the Lord are pure words; as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times." Ps. xii, 6. Brethren, are you prepared to enter into judgment, and answer for the liberties you have taken with God's word? In substituting the vague and indefinite expression, "one day in seven," for the definite and unequivocal terms, "the Sabbath-day," and "the seventh day," you have as truly taken "away from the words of the prophecy of this book," as if you had blotted the fourth commandment from the Decalogue; while your leading object has been to make way for the introduction of a new command that, for ought the Scriptures teach, it never entered into the heart of the Almighty to put into his law. "A faithful witness will not lie," and when the world asks, Which day of the seven hath God appointed to be the weekly Sabbath? God expects that you, as faithful witnesses, will not only "not lie," but that you will not equivocate, or give with the gospel trumpet "an uncertain sound." He does not expect that you will quote a text from the Acts of the Apostles, that says not one word about Sabbath-keeping, to prove that the fourth commandment enjoins the keeping holy of "one day in seven," but of "no day in particular."

2. God never blessed "one day in seven," without blessing a particular day. He either blessed some definite object or nothing. You *may* say, indeed, without falsehood, that God blessed "one day in seven;" but if you mean that this act of blessing did not terminate on any particular day, you ought to know, that you are asserting what is naturally impossible. As well might you say of a band of robbers, that they had killed "one man in seven," while in reality they had killed no man in particular. No, brethren, yourselves know very well, that God had not blessed and sanctified any day but *the seventh of the seven*, prior to the giving of the written law. You know that if God blessed any day of the week at all, it was a definite day, distinct from all the other days of the week. But this commandment says that "the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day." Therefore the Sabbath-day must be a particular day of the week. Therefore the "Sabbath day" is not "one day in seven," or an indefinite seventh part of time. Therefore it is not "one day in seven" that we are required to remember, and keep holy, and in which we are forbidden to do any work; but "the seventh day" of the week, which was then, is now, and will be till the end of time, "the day of the Sabbath of the Lord" our God.

3. No day of the week but the seventh was ever called the "day of the Sabbath," either by God or man, till long since the death of the last inspired writer. Search both Testaments through and through, and you will find no other day called "*the Sabbath*," or even "*a Sabbath*," except the ceremonial Sabbaths, with which, of course,

we have nothing to do in this controversy. And long after the close of the canon of inspiration, the seventh day, and no other, was still called "the Sabbath." If you can prove that any one man, among the millions of Adam's children, from the beginning of the world to the *rise of Anti-Christ*, ever called the first day of the week "*the Sabbath*," you will shed a light upon this controversy, for which a host of able writers have searched in vain.

But farther, the first day of the week was not observed by any of the children of men, *as a Sabbath*, for three hundred years after the birth of Christ. Do you ask proof? I refer you to Theodore de Beza, who plainly says so. If you are not satisfied with the witness, will you have the goodness to prove the affirmative of the proposition?

I infer, therefore, that "the day of the Sabbath," or "the Sabbath-day," is the proper name of the seventh day of the week, as much so as "the day of Saturn;" and that to attach this proper name *now* to some other day of the week, and to affirm that God meant that other day, as much as he did the seventh, when he wrote the law on tables of stone, is as unreasonable as it is impious. If you say that when God speaks of the Sabbath-day, he means "one day in seven, but no day in particular," you are as far from the truth as if you had said that when he speaks of Moses, he does not mean any particular man, but some one of the Israelites." Moses *was* one of the Israelites, just as the Sabbath-day *is* one day in seven. But when God says Moses, he means

Moses, the son of Amram; and when he says "the Sabbath-day," he means the seventh day of the week. You *may* give different names to the same object, without interfering with its identity; but to apply the same name to two different objects, and then to affirm that these two objects are identically the same, so that what is predicated of the one must be true of the other, is as though a navigator should discover an island in the Southern Ocean, and call it "England," and then affirm that the late work of Mr. Macaulay, entitled, "The History of England," is a veritable and authentic history of his newly-discovered empire. Which would you wonder at the most, the stupidity or the effrontery of that navigator?

I cannot close this chapter without reminding you that, in attempting to refute the above reasoning, the main thing you will have to show is, that "the Sabbath-day," or "the day of the Sabbath," is an indefinite or general expression, applicable alike to at least two different days of the week, and that it is used indefinitely in this commandment. If it has been proved that "the day of the Sabbath" refers, and can refer, *only* to the seventh day of the week, then it is true, and will remain forever true, that the original Sabbath law requires the sanctification of no other day. This is the truth which I undertook to exhibit in this chapter, and is my first reason for believing the proposition under consideration.

CHAPTER II.

Second Reason.

My second reason for believing this proposition is, That Adam and all his posterity have solemnly covenanted to keep holy the seventh day.*

Gen. ii, 15–17. “And the Lord God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden, to dress it, and to keep it. And the Lord commanded the man saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.”

Rom. v, 12, 19. “Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.” “For as by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners: so by the obedience of one many shall be made righteous.”

Gal. iii, 10. “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.”

On these passages it may be remarked—

1. “God gave to Adam a law, as a covenant of

* The Author in this “Second Reason,” argues with the Reformed Presbyterians with whom he was connected up to the time of his writing this work, *on their own ground*, and makes use of arguments which we should not consider essential to a discussion of this subject for readers in general.

works, by which he bound him, *and all his posterity*, to personal, exact, *entire*, and *perpetual* obedience."

2. "This law, after his fall, continued to be a *perfect rule of righteousness*; and, *as such*, was delivered by God upon Mount Sinai in ten commandments, and written in two tables." Therefore, the fourth commandment and the Sabbath law of the covenant of works are *one and the same law*; and all believers in Christ are now bound by this law, *as a rule of life*, to remember and keep holy the *same Sabbath day* that Adam and all his posterity covenanted to remember and keep holy.

3. You admit that Adam, *and all his posterity*, pledged themselves to keep holy the seventh day of every week, *and no other*. Therefore, *we* are all born under a solemn obligation, our own obligation in Adam, to keep holy that same seventh day of every week as long as we remain on earth: "*Neither doth Christ in the gospel any way dissolve but much strengthen this obligation.*"

4. It is now too late to alter the covenant of works, by substituting some other day of the week for the seventh, for the following reasons:

First. Because the whole transaction was finished, in the person of our representative, nearly six thousand years ago. The covenant was made, the obligation assumed, the deed of transgression consummated, the curse pronounced, and the bitter *death* experienced, in *kind*, though not in *degree*, and all this before the first revelation of the mercy of God in Christ. We are, therefore, all of us, the very moment we are born, accursed of God, for not having kept holy the seventh day

of the week, according to our covenant. And all who are not redeemed therefrom by Christ, remain for ever under this curse. From which it is plain, that to substitute some other day for the seventh, since the fall of man, is as impossible as it would be to substitute *some other tree* for the "tree of knowledge." To all who admit that God made a covenant of works with all mankind *in Adam*, these truths ought to be self-evident. Brethren, *we* acknowledge that we are all guilty before God of having eaten of the fruit of the tree of knowledge, while we disclaim *any guilt whatever* in regard to the fruit of every other tree; so are we guilty of violating the rest of the seventh day of the week, while we are not by nature guilty of polluting any other day.

Second. Because such substitution would destroy an integral part of the moral law. The law written on the heart of man said nothing about keeping holy any other day than the seventh; for all admit that, had Adam not fallen, there never would have been any other holy day. If, then, this law does *not now* require the sanctification of the seventh day, *the fourth commandment must have been annihilated*; and if another day is *now* the Sabbath, a new commandment, requiring for *a new reason* the sanctification of a different day, must have been substituted in its place. But this new law can be *no part of the moral law*, because it was *not written on man's heart*, nor did any human being know of its existence till thousands of God's people had been taken home to glory. God gave to Adam *free permission* to labor and do work on every day but the seventh, and

he, as a free moral agent, accepted the proffered boon. Therefore, to labor on any one of the first six days of the week is, under the covenant of works, *as innocent in itself* as to pray to the Creator of the Universe. It is as much a natural and inalienable right, as "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Now, if there is a law that requires the keeping holy of some other day, it must have its origin in the new covenant grace of God; and if that other day, and not the seventh, is *now* the Sabbath, men are no more under a *natural* obligation to keep a Sabbath than to be baptized, or to celebrate the Lord's supper. The obligation to keep it *must*, on your principle, grow out of their new-covenant relation to God in Christ.

Let us now look for a moment at the consequences flowing from the doctrine that some other day—the first, for example—has been substituted for the seventh. "Try the spirits." "By their fruits ye shall know them."

1. If this doctrine be true, the doctrine *that Adam represented all his posterity, must be false*; for, if Adam covenanted, as you admit he did, to keep holy the seventh day of every week, and *we* are not bound to do so, he certainly did not represent us, neither in that nor in any other part of the covenant; for, if we did not promise in Adam to keep holy the Sabbath day, we did not promise to keep any thing else.

2. If this doctrine be true, *there is now no such thing as original sin*. This follows as a matter of course; for, if Adam did not represent us, we

are not *born sinners*. The fact might be proved in another way, but this is enough.

3. If this doctrine be true, and the law of the new Sabbath bind "all men," as you say it does, it must bind *the heathen*, who are a part of "all men." But if there is a new Sabbath instituted, it can only be made known through the written word of God, of which the heathen *can know nothing*. This new Sabbath has never been made known to them, nor to any of their ancestors. Nevertheless, you say that they are bound to observe it, *according to the written word*, and that they shall be punished to all eternity for breaking it; which is contrary to the teaching of the Apostle [Rom. ii, 12], that the heathen shall be judged and condemned, not by the written word, but by *the law of nature*, which you know can reveal no Sabbath but that of the seventh day; for Adam, who understood the law of nature better than any other mere man, never thought of keeping holy any other day. And, moreover, the heathen have, on your principle, only nine commandments to obey or disobey; for they are under the law of nature, which says, "Keep holy the seventh day:" but you say that God does not *now* require this: therefore they are released from the obligation. And, what is stranger still, the heathen have no means of knowing that to keep the seventh day is a work of *supererogation*. These are *a few* of the consequences of your doctrine of a change of Sabbath. What must be the character of that tree which yields such fruits!

Let us now attend for a moment to your objections.

Do you say, Those who believe in Christ are redeemed, not only from the curse of the Sabbath law, but also from the obligation to obey it in future? If so, who can tell but we are redeemed from *every other* moral obligation?

Or, do you allege, that Christ makes a new contract with the sinner, saying, If you keep holy the first day, I will release you from the obligation to sanctify the seventh? "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law." Rom. iii, 31. But perhaps you say, To change the Sabbath from one day to another is not to "make void the law;" it is only to vary its application. I reply, It *is* to make void, to *annul*, to *annihilate*, one tenth part of that law that God wrote on Adam's heart; for, as has been shown already, that law required him to keep no day holy but the seventh.

Or, do you plead that, as God *has* substituted the Lord Jesus Christ for the sinner, without violating the moral law, so he *may* have substituted some other day for the seventh? I reply, The cases are not parallel; for,

1. The substitution of Christ does not render a change of any part of the law necessary; but the other does. Christ "came not to destroy the law," but to fulfill it; and in fulfilling it, he honored the seventh day. But the substitution of some other day for the seventh, had it taken place before Christ came, would have released him, as well as us, from the obligation to obey a part of the law of the covenant of works.

2. A change of Sabbath is not, like the substitution of Christ, *necessary* to the salvation of sin-

ners; for God had saved thousands before this change is alleged to have taken place.

3. The substitution of Christ changes the moral condition *of the church only*; but the change of the Sabbath would affect the moral relations of all men; for the Sabbath was made, not for the church, but "for man."

4. The evangelical doctrine of the substitutionary sacrifice of Christ, of itself, proves the impossibility of a change of Sabbath. All evangelical Christians hold, that believers are delivered, through Christ, from the *curse* of the law—the law of the covenant of works—but *not from the obligation to obey it*. If therefore, that law required *Adam and his posterity* to keep holy the seventh day of the week, Christ has never redeemed them from the obligation to render *exact obedience*, in this particular, as in every other.

Do you plead, as a last resort, that, as the command not to eat of the fruit of the tree of knowledge has passed away, so it may be with the law of the seventh day Sabbath? I reply, The cases are not parallel; for that command never was a part of the moral law. It was never written, either on man's heart, or on tables of stone; but this was. Besides, the tree of knowledge has been destroyed from the face of the earth, so that to eat of its fruit is now impossible; but the seventh day will continue to return "while the earth remaineth."

Brethren, you bewilder yourselves and others, by adopting, as a moral axiom, the false principle, that whatever is in its nature positive, is, *for that reason*, changeable. There is no principle

more deadly than this. Do you not know, that all our hopes, as Christians, for time and for eternity, are suspended on the *immutability* of that *positive arrangement* between the Father and the Son, which we call the covenant of grace? Are not the decrees of God all *positive*, yet, at the same time, immutable? So, also, the *Sabbath law*, though in its nature positive, has been made unchangeable, by a solemn covenant arrangement, "in which it was impossible for God to lie." If God had not made the law, requiring the sanctification of the seventh day, an essential part of the covenant of works, your doctrine of a change of Sabbath would not be so preposterous. As it is, how can serious, thinking men, help viewing it as a monstrous and impious absurdity!

CHAPTER III.

Third Reason.

My third reason for believing this proposition is, That Christ and his Apostles honored this day; and did not intimate that it would ever cease to be the Sabbath, but the contrary.

1. *Christ honored this day.*

Luke iv, 16. "And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up: and, as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and stood up for to read."

Luke iv, 30, 31. (See also Mark i, 21.) "But he, passing through the midst of them, went his way, and came down to Capernaum, a city of Galilee, and taught them on the Sabbath days."

Luke xiii, 10. "And he was teaching in one of the synagogues on the Sabbath."

Mark iii, 1, 2. "And he entered again into the synagogue; and there was a man there which had a withered hand. And they watched him whether he would heal him on the Sabbath day."

Mark vi, 2. "And when the Sabbath day was come, he began to teach in the synagogue."

2. *The Apostles honored this day. Read carefully the following passages and their contexts.*

Acts xiii, 14. "But when they departed from Perga, they came to Antioch in Pisidia, and went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and sat down."

Acts xiii, 44. "And the next Sabbath day came almost the whole city together to hear the word of God." (That is, to hear Paul and Barnabas preach.)

Acts xiv, 1. "And it came to pass in Iconium, that they (Paul and Barnabas) went both together into the synagogue of the Jews, and so spake, that a great multitude, both of the Jews, and also of the Greeks, believed."

Acts xvi, 23. "And on the Sabbath we went out of the city by a river side, where prayer was wont to be made; and we sat down, and spake unto the women which resorted thither."

Acts xvii, 2. "And Paul, as his manner was,

went in unto them, and three Sabbath days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures."

Acts xviii, 4. "And he (Paul) reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks."

Brethren, if you produce one solitary apostolic example of unnecessary labor performed on the seventh day, I will at once give up the argument in its favor.

3. *Neither Christ nor his Apostles intimated that the seventh day would cease to be the Sabbath.*

This being a negative assertion, I am not bound to prove it, of course. If you assert that they did, I demand the proof of it.

4. *Christ has very plainly intimated the contrary.*

Matt. xxiv, 20. "But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath day."

The "flight" here spoken of was to take place about the time of the destruction of Jerusalem; and the Saviour admonishes his disciples to pray that it might not happen on the Sabbath day. Now, if he knew that the Sabbath day would be changed into the "Lord's day," forty years before the event he had just alluded to, why did he speak of it as a thing that would be then in existence? Many are the efforts that have been made to evade the force of the argument from this text; but they are all unavailing.

Matt. v, 17-19. "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 least in the kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven."

It is almost universally admitted, that the Saviour, in these verses, refers principally to the ten commandments, which were then, as now, called, by way of pre-eminence, "*the law.*" That he may have referred also to the ceremonial code, which he came to fulfill, we do not deny. But this has nothing to do with our present purpose.

That the fourth commandment enjoins the sanctification of the seventh day of the week, no man in his senses denies. But you allege that that part of it has been taken away, so that it does not now bind us.

Now, in making this assertion, you either affirm what is positively denied in the above quotation, or you make this commandment at least *partly* ceremonial, and *peculiar to the Jews*. This will appear evident from the following considerations:—

First. The command to keep holy the seventh day of the week, is far more than "one jot or one tittle" of this law." It could be no less, but it is much more. Indeed, it is very certain, that Adam considered it a very important part of the law; and so did Christ, when he uttered these words, for he kept the Sabbath as devoutly as Adam ever did.

Second. Heaven and earth have not yet pass-

ed away; but you say that this seventh-day law has; therefore, much more than "one jot or one tittle" has passed from the law—which is contrary to Christ's assertion.

Third. If you say that Christ has fulfilled this law, and so taken it away, you make it a ceremony, like the Passover. You know that Christ never fulfilled, *so as to take away*, any law but those that he "nailed to his cross," and that he never nailed to his cross any law that bindeth "all men in all ages." If, then, the law requiring the sanctification of the seventh day of the week has been nailed to the cross of Christ, it must have been a ceremony peculiar to the Jews, and to which the Gentiles were never bound. Was Adam a Jew? Was Enoch a Jew? Were Noah and his sons Jews? But these all kept the seventh day, *and no other*.*

Brethren, it has been proved, in the first chapter of this treatise, that the fourth commandment

*Some of my Reformed Presbyterian brethren appear to be as far from believing "the whole doctrine of the Westminster Confession of Faith" as myself, only they are a little more guarded in the choice of words. That Confession says: (chap. xxi, sec. 7,) "So, in his word, by a positive, moral, and perpetual commandment, *binding all men in all ages*, he hath particularly appointed one day in seven for a Sabbath, to be kept holy unto him." But Rev. Andrew Stephenson, in a letter to me, speaking of the seventh day Sabbath, styles it, "This relict of Judaism;" and Rev. James Milligan, in a recent letter, asks me, "Why has not the Lord's day as good a right to take the place of the seventh day, as the Lord's Supper has to take the place of the Passover?" Query—Are Reformed Presbyterians, who hold such sentiments, any better qualified to judge their brethren for Sabbath breaking, than I would be to judge them for a like offense?

requires simply the observance of the seventh day of the week. I will not repeat what is there said. I now ask you, as candid inquirers after truth, to place this commandment and our Saviour's declarations, quoted above, side by side, and see if *your* conduct is not at war with both. You neglect the only day that God's law requires you to remember, while Christ assures you, in the most solemn manner, that "one jot or one tittle" shall in no wise pass from the law, "till heaven and earth pass, or till time shall be no more.

There is a little commandment in that law that says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." Christ says, that whosoever doeth and teacheth this commandment "shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." But this hath been my only crime. God knows, and you know, that the only thing I **have** done to offend you is, that I endeavor to **refrain** from doing work on the seventh day, and to "teach men so." Yet for this I am declared to be the "least in the kingdom of heaven," and no longer worthy of a seat at the table of Him who said, that "one jot or one tittle" should *in no wise pass* from the law.

Blessed be God! it is a light thing to be judged of man's judgment. But I confess that sometimes my blood runs cold, when I think of this solemn declaration of the same "Lord of the Sabbath" [John xii, 48], "He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day." "Never man spake like this man." O, brethren, are you ready

for that awful judgment day? Nothing but God's *word* will avail you there. If you are determined to go on, appropriating the seventh day to secular purposes, and "teaching men so," I cannot help it; but I call heaven and earth to witness, that, in regard to every reader of these pages, my skirts are henceforth clear. On your own souls will rest the responsibility of rejecting these solemn words of Christ. And you who are ministers—how will you answer for the wanderings of those lambs of Christ's fold, whom you are leading into strange pastures?

CHAPTER IV.

Fourth Reason.

My fourth reason for believing this proposition is, That God has never blessed and sanctified any day of the week but the seventh.

In sustaining this reason, as I occupy negative ground, I shall simply defend it against your usual scripture arguments in defense of your favorite doctrine, that God blessed and sanctified the first day of the week, in commemoration of the resurrection of Christ.

In arguing this doctrine, you do not pretend to offer *positive*, but only *inferential* proof. You quote certain texts, and say, Hence we infer that the first day of the week is the Sabbath. Now,

as there are many possible, and even plausible, inferences, that are not necessarily true, I intend to be governed, in the examination of your scripture proofs, by the following rule of interpretation:—

“The whole counsel of God, concerning all things necessary for his own glory, man’s salvation, faith, and life, is either expressly set down in scripture, or *by good and necessary consequence* may be deduced from scripture.”

Brethren, I intend, with God’s help, to show that, according to the above rule, which you admit to be correct, all your inferences in favor of a first-day Sabbath are *unnecessary*, and some of them wholly inadmissible.

YOUR FIRST PROOF.

Heb. iv, 9, 10. “There remaineth therefore, a rest (*sabbatism*) to the people of God. For he that is entered into his rest, he also hath ceased from his own works, as God did from his.”

Your premises consist of four assertions:—*First*, That the rest, or *sabbatism*, that remaineth, is something different from the ancient Sabbath. *Second*, That the person who “hath ceased from his own works as God did from his,” is the Lord Jesus Christ. These two assertions I most cheerfully admit. *Third*, That Christ entered into his rest on the day of his resurrection. *Fourth*, That the *sabbatism* of God’s people is enjoyed in this life. These last two assertions I utterly deny.

Your inference is, That the first day of every week, that being the day of the week on which

Christ rose, is the sabbatism of God's people. Of course, if I prove that the last two assertions are false, your inference will be shown to be inadmissible.

I assert, then,—

1. That Christ did *not* “enter into his rest” on the day of his resurrection, for the following reasons—(1.) Because the Scriptures do not say so. (2.) Because this earth is not the place of his rest. He was, to the last day he spent here, “a pilgrim and a stranger in the earth,” and had not therein “where to lay his head.” But his resurrection took place on earth, and he continued on earth for “forty days” afterwards. (3.) Because the Scriptures plainly teach, that the Mediator *did* “enter into his rest,” when he “sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high.” Heb. i, 3. “Arise, O Lord, into thy rest; thou, and the ark of thy strength.” Ps. cxxxii., 2. This was the prayer of David and the congregation of Israel, when they removed the ark from the house of Obed-Edom to the place “that David had pitched for it.” When Solomon and the elders of Israel brought up the ark from the city of David, and placed it in the holy of holies, in the temple “made with hands,” they prayed in like manner, “Now therefore arise, O Lord God, into thy resting place, thou, and the ark of thy strength.” 2 Chron. vi, 41. Now the ark was a type of Christ, while “heaven itself” is the true “holy of holies,”* “whither the forerunner is for us entered,

* Those who have carefully examined the subject of the Sanctuary, will hardly agree with the Author in some of the positions here taken.—PUBS.

even Jesus, made a High Priest forever after the order of Melchizedek." Heb. vi, 20. If, then, the ark entered into its rest, when it was placed in the holy of holies, Jesus Christ, the antitypical ark, entered into *his* rest when he sat down on the right hand of God, in the antitypical holy of holies. (4.) Because the apostle's great design, in this epistle, was to convince the church, and especially the Hebrews, that Christ, having "by himself purged our sins," as they all admitted he had done, "sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high" [chap. i, 3], as our ever-living Intercessor. Yes, the "one idea" that runs through the whole epistle is, to illustrate and magnify the doctrine of the glorious intercession of Christ the Mediator, who, "after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, forever sat down on the right hand of God." Do you ask proof? Take, then the apostle's own assertion [chap. viii, 1]: "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; a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man." All that is said in the third and fourth chapters, about the rest of Christ and the sabbatism of the people of God, is included in this summary; so that it is to Christ's eternal rest in the heavens that the verses under consideration refer. Indeed, we have evidence of this fact, satisfactory enough, in the immediate context. Chap. iii, 4. "Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Christ

Jesus,"—compared with chap. iv, 14—"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." (5.) Because there is not, in this epistle, one solitary reference to the resurrection of Christ, except in the concluding benediction; but it abounds in references to his ascension and intercession.

2. If I have reasoned correctly above, your assertion, that the sabbatism of God's people is enjoyed in this life, scarcely needs refutation. As Christ entered into his rest, when he received the crown of glory from the Father; so believers shall enter into his rest, when they "shall be glorified with him." Moreover, as Christ did not enter into his rest on the first day of the week, your inference, that that day is the Sabbath, is not only *unnecessary*, but wholly inadmissible.

But bear in mind also, brethren, that if Christ did not enter into his rest on the first day of the week, then your great philosophical argument for the first-day Sabbath, founded upon the fact, that the work of redemption is greater than that of creation, vanishes at once into smoke, or, at least, becomes useless for your purpose.

YOUR SECOND PROOF.

Psa. cxviii, 22, 24. "The stone which the builders refused, is become the head stone of the corner." "This is the day which the Lord hath made: we will rejoice and be glad in it."

Acts iv, 10, 11. "Be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that by the name

of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even by him doth this man stand here before you whole. This is the stone which was set at naught of you builders, which is become the head of the corner."

You premise, that "the day which the Lord hath made" is the day of the resurrection of Christ. Whence you infer, that the first day of the week is the Sabbath.

1. If what you premise were true, the inference does not follow. The prophet does not say, We will rejoice and be glad in the same day of every week; but, We will be glad and rejoice *in it*, that is, in that day, whatever it may be. Now Christ did not rise on the first day of every week, but on one single day; and we may very well rejoice and be glad in that one day, without keeping any Sabbath in connection with it. Abraham rejoiced and was glad in the day of Christ; but he kept no Sabbath in honor of it. So, doubtless, *you* rejoice and are glad in the day of his crucifixion, though you do not celebrate it on any particular day of the week. But—

2. You are evidently mistaken in referring this language of the Psalmist to the resurrection of Christ, for the following reasons:

First. Because "the day which the Lord hath made" is the same in which Christ went in by the gates of righteousness. Verses 19, 20. "Open to me the gates of righteousness: I will go into them, and I will praise the Lord. This gate of the Lord into which the righteous shall enter." Now, though Christ, *did* come up from "the gates of death" on the day of his resurrection, he *did*

not formally "enter" by "the gates of righteousness," till that day when he ascended from Mt. Olivet, which was not the first day of the week. His almighty power and eternal Sonship were declared most gloriously on the day of his resurrection; but it was on the day of his ascension that his mediatorial righteousness was formally approved by the Father; while it was visibly manifested, in the presence of the universe, that the door of heaven had been opened to all true believers. Then shouted the seraphim, and all the host of heaven, while the door-posts of the New Jerusalem trembled at the voice, "Arise, O Jehovah, into thy rest, thou, and the ark of thy strength. Let thy priests be clothed with righteousness; and let thy saints shout for joy!" Therefore, this is not the day of Christ's resurrection, but that of his ascension.

Second—Because "the day which the Lord hath made" is the same in which "the stone which the builders refused" became "the head-stone of the corner" [verse 22]. Christ did not become "the head of the corner," till he "sat down on the right hand of God." You assert that he did, and refer to Acts iv, 10, 11, quoted above, as proof. From what the Apostle there sets forth, you draw the inference, that, as he was set at naught by the builders, when he was crucified, so he became the head of the corner, when God raised him from the dead. The Apostle does not say, however, that this took place on the same day that he rose from the dead; and all that we must *necessarily* infer from what he *does say*, is, that he became the head of the corner since his resurrection, which is

cheerfully admitted. But whether it was on the same day, or two, or ten, or forty, days after, the Apostle saith not. Still your inference would be entirely natural and proper, if it were not contrary to the analogy of faith, and to the teachings of the same Spirit in other parts of the Scriptures.

I suppose it will be admitted that when Christ became the head of the corner, he became "the head over all things to the Church," and that then "all things were put under his feet." Now the Apostle clearly teaches, that these things took place when he sat down on the right hand of God, as appears from the following texts :

Eph. i, 20-22. "Which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead (or, having raised him from the dead) and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come : and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the church."

Heb. ii, 8, 9. "But now we see not yet all things put under him (man); but we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor." Observe that the Apostle's great object in this epistle is to show that Christ is *in heaven*, forever interceding for the church.

Now, is it not manifest from these texts, that Christ became the head of the corner when he ascended to his Father and our Father, to his God and our God? Nor is there anything in Acts iv, 10, 11, that contradicts this idea.

Brethren, the glorious building of grace has its foundation not on earth, where we are pilgrims and strangers, but in heaven, where Jesus, the corner stone, "elect and precious," sitteth at the right hand of God, and is constantly occupied in gathering from afar the "lively stones" of the glorious edifice. Blessed forever be his holy name!

YOUR THIRD PROOF.

John xx, 19, 26. "Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut, where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you." "And after eight days again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them; then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you." See also Luke xxiv, 26.

You premise that the disciples, on the two days referred to above, one of which certainly was, and the other may have been, the first day of the week, had met together for public or social worship, when Christ appeared to them. Whence you infer that the first day of the week is the Sabbath.

Now what you premise *seems* to be a mere assumption, for which there is not a shadow of proof, either in text or context. No one of the Evangelists says that they met for worship; nor did they worship, so far as we know, when met together. In regard to the first of those occasions, we are told that they were "assembled for fear of the Jews;" and, as to the second, we are simply in-

formed that they "were within," which means, probably, that they were *at home*; for Luke tells us that on the day of the ascension, the eleven "abode" in an upper room. Acts i, 13.

Again your inference is not *necessary*; for the matter may be explained thus: On the day of the resurrection, the eleven, having procured a common lodging-room, "assembled for fear of the Jews;" and Christ appeared to them before the close of the same day, in order that they, who are to be witnesses of the resurrection, might have ocular demonstration of the fact, that he rose "according to the scriptures." On the other occasion, "after eight days," he met them, probably, "as they sat at meat" [Mark xvi, 14], because Thomas, who had not seen him since his resurrection, was then with them.

These reasons are surely sufficient to account for his appearing on those occasions. But why demand reasons at all? Had he not a right to meet his disciples on any day of the week he chose, without telling us why? Can you tell us why he appeared to the brethren when they were fishing? Christ has done many things for which the only reason we can give is, that it seemed good to him.

YOUR FOURTH PROOF.

Acts ii, 1. "And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place."

Your premises are—1. That the feast of Pentecost fell that year on the first day of the week. 2. That the disciples were, *for that reason*, with

one accord in one place." Whence you infer, that the first day of the week is the Sabbath. I reply—

Whether the feast of Pentecost fell that year on the first day of the week, or not, the disciples did not meet to keep the Sabbath, but to celebrate Pentecost. They would have been, in like manner, "with one accord in one place," if it had been the fourth day of the week, because it was the day of Pentecost. Therefore your inference is not only *unnecessary*, but wholly inadmissible.

YOUR FIFTH PROOF.

Acts xx, 7. "And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight."

You premise, that the disciples came together in this instance to celebrate the Lord's supper, and to hear the word. Whence you infer that the first day of the week is the Sabbath.

What you premise is very uncertain; for—

1. There is no evidence that they met to hear the word. The object of the meeting was "to break bread;" and the preaching of Paul seems to have been *incidental*, and not by appointment.

2. It is not certain that "to break bread" means to partake of the Lord's Supper. The Greek word translated *to break*, is used very often in the New Testament in reference to ordinary meals. An instance occurs in Luke xxiv, 35—
"And they told what things were done in the way.

and how he was known of them *in breaking of bread.*”

But if what you assert were true, your inference is not necessary ; for—

1. It is entirely proper, for ought we know to the contrary, to celebrate the Lord's Supper, and hear preaching on any day of the week.

2. Perhaps this meeting was held at that particular time, because the Apostle and his company were “ready to depart on the morrow.” It was probably a farewell meeting, as many learned men think, and the text itself *seems* to hint.

3. There is not one word said in the text about Sabbath-keeping ; nor is there the least intimation, either in the text or context, that the disciples were *accustomed* to meet on the first day of the week for any purpose whatever.

But you say, Paul waited there seven days, and we have no account of his preaching till the last night of his stay, which was the first of the week. We reply, This is no evidence that he did not preach during the other six days. Luke tells us, in this same chapter, verses 2, 3, that “he came into Greece, and there abode three months ; and he does not say that he preached once during that time. But a small part, indeed, of the doings of the Apostles is recorded.

It is a remarkable fact that this text, which is the only one in the New Testament that speaks of public religious exercises on the first day of the week, is at the same time, the only one in the Bible that directly proves, that this day is *not* the Sabbath. I have already proposed to give up the argument in favor of the seventh day, if you pro-

duce one apostolic example of unnecessary labor performed therein. Will you give up your argument for the first day on the same condition? I believe this verse furnishes such an example.

The text proves nothing for you, if Paul's sermon and the breaking of bread were not on the first day. The sermon was preached between evening and midnight, and the bread was broken between midnight and break of day, and then Paul set out on his journey. According to the Roman method of computing time, the breaking of bread, at least, was in the morning of the same day in which Paul traveled from Troas to Assos, and thence to Mitylene; and, according to the Jewish method, the sermon, the breaking of bread and the journey from Troas to Mitylene, were all within the compass of the same "first day of the week." That Luke should follow the unnatural Roman method, is so unlikely as hardly to be supposable. Now if Paul traveled unnecessarily from Troas to Mitylene, as it seems he did, on the first day of the week, surely that day was not then the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. This text, therefore, *proves positively that the first day is not the Sabbath*, on which account it is of no little value in this controversy.

YOUR SIXTH PROOF.

1 Cor. xvi, 2. "Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come."

Your premises are—1. That the Apostle here

commands the Corinthians to make public collections on the first day of the week. 2. That, therefore, public assemblies were accustomed to be held on that day. Whence you infer that the first day of the week is the Sabbath.

I deny both your premises. The apostle simply orders that each one of the Corinthian brethren should lay up *at home* some portion of his weekly gains on the first day of the week. The whole question turns upon the meaning of the expression, "by him;" and I marvel greatly how you can imagine that it means "in the collection-box of the congregation." Greenfield, in his Lexicon, translates the Greek term, *παρ ἑαυτῶ* "*by one's self, i. e., at home.*" Two Latin versions, the Vulgate and that of Castellio, render it, "*apud se,*" with one's self, at home. Three French translations, those of Martin, Osterwald, and De Sacy, "*chez soi,*" at his own house, at home. The German of Luther, *bei sich selbst,* "*bei sich selbst,*" by himself, at home. The Dutch, "*by hemselven,*" same as the German. The Italian of Diodati, "*appresso di se,*" in his own presence, at home. The Spanish of Felipe Scio, "*en su casa,*" in his own house. The Portuguese of Ferreira, "*para isso,*" with himself. The Swedish, *när sig self,* "*naer sig self,*" near himself. I know not how much this list of authorities might be swelled, for I have not examined one translation that differs from those quoted above. Now, if your premises are false, your inference is not only *unnecessary*, but wholly inadmissible.

YOUR SEVENTH PROOF.

Rev. i, 10. "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day."

You premise that the Lord's day is the first day of the week. Whence you infer that the first day of the week is the Sabbath.

You here assume the principal point in dispute, namely, that God has appointed the first day of every week to be kept in commemoration of the resurrection of Christ. Is every Friday the "Lord's day," because he was crucified on Friday? You answer, No. Is every Thursday the Lord's day," because he ascended on Thursday? You answer, No. So when you ask, Is every first day of the week the "Lord's day," because he rose on the first day? I answer, No. And is it too much that I should ask you to prove your assumption? I have never yet met with an attempt to prove it.

But, were this even proved, your inference would not be necessary. The first day *might* be the "Lord's day," and yet not the Sabbath. Would the bare mention of this day by the Apostle John, even if it were certain that he referred to the first day of the week, repeal or alter the fourth commandment? Certainly not. But you ask, What day did he mean? I reply, Most probably he meant the seventh day, since we know from several scriptures that this *is in fact the Lord's day*. See Neh. ix, 14, and Isa. lviii, 13. But you ask again, Why did he not say "the Sabbath," if he meant it? I reply by asking you, Why did he not say "the first day," if he meant it?

Brethren, who can say that, from any or all of the texts commented upon above, the inference is *necessary*, that the first day of the week *is*, and that the seventh *is not*, holy? But this is precisely what *you* infer from them. On the sole authority of these passages, together with that one in which Christ says, that he is "Lord of the Sabbath," you have no hesitation in affirming that the first day of the week is the very Sabbath-day spoken of in the fourth commandment, and that the seventh day of the week is not *now* more holy than any other; or, in other words, that the blessing which God put upon it in the beginning [Gen. ii, 2, 3], has been taken from it, and given to another day. What! because "there remaineth a sabbatism to the people of God," therefore the seventh day *must* have ceased to be the Sabbath! Because "we will be glad and rejoice" in "the day which the Lord hath made," therefore the seventh day *must* have ceased to be holy! Because Christ showed himself to his disciples once or twice on the first day of the week, therefore the seventh day *cannot* be the Sabbath! Because the Pentecostal effusion of the Holy Ghost happened on the first day of the week, as is clearly demonstrated by arithmetical calculation, therefore the seventh day *cannot* claim to be the Sabbath! Because the disciples met *once* "to break bread" on the first day of the week, therefore God *must* have unsanctified the seventh day! Because the Corinthian and Galatian Christians were commanded to "lay by them in store" on the first day of the week, for the relief of the poor saints, therefore the seventh day *can be*

nothing more than a working day! Because John was “in the Spirit on the Lord’s day,” therefore the seventh day *cannot* be “the Lord’s day,” as it used to be! Because Jesus Christ is “Lord of the Sabbath,” and has the right to change it, or even to annihilate it, (?) therefore the seventh day *must* have ceased to be a day of rest! O, brethren, you dare not say that any of these inferences flow from the Scriptures as *necessary consequences*. But if they are not *necessary*—if there is any way of avoiding them, without doing violence either to the text or context—how *can* you ask me to believe that the first day *is*, and that the seventh day *is not*, holy?

CONCLUSION.

“The Sabbath was made for man.” I am a man; therefore, the Sabbath was made for me. God has blessed and sanctified the *seventh day* of the week, and commanded me to keep it holy for *that reason*; therefore, as long as the seventh day continues to be divinely blessed and sanctified, I am bound to keep it holy. But it is nowhere said in the Bible that God has removed the blessing from this day, or that he has un sanctified it. *You* say so, indeed; but you are neither the authors nor the finishers of my faith; nor will your unsupported assertion, a thousand times repeated, amount to a divine revelation. If you assert that it is the will of God that I should cease to regard the seventh day as holy, I ask, Where

is this revealed? What Prophet or Apostle has said so, *directly or indirectly*? It is not enough for you to answer, that the first day has been blessed and sanctified, as a memorial of the work of redemption. That assertion, if it were true, would not prove that the seventh day *is not holy*. No, brethren, your own conscience must tell you, that there is not one syllable in the Bible on which to ground the doctrine that God has *unsanctified* the seventh day of the week.

But one of your ministers has told me, that God did not bless and sanctify any particular day of the week, but only the Sabbath Institution. To this I have only to say, "Let God be true, and every man a liar." The Holy Ghost says [Gen. ii, 2], "And God blessed the *seventh day*, and sanctified it;" and again [Ex. xx, 11], "Wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath DAY, and hallowed it." Now, if you assert, with these scriptures staring you in the face, that God never blessed and sanctified any particular day, but only the Sabbath Institution, do you not make God a liar, in order to excuse your own rebellion? O brethren, I perceive that these texts are an eyesore to you, and that in your hearts you wish they were out of the Bible. If you loved them you would not flatly contradict them. I appeal to your own consciousness, is it not your great effort, when you take up the fourth commandment, to convince yourselves and others, that God's Spirit *does not mean* what he says, in as plain language as any Sabbatarian could employ; that is, that "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God?" And when you take up these pass-

ages in the New Testament, which have been considered above, do you not labor to convince yourselves, that the same Spirit *does mean* what he *does not say*? that is, that the first day is the Sabbath?

You do not believe that what God says a dozen times, or more, *can* be true; but you are sure that what he *does not say even once* is infallibly true; and that nothing but stupidity or skepticism would presume to doubt it. When you are told that the seventh day is the Sabbath, and the testimony of God's Spirit, plainly uttered in one dozen passages, together with the uniform practice of the church as long as we can trace the inspired history of the Sabbath, is offered in proof of the assertion, you shut your eyes, and declare that you can see nothing, and that all this proves nothing. But when you tell me, that the first day *is*, and that the seventh *is not*, the Sabbath, and quote, as proof, Acts xx, 7, and a few other passages, not one of which says one word about the Sabbath, or the seventh day, or a day of rest, or holy time, or exercises which are proper only on the Sabbath, you affirm, that you have proved your position beyond all doubt, and that the only reason why I cannot see the evidence is because the veil of Judaism is over my eyes. The moral law says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath;" but you say, "No, the seventh day is not the Sabbath; you do not understand the law; you mistake its meaning." Neither that law, nor any other in the Bible, says, "The first day is the Sabbath." Notwithstanding, you dare to lift up your hands, and swear by the living God, that

the first day *is* the Sabbath. But this is not all. Oh! that it were! The Holy Ghost has said, not only in the record that God made on Adam's heart, and in the covenant of works, but also in the written law given at Mount Sinai, and in several other passages of Scripture, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." But you have repeatedly sworn by the infinite, eternal, and unchangeable Jehovah, that *this assertion is not true*—that the seventh day is *not* the Sabbath of the Lord our God—that it is a common working day. Because I can no longer join you in this heaven-daring oath, you have declared me unworthy of the confidence of a christian people, and forbidden me to perform any longer the functions of a missionary of the cross. You have told the church, that, having violated my ordination vows, I have forfeited my ministry, and that my seat at the Lord's table is vacant. You have thus flung upon the heedless winds the mad-dog cry of "suspended minister," "covenant-breaker," and "disturber of the church's peace."

But think not, brethren, beloved in the Lord, that the treatment which I have received at your hands shall deter me from proclaiming what I believe to be God's truth, as God may give me utterance. That you wish to do what is right, I do not doubt. That you believe you do God service in thrusting me from your christian embraces, is evident enough. That many of you love me yet, and pray for me, I can but hope. But that you all sin in not searching the Scriptures daily to see whether these things are so, I do firmly believe.

And now, brethren, I cannot close this treatise

without uttering a word of warning to every one of you, which will, I fear, be very generally disregarded by you. Yet "wo is me" if I utter it not! Do not, I beseech you, be angry at any thing I have written, or refuse to hear my parting words because I am a "suspended minister." You have loaded me with reproach, not because I have committed any crime, but because I have plead for the integrity and immutability of the moral law. I am neither a thief, nor a murderer, nor a robber of churches, but I do most firmly believe, that the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord my God, and that you, and all others who do not keep it holy, are guilty before God of a gross violation of the moral law. And can I, under those circumstances, regard your reproaches as a legitimate expression of the divine displeasure? No. That I am really unworthy of the gospel ministry, I confess. That I am not sufficient for these things, I know. But, after having been regularly called to this responsible work, I will not be driven from it for such a cause. Know then, ye rulers in the house of God, that I am still a minister of Jesus Christ, sent forth to proclaim the terrors of God's law to the rebellious and impenitent, and to promise the grace of the gospel to the penitent and believing. Know also, ye professors of the christian religion who neglect the sanctification of the seventh day, and especially ye ministers of Jesus who "teach men so," that you make dark what God has made plain; that you pluck out of the hand of God's schoolmaster one of those rods wherewith he would lash the carnal heart; that you hide one of God's candles

under a bushel, and compass yourselves about with sparks, and a fire of your own kindling; that you provoke the Holy Spirit, in rejecting his testimony, and teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. Yes, brethren, though my words fall upon your ears as an idle tale that you believe not, I declare to you, in the name of Him whom your doctrine dishonors and your philosophy insults—in the name of that *suspended Minister*, to whom all the ends of the earth shall look for salvation—that, if you repent not, the Holy Ghost will bear witness against you, in the awful day of retribution, that you have refused his words, and that you have “put darkness for light, and light for darkness!”

Think not that I am your enemy, because I thus speak. Think not that I have no confidence in your piety, because I rebuke you sharply. Think not that I am proud, boastful, and self-confident, because I dare to approach *you*, who are vastly my superiors in knowledge, and remind you of your duty. I would gladly have avoided this public exhibition of my sentiments. Had it been possible to withhold my testimony, you would never have seen these pages. But “necessity is laid upon me.” And think not, I beseech you, that I am against the Church of our Redeemer, or would hinder her prosperity, because I oppose a human institution which Christians very generally observe. “If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning. If I do not remember thee, let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth; if I prefer not Jerusalem above my chief joy.”

AN APPEAL

FOR THE

RESTORATION OF THE BIBLE SABBATH:

IN AN

ADDRESS TO THE BAPTISTS,

FROM

THE SEVENTH-DAY BAPTIST GENERAL CONFERENCE.

STEAM PRESS OF THE REVIEW AND HERALD OFFICE,
BATTLE CREEK, MICH.

1860.

THE ADDRESS.

The Seventh-day Baptist General Conference, to the Members of the Baptist Denomination throughout the United States, holding to the Observance of the First Day of the Week as a Divine Institution.

BELOVED BRETHERN: When our Divine Redeemer dwelt on earth, he prayed that all his disciples might be made perfect in one. As this prayer was in harmony with the sure word of prophecy, which instructs us to look for a time when "the watchmen shall see eye to eye, and sing with united voice," we are sure that it will ultimately be answered. We see nothing, however, to warrant us in looking for such a happy consummation, while we contemplate the multiplied divisions of the Christian world, perpetuated as they are by the selfishness of human nature. Here the prospect is dark indeed. But we have an unshaken confidence in the power of God to bring about his own purposes,* notwithstanding all the devices of men. "The hearts of all are in his hands, and he turneth them whithersoever he will." He that made "the multitude of one heart and of one soul," in the first age of the church, can again

* We do not look for the unity of the great religious bodies upon Bible truth; but we do believe that God will "take out of them a people for his name," who will exhibit the unity expressed in Eph. iv; John xvii; Rom. xv, 6, 7; 1 Cor. i, 10; Col. iii, 1-4; 1 Pet. iii, 8.

concentrate his scattered bands, break down every wall of separation, and enlighten every mind by the effusion of his Spirit. Then shall Zion move forth, "clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners."

We rejoice, brethren, that you, as well as ourselves, are looking for this day of glory. Moreover, we have knowledge of your firm persuasion, that this glorious union of the now scattered forces of Israel, can be effected only upon the basis of divine truth. With a single glance you see the fallacy of that reasoning, which calls upon you, for the sake of union, to sacrifice the least particle of God's word. Taught by the Spirit of God, you have learned that the smallest atom of truth is more precious than fine gold. That meager piety which finds "non-essentials" in the appointments of Jehovah, you cannot abide. Your language is, "We esteem ALL thy precepts concerning ALL things to be right, and we hate EVERY false way."

We know, moreover, that it is the desire of your hearts, that all dissensions between Christians should be forever ended. For this object you are laboring and praying; and while you are doing so, you have the enlightened conviction, that your labors and prayers will be successful, in proportion to the amount of truth with which your own minds are imbued, and which you can bring to bear upon the minds of others. Laboring as you are to expound to others the way of the Lord more perfectly, we cannot suppose that you are yourselves unwilling to learn. We therefore approach you with confidence, affectionately and earnestly requesting you to take into consid-

eration the subject which is the only ground of difference between you and us. In our estimation, it is a subject of great importance; and though some of you have made it a matter of thought, we are persuaded that the great body of your denomination have dismissed it without any particular investigation. Indeed, we speak not unadvisedly when we say, that on this question the whole church of God have been hushed to sleep. In urging it upon your attention, we think you will not charge us with wishing to raise disturbance in Zion. We indulge the hope that you will impute to us the same disinterestedness of motive by which you yourselves are actuated when you boldly proclaim your denominational sentiments upon every high place, and scatter your publications in every direction. Your course springs not from any wish to foment disturbance, but from the pain which your hearts feel to see the institutions of Christ made void by the traditions of men. Our action in this matter springs from the same principle. We feel in regard to the Sabbath just as you do in regard to baptism. We declare before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, that we are moved by a desire for your good and God's glory.

When we look over your large and influential denomination, we find that, in reference to the subject upon which we now address you, you are divided into about three classes. 1. Those who, acknowledging the perpetuity of the Sabbath law, enforce the observance of the Sabbath by the fourth commandment, but change the day of its celebration from the seventh to the first day of the week. 2. Those who see the impossibility of

proving a change of the day, and therefore regard the commandment as abolished by the death of Christ. But, at the same time, they consider the first day of the week as an institution entirely new, to be regulated as to its observance wholly by the New Testament. 3. Those who consider neither the Old nor the New Testament to impose any obligation upon them to observe a day of rest, and advocate one merely on the ground of expediency.

I. To those of you who acknowledge the obligation of a Sabbath, but change the day of its celebration from the *seventh* to the *first* day of the week, we would say, that while from the law only you infer any obligation to sabbatize at all, yet make the particular time of sabbatizing to stand upon New Testament authority, we do not see how you can relieve yourselves from the charge of departing from the great principle contended for by Baptists; viz., That whatever is commanded by an institution, is to be learned from the law of the institution, and not from other sources. On this principle, you reject the logic of Pedobaptists, who, while they find the ordinance of *baptism* in the New Testament, go back to the law of *circumcision* to determine the subjects. You tell them, and very justly too, that the *law* of the institution is the *only rule* of obedience. But do you not fall into the same error when the argument has respect to the Sabbath? We can see no more fitness in applying the law of the Sabbath to the first day of the week, than in applying the law of circumcision to the subjects of baptism. For the law of circumcision was not more expressly con-

fined to the fleshly seed of Abraham, than was the law of the Sabbath to the seventh day of the week. The true principle is, that every institution is to be explained and regulated by its own law. Therefore, if the first day of the week is an institution binding upon us, the law to regulate its observance should be looked for where we find the institution. Be pleased, brethren, to review this argument, and see if you are not treading on Pedobaptist ground.

In justification of this change of the day, we often hear you plead the example of Christ and his apostles. But where do we find anything to this effect in their example? Did the apostles *sabbatize* on the first day of the week? Did the churches which were organized by them do so? Observe, the question between you and us is NOT, Did they *meet together* and *hold worship* on that day? BUT, Did they *sabbatize*? that is, Did they REST FROM THEIR LABOR on the first day of the week? Did they observe it AS a Sabbath? This is the true issue. We have often asked this question, but the only answer that we have received has been, *that they assembled for worship*. But this is not a candid way of meeting the point. It is in reality an answer to a very different question from the one we ask. Brethren, act out your own principles. Come up fairly to the question. When you ask a Pedobaptist, Did Christ baptize or authorize the baptism of little children? you expect him to make some other reply than, "*He put his hands on them and prayed.*" When you ask, Did the apostles baptize unconscious babes? you are not well pleased with the reply, *They baptized*

households. Your question was with regard to *infants*—the *baptism* of them. If, therefore when we ask you, Did the apostles and primitive Christians *sabbatize* on the first day of the week? you merely reply as above, we do not see but you are guilty of the very same sophistry you are so ready to charge upon your Pedobaptist brethren. Your adroit evasion of the real question seems to place you much in the same predicament as were the Pharisees, when Christ asked them whence was the baptism of John. It appears as if you reasoned with yourselves, and said, “If we shall say they *did* sabbatize on the first day of the week, the evidence will be called for, and we cannot find it; but if we shall say they did *not*, we fear the day will lose its sacredness in the eyes of the people.” We do not by any means wish to charge you with a Pharisaic lack of principle, but we put it to your sober judgment, whether your position is not an awkward one. Brethren, re-consider this point, and see if you are not on Pedobaptist ground.

If the apostles did not sabbatize on the first day of the week, then it follows, as a matter of course, that whatever notoriety or dignity belonged to that day, they did not regard it as a substitute for the Sabbath. Consequently, unless the Sabbath law was entirely abrogated by the death of Christ, the old Sabbath, as instituted in Paradise, and rehearsed from Sinai, continues yet binding, as “the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.”

But more than this. Even if it could be proved, that the apostles and primitive Christians *did* actually regard the first day of the week as a Sab-

bath, it would not follow that the old Sabbath is no longer in force, unless it could be proved that they considered the new as a SUBSTITUTE for the old; or, that so far as the particular day was concerned, it was of a CEREMONIAL character. But where do we find proof for either of these points? In the whole record of the transactions and teachings of the apostles, where do we find this idea of *substitution*? Nowhere. Where do we find evidence that, so far as the *particular day* was concerned, it was *ceremonial*, and therefore to cease at the death of Christ? Nowhere. The argument that proves the *Sabbath law* not to be ceremonial, proves the same of the *day*. Did the *Sabbath law* originate in Paradise, when man was innocent, and had no need of a Redeemer? So did the *day*. It was then sanctified and blessed. Does the *Sabbath law* take cognizance of the relation on which all the precepts of the moral law are founded; viz., the relation we sustain to God as *creatures* to *Creator*? So does the *day*. It is a memorial of this relation, and of the rest entered into by God after he, by his work, had established the relation. It appears, then, that neither the *Sabbath law*, nor the *day* it enjoins, was of a ceremonial character. True, it is not *moral*, in the strictest sense, but rather *positive*. Nevertheless, by divine appointment it is in the same category with the moral law, and must be considered a part of it. If this reasoning is correct—and if it is not, we hope you will point it out—it would not follow that the old Sabbath is done away, because Christ and his apostles sab-

batized on the first day of the week ; but only that there were *two* Sabbaths instead of *one*.

But could Christ or his apostles consistently alter the law of the Sabbath ? In all his ministry, Christ acted under the *appointment* of the Father, and according to such *restrictions* as were contained in the law and the prophets. By those restrictions, no laws were to be set aside at his coming, except such as were peculiar to the Jewish economy ; such as “meats, and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed until the time of reformation.” Heb. ix, 10. To set aside these, the law gave the Messiah an express grant. Heb. x, 9. But the very moment he should attempt to go beyond the limits of that grant, he would destroy all evidence of his being the Messiah promised and appointed. For it was by his exact conformity to the law, that his claims were established. Hence, early in his ministry, he declared that he “came not to *destroy* the law or the prophets.” Matt. v, 17. Most cheerfully do we recognize him as God over all, and blessed forever ; yet we are well satisfied that, even in virtue of his divinity, he could not consistently set aside any laws except those which were “a shadow of things to come.” Otherwise we should have God *denying* himself—God *contradicting* himself ! The New Testament records not a single instance of his claiming a right to do so. When he avowed himself Lord of the Sabbath, he only claimed to determine what was the proper method of keeping it—what were breaches of it, and what were not. The Sabbath was made *for* man, and

consequently it was his prerogative to decide what acts and duties answered to the nature and design of the institution. *Therefore*, the Son of man is Lord of the Sabbath. Mark ii, 28.

In regard to the obligation resulting from apostolic example, it appears to us that you have fallen into some errors. We are not convinced that the example of the apostles can be justly pleaded for anything else than the order and arrangement of the *church*. However proper it may be to imitate them in other respects—in the duties of the moral law, for instance—yet, if it were not known to be proper, independent of their example, we cannot suppose their example would make it so. We must first ascertain, by some settled and infallible rule, whether their practice is worthy of imitation. In regard to the ordering of *church affairs*, there can be no doubt, for they were sent upon this very errand, with the promise of the Holy Spirit to qualify them for the work. But the Sabbath is not a *church ordinance*. It is not an institution for the church *as such*, but for *all mankind*. All reasoning with reference to it, from apostolic example, must therefore be very inconclusive. Even if we should admit that the *church* is bound by such example to regard the first day of the week, yet this is the utmost extent to which our admissions can go. We cannot see how the institution becomes binding upon the world at large. Consequently, we are compelled to maintain, that an institution which was originally given for all mankind, remains unaltered. We are willing that the example and practice of the apostles should regulate the *church* as to its ordinances and

government, and herein we claim to follow them as strictly as you do ; but when they are pleaded for anything more, we want first to know whether they conform to the express law of God. Otherwise we must consider them as no more binding than an apostle's quarrel with Barnabas. Acts xv, 39.

If this argument is well founded, we are led to a very satisfactory disposal of a question often proposed ; viz., Why do we never read in the New Testament of Christian assemblies being convened *as such* on the Sabbath ? For if the Sabbath be not a *church ordinance*, but an institution for mankind at large, it can be of no importance for us to know what Christian assemblies *as such* did with regard to it. All that is of real importance for us to know, is the precise bearing of the institution upon man *as man*—upon man *as a* rational and accountable creature. On this point the information is clear and decisive.

The controversy between us and you appears to be brought down to a very narrow compass. *Did the apostles and primitive Christians sabbatize on the first day of the week ? And, Is it the duty of all men to imitate their example, or only the CHURCH ?* If, upon a solemn and prayerful consideration of this subject, you are persuaded that there is no proof that the early Christians regarded the first day as a Sabbath (substituted in place of the seventh), and will honestly avow your conviction, we have no fear that the controversy will be prolonged. For, should you still be of opinion that some sort of notoriety was attached to the day, and that Christians met for worship, we shall not be very

solicitous to dispute the point. The apostolic rule, "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind," will then govern us. See Rom. xiv, 5, 6. Our concern is not that you keep the first day of the week, but that you keep it *in place of the Sabbath*, thus making void the commandment of God. If once you discover that Sunday is not the Sabbath by divine appointment, and therefore cannot be enforced upon the conscience, we are persuaded that your deep sense of the necessity of such an institution, will soon bring you to the observance of the one originally appointed.

II. But we proceed to address those of you who regard the sabbatic law as having been nailed to the cross, and consider the first day of the week as an institution entirely new, regulated as to its observance wholly by the New Testament.

You, whom we now address, are exempt from some of the inconsistencies which we have exposed; but your theory labors under very serious difficulties, and is to be regarded, on the whole, as more obnoxious to the interests of religion, than the one we have been considering.

According to your position, the New Testament recognizes no Sabbath at all. Do not start at this charge. That it is repugnant to your feelings, we allow. You have never thought of anything else than *entire abstinence from labor* on the first day of the week. It is your day of *rest*, as well as *worship*. But on what ground do you make it a day of rest? What *example* have you for doing so? What *law* of the New Testament requires you to lay aside all your secular business? As sin is the transgression of the law, and where

no law is there is no transgression [1 John iii, iv ; Rom. iv, 15], how do you make it appear to be sin to work on the day in question ? It is by the commandment that sin becomes exceeding sinful. Rom. vii, 13. By what commandment do you make it appear sinful to work on Sunday ? These are questions of the highest importance.

Now suppose one of your brethren attends public worship on the first day of the week, and—to make his conformity to what is supposed to be apostolic example as perfect as possible—participates in the breaking of bread. He then goes home, and labors diligently till the day is closed. By what law will you convince him of sin ? Not the law of the Sabbath as contained in the Decalogue, for that you hold to be abolished. Not any law of the New Testament which says, “ Keep the first day of the week holy ; in it thou shalt not do any work,” for there is no such law. Not the law of apostolic example, for there is no proof that the apostles ever gave such example. The very utmost that you can with any show of reason pretend of their example is, that they met together for worship and breaking of bread. To this example your brother has conformed to the very letter—who can say he has not in spirit also ? What now will you do with him ? “ The Bible, and the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants.” The Bible, therefore, is the rule by which he is to be tried. Convict him of sin by this rule, if you can.

But the case becomes still more difficult, when you come to apply it to those who are without the pale of the church. We have already seen that apostolic example concerns merely the ordering

and arrangement of the *church*. Attempt now to convince the unbeliever of sin in working on the first day of the week. In order to do this, charge apostolic example upon him. What is his reply? "I know not," says he, "that I am bound to imitate them in this matter. How does it appear that I am? I will admit, for argument's sake, that they celebrated the resurrection on Sunday by religious worship; but they also broke bread and partook of it by way of celebrating his death. If their example binds me in one particular, why not in the other? Prove to me," says he, "that any but the church assembled on the first day for worship, and I will do so too. But in the absence of all such proof, I must conclude that their example has nothing to do with me; unless, indeed, you can make it appear that their example and practice were in conformity to some law, which commanded them as rational creatures, independent of their relation to Christ and his church. When you can produce that law, then I shall feel bound to obey it, and imitate the apostles in their obedience to it; but not till then." Such is the reasoning by which an unbeliever may set aside all your attempts to charge sin upon him. Where, brethren, is your law which, like a barbed arrow, pierces the very soul, and fastens guilt upon the conscience? Where is that law which speaks out its thunders, saying, "Thus saith the Almighty God, the Lord, the maker of heaven and earth, It is the Sabbath-day; in it thou shalt not do any work?" To throw aside the law, which cuts and flames every way, reaching soul and spirit, joints and marrow, in order to deal with the ungodly by

mere apostolic example, is like muffling the sword, lest it should give a deadly wound. Apostolic example is indeed powerful with those whose hearts have been made tender by the Spirit of God, but with others powerless.

We are persuaded, brethren, that your conscientious scruples about laboring on the first day of the week, never resulted from the mere contemplation of apostolic example. Such example, it is true, is all the law you acknowledge ; but this is the theory you have adopted since you came to maturity, and began to think for yourselves. Your scruples have an earlier and different origin. They commenced with your childhood, when you were taught to consider the day as holy time. It was then carefully instilled into your mind, that God had, by express law, forbidden you to desecrate the day, and that you would incur his displeasure in case you should do so. The idea was then imbibed, that if you did not keep the day, you would violate the fourth commandment. This idea has grown with your growth, and strengthened with your strength. It has obtained such commanding influence over your feelings, that you cannot comfortably forbear keeping a day of rest, though your theory does not require it. Even to this day a strong impression rests upon your minds, that the fourth commandment contains much of moral excellence—too much to be thrown altogether away, notwithstanding your system of theology teaches its abrogation. Such is the true secret of your tenderness of conscience. Apostolic example has in reality nothing to do with it. Following the secret monitions of conscience, your pros-

perity is promoted in spite of your theological system. But sound reason discovers that your experience and your theory are in opposition to each other. Some of the more thinking ones among you are aware of this, and are continually aiming at such a modification of their theory, that their experience will harmonize with it. But be assured, that there will be an everlasting conflict, till you are brought to acknowledge fully and heartily the claims of the sabbatic law.

We are aware of that system of theology which regards the New Testament as furnishing the only code of laws by which men are bound since the death of Christ. We have looked at this doctrine with attention; and so far as the order, government, and ordinances of the *church* are concerned, we admit its truth. As the laws and ordinances of the *Jewish* church were determined by the *Old* Testament, so the laws and ordinances of the *Christian* church are determined solely by the *New* Testament. Therefore, we should say at once, the argument is yours, if the Sabbath were a church ordinance. In such case, however, none but the church has a Sabbath. But the question is not concerning church ordinances. In these we follow the New Testament as closely as yourselves. The question is concerning an institution which has respect to mankind at large—to man *as man*; for the Saviour teaches us that the Sabbath was made *for* man. Now, it will be a very hard matter to prove that when men as rational creatures are concerned, the only code of laws by which they are bound is the New Testament. Let us put the matter to the test. How will you prove

that it is unlawful for a man to marry his sister, his daughter, or any other of near kin? The New Testament utters not a word on the subject. It is not enough to say, It is implied in the law which forbids adultery; for it must first be proved to be a species of adultery to do so. Nor will it do to say, The common sense of mankind is a sufficient law on the subject; for the moment we suppose that its unlawfulness is to be determined in this way, we abandon the argument that the New Testament is the only code of laws, and resort to the common sense of mankind as furnishing a part of the code. But if the common sense of mankind shall furnish a part of the code by which we are bound, who shall undertake to say how large a part? Besides, on this principle, the book of divine revelation is not complete and perfect. It is a lamp to our feet only in part, and the common sense of mankind makes out the deficiency! You are, therefore, driven to take your stand again upon the New Testament. Finding you there again, we repeat the question, *How do you prove by your code that a man may not marry his sister?* It is impossible. You must, of necessity, look to that division of the Scriptures usually called the Old Testament; for the New says not one word about it.

Let us turn now to the 18th chapter of the book of Leviticus, and we shall find a collection of laws exactly to the point. "None of you shall approach to any that is near of kin to him," &c. Verse 6. The degrees of kindred are then expressly marked. Will it be objected, that these laws were given particularly to the Jews, and to

no other people? We admit they were given to the Jews, as indeed was the whole system of revelation in that age; but we cannot admit that they concerned no other class of people. For it is expressly shown in that chapter, that the matters of which they took cognizance, were regarded as abominations in the Gentiles. Because of such things, the fierce wrath of Jehovah came down upon the Canaanites, and they were cast out of the land as loathsomeness. Verses 24, 30. If these things were viewed as abominable in the Canaanites, they surely were not *ceremonial* pollutions. They were not mere *Jewish* laws. The fallacy of the doctrine is therefore sufficiently exposed.

We think you have fallen into error concerning the nature and design of that division of the Scriptures commonly called the New Testament. We regard it not as the *Law Book* of mankind, in the strict and proper sense; but rather as a *Treatise on Justification*, or an *Expose of the Way of Salvation*, in which are contained such references to the law, and such quotations from it, as are necessary to the complete elucidation of the subject. The preparation of this treatise was of necessity delayed until the great Sacrifice for sin had been offered, and our High Priest had entered into the holy place. For, as the sacrifice and intercession of our High Priest constitute the sole foundation of our justification, so "the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while the first tabernacle was yet standing." Heb. ix, 8. So much of the plan of salvation was illustrated to the people, as could be by means of the ritual service; and that, together with the prophecies, laid a foun-

dation for them to *believe* that, *in some way or other*, they would be just before God. So that by *faith* the patriarchs were justified. Heb. xi. They knew it was to be *somehow* through the work of him who was typified and promised as the great Redeemer. But they could not understand the plan until the Redeemer came and died for them.

Because this expose of the way of salvation could not be made until after the death of the High Priest, *therefore* it was not proper to organize gospel churches. The only church that was suitable for that age was found in the Jewish nation, and from its very nature was unfit for the world at large. It was, therefore, confined to that people. Moreover, because it was not proper to organize gospel churches until the way of salvation was fully laid open, it was also not proper to lay down the laws and ordinances of the church until that time. This accounts for the laws of the church being found only in the New Testament.

Now, if the New Testament is to be regarded as an exhibition of the way of salvation, with such references to the Old as are necessary for the elucidation of the subject, rather than as the Law Book for mankind at large, the idea that the Sabbath ought not to be looked for in the Old Testament, falls to the ground. Nevertheless, to some minds it appears strange that while the New Testament writers mention all the other duties of the Decalogue, this of Sabbath-keeping is apparently omitted. In speaking of the sins of which Christians were guilty before their conversion, not one word is said about Sabbath-breaking, though upon other sins they dwell with emphasis. But this

admits of a very easy solution. Those writers addressed two classes of converts—those from among the Jews, and those from among the Gentiles. As to the former, they were already rigid to an extreme in keeping the Sabbath. All that was necessary to do in their case, was to vindicate the institution from Pharisaic austerities, and determine what was lawful to be done, and what was not lawful. This was done by Christ. But as for the Gentile converts, to charge them with having been guilty of the sin of Sabbath-breaking in their state of heathenism, would have been manifest impropriety. For the Sabbath being for the most part a *positive* rather than a *moral* precept, it could not be known without a revelation. But as the Gentiles had no revelation, this is a good reason why the apostle dwelt not upon this sin, to charge it upon them, but those only which were more obviously breaches of the Moral Law. Thus it appears, there was no necessity for any more particular mention of the Sabbath to be made in the New Testament than what is made.

But it is not our object in this Address to cover the whole field of argument. We design simply, by presenting some of the strong points, and exposing your inconsistencies, to stir up your attention to the subject. We are sure that the great majority of you have never given it a thorough investigation. For a complete discussion of the whole ground we refer you to our publications. Will you read them? Will you anxiously inquire, What is truth? Will you pray over the matter, saying, “Lord, what wilt thou have us to do?”

Or will you sleep over it as if it were of no great practical importance?

III. But we must address that class of Baptists who consider neither the Old nor the New Testament to impose any obligation to observe a day of rest, and advocate one merely on the ground of expediency. In some sections of our country, Baptists would consider it almost a slander upon their denomination to intimate that there were persons among them of such anti-Sabbath principles. But any one who is conversant with the order at large, knows very well that it is true. There are those who boldly avow such doctrine, and many others who do not deny that it is their real sentiment, though they are not forward to proclaim it upon the house-tops. Whether this class embraces a very large proportion of the denomination, it is not necessary to inquire. It is our impression that the proportion is sufficiently large to justify an effort for their conversion to right views of Divine Truth.

If there is no day of rest enjoined by divine authority, and the observance of one rests wholly upon expediency, we see no reason, except that the voice of the multitude is against it, why you cannot as well observe the *seventh* as the *first* day of the week. There would be no sacrifice of conscience in so doing, while it would be a tribute of respect to those who feel that the keeping of the seventh day is an indispensable part of duty. But it is not on this principle, particularly, that we desire you to change your ground. Feeling that it is not *our party* that must be honored, but rather *divine*

truth, and our party only *for the sake of the truth*, we would much rather correct your doctrinal views.

Of course you do not deny that a day of rest was once enjoined upon God's chosen people. It is only under the gospel that you suppose all distinction of days to be annihilated. If, then, it is *expedient* that a day of rest should be observed, it follows irresistibly, that the annihilation of all distinction in days, by the gospel, was very EXPEDIENT! And thus, whatever blessings the gospel dispensation brings to the human race, a strict following out of its principles would be INEXPEDIENT! And, farther, that the law which enjoined a day of rest, had more of an eye to expediency than the *gospel* has! Consequently that the gospel, though declared to be *faultless*, and capable of *perfecting* those who believe, must nevertheless, FOR EXPEDIENCY'S SAKE, borrow a little help from the abrogated rites of the law! In other words, God, in setting aside a day of rest, committed an oversight, and left his work for man to mend! Brethren, we see not how it is possible for you to escape such monstrous conclusions. They are the legitimate result of your principles—principles that you must have adopted without considering where they would land you. For we are not disposed to believe you so completely destitute of piety, as willingly to abide by the result of them. We entreat you to reconsider them, and adopt such as are more in accordance with the spirit of our holy religion.

When you advocate the observance of a day of rest on the ground of *expediency*, we are persuaded

that you do so in view of the bearing you perceive it to have upon the well being of mankind. But still the question will arise, Has the gospel less regard to the well being of mankind than the law had? Look at the humanity of the Sabbath institution. How necessary that both man and beast should rest one day in seven. How evident that they cannot endure uninterrupted toil. How perfectly well established, that, if doomed to constant labor, they sink under the premature exhaustion of their powers. So well is this established that we cannot put such a low estimate upon your judgment as to suppose it necessary to enter upon any proof of it. But the question returns, Does the gospel breathe less humanity than the law? Or, consider the bearing of the institution upon the interests of religion. It affords opportunity for men to be instructed in the great things which pertain to their salvation; and if there were no Sabbath to call them away from their labors, it would be impossible to bring religious instruction into contact with their minds. Does the gospel afford less advantage in this respect than the law did? Did the law provide a season for instructing the people in religion as it *then* stood? and does the gospel provide no season for instructing them in religion as it now stands? Must they be instructed in *types*, but not in the *substance*?—in *prophecy*, but not in the *fulfillment* of prophecy? No one will be responsible for the affirmative of these questions.

If the New Dispensation actually has abrogated the Sabbath, we do not believe that it is *expedient* to observe it. We cannot believe, however, that an

institution so important to the civilization, refinement and religious prosperity of mankind, has been abrogated. We refer you to our publications, and to the publications of those who have, in common with us, defended the perpetuity of the Sabbath law; and we entreat you to reconsider your ground. The doctrine of expediency! What a fruitful source of corruption has it been to the church of God! There is not an anti-Christian, popish abomination, but what pleads something of this kind. Do, dear brethren, let it be expunged from your creed.

BRETHREN OF THE BAPTIST DENOMINATION:—
 You are a great and growing people. Your influence is felt throughout the length and breadth of our land. We rejoice in your prosperity. “May the Lord make you to increase and abound in love one towards another, and toward all men.” In your prosperity we behold, in a measure, our own. Your baptism is our baptism. Your church government is our government. Your doctrinal principles are ours; and there is nothing which constitutes any real ground of separation, except the great and important subject we now urge upon your attention.

The popularity you have gained as a denomination, however, is not owing to your Sabbath principles. It is founded entirely on your views concerning the initiating ordinance of the gospel. These views are characterized by that perfect simplicity which marks every divine institution. Hence you have won the affections of the common people, while, if you had attempted to operate on

them by a more complicated theory, failure would have been the result.

This induces us to urge upon your notice the *exceeding simplicity* of the Sabbatarian argument, compared with all those theories which stand in opposition to it. It is adapted to persons of weak capacities. Any illiterate person can open the Bible, and point to the chapter and verse, saying, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." This is plain; he can understand it. But tell him that redemption was a much greater work than creation; that redemption was finished by the resurrection of Christ; that an event so important ought to be commemorated; and that, in order to do this, the day of the Sabbath was changed from the seventh to the first day of the week; for all which there is not a single "thus saith the Lord," nothing but the uncertain deductions of human reason; can he understand it? No. It requires an elevation of intellect which God has not given him. The inferences and deductions are beyond his capacities. How then is he to render an *intelligent* obedience? If he conform his practice to the theory thus set before him, it will not be because he understands it, but because he is willing to trust the guidance of his mind to those who, he thinks, know more than he does himself. This, therefore, is strong internal evidence that the keeping of the first day is not of God. For the book of God is adapted not only to those of elevated intellect, but to the ignorant and rude. Everything concerning our practice is plain even to wayfaring men. Were it otherwise,

we should conclude that the Bible is not an inspired production. If it did not come down to the capacities of all, we should infer that it was not made by Him who made all minds. Indeed, it would not, in such case, be a *revelation* to all, but only to the more talented. But it is a revelation to *all*; and he that obeys God must do it for himself; he that repents and believes, must do so for himself; and at the great day, every one of us shall give account for himself unto God. It is of the highest importance, therefore, that every one knows *for himself* the foundation of his faith and practice.

In thus urging the simplicity of the argument for the Sabbath, we are but doing what you do in regard to Baptism. Compare the cases. A man of considerable intellect can reason from the Abrahamic covenant, lay propositions together, and draw inferences and deductions, until, finally, he makes it pretty clear to his own mind, that the children of the flesh, these are the children of God; Paul to the contrary notwithstanding. But how is it with some good old Baptist sister, who can hardly join two ideas together, and draw a logical inference from them? Why, she cannot tell about this reasoning from the Abrahamic covenant. It is something she does not understand. But she can open her Bible, and point to chapter and verse for believers' baptism. She puts her finger upon something that is just adapted to her capacities. As she has a soul to save, an obedience to render, and an account to give, all for herself, her practice is accordingly. Brethren, think this matter over, and see whether your reasoning on the Sabbath is not very much akin to that of

those who reason from the Abrahamic covenant to Baptism. Think seriously, whether it does not render *intelligent* obedience impossible to vast numbers of Christians. Think whether a course of reasoning which darkens a very simple subject, is not more specious than solid.

Again, your children are to be early instructed in this matter. How do you succeed in making them understand it? Is your little child capable of comprehending all this argument, which you found upon the finishing of redemption by the resurrection of Christ? Can you point him to any plain passage, where Christ authorizes a change of the Sabbath? How do you feel when the little creature says, in the simplicity of his heart, "Father, mother, does not the fourth commandment require the observance of the seventh day of the week? But do we not keep the first day? I should think this is not keeping the commandment." One would think you would be forcibly reminded of that Scripture, "Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings thou hast ordained strength." Ps. viii, 2.

The extensive operations in which you are engaged for the conversion of the world, render it in the highest degree important that you should not err on a question like this. If you are right, you ought to be very certain of it. Among the heathen, you are extending the observance of Sunday as a sacred day. If you are thus sowing the seeds of error instead of truth, the evils who can calculate? Hence you cannot too early begin to review your ground. Consider the difficulties your missionaries already have to encounter,

because of unscriptural sentiments propagated among the heathen by those who nevertheless loved their souls. The poor, perishing idolaters are witnesses of the clashing of doctrine between Jesus Christ's men, and they ask, "*Why is this? You have come to give us a gospel which professes to make its followers 'perfect in one,' and yet you yourselves are divided.*" You cannot in conscience abandon your principles, however, nor dare you, in your translations, give to a sentence or a particle one single turn, which will not fully express the mind of the Holy Spirit. Dare you, then, without feeling the most entire certainty, teach them that God says, "Remember the first day of the week to keep it holy?" The responsibility of the missionary, in this respect, is not less than where his translation is concerned. Does he feel the same awful sense of responsibility?

From the heathen turn to the contemplation of the Jewish nation.* The time cannot be far distant, when those who, "as touching the election, are beloved for the fathers' sakes," shall be called to behold the glory of God, in the face of Him they have so long rejected. But in order to this, a voice from the divine word cries, "Cast ye up, cast ye up, prepare the way, take up the stumbling block out of the way of my people." Have Christians seriously considered what this stumbling block is? For our own part, we are persuaded that nothing can be more justly called by this

* The desecration of the Sabbath by professed believers in Christ, doubtless has been, and still is, a stumbling-block in the way of the Jews to keep them from Christ; but we see no promises for the "Jewish nation" more than for other unbelieving nations.—PUBS.

name, than the general abandonment, on the part of Christians, of the Sabbath of the Lord. The Jews, taking it for granted, without examination, that this abandonment is really taught by the Christian religion, suppose that its author cannot be the true Messiah. They have seen, through every period of their nation's history, that God has put signal honor upon this institution. They have seen its sacredness elevated high above that of the ceremonial institutions. They have heard their prophets dwell upon the profanation of it as the crying sin of the land, on account of which the sore judgments of Heaven came down upon it. It is true, some teach that the whole Mosaic system was clothed with as much sacredness as the Sabbath; and that it was not for the sin of Sabbath breaking, any more than for a disregard of the ritual service in general, that they suffered the wrath of Jehovah. But such persons must have paid only a superficial attention to the subject. The attentive reader cannot fail to be struck with the fact, that while in the prophets the Sabbath is exalted as of vast importance to the nation, and all its prosperity, and the favor of God, seemingly, suspended on the proper keeping of it, ceremonial usages are comparatively depreciated.

Since the Sabbath holds such a sacredness throughout the ancient oracles of God—since the Israelites have taken their lessons of obedience to it under “the rod of his wrath”—since no grant was given to the Messiah to set it aside, nor the least intimation ever made to the Jews that it would be set aside—can we wonder that they

think that teacher to be an impostor who should break this commandment, and teach men so?

But there is a crisis approaching—the day is near, and it hasteth greatly—when it will be indispensable that all those who truly love the Lord Jesus Christ, have their “loins girt about with truth.” Popery is preparing for another desperate struggle. The great principle of the Reformation, that “the Scriptures are the only rule of faith,” is to be discussed anew. In the Church of England, this discussion has already commenced. Rome has opened her sluices, and anti-christian corruption again threatens to flood the church of God. As the water naturally seeks such channels as may already be prepared, so will it be with this doctrine. What branch of Zion will be next troubled? Probably that which makes the next widest departure from the great Protestant principle. Then that which is next in order; and so on. For it can not reasonably be expected to stop, until it reach that order of people which is governed by the Bible alone. Upon all others the desolation must be more or less extensive. For those who acknowledge the principle of departing from the Bible in ever so small a degree, may be expected to exemplify it to an indefinite extent, when the circumstances of the times are so modified as to give occasion for it. As for yourselves, you do not avow the *principle* of departing from the Scriptures, but profess to hold it in abhorrence. The language of your *creeds* is explicit on this point; and we know of no denomination so forward to plead a strict conformity to this principle as yourselves. Yet it is impossible for you to pre-

tend, with any show of modesty, that the Scriptures expressly enjoin the keeping of Sunday as a Sabbath to the Lord. You cannot say, from Scripture authority, that the apostles observed it as such. Nevertheless, your creed declares that it ought to be so observed; and your practice accords with your creed. Wherefore, it is as evident as mathematical demonstration, that you do depart from the great Protestant principle. Consequently, if our views be correct in regard to the crisis which is at hand, the time cannot be far distant, when your own denomination will in some modified form be affected with the deprecated evil, and you will be compelled to abandon every principle and practice which can give it the smallest advantage.

Do you think, brethren, that in your present position you are prepared for the great struggle? When the Puseyite, replying to those who contend for the Protestant maxim, refers to the observance of Sunday, and says, "Here we are absolutely compelled to resort to the aid of ancient usage, as recorded, not by the inspired, but by the uninspired writers," are you ready for the issue? Can you confute what he says? When another one says, "The *seventh* day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; we celebrate the *first*. Was this done by divine command? No. I do not recollect that the Saviour, or the apostles, say we shall rest on the first day of the week instead of the seventh;" and then concludes, "The same reasons which urge you to dissent from the observance of the three grand festivals of the Church of England, ought to operate with you respecting the

Sabbath ;"—are you prepared to join issue with him? Can you justify yourselves on your own principles? If you can, we will confess our short-sightedness. But indeed we fear, we tremble, in view of the crisis which is approaching, when we look at the traditional usages prevailing among Christians, and consider with what a tenacious grasp they are held. O Lord God Almighty! thou who hast sworn that "thy kindness shall not depart from thy church, nor the covenant of thy peace be removed," let not thy truth fall in the contest.

We mean not to goad your feelings, by charging upon you any of the abominations of Popery. We are sure you would not cherish one of them, if you were conscious of it. But we take it for granted, that those who are forward to take the mote out of their brother's eye, are willing to have the beam taken out of their own. You have charged Pedobaptist denominations, over and over, with upholding Popery's chief pillar. You have told them, that their zeal, against the man of sin would avail them but little, until they first rid themselves of his traditions. You have talked feelingly of the sin of encumbering the ordinances of God with human inventions. You have read the church of Christ many a good lesson on the importance of holding the truth in its purity. In all this you have, doubtless, been sincere. We have no fault to find with you; for you have only followed the Bible direction, "Cry aloud, spare not, show my people their transgression." In conformity with this direction, we would endeavor to act our part as faithful reprovers. Yet our de-

sire is, to do it with meekness, considering ourselves lest we also be tempted. It may be—we know not—that some of the abominations of the man of sin are cleaving to us. If so, “let the righteous smite us, it shall be a kindness; let them reprove us, it shall be an excellent oil, which shall not break our head.”

Turn, brethren, to the seventh chapter of the prophecy of Daniel, and twenty-fifth verse. You there find one spoken of who “shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, *and think to change TIMES and LAWS.*” You have had no difficulty in finding in this prophecy a reference to the law of baptism, as one of the *laws* which this great power has changed; but you have not shown satisfactorily what are the *times*. You have usually referred them to the numerous festivals and holy-days, which have been multiplied by the church of Rome. But these were *times* ESTABLISHED; not *times* CHANGED. Will you please to expound this passage a little more clearly? Will you tell us whether, under the gospel, there is any sacred time except the Sabbath? We will not be unreasonably confident, but we are much mistaken, if you can give any clear and satisfactory construction to this prophecy, without finding that something of Rome still cleaves to you.

Suffer us here to declare our conviction, that you could take no more effectual step toward converting the Christian world to right views about baptism, than to embrace the Sabbath of the Bible. In your discussions with Pedobaptists, you are constantly referred to the change of the Sab-

bath, as proof that some things may be binding which the Scriptures do not expressly enjoin. You have never met this argument fairly and fully. To be sure, you always make an attempt to meet it. But how do you do it? By proving that Christ expressly enjoined his followers to *sabbatize* on the first day of the week? By showing from express scripture testimony, that the apostles *did actually rest from their labors* on that day? No. Neither of these things have you ever shown; nor can you show them. The whole head and front of your proof—if proof it may be called—amount only to this: that the apostles and primitive Christians *met together for worship* on that day. It is true, by such a course you have generally talked your opponents into silence, because by exposing fully the defect of your reply, it would only render their own transgression the more glaring. But while you *silenced* them, you did not *convince* them. While they saw that for one of *your own* customs you could not plead a “thus saith the Lord,” they felt comparatively easy under all your rebukes, and naturally enough thought it not *very* important, that *they* should have a “thus saith the Lord” for the sprinkling of babes.

But a most important consideration, in view of this subject, is the influence of your large and powerful denomination upon an unconverted world. Whatever your theory about the perpetuity of the sabbatic law—whatever your doubts and scruples about the use of the term *Sabbath* under the gospel—you cannot rid yourselves of a deep sense of the importance of a day of rest to the world

at large. Hence the resolutions of your churches and conventional bodies, with regard to the profanation of what you call the Lord's day. Hence your plain, out-spoken censures of running cars, stages, steamboats, and other public conveyances, on this day. Hence your griefs and lamentations over those who make it a day of recreation or mirth. Hence your readiness to co-operate with those bodies which are organized to suppress, if possible, the violation of what is called the Sabbath. We admire the principle which governs you in all this; but we regret that it is not *regulated* by a better understanding of the subject.

If you would promote right principles, you must be careful that your proofs, and examples for illustration, are pertinent, and free from all uncertainty. We are fully persuaded, that your *Recommendations* and *Pledges*, your *Resolutions* and *Associational Acts*, will always meet with defeat, until you can fortify them by a law of God, so clearly expressed, that it will urge and goad the violater's conscience wherever he may go. The consciences of guilty men cannot be reached by the method you are pursuing. You behold them desecrating the Sunday, and, in order to make them lay it to heart as a sin, you bring down upon them—what? Apostolic example? New Testament intimations, and far-fetched inferences? No. None of these do you think of employing. But the *Law*, the all-searching, sin-rebuking *Law* of God, is the only means you think of in such a case. Nothing else suits your purpose, be your *theory* what it may. But hear their reply. "Is the law of the commandment upon

US TO-DAY? That it was YESTERDAY, we allow ; for it says, "*The seventh day.*" That the law of the commandment lies against us *every* day, you will not pretend ; but only *one* day in seven. If that one day was *yesterday*, you are yourselves as guilty as we ; and we, therefore, feel comparatively comfortable. To be sure, some sense of the necessity of keeping the Sabbath holy, does at times rest upon our minds ; and our consciences, for the moment, reproach us ; but when we see you, and all the Christian world, living in the neglect of it, we feel quite easy again, and think our sin to be but a light one." Such may not be their precise language, but it is the exact expression of their hearts' feelings. Thus even the law fails in your hands, because you attempt to make it speak *what it will not speak*.

If you ask us, "Do you meet with success in attempting to reach the conscience of guilty, unbelieving men?" we reply, that we have no difficulty, except so far as you, and the whole body of observers of the first day, stand in the way. We bring them to admit, openly and honestly, the claims of God's law, and a sense of guilt momentarily rests upon them. But immediately they turn to contemplate *your* practice, and their hearts become hardened. We do, therefore, affectionately, but earnestly, invite you to consider, how tremendous is your influence toward perpetuating Sabbath profanation in the land. Your numbers, your learning, your talents, your wealth, your general respectability, all combine to operate with overwhelming effect in this matter.

Our observations, if correct, go to show what a

source of danger the Sunday heresy is to the Moral Law. The Sabbath is a most important precept of this law, "the golden *clasp*," as an old writer quaintly observes, "which joins the two tables together; the *sinew* in the body of laws, which were written with God's own finger; the intermediate precept, which participates of the sanctity of both tables, and the due observance of which, is the fulfilling of the whole law." This important precept is either set aside entirely, or its edge and keenness so muffled by a transfer to another day, that the united efforts of the church can do little or nothing toward impressing it on the conscience. Here, then, is a relaxation of the standard of morality; and while the standard is relaxed with regard to this one precept, in vain do we look for the Law, as a whole, to appear glorious in the eyes of men.

This remark will be strengthened, if we consider to what inconsistencies the advocates of Sunday are driven. Some, in their zeal to defend it, even go so far as to deny the Moral Law to be a rule of conduct to Christians. Others, though they admit the Law to be a rule of conduct, cannot relieve themselves of at least *seeming* to undervalue it. When the Sabbath discussion is out of sight, they speak out clearly, and without equivocation, giving the fullest proof that they regard the Law as the unchangeable standard of obedience.

But at other times they reason from the New Dispensation in a manner so vague and indefinite that one is puzzled to tell whether they regard the Gospel as enforcing strict obedience to the Law or not. Now he that is established in the

clear truth, is hampered with no such difficulties. There is with him not only the naked and abstract admission, that the Moral Law is unchangeably binding, but there appears such a beautiful and perfect conformity between this admission and the principles he inculcates, that the most common minds are struck with it, and every doubt is scattered.

While you are fettered by such difficulties, is there no danger that the Law will lose its sacredness in the eyes of the people? Surely there is. There is danger, also, that your system of theology will be corrupted in other particulars. Error goes not alone. Could an opinion exist in the mind, circumscribed and isolated, without affecting any of our other principles, it would be comparatively harmless. But it is not more a truth, that a man who utters one falsehood is obliged to tell twenty more to hide it, than that he who supports one error is obliged to forge numberless others to give consistency to his creed. It is also a truth, which reflection and daily observation will confirm, that nearly if not quite all the heresies which ever infested the church of God, are traceable to some loose notions concerning the moral law. Nothing, therefore, can be more necessary, than that our creed give the greatest possible prominence to the law as a standard of holiness; and that our customs be in perfect conformity with our creed.

Brethren, can we hope that the subject on which we have addressed you will receive your prayerful attention? Almost your entire denomination has slumbered over it; but may we not hope that

you will now awake? May we not hope that it will be discussed in your private circles, and in your public assemblies; in your Bible classes, and in your Sunday schools; that it will be studied by your ministers, and by the people in general; and that every one will, in the deep desire of his soul, pray, "Lord, open thou mine eyes, that I may discern wondrous things out of thy law."

But if, on the other hand, we see a disposition to pass it by with cold neglect—an unwillingness to look the question in the face—an attempt, on the part of your teachers and leaders, to hush it up as a matter of no importance—a studied effort to lead the people away from it, when they are disposed to examine—or teaching them that it is the spirit, rather than the letter of the law that God requires—we shall be constrained to apply the language of Him who spake as never man spake—"EVERY ONE THAT DOETH EVIL HATETH THE LIGHT, NEITHER COMETH TO THE LIGHT, LEST HIS DEEDS SHOULD BE REPROVED." John iii, 20.