

THE
CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT:

—OR—

THE SUNDAY, THE SABBATH,

THE
CHANGE, AND RESTITUTION.

~~~~~  
BY W. H. LITTLEJOHN.  
~~~~~

—
STEAM PRESS
OF THE SEVENTH DAY ADVENTIST PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION,
BATTLE CREEK, MICH.:

1873.

CATALOGUE

Of Books, Pamphlets, Tracts, &c. Issued by the Seventh-
Day Adventist Publishing Association,
Battle Creek, Mich.

BY Vault
125
.25
1893
6.2
HER.



LIBRARY of

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY



207411

In board, 50 cts., in paper, 30 cts.

HYMNS AND SPIRITUAL SONGS for Camp-meetings and other Religious Gatherings. Compiled by Eld. James White. 196 pp. Bound, 50 cts., paper, 25 cts.

THE UNITED STATES IN PROPHECY. By U. Smith. Bound, 40 cts.; paper, 20 cts

REPUTATION OF THE AGE TO COME. By J. H. Waggoner. Price, 20 cts. (See 3d page of cover.)

THE

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT:

—OR—

THE SUNDAY, THE SABBATH,

THE

CHANGE, AND RESTITUTION.

~~~~~  
BY W. H. LITTLEJOHN.  
~~~~~

STEAM PRESS

OF THE SEVENTH DAY ADVENTIST PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION,
BATTLE CREEK, MICH.:

1873.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1873, by the
S. D. A. P. ASSOCIATION,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington

PREFACE.

As it has been thought best that the following articles, which have already been published in the *Christian Statesman*, the *Sabbath Recorder*, and the *Advent Review*, should have a still wider circulation, it has been at last decided to present them to the public in the form of the present tract.

The occasion of their first appearance was as follows: Within the last few years, a party has been organized in this country, whose especial aims are the amendment of the Constitution so that the names of God and Christ may appear in it; the recognition in the same instrument of the Bible as the fountain of national law; the securing of the reading of the Bible in the common schools; and the enforcement, by law, of the observance of Sunday as the Christian Sabbath. Slowly, but steadily, the friends of this movement are bringing it to the public notice and enlarging the circle of its active supporters. A single glance at the existing state of affairs reveals the fact that at no distant date the issues which these men are making up will be the ones over which contending parties will wage fierce contest. Already the press of the country, by the drift of events which they find themselves incapable of controlling, are compelled almost daily to record transactions which are not only calling the attention of the people to a conflict which is both imminent and irrepressible, but which are also continually adding fuel to a flame which even now burns with a fierceness and vol-

ume indicative of its future scope and power. In view of these facts, the writer of the subjoined articles, while taking no particular interest in party politics merely as such, nevertheless felt a profound conviction that the time had come, in the providence of God, when Christian men should offer a solemn protest against a state of affairs which, while inaugurated ostensibly in the interest of the kingdom of Christ, will ultimately prove most destructive of religious liberty. This he therefore attempted to do purely from the stand-point of the Bible. Through the courtesy of the editor of the *Christian Statesman*, which paper is the organ of the amendment party, the following communications were permitted to appear in the columns of that periodical. The reader will discover that they treat the subject almost exclusively from the stand-point of the Sabbath; and, as he proceeds in his examination of the positions taken, the writer will most earnestly pray that the God of the Sabbath, in whose interest they have been penned, will lead him to right conclusions.

W. H. L.

Allegan, Mich.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

ARTICLE I.

ONE of the marked features of our time is the tendency toward the discussion of the Sabbath question. Nor can this subject be treated with more indifference in the future than it is at the present. Agitation, ceaseless, unrelenting, excited, and finally severe, is rendered certain by the temper of all the parties to the controversy. On the one hand, the friends of Sunday observance are dissatisfied with the laxity of the regard which is paid it, and are loud in their demands for statutory relief; denouncing upon the nation the wrath of God, in unstinted measure, should their petition be set at naught. On the other hand, the enemies of the Sabbath institution, in all of its phases, are becoming bold in their protestations against a legalized Sabbath, as something extremely oppressive and inexpressibly intolerable in its very nature.

