




Library of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

BV 110 .J87 1867 c.1

A reply to the Rev. Dr.
George Junkin's treatise



✓
A REPLY

TO THE

REV. DR. GEORGE JUNKIN'S TREATISE

ENTITLED

“SABBATISMOS.”

BY

JUSTIN MARTYR.

When complaints are freely heard, deeply consider'd,
and speedily reform'd, then is the utmost bound of
civil liberty attain'd, that wise men look for.

MILTON.

PHILADELPHIA:

T. ELLWOOD ZELL, PUBLISHER,

17 & 19 S. Sixth St.

1867.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1867,

By T. ELLWOOD ZELL,

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States for the
Eastern District of Pennsylvania.



CAXTON PRESS OF SHERMAN & CO.



P R E F A C E.

THE writer of this "Reply" at one time held the same views upon the "Sabbath Question," popularly so called, as those entertained by the author of "Sabbatismos;" having, unfortunately, during many years of his life, taken for granted that that *must* be true which, without qualification, was so positively asserted. He does not now recollect what excited a spirit of inquiry, but he began and pursued his examinations in silence, knowing that any utterance of dissent from the commonly received opinions would be denounced as rank infidelity,—an easy and unscrupulous answer, and one, alas! too often resorted to against those who venture to question the verity of a religious dogma.

Surprised he was to find how much had been assumed as undeniable, without even the semblance of a proof; how much, he regrets to say, was disingenuously explained; how much apparently wilfully misunderstood; and how much suppressed.

When the treatise under review came under his notice, he found that it abounded, to a greater extent than any he had seen, with the same gratuitous assumptions, and some of the other shortcomings to which he has just referred. And as it was written with the avowed purpose

of affecting public opinion upon the *religious* unlawfulness of running street cars on the first day of the week, and as no one seemed disposed to reply to it, the writer, whose convictions were the result of much deliberation, and, as he trusts, of candid and unbiassed investigation, determined to do so.

There is evidently but one alternative with the author of "Sabbatismos" and those who hold similar sentiments, which is, that you shall accept their doctrine without questioning it, or expect to be charged with skepticism. Is not the Sabbath a good institution, say they; would you wish to see it abolished, as was done during the Reign of Terror? would not such a result be fraught with disaster to the morals of the community and the good of society? or, in the words of our author, would you "*force*" people "to rush away from the holy sanctuaries into haunts of dissipation; the wayside traps in the country, whence they return fatigued, wearied, and worn down with recreation, if not battered, bruised, and bloody, the most natural and not uncommon result of worshipping at the shrine of Bacchus" (p. 204). To this unfair method of exciting the prejudices of one portion of the community against another, we object, and reply that the wish of those who favor the removal of the restriction is not to abolish the Sabbath. It is not to induce the people to leave the "holy sanctuaries," and who, according to our author, need but the means of escape to return, sad to say, "battered, bruised, and bloody." It is not to undermine the morals of society. It is not to bring ruin upon the state.

The wish, however, is to abolish a legal restriction which exists, but which is based upon a religious restriction which has ceased to exist.

As a temporal and political institution, the observance of a stated day of physical rest for man and the animal creation may be, under *limitations*, a wise provision, but we claim the largest liberty consistent with the general good. It may be a difficult undertaking to adjust the exact boundary between liberty and license. But this is a problem which has puzzled political philosophers from the infancy of society to our own day. When he is born who shall solve this secret, honors will be lavished on him while living; and dead, his memory will be held in veneration by his grateful country, for he will have discovered the perfection of all government; and if the people be virtuous, they will have reached the height of human freedom.

The opponents of running the cars base their objections mainly upon the supposition that the people are immoral; that they are not to be trusted with their own liberties; that so corrupt is the heart that the privilege of unrestrained locomotion which one who is *able* may indulge, without sin, upon a weekday, becomes with him who is *unable* a sin, should he indulge in it upon Sunday; that the removal of this legal restraint will result in a standing temptation to a breach of the peace and an occasion for the wildest license; that a kind Providence looks with benignant approval upon the conduct of a provident parent who, for the sake of his children, may seek the country upon a secular day, while it frowns in anger upon another who, with no ability to leave his home upon a weekday, shall, from the same motives, do so upon a Sunday. The line between a sinless and a sinful act has a broader and a darker margin than this. The freedom which Boston, in this respect, enjoys, has not, that we have ever heard, injured the morals of that

city, nor is there, in consequence, any wish to abolish the Sabbath; nor are worldly avocations pursued to any greater degree than before; nor do those who leave the city, for the purer air of the country, appear to return in the sad condition which our author describes, namely, "battered, bruised, and bloody." The advocates of restriction who thus endeavor to arouse passions and alarm prejudices cannot be sincere, or they would not by their own example violate the law as it now stands or countenance its violation in others. Their own conduct shows their insincerity, for they are not willing to accord, the liberty which they claim for themselves. The whole question is resolved into this: Is the fourth commandment *now morally binding*? If it is, there is an end of the discussion; and so far from the law of the State being too strict, it is not strict enough, and should be enforced by heavier penalties. Instead of leaving attendance upon worship optional, it should then be made compulsory. If, on the other hand, the fourth commandment is not obligatory, and of no Divine authority for the binding observance of Sunday, then it is as unlawful to restrict the public liberty by preventing the running of cars, as it would be to compel the attendance of every one upon a place of public worship. For it is as wise to assert that the morals will be infallibly corrupted by the one, as to assert that they will be infallibly improved by the other.

It is *our* choice to attend a place of worship on Sunday, and we would concede the same liberty of action, we claim for ourselves, to him who sought the country by public conveyance. Nor are we willing to admit that, when in church, our nerves are any more disturbed

by the running of cars over an iron rail, than by the rattling of a carriage over the public pavement.

The result of our inquiries, and for which no special originality is claimed, will be found in the following pages. The arguments advanced by the author of "Sabbatismos" are the same adduced by every writer upon this subject, and which from time to time have been promptly met and refuted, to be again, in due time, proffered, and, like false coin, again rejected.

There is not a reason urged, nor a quotation given, of which an examination and verification is not earnestly desired. And let the candid reader note, that every religious newspaper that may condescend to comment upon this "Reply," will begin and end with the charge of infidelity, notwithstanding that every position may be sustained by the testimony of some one or other of the lights of the church, whom they dare not individually thus assail.

The writer cannot hope to escape the treatment which all have undergone who have been so bold as to question the truth of any long-cherished religious opinion.

Bigotry cannot trust itself in the light; it becomes dazzled and confused; the glare of truth disarms it. Rarely, therefore, does it meet argument with argument; but prefers the reckless assertion, the disingenuous insinuation, the unscrupulous charge of skepticism, feeling assured that such a note of alarm will at once arouse the timid, who seldom reflect, and have, perhaps, neither the courage nor the industry to investigate. If there ever was a tyranny, cruel, defiant, exacting, and unmerciful, and with which it must be instant, unquestioning assent, or else malignant persecution, it is that of religious intolerance. Following its victim into pri-

vate as into public life, and knowing no commiseration or relentings, it would snatch the very crust from the lips of the famished child, because of the alleged offences of the parent. It is as much in contrast with the spirit of the Gospel, and with the holy teachings of our Saviour, as light is with darkness; as all that is good with all that is bad. A tyranny as fierce now as in the dark ages, and which is, in our midst, as harsh, and unscrupulous, and wicked as ever, and the cause of more doubt and infidelity than all the writings of all the skeptics who have ever lived.



A REPLY

TO THE

REV. DR. GEORGE JUNKIN.

CHAPTER I.

1. The reasons alleged for the observance of Sunday noticed. 2. Geology in conflict with the scriptural account of the creation so far as relates to our computation of time. 3. Views of the Rev. Baden Powell. 4. Kenrick on Primeval History. 5. Scriptural silence previously to Moses as to the observation of a "Sabbath."

1. THE Doctor asserts, in his first chapter, that the observance of the "*Sabbath*," by which he means what is called by some denominations "Sunday," and by, perhaps, the majority of Christians, the "Lord's Day," is a permanent and moral obligation; and such for three reasons, which may be briefly stated:

1st. That the law, ordaining the Sabbath, was the first God ever gave to man.

2d. That the Creator, having for six days been employed in the creation of the universe, rested upon the seventh day, "from all his works which he had made" and sanctified that day.

3d. That the figure seven has a "mystical use;" that it is the "number of perfection." That the seven well-favored and the seven ill-favored kine, the seven good and seven bad ears on a stock, the seven days and seven priests, bearing seven trumpets, &c., "plainly show the number seven to be peculiarly distinguished in the Scriptures;" and that this number, having been first used with reference to the rest of the Creator from his labors, its after use, in the cases just cited, and in other instances, "amounts to more than a violent presumption;" nay, constitutes a "*proof* of the seventh day's consecration as a Sabbath from the beginning!"* As to the last of these grounds, we remark, without further comment, that it appears to savor more of superstition than of proof; and, as to the first, we reply, conceding for the sake of the argument that it was a law, and as such given to man, that the antiquity of a law is no proof of its moral and perpetual obligation.

And with regard to the second reason, of which more particularly hereafter, there is no evidence, in Genesis or elsewhere, showing the enactment of any law binding man to sanctify the seventh day, after Creation, nor of any patriarchal public or private worship. The distinction given to the seventh day occurred before the existence of the *necessity of rest to the human race was even intimated*, before the fatal expulsion from Eden and all its joys, and the announcement of that terrible curse, and of man's mortality, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for *dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return.*" (3 Gen. 19.)

2. If, however, the perpetuity of the alleged patriarchal Sabbath is based upon the creation of the world,

* Page 12.

according to the division of time, as understood by us, the whole fabric falls, and the best evidence is afforded against the supposition of the enactment of any law whatever. There was a period when to interpret this great mystery in any other sense than that insisted upon in the book we are reviewing, would have been regarded as the grossest infidelity, but science, which concerns the occupation of the highest capacities of the human intellect, is as resistless as are the very elements, when wrought upon by the laws of Him who brought them into being. Geology has long since shown that the Creation was the result, not of one hundred and forty-four hours' work, but of the silent operation of, perhaps, millions of years. Thus does our author condemn his fellow for "the violation of a law" which never had existence upon the interpretation presented by him; for to credit that it had would involve a disbelief in that Power which brought perfection out of nothing.*

In confirmation of our view as to the announcement in Genesis with reference to the history of creation, we present the authority of one of the most distinguished divines of Great Britain, that of the late Rev. Baden Powell, who says in his *Christianity without Judaism*,

* We must not be understood as expressing the belief that the Supreme could not have created in the twinkling of an eye our own and the other infinite globes which swim in space, had it been his divine pleasure so to do, but we assert that Geology has proved that such was not his pleasure, and that the theory of a "law" based on the sense which we attach to the word *day* cannot be received. It is a choice as to which is safer, whether to infer the enactment of a "perpetual and irrevocable law" when the Scriptures are silent as to any such enactment, or to believe that some other sense is to be assigned to the word *day*, and that it was not used to convey the idea now affixed, but to express a *period* of time.

and from which we shall have occasion frequently to quote :

3. "Some have imagined from the figurative account of the Divine 'rest' after the creation that there was a primeval institution of the Sabbath, though certainly *no precept* is recorded as having been given to man to keep it up. But since, from the irreconcilable contradictions disclosed by geological discovery, the whole narrative of the six days' creation cannot now be regarded by any competently informed person as *historical*, the historical character of the distinction conferred on the seventh day falls to the ground along with it.

"The disclosures of the true physical history of the origin of the existing state of the earth, by modern geological research, as shown in a previous essay, *entirely overthrows the supposed historical character of the narrative of the six days, and by consequence that respecting the consecration of the seventh day along with it*, and thus subverts entirely the whole foundation of the belief in an alleged primeval Sabbath, coeval with the world, and with man, which has been so deeply mixed up with the prepossessions of a large class of modern religionists. Yet without reference to this consideration, even long before the geological discoveries were known, some of the best commentators have regarded the passage as proleptical or anticipatory." (*Christianity without Judaism*. By the Rev. Baden Powell, F.R.S., &c., &c., p. 88. London, 1866.)

We also give the views of Mr. Kenrick, as quoted by Mr. Robert Cox in his able and exhaustive treatise entitled *Sabbath Laws and Sabbath Duties*, p. 87, and to whose labors we acknowledge our obligations.*

* To this gentleman the cause of the Sunday question and of truth owe a heavy debt. With a courage and manliness, which

4. "The credibility of every historical writing," says Mr. Kenrick, in the preface to his *Essay on Primeval History*, "must stand on its own ground; and not only in the same volume, but in the same work, materials of very different authority may be included. The various portions of a national history, some founded on documentary and contemporaneous evidence, some derived from poetical sources, some from tradition, some treating of a period anterior to the invention of writing, some to the very existence of a nation, and even of the human race, cannot possess a uniform and equal degree of certainty. We cannot have the same evidence of the events of the reigns of David and Solomon and those of the period comprehended in the first eleven chapters of the Book of Genesis; nor can we be surprised if, in the necessary absence of documents respecting primeval times, a narrative should have formed itself reflecting the opinions, partly true and partly erroneous, of the people among whom it had its birth. Had the Hebrew literature not borne this character, the phenomenon would have been unparalleled in history; it would have wanted a most decisive stamp

cannot be too highly praised, he threw himself into the discussion, many years since, upon the moral and scriptural lawfulness of running Sunday trains, an event which intensely agitated the Scottish community. As this was at a time when religious intolerance ran high, he necessarily encountered his full share of popular odium. Nothing daunted, however, for his principles were fixed, he devoted much time to research and produced a treatise so thorough as to leave nothing to be desired. He has the satisfaction of all those who labor in the cause of truth and bide their time, that of seeing many who differed now of the same way of thinking and standing with him on the same broad and unassailable platform, for the change of sentiment in Scotland on the Sunday question, all things considered, is remarkable.

of high antiquity had it exhibited in its earliest pages a scientific, not a popular philosophy. . . . It is the natural consequence of this Divine instruction that their (the Jews) early traditions should be, as we find them, more pure and rational than those of their neighbors; but it does not necessarily follow that their primeval chronology must be exact, or their history everywhere free from exaggeration and misconception.

“These opinions may be startling to many persons, by seeming to derogate from an authority concerning which ‘*sanctius ac reverentius risum credere quam scire.*’ Yet, I believe it will be found that neither our religious feelings nor our religious belief are necessarily and permanently affected by the exercise of a freer and more discriminating criticism upon the Jewish records. Creation will still appear to us as an example and proof of omnipotence, though in the limitation of its manifold and progressive operations to a period of six days we have the influence of the Jewish institution of the Sabbath. . . . I am persuaded that there are many persons of truly religious mind to whom it will be a relief from painful perplexity and doubt to find that the authority of revelation is not involved in the correctness of the opinions which prevailed among the Hebrew people respecting cosmogony and primeval history. They delight to trace the guiding hand of Providence in the separation of this people from amidst the idolatrous nations, in order to preserve the worship of a spiritual Deity, and in all the vicissitudes of their history till its consummation. They admire the wisdom and humanity of the Mosaic institutions, and acknowledge this dispensation as the basis of the Christian; they feel the sublimity and purity of the devotional, moral, and prophetic writings of Scripture;

but they can neither close their eyes to the discoveries of science and history, nor satisfy their understandings with the expedients which have been devised for reconciling them with the language of the Hebrew records. I know that this is the state of many minds; the secret, unavowed, perhaps scarcely self-acknowledged convictions of many others are doubtless in unison with it. And such views would be more general, were it not for a groundless apprehension that there is no medium between implicit undiscriminating belief and entire unbelief. It has been my object to show that between these extremes there is ground firm and wide enough to build an ample and enduring structure of religious faith.”*

5. The silence of Scripture as to the sanctification of the seventh day, from the first mention of it in Genesis until its second announcement in the time of Moses, must have its weight; but our author, while strenuously insisting that there is evidence of the day having been observed by the patriarchs, and of its continued observance during succeeding years, speaks of the revival and restoration of the Sabbath law. That cannot be revived and restored, which has not previously fallen into disuse.

In this connection Dr. Junkin animadverts upon the Rev. Dr. Norman Macleod,† whom, with much bitter-

* An Essay on Primeval History. By John Kenrick, M.A. London, 1846. Pp. xviii-xxii.

† We find the following explanation of Dr. Macleod's course in an able article on "Sunday," by the Rev. E. H. Plumtre, A.M., in the January number, for 1866, of the "Contemporary Review," London.

"The North British Railway Company having come into possession of the line between Edinburgh and Glasgow, signaled

ness, he styles the "Glasgow Colenso," and accuses of open infidelity, because; among other reasons, that gen-

its new proprietorship by running Sunday trains where none had run before. The clergy and many of the laity of Glasgow were alarmed at what seemed to them to threaten a revolutionary change in the national observance. A meeting of the Presbytery of the Established Church was convened, and it was agreed to issue a pastoral address on the subject. The language of the address was temperate; that of the speakers far from violent. Their case was rested, however, on the assumption that the Fourth Commandment was at once the ground and the rule of the observance of the Lord's day, and an amendment, with a view to the omission of the clause affirming this, was moved by Dr. Norman Macleod, of the Barony Church, Glasgow, the well-known editor of *Good Words*. At an adjourned meeting, on November 16th, he supported the amendment in a speech, which took three hours in delivery, and which has since been published.

It is pleasant to be able to acknowledge, as Dr. Macleod himself has done, the Christian courtesy, candor, and gentlemanly bearing, which characterized the discussion of the Presbytery. There was little or nothing of the bitterness, which has so often disgraced controversies on this subject; a total absence of the extravagance which led the Presbytery of Strathbogie, in 1658, to condemn an offender, accused of Sabbath-breaking, for saving the life of a sheep; and which, in 1863, prompted the Free Church Presbytery of the same district (as though their teeth were still set on edge with the sour grapes which their fathers had eaten), to present *Good Words* to the General Assembly of the Free Church, because it had admitted a paper by Mr. Thorold, the excellent Rector of St. Giles', London, advocating, among other things, the practice of allowing boys at school to write letters to their parents, on the leisure hours of Sunday. The speeches of Dr. Macduff, Mr. Charteris, and others, we may add, also, the paper on this subject, by Dr. Hanna (the son-in-law and biographer of Thomas Chalmers), in the *Sunday Magazine* for December last, present a refreshing contrast to this unintelligent narrowness. Concessions were made which would have startled those who, in the General Assembly of 1834, declared a Sunday walk ('wan-

tleman can find no evidence of the keeping of the Fourth Commandment, from the time of Adam to that of Moses. The offence of Dr. Macleod, one of the brightest intellects and best men in Scotland, is explained in the subjoined note. "Nothing," says the Rev. Mr. Plumtre, in speaking of Dr. Macleod's views, "is easier for those who simply want a 'cry to go to the country with,' than to repeat incessantly that Dr. Macleod sets aside the authority of the Ten Com-

dering in the fields,' grouped together with 'riot, drunkenness, and other immoralities'), to be a breach of the commandment. Dr. Macduff spoke with approval of the opening of the parks of Glasgow, 'when the Sabbath services are over.' It was allowed by Mr. Charteris that some cabs and omnibuses might legitimately ply on the Lord's day; that one morning and one evening train might, if there were fair evidence of their being wanted, legitimately run. In practical suggestions for the observance of the day Dr. Macleod and his opponents were, for the most part, of one mind. What startled and alarmed them, was that he threw overboard the principle on which they laid stress,—that the Lord's day rests upon the Fourth Commandment; that he went on, with a Luther-like boldness, to declare that the Decalogue itself, *quâ* Decalogue, was no longer binding on those who accepted the law of their Master, Christ; that the moral elements of it are of perpetual force, not because they are *there*, but because they *are* moral, part of the eternal will of God, incorporated with the teaching of our Lord. To them the former position seemed to undermine the only ground on which the holiness of the Lord's day could be maintained; the latter to let in an unbridled Antinomianism. It is to their honor, that in spite of their fears, they continued to use the language of courtesy and calmness. The vehemence of popular religious feeling, however, has gone far beyond the moderation of the Presbytery, and Dr. Macleod is probably, at present, the best abused man in Great Britain. Journal after journal declaims against him, as English religious newspapers have declaimed (with more reason, it must be owned), against the Bishop of Natal, and the writers of 'Essays and Reviews.'"

mandments. Those who do not shrink from low jesting on the gravest questions, will add to that cry that, if his teaching gains ground, they must lock up their spoons, &c. Men who wish to deal with facts, as they are, will recognize that what he maintains is simply this, that every commandment but the fourth was binding before the law was given on Sinai, would have been binding now, even if that law had never been given, and is actually binding on the consciences of Christian men, not because it was then written on tables of stone, but because it was written on the 'fleshy tables of the heart,' and has been confirmed and expanded by the teaching of our Saviour Christ. To represent the moral laws of God as *depending* on the thunders of Sinai for their validity, and all laws so given as equally binding, must lead either to Judaism, if we believe the Sabbatic law, as such, to continue, or to Antinomianism, if we believe it, as such; to have passed away."

It appears that the position of Dr. Macleod, for maintaining which with such courage and honest frankness, he is so violently and uncharitably assailed as an infidel, is impregnable. The laws of the Decalogue, other than that of the Fourth Commandment, are not binding because they are *there*, but because their foundation is laid in the everlasting principles of right, were binding before the giving of the law, and will be until the end of time, together with the other precepts and prohibitions, which, though not mentioned with the nine, yet stand in as indissoluble relation to man and his duty to his God and his fellows, as do any of the nine delivered at the Mount.

It is therefore maintained by the author of "*Sabbatismos*" that the Sabbath was patriarchal, and as such is

morally binding through all time. If it be conceded that the Sabbath, as a *day of worship*, was instituted in the age of the patriarchs, there is no proof that because of this it is morally binding upon mankind throughout all time. If, as is alleged, the light of nature makes known to mankind not the duty of worshipping at all times, but that of consecrating the seventh as the least portion of time that could be properly set apart for the worship of God, how is it that the light of nature did not impart this to Socrates and to other good men among the ancients, and to Luther, Milton or Chillingworth, and other good men among the moderns whose moral sense of right and wrong, judging from the purity of their lives, should have taught them as readily as others that the seventh day was the least division that should be devoted to the worship of the Deity? (Cox, p. 219.)

The pious and conscientious Dr. Owen regards the doctrine, which so much as to doubt our author pronounces rank infidelity and worthy of a Colenso, as one presenting but a "high degree of *probability*." He observes:

"And, as is said of Abraham, that he taught his household and children after him to keep the way of the Lord, and to do justice and judgment (Gen. xviii, 19). If, then, the observance of the Sabbath be a statute and ordinance and was made known to Abraham, it is certain that he instructed his household and children, all his posterity, in their duty with respect thereunto. And if so, it could not be revealed unto them at Marah. Others, therefore, of the (Jewish) Masters do grant, as we observed, also the original of the Sabbath from the Creation, and do assert the patriarchal observance of it upon that foundation. The

instances I confess which they make use of are not absolutely cogent, but yet, considered with other circumstances wherewith they are strengthened, they may be allowed to conclude unto a *high probability*." (*Exposition of Hebrews*. By John Owen, D.D., i, 630. Lond., 1840.)

The eminent theologians who hold the reverse of what our author so dogmatically insists upon as beyond the reach of contradiction, and who could not see even the "high probability" of Dr. Owen, are numerous, and their views will be quoted in the course of this "Reply." The language of the learned and distinguished Dr. Isaac Barrow is so comprehensive and to the point that we here cite what he says upon the subject:

"As circumcision was the seal of the covenant made with Abraham and his posterity, so keeping the Sabbath did obsignate the covenant made with the children of Israel after their delivery out of Egypt."

After referring to Exod. xxvi, 16; Ezek. xx, 11, 12, 20; Neh. ix, 13, 14; Exod. xvi, 29, Barrow says:

"Where making *known* to them the Sabbaths, as also otherwhere *giving* them the Sabbath, are expressions (together with the special ends of the Sabbath's appointment, which are mentioned in those places), confirming the judgment of the ancient Christians, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, &c., who refer the *first* institution of the Sabbath to MOSES, affirming (that which indeed the history by its total silence concerning the Sabbath before him sufficiently doth seem to confirm) that the patriarchs were not obliged thereto nor did practise it." (*Exposition of the Decalogue*. Barrow's Works, vol. ii, p. 570. Edinburgh, 1839.)

CHAPTER II.

1. Proof that the Fourth Commandment, or "Jewish Sabbath," is not morally binding. 2. Absence of any scriptural distinction between the "Sabbath" and the "seventh day."

1. THE Doctor asserts that the Decalogue has been held, since the period of its promulgation, "by all who *knew* it, a brief compend of the moral law" (p. 39). And while admitting it was given to the Jews, insists that it is equally binding now, as when first delivered; that the commandments "are a transcript of the moral attributes of God (p. 32), and as unchangeable as his own eternal nature." That nothing *short* of this can be inferred from the MATERIAL and the writing; that the Sabbath, not the sanctification of the seventh day, is as old as the creation; that of the Ten, the Fourth is the *central* one. He acknowledges, after making all these statements, that the Sabbath was not the "discovery of reason; but when proposed to reason, secured its conviction to this amount,—that it is a law of God, the Creator, given for man's benefit." (p. 39). The contradictions involved in these assertions must be apparent to the most casual observer, for it must be presumed that, in using the words, "moral law," &c., he intended to employ them in the accepted sense. The fallacy of his position, and the exposure of which solves the whole difficulty, lies in confounding the natural impulse of man (be he savage or civilized, to worship an overruling or supreme Existence, or that which he deems such,

whether it be the sun or an idol of his own creation, or the Great Spirit), with the worship of the Christian, recurring at stated intervals, and for a reason which must appear arbitrary: for it would have seemed as reasonable had the tenth or twentieth day been selected as a season of rest, as that the seventh should have been. The worship of God, therefore, or to the unenlightened of some God, or superior Being, may be regarded as a moral impulse of the human breast; but the worship of God upon every returning seventh day is a commandment of a *positive* nature, and, therefore, cannot be moral.

“The moral law revealed itself in the infancy of society; philosophers are its expounders, not its creators; their voice is but the echo of conscience.” *Encyc. Amer., Tit. Moral Philosophy.* Yet we are told, by the Doctor, that the command to hallow one day in seven, was of itself sufficient to prove the precept moral; that is, the “echo of conscience,” yet a precept not “discoverable by our reason!”

The fact that there is a consciousness of wrong in stealing or in bearing false witness, proves the existence of a sense of the breach of a perpetually binding and moral law. Whereas it would be the height of the absurd to allege that there would be any such consciousness, were we, from preference or the force of circumstances, to keep every tenth rather than every seventh day, or every Friday rather than every Sunday. The very statement shows the distinction between the violation of a moral law and a positive statute. The moral law is eternal; the statute which was once law, has now ceased to exist.

It is naturally good to obey our parents, and to abstain from murder or adultery. It is naturally good to

worship our Maker. But the "very light of reason and principle of nature" teaches us to avoid the disobedience to parents, or the commission of murder or adultery, always, and to worship our Maker and hold him in reverence always. It does not, however, on the one hand, teach us that we may intermit the duty, or worship or perform it at some arbitrary interval of time, and on the other render a commission of the offences named either more or less unlawful at one time than at another.

This view of the question is well put by the Rev. Baden Powell, who remarks: "The tendencies to Judaism, arising from mistaken views of Scripture, and a want of due recognition of Christianity in its primitive simplicity and purity, as disclosed in the apostolic writings, are powerfully seconded and upheld by the *tendencies of human nature*; and though there is no foundation for sabbatism in morality or Christianity, there is a deep-seated foundation for it in the formalism and superstition so congenial to the human heart.

"Of all corrupt notions, that of relegating religious duties to certain fixed periods or days is one of the most grateful to human nature, but most radically hostile to Christian principles, though often defended on the plea, that what is left to be done at any time will never be done; whereas the true argument is, that it is to be done at *all* times.

"Those who are not religious *habitually*, will seek to be so *occasionally*; those who do not keep up *continual* holiness, will seek *periodical* sanctity. Those who do not make their *lives* holy, can punctiliously keep days holy. It is easier to sanctify times and places than our hearts; human nature clings to religious formalism, and

especially of sabbatism, as an easy mode of compounding for a worldly, if not irreligious life."

Again :

"The distinction adopted by many modern divines between the '*ceremonial*' and the '*moral*' law appears nowhere in the books of Moses. No one portion or code is there held out as comprising the rules of moral obligation distinct and apart from those of a *positive* nature. In the low stage of the advancement of the Israelites such a distinction would have been unintelligible to them ; and 'the Law' is always spoken of, both in the Old Testament and in the New, as a *whole*, without reference to any such classification ; and the obligations of all parts of it are indiscriminately urged on the same grounds, and as of the same kind.

"In particular, what is termed the moral law is certainly in no way peculiarly to be identified with the Decalogue, as some have strangely imagined. Though moral duties are specially enjoined in many places of the Law, yet the Decalogue most assuredly does not contain *all* moral duties, even by remote implication, and on the widest construction. *It totally omits many such*, as *e. g.*, beneficence, truth, justice, temperance, control of temper, and others ; and some moral precepts omitted here are introduced in other places. But many moral duties are hardly recognized ; *e. g.*, it is difficult to find any positive prohibition of drunkenness in the Law. In one passage only an indirect censure seems to be implied (Deut. xxix, 19). The prohibition in respect to the priests (Lev. x, 9), and the Nazarite vow, were peculiar cases (Deut. vi, 3)." (*Powell's Christianity without Judaism*, pp. 187, 188, 104.)

Dr. South says :

. . . . "I conceive that the matter of all the commandments (the fourth only, as it determines the time of God's solemn worship to the seventh day, *excepted*), is of natural moral right, and carries with it a necessary and eternal obligation." (*Sermons by Robert South, D.D.*, i, 224. London, 1859.)

Mr. Cox has the following quotations which properly belong to this division of our subject :

"If the duties prescribed in the fourth commandment rest upon a law written on the heart and grafted on the constitution of man, how was it possible for the acute and learned Baxter to declare that they are 'but a positive institution and not naturally known to man,' as other duties are?" (*Works*, vol. ix, p. 186.)* How can Dr. McCrie affirm that "it is only from the law of revelation that we learn sabbatical duty?" (*Memoirs of Sir A. Agnew*, p. 152.) And how could the accomplished Dr. Barrow conclude that, seeing in its own nature the Fourth Commandment different from the rest of the Ten Laws, the obligation thereto being not, discernibly to natural light, grounded in the reason of the thing, "we can nowise be assured that a universal and per-

* Baxter has also these remarks. It is of the law of nature (that is, known by natural light without other revelation), 1. That God should be worshipped ; 2. That societies should assemble to do it together ; 3. That some set time should be separated steadily to that use ; 4. That it should be done with the whole heart, without worldly diversions or distractions. But I know nothing in nature alone from whence a man can prove that. 1. It must be either just one day in seven ; 2. Or, just what day of the seven it must be ; 3. Nor just what degree of rest is necessary : though reason may discern that one day in seven is a very *convenient* proportion. (*Works*, vol. xix, p. 187. Quoted in Cox, p. 217.)

petual obligation thereto was intended, or that its obligation did extend further than to the Jews, to whom it was a formal law delivered, and upon special considerations severely inculcated; to whose humor, condition and circumstances it might also, perhaps, be particularly suited?" (*Exposition of the Decalogue, Works*, ed. 1847, vol. ii, p. 572.) According to Bishop Jeremy Taylor, the rest which the Jews were commanded to observe on the Sabbath, "being only commemorative of their deliverance from the Egyptian servitude, was not moral nor perpetual; it could be dispensed with at the command of a prophet; it was dispensed with at the command of Joshua,—it was broken at the siege of Jericho,—it always yielded when it clashed with the duty of any other commandment; it was not observed by the priests in the Temple, nor in the stalls by the herdsmen, nor in the house by the 'major-domo;' but they did lead the ox to water, and circumcised a son; that is, it yielded to charity and to religion, *not only to a moral duty but to a ceremonial*, and therefore could not oblige us. But that which remained was imitable; the natural religion which was used upon the Jewish festivals was fit also for the holidays of Christians." (*Ductor Dubitantium*, B. ii, ch. 2, rule C, § 58; *Works*, vol. xii, p. 425.)

Even in so orthodox a journal as the *Presbyterian Review* (vol. i, p. 503, Jan. 1832), the following broad admission is made, the writer afterwards adding truly, that a ceremonial law *may*, however, be of perpetual and universal obligation. The question is simply whether God has made it such? "And here," says the *Review*, "we readily admit that the Sabbath is a ceremonial institution, and that the Fourth Commandment cannot be strictly termed a *moral* law. It

forms no part of the law written on the heart, and has no natural and inherent obligation upon the conscience. This would never have been disputed had it not been for its position among the Ten Commandments, which are essentially moral. But that which is in its own nature positive and ceremonial, can never become otherwise by any solemnity of announcement, or by any association with what is moral. The reluctance of good men to admit so plain a point is easily accounted for, and has led Owen and others to attempt a compromise between the two opinions, affirming that it is both moral and ceremonial; moral, because it is a duty to give some portion of our time to God, and ceremonial, as to the seventh portion. The same, however, might be said of the Levitical law regarding tithes, since it is a moral duty that those who serve at the altar should live by the altar. The whole Jewish ritual is, in this respect, moral; for that God is to be worshipped in some way is a moral duty, and that he is to be worshipped in the way of his own appointment, is an equally clear moral principle; yet what is ceremonial, if the Jewish ritual be not? The spirit of the Fourth Commandment is not the acknowledgment of God's right to some portion of our time, for this is acknowledged in every act of worship; but it is an acknowledgment of His right to the seventh portion of it,—an arrangement in which there is nothing moral,—a fifth or a tenth portion of our time being, for aught we know beforehand, as acceptable to God. To prove the ceremonial and positive nature of the Fourth Commandment, it is only necessary to adduce our Saviour's declaration, 'that the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath.' This could never have been said of any of the other Ten [nine?] Commandments. They

were not made for man, but man was made for them, that thereby he might glorify God; and heaven and earth shall pass away, nay, God himself be changed, ere one jot or tittle of the moral law can be departed from." (See *Sabbath Laws and Sabbath Duties*, by Robert Cox, p. 217 and note at p. 490. Edinburgh, 1852.)

The Doctor maintains that "the preamble to a resolution, a law, a constitution, is the index to its interpretation,—it gives the reason beforehand, and that the same is true when the reason is given anywhere" [p. 67], that the commandment is moral and perpetually binding, and "that it were perfectly easy to throw it into the form of a preamble," thus, "Whereas, in six days the Lord, &c., wherefore the Lord blessed the rest-day," *i. e.* the seventh. Let us, therefore, in answer to this alleged general application, and to show that the commandment was designed only for the Jews, use the form set forth in Deut. v. 15, which is already to our hand in the form the Doctor approves, that of a *preamble*. Whereas, in remembrance, "That thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt and that the Lord thy God brought *thee* (*i. e.* the Israelites), out thence, through a mighty hand and by a stretched-out arm, *therefore*, the Lord thy God commanded *thee* to keep the Sabbath-day." It follows, from the Doctor's own showing, and as the result of the *preambular* method, that in the form the Fourth Commandment is set forth in Deuteronomy, it fatally makes against his hypothesis, and from his own mode of reasoning, annihilates his position at p. 67, "That the Fourth Commandment is a moral law, and not in any sense restricted to the Jewish people, is manifest from the reason embodied within it. The preamble to a resolution is the index to its interpretation!"

2. The Doctor insists, and we cannot perceive the cause of his solicitude upon this head, nor even the distinction which he endeavors to enforce, that it was the Sabbath, and not the seventh day, which the Lord blessed and made holy, and that the phrase "seventh day" is not used in the Bible as the name of the day of holy rest.

This commandment shows that it was intended that the Sabbath should be devoted to rest, because it was the seventh day. "Six days shalt thou," &c., "but the seventh is the Sabbath," &c., showing that the "seventh" and "Sabbath" are convertible terms.

The effect of the dilemma, by his endeavor to draw a distinction where none exists, will be perceived when he insists that the commandment is purely *moral*, and *therefore* binding through all time, upon all mankind, and equally upon the Jew as upon the Gentile, because it related to the seventh day. "In six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and rested the seventh day, wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day," that is because it was the seventh day, "and hallowed it." Incredible, therefore, as it may appear, it is not the less true, that in this enlightened age, the main reason which he again gives why the Fourth Commandment is a moral law, and not in any sense restricted to the Jewish people, is because the earth was made in six days, entirely ignoring, in this connection, the explanation given in another portion of the Old Testament why the seventh day was set apart as a day of rest, namely, to commemorate the delivery of the Jews from their bondage in the land of Egypt (Deut. v. 14, 15), showing the ordinance was of entirely Jewish application; and although in this portion of his book, he claims the general application of the Fourth Com-

mandment, he subsequently admits its enactment "was a sign between God and the children of Israel forever," (page 90), thereby showing its special application only.

"The observance of the Sabbath," says Powell, "is always expressed and regarded not as of *one day in seven*, but specifically of the *seventh day of the week*, as such, in commemoration of the rest after the creation, though, in one respect, also, it is afterwards urged as reminding the Israelites of their deliverance out of Egypt." (Deut. v. 15.)

"These distinctive institutions and peculiarities constituted at once their security and unity as a people, and supplied their motives of obedience. The law, throughout, is a series of adaptations *to them*, and their national character and position; yet by many theologians it is, very strangely and unaccountably, spoken of as something general, as 'a preliminary education of the human race,' as a part of the general system of instruction and advance of mankind. But the plain history discloses nothing but the separation of one single people for a specific purpose."—*Christianity without Judaism*, 102.

CHAPTER III.

That the Fourth Commandment, if binding, is so in all its strictness.

IF the fourth commandment is binding as a moral law, and which to prove Doctor JUNKIN has devoted great labor, it is binding in all its strictness or it is not binding at all. But we are met by the terrible words, "Thou shalt *not*," without the least hint of any alleviation in their rigor.

With what consistency, therefore, can one so fond, as is the Doctor, of allusion to legal enactments, whose book, page after page, is darkened with texts setting forth the awful penalties against the people of Israel—who describes the solemnities under which the law (of which he says the fourth commandment is central) was proclaimed amidst "thunders and lightnings," "fire and smoke," "the grandest and most sublime scene our earth ever witnessed" (p. 29)—with what consistency can he afterwards assert that so positive a statute, given without qualification or proviso, may yet be explained, qualified, and softened; be subject to gloss, and modified to suit a state of affairs evidently not contemplated when it was given, but which might arise ages after its promulgation.

He is, therefore, here estopped and remitted to his first and favorite ground of argument, that the fourth commandment is a *moral* law. But can a moral law be the subject of changes? A moral law is as immutable

as are the eternal principles of right. That which was moral in the time of Moses is moral now; so that the Doctor himself, and all of us, are upon every Sunday in the practice of violating the fourth commandment, in the sense in which Moses understood it. A law which permits of modification, and makes that right now which would have been wrong in the eye of Moses, cannot be a moral law. How, consequently, are we to understand the Doctor, when in one place he asserts that the fourth commandment has been the subject of modification and change, and in another that it is "a transcript of the moral attributes of God, and as *unchangeable* as his own eternal nature" (p. 32), and that nothing short of this can be inferred from the "*material* and the writing" of the tables.

The admission by the author of *Sabbatismos*, that by consent the observance of Sunday may be transferred to any other day, is fatal to his argument.

The author of *Sabbatismos* has, in one unfortunate sentence, relinquished all for which in one hundred and seventeen pages of his book he has been strenuously contending. "We admit," he says, "that any other day" than Sunday—"Tuesday, Thursday, if agreed upon over the whole country and the world, would answer as well" (p. 118). What he means by the "whole country and the world" he does not tell us. Whether he would demand the unanimous consent of each *Presbyterian* professing Christian, or that of each of all denominations. Whether he would include every being capable of a decision, whether professing Christianity or not. Whether he means a unanimous assent of the entire Christian population of the globe, or merely such a concurrence as would be obligatory upon a legislative body to secure the passage of a law, he does not state.

This is clear, however, the unanimous decision of all the good men in *Pennsylvania*, by an agreement to abandon the observance of Sunday and to substitute that of Thursday, with Jewish severity, would not be in his eyes sufficient to justify the change. The *unanimous* consent, however, giving the most liberal interpretation, would, in his judgment, sanction a revocation of that which he has so constantly and earnestly maintained was an "irreversible decree of the Almighty;" and the ink was not dry with which he wrote this admission, when in the very next sentence he affirms, as if repenting his liberality, though unconscious of his inconsistency, "Instead of leaving man to settle the question by experiment and consultation, constitutional adjustment and agreement, God was pleased to decide it for us."

Two such contradictory postulates, we imagine, have rarely in so small a space of type, been presented by any writer on this subject. We are told by him that the fourth commandment is binding because of the reasons set forth in it, yet that notwithstanding the duties enjoined on the seventh, it is proper to pretermit and to perform them on another day, which is to be kept holy, not because God ceased from all his works on that day, but because our Saviour rose from his tomb. The observance of one day is abandoned by the Doctor, notwithstanding the "*irrevocable*" reasons for its institution, and that of another is enjoined upon a ground entirely different;—That all the strictness which adhered to the seventh day, or Jewish Sabbath, for the special reasons set forth at the time of its enactment, and upon which foundation the superstructure rested, is to be imported into the observance of another day, and which observance was established for causes

entirely distinct from those which ordained obedience to the seventh. Here is contradiction in our author beyond the power of the most astute theologian to reconcile. If a law be passed for reasons set forth in its "*preamble*" embodying severe restrictions, and another be passed for grounds set forth in *its* preamble, differing entirely from those announced in the first law, and which shall repeal the first law, it is worse than absurd to tell us, and thus mislead the consciences of men, that both laws are binding. The repeal is operative, or it is inoperative; if operative, the seventh day is obliterated, with all its incidents, and for reasons set forth in the "*preamble*" of the repealing act (although upon Gentiles the said law is not acknowledged by us ever to have been binding); if inoperative, we are again relegated to the Jewish Sabbath.

So strong a hold upon the early Christians had the notion of the duty to regard the Jewish Sabbath, a notion which, as we shall see, was fated to be revived by the Puritans in the seventeenth century, who confounded the seventh day with the first, that these early Christians kept the Jewish Sabbath as well as that which they designated as the Lord's Day.

There is still a sect of Christians, who cannot conscientiously find, in Scripture, the sanction of this change, and who consequently retain the Jewish Sabbath.

CHAPTER IV.

That there is no Scriptural warrant for the assertion that the observance of Saturday under the Fourth Commandment was transferred to the first day of the week.

“CHRIST finishing his work,” says Dr. Junkin, “for the salvation of lost men, is followed by his entering into his rest and securing a Sabbatismos for his people. Thus the creation-example is imitated; and this is a most satisfactory reason of the change. Jesus rose from the dead and went to his heavenly glory, and thus consecrated the first day to holy services. His church obeyed his command, and followed his example.” (p. 119.)

We are told by the Doctor that the reason given is satisfactory for the change. What change? “That Jesus rose from the dead, and thus consecrated the first day to holy services.” He was crucified upon Friday, and a sacrifice in the view of the great mass of Christians, essential to man’s salvation, should render Friday as proper a day for perpetual observance as Sunday. “His church obeyed his *command*, and followed his example.” What command, and what example? If he means a command to consecrate the first instead of the seventh day, and to transmute the obligation of the fourth commandment from the seventh to the first day, we say that a more serious assumption, and so unsupported by a particle of Scriptural proof, cannot be condemned in terms too strong.

It is to us repugnant beyond expression, that any one should have the boldness to allege in the presence of those who have their eyes upon him, and their Testament in their hands, that there is any, the *slightest* proof, of a command, or even so much as the faintest intimation of one, on the part of our Lord, that we should consecrate the first instead of the seventh day by his prospective resurrection.

He never, during the course of his ministry, made allusion to any coming change, and there is not the fragment of a proof that the idea of substituting one day for the other ever crossed the mind of a disciple. We defy the author of *Sabbatismos* to show any such intention, and are willing to rest the case here. They are, one and all, entirely silent upon the subject. The Jewish Sabbath and the obligation of the fourth commandment fell, upon the resurrection of our Lord, into the womb of the past. It had fulfilled its mission—was at an end forevermore, and any attempt to revive it, comes within the line of condemnation, which St. Paul has marked, in Romans and Galatians, in sharp letters of living light, and which shall blaze through all time, for man's warning and his guidance.

The author of *Sabbatismos* further states: "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 their midst, and saith unto them, Peace *be* unto you." (John xx. 19.) "The law being changed, the day must also be changed; and here is the express sanction of it. The disciples were assembled: and for what? No man can doubt—for religious worship. And the Master enters by a miracle, giving a new proof of his divine mission and power." (p. 119.)

Here we are told that the law was changed. What law? If he means the law of the fourth commandment, we supposed he had been striving to show that the law had not been changed, but instead of "being" binding upon the seventh was binding upon the first day, and that all the stringency of the fourth commandment was merely *transferred* from one day to the other.

On the other hand, he may mean that the law was changed by the alleged substitution of the seventh for the first; but that would be equivalent to the truism—the day having *been changed*, the day *must be changed*, or the day was changed, because it was.

But he asserts that the day was changed, and that the appearance of our Lord was the sanction for it. Where is the proof of this, and how does this comport with his previous assertion, that the day was actually changed by the *command* of our Saviour? And, then, after the positive assertion that the day was changed by divine *command*, but evidently under the belief that a doubt would naturally arise in the mind, he asks, who can doubt but that they were assembled for religious worship? We reply, that hundreds of the most devout Christians have doubted, and still doubt, because they saw no proof of it in Scripture.

Mark, however, another inconsistency of the Doctor. The disciples were assembled, for religious worship, on the day of our Lord's resurrection, and this assembling is adduced as proof of the change of day; how, therefore, could there have been an agreement to change the day, or the sanction for a change, when the warrant for the change did not arise until afterwards, namely, the appearance of our risen Lord, for the first time, to the sight and knowledge of his disciples.

The disciples were constantly together after the cru-

cifixion. They were watched and surrounded by their enemies, doubtless ready and disposed to take *their* lives, as they had that of their Lord. Impulse, fraternity, sympathy, and apprehension drew and kept them together.

A perusal of the four narratives of the same event, our Saviour's first appearance to his disciples as they were gathered together, or in the words of the authority, "at meat," with closed doors, *for fear of the Jews*, must convince any reasonable mind that their convocation had no relation to his resurrection. In truth, they did not *all* know of the resurrection until he appeared in their midst, and even then their *disbelief* of his resurrection was a source of anguish to their risen Lord.

"When we proceed," says Powell, "to consider the actual ministrations of Christ, during his sojourn on earth, in his teaching we find no *repeal* of an old dispensation to substitute a new, but a gradual method of preparation, by spiritual instruction, for a better system. . . . Yet he offered no disparagement to the law, as such. While he insisted on its weightier matters, he would not have its lesser points neglected. (Luke xi. 42.) . . . He particularly and repeatedly reproved the pharisaical moroseness in the observance of the Sabbath; himself wrought cures on it, and vindicated works of charity and necessity (Matt. xii. 1; Luke xiii. 15; John v. 9, &c.); yet only by such arguments and examples as the Jewish teachers themselves allowed, and their own Scriptures afforded authority for; but he did not in any way modify or abolish it, or substitute any other for it. At the same time, he fully asserted his power to do so. He declares himself Lord, also, of the Sabbath, *i. e.*, he had power to abrogate it

partially or wholly, if he thought fit; but he did not at that time use such power. And more precisely, he added (Mark i. 29), the Sabbath was made for the man, *διὰ τὸν ἀνθρώπου*, not the man for the Sabbath (*ὁ ἀνθρώπου*); it was an institution enjoined by way of *adaptation* to the case of those to whom the precept was given, but of no inherent obligation in itself." Again, the truth of the following reflections, from the same author, will correct the error into which, as the reader has already noticed, many theologians have fallen—a disposition to regard the fourth commandment as abrogated under the new dispensation, when such was the case so far only as the Jews were concerned, but which, as to the Gentiles, and, therefore, as to us, never had existence. It would be just as proper to speak of the repeal of an early law of the Colony of Maryland, as affecting Pennsylvania, when as to the latter the statute never was in force. It is of moment that this distinction should be kept before us.

"Yet we cannot but notice among the larger portion of the Protestant testimonies, whether of public formularies or of individual opinion, indications of that primary confusion of thought which seems all along to have led them to imagine some previous obligation of Old Testament ordinances on the Gentiles, which was at length *abrogated or had ceased*, instead of the simple admission, that no such obligation *had ever existed*. This idea seems to have more or less hampered all their expositions and arguments. Thus, in many such statements we find the idea of a change or *substitution* made by the Christian Church of the Lord's day for the Sabbath, inculcated, as if it were possible for any *human* authority to change a *divine* ordinance, or as if the Chris-

tian Church, by any known declaration, had ever pretended to make such a change.

“The notion of the complete identification of the Lord’s day with the Sabbath seems to have been first formally propounded in this country by Dr. Bound (1595), a divine of great authority among the Puritans; from whom it was adopted by the Westminster Assembly in their Confession, and thence has become a recognized tenet of the Scottish and other Presbyterian communions in Great Britain, and imported by them to America, though as wholly unknown to the continental Protestants as to the old unreformed church.”—*Powell’s Christianity,*” &c., 117, 120, 171.

CHAPTER V.

The compulsory observance of the first day of the week.

THE attempt to enforce, upon every citizen, as a moral law, and for reasons not applicable under the new dispensation, to compel, we say, an observance of the first day of the week, no matter what may be the religious convictions, or the light in which the subject may be viewed, is a tyranny which language can hardly be found adequate to describe. There is a broad, well-defined line between the enactment of a law from motives of public policy, and the enactment of a law which derives its sanction mainly from religious grounds.

Upon a question as to what would or what would not promote the public welfare, men may honestly differ; but when we are compelled *by law* to desist from an act on one day of the week, which, if done upon any other, would be proper, nay, perhaps, commendable, because its performance offers, in the opinion of *some*, a violation of the law of God, such compulsion becomes oppression.

We speak with deliberation and warning, and believe that the judgment of the intelligent and unbiassed reader of history will sustain us, when we say, that prohibitions upon religious grounds, especially where the reasons given admit of question as to soundness, have, and always will end, in a reaction unfriendly to the progress of sacred truth, and fearfully prolific of latitudinarianism and infidelity.

The strictness of the enforcement of the "law of the *Sabbath*" as it once prevailed would not be now endured, but if such could be sustained by a strength of argu-

ment not to be gainsaid, if it were shown beyond the power of refutation that the fourth commandment is transferred to the first day of the week and is *morally* and religiously binding, upon all mankind, then, as we have already said, its observance should be compelled, come what might. When, however, it is attempted to impose on a community an observance which many view as abrogated, which others are convinced never had existence as to the Gentile world, and which even the most rigid do not with strictness regard;—when upon the assumption that the fourth commandment is binding, an invidious distinction is made between its breach by the rich Christian (we regret to use the term, but truth compels us) and its violation by the poor, and, which, if not in every case sanctioned by the ministers of religion, is at all events not by them condemned. Indeed, when they in their own persons, and perhaps unwittingly, in many ways, violate the letter of the fourth commandment, and overlook its violation in others, and yet resist that which, if permitted would amount to no worse a violation than that they sanction or do not censure; the inconsistency becomes so enormous that the spirit rebels against it.

How damaging, therefore, to the public morals, and what a hinderance to the spread of religion is the imposition of a religious ordinance which is *taught* to be binding, but which is in letter and spirit violated by teacher and people many times before the Sunday ends. So persuaded was St. Paul of the danger of a slavish and superstitious adherence to a commandment intended for a state of things which had passed to return no more, that he denounced it upon several occasions, especially in those celebrated passages in Romans, Galatians, and Colossians.

CHAPTER VI.

THE THREE TEXTS.

ONE MAN ESTEEMETH ONE DAY ABOVE ANOTHER: ANOTHER ESTEEMETH EVERY DAY ALIKE. LET EVERY MAN BE FULLY PERSUADED IN HIS OWN MIND.

HE THAT REGARDETH THE DAY, REGARDETH IT UNTO THE LORD; AND HE THAT REGARDETH NOT THE DAY, TO THE LORD HE DOETH NOT REGARD IT. HE THAT EATETH, EATETH TO THE LORD, FOR HE GIVETH GOD THANKS; AND HE THAT EATETH NOT, TO THE LORD HE EATETH NOT, AND GIVETH GOD THANKS.—*Romans*, xiv. 5, 6.

YE OBSERVE DAYS, AND MONTHS, AND TIMES, AND YEARS.

I AM AFRAID OF YOU, LEST I HAVE BESTOWED UPON YOU LABOR IN VAIN.—*Galatians*, iv. 10, 11.

LET NO MAN THEREFORE JUDGE YOU IN MEAT, OR IN DRINK, OR IN RESPECT OF A HOLYDAY, OR OF THE NEW MOON, OR OF THE SABBATH *days*:

WHICH ARE A SHADOW OF THINGS TO COME; BUT THE BODY IS OF CHRIST.—*Colossians*, ii. 16, 17.

THESE texts are formidable obstacles to those who, dogmatically, assert that the fourth commandment is *morally* binding. Some Sabbatarian writers, knowing that any attempt at exposition would be but to confute all that they had previously maintained, discreetly pass them without even so much as an allusion; others, relying upon the docility of their reader, or his supposed willingness to accept any gloss that might appear to interpret a difficulty felt by a mind ready to believe anything in support of a foregone conclusion, have boldly ventured to grapple with these texts and to explain them away, but sadly to their discomfiture, and

the strengthening of the hands of their opponents; others, again, to their immortal honor, and whose names should be held in precious remembrance by the just, have frankly acknowledged their full force and plain import as proving either the entire abrogation of the fourth commandment or its inapplicability to the Gentile world, and this at the risk of being denounced *infidels* or schismatics.

After these admissions, by so many divines, of the lion in the path, I was curious to know how Dr. JUNKIN met these cogent texts.

Out of a book of two hundred and eleven pages he devotes but two to the discussion of the most essential points in the whole controversy, and this he does in the most superficial and perfunctory manner, while the rest of the volume is filled with citation upon citation from Deuteronomy, Leviticus, &c., which, after what the apostle has written, have as much to do with the subject, as the Temple of Solomon has with St. Paul's Cathedral.

As to Romans, he omits the sixth verse altogether; a vital omission, in the connection, and *skims lightly* over the fifth, as if the less he had to do with it the better for himself. The words "every day" do not, in his opinion, mean the weekly Jewish Sabbath, but the "*annual Sabbaths.*" The first day of the week, our present Sunday, which the Doctor insists was then observed—having, as is alleged, been substituted for the seventh—St. Paul, he says, does *not* mean, but Christmas, Good Friday, Easter Monday, Ascension Day; to which he appears to have antipathy, "in this enlightened age," he insists that St. Paul *does* mean. We cannot understand by what process he arrives at this application of the text, while he insists that the words

“*every day*” mean the *annual* Sabbaths; rejecting the only interpretation of which the text is susceptible, unless in the possession of some occult source of knowledge, and through which he now informs us that although St. Paul did not intend to apply the words *every day* to the seventh, or to the first days of the week, he did mean to apply them to Christmas, Good Friday, &c.

The Doctor can find the “command” of our Saviour, that we should keep the first, instead of the seventh day, when none is given, nor even the allusion to one made, and yet can persuade himself that *every day* does not mean every day, although there is no qualifying word justifying such conclusion. The passage in Colossians is despatched in as business-like and off-hand manner as that in Romans.

After some preliminary allusions, the object of which no one would suspect, because no one could anticipate their application to the passages in question, he says—(and mark well the casual air, the “jaunty” mode, in which he treats the topic, as if it were impossible, nay *preposterous*, to have other than one opinion, and that the one he entertains): “And just *here, whilst these facts* are before us, we *may* as well *dispose* of an argument, on which great stress is laid by the opponents of the holy day; and whose entire force is destroyed by the distinction here presented” (that of the annual Sabbaths). “It is built on Col. ii. 16, ‘Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or the Sabbaths.’ It is obvious, at a *glance*, that the Apostle is cautioning his readers against *Judaizing teachers**—persons disposed to enforce

* The Doctor seems happily unconscious that he is painting his own portrait.

observances of the ceremonial law." . . . "The Sabbaths are those we have just been discussing; the three holy days, including the new moons; and the four feasts, which we have seen are Sabbaths, but not the weekly rest-days" (page 83).

In the quotation he takes a liberty with the authorized version, and the second verse of the text is omitted (pp. 83, 84).

We fear that this exegesis of some of the clearest sentences in Holy Writ will weaken the confidence of the reader in the soundness of our author's theology. "And just here," and "we may as well," &c., as if the solemn warning of St. Paul could be "disposed" of in this incidental, trivial, and dogmatic manner.

The Evangelists have not a word upon the observance of the first day of the week; nor has Paul one word upon the subject; while in three different epistles, as if his heart was torn with anguish at the Judaizing spirit of teacher and people, he expostulates and exhorts against stated observances, such as had but now ceased to exist, well knowing the earthly preference to worship God at stated times, and not to keep him in remembrance and worship him at all times.

Such was Paul's despondency, that in those few words to the Galatians, all allusion to which the Doctor has passed over, he reiterates his warning,

"Ye observe DAYS, and months, and times, and years.

"I AM AFRAID OF YOU, LEST I HAVE BESTOWED UPON YOU LABOR IN VAIN."

To recur to the language of the author of "Sabbatismos," it will be seen with what apprehension he views any other interpretation of the passages in Romans and Colossians than that he has assigned, namely,

that the Apostle does not mean to instance weekly Sabbaths, claiming that the entire force of the argument against him is destroyed by the distinction which he draws. It must be admitted, therefore, that if his distinction has, by some of the leading authorities of his own as well as by those of other denominations, been pronounced unsound, *his case is gone*. He has made the issue, and must abide the result.

And now let us see how the leading commentators interpret these texts, and regard the distinction which our author attempts to make, and upon which he seems so much to pride himself.

CHAPTER VII.

The opinions of commentators on The Three Texts.

IN the standard commentary of *Blackley and Hawes*, the passage in *Colossians* ii. 16, is thus treated: "*Let no man judge*—Metonymy (the antecedent for the consequent)—to disregard any one who wishes to judge you; see verse 18. *Therefore*—a deduction from verse 18, 15; see verse 16; comp. note on verse 20, chap. iii. 1512. *In meat*—Tapeinosis (less said than meant). *In respect of a holy day*. The phrase *in respect of* appears to have a separate force. Some might harass the faithful about meat and drink; others, again, about holy days. The *holy day* is annual; the *new moon* monthly; the *Sabbath* WEEKLY; comp. Gal. iv. 10, note; or of the Sabbath days—the plural for the singular, Matt. xii. 1, used here in a more significant sense. The several days of the week are called Sabbaths, Matt. xxviii. 1; consequently Paul implies that all distinction of days is removed, for on no occasion has he written more plainly on the Sabbath. After Christ, the Lord of the Sabbath came; he, before his Passion, clearly taught freedom from the Sabbath. After his resurrection he made a more open declaration through the mouth of Paul. Up to the present time it has not been definitely shown how much is due to the Sabbath, and how much to the Lord's day. This has been left as a measure of every man's faith. The observance of the Sabbath is not praised and is not commanded. An appointed day

is needful and useful for all occupied in worldly matters. Those who enjoy a perpetual Sabbath enjoy more freedom. The Sabbath is a type of eternity: Heb. iv. 3, 4; nevertheless its *binding force does not on this account continue under the New Testament; for, if so, the new moon observance should also be retained: Is. lxvi. 23.* "The Critical English Test, &c., showing the Precise Results of Modern Criticism and Exegesis. Vol. ii. 704. Edited by W. L. Blackley, M.A., and Rev. James Hawes, M.A. London and New York, 1866."

It will be perceived that this language gives no color to the Doctor's assertion, that the words "Sabbath days" mean annual Sabbaths.

Powell forcibly remarks upon the passages in Colossians and in Romans:

"The distinction of meats, clean or unclean, of days to be kept holy or not, remained actually in force to the Jewish Christians until their convictions became sufficiently enlightened to see the designed abolition of those distinctions. To the Gentile, it was equally clear that they were not obligatory *on him*, while his service was a spiritual one in faith. Under no such obligation originally, he did not now incur it; and (if it were needed) a still more positive declaration of his freedom from such ordinances is made by St. Paul, who places the Sabbaths in exactly the same predicament as new moons and distinctions of meats; and distinctly declares all alike to be shadows (Col. ii. 18). Even among those who had conformed to the law, in Sabbaths and meats each might judge for himself (Rom. xiv. 5, 6). There was no moral immutable obligation, no natural or eternal distinction; but neither party was to judge the other. Each acting in faith was accepted in doing so; to act otherwise would be sin (Rom. xiv.

23). But each was exhorted to mutual charity, a line of conduct preëminently recommended by the Apostle's own example (1 Cor. x. 23; viii. 13, &c.). But there was no compromise of essential truths. We cannot but be struck with the contrast of the Apostle's liberality of sentiment with his strenuous assertion of Christian freedom—his anxiety to avoid tempting a weak brother to offend, and his stern refusal to give way to those who sought to impose the obligations of the law on the Gentiles—his charity in practice contrasted with his firmness in teaching—his conciliation in conduct contrasted with his uncompromising boldness in doctrine."

Again :

"All the original Christian institutions were independent and simple. We must carefully distinguish, from the more essential and permanent, some minor ordinances of a purely temporal and occasional character, which certainly bear a more formal appearance, but were evidently adapted for the sake of peace and union, and especially for the great object of mutually conciliating the Jewish and Gentile converts, or from a wish, not abruptly to violate existing customs, as *e. g.* the injunction in the apostles' decree (Acts xv.), already referred to, and some of those given by St. Paul to the Church at Corinth (as throughout 1 Cor. v-vii.), and to Timothy (1 Tim. v., &c.)."

The same may be said of the practice of fasting, though retained by the apostles on some occasions, yet there does not exist a single precept or hint for its general adoption by Christians; much less is there any sanction for other ascetic observances which soon claimed an availing merit at variance with the spirit of the Gospel. So far as they had begun to prevail they

met with unequivocal censure (Col. ii. 18, 23; 1 Tim. iv. 3, 8, 7) from St. Paul. Of other institutions of Christian worship very little can be collected from the New Testament. At first the disciples met *daily* for prayer and communion (Acts ii. 26). In one instance, afterwards, some think it *may* be *implied* that they assembled peculiarly on the first day of the week (Acts xx. 7. See *Jahns' Biblical Antiq.*, § 398, and Heylin's *Hist. of Sabb.* ii. 25). Though the inference is a very doubtful one; and in the latest period of the New Testament age 'the Lord's day'* is spoken of once, but wholly without explanation, though the expression is understood by some in a totally different sense. Thus the evidence from this observance amounts to little or nothing." *Christianity without Judaism*, 135, 136, 149.

CHALMERS, of Scotland, in his *Commentary on Romans*, N. Y., 1863, p. 486, gives no explanation whatever of the word "every day."

Dr. HODGE, of the American Presbyterian Church, in his *Commentary on Romans*, says: "Paul does not mean the *Christian Sabbath*, that is, the 'Lord's day, or first day of the week.'"—*Hodge on Romans*, Phila., 1864.

This distinguished divine, although differing in his views from those entertained by his friend, the Rev. JAS. W. ALEXANDER, of his own church, and by LUTHER and CALVIN, does not agree with our Doctor in believing that by the words "Sabbath," "every day," &c., PAUL meant "*once a year*," and has, therefore, a better opinion of that apostle's *soundness* and consistency than appears to be entertained by our author.

The Rev. ALBERT BARNES, in his *Commentary on Romans*, does not think the Apostle had reference to

* I was in the spirit on the Lord's day, &c.—Rev. i. 10.

the Christian Sabbath; but does not say, as our author does, that the words do not apply to the Jewish weekly Sabbath (Col. ii. 16, 17).

“As concerning,” says DAILLÉ, “the Sabbath, that is, the seventh day of every week, which we call Saturday, no one is ignorant with what devotion it was observed and kept holy by the Jews, according to the ordinance of God, repeated in various parts of the books of Moses, and even registered among the ten articles of the Decalogue. . . . So you see here the Apostle points at all three kinds of Jewish feasts; those of the year, which he calls simply festivals, namely, the Passover, Pentecost, and the Tabernacles; those of months, which were new moons; and, finally, those of the *weeks*, which were *Sabbaths*. . . .

“But these men put them in subjection to days and months, and reduce them under the yoke of the Jews, and make their piety to depend on the Almanac. If they do not observe all the days of the year; if they fast not one day; if they eat not on another; if one day they do not perform penance; if they make not mirth on another; though upon the former they should have ceased to rejoice in God, and upon the latter to afflict themselves for their sins or their sufferings, they commit a heinous sin, though they did it without contempt or scandal. . . .

“Was ever a discipline less reasonable and more contrary to the doctrine of Paul, who would not have Christians condemned for the distinctions of a festival day, of a new moon, or of the Sabbath; who reprehends the Galatians for their observing days, and months, and times, and years (Gal. iv. 10), and counts it for a weakness or fault to esteem one day above another (Rom. xiv. 5).

“Neither may it be replied here that we always discriminate Sundays, and Easter, and Christmas, and

Pentecost. We observe them for order's sake, not for religion's; for the polity of the Church, and not upon scruples of devotion.* For what a confusion would there be, if we had no days appointed for the assembling of the faithful! It is for our mutual edification, and not for the worth and value of the days that we observe them."—*An Exposition of the Epistle to Colossians*. By the Rev. Jean Daillé, Minister of the French Reformed Church at Charenton. A. D. 1639, pp. 376, 382. Presbyterian Board.

SCOTT in his commentaries in regard to the words "Sabbath days," in Colossians ii., says: "Doubtless they related principally to the *weekly* Sabbaths, which, as observed on the seventh day, was now become a part of the abrogated Jewish law." *He*, therefore, does not sanction our author's interpretation.

GILLIES offers no comment whatever on the texts in Rom. xiv. and Gal. iv. "*New Testament*. John Gillies, D.D., late one of the ministers of Glasgow." London, 1810.

* "It is much to be regretted that the author should have been influenced by the prevailing opinion of the times as not to distinguish the Sabbath above other festivals as a Divine institution of perpetual obligation."—EDITOR, Presbyterian Board.

We cannot pass without observation the above extraordinary note; as if the text of the excellent and devout Daillé of Charenton were poison and needed this antidote. The editor, when thus speaking, dogmatizes and deserves censure for the *unscholarly* proceeding; for when he writes of the "prevailing opinion of the times," as if the views of Daillé's were a temporary heresy, he "ignores" the fact that Paul, the "Fathers," Calvin, the great light of the editor's own division of the Church, and we may say all of any note to the period of the beginning of the seventeenth century, thought as did this worthy commentator. That which the editor condemns is *orthodoxy*, and that, we regret to say, which he commends is the *heresy*.

CALVIN. "He that regardeth the day," &c. . . . "Forasmuch," says Calvin, "as Paul knew certainly that the observation of days proceedeth for the not knowing of Christ, it is not credible that he did not wholly defend such a compliance; and yet the words seem to import that *he sinneth not*, which observeth the day, for nothing can be acceptable to God unless it be good." *Calvin on Romans.*

STUART of Andover is candid enough to admit in effect that the words "every day" are by some supposed to refer to the first day of the week, although not a few think otherwise. He remarks:

"Whether the Apostle means to include the Sabbath, or rather the *Lord's day*, under what he says here of the special observance of particular days, has been called in question by not a few distinguished commentators and divines. It is well known that in the early ages of the Church a distinction was made between *Sabbath* and *Lord's day*. The former was the Jewish *weekly Sabbath*, *i. e.* the seventh day of the week. It embraced all the occasional fasts and feasts presented by the Mosaic law (comp. Col. ii. 16; Gal. iv. 10). Such was the Jewish use of *Sabbaton*. But the early Christians, in order to distinguish this from the first day of the week, on which they held their religious assemblies of worship (1 Cor. xvi. 2; Acts xx. 7), called the first day of the week (*ἡ κυριακὴ ἡμέρα?*) *Lord's day*, in the writings of the ecclesiastical fathers. That it was very early made, even in apostles' times, is sufficiently evident from comparing Col. ii. 16, and Rev. i. 10." *Commentary on Romans.* By Moses Stuart. Andover, 1835.

CALVIN, with his usual boldness, treats the passage in Colossians, which, with the other texts, the Doctor thinks has so little to do with this important question,

in a mode the candid will perhaps admit completely "disposes" of any further doubt upon the subject. In discussing the passage in Colossians, he observes that what St. Paul had "previously said of circumcision he now extends to the difference of meat and days. He says, therefore, that it was not in the power of men to make us subject to the observance of rites that Christ by his death abolished and exempted us from their yoke; that we allow not ourselves to be fettered by the laws which they have imposed. But some one will answer that we still keep up observances. I answer that we do not, by any means, observe days as though there were any *sacredness* in holidays, or as though it were not *lawful* to LABOR upon them, but that respect is paid to government and order, not to days." *Calvin's Commentaries on Philippians, Colossians, &c.*, p. 192. Translated by the Rev. John Pringle. Translated for the Calvin Translation Society. Edinburgh, 1851.

It were in our power, did we deem it necessary, to add many additional authorities in opposition to our author's interpretation of these texts, but the reader will doubtless agree with us in thinking those which we have cited are sufficient.

Having now proved that the three texts, as explained by many eminent commentators, do not sanction the interpretation put upon them by the author of "Sabbatismos," we proceed to show how formidable these passages (especially that in "Romans") are regarded; so much so, that the most strenuous and accomplished advocates of the opposite side of the question deem discretion the better part, preferring, as the lesser difficulty, suppression to any attempt to remove the obstacles from their path. Mr. Cox, in his treatise, at page 56, says:

“As far as Dr. Lorimer’s treatise on what he calls the Protestant and Popish Sabbaths permits us to know, *he* has not yet discovered the existence, in the Bible, of this the most explicit and, perhaps, only absolute declaration which it contains on the subject of the controversy (the text, Romans xiv.); and I am compelled to add, that in nine-tenths of the sabbatarian treatises and sermons which I have read (and they are not a few), its existence is similarly ignored. Either the writers thought the passage of no importance, or they did not; if they did, their notion is strange and unaccountable; if they did not, then by passing over it in silence, while huddling together from the Old Testament and the New, but principally from the Old, a number of passages which, when tested by those rational principles of interpretation which are constantly applied in every department of literature but the theological, and are *professed* even by theologians who forget them in practice, evidently have no bearing whatever on the question at issue—by following, I say, this remarkable course, they plainly confess that the apostolic declaration is conclusive against them.

The absence of these words of St. Paul from the texts quoted in the Scottish Confession and Catechisms, is not to be wondered at; for, as we shall afterwards see, it was not till these famous productions were completed by the divines at Westminster, that the scriptural texts which were thought to establish the doctrines there stated were added in the margin, by command of the Parliament, under whose authority the Assembly were acting. Of course nothing of a hostile tendency could, in such circumstances, be included among the “proofs,” nor, indeed, could inconvenient texts, in any circum-

stances, have found admission into such manifestoes as these.

Even the able Dr. Wardlaw, in his *Discourses on the Sabbath*, makes no attempt whatever to remove this stumbling-block in the way of the perplexed Sabbatarian. He extracts from Belsham's *Review of Wilberforce*, p. 139, a passage in which the words, "every day alike," are quoted and given effect to; but, instead of attempting to *prove* that an erroneous interpretation is there put upon them, what does he do? He tries to divert attention from the difficulty, and to weaken the force of Belsham's observations by the mean device of rousing the orthodox prejudices of his readers against the writer as a Socinian! "We need not," says he, "be greatly astonished, that one who could not find in the Scriptures the divinity and atonement of Christ, the depravity of human nature, and the existence and influences of the Holy Spirit, should have been little at a loss to exclude from them the duty of sanctifying the Lord's day; and that, even as to the public worship of that day, he should have made light of the admitted example of the apostolic churches, commending it, indeed, as a 'laudable and useful custom,' and condescending to 'approve of its continuance,' but not at all allowing in it any obligation of divine authority." —*Discourses on the Sabbath*, by Ralph Wardlaw, D.D., p. 100. Glasgow, 1832.

This is all that Dr. Wardlaw can say to neutralize the words of the Apostle; and it is a plain confession of inability to propound a syllable to the purpose. He might as well have referred to Mr. Belsham's hair, or the rotundity of his person, as presumptive evidence against his opinion about Sunday; nay, he might, by

this kind of logic, assail with equal success the philosophies of Newton and Locke, who were as much Socinians as Mr. Belsham was.

Dr. Chalmers, a still more famous *minister* than Dr. Wardlaw, treats of the Sabbath in three of his Congregational Sermons, vol. ii, p. 252 *et seq.* Here, not a word "of every day alike" is to be found! "But," it may be suggested, "he wrote, also, Lectures on the Epistle to the Romans. What says he *there*? Look at Lecture 95, vol. iv, p. 329, and you will see that the bearing of the passage upon the Lord's day is completely ignored."

Mr. Cox proceeds to state that there was published in Scotland a Cyclopædia, conducted by biblical scholars of far higher rank than any who had previously contributed to such a work, in which the passage under consideration was discussed, but that in an abridged edition by another "*Glasgow minister!*" it was *omitted*.

"About the same time, a biblical Cyclopædia was published by a *fifth Glasgow minister*, Dr. John Eadie. There is, of course, an article on the Sabbath; and that article contains a classified list of references to Scripture texts bearing upon the subject. But, according to custom, the passage in Romans xiv *is not referred to*, either there or in any other part of the article; nor is mention made of certain other texts, which will be noticed below. This omission, *in a formal array of references*, of the most important text of all, is quite indefensible; even though the writer has provided himself with a reply to the charge of *positive* misrepresentation, by introducing his list as one containing references only to texts which 'are *AMONG the leading authorities* of the Bible, respecting the Sabbath and its proper observance.'

There is a line in Young's Night Thoughts, which says,

“Truth never was indebted to a lie.”

And I cannot help thinking that the striking disingenuousness of this special pleading is not a whit better calculated than a “lie” to serve her cause.

Mr. Cox goes on to quote other instances in which the same process of suppressing these important texts is pursued; but the reader is, doubtless, by this time satisfied that we have brought forward sufficient evidence to show the utter abhorrence Sabbatarian writers have to grapple with these texts; a silence which confesses that they involve a complete reply to all their arguments, and a humiliating admission of inability to prove the fourth commandment obligatory.

CHAPTER VIII.

The Primitive Christians.

THE primitive Christians, to some extent, observed both the Jewish Sabbath and the first day of the week; the latter as a festival day and a day of rejoicing. It was the observance of the former that, as we have seen, St. Paul in several places condemns, particularly the attaching of any superstitious importance to the seventh, or to the first day, in preference to any other day.

We must, however, be careful to note that there was not, among the early Christians, any idea of the transference of the duties enjoined by the fourth commandment from the Sabbath to Sunday.

In the language of Neander, "All speculations were abolished at the resurrection." "The Christian worship claiming for itself the entire life, and flowing from a conversation in Heaven that depended not on the elements of the world, was no longer to be confined exclusively to any particular place or time. In the fulfilment of the law by the New Testament, *i. e.* the perfect sanctification of the whole life, in which every day alike is consecrated to God, the Old Testament law of the Sabbath must find its repeal. Not barely the observance of Jewish feasts, but all forms and modes of particularizing the Christian life, by an exclusive reference to certain times, are represented by the Apostle Paul as a Jewish practice, a bondage under the elements of the world. And if, notwithstanding, *men* did from the

very first set apart certain days, with which they associated the remembrance of the great facts of the history of the redemption, and to which the whole Christian life was to be referred, by its making them the central points of Christian fellowship, this was not by any means inconsistent with the fundamental tendency and intuition of Christianity. It was only a condescension to human weakness from the height of pure spirituality.”*

The practice, by the early Christians, of observing the first day of the week as a festival, or day of rejoicing, not in pursuance of any divine authority, according to Neander, the leading authority, but as a measure of propriety and expediency, failed to receive the sanction of the civil power until the reign of Constantine.

The Rev. BADEN POWELL observes, as to the decree of this emperor: “The celebrated edict of Constantine has been differently interpreted. It certainly contains no reference to the Christian religion, or its ordinances. It simply enjoins that, ‘on the venerable day of the sun, the magistrates, and citizens, and all business, shall be at rest’ (*quiescant*). The labors of agriculture, however, may be continued as the season may require. In the same year, also, he made a decree for the better regulation of the heathen sacrificial ceremonies. Also to conciliate both Jews and Jewish Christians, he upheld and protected them in the observance of the Sabbath, for which he is much commended by Eusebius” (tit. *Const.* iv, 18).

* *Neander's History of the Church*, i, 406; Id. 408-9, Bohn's edition. See, also, *Neander's History of Planting of Christian Church*, vol. i, p. 159; ii, p. 321, Bohn's ed.

“The former edict relative to Sunday, has been supposed to have been called for by the great and inconvenient increase of festivals among the Romans.”—*Powell*, 229.

The spirit of the observance of the first day of the week was entirely different, with the early Christians, from that which obtains now. It was kept by them as a “festival of joy,” in preparation of which every Wednesday and Friday, but which are not observed now, were consecrated as days of *prayer* and fasting, in memory of Christ’s betrayal and passion (*Neander*, i, 408). The proof that Sunday was thus acknowledged is abundant, from the writings of the early Christians, a fact to which writers upon this question have not generally ventured to call the attention of their readers.

For example: Tertullian, two hundred years after Christ, says, on Sunday we give ourselves to joy. “*Diem Solis lætitiæ indulgemus*” (*Apol.*, ch. 16, p. 688; works fol. Paris, 1580).

St. Barnabas, fifty years after Christ, says: “We keep the eighth day with gladness” (*Epist. Cathol.*, § ii, p. 244. Amster., 1646). And Ignatius, in his *Epistle to the Magnesians*, p. 35, Amster., 1646: “We observe the Lord’s day, banishing everything on the day that has the least tendency to, or the least appearance of sorrow or grief, inasmuch that now they esteem it a sin either to fast or *kneel*.” Even the Montanists, with which sect our author appears to sympathize, “those rigid observers of Fasts and Abstinences, abstained from fasting on this most glad and joyful day.” Justin Martyr declares against the Judaical observation of even “the seventh day, although both, that is, the seventh as well as the first, were observed by some of the early Christians” (*Dial. cum Tryphon*).

It is thought that the works of the last-named writer clearly afford the proof, that it was more than a century after Christ that the first day began to be generally observed among the Christians; and that the day was kept free from that Judaizing spirit which afterwards proved a source of corruption and danger to the Church (*Cox on Sabbath*, p. 282, in note. See, also, what Justin Martyr says in his "*Apologies*," &c., p. 274-6; translated by the Rev. Temple Chevallier, Cambridge, 1833).

The Rev. Baden Powell has some learned remarks in this connection, which we cannot omit to quote:

"The writers of those times (that is, of the Fathers) often speak of the Lord's day in conjunction with the Sabbath; but always in the way of *contrast*, and as obviously distinct institutions. . . . But though a certain kind of assimilation between the two institutions was carried farther by some later writers, yet neither was the observance itself ever pushed to the extent which has since been sometimes contended for; nor was it possible for that confusion of ideas between the two institutions to arise which in modern times has extensively prevailed. Indeed, from the mere fact of this twofold observance of the Sabbath and the Lord's day, which prevailed with some churches, one thing is perfectly manifest, viz., that there could not have existed the slightest notion of the obligation of the one institution having been transferred to the other, as imagined by many in later times.* There is, again, a wide differ-

* "Yet so inveterate has the *absurd* idea become in the minds of modern divines, that even so acute and independent a writer as Bishop Warburton, arguing, too, expressly against the Sabbatists,

ence between 'keeping a day holy' and simply commemorating an event upon it; yet the latter easily degenerates into the former idea. Down to the later times we have some remains of the observance of the Sabbath in the solemnization of Saturday as the eve or vigil of the Lord's day."

"The constant reference to the Old Testament law, on the part of the Jewish converts, not unnaturally led to the disposition to find in it at least some sort of allegorical application to the Gentiles. Thus, guided possibly by the figurative language of the Apostle (Heb. iv, 4), and the fondness for what they termed evangelizing the Old Testament, some of the Fathers adopted the idea of a metaphysical interpretation of the fourth commandment (where, of course, the literal sense could not apply), in the case of Gentile converts, as meaning the perpetual service of a Christian life, preparatory to eternal rest."*—*Powell's Christianity*, &c., p. 160.

The early Christian writers had no better means of interpreting Scriptures than we have. Indeed, when we consider the concentration of various minds upon

speaks incidentally of 'a change in the day having been made by the primitive church' (*Div. Leg.*, 434, note), which most assuredly there never was, nor could have been, except by divine authority."

* "Thus, Justin Martyr (*Dialog. cum Trypho*. 229) says: "The new law obliges us to keep a perpetual Sabbath." And later, to the same effect, Augustin, whose opinions approached towards modern Calvinism (*Ep.* 119), observes: "Inter omnia decem præcepta solum id quod de Sabbato positum est figurato observatum præcipitur." *Among all the ten commandments, that alone respecting the Sabbath is to be observed figuratively.*

Athanasius, also, says: "We keep no Sabbaths, as the ancients did; looking for an eternal Sabbath." Quoted by Heylin, ii, 183.

the same passages of Sacred Writ, the accumulation of centuries of theological lore, the aid afforded by the press in giving us at one view, as it were, for the sake of collation, the entire text, our means of forming a correct judgment as to Scripture difficulties are better than were those of the early Christians.

But, with respect to a narrative of facts, or a description of the usages of the early Church, as handed down by the fathers and primitive writers, we do not see how we can refuse to give them credence, so far as the facts or the usage are presented and described, as happening or existing within their own knowledge and experience. We, therefore, have the amplest evidence that they did not regard the observance of the first as a substitution for the observance of the seventh. That many who kept the first also observed the seventh; that St. Paul taught them not to regard the Jewish Sabbath; that succeeding writers, in succeeding centuries, condemned in turn that which was cause of condemnation with their predecessors, which condemnation, as we have seen, they followed up in practice by rejoicing upon their festival day or Sunday, and eschewing worship on the seventh altogether.

The existence of a day of rejoicing, in remembrance of a *civil* event in the history of our own country and people, will occur to the reader, when, before the Revolution, many of the loyal colonists were accustomed to celebrate the birthday of their reigning prince, whom they chose to regard as the fountain of power and the head of the Church, but which celebration after the Declaration of Independence, and the severance of the tie which bound them to the mother country ceased, and another day was kept, but not substituted, in token

of the birth of a new nation and of deliverance from an order of things which had forever passed away.*

* "Wherever the cessation of the Law is spoken of, it is as a *whole*, without reference to any distinction of moral or ceremonial, letter or spirit. We find no such qualification as that 'the Law, as being of Moses, was abrogated, yet, as the law of the spirit, still binding,' as some have represented it. The whole tenor of the argument and language of St. Paul is utterly opposed to any such idea. It was an entire system which passed away, to give place to a new one based on a *different ground*."—*Powell*, p. 141.

CHAPTER IX.

The Puritan "Sabbath."

THE interpretation which had been grafted by the usage of the fathers upon the observance of the early Christians continued to be held in respect onward during the progress of centuries—no one thought of doubting that which time had so long sanctioned, until after the period of the Reformation, when the public mind becoming affected with a change of sentiment, the current of religious feeling ran violently in a new direction. The cheerful view of duty which man owed to his Creator in the appropriation of a portion of the week to his service passed into one of gloom and asceticism. The scene shifted from the bright landscape into one hung with clouds and darkness. The New Testament, with all its cheering inspirations and comfortable hopes, became of less account, and the Old, with its ceremonial law, its Jewish sanctions, its terrible retributions, rose into high esteem. Hallam well depicts the change: "The founders of the English Reformation, after abolishing most of the festivals kept before that time, had made little or no change as to the mode of observance of those they retained. Sundays and holidays stood much on the same footing, as days on which no work, except for good cause, was to be performed. The service of the church was to be attended, and any lawful amusement might be indulged in. A just distinction, however,

soon grew up. An industrious people could spare time for very few holidays; and the more scrupulous party, while they slighted the church festivals as of human appointment, prescribed a stricter observance of the Lord's day. But it was not till about 1595, that they began to place it very nearly on the footing of the Jewish Sabbath, interdicting not only the slightest action of worldly business, but even every sort of pastime and recreation. A system which once promulgated, soon gained ground, as suiting their atrabilious humor, and affording a new theme of censure on the vices of the great.* Those who opposed them, on the High Church side, not only derided the extravagance of the Sabbatarians, as the others were called, but pretended that the commandment having been confined to the Hebrews, the modern observance of the first day of the week as a season of rest and devotion, was an ecclesiastical institution, and in no degree more vener-

* The first of these Sabbatarians was a Dr. Bound, whose sermon was suppressed by Whitgrift's order. But some years before, one of Martin Marprelate's charges against Aylmer was for playing at bowls on Sundays; and the word Sabbath, as applied to that day, may be found occasionally under Elizabeth, though by no means so usual as afterwards; it is even recognized in the Homilies. One of Bound's recommendations was that no feasts should be given on that day, "except by lords, knights, and persons of quality;" for which unlucky reservation his adversaries did not forget to deride him. (*Fuller's Church History*, p. 227.) This writer described, in his quaint style, the abstinence from sports produced by this new doctrine, and remarks what a slight acquaintance with human nature would have taught Archbishop Laud, that "the more liberty people were offered, the less they used it; it was sport for them to refrain from sport." (See also, *Collier*, 643; *Neal*, 386; *Strype's Whitgrift*, 530; *May's Hist. Parliament*, 16.)

able than that of the other festivals, or the season of Lent, which the Puritans stubbornly despised." "A circumstance that occurred in the session of 1621, will serve to prove their fanatical violence," (that of the House of Commons). "A bill having been brought in 'for the better observance of the Sabbath, usually called Sunday,' one Mr. Shepherd, sneering at the Puritans, remarked that, as Saturday was *dies Sabbati*, this might be entitled a bill for the observance of Saturday, commonly called Sunday. This witticism brought on his head the wrath of that dangerous assembly. He was reprimanded on his knees, expelled the house, and, when he saw what befell poor Floyd, might deem himself cheaply saved from their fangs with no worse chastisement. Yet when the Upper House sent down their bill, with 'the Lord's day' substituted for 'the Sabbath,' observing, 'that people do now much incline to words of Judaism,' the Commons took no exception. The use of the word Sabbath instead of Sunday, became, in that age, a distinctive mark of the Puritan party."—*Constitutional Hist. Eng.*, I, pp. 388, *et seq.* Boston, 1865.*

* The Episcopal Church, notwithstanding it has incorporated into its service the use of the Commandments, with a prayer for their observance, holds to a more Scriptural view of the Fourth Commandment than is laid down in the *Westminster Confession*. We are aware, however, that each "receives its appropriate *Christian* sense, and the meaning annexed to the Fourth Commandment, and the duty stated to be inculcated in it, is simply this: 'To serve God truly all the days of my life,'—not one day in seven, but every day." We are also aware, that "the existing authorized formularies were designed to be *comprehensive*, and are characterized on these points by the *omission* of topics in dispute. While the Decalogue was inserted to satisfy one party, the *Christian* exposition of it, in which its Judaical tendency is neutralized,

We must take occasion to remark upon an admission which, though small in compass, covers the entire ground under discussion and yields it in our favor, and we do it with the more pleasure because from the pen of one whose authority the author of *Sabbatismos* should feel inclined to respect, happening to belong with him to the same branch of the same religious denomination, and professing to hold in all their strictness the same views of this interesting question.

The Rev. Dr. COLEMAN, who is regarded as authority, says :

“ But it is not a little singular that the Church, though right in theory and to some extent in practice, continued through successive centuries down to the age of the Reformation, and even beyond it, wrong in *principle* in that she disowned the sanctity of the law of the Sabbath. In other words, the divine authority of the Sabbath neither was recognized by the ancient fathers nor by Luther or Calvin or the early Reformers. It was reserved for the Puritans,” &c. *Ancient Christi-*

must be assented to by all.” (*Powell*, 170.) The Sabbath is not once mentioned in the Prayer-Book. There is, however, an incongruity, to the perception of which, long familiarity has deadened the mind. The hoar of antiquity has toned down that, which in its newness, must have seemed harsh and repulsive; for what is really more inconsistent than to ask, without qualification, that the heart may be inclined to keep the seventh day, or Jewish Sabbath, when by that church it never has been kept, but is, and has always been, utterly repudiated. Nothing is more distressing than the existence of a tarnish, or a blemish, which we know it is entirely possible to remove. A defect so obvious in a service, as to excite the observation of the merest neophyte, and to place any sensible explanation beyond the ability of the most astute, much retards the progress of religion and truth. We regret that the attention of the body which has the authority to make the change, has not long since been directed to the necessity in this regard.

anity Exemplified. By Rev. Lyman Coleman, p. 532. Philadelphia, 1856.

We feel not a little grateful that we are in such good company as that of the ancient fathers, and of Luther; and particularly of Calvin. There is a talismanic influence connected with the name of the latter great Reformer, which we shall be pardoned for regarding, however dangerous the reliance upon any mere human authority in a question of conscience, and which, from the lights before him, every one must decide for himself.

We presume the writer of *Christianity Exemplified* meant to say that the Church was wrong in theory as well as principle, for we cannot perceive how she could be right in theory had she been wrong in principle. And we are now, for the first time, taught that the ancient fathers, those who lived so near the period of the apostles, and who had, if any, the right to speak with confidence upon the subject, were wrong, as were Luther and Calvin; and *all* having failed to discover that the observance of Sunday was not by divine authority, but merely by that of the Church, it was due to the Puritans (after mankind had groped in darkness and been immersed in error for fifteen centuries), that the one was discovered and the other dissipated. Surprising discovery; wonderful Puritans!

What a consolation, that the text of Scripture remains through all time the protection of the innocent and of the oppressed, an everlasting wall of defence against heresy, superstition, tyranny, and error; that we have but to display the great Apostle's warning words of earnest exhortation to the Romans, the Colossians, and Galatians, when the eye of the bigot is averted, and his confidence abashed.

CHAPTER X.

The testimony of the Reformers and others of more recent times against the doctrine held by the author of "Sabbatismos" and his adherents.

THAT the Sabbath was exclusively a Jewish institution, and is not binding upon us, is maintained by an array of authorities which, in the exercise of the sacred right of private judgment, we dare not say should silence further controversy, but which we do say is entitled to a candid consideration. We have in support of this view the testimony of Luther, Calvin, Melancthon, Beza, Bucer, Zuinglius, Cranmer, Ridley, Frith, Knox, Chillingworth, Jeremy Taylor, Baxter, Barrow, Milton, Barclay, Limborch, and, in more recent times, of Paley, Arnold of Rugby, Whately, Robertson of Brighton. In America, that of Bishop White, the Rev. Dr. James W. Alexander, &c., &c.

In presenting the convictions of some of those we have named, and whose opinions have already to some extent been adduced, we shall have occasion to comment upon the Doctor's "vindication" of Luther, Calvin, and others. For in his appendix he endeavors to repel the "*charge*" that these regarded the "Sabbath" of the fourth commandment as a purely Jewish ordinance and not binding upon Christians.

The candid reader will, in the course of our remarks, be able to decide how far the Doctor in his "vindication" is successful.

LUTHER.

LUTHER'S language is very strong: "As for the Sabbath, or Sunday, there is no necessity for its observance; and if we do so, the reason ought to be, not because Moses commanded it, but because nature likewise teaches us to give ourselves, from time to time, a day of rest, in order that man and beast may recruit their strength, and that we may go and hear the word of God preached." *Works*, 11, 16; quoted in *Hazlitt's Translation of Michelet's Life of Luther*, p. 271. London, 1846.

The following is a translation of the same passage by another hand: . . . "As regards the Sabbath, or Sunday, there is no necessity for keeping it; but if we do, it ought to be not on account of Moses' commandment, but because nature teaches us, from time to time, to take a day of rest, in order that men and animals may recruit their strength, and that we may attend the preaching of God's word." *Michelet's Life of Luther*. Translated by G. H. Smith, F.G.S. Whittaker & Co., London.

Again, Luther says: "The Gospel regardeth neither Sabbath nor holidays, because they endured but for a time, and were ordained for the sake of preaching, to the end God's word might be tended and taught." *Colloquia Mensalia*, or Table Talk. Translated by Captain Henry Bell, chap. xxxi, p. 357. London, 1652.

Still further: "Keep the Sabbath holy for its use both to body and soul; but if anywhere the day is made holy for the mere day's sake—if anywhere one sets up its observance upon a *Jewish* foundation—then, I order you to work on it, to ride on it, to dance on it, to feast on it, to do anything that shall remove this

encroachment on the Christian spirit and liberty." *Christian Sects in the Nineteenth Century*, p. 20. London, 1846. (See Cox, p. 121.)

And this last passage, the Doctor exclaims with earnestness, is "quoted in the nineteenth century to sustain a breach of the laws of Pennsylvania and of God;" complaining at the same time that no authority is given for the quotation, a deficiency which we now supply. Much has been written in the sixteenth century which is not the less worth citing in the nineteenth, if while pertinent it shall vindicate Christian liberty and expose that spirit of Judaism which it is sought to countenance, and that the progress of time has so much ameliorated although not as yet suppressed.

There is an authority much older than that of Luther, though none the worse for its antiquity, and just as applicable in this, the nineteenth century, as were the words of Luther in the sixteenth, for the language was directed to the same end: "Let no man therefore judge you, in meat or in drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath *days*: which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ." Colossians ii, 15, 16.

Again. The Doctor remarks, "Does any one of the one hundred and forty-three clergymen who signed the letter to the Mayor, &c., advocate the ascetic and gloomy observance of the first day of the week?" They may not; but it cannot be denied that the Doctor does, and not in the way that Luther recommends; for he who for six days of the week has toiled in the close and impure atmosphere of the factory, or pursued his calling within sight of brick walls, "is but recruiting his strength" if he does, as the Doctor says, even "rush

out to the country and worship nature." But how little faith in the toiling thousands (who desire a change of scene and place, and who may not lose a day in the pursuit of honest industry without the curtailment of some necessity, not luxury), does he exhibit, when in such sweeping and unguarded language he asserts that all such who "rush into the country" do it but "to worship in the grog-shops, at the shanties by the way, promoting employment by the policemen and magistrates?" We are pleased to say that our faith in the sons and daughters of toil is greater than the Doctor's, and fear that those who wish to worship nature in the mode he indicates would in any event seek a gratification of their longings at shrines nearer at hand.

Luther says, "As for the Sabbath, or *Sunday*, there is no necessity for its observance," &c.; upon which the Doctor remarks, What does Luther mean? We reply, it is plain enough what he means; but the Doctor replies, that he means "what *all evangelical* men, clergy and laity, mean,—that the Sabbaths of the Jews (of which five are mentioned in Leviticus xxiii., which are called Sabbaths"), &c., are the Sabbaths to which Luther refers. We recollect but one parallel to this, and that, we fear, is fiction, where a judge, in a celebrated case, not that of Specht *versus* Commonwealth, which the Doctor cites, insisted that the name of the witness was not as witness had distinctly pronounced it, but as his Honor had written it, and so it should remain. We take no particular exception to this contradiction; but we do to the assertion that the Doctor's interpretation is "that of *all evangelical* clergymen," &c.

He further tells us that the moral law of the third commandment, has, in Levit. xxiv. 16, a death penalty appended (p. 157), and are asked, whether in abandon-

ing this "Jewish foundation," we also abandon the moral law of the third commandment? We reply, that we have never heard before, that the penalty of the law was its foundation. Were it so, we apprehend criminal legislation would be as impracticable and useless as the attempt to rear a superstructure before that was provided on which, by the law of nature, the superstructure should rest.

Much effort has been made by him to prove that "the fourth precept of the moral law does not bless the seventh day, and hallow it, but the Sabbath day" (p. 186). We have offered our comments on this elsewhere, but we thank the Doctor for quoting Luther in our aid, when, using Luther's words, he says, "That after the fall, God sanctified the seventh day," &c. (p. 189).

In conclusion, we observe that the opinions of Luther upon the Sabbath are directly opposed to those of the Doctor, and we could adduce page upon page in support of this allegation; we shall be obliged, however, to content ourselves with but one, and that from his larger Catechism. We do this because it contains a distinct summary of his views, and is, at the same time, an answer to the Doctor's assertion, that Luther meant, when he used the words *Sabbath* or *Sunday*, "not what *all evangelical men mean*,"—the five Levitical Sabbaths,—but that he meant our present Sunday, or in other words, if it is a truism, the Doctor compels us to use it, that *Luther meant what he says he meant!*

This is what Luther says, "God set apart the seventh day, and appointed it to be observed, and commanded that it should be considered holy above all others; and this command, as far as the outward observance is concerned, was given to the Jews alone, that they should

abstain from hard labor, and rest, in order that both man and beast might be refreshed, and not be worn out by constant work. Therefore, this commandment, literally understood, does not apply to us Christians; for it is entirely outward, like other ordinances of the Old Testament, bound to modes and persons, and times and customs, all of which are now left free by Christ. But, in order that the simple may obtain a Christian view of that which God requires of us in this commandment, observe that we keep a festival, not for the sake of intelligent and advanced Christians, for those have no need of it; but first, *for the sake of the body*, because Nature teaches us that the working-classes, servants and maids, who have spent the whole week in their work and occupation, absolutely require a day in which they can leave off work and refresh themselves; and chiefly, in order that men may, on such a day of rest, *have time and opportunity*, such as they could not otherwise have, *to attend to the worship of God*, that so they may come in crowds to hear the word of God, and practise it, to praise God, and sing and pray. *But this is not bound to any particular time*, as with the Jews, so that it must be this day or that; for no day is in itself better than any other; but it ought to be performed daily, only, because this would be impossible to the mass of the people, we must at least devote one day to this purpose. And because Sunday has been appointed from the earliest times, we ought to keep to this arrangement, that all things may be done in harmony and order, and no confusion be caused by unnecessary novelties." *Hengstenberg on the Lord's Day*, translated by James Martin. London, 1853, p. 63. Quoted by Cox, p. 503.

The Rev. BADEN POWELL has the following pertinent

observations on the freedom of Luther as well as Calvin from sabbatical formalism :

“ But against all tenets of a legal and sabbatical formalism, Luther, with his accustomed masterly grasp of the breadth and depth of evangelical principles, most strenuously contended, as also, still more remarkably (considering his principles), did Calvin (*Instit.*, lib. ii. chap. 8, § 28–34), especially denouncing the notion of the *moral* obligation of the Sabbath, as one of the follies of false prophets (*nugæ pseudo-prophetarum*); and more forcibly still in his French version, as *mensonges des faux docteurs*,—the lies of false teachers.

“ Luther claimed a freedom to retain or dispense with the observance of days just as it might be found to tend to spiritual edification, or to superstition; and in this strenuous repudiation of Judaical subjections in general, and sabbatism in particular, he and Calvin were supported by the most eminent Reformers on the continent, both among the Calvinists, as Beza, and the Lutherans, as Chemnitz and Bucer. Similar views were professed by several of the English Reformers, as Tyndal and others; and at a later period by the greater minds of the Reformed school: by Grotius (*De Verit.*, chap. 5) and Limborch; as by Milton (*Christian Doctrine*, 128, Ed. Sumner), Prideaux, Heylin, and others in England.” *Powell's Christianity*, &c., p. 167.

In the vindication of Melancthon and Cranmer, and which forms a part of the Doctor's appendix (p. 195), he ventures to call *The Press* to account for arraying Melancthon against the Sabbath—because the editor, in using the precise words of that Reformer, does not happen to state whence they were derived—whereupon the Doctor remarks, “ here is unfairness again.”

Our author is too much inclined to presume (an error

into which so old a controversialist should less frequently fall) that the object of his opponent in citing a passage from the pages of any eminent authority, who differs from the Doctor in his views, is to array such authority against all Christian observances whatever. This we do not understand to be the purpose, but on the contrary to show that when a clergyman, conspicuous for godliness, learning, and abilities, of position unassailable, and who from every motive that could properly impel would be inclined to hold the strictest notions of Sabbath sanctification, is at the same time unwilling to yield his prejudices to such compliance, his testimony, above that of all others, deserves to be received with the utmost readiness and cordiality.

The passage from Melancthon which *The Press* offers, and it might have produced much that would have been even more to the purpose, is from the celebrated *Augsburg Confession*, which that great Reformer framed, and in which Luther also had a part. This Confession, in almost the next sentence after his condemnation of *The Press* for having cited, the *Doctor cites himself*. We are, therefore, forced to one of two conclusions,—either that he had not read the whole of what Melancthon says, or, knowing whence the extract was derived, did not choose to admit his knowledge; and of these inferences we prefer the former.

In this Confession we have, on the one part, Melancthon's positive convictions, proclaimed with deliberation, under circumstances the most solemn, and in a document whose promulgation illumined, as it were, his age, and threw a glory around his name, and upon the other we have sentences torn plainly from their context, by which it is attempted to be proved that Melancthon held opinions which were in unison

with those of our author. The eminent Reformer, as dealt with by the Doctor, is therefore open to the charge of vacillation; but these selections, if given in their integrity, would clear him of such suspicion.

One fact cannot be questioned, that prominent writers on the "Sabbath" always speak of the Reformers as entertaining the belief that as Jewish and ceremonial it came to a close with the Mosaic dispensation generally, and Dr. Hetherington, a celebrated advocate of the same notion held by our author, opposes, in his *Christian Sabbath Considered in its Various Aspects* (Edinburgh, 1850), the theory of the Reformers upon the ground that (*in his opinion*, of course) they held an erroneous doctrine.

The Rev. BADEN POWELL gives the following brief history of Melancthon's Formulary, and also some extracts from the Heidelberg and other catechisms, on the subject of the fourth commandment, which we present in the same connection :

"As indicative of the state of opinions among the great branches of the Reformed Church, the celebrated Augsburg Confession stands preëminent. In reference to our present subject, it first makes some allusion to the controversies which had existed, bearing on the extent of the authority of the Church to change ordinances."

Afterwards, speaking of points ordained by the authority of the Church, this Formulary proceeds :

"Such cases are, the observance of the Lord's day, Easter, Pentecost, and other like festivals and rites. For those who judge that by the authority of the Church, instead of the Sabbath the observance of the Lord's day was instituted as essential, are greatly in error.

“The Scripture has abrogated the Sabbath, which teaches that all Mosaic ceremonies, after the revelation of the Gospel, may be omitted. And yet, since it was necessary to appoint a certain day, that the people might know when to assemble together, it appears that the Church appointed for that end the Lord’s day, which seems, on this ground, to have been the more acceptable, that men might have an example of Christian liberty, and might know that the observance neither of the Sabbath nor of any other day is necessary. There have been great disputes on the change of the law; on the ceremonies of the new law; on the change of the Sabbath; all which have arisen from the false persuasion that the worship of the Church ought to be similar to the Levitical” (*Confessio Augustana*, 1531, § vii; *Sylloge Confessionum*, p. 156, Ed. Oxford, 1827).

Notwithstanding (says Powell) the plainness with which all idea of sabbatism is here repudiated, it yet cannot but be noticed how much the prevailing confusion of thought remains in the *reasons* and *grounds* assigned; that the Mosaic ceremonies “may be omitted” when the question is, what should enforce them? or how the Gentiles could have anything to do with them? or could have any ground for imagining that Christian worship ought to resemble the Levitical. The real fundamental “false persuasion,” which might have been referred to, is that of not seeing the distinction between Jewish and Gentile Christianity. All that is here said might well apply to the Jewish converts.

The original form from which the above is cited was that adhered to by the Lutherans. But, in 1540, an altered version was made to suit the views of certain other parties. In this version the passage quoted re-

mains the same, with the exception of the sentence beginning, "The Scripture has abrogated," &c., which here stands thus: "The Scripture allows that the observance of the Sabbath may now be a matter of liberty; for it teaches that the Mosaic ceremonies, after the revelation of the Gospel, are not necessary; and yet," &c. (*Sylloge Confessionum*, p. 230), an assertion certainly of the safest nature.

The Palatine, or Heidelberg Catechism (1563), after stating "the Decalogue" to be "the law of God," in answer to the question, "What does the fourth commandment enjoin?" replies:

"First, that the ministry of the Gospel and of the School should be preserved; that, as well as other times, so particularly on festival days, I should studiously attend divine assemblies; should diligently hear the Word of God; should add my prayers to the public prayers; and, according to my ability, should contribute something for the poor.

"Lastly, that through all my life I should abstain from wicked actions; yielding to the Lord, that, by the Holy Spirit, he will do his work in me; and thus, that I may, in this life, begin the eternal Sabbath." (*Syl. Con.*, p. 388.)

"The Racovian Catechism, after quoting the fourth commandment, puts the questions following:—

"Q. What think you of this precept?

"A. That it is taken away under the New Covenant, as well as other ceremonial observations.

"Q. Did not Christ institute that we should celebrate the day commonly called the Lord's day, instead of a Sabbath?

“By no means; since the Christian religion, as it taketh away other ceremonial observations, so also the difference of days. (See Col. ii. 18.) But, forasmuch as we see the Lord’s day to be of old celebrated by Christians, we permit the same liberty to all Christians.” (Ed. Amsterdam, 1652, p. 91.)

It is here remarkable how, even in the freedom which this Formulary asserts, there still lingers the fundamental misapprehension of dwelling on the *abolition* of an ordinance, which, to the Gentile, never was in force, or of introducing the Decalogue at all.

The French Protestant Catechism, while it regards the Decalogue in general as obligatory, yet makes the fourth commandment *peculiar*, and as not to be taken literally, and holds that the ceremonial part of it is abolished by the coming of Christ; that it is typical of spiritual rest; yet that it has reference to the observance of ecclesiastical ordinances, and the relief of servants from labor. (See *La Forme des Prières et le Catechisme*, &c., annexed to the French Testament. Ed. Leyden, 1687.)

A similar view is upheld at the present day by one of the most able French Protestant writers, Athanase Coquerel, who maintains that there is “no specific time—no consecrated day—assigned in the Gospel.” (*Christianity*, &c., p. 380; transl. London, 1847.)

On the other hand, the formal expression of that primary confusion of ideas which has so peculiarly beset the whole conception of the divine law in modern theology, may be fully traced in the Helvetic Confession, A.D. 1536.

It first (§ xii.) recognizes the natural moral law writ-

ten in the hearts of men, and then the divine written law in the two tables of Moses; and this is distinguished again into "the moral law comprehended in the Decalogue," the ceremonial, and the judicial or political.

But "this law is not given to men that they may be justified by its observance; but rather by its indications that they may acknowledge their infirmity, their sin, their condemnation, and thus be led to faith in Christ. . . . Thus far the law is abrogated, that it no longer condemns us, or works wrath in us.

. . . "We know that the scripture of the law is useful, if it be expounded by the Gospel; thus the reading of it is not to be abolished." (*Sylloge Confessionum*, pp. 42, 43.)

"It may be readily understood how this kind of dogmatizing prepared the way for the deeper subtleties and Judaical aberrations and enormities of the Westminster Assembly." (*Powell's Christianity, &c.*, pp. 229 to 234.)

CRANMER.

The production of Cranmer's testimony by *The Press* has excited the strong disapprobation of the author of *Sabbatismos*, who characterizes the attempt as an act of "effrontery and deception, which merits some sharpness of rebuke." It would have been surprising had it disregarded the authority of so strong a supporter as Cranmer. These are the opinions of Cranmer, as given by our author: "The fourth commandment is distinguished from the other nine, the latter being merely moral, the former ceremonial, as regards 'rest from bodily labor on the seventh day,' which belonged only to the Jews; but moral as regards the spiritual

rest from sin, which binds Christians at all times. The command, however, binding also to rest from all bodily labor, and to the exclusive service of God at certain times." We have, however, the avowal that the fourth commandment is ceremonial, and moral so far as it is our duty to worship God, and we cannot but commend the Doctor's candor in adducing so strong a condemnation of his own chief position. It would exhibit an equal want of candor on our part, did we forbear to state that the Doctor enters his "caveat" against the damaging part of Cranmer's statement, while gratefully accepting that which accords with his own views, for the Doctor says, "*our* doctrine is distinctly stated, along with *some* points which are not *correct*." (See *post*, p. 104.)

BAXTER.

The Doctor is of opinion that also Baxter is strongly with him, and it might be supposed from the paragraphs presented from the writings of that divine, that no Puritan could go further in strictness of sabbatical ideas. The author of *Sabbatismos* has, however, omitted to mention that Baxter is opposed to *his* interpretation of the texts in Romans and Colossians, and cannot find that St. Paul has reference to *other* Jewish Sabbaths than those referred to in the fourth commandment. (*Works*, vol. xiii. 367.) Baxter believed that the Jewish Sabbath was abolished, and that the Lord's day took its place by *Divine* appointment. Baxter, no less firmly than Cranmer, believed that the fourth commandment was not *morally* binding in the sense that it should be kept on the first day of the week only: although he thought that "it is of the law of nature that God should be worshipped," he did not

think that the law taught the observance of "one day in seven, or just on what day of the seven it should be," "although *reason*," he says, "may discern that one day in seven is a very *convenient* proportion." (*Works*, vol. xix. p. 186; *Cox*, 217.)

CALVIN.

In the whole range of ecclesiastical authority we do not know where to find a more complete answer and emphatic censure of the notions which the author of *Sabbatismos* so earnestly endeavors to enforce, than are contained in the clear and lofty language, the liberal doctrines, and eminently catholic sentiments of Calvin's "Exposition" of the fourth commandment.

In his commentary on this commandment he says: (xxviii.) "The end of this precept is, that, being dead to our own affections and works, we should meditate on the kingdom of God, and be exercised in that meditation in the observance of his institutions. But, as it has an aspect peculiar and distinct from the others, it requires a little different kind of exposition. The fathers frequently called it a *shadowy commandment*, because it contains the external observance of the day which was abolished, with the rest of the figures, at the advent of Christ. And there is much truth in their observation, but it reaches only half of the subject, wherefore, it is necessary to seek further for an exposition, and to consider three causes, on which, I think, I have observed this commandment to rest. For it was the design of the Heavenly Lawgiver, under the rest of the seventh day, to give the people of Israel a figure of the spiritual rest, by which the faithful ought to refrain from their own works, in order to leave God

to work within them. His design was, secondly, that there should be a stated day in which they might assemble together to hear the law and perform the ceremonies, or, at least, which they might especially devote to meditations on His works; that, by this recollection, they might be led to the exercise of piety. Thirdly, He thought it right that servants, and persons living under the jurisdiction of others, should be indulged with a day of rest, that they might enjoy some remission from their labor. (xxxii.) . . . But all that it (the Sabbath) contained of a ceremonial nature was, without doubt, abolished by the advent of the Lord Christ. For He is the truth, at whose presence all figures disappear; the body, at the sight of which all the shadows are relinquished. He, I say, is the true fulfilment of the Sabbath. Having been buried with Him by baptism, we have been planted together in the likeness of his death; that, being partakers of His resurrection, 'we may walk in newness of life' (Rom. vi. 4, &c.). Therefore, the Apostle says in another place, that 'the Sabbath was a shadow of the things to come; but the *body* is of Christ' (Col. ii. 16, 17); that is the real substance of the truth, which he has beautifully explained in that passage. This is contained not in one day, but in the whole course of our life, till, being wholly dead to ourselves, we be filled with the life of God. Christians, therefore, ought to depart from all superstitious observance of days. (xxxii.) As the two latter causes, however, ought not to be numbered among the ancient shadows, but are equally suitable to all ages. Though the Sabbath is abrogated, yet it is still customary among us to assemble on stated days for hearing the Word, for breaking the mystic bread, and for public prayers, and, also, to allow servants and

laborers a remission from their labor. That in commanding the Sabbath, the Lord had regard to both these things, cannot be doubted. The first is abundantly confirmed, even by the practice of the Jews. The second is proved by Moses, in Deuteronomy, in these words, 'That thy man-servant and maid-servant may rest as well as thou;' 'And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt;' also in Exodus, 'That thine ox and thine ass may rest, and the son of thy handmaid, and the stranger, may be refreshed.' Who can deny that both these things are as proper for us as for the Jews? Assemblies of the church are enjoined in the Divine word, and the necessity of them is sufficiently known, even from the experience of life. Unless there be stated days appointed for them, how can they be held? According to the direction of the Apostle, 'all things' are to be done 'decently and in order' among us. But, so far is it from being possible to preserve order and decorum without this regulation, that, if it were abolished, the church would be in imminent danger of immediate convulsion and ruin. But if we feel the same necessity, to relieve which the Lord enjoined the Sabbath upon the Jews, let no one plead that it does not belong to us; for our most provident and indulgent Father has been no less attentive to provide for our necessity than for that of the Jews. But why, it may be asked, do we not rather assemble on every day, so that all distinction of days may be removed? I sincerely wish that this were practised; and truly spiritual wisdom would be well worthy of some portion of time being daily allotted to it; but if the infirmity of many persons will not admit of daily assemblies, and charity does not permit us to require more of them, why should

we not obey the rule which we have imposed upon us by the will of God ?

(xxxiii.) "I am obliged to be rather more diffuse on this point, because, in the present age, some unquiet spirits have been raising a noisy contention respecting the Lord's day. They complain that Christians are tinctured with Judaism, because they retain any observation of days. But I reply, that the Lord's day is not observed by us upon the principle of Judaism ; because, in this respect, the difference between us and the Jews is very great, for we celebrate it, not with scrupulous rigor as a ceremony, which we conceive to be a figure of some spiritual mystery, but only use it as a remedy necessary to the preservation of order in the church. But, they say Paul teaches that Christians are not to be judged in the observance of it, because it is a shadow of something future (Col. ii. 16, 17). Therefore, he is 'afraid lest' he has 'bestowed' on the Galatians 'labor in vain' because they continued to observe days (Gal. iv. 10, 11). And in the Epistle to the Romans he asserts him to be 'weak in faith' who 'esteemeth one day above another' (Rom. xiv. 5). But who, these furious zealots only excepted, does not see what observance the Apostle intends ? For they did not observe them for the sake of political and ecclesiastical order ; but when they retained them as shadows of spiritual things, they were so far guilty of obscuring the glory of Christ and the light of the gospel. They did not, therefore, rest from their manual labors, as from employment which would divert them from sacred studies and meditations, but from a principle of superstition, imagining, then, cessation from labor to be still an expression of reverence for the mysteries formerly represented by it.

“This preposterous distinction of days the Apostle strenuously opposes, and not that legitimate difference which promotes the peace of the Christian church; for in the churches which he founded the Sabbath was retained for this purpose. He prescribes the same day to the Corinthians for making collections for the relief of the brethren at Jerusalem. If superstition be an object of fear, there was more danger in the holy days of the Jews than in the Lord’s day now observed by Christians. Now, whereas, it was expedient for the destruction of superstition that the day which the Jews kept holy was abolished, and, it being necessary for the preservation of decorum, order and peace in the Christian church, another day was appointed for the same use.

(xxxiv.) “However, the ancients have not, without sufficient reason, substituted what we call the Lord’s day in the room of the Sabbath. For, since the resurrection of the Lord is the end and consummation of that true rest, which was adumbrated by the ancient Sabbath, the same day which put an end to the shadows, admonishes us Christians not to adhere to a shadowy ceremony. Yet I do not lay so much stress on the septenary number, that I would oblige the church to an invariable adherence to it; nor will I condemn those churches which have other solemn days for their assemblies, provided they keep at a distance from superstition; and this will be the case, if they be only designed for the observance of discipline and well-regulated order. Let us sum up the whole in the following manner: As the truth was delivered to the Jews under a figure, so it is given to us without any shadows; *first*, in order, that during our whole life, we should meditate on a perpetual rest from our own

works, that the Lord may operate within us, by His spirit; *secondly*, that every man, whenever he has leisure, should diligently exercise himself in private, in pious reflections on the works of God; and, also, that we should, at the same time, observe the legitimate order of the church appointed for the hearing of the word, for the administration of the sacraments, and for public prayer; *thirdly*, that we shall not unkindly oppress those who are subject to us. Thus vanish all the dreams of false prophets, who, in past ages, have infected the people with Jewish notions, affirming that nothing but the ceremonial part (which, according to them, is the appointment of the seventh day), has been abrogated, but that the moral part of it, that is the observance of one day in seven, still remains. But this is only changing the day in contempt of the Jews, while they retain the same opinion of the holiness of a day; for, on this principle, the same mysterious signification would still be attributed to particular days which they formerly obtained among the Jews. And, indeed, we see what advantages have arisen from such a sentiment; for those who adhere to it, far exceed the Jews in a gross, carnal and superstitious observance of the Sabbath; so that the reproofs we find in Isaiah, are equally applicable to them in the present age, as to those the prophet reproved in his time. But the principal thing to be remembered is the general doctrine, that lest religion decay or languish among us, sacred assemblies ought diligently to be held, and that we ought to use those external means which are adapted to support the worship of God." (*Calvin's Institutes*. Book ii, ch. viii. Presbyterian Board Pub., pp. 354 to 359.)

The author of "Sabbatismos," at page 189, essays to vindicate the memory of Calvin from the serious charge

of holding sentiments differing from his, the author's.* This is, at least, the result of his mode of criticism. All that Calvin says upon the subject, in his *Institutes*, is now before the reader, and *The Press* having quoted this passage—"The false prophets have said that nothing was abrogated, but what was ceremonial in the commandment; but the moral part remains, to wit: the observance of one day in seven. This is nothing else than to insult the Jews, by changing the day, and yet mentally attributing to it the same sanctity; thus

* The reader will have observed how frequently Luther and Calvin have been referred to by writers as holding convictions directly opposed to those entertained by the advocates of the perpetual binding efficacy and moral obligation of the fourth commandment. Yet Dr. Junkin, with a most censurable want of fairness and candor, would fain persuade his readers that he and Luther and Calvin think precisely alike upon this question, and deems it necessary to "*vindicate*" their *memory* from an opposite opinion. We have, in addition to the testimony already produced, that of two clergymen of the Doctor's own branch of the Church—the conclusions of Rev. Dr. James W. Alexander, soon to be quoted, and the following language of Rev. Dr. Rice:

"Unhappily for the cause of religion, the Reformers, Luther and Calvin, seem not to have admitted the *identity* of the Lord's day with the original Sabbath. They have observed the form rather as a matter of necessity or expediency than as divinely commanded." After quoting from Calvin, he says: "These views of the Sabbath go far for accounting for the sad decay of vital piety; for it is in vain to hope for any profitable observance of Sunday, if it be admitted that its appointment is not of divine authority." (*Rev. N. L. Rice, D.D., of Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, on the Origin and History of the Sabbath*, p. 68. New York, 1862.) We sympathize with Dr. Rice as to Calvin's *unsoundness*, and that a pillar of such fine proportions, and on which reposes so much in doctrine of all which that church holds dear, should swerve in the slightest from the perpendicular; but we do not see how, at this late day, the matter is to be remedied.

retaining the same typical distinction of days as had place among the Jews,"—the author of "Sabbatismos" accordingly ventures this comment upon it: "The reader will see how garbled and unfair is *The Press* quotation, forcing a meaning upon Calvin's language the contrary of what he does in reality mean. In this thirty-fourth section Calvin reprobates and repudiates the superstitious observance of the Jews, in regard to the seventh day, and rebukes those who, in *past ages*, changed the day, but retained the superstitions. This utter perversion will further appear from the following testimony of Calvin, from other parts of his writings," &c. (p. 192):*

* The encouragement by Calvin of sports, such as "bowling and shooting," on the Lord's day, will surprise some of our readers, but will not those who shall have carefully read his "Exposition."

"If Mr. Baxter," says Archbishop Bramhall, "thinks that no recreations of the body at all are lawful or may be permitted upon the Lord's day, he may call himself a 'Catholic' if he please; but he will find very few churches of any communion whatever, old or new, reformed or unreformed, to bear him company.

"No. No. Even among churches of his own communion, which he calleth the holiest parts of *the Church upon earth*, he will find none at all to join with him except the churches of New England, and Old England, and Scotland, whereinto this opinion has been creeping, by degrees, the last half century of years, or somewhat more. Before that time, even our greatest Disciplinarians in England abhorred not private recreations, so they could practise them without scandal. *And Calvin himself*¹ *disdained*

¹ In the edition of Bramhall's works published by Parker, Oxford, 1844, in 5 vols.: there are, at p. 576, vol. iii, the following notes, which we do not recollect seeing in the edition we consulted. The texts precisely agree, and the notes are appended to the passages indicated:

"'Ut servis et operariis sua detur a labore remissio,' is one purpose of the Christian Sabbath, according to *Calvin Inst.*, lib. ii. c. 8, § 32. (Op. tom. ix. p. 99, 6; and compare his denunciation of a Judaical Sabbath, ib. § 34, p. 100, a. b.)"

It gives us pain to say that, in all our reading upon controversial subjects, we have never met a comment so uncalled for and so unfair as this. Is it in truth the case, as is alleged? Let the candid reader again examine all that Calvin has said in the sections quoted by us, in *full*, and in *snatches* by the Doctor, and ask himself whether Calvin meant to rebuke those only who "in PAST AGES changed the day but retained the superstitions," when, in the very next sentence after the words which *The Press* quotes, and in the same connection, Calvin says "Those who cling to their constitutions go twice as far as the Jews, in the gross and carnal superstition of sabbatism, so that the rebukes which we read in Isaiah apply as much to those of the *present day* as to those to whom the Prophet addressed them?"*

This is most inexcusable. In other words, what Calvin says is this:

That the false prophets, who by the way are as plen-

not to countenance and encourage the burgers of Geneva by his own presence and example at these public recreations, as bowling and shooting upon the Lord's day, after their devotions at church were ended. In Germany, Switzerland, France, and the Low Countries, all the churches of his own communion do enjoy their recreations. And in sundry of them their prayers and sermons on the afternoon of the Lord's day are but lately introduced; whereas, formerly, not the vulgar only, but the most eminent persons did use to bestow the whole afternoon upon their recreations."¹—*Archbishop Bramhall's Vindication of Grotius*. Works, p. 638, tom. i, div. iii. ch. 9. Dublin, 1676.

* The translation here used is that of Henry Beveridge. Edinburgh, 1845. That *ante*, p. 91, line 25, differs little.

¹ "See *Heylin's Hist. of Sabbath*, p. ii. c. 6, §§ 9, 10, and *Hist. of Presb.*, bk. ii. §§ 10, 11."

tiful as in the Reformer's day, admit that the *ceremonial* part of the commandment, or the observation of Saturday, or the Jewish Sabbath, is abrogated, but that the moral part, or the keeping of *one* day in the week, is still required, an obligation which Calvin *contemptuously* (there is no other word so fit to apply to it) repudiates, alleging that to abandon *Saturday* and yet retain some *other* day of the seven is but to reflect upon the Jews by repudiating *their* day and still to attach a "*holiness*" and "*mysterious signification*" to *another* day. The Reformer, however, admits that for order's sake Christians should still, at proper times, assemble for worship.

A controversialist should be held to strict accountability, when after alleging unfairness and dishonesty he fails to sustain the charge. In his *attempt* to show that Calvin has in one place pronounced false that which in another Calvin has solemnly declared to be true, he offers an affront to, not a "*vindication*" of, the memory of the great Reformer of Geneva.

BARCLAY.

We not seeing any ground in Scripture for it, cannot be so superstitious as to believe that either the Jewish Sabbath now continues or that the first day of the week is the anti-type thereof, or the true Christian Sabbath; which, with Calvin, we believe to have a more spiritual sense; and therefore we know no moral obligation by the fourth command, or elsewhere, to keep the first day of the week more than any other, or any holiness inherent in it. But 1st, forasmuch as it is necessary that there be some time set apart for the servants to meet together to wait upon God; and that 2dly, it is fit at some times they be freed from their *out-*

ward affairs; and that, 3dly, reason and equity doth allow that servants and beasts have some time allowed them to be eased from their constant labor; and that, 4thly, it appears that the apostles and primitive Christians did use the first day of the week for these purposes, we find ourselves sufficiently moved, for these causes, to do so also, without superstitiously straining the Scripture for another reason; which that it is not to be there found, many Protestants—yea, Calvin himself—upon the fourth command hath abundantly evinced. And though we, therefore, meet and abstain from working upon this day, yet doth not that hinder us from having meetings also for worship at other times.” *Barclay’s Apology*, sect. iv, p. 327. Philadelphia, 1850.

MILTON.

The Doctor’s attack upon the character of MILTON is discreditable to his taste and judgment, his reading, and his charity.

Paradise Lost, nor any of the masterpieces of this, by many esteemed the greatest of all Englishmen, he has evidently never read; or, if he has, not carefully read.

It is plain, however, that he has confidingly imbibed all that the malignancy of Johnson records against this glory of his day and generation, and of all time; that unscrupulous and prejudiced critic and “stern moralist,” who is better known as the calumniator of Milton than as the author of the poem “London, a Satire.”

The Rev. H. J. Todd, in his *Life of the Poet* (London, 1826, p. 253), says “Milton adorned with every graceful endowment, highly and *holily* accomplished as he was, appears, in the dark coloring of Johnson, a

most unamiable being; but could he revisit earth in his mortal character, with a wish to retaliate, what a picture might be drawn, by that sublime and offended genius, of the great moralist who has treated him with such excess of asperity. The passions are powerful colorists, and marvellous adepts in the art of exaggeration; but the portraits executed by *Love* (famous as he is for overcharging them) are infinitely more faithful to nature than gloomy sketches from the heavy hand of *Hatred*, a passion not to be trusted or indulged even in minds of the highest purity and power; since hatred, though it may enter the field of contest under the banner of justice, yet generally becomes so blind and outrageous, from the heat of contention, as to execute, in the name of virtue, the worst purposes of vice. Hence arises that species of calumny the most to be regretted, the calumny lavished by men of talents and worth on their equals or superiors, whom they have rashly and blindly hated for a difference of opinion."

Now listen to Dr. JUNKIN, and, we ask, could anything be more wretched in taste, or much worse in its spirit: "Milton, like most men of his day, and many in our day, was befogged in the Red Sea; they have not been able to see the difference between the regular seventh-day rest and the extra Sabbaths of the Israelites, of which you have five in Lev. xxiii." (Unfortunate Milton!) "Milton was a splendid linguist and a great poet. He has never enjoyed the reputation of a pious, godly man. He is claimed, by them of that creed, as a Unitarian, and all that sect go in for a lively, slack, and sportive Sabbath." . . . Quoting from Dr. Johnson, he says: "Milton grew old without any visible worship. In the distribution of his time there was no hour of prayer, either solitary or with his household;

omitting public prayer, he omitted all." (Page 207.) "It is fortunate for the Sabbath," further says the Doctor, "that Milton was not its friend." (Page 208.)

Now hear what Milton, himself, says: "Although it is the duty of believers to join themselves, if possible, to a church duly constituted (Heb. x. 25), yet such as cannot do this conveniently, or with full satisfaction of conscience, are not to be considered as excluded from the blessing bestowed by God on the churches." (Book i. chap. 29, *Of the Visible Church*.) This is an important passage, Dr. Sumner says, "because it discloses Milton's real views upon a point in which his opinions have been represented in a more unfavorable light than they seem to have deserved."

After quoting from some observations of Bishop Newton, his biographer remarks, "It has been candidly and judiciously stated in a note upon this passage, by Mr. Hawkins," to which Dr. Sumner refers, "that the reproach which has been thrown upon Milton, of frequenting no place of public worship, in his latter days, should be received, as Dr. Symmons observes, with some caution. His blindness, and other infirmities, might be, in part, his excuse; and it is certain that his daily employments were always ushered in by devout meditation and study of the Scriptures." (Todd, page 332.)

"His favorite book was the Book of God. To Milton, when a child, Revelation opened not her richest stores in vain. To devotional subjects his infant strains were dedicated; and never did 'his harp forget' to acknowledge the aid he derived from the muse of sacred inspiration. . . . It must gratify every Christian to reflect," Mr. Hagley observes, "that the man of our country most eminent for energy of mind, for intense-

ness of application, and for frankness and intrepidity *in asserting whatever he believed to be the cause of truth*, was so confirmedly devoted to Christianity, that he seems to have made the Bible not only the rule of his conduct, but the prime director of his genius." Yes, he says of himself, "I am among the free and ingenuous sort of such as evidently were born for study, and love learning for itself, not for lucre, or *any other end but the service of God and truth*, and, perhaps, that lasting fame and perpetuity of praise, which God and good men have consented shall be the reward of those whose published labors advance the good of mankind." (*Areopagitica*. Todd, page 248.)

Such was Milton, the devout student of the Scriptures; the ardent seeker after truth; the profound theologian; one of the ripest scholars and brightest intellects of his own, or of any age; and above all, as the highest title, the sincere Christian. And what is his grave offence? Why should the author of *Sabbatismos* declare it fortunate that, as to Sunday, Milton "was not its friend?" We reply, simply because he held the same convictions on this question as did Luther, Calvin, Whately, White, Alexander,—*no more!*

As if it should be a matter of congratulation and of gratitude, a "*fortunate*" circumstance, that an institution of God's *perpetual* appointment (were it such), depended upon the puny skill of the advocate for or against it, thus placing it upon the lowest foundation conceivable, as you would a cause in court, to be gained not by the evidence and the law, but by the good "*fortune*" of your choice of an advocate. Could any admission, or any language, be more unhappy for the purposes intended.

We cannot close this brief "*Vindication*" of the mem-

ory of John Milton, without quoting the noble lines of Wordsworth:

“Milton! thou shouldst be living at this hour.
 Return to us again,
 And give us manners, virtue, freedom, power.
 Thy soul was like a star, and dwelt apart;
 Thou hadst a voice, whose sound was like the sea:
 Pure as the naked heavens, majestic, free;
 So didst thou travel on life’s common way,
 In *cheerful Godliness*, and yet thy heart
 The lowliest duties on herself did lay.”

ARCHBISHOP WHATELY.

Of all those who have discussed the “Sabbath question,” no one has written with more precision and conclusiveness than Archbishop Whately. Of singularly penetrating understanding, logical mind, great breadth and clearness of view, a large share of theological knowledge and eminent piety, he was prepared to speak with some degree of authority.

The argument which we quote at some length, will please the reader as possessing all the qualities which might be expected from the pen of one so thoroughly equipped. It does not, however, constitute all that Whately has written upon this topic, and a reference to his other works will reward the student who desires to pursue his investigations on this subject.

“I have already,” says Whately, “hinted my suspicions, that some persons, who do not really believe the Mosaic law relative to the Sabbath to be binding on Christians, yet think it right to encourage, or tacitly connive at, that belief, from views of expediency, for fear of unsettling the minds of the common people. But there are many, no doubt, who maintain the same

tenet from sincere conviction. Some again there are, who conceive the observance of the Lord's day to be founded, not on the authority of the Decalogue, but on a supposed command given to all mankind at the creation, the force of which, as it was antecedent to the Mosaic law, cannot, of course, be affected by its abolition. These views, though I cannot coincide with them, are not, it is plain, at all at variance with what has been said in the fifth essay.

“But the opinion that Christians are bound to the hallowing of the Lord's day, in obedience to the fourth commandment, goes to nullify all that I have there urged, since it implies that there is a *part*, at least, of the Mosaic law binding on Christians. I should say the *whole*; for, since the fourth commandment is evidently not a moral, but a positive precept (it being a thing in itself indifferent, antecedent to any command, whether the seventh day, or the sixth, or the eighth, be observed), I cannot conceive how the consequence can be avoided, that ‘we are debtors to keep the whole law,’ ceremonial as well as moral. The dogma of the ‘Assembly of Divines at Westminster’ (in their ‘Confession of Faith,’ chap. xxi. § 7), that the observance of the Sabbath is a part of the moral law, is to me utterly unintelligible. Yet, unless we assent to this, adopting some such sense of the term ‘moral’ as it is difficult even to imagine, I do not see on what principle we can, consistently, admit the authority of the fourth commandment, and yet claim exemption from the prohibition of certain meats, and of blood, the rite of circumcision, or, indeed, any part of the Levitical law. But to those who fear that the reverence due to the Lord's day would be left without support, should we deny the obligation of the Mosaic law, I would suggest two con-

siderations, either of which would be alone sufficient to show that their apprehensions are entirely groundless :

“ First, That there is no mention of the Lord’s day in the Mosaic law.

“ Second, That the power of the church, bestowed by Christ himself, would alone (even independent of apostolic example and ancient usage), be amply sufficient to sanction and enforce the observance.

“ To seek, therefore, for the support of an institution which is ‘ bound on earth ’ by the church of Christ, and which, consequently, He has promised to ‘ bind in heaven,’ among the abrogated ordinances of the Mosaic law, where, after all, it is not to be found, is to remove it from a foundation of rock to place it on one of sand ; it is to ‘ seek for the living among the dead.’

“ In saying that there is no mention of the Lord’s day in the Mosaic law, I mean that there is not only no mention of that specific festival which Christians observe on the *first* day of the week, in memory of our Lord’s resurrection on the morning following the Jewish Sabbath, but there is not (as has sometimes been incautiously stated), any injunction to sanctify one day in seven. Throughout the whole of the Old Testament we never hear of keeping holy *some one* day in every seven, but the seventh day, as the day on which ‘ God rested from all His work.’ The difference, accordingly, between the Jews and the Christians, is not a difference of *reckoning*, which would be a matter of no importance. Our computation is the same as theirs. They, as well as we, reckon Saturday *as* the seventh day, in memory of God’s resting from the work of creation. We keep holy the first day of the week, *as* the first, in memory of our Master’s rising from the dead, on the day after the Sabbath. Now, surely, it is presumptu-

ous to say that we are at liberty to alter a divine command, whose authority we admit to be binding upon us, on the ground that it matters not whether this day or that be set apart as a Sabbath, provided, that we obey the divine injunction to observe *a Sabbath.*”

Whately then instances the offence of “Jeroboam, the son of Nebat,” who had made Israel to sin, “by instituting a feast that he had devised of his own heart;” that of the Samaritans, when they built a temple on Mount Gerizim, &c., and proceeds to say, “I cannot, therefore, but think that the error was less of those early Christians, who, conceiving the injunction relative to the Sabbath to be binding on them, obeyed it just as it was given (provided, they did not, contrary to the Apostle’s injunction, Rom. xiv. 2-6, presume to judge their brethren who thought differently), than of those who, admitting the eternal obligation of the precept, yet presume to alter it on the authority of *tradition.* Surely, if we allow that the ‘tradition of the church’ is competent to change the express commands of God, we are falling into one of the most dangerous errors of the Romanists; and this, while we loudly censure them for presuming to refuse the cup to the laity at the Lord’s supper, on the authority of their church, though Christ said to his disciples, ‘drink ye *all* of this,’ and for pleading tradition in behalf of saint-worship, &c. But, in the present case, there is not even any tradition to the purpose. It is not merely that the Apostles left us no command perpetuating the observance of the Sabbath, and transferring the day from the seventh to the first. Such a change certainly would have been authorized by their express injunction, and by nothing short of that,—since an express divine command can be abrogated or altered only by the same power, and by the

same distinct revelation, by which it was delivered. But, not only is there no such apostolic *injunction*, than which nothing less would be sufficient, there is not even any *tradition* of their having made such a change; nay, more, it is even abundantly plain that they made no such change.

“There are, indeed, sufficiently plain marks of the early Christians having observed the Lord’s day as a religious festival, even from the very resurrection (John xx. 19, 26; Acts xx. 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 2; Rev. i. 10); but so far were they from *substituting* this for the Jewish Sabbath, that all of them who were *Jews* actually continued themselves to observe not only the Mosaic Sabbath, but the whole of the Levitical law, while to the *Gentile* converts they said, ‘Let no man judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the *Sabbath-day*, which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ.’ And, if we come down to later ages of the church, we not only find no allusion to any such tradition, but we find the contrary distinctly implied, both in the writings of the early fathers, and in those of the most eminent of the founders of our Reformation; *e. g.* in *Cranmer’s Catechism*, published in 1548, viz., the first year of Edward VI. we find the following passage: ‘And here note, good children, that the Jewes, in the Old Testament, were commanded to keep the Sabbath-day, and they observed it every seventh day, called the Sabbath, or Saturday. But we Christian men, in the New Testament, are not bound to such commandment of Moses’ law concerning differences of times, days, and meats, but have liberty and freedom to use other dayes for our Sabbath-dayes, wherein to hear the word of God, and keep an holy rest. And, therefore, that this Christian

liberty may be kept and maintained, we now keep no more the Sabbath on Saturday, as the Jews do; but we observe the Sunday, and certain other days, as the magistrates do judge convenient whom in this thing we ought to obey.'

"By the authority of the magistrates, Cranmer evidently meant that of the church, &c., &c. In fact, the notion I am contending against, seems, as far as I can collect, to have originated with the Puritans not much more than two hundred years ago, and to have been, for a considerable time, confined to them; though it was subsequently adopted by several members of our church. . . . But if any persons are convinced that it was given to Adam, and also conclude thence that it must bind all his posterity, they are, of course, at least equally bound by the (recorded) precept to Noah, relative to abstinence from blood. . . . He who acknowledges a divine command to extend to himself, ought to have an equally express divine command to sanction any alteration in it. Those Christians of the present day, however, who admit the obligation of the ancient Sabbath, have yet taken the liberty to change not only the *day*, but the *mode* of observance. . . . If we admit the authority of the written law, and reject merely the Pharisaical additions to it, we are then surely bound to comply, at least, with the express directions which *are* written; for instance (Exod. xxxv. 2, 3), 'Ye shall *kindle no fire* throughout your habitations upon the Sabbath-day,' no one can pretend is a traditional precept; yet I know of no Christians who profess to observe it. . . . If the positive institutions of the Old Testament are wholly abrogated, THEN, (and not otherwise) all days become in themselves indifferent, and in such a case, the Church has, as I have above

remarked, full power to sanctify any that may be thought more fitting; but, on the other hand, the Church has not power to ordain anything *contrary* to *God's word*; so that if the precepts relative to the ancient Sabbath are acknowledged to remain in force, *then* the observance of the first day of the week, instead of the seventh, becomes an unwarrantable presumption. This, therefore, is a case in which (unless we consecrate two Sabbath-days in each week), we must absolutely make our choice between the law and the Gospel." (*Note to Archbishop Whately's Essays on some of the Difficulties in the Writings of St. Paul*; p. 45, and Appendix 337. London, 1830.)

We had proposed to here insert some extracts from the sermons and letters of that eminent divine, the late Frederick W. Robertson, of Brighton, England. We shall endeavor to print them in an appendix, if the space, which we have allotted ourselves, will permit.

BISHOP WHITE.

BISHOP WHITE, in his lectures on the Catechism of the Protestant Episcopal Church, after reciting the fourth commandment, and noticing the difficulty which attends the statement, that the "Sabbath" was observed by the patriarchs, and expressing the belief that the institution ceased in relation to the Jewish converts to Christianity, quotes the text in Col. ii. 16, in proof of it. He also remarks, "And this may show the reason on which our Church avoids the calling of her day of worship—'the Sabbath.' It is never so called in the New Testament. And in the primitive Church,

the term 'sabbatizing' carried with it the reproach of a leaning to the abrogated observances of the law. But on the ceasing of the Sabbath, with the moral reason of it remaining—that is, in the duty of social worship, and in the utility of there being regular returns of opportunities of it, the Apostles of our Saviour appointed, that there should be, as before, one day in seven thus appropriated; but preferring the first day of the week, in memory of the resurrection. Hence it is called in one place in Scripture, 'the Lord's day' (Rev. i. 10). And there are other places which show that the first day of the week was the stated time to assemble for public worship. Perhaps the Lord's day may be considered as the most suitable name for the Christian Sabbath. And yet there is no need for such stiffness in this matter, as to fault the use of the word 'Sunday,' which prevails in our Liturgy. The early Christians conformed to the customs of their heathen neighbors, in the calling of the days and the months. In proof of this I shall refer to one authority only. It is that of Justin, a blessed martyr, quoted in a preceding lecture, as writing within half a century after the last of the Apostles. Justin, in describing the worship of Christians, as then performed on the first day of the week, applies to it the name of 'Sunday.'

"It is hoped that the view here taken of the subject, will enable us to answer the third question: How far the appointment of the Sabbath is now binding on the Christian Church.

"If the principles stated be correct, it follows, that whatever rests only on any precept to the Israelites is done away. But the object now being simply the uses attached to public and private devotion, and to religious instructions received or given, the spirit of the

appointment remains, dictating the means the best adapted to the accomplishing of these uses, and prohibiting whatever interferes with the same. This is to be understood, with the exception of works of necessity, and those of mercy, so that in the present state of society, differing materially, as it does, from the circumstances of the Jewish people, if there be any employment conducing to the civil weal, which cannot be suspended on the Lord's day without the defeating the very object; it seems to follow, that the suspension may be dispensed with under such regulations of alternate labor, as will be consistent with the interests of civil life, without destroying, although, doubtless, abridging the religious privileges of the persons so employed. In addition to this, the latitude here taken embraces such occasional occupation, as may prevent great loss: such as the gathering in of the harvest, when it might otherwise be ruined, or materially damaged, by an unfavorable state of the weather.

“This instance is here given in consequence of finding, that on the conversion of the Roman emperors, and when they began to make laws for the hallowing of the Lord's day, this was one of the exceptions; which would not have been made, had it been alien from the sense of the Church, in her state then existing, and to which she had attained after the fiery trials of her heavy persecutions. What has been here said, is deemed to be nothing more than what is consonant to the saying of our Saviour, that the ‘Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath.’

“Cases of difficulty and emergency being out of the question, there can be nothing clearer, than that persons *who have their time*, and their *conduct* at their own disposal, are bound to spend the Lord's day in such a

manner as shall answer the purposes of the appointment. It is not here said—for it is not thought—that they are bound to a degree of precision, affected by some, *forbidding the ordinary civilities of life*; or such *exercise of the limbs of persons in sedentary employment*, as may be beneficial to their health. But all habits of living, which prevent either masters and mistresses of families, or their children, and their servants, from the devotions of the Church, and of the closet; and anything under the name, either of business or amusement, having the same effect, is contrary to the *Christian* character; contrary to it in a point which wise men have always held essential to the maintaining of the visible profession of Christianity; and not only this, but to the maintaining of a popular regard to law, to order, and to decorum.”

By the phrase, the “moral reason of the Sabbath remaining,” we presume is meant that the duty of worshipping our Creator is unalterable, and does not depend upon the existence or non-existence of the obligation of the fourth commandment. As to the ideas of “substitution,” and the alleged appointment by the Apostles of the first day of the week, the subject has already been discussed, and the reader, with the New Testament before him, is as capable of forming a correct judgment as the most acute theologian.

Though the thoughts expressed by the Bishop are apparently less liberal than those of Luther and Calvin, we think, upon examination, they will not be found so. This, however, will the candid yield, that it is not the “Puritan Sabbath” which he commends, if he is somewhat guarded in the expression of his sentiments. He does not explain what he means by the interchange of

the "civilities of life;" yet we can understand that the concession of the right of recreation to the sedentary admits pretty much all for which we have been contending, and imports a much less rigid conception of the privilege of Christians than the Doctor entertains, when upon Sunday he would prohibit "meditation and study," except upon religious topics, and falls back, as his warrant for this position, upon the words in Isaiah lviii. 13, which enforce a dispensation which has passed away: "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, *from* doing thy pleasure on my holy day, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words" (p. 143).

REV. JAMES W. ALEXANDER, D.D.

This eminently excellent and pious clergyman, ripe scholar, and liberal theologian, whose loss was deeply lamented not only by his own denomination, the Presbyterian Church, but by other communions, in writing from New York, says: "The question of riding in our street cars on Sunday is agitating our community. I have not been able to decide it. The poor go in cars; the rich in coaches. The number of horses and men employed is less than if there were no cars. It is a query whether as many cars as these would be demanded by those (among half a million), who have lawful occasion to journey. If so, the question of duty would be reduced to one of individual vocation to this amount of locomotion. The whole matter of the Christian Sabbath is a little perplexed to my mind. 1. All that our Lord says on it is *prima facie* of the side of relaxation. 2. The Apostles, who enforce, and, as it were,

re-enact every other commandment of the ten, never advert to this. 3. Even to Gentile converts they lay no stress on this, which might be expected to come first among externals. 4. According to the letter, Paul teaches the Colossians (ii. 16), not to be scrupulous about Sabbaths. I am not, therefore, surprised that Calvin had doubts on the subject. The very strict views on the Sabbath have prevailed in no part of Christendom unconnected with the British Isles. I must wait for more light. I admit the fact that spiritual religion has most flourished where the strict opinions have prevailed. My good father used to say, 'Be very strict yourself; be very lenient in judging your neighbors.' I have always taken milk without scruple, which is an offence to hundreds of good people among us. Some began to have qualms on Sunday gas; but, on inquiry, they found the labor which produced it fell on Thursday or Friday. As I always give my people a motto for the year, and preach on it, I have chosen, 'My grace is sufficient for thee.'" (Letter dated New York, Dec. 31, 1852, from *Forty Years' Familiar Letters*, by James W. Alexander, D.D., vol. ii., p. 183. New York, 1861.)

The doctrine maintained by the author of "Sabbatismos," is not a half-way doctrine. There is no qualification or modification in it. It is with him the *whole* law, as binding and as rigidly to be enforced *now*, as it was by the Jews, before the new dispensation, or by the Puritans and "Pilgrim Fathers" since. He evidently believes the ceremonial part of the fourth commandment still in existence, else why so inconsistent as to overload his book with obsolete quotations from the Old

Testament. He is opposed to the convictions of the great lights of his own and other churches. He brings himself clearly within the line of Calvin's condemnation, as one of those "*false prophets*" whom the Reformer so bitterly denounces.

Indeed, if we did not believe the Doctor *eminently sincere*, in all he has attempted to prove, we should pronounce him a Jew in disguise (not that we mean to reflect upon those of that sect who, in their strictness, conscientiously think they are right), for what Jew in the days of Moses could go further than the Doctor goes, when he insists, as we have already mentioned, that the individual is prohibited "from meditation and study and the outgo of desire after his business on the holy day; for this interferes with *other parts of the consecration*" (p. 143). It, therefore, follows—that if the whole of the Sunday is not observed, nay, if nine-tenths of such portion of it as is not required for sleep, &c., is not kept sacred, that is by attendance upon church, or devotion to holy meditation, and if not to meditation, at least to all freedom from thought, whatever, or from such thoughts as are worldly in their nature; the one-tenth so bestowed, nay, the least conceivable portion of a tenth, neutralizes all the piety, all of the "good works," exhibited in the other nine-tenths, and the man has grievously sinned by breaking the fourth commandment. This is a reiteration of the violation of the law even in a tittle. There is no escape in this conclusion from the premises laid down. Now, let us in all seriousness ask our author whether he has not often, since he assumed the duties of his calling, infringed the fourth commandment. Has he never, in his long life, had a wayward passing thought upon worldly affairs, or conversed upon a worldly topic, even if but for a moment?

Has he never, if not counselled, at least permitted, upon occasion, to pass without rebuke, some violation of the strictness he endeavors to enforce? Has he never been driven to the house of God, when he might as conveniently have walked? Has he not, upon Sunday and without protest, partaken of hospitality, if he has forbidden it under his own roof, where those who served had not, in consequence, that rest which the fourth commandment so strictly enjoins? We mean no reflection upon him, *we* do not blame him, we cast no censure, he is but a mortal; and we allude merely to that unavoidable breach of the Jewish code which all may commit, who live among their fellows, and an escape from which can be found, only, in the life of the ascetic. We have said, we do not blame him; we should, however, have been gratified, had he frankly admitted that such observance as he insists upon, is not attainable in our sublunary sinful sphere, but this perhaps would have been a relinquishment of his ground, and an acknowledgment that the fourth commandment may, under some circumstances, be the subject of qualification or change.

A statute, however, although it may cease by its own limitation, cannot be the subject of alteration or repeal, save by the power which enacted it. It is not, therefore, to suit his own view, in the power of him against whom its provisions are directed, to modify the stringency of its requirements.

In speaking of the letter of the Jewish Law, the Rev. Baden Powell, says, "The Law conformed to many points of human infirmity. It afforded splendid rites and ceremonies to attract popular reverence, and wean the people from their proneness to the gross ceremonies of idolatry. It indulged the disposition so pow-

erfully inherent in human nature, to observe 'days and times and seasons,' by the Sabbaths and feasts, and by occasional fasts, originally only a symbol of ordinary mourning, but afterwards invested with a religious character (Isa. lviii; Joel ii. 12). It commended avenging and sanguinary zeal, especially in the punishment of blasphemy (Lev. xxiv. 14; Deut. xiii. 9). It sanctioned the "*lex talionis*," life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth (Exod. xxi. 23, 24), that most perfect idea of retributive justice to the uncivilized mind; and, in general, it connected the idea of *punishment* with that of *vengeance* and *satisfaction*, the most congenial to a barbarous apprehension. If it restricted marriages within certain degrees of kindred, it at least connived at polygamy (Exod. xxi. 10; Deut. xxi. 15; Judg. viii. 30, &c.; *Neander's Life of Christ*, translation, p. 252, Bohn's ed.), and allowed a law of divorce suited to 'the hardness of their hearts' (Matt. xix. 8). On the other hand, it visited the violation of conjugal fidelity in the severest manner, punishing fornication in married persons with death by stoning (Deut. xxii. 22; Lev. xx. 10). It fully recognized and upheld slavery" (Lev. xxv. 44, &c.).

CHAPTER XI.

THE QUAKER AND THE PURITAN.

THE principles of Penn with respect to the observance of the first day of the week, were those of Barclay (see the extract from the "*Apology*," *ante*, p. 95), and are as widely apart from the Doctor's as are the poles.

Mark the language of Penn's law of 1682.* The

* The following is taken from an authentic copy, and forms a part of the 'Great Law,' or body of acts passed at Chester, in December, 1682, in the beginning of Penn's administration.

The sentiments expressed are so liberal, and so strongly in contrast with the legislation of the other Colonies and Provinces, that we deem it excusable to give space to its insertion.

CHAP. I. § 1. CONCERNING LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE.

"ALMIGHTY GOD, being only Lord of Conscience, Father of Lights and Spirits, and the Author as well as Object of all divine knowledge, faith and worship, who only can enlighten the Minds, and persuade and convince the understandings of people, in due Reverence to His Sovereignty over the Souls of Mankind, Be it Enacted, &c., That no person, now, or at any time hereafter, Living in this Province, who shall Confess and acknowledge One Almighty God to be the Creator, Upholder, and Ruler of the world, and that professeth, him or herself, obliged in Conscience to Live peaceably and quietly under the Civil government, shall, in any Case, be molested or prejudiced for his or her conscience, persuasion, or practice.

"Nor shall he or she, at any time, be compelled to frequent or

“good example of the primitive Christians,” and the “ease of the creation,” are specially mentioned, while not a word is said about the Doctor’s favorite dogma—for the phrase “perpetual *moral* obligation of the fourth commandment,” and the use of the word “*Sabbath*,” are carefully excluded. And what is equally remarkable, *no penalty* is designated for the violation of the statute.

The Doctor is complaisant, and evidently gratified because Penn thus “records his estimation of the Sabbath” (p. 125). He is so happy to have the founder of Pennsylvania apparently on his side, that he brings him into his councils without scrutiny of the plainness of his garb, or the liberality of his principles.

The significant omission of any allusion to the fourth commandment in the use of the word Sabbath, cannot be overlooked. The Doctor must, however, say some-

maintain any religious worship, place, or ministry whatever, contrary to his or her mind, but shall freely and fully enjoy his or her Christian Liberty in that respect, without any interruption or reflexion.

“And if any person shall Abuse or deride any other for his or her different persuasion and practice in matter of religion, such person shall be Looked upon as a disturber of the peace, and be punished accordingly.

“But to the End that Looseness, Irreligion, and Atheism may not creep in, under pretence of Conscience in this Province, Be it further enacted by the Authority aforesaid, that according to the example of the primitive Christians, and for the ease of the Creation, every first day of the week, called the Lord’s Day, people shall abstain from their Usual and Common Toil and Labour; That, whether masters, parents, children, or servants, they may the better dispose themselves to read the Scriptures of truth at home, or to frequent such meetings of Religious worship abroad as may best suit their respective persuasions.”

From the Great Law adopted at Chester, 7th 10th mo. 1682.

thing, and accordingly observes: "He, Penn, does not use the word Sabbath, nor the word Sunday; but first day of the week, and the LORD'S DAY, both Scriptural epithets. So let it stand" (p. 126). And so it shall stand against the Doctor, but the Doctor does not stand. The ground slips from under his feet, and he is hoisted by his own petard. He gives up the vital point of the whole controversy—Penn's avoidance of the word "Sabbath," meant, as we shall see, *all of Penn's faith* on this subject.

We imagine the Doctor, when we have proceeded a little further, will feel surprised at the company he has been keeping, and blame the innocency of his heart for the expression of such strong terms of admiration for a law which he has thus been betrayed into eulogizing. Had he read Penn's writings, or consulted the Colonial Records, he would not have hauled down his flag upon which the word "Sabbath" was inscribed, to flaunt another with a different inscription.

In the Colonial Records he would have found that at the meetings of the Executive Council, over which Penn, in person, presided, "*Saturday*" is called "*Sabbath*," as for example, "*die Sabbathi*, 27th January, 1699, 1700;" "*die Sabbathi*, 3d February, 1699, 1700;" "*die Sabbathi*, 1st June, 1700," &c. (1 *Col. Rec.*, 510, 591, 593.)

And had he read Penn's writings, he would have found the plainest and most direct expression on the utter annihilation of the fourth commandment as a *moral* obligation, and as clear an exposition of the whole subject, as can be found in the compositions of any of the theologians who have written on the subject. *His* trumpet gives no uncertain sound, and it

will be abundantly manifest why he so carefully avoided the use of the word "Sabbath."

He says, "To call any day of the week a *Christian Sabbath*, is not *Christian* but *Jewish*; give us one scripture for it; I will give two against it. Gal. iv. 9, 10, 11, 12, where the apostle makes their observation, or preference, of days, to be no less than a token of their turning from the gospel. Also, Col. ii. 16: an outward Sabbath, a keeping of a day, to be but a *shadow*; and that Christians ought not to be judged for rejecting such custom; for this very reason the Protestant churches beyond the seas *generally deny the morality of the first day*, counting all days alike in themselves, only they have respect to the first day, as an apostolical custom, and think it convenient to give one day of rest from labor to man and beast each week. In short, though we assert but one Christian Sabbath, and believe that to be the everlasting day of rest from all our own works, to worship and enjoy God in the newness of the spirit; yet 'tis well known that we both meet upon the first day in the week, and behave ourselves with as an inoffensive a conversation as any of our *sabbatarian adversaries*." . . . (Note to *John Faldo's Vindication*—Penn's Works, First Folio Edition, vol. ii. p. 379, London, 1726.)

Penn is, if possible, still more emphatic in the assertion of his convictions in a treatise also written in 1673, entitled "*Wisdom justified of her Children from the Ignorance and Calumny of H. Hallywell*," &c., ch. iv. § 1. "*Of the Sabbath-day*."

Hallywell accuses the Familists and Quakers of making no distinction between "Sabbath" and any other day, and of following their usual trades on that day.

To which Penn replies, that *if* the Familists did so, it was nothing to the Quakers. "And to say," he remarks, "that we many times follow our usual trades on that day, is a plain untruth; the whole world knows better, though we do not Judaize; for worship was not made for time, but time for worship; nor is there any day holy of itself, though holy things may be performed upon a day."

"But he (Hallywell) tells us, yes; *for the fourth commandment being as moral as the rest*, and that requiring a Sabbath-day, is perpetuated also.

"*Answer.* But this hurts us not, since the *Jewish Sabbath* is not observed by the Church of England. But if a Sabbath-day be moral because mentioned in the fourth commandment; then because the *Jews'* seventh day is there particularly mentioned, *their Sabbath* must be only *moral*, and consequently unalterable.

"But," says he, "No; for that the apostles and succeeding church of God, may very reasonably dispose of us in matters of this nature; and it is obligatory from the ten commandments, every one of which is moral, and binds all Christians still; and therefore the Church of England (though these rebellious Quakers disown their mother) doth make it part of her liturgy.

"*Answer.* If it be as moral as all the rest, as it must be if it be moral, because of its being there, they could no more dispense with it, than with any other commandment. To call that day moral, and make it alterable, is ridiculous. 'Tis true, the apostles met upon the first day, and not on the seventh; but as that released us from any pretended morality of the *seventh*, so neither did it confer any morality upon the *first*; yea, so far were they from it, that not one speaks any such thing; but *Paul* much the contrary: *Let no man judge*

you in meats or in drinks, or in respect of a holy day, or of new moons, or of the Sabbath-days, which are a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ. Col. ii. 17, 18. The outward Sabbath was typical of the great rest of the gospel, which such come to who cease from their own work, and in whom the works of God's new creation come to be accomplished.

“And though I should acknowledge the other commands to be moral, yea, and times too, both respecting God's worship, and the creature's rest; yet there is no more reason for the morality of that day, because amongst those commandments, than for the ceremoniousness and abrogation of several moral precepts, because scattered up and down among the ceremonial laws, and recorded in Leviticus.

“I grant that the apostles met on that day; but must it, therefore, be moral! Certainly the Scripture's silence in this particular must either conclude a great neglect against those holy men in not recommending and enjoying more expressly both water, bread, wine and holy days in their several epistles to the churches; or warrant us in our belief concerning the temporariness of these things. Let our adversary reproach us not for not believing that to be durable, which was wearing off and vanishing in those days; but soberly consider, that the practice of the best men, especially in such cases, is no institution, though sometimes it may be an example. But I perceive he makes bold, like an irreverent son, with his ghostly fathers, who, through his reflections upon us, severely rebuke them. Has he so quickly forgot the *Book of Sports*, and who put it out; when not to prophane this Sabbath with dancings, riots and revels, had been enough to render a man an enemy to Cæsar, and a schismatical Puritan to the Church? If he

be not satisfy'd with this, I refer him to *Calvin's Institutes*, Bp. *Ironside* and Dr. *Peter Heylin*, concerning the *non-morality* of the Sabbath; and a great wonder it is, that *John Calvin* and *Peter Heylin* should be of one opinion on anything." (Id., vol. ii, pp. 479, 480.)

It is curious, though, that the Doctor, whose sentiments accord with those of the Puritans in all their severity, should have, as a witness, summoned Penn, for, had that eminent "Quaker" or any of the same faith have visited Boston a second time, after a warning to depart, he would have suffered upon Boston Common the fate of poor Mary Dyer.*

That simplicity of dress and speech, which seem to have won the Doctor's tender confidence, so that from a controversialist he becomes a courtier, would have been Penn's surest source of condemnation with the dread tribunal of Boston. The Puritan who had suffered for opinion's sake does not seem to have had his heart warmed towards the gentle, unresenting, unresisting Quaker. With one it was "an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth," with the other obedience to the Saviour's injunction of submission under injuries. The one did not become the gentler under persecutions, but the other became forgiving, charitable, catholic, the ardent friend of civil and religious liberty.

These were the terms used towards the inoffensive disciples of George Fox. These "blasphemous heretics," "this pernicious sect," with "their dangerous and horrid tenets." To entertain a Quaker was to be whipt—"Plymouth Records,"—and the punishment was graduated to the offence. A male Quaker who a

* It is possible that some of the severe laws, against the Quakers, may have been repealed in 1682; but if the fact, it does not affect the argument.

second time offended, by coming into the jurisdiction, should, for the first offence, "have one of his ears cut off, and be kept at work in the house of correction till he can be sent away at his own charge, and for the second to have the other ear cut off;" a woman, for the same offence, was to be "severely whipped," and kept at the house of correction, and for the third offence "they shall have their tongues bored through with a hot iron." *Massachusetts Records*, Oct. 14th, 1657.

The culmination of punishment was *death*. One of the reasons given for the enactment of the law of 1682, by the first Assembly of Pennsylvania, which the Doctor so much lauds, was that all "may better dispose themselves to read the Scriptures of truth at home, or to frequent such religious meetings abroad as may best suit their *respective* persuasions," leaving an alternative.

How did the Doctor's friends in New England, or rather those who held the same scriptural notions which he now entertains, treat those who were inclined to worship God according to the dictates of their conscience? Why, by banishment upon pain of death; they were styled the "pernicious sect," . . . "who do take upon themselves to change and alter the received laudable customs of our nation in giving civil respect to equals, in reverence to superiors, whose actions tend to undermine the authority of civil government, so as to destroy the order of the churches, by denying all established forms of worship, and by withdrawing from the orderly church assemblies allowed and approved by all orthodox professors of the truth." *Laws of Massachusetts*, Edition of 1672.

The laws of New Plymouth were very rigid, following Deuteronomy, Numbers, &c., in several particulars:

“Any child, above sixteen years old,” “smiting their natural father or mother,” “shall be put to death;” “profaning the Sabbath or Lord’s day by doing unnecessary servile work,” “unnecessary *travailing*,” “or by sports and recreations,” was punished by fine or public whipping, and if the offence was “proudly, presumptuously and with a high hand committed,” the penalty was *death!* or such other punishment as the court might inflict. The *Capital Laws of the Colony of New Plymouth*, revised and published by order of the General Court, in June, 1671. See *Blue Laws of Massachusetts*. Hartford, 1838, pp. 17, 55.

By the laws of Connecticut, without just cause the “withdrawing one self from hearing the public ministry of the Word.”

“Doing servill work” on Sunday, “such as are not workes of piety,” &c., “prophane discourse or talke, rude and unreverent behavioure,” were all punishable offences. *Blue Laws of Connecticut*, p. 108.

In 1776 the law, with respect to non-attendance on divine worship, was regarded as having grown obsolete.

But these were still held to be punishable offences: “Presence at a concert of music, travelling, a collection of persons, or, in the words of the law, companies meeting in the street or *elsewhere*,” “going from home unless to attend a place of public worship or some work of necessity or mercy.” No vessel was allowed to leave port on the first day of the week, nor to pass any town where public worship was maintained. See “*A System of the Laws of Connecticut*,” by Zephaniah Swift, vol. ii., p. 325. Windham, 1796. See also *Compilation of Earliest Laws of Connecticut*. Hartford, 1822.

The following were punishable offences by the laws of Massachusetts:

Travelling on the Lord's day, "except by some adversity they were belated and forced to lodge in the Woods, Wilderness or Highways the Night before." Act of 4 William & Mary. *Acts & Laws of Prov. Mass. Bay, N. E.* Boston, 1762, p. 14.

"Persons walking, recreating and disporting themselves in the Streets, Wharffs or Fields in the time of public worship." Act of 1711, Id. 185.

One month's neglect, without good cause, of attendance upon place of public worship. Act of 1716, Id. 211.

The reader is further referred to the reprint of the "General Laws and Liberties of Conecticut Colonie," &c., 1673. Edited by George Brinley. Hartford, 1865.

And to the reprint of "New Haven's Settling," &c. By Charles J. Hoadley. Hartford, 1858.

Such were some of the laws of the Pilgrim Fathers, and of the New England pioneers who, notwithstanding their hardness and despotic temper, have still claims to our regard. We should be better pleased, however, as would, doubtless, many others, to see upon Forefathers' Day those claims, about which there is no dispute, for the sake of the virtuous example, enlarged upon with even greater earnestness, and the vices of bigotry, intolerance, and spiritual pride, about which there is also no dispute, brought a little more into the foreground, for the sake of the warning example.

But, what a curious metamorphosis has the lapse of two centuries wrought. The descendants of the Puritans are now the strenuous champions of the sacred right of private judgment, the staunchest advocates of civil and religious liberty, and wherever they go they bear with them the blessings of thrift, enterprise, and education. Boston tolerant, sets an example to Philadelphia in-

tolerant, upon the very question on which of all others, Penn, and his associates in 1682, most differed from the Bostonians of that day.

We have now finished the task which we had assigned ourselves. If we have quoted largely, it was because we preferred that others should speak rather than we. And besides, there is but one mode of calming the fears of the timid, and of inducing inquiry on their part, and that is by presenting the arguments of the leading authorities of the Church. If a positive assertion of Dr. Junkin is met by the positive assertion of one greater than he, no exertions which he may put forth will preserve an equilibrium, the beam must go up, if Calvin and Luther are in the opposite scale; such is the homage man invariably pays to superiority of intellect.

It is to be lamented that theology, like the law, has become a science of precedents, and although we are told that he who runs may read, yet the question is too often put, "What does this or that commentator say upon this or that passage?" so that the unlearned should congratulate himself, when the more learned range themselves on that side which to his mind appears the just and obvious one, and to which his heart responds as the cause of truth.

The whole subject at issue turns upon the binding force of the fourth commandment, for the Sabbatarian sets out with the *assertion* that the *morality* of the fourth commandment is still operative, and that the command therein is not to worship God at all times, but to worship him on a *particular* day, wherein consists the *morality* of the commandment. The reader will please not forget the distinction, namely, that the Anti-sabbatarian does not dispute, that man is bound to worship

his Maker at all times, but says that he is not bound to worship him on the seventh day, which is the only day pointed out in the Decalogue.

With this the Sabbatarian immediately *shifts his ground*, when you press him, and tells you that he admits that man is not bound to keep the fourth commandment so far as relates to the observance of the seventh day; that *it* has ceased under the new dispensation, and you need no longer pay the least respect to it. Nay, further, that it is Judaizing, and in a sense discreditable in a Christian to pay the least regard to it.

If you then ask him, why he so insists upon the fourth commandment, coupling in its support text upon text from Leviticus, Deuteronomy, &c., and that all this seems insincere, and also inconsistent with his professions to disregard it, he replies, that you mistake him, that he *does not* say you may *disregard* it, but that when we repeat the commandment that the Lord blessed the seventh day, we must, *in our minds*, substitute the word **FIRST** day, and say that "he hallowed *it*," because the first day was *substituted* by the apostles for the seventh day!

Here, you remind him, as to what Calvin says, that "this is only changing the day in contempt of the Jews, while you retain the same opinion of the holiness of a day" (see *ante*, page 91), and ask him for his authority, as to any command of substitution, whereby the seventh day, which was commanded to be kept holy for special reasons, should be thus changed for the first day. He is unable to give you any authority of Christ, or of the apostles, but points you out sundry texts, wherein to him, he says, it is *clear*, that the disciples met on the first day for worship. (See *ante*, pp. 37, 38, &c.) It is thus you are treated, and if you are not satisfied with

his mere assertion, you are pronounced an infidel, a disbeliever in the Scriptures; for his mind *continually recurs to the Judaizing view of the case*, and in *this rut his intellect ever runs*, and if for a moment lifted out of it, is but fated to *fall* into it again. Penn, in his usual forcible way, well describes this mental infirmity, when he says, as we have seen, "*to call that day*" (*i. e.* the seventh) "*MORAL, and make it alterable, is ridiculous.*"

Some may doubt how any apostolic *command* could dispense with the obligation of the fourth commandment (were it *moral*, when in truth it is simply *ceremonial*), any more than that an apostolic *command* could dispense with any of the nine, which are admitted to be *moral*, and for reasons irrespective of the fact that they are incorporated in the Decalogue.

But this cannot be disputed, that nothing short of an apostolic command unequivocally expressed (and so expressed, were that possible, as to harmonize with Paul's declaration to the Romans—xiv. 5, 6), to keep the fourth commandment, by *substituting* the first for the seventh day, would be binding on mankind.

WE have now shown the perfect lawfulness, in a religious point of view, of unrestrained locomotion upon the first day of the week, whether the freedom of physical action relates to ourselves, or to the running of passenger cars upon the street.

It, therefore, follows that all legislation, adverse to this right, is as unconstitutional as it is iniquitous. It is a shallow pretence, to say, that this despotic restriction must find its justification, in the right of all States to impose that which tends to the alleged promo-

tion of the public good. This is begging the question, and is merely the enforcement of the plea, by which tyranny, be it civil or religious, has ever sought to palliate its action. History is full of such examples; they are the dark spots upon the sands of time, where blood has been shed, where the struggle between right and wrong has taken place too often, alas! in favor of the wrong.

If, therefore, there is no *inherent* immorality—if that which it is sought to prohibit upon one day of the week, is *morally* lawful, nay, as we have said, perhaps commendable, to do upon any other, no legislation can make it criminal or punishable. The whole question turns upon the morality or immorality of the act of volition sought to be restrained, and in this distinction there is that well-defined boundary, which, if over-leaped, makes legislation unlawful and tyrannous.


Man in society surrendered certain rights which, in a state of nature, he enjoyed, and others he did not surrender, because inalienable. He never surrendered that which related to the exercise of volition, or gave others the right to declare that immoral, improper, and to be prohibited, upon any one day of the seven, which was moral and proper, and not to be prohibited upon any of the six days of the week.

But the advocate of prohibition says, “I have a right to worship God upon the first day of the week according to the dictates of my conscience, and *you* have no right to disturb me in its enjoyment.” To which he, who seeks the country by his own or a public conveyance, replies, “I do not wish to disturb your rights, or to invade your house of worship, or to impose any other creed than that which you have chosen. I prefer worshipping God at all times, or I prefer to worship

him some other day of the week, or in the early morning before your service may begin, but *you* must not disturb *me* in the enjoyment of *my* right, if in its pursuit I use such lawful means as are within my reach. It is possible that in the pursuit, I may disturb *you*, but not others whose nervous sensibilities may not be so acute; but if I am seeking a legitimate end by legitimate means, and creating no greater confusion than is absolutely unavoidable, and that the use of the most available mechanical contrivances may permit, and all this peaceably and without malice, I infringe no privilege of yours. If you have the right to restrain my means of locomotion, whether in walking or riding, in driving or in being driven, you may, if you have the power and choose, limit me to the confines of my own dwelling, and revive against my civil and religious liberties the most odious laws that ever disgraced a government that was not a despotism."

In conclusion, we remark that right must ever triumph in the end; senseless bigotry may retard reform, but it never yet won the day against enlightened public sentiment.

Let all who now despond take courage, for the hour of deliverance draweth nigh.



A P P E N D I X.

THE following extracts, of too great length for insertion in the body of the work, are from the writings of the late Rev. Frederick W. Robertson, incumbent of Trinity Chapel, Brighton, England, a man beloved by all who knew him for the consistent purity of his life, and esteemed for the scholarship, fearlessness, and ability of his pulpit ministrations, but whose career was brief. He died in August, 1853, at the age of thirty-seven.

The American editor of his sermons remarks of him :

“The Rev. Frederick W. Robertson,—whose beautiful life and early death have left the deepest impression of love, admiration, and regret on all who knew him,—finished his career on the very threshold of middle age, having exercised his sacred calling, during the last years of his life, at Brighton, where the effect of his ministry will long be felt by all classes, and where the seed of righteousness he sowed will yield increasing harvests when all personal memory of him must have passed away. . . . But, beside the effect produced by his public ministry and personal intercourse on the more educated classes who came within his influence, Mr. Robertson obtained a power for good over the workingmen and mechanics of Brighton, which makes his name a watchword still among them, full of Divine inspiration, of strength, and efficacy. His deep respect and tender love for humanity, induced him and enabled him to become a friend to the laboring population of the city where he lived, such as they may hardly hope in each of their individual lives to find again.

“With the strongest feelings for their peculiar wants, he had a wise and true perception of their duties and compensations; his sympathy for them never betrayed him into injustice to others,

and the temperate soundness and manly sobriety of his judgment, prevented his genuine and deep tenderness of feeling from ever becoming that species of pseudo-philanthropy, which, in its championship of the rights of one class forgets the claims of all men, and becomes a bitter sort of social fanaticism, which has nothing in common with the spirit of Christ.

“The death of this man was assuredly his own exceeding great reward. To all who knew him, it must be a lifelong loss, but sadly softened by the remembrance of his excellence.”

Mr. Robertson's sermons, which are not excelled by any similar compositions for boldness, clearness, and comprehensiveness, are read by a constantly increasing circle of admirers. The discourse, from which we quote, is upon Romans xiv. 5, 6, with which text our readers will have, ere this, become tolerably familiar, and was preached when the excitement ran very high in England upon the proposal for opening the Crystal Palace upon Sundays. He has the courage to maintain that the Apostle means just what he says, that every day applies with equal force to the Jewish seventh as the Christian first day. The word courage, we repeat, because we are disposed to contrast the intrepidity of his utterance, and which receives an impulse from the fearless spirit of the great Apostle himself, with, to use the mildest term, the timidity of many other commentators upon the sacred text, who, wedded to a preconceived theory, or fearful to alarm the prejudices of their readers, have either passed in silence a portion of the passage in question, or apprehensive that the frank interpretation of the remainder would injure what they choose to regard as the *cause* of the Christian Sabbath, have presented the less obvious for the plainer explication; a treatment, which in this scanning and keenly critical age, when the very foundations of truth are undergoing investigation afresh, is shortsighted and damaging to the side they espouse, to morality, and to the dearest interests of religion itself.

Let that great jury, the eager generation of inquiring minds, now beginning its career, earnest in the pursuit of truth, disposed to question rather than assent, inclined to distrust rather than to repose confidence, but doubt the credibility of the testimony offered for its consideration; let it suspect an inclination to suppress or gloss; let it believe that in the opinion of the advocates of a particular theory, the appearance of consistency demands the forced

construction of a word or a sentence, and the moral and religious history of a century may by its verdict be forever changed.

All honor, therefore, to that candor of soul, whose purity of Christian motive none can doubt, which, without being captious, speaks forth its convictions in the belief that truth honestly spoken cannot harm.

EXTRACTS FROM A SERMON PREACHED ON ROMANS xiv. : 5, 6.

“It has been maintained that the Sabbath is a Jewish institution; in its strictness, at all events, not binding on a Christian community. It has been urged with much force that we cannot consistently refuse to the poor man, publicly, that right of recreation which, privately, the rich man has long taken without rebuke, and with no protest on the part of the ministers of Christ. And it has been said, that such places of recreation will tend to humanize, which, if not identical with Christianizing the population, is at least a step towards it.

“Upon such a subject where truth does not lie upon the surface, it cannot be out of place, if a minister of Christ endeavors to direct the minds of his congregation towards the formation of an opinion; not dogmatically, but humbly, remembering always that his own temptation is, from his very position as a clergyman, to view such matters, not so much in the broad light of the possibilities of actual life, as with the eyes of a recluse; from a clerical and ecclesiastical, rather than from a large and human point of view. For no minister of Christ has a right to speak oracularly. All that he can pretend to do is to give his judgment, as one that has obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful. And on large national subjects there is, perhaps, no class so ill-qualified to form a judgment with breadth as we, the clergy of the Church of England, accustomed as we are, to move in the narrow circle of those who listen to us with forbearance and deference, and mixing but little in real life, till in our cloistered and inviolable sanctuaries we are apt to forget that it is one thing to lay down rules for a religious clique, and another to legislate for a great nation.

. . . “No one, I believe, who would read St. Paul’s own writings with unprejudiced mind, could fail to come to the conclusion that he considered the Sabbath abrogated by Christianity. Not merely in its stringency, but totally repealed.

“For example, see Col. ii. 16, 17; observe, he counts the Sabbath-day among those institutions of Judaism which were shadows, and of which Christ was the realization, the substance, or ‘body,’ and he bids the Colossians remain indifferent to the judgment which would be pronounced upon their non-observance of such days. ‘Let no man judge you with respect to . . . the Sabbath-days.’ More decisively in the text. For, it has been contended that in the former passage, ‘Sabbath-days’ refers simply to the Jewish Sabbaths, which were superseded by the Lord’s day; and that the Apostle does not allude at all to the new institution, which it is supposed had superseded it. Here, however, there can be no such ambiguity. ‘One man esteemeth *every* day alike,’ and he only says let him be fully persuaded in his own mind. ‘Every’ day must include first days as well as last days of the week; Sundays as well as Saturdays.

“And again he even speaks of scrupulous adherence to particular days, as if it were giving up the very principle of Christianity. ‘Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years. I am afraid of you lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain,’ so that his objection was not to Jewish days, but to the very principle of attaching intrinsic sacredness to any days. All forms and modes of particularizing the Christian life, he reckoned as bondage under the elements or alphabet of the law. And this is plain from the nature of the case. He struck not at a day, but a principle; else, if with all his vehemence and earnestness, he only meant to establish a new set of days in the place of the old, there is no intelligible principle for which he is contending, and that earnest apostle is only a champion for one day instead of another,—an assertor of the eternal sanctities of Sunday, instead of the eternal sanctities of Saturday. *Incredible, indeed!** Let us then understand the principle on which he declared the repeal of the Sabbath. He taught that the blood of Christ cleansed all things; therefore, there was nothing *especially* clean. Christ had vindicated all for God; therefore, there was nothing more God’s than another. For, to assert one thing as God’s more than another, is by implication to admit that other to be less God’s. . . . In early, we cannot say exactly how early times, the church of Christ felt the necessity of substituting something in place

* The *italics* are our own.

of ordinances which had been repealed. And the Lord's day arose, not a day of compulsory rest; not such a day at all as modern Sabbatarians suppose. Not a Jewish Sabbath; rather a day in many respects absolutely contrasted with the Jewish Sabbath.

“For the Lord's day sprung, not out of a transference of the Jewish Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday, but rather out of the idea of making the week an imitation of the life of Christ. With the early Christians, the great conception was that of following their crucified and risen Lord; they set as it were, the clock of time to the epochs of his history. Friday represented the death in which all Christians daily die, and Sunday the resurrection in which all Christians daily rise to a higher life. What Friday and Sunday were to the week, that Good Friday and Easter Sunday were to the year. And thus in larger and smaller cycles, all time represented to the early Christians the mystery of the cross and the risen life hidden in humanity. And as the sunflower turns from morning till evening to the sun, so did the church turn forever to her Lord, transforming week and year into a symbolical representation of his spiritual life.

“Carefully distinguish this, the true historical view of the origin of the Lord's day, from a mere transference of a Jewish Sabbath from one day to another. For St. Paul's teaching is distinct and clear, that the Sabbath is annulled, and to urge the observance of the day as indispensable to salvation, was, according to him, to Judaize, ‘to turn again to the weak and beggarly elements, wherunto they desired to be in bondage.’

“The second ground on which we are opposed to the ultra rigor of Sabbath observance, especially when it becomes coercive, is the danger of injuring the conscience. It is wisely taught by St. Paul that he who does anything with offence, *i. e.*, with a feeling that it is wrong: to him it is wrong, even though it be not wrong abstractedly. Therefore, it is always dangerous to multiply restrictions and requirements beyond what is essential, because men feeling themselves hemmed in, break the artificial barrier, but breaking it with a sense of guilt, do thereby become hardened in conscience, and prepared for transgression against commandments which are divine and of eternal obligation. Hence, it is that the criminal has so often, in his confessions, traced his deterioration in crime to the first step of breaking the Sabbath-day, and no doubt with accurate truth. But what

shall we infer from this? Shall we infer, as is so often done upon the platform and in religious books, that it proves the everlasting obligation of the Sabbath? or, shall we, with a far truer philosophy of the human soul, infer, in the language of St. Peter, that we have been laying on him 'a yoke which neither we nor our fathers were able to bear?'—in the language of St. Paul, that the 'motions of sin were by the law,' that the rigorous rule was itself the stimulating, moving cause of the sin; and that when the young man, worn out with his week's toil, first stole out into the fields, to taste the fresh breath of a spring-day, he did it with a vague, secret sense of transgression, and that having, as it were, drawn his sword in defiance against the established code of the religious world, he felt that from thence-forward there was for him no return, and so he became an outcast, his sword against every man and every man's sword against him? I believe this to be the true account of the matter; and believing it, I cannot but believe that the false, Jewish notions of the Sabbath-day which are prevalent have been exceedingly pernicious to the morals of the country.

"Lastly, I remind you of the danger of mistaking a 'positive' law for a moral one. The danger is that proportionably to the vehemence with which the law positive is enforced, the sacredness of moral laws is neglected. A positive law, in theological languages, is a law laid down for special purposes, and corresponds with statute laws in things civil. Thus laws of quarantine and laws of excise, depend for their force upon the will of the legislature, and when repealed are binding no more. But a moral law is one binding forever, which a statute law may declare, but can neither make nor unmake.

"Now when men are rigorous in the enforcement and reverence paid to laws positive, the tendency is to a corresponding indifference to the laws of eternal right. The written supersedes in their hearts the moral. The mental history of the ancient Pharisees, who observed the Sabbath, and tithed mint, anise, and cumin, neglecting justice, mercy, and truth, is the history of a most dangerous but universal tendency of the human heart. And so, many a man whose heart swells with what he thinks pious horror when he sees the letter delivered or the train run upon the Sabbath-day, can pass through the streets at night undepressed and unshocked by the evidences of the wide-spreading profligacy which has eaten deep into

his country's heart. And many a man who would gaze upon the domes of a Crystal Palace, rising above the trees, with somewhat the same feeling with which he would look on a temple dedicated to Juggernaut, and who would fancy that something of the spirit of an ancient prophet was burning in his bosom, when his lips pronounced the Woe! Woe! of a coming doom, would sit calmly in a social circle of English life and scarcely feel uneasy in listening to its uncharitableness and its slanders; would hear without one throb of indignation, the common dastardly condemnation of the weak for the sins which are venial in the strong; would survey the relations of the rich and poor in this country, and remain calmly satisfied that there is nothing false in them, unbrotherly, and wrong. No, my brethren! let us think clearly and strongly on this matter. It may be that God has a controversy with this people. It may be, as they say, that our Father will chasten us by the sword of the foreigner. But if He does, and if judgments are in store for our country, they will fall, not because the correspondence of the land is carried on upon the Sabbath day; nor because Sunday trains are not arrested by the legislature; nor because a public permission is given to the working classes for a few hours' recreation on the day of rest; but because we are selfish men; and because we prefer pleasure to duty, and traffic to honor; and because we love our party more than our church, and our church more than our Christianity, and our Christianity more than truth, and ourselves more than all. These are the things that defile a nation; but the labor and the recreation of its poor, these are not the things that defile a nation." (*Sermons*, 2d series, p. 190. Boston: Ticknor & Fields, 1858.)

The following extracts from Mr. Robertson's Biography will explain the circumstances under which the foregoing discourse was composed and preached.

"On his return from his usual absence during October, he found Brighton boiling over with excitement on the Sabbath question. It had been proposed to open the Crystal Palace on Sundays. It was at once inferred that Christianity was in mortal danger, and, to protect it from its death-wound, the whole religious phalanx of Brighton rallied around its standard. Large talking assemblies met together, and the wildest and most unfounded assertions were made. The 'Times' was accused of the grossest venality, because

it defended the throwing open of the Palace; but the accuser, a clergyman, was obliged to eat his words. Mr. Robertson alone stood against the torrent in behalf of Christian liberty. He did not, for several reasons, approve of the opening of the Palace on Sunday; but he did refuse to adopt arguments against it, based on the supposition of the non-abrogation of the Jewish Sabbath. He preached a sermon—‘The Sydenham Palace, and the Religious Non-Observance of the Sabbath’—on the whole subject, in which he declared that he had satisfied himself.”

In writing to a friend, he says :

“November 16, 1852.

“MY DEAR TOWER: As you will be here next week, I will not write you a volume, for nothing else would do. I preached on the subject on Sunday, satisfactorily to myself, at least, a thing which has occurred to me but once or twice in all my ministry; so I am thoroughly prepared with an opinion on a matter I have well considered. I will say at present I am resolved to sign no petition. Dr. V.’s pamphlet does not go to the root of the matter. I agree with him in viewing the move, so far as it is an *avowed* innovation, with great jealousy; but I cannot ask for a state enactment to reimpose a law which Christianity has repealed, without yielding the very principle of Christianity. Historically, the Lord’s day was not a transference of the Jewish Sabbath at all from one day to another. St. Paul, in Rom. xiv. 5, 6, speaks of a *religious non-observance* of the Sabbath; I cannot say or think that the Crystal Palace affair is a *religious non-observance*, believing it to be merely a lucrative speculation; nevertheless, I have nothing to do with that. The Sabbath is abrogated, and the observance of a day of rest is only a most wise human law now, not to be enforced by *penalties*. Besides, how dare we refuse a public concession to the poor man of a right of recreation which has been long assumed by the rich man with no protest or outcry from the clergy, who seem touched to the quick only when desecration, as they call it, is noisy and vulgar.”

[Mr. Tower suggested, in answer, Bishop Horsley’s critical treatment of the question, and to this letter he replied:]

“‘Horsley’s Sermons,’ I only vaguely remember. I am quite

at ease on the subject. The critical disposal of this or that text would not alter my views. I am certain of the genius and spirit of Christianity; certain of St. Paul's *root thoughts*, far more certain than I can be of the correctness or incorrectness of any isolated interpretation; and I must reverse all my conceptions of Christianity, which is the mind of Christ, before I can believe the Evangelico-Judaic theory; which is, that Mr. — may, without infringement of the fourth commandment, drive his carriage to church twice every Sunday, but a poor man may not drive his cart; that the two or three hours spent in the evening by a noble lord over venison, champagne, dessert, and coffee, are no desecration of the command; but the same number spent by an artisan over cheese and beer in a tea-garden will bring down God's judgment on the land. It is worse than absurd. It is the very spirit of that Pharisaism, which our Lord rebuked so sternly. And then men get upon platforms, as — did, and quietly assume that they are the religious, and that all who disagree, whether writers in the 'Times,' Sir R. Peel, or the 'sad exceptions,' of whom I was one, to which he alluded, are either neologians or hired writers! Better break a thousand Sabbaths than lie and slander thus! But the Sabbath of the Christian is the consecration of all time to God, of which the Jewish Sabbath was but the type and shadow. See Col. ii. 16, 17. Bishop Horsley's attempt to get over that verse is miserable, I remember."

To another he said, among other things, in reply:

"I hold this institution of the Lord's day to be a most precious and blessed one, not to be dispensed with except with danger; and, I believe, that no one who loves his country can look on any measure which is likely to decry its observance, or break through our English feeling towards it, without great misgiving and apprehension."

After enumerating other objections, he expresses himself as "strongly opposed to every endeavor to put down the Crystal Palace by petition or legislative enactments, on the three following grounds," and reiterates the positions taken in his sermon.

"I may much regret," he says, "the probable tendencies of this measure; but still I cannot try to forbid by law a sort of recreation for the poor man in public gardens and public picture galleries, which the rich man has freely allowed himself in private gardens and galleries, with no protest whatever from the clergy."

. . . "Whoever multiplies enactments beyond what is essential, tempts human conscience to transgression. . . . And I refuse to sign such a petition because to exalt a 'law positive,' that is, a law contrived for temporary special ends, into the rank of a moral law eternally binding, has always been the first step towards relaxing the reverence for that which is moral. . . . Speaking of the Pharisees, he says :

. . . "And so, in the same way, there is a tendency now to be very indignant about a poor man's spending Sunday afternoon in a tea-garden, whilst there is little zeal against the real damning sins of social life. . . . Why do they hold up hands of pious indignation when a train runs by, while more than one religious person in this town (Brighton, England), drives regularly to church on fine days as well as wet? Why do they say it is a crime to sacrifice a single policeman to the comfort of the community by making him work on the Sabbath, when their own servants are 'sacrificed,'—if it be a sacrifice,—in making their beds, cleaning their rooms, boiling their luxurious hot potatoes, &c., &c., and none of which are works of necessity, or works of mercy? . . . Why are they touched to the quick only when desecration of the Sabbath puts on a *vulgar* form? Because, as I said before, scrupulosity about laws 'positive,' generally slides into laxity about the eternal laws of right and wrong.

"For all these reasons, I am against the petition movement, and strongly against it. Besides, though I look jealously and suspiciously at the Crystal Palace plan, I am not yet certain that it may not be an improvement on the way in which the poorer classes at present spend their Sundays."

His biographer remarks: "And yet he was more particular in his observance of that day than many of his censurers. He has often walked ten miles and more to preach on a Sunday, rather than accept a carriage or take a fly, and this lest he should *cause his brother to offend.*"

Life and Letters of Frederick W. Robertson, incumbent of Trinity Chapel, Brighton. Edited by Stopford A. Brooke, late Chaplain, &c. Boston, 1865. Vol. ii. pp. 111-117.

I N D E X.

- Alexander, Rev. J. W., adverse to Sabbatism, 92.
Apostles meeting on first day does not make commandment moral, 120.
Augustine, St., 64.
Augsburg Confession, 79, 80.
- Barclay, 93.
Barnes, 51.
Barrow, Rev. Dr., on Decalogue, 20, 25.
Baxter, 25, 85.
Belsham, 57.
Beza, 78.
Blackley and Hawes's Commentary, 48.
Blue Laws. See also Swift, 123.
Bound, Rev. Dr., his celebrated sermon, 40, 68.
Bramhall, Archbishop, 93.
Brinley George, General Laws of Connecticut, 124.
Bucer, 78.
- Calvin favors Sunday sports, 93; also 54, 55, 86, 92, 96, 121.
Ceremonial Law, 24, 26.
Chalmers, 51, 58.
Charteris, 16.
Chemnitz, 78.
Chillingworth, 19.
Christians, Primitive, 60.
Coleman, Rev. Dr., on "Sabbath," 70.
Colossians. See Texts.
- Constantine's Edict, 61.
Coquerel, A., 83.
Cox, Robert, on "Sabbath Laws," 12, 25.
Cox, Robert, on the Glasgow clergy, 55.
Cranmer, 76, 84, 104.
- Daillé's Commentaries, 52.
Dyer, Mary, the Martyr, 121.
- Eadie, 58.
Episcopal Church and Fourth Commandment, 69.
Eusebius, 61.
- Faldo and Penn, 118.
Fathers, Sabbath and Sunday, distinguished by them, 63, 64.
Fourth Commandment not moral, says Penn, 119.
Fourth Commandment inoperative, 125.
Fox, George, 121.
French Protestant Catechism, 83.
- Geology, as connected with Sabbath, 11, 12.
Gillies, Rev. Dr., 53.
- Hallam, 67.
Hanna, Rev. Dr., 16.
Hallywell, 118.

- Heidelberg Catechism, 80, 82.
 Helvetic Confession, 83.
 Hengstenberg, 77.
 Hetherington, Rev. Dr., 80.
 Heylin, Peter, 75, 121.
 Hoadley, C. J., "New Haven's Set-
 tling," 124.
 Hodge, Rev. Dr., 51.
 Horsley, Bishop, 138, 139.
- Ignatius, 62.
 Institutes, Calvin's, 86.
 Irenæus, 20.
 Ironside, Bishop, 121.
- Johnson, Dr., attack on Milton, 96.
 Justin, 62, 64.
- Kenrick, John, on Primeval Sab-
 bath, 12.
- Locke, 58.
 Lorimer, Rev. Dr., 56.
 Luther, 72.
- Macduff, Rev. Dr., approves of open-
 ing parks on Sunday, 16, 17.
 Macleod, Rev. Dr. Norman, his man-
 ly course on the Sunday question,
 15.
 Macleod, Rev. Dr. Norman, on the
 Decalogue, 16.
 McCrie, Rev. Dr., 25.
 Melancthon, 76, 79, 80.
 Milton, 19, 78, 96.
 Montanists, 62.
 Moral Laws, 22, 24; immutable, 31.
 Morality of Fourth Commandment,
 21.
- Neander, 60, 62.
 New England Laws, severity of their
 character, 121.
 Newton, 58.
- Owen, Rev. Dr., on Patriarchal Sab-
 bath, 19.
- Palatine Catechism, 82.
 Patriarchal Sabbath denied, 82.
 Penn and the "Sabbath," 117.
 Penn asserts Fourth Commandment
 not moral, 119.
 Pilgrim Fathers' and Forefathers'
 day, 124.
 Plumtre, Rev. E. W., on Sunday,
 15.
 Plymouth Records, 121.
 Powell, Rev. B., 11, 21, 23, 31, 38,
 49, 50, 60, 61, 63, 64, 66, 70, 77, 80.
 Presbyterian Review admits Sabbath
 is ceremonial, not moral, 26.
 Prideaux, 78.
 Primeval Sabbath, no evidence of,
 12.
 Primitive Christians, 60.
 Puritan and the Quaker, 115.
- Quaker and the Puritan, 115.
 Quakers, New England Laws against,
 121.
- Racovian Catechism, 82.
 Robertson, Rev. Frederick W., 133.
 Rice, Rev. Dr. N. L., 92.
- Sabbath, if binding, is strictly so, 31.
 Rev. Dr. Bound, founder
 of Puritan Sabbath, 40,
 68.
 as connected with creation,
 11.
 its compulsory observance
 dangerous, 41.
 Rev. Dr. Coleman on, 70.
 Christian, a phrase, Jew-
 ish in its spirit, 118.
 no distinction between it
 and the seventh day, 29.
 no evidence of its sanctifi-
 cation prior to Moses,
 10, 15.
 and Geology, 11.
 Luther's views, 19, 72.
 non-morality of, 24, 26.
 if moral, cannot be chan-
 ged, 32.
 opinions of Neander, 60.
 not Patriarchal, 19, 20.

- Sabbath, use of word repudiated by Penn, 117.
 permanency of disproved, 9.
 Presbyterian Review (Scottish), admits it to be ceremonial, not moral, 26.
 no evidence of a primeval, 11.
 Puritan, arose after the Reformation, 67.
 Puritan, and Rev. Dr. Bound, 40, 68.
 testimony of Reformers, 72.
 totally repealed, 133.
 rigor of injurious to conscience, 135.
 natural impulse to adore a Supreme Being, 21.
 Rev. Dr. South asserts not morally binding, 25.
 special reasons for its enactment, 28.
 no scriptural warrant of substitution, 35.
 and Sunday, distinguished by Fathers, 63.
 and Sunday, extract from Hallam, 68.
 is identical with the seventh day, 76.
 Swift's system of laws, 123.
 exclusively Jewish, 72.
 festival of joy, 60.
- Sanctity, periodical, 23.
 St. Barnabas, 60.
 St. Paul in Colossians, Galatians, Romans. See Texts.
 Scott, Commentaries, 53.
 Seventh, the figure mystical, 10.
 Seventh day, not morally binding, 127.
- Seventh day, its alleged sanctification denied, 15.
 Seventh day is identical with Sabbath, 52, 76.
 South, Rev. Dr., on Fourth Commandment, 25.
 Stuart, Rev. Dr. Moses, 54.
 Sunday, Rev. E. H. Plumtre on "Sunday" in Contemporary Review, 15.
 Sunday as to the disciples, 36.
 Sunday festival of joy with Primitive Christians, 62.
 Sunday nor Sabbath morally binding according to St. Paul. See Texts.
 Sylloge Confess., 81, 82.
- Taylor, Jeremy, 26.
 Tertullian, 20, 62.
 Texts, silence as to or suppression of, 55.
 misapplication of, 43.
 ROMANS, xiv. 5th and 6th, 43, 49, 51, 54, 56, 85, 87, 89, 103, 127, 133, 138.
 GAL. iv. 10 and 11; 43, 46, 54, 89, 118.
 COL. ii. 16 and 17; 43, 48, 49, 52, 54, 55, 74, 85, 87, 89, 118, 120, 124.
- Theology, a science of precedents, 125.
 Thorold, Rev. Mr., 16.
 Tyndale, 78.
- Warburton, Bishop, 67.
 Wardlaw, Rev. Dr., 57.
 Westminster Assembly, 101.
 Whately, Archbishop, 101.



Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 01003 3118