In all parts of the country, activity characterizes the camps of both these contending hosts. Everywhere the elements of strength—hitherto unorganized, and inefficient to the accomplishment of great results because of that fact—are being brought out and employed in effective service.

Cincinnati, Chicago, New York, Boston, San Francisco, in their turn, become the theaters

where the skirmish lines of future combatants, on a larger scale, are brought into occasional collision. The ordinary appliances of dinners, processions, national and State conventions, city, town, and district societies, are rapidly becoming the order of the day, while those who are brought within the range of their influence are stimulated and aroused, on the one hand, by earnest appeals to the Bible and religion, and on the other, to natural rights and individual conscience. So far has the matter now proceeded, so much has already been said, so fully has the contest been opened, that retrogression means defeat to either the one or the other party. And as to compromise, this can never be attained, from the fact that the position from which both parties are now seeking to emerge is that of toleration. Why, says the ardent advocate of the Sunday law, it is not sufficient that I observe the day of rest with strictness and fidelity in my own family. I owe a duty to the public; I am a member of a great Commonwealth, which God treats as a personality, and if I do not see to it that the statute laws of the land are in harmony with, and enforce the requirements of, the law of God, this nation, like all others which have ignored their obligation to legalize and enforce his will in matters of this nature, will be devoted to a ruin for which I shall be accountable, and in which I shall be a sharer. Moved by such considerations as these, his purse is open and his labors untiring for the accomplishment of that which now appears to him to be in the line of both individual interest and religious duty.

Again, his neighbor across the way being, perhaps, of the free-thinking order, and an ardent

admirer of the complete separation of Church and State, wonders that he has so long consented to that abridgment of his personal liberty which has been made by statutory provision, and which has hitherto compelled him to surrender much of what he calls natural right to the whims and caprices of those with whom he differs so widely on all questions bearing upon the relation of man to his God. Henceforth, says he, I pledge my means, my influence, and my untiring effort, to a revolution which, if need be, shall shake society to its very center, rather than to consent to the legalized perpetuation of an institution which requires on my part an acknowledgment of a faith which I have never held, and of doctrines which I detest.

Of course, all do not share alike, either in the enthusiasm or the animosity which characterizes certain individuals when entering upon a conflict like the one in question. In every party is found more or less of the aggressive and the conservative elements. Especially is this true in the incipient stages of its history. Some men are necessarily more earnest than are others in everything which they undertake. Some are bold, headlong, defiant; others, cautious, slow, and timid. One class leaps to its conclusions first, and looks for its arguments afterward; the other moves circumspectly, and, while it gives a general assent to the desirability of results, finds a world of trouble in deciding upon what means ought to be employed in securing them. One is forever foaming because of delay, and fears defeat as the result of hesitation; while the other protests against too rapid and ill-considered action.

Such is, at present, the condition more espe-

cially of the positive side of the Sunday movement in this country. The strong men and the weak men, the resolute men and the undecided men, are struggling for the mastery of the policy in the camp. One sort discovers no difficulties in the way of immediate and complete success. Lead us to the front, say they, our cause is just, and all that is necessary to success is the courage and inspiration of battle. But hold, say the others, not too fast; public sentiment is not prepared for the issue. And besides, we are not so clear in our minds as are you respecting the lengths to which this controversy should be carried, and the line of argument which ought to be pursued. Why, say the first, what need can there be of more delay? Nothing is more manifest than the means which we ought to employ for the accomplishment of our purpose. Our work is simply that of enforcement. Has not God said in so many words, in the decalogue, "Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work"? Is not this language explicit? Is it not a part of that law which nearly all Christians acknowledge to be binding? Do we not enforce the observance of the remaining commandments by statutory provision? And is it not equally clear that this should be treated in like manner? Why delay, then? Why not move upon the enemy's works with the inspiring battle-cry of "God in the Constitution?" Why not at once clamor for the amendment of that instrument, and for the passage of statutes by which the better observance of the Christian Sabbath can be secured? Give us these, and our victory is won. Our

Sunday mails, and trains, and travel, and public amusements of every name and nature, can be removed at a single stroke. As a result, the nation will stand higher in the estimation of God; and the people, having acknowledged his supremacy, will have taken a long step in the direction of final renovation and conversion.

But wait, says another, not too fast in matters of so great moment. Please bear in mind the fact that this contest is to be one of words and arguments. Your danger is that of underrating the capacity and intelligence of our opponents. If you expect to meet them successfully, it must be by a logic which will bear criticism and examination.

As an individual, I am by no means certain that the Bible authority for our movement is so clear and abundant as you seem to imagine.

The law which you quote in justification of our course is truly a Sabbath law, and its import is unmistakable; but, unfortunately, instead of making for our cause, it is diametrically opposed to your efforts, and plainly declares that the *seventh day* of the week is the Sabbath of the Lord, whereas you are unmistakably occupying before the world a position no less awkward than that of insisting that the first, and not the seventh, is the one which should be enforced by legal enactment. While, therefore, I am in full sympathy with the general purposes of this movement, I am convinced that, before we shall succeed, we must rest it upon a different basis than the fourth commandment. So far as my individual preferences go—in order to avoid the difficulties which lie along the line of Scripture justification for our conduct—I suggest that we rest it upon the

broad principle of social necessity, relying for our success upon the generally conceded fact that *rest* upon one day in seven is indispensable to the well-being of individuals and communities.

But, says a third party, while I agree with you in condemning the proposition that the fourth commandment, as originally given, furnishes us warrant for the observance of the first day of the week, I can never consent to the idea of its unconditional repeal; for without it in some form we are entirely without a Sabbath law; a condition of things which would be deplorable indeed. I therefore conclude that that law has been brought over into our dispensation, and so far changed as to adapt it to the enforcement of the observance of the first day of the week, agreeably to the example of Christ and the apostles. With this view, I can safely predict power and triumph for the grand scheme upon which we have entered. Give us a Sabbath of divine appointment and backed by a sacred precept, and victory is certain. But so sure as we lower the controversy to one which is merely corporeal in its nature and results, and pecuniary in its considerations, defeat is written upon our banners, since you have taken from us all the inspiration of the contest, and dried up the very springs of our enthusiasm and courage.

What the final result of such discussions will be, there is little room for doubt. That a revolution is fairly inaugurated in the minds of the people, it is now too late to question. What remains to be done, therefore, is simply to execute the grand purpose for which it has been instituted.

That this cannot be accomplished by a merely negative policy, has been illustrated too many

times in history to require further demonstration. Men, having once entered the field of conflict, universally become less and less scrupulous in regard to the means employed to secure the desired object. In the primary meetings of a great movement, the voice of the conservative may be listened to with attention and respect; but should he give expression to the same prudent counsel upon the battle field, when the sword of the enemy is red with the blood of his compatriots, his utterances would be silenced in a storm of indignation such as would threaten his very existence, and consign his name to the list of those whose fidelity was at least questionable, and whose sympathy with the common foe was far from being impossible.

So, likewise, with the half-way men in this incipient struggle, which is about to throw open the gates of controversy upon one of those religious questions which, above all others, is sure to be characterized, first, by uncharitableness, and finally, by bitter hate and animosity. With each advancing month, their hold upon the confidence of their associates will grow less and less, and the counsels of their party will come more and more fully under the control of those positive, nervous spirits, who are swept along by convictions so deep and strong that they will bear down everything before them.

Nevertheless, candid reader, it is by no means certain that there may not be much of truth in the positions assumed by the more moderate men in the existing issue. At all events—since we have not as yet entered into that impassioned state of the public mind from which calm deliberation is banished by the necessity of immediate

action—let us pause here for a moment, and carefully weigh the correctness of the suggestions presented above.

Is it worth the while to enter the lists in the approaching struggle, in order to secure the results proposed?

I say proposed, because, of course, the result is as yet more or less uncertain; nevertheless, we incline to the opinion that the end desired will be substantially realized, so far as appearance is concerned. Yet this will not be brought about in a moment, nor will it be accomplished without a hard fight. It must, from the very necessity of the case, be a contest which will enter, divide, and distract families, and which will alienate a large portion of the community from the other. But, with a united and well-drilled ministry, on the one hand, backed by the compact organization of their respective churches, and opposed by a heterogeneous mass of discordant elements, there can be little doubt as to final success.

First, then, let us suppose that the policy inaugurated shall be that of the class represented above as desiring to strip the subject of its religious garb, and to array it in the habiliments of mere policy and temporal considerations. Are the benefits reasonably to be expected from such a course such as would warrant the enthusiasm now manifested by the advocates of the proposed reformation? We believe not. In fine, so certain are we of it, that we should not hesitate to predict immediate and perfect paralysis to their efforts, so soon as they should inscribe this doctrine upon their banners. How many of the gentlemen in question are really so profoundly interested in the social status of the working-man

that their zeal in his behalf could be wrought up to the point of sacrificing time and money, and of devoting voice and pen to the mere work of giving him a septenary day of physical rest? What satisfaction would be afforded them by the reflection that, as the result of legal enactment, the carefully appointed police in our great cities should be able to meet each other on the boundary lines of their respective beats, on the morning of Sunday, with the accustomed salutation, All is quiet! and cessation from labor is complete in all parts of the great metropolis? Who would highly prize a coerced rest of this sort? What particular gratification would be afforded to the religious world, as they gather, in their costly churches, by the thought that the great mass of the people were quietly sleeping, or lazily lounging in the various places of their retirement? Certainly there is nothing in such a state of things which offers results sufficiently desirable either to reward them for the great sacrifices with which it would be necessary that they should be purchased, in the first instance, or to secure that patient continuance in vigilant perseverance which would be required to insure the perpetuity of an order of things at once so compulsory and so precarious. We say, therefore, that to rest the contest upon this issue would be simply to falsify the facts. It is not the physical consideration of rest, in any large degree, which animates the mind and strengthens the resolve of those engaged in the newly organized reform. No; there is something behind all this. The informing soul, that which electrifies, stimulates, and nerves to action, is the profound conviction that this is a religious movement; that which is

sought is the honoring of God by the observance of a Sabbath such as is found in his word. If this be not so, if the higher idea of Christian worship as the primary one is not paramount in this matter, then the whole thing is a farce, from beginning to end. Not only so; if what is sought is merely the improvement of bodily condition, then the plan suggested is, in many cases, far from being the best which might be offered. Take, if you please, our over-populated cities, with the dense masses of human beings who are there crowded together, under most unfavorable circumstances, many of them perishing for lack of pure air, and others pale and sickly for want of exposure to the vivifying rays of the sun, which is continually shut out from their gaze by the massive piles of masonry by which they are inclosed; who will not say that, leaving the spiritual out of consideration, and setting aside the idea of the sanctity of the day, it would be a blessing incalculably greater for them, should provision be made whereby this should become to them a day of recreation, while wandering amid flowers, and over hills, and through groves, instead of one in which, either from necessity or choice, they should still perpetuate the confinement which has already nearly proved fatal in their cases?

ARTICLE II.

Turning from the secular phase of this subject, let us regard it for a moment from the religious stand-point.

Is there anything in the purpose itself which is worthy of the cost at which alone it can be realized? In other words, since the object aimed at is ostensibly that of bringing the nation up to the point of a general regard for the first day of the week as a Sabbath, would such a result be one which should be profoundly desired?

We reply that this will depend altogether upon circumstances. In this case, as in the first, mere cessation from labor on that day, which is not prompted by a regard for the will and approval of Jehovah, could afford no relief to a nation which is seeking to avert divine displeasure, since there is no element in the act itself calculated to recommend it to the favor of Heaven. To illustrate: The individual sentenced to solitary confinement in the State's Prison is precluded from the possibility of laboring on the Sunday; will any one therefore argue that there is any merit in his inaction on that day? Again: The heathen nations, in common with the majority of the Christian world, have many of them regarded the Sunday as a sacred day; should we presume, therefore, that they are looked upon by the Almighty more complacently on this account? You answer, No; and urge, as a reason for this reply, that they have been engaged in a false worship, and have not been actuated by any re-

gard for the true God. Where, then, is the line? Manifestly, right here: The men who honor God by the keeping of any day must be prompted by the conviction that they are doing it in strict and cheerful obedience to a divine command.

Here, then, is the crucible in which we will try the metal of this modern movement. If, when their grand design shall be accomplished—as the result of many labors and toils—and, even though before their purpose is attained, it shall be found necessary for them to reach their object through a conflict intensely bitter and impassioned on the part of the opposition, we shall witness the spectacle of a nation bowing submissively to the *law and will of God* in the humble and fervent observance of a weekly rest of *divine appointment*, it will be the grandest triumph which history has recorded. No treasure of gold—we were about to say no sacrifice of life—would be too great a price to pay for so glorious a victory. Let it be understood, however, that this must be a voluntary and intelligent worship on the part, at least, of the mass of the people.

But will this be true, should our friends compass the great object of their ambition? Let us inquire once more after their intentions. What is it they advocate? The answer is, A universal regard for the first day of the week, as the Sabbath of the Lord.

But what is the authority upon which the majority of them rest their argument for the proposed observance? Is it merely pecuniary advantage? No, say they, it is out of a sincere regard for the God of Heaven, and a conscientious desire to fulfill his law. But this implies religious duty. So far, so good. It also clearly sets forth

the fact that God has a law, and a Sabbath which it enforces. The appeal, therefore, must inevitably be to that law, as the proper instrument from which to instruct the people.

To that they must be brought, again and again. Its import must be patiently taught, its sacredness must be thoroughly inculcated. Let them but be satisfied by *sound logic* that the divine statute is explicit in its demands for a strict observance of the first day of the week, let them be thoroughly educated into the idea that they are under its jurisdiction, and let them be instructed that this whole movement proceeds upon this religious conviction, and you have laid a foundation which will uphold a structure of imposing dimensions and enduring character, the cornerstone whereof is the fear of God, and an acknowledgment of his presence in the affairs of men. But how is it in the case in question? Is the commandment of a nature such as to support, in every particular, the tenets presented by the reform under consideration? This is really the vital point. Let it speak for itself. It is the fourth of the decalogue which is urged. "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." If this is not a Sabbath law, then

there is none in existence; for, *mark it*, this is the only instance in all the Scriptures in which it will be claimed by any one that we have a positive command for the observance of the Sabbath. So far, therefore, as the first day of the week is concerned, its friends have this advantage, that, if they but succeed in resting it upon this commandment, their labor is ended; for it—*i. e.*, the commandment—has no rival. All that is needed, consequently, is a clear, pointed exegesis showing that the day in question is the one, the observance of which the divine Lawgiver has required. But, unfortunately, such an exegesis would be beset with difficulties. To begin with, Who shall be able to harmonize the declaration which the commandment contains in these words, “The *seventh day* is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work,” with the utterance of those who, on the contrary, say that the *first day* is the Sabbath of the Lord, and must be observed as such? The divine Lawgiver—as if determined that there shall be no room for debate in regard to the day which he had in his mind—has identified it in a manner such as to leave no room for dispute. In the first place, he announces his willingness that six days of the week should be devoted to secular employment, “Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work:” then follows the disjunctive, “but—the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work.” Here it is made plain that it is the “Sabbath of the Lord” upon which we are to rest. Again, passing over the intermediate space, we come to the close of the commandment, in which he sets forth three important transactions by which that was

constituted the Sabbath, and by which it may ever be recognized. He says, “For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.” That is, the day which we are to keep as the Sabbath of the Lord is the one upon which he *rested*, which he *blessed*, and which he *hallowed*. Therefore, before the first day of the week can, with any show of reason, be kept in fulfillment of this commandment, *i. e.*, before it can be regarded as the “Sabbath of the Lord,” it must be shown that, at some time, God has rested upon it, blessed, and hallowed it. But this would be a difficult task; for not only are the Scriptures silent, so far as the affirmation of this fact is concerned with reference to the first day of the week, but, on the contrary, they positively declare that it was the very day upon which Jehovah *entered upon the stupendous undertaking of making a world*. Should additional evidence be required on this point, *i. e.*, that the last day of the week, and not the first, is the one which Jehovah intended to sanctify, we have but to cite the intelligent reader to the fact that Moses, the prophets, the Lord himself, the holy women after his death, and the whole Jewish nation—in whose language the decalogue was given—are, and have been, unanimous in placing this construction upon the Sabbatic law.

Should any, however, perceiving the dilemma into which they are thrown by the effort to enforce their view in the use of the law, as it was originally given, seek relief in the position that it was so far amended in the days of Christ as to admit of the substitution of the day of his resur-

rection for that of God's rest at the end of creation week, we reply, If such a fact can be clearly made out, it would certainly furnish the very help which is needed just at this juncture, and without which confusion must inevitably characterize the movements of those who feel the necessity of a Sabbath law for the keeping of Sunday.

Let us, therefore, carefully investigate this most important point. Is it true that the Son of God did so change the phraseology of the commandment of the Father that, from his time forward, its utterances have not only justified the secularizing of the last, but have also enforced, by the penalty of eternal death, a strictly religious regard for the first day of the week, on the part of both the Jewish and the Gentile world? Now this, if accomplished, was no trifling affair, and could not have been done in a corner; since it involved the guilt or innocence, the life or death, of countless millions of men and women, whose condemnation in the day of Judgment for the violation of Sunday sanctity would turn, of necessity, upon the words of one who both had the power to change, and had brought the knowledge of that change clearly before them. Certain it is, therefore—since God does not first judge, and legislate afterward—all the light which is necessary for the proper elucidation of this subject is now to be found in his written word. To this, then, we turn; and with a profound conviction that the language of Christ was true in its largest sense, "If any man will do his will he shall know of the doctrine,"—we inquire, Where is it stated, *in so many words*, that God made the amendment in question?

Should the response be returned, as it certainly must be, that such a statement is not to be found within the lids of the Bible, we answer that this is a concession which, most assuredly, will greatly embarrass our friends in the proposed reform. Sagacious men will not be slow in discovering its bearing upon the subject, and it will be very difficult to explain such an omission to the satisfaction of cautious and reflecting minds. Should it be suggested, however, that—notwithstanding the fact the change has not been set forth in so many words—it has nevertheless occurred, and is therefore binding, we answer: Although the transaction upon the face of it, to say the least, would be a singular one, if an alteration has really been made, the next thing to be ascertained is its precise nature. We have already seen that the first law was very explicit in its statements; and all are conversant with the fact that to it was given the greatest publicity, and that it was uttered by the voice, and written by the finger of God, under the most imposing circumstances. Now, if Christ—whose power to do so we shall not question here—has really undertaken the task of adding to, or taking from, this most sacred precept, will some one furnish us with an *authentic copy* of the statute, as amended? Now this is a reasonable and just request. To declare simply that a change has occurred, without making known precisely what that change is, is but to bewilder and confuse. Conscious of this fact, the State is always extremely careful to give to its citizens—in the most public manner—every variation which is made in its enactments, lest the loyal man should be incapable of proving his fidelity by obedience, or the disloyal justify his

violation upon the plea of necessary ignorance. Shall man be more just than his Maker? Shall Christ—who, in every other respect, has, in matters of duty, furnished us with line upon line, and precept upon precept—be found, at last, upon this most important point, to have been unmindful of the highest interests of his followers? Most assuredly not. He that never slumbereth nor sleepeth, He that knoweth the end from the beginning, He who hath said, "Where there is no law there is no transgression," has certainly never required his people to occupy a position in the face of their enemies so extremely embarrassing as that in which they would be compelled to ignore the plainest dictates of reason and Scripture, by seeking to condemn in the world a practice which is not necessarily immoral in itself, and against which there is no explicit denunciation of the Bible. Who, then, we inquire again, will furnish us from the sacred page the precept so remodeled as to meet the exigences of this case? Is it *larger* or more *condensed* than before? Does the first clause read, "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy?" If so, it is well. Is the second in order expressed in these words, "Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work?" This, again, is good. But how is it with the third, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work?" Here, unquestionably, the change must begin. Who among us, therefore, can produce the divine warrant for a reading of this passage which shall make it harmonize with the keeping of Sunday? Who dare declare, upon his veracity, that he has ever discovered in the sacred word an instance in which it has been so re-

written as to read, "But the *first* day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work?"

Furthermore, passing over the instructions in regard to sons, daughters, servants, the stranger, etc., what has the pen of the divine remodeler done with the *reason* of the commandment as found in the words, "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it?" Has that been stricken out altogether? Or, is there a glaring inconsistency in the remodeled statute, by which it is made to state that the *first* day of the week, instead of the *seventh*, is now the Sabbath of the Lord our God, because of the fact that, in the creation of the world, God rested upon, blessed, and hallowed, the latter? These are weighty questions. Upon them, virtually, turns the issue of an amended law. For, to amend, is so to change or alter as to vary the duty of a subject; and if no one is capable of informing definitely and particularly in regard to the precise variations of the phraseology, then, of course, no one is able to decide just how far our course of action should deviate from what it has been hitherto, in order to meet the demands of the divine will as now expressed, in a rule which has never been seen, and which no hand would venture to trace with any claim to exactitude. Who, then, we inquire again, is sufficient for this task? Not one among the millions of Protestants who are so earnestly clamoring for the sanctity of the day in question will seriously lay claim to the ability to perform that which would at once elevate him to a position—in view of the relief

which it would bring to thousands of troubled minds—more exalted than that of any saint or martyr who has ever lived.

Nor is this all; behind all this pretentious claim for an amended law are very many indications of a wide-spread conviction—though undefined and hardly recognized by the individuals themselves—that the fact upon which they place so much stress is, after all, one in regard to which there are serious doubts in their own minds. As an illustration of this, we have but to call attention to two things. First, on each Lord's day, so-called, thousands of congregations—after devoutly listening to the reading of the fourth commandment of the decalogue, word for word, syllable for syllable, letter for letter, precisely as it was written upon the table of stone by the finger of God—are in the habit of responding with solemn cadence to the utterances of the preacher, "O Lord, incline our hearts to keep this law." Now this prayer means something, or nothing. It is either an expression of desire, on the part of those employing it, for grace to enable them rightly to observe the commandment as it reads—seventh day and all—or else it is a solemn mockery, which must inevitably provoke the wrath of Heaven. These people, therefore, judging from the most charitable stand-point, are witnesses—unconscious though they may be of the fact—of a generally pervading opinion that the verbiage of the fourth commandment has not been changed, and that it is as a whole as binding as ever. Second, nor is it simply true that those only who have a liturgy have committed themselves to this idea. It is astonishing to what extent it has crept into creeds, confessions

of faith, church disciplines, and documents of a like nature. But among the most striking of all evidences of its universality, when properly understood, is the practice of nearly all religious denominations of printing, for general distribution among the Sunday-school scholars, verbatim copies of the decalogue, as given in the twentieth chapter of Exodus. Yet this practice would be a pernicious one, and worthy of the most severe censure, as calculated to lead astray and deceive the minds of the young, if it were really true that this code, in at least one very important particular, failed to meet the facts in the case, as it regards present duty.

In view of these considerations, a change of the base of operations becomes indispensable. A commandment, altered in its expressions so as to vary its import, and yet no one acquainted with the exact terms in which it is at present couched—and all, in reality, being so skeptical upon the point that even its most ardent advocates reason as if it had never occurred—would certainly furnish a foundation altogether insufficient for the mighty superstructure of a great reform, which proposes, ere the accomplishment of its mission, to revolutionize the State.

ARTICLE III.

Where, then, shall we turn for relief? There is one, and but one, more chance.

Acknowledging that the law, as originally given, will not answer the purpose, and that its

amendment cannot be made out with sufficient clearness to warrant the taking of a stand upon it, we turn, for the last time, to examine a position quite generally advanced; namely, that of Sunday observance inaugurated, justified, and enforced, by the resurrection and example of Christ. Is it true, then, that such is the fact? Have we, at last, found relief from all our difficulties in the life and career of no less a personage than the divine Son of God? Let us see.

The point of the argument is briefly this:—

Our Lord—by rising from the dead, and by his practice of meeting with his disciples on that day—both introduced, and made obligatory upon his followers, the necessity of distinguishing between the first and the remaining days of the week, as we would between the sacred and the profane. Now, if this be a case which can be clearly made out, then we are immediately relieved in one particular; that is, we have found authority for the observance of the Sunday. But how is it as it regards the seventh day? This, we have seen, was commanded by God the Father. The obligation of that command is still recognized. Now, consequently, if Christ the Son has, upon his own authority, introduced another day immediately following the seventh, and clothed it with divine honors, is it a necessary inference that the former is therefore set aside? To our mind, it is far from being such. If God has a law for the observance of a given day, and Christ has furnished us with an example for that of another also, then the necessary conclusion is, that the first must be kept out of respect for God the Father, and the last through reverence to Christ the Son. Three facts, there-

fore, must be clearly made out, or our situation is indeed one of perplexity.

First, it must be shown, authoritatively, that the resurrection effected the change which is urged, and that the practice of Christ was what it is claimed to have been.

Second, that that practice was designed to be exemplary; in other words, that what he did in these particulars was of a nature such that we are required to imitate it.

Third, it must also be shown that he not only sanctified the first, but, also, that he secularized the seventh day of the week.

But can this be done? Let us see. First, then, we will consider the matter of the resurrection. Now, that it was an event of surpassing glory, and one ever to be held in grateful remembrance, there is no room for dispute among Christians. But shall we, therefore, decide that it must of necessity be commemorated by a day of rest? This would be assuming a great deal. It seems to us that it would be better, far better, to leave decisions of such importance as this entirely with the Holy Spirit. Protestants, at least, warned by the example of Roman Catholics, should avoid the danger of attempting to administer in the matter of designating holy days; since, manifestly, this is alone the province of God. Hence, we inquire, Has the Holy Ghost ever said that the resurrection of Christ imparted a holy character to the day upon which it occurred? The answer must, undeniably, be in the negative. No such declaration is found in the Holy Word. Nor is this all; even from the stand-point of human reason, every analogy is against it. It were fitting that, when God had

closed the work of creation, and ceased to labor, he should appoint a day in commemoration of that rest. The propriety of such a course, all can see. But, on the contrary, is it not equally manifest that to have remained inactive on that glorious morning, when the Son of God had burst the bands of death, and the news was flying through all parts of the great city of Jerusalem, "Jesus has risen to life again," would have been a condition of things wholly out of the question? Both the enemies and the friends of Christ—the one class stimulated by hate, and the other released by the mighty power of God from the overwhelming gloom and crushing despondency of three terrible days—were, by the very necessities of the case, moved to action by an energy which would cause them to overleap every barrier and to break away from every restraint. Everything, everywhere, animated by the new aspect which affairs had suddenly assumed, demanded immediate, ceaseless, and untiring activity. And such it had. From the early morning, until far into the hours of the succeeding night, scribe and Pharisee, priest and Levite, believer and unbeliever, were hearing, gathering, and distributing, all that could be learned of this most mysterious event. We say, consequently, that so far is it from being true that the day of the resurrection is one which should be hallowed, either exactly or substantially as that of the decalogue, the very opposite is the fact; and, if it were to be celebrated at all, every consideration of fitness demands that it should be done by excessive demonstrations of outward and uncontrolled joy, rather than by quietude and restraint.

Passing now to the other branches of the sub-

ject, we inquire, finally, What was there in the *example* of Christ and the apostles which in any way affects the question? If they are to be quoted at all upon this subject, it is but reasonable that their history should be examined with reference both to the seventh and the first day; for, if precedent, and not positive enactment, is to be the rule by which our faith is to be decided, in a point of this significance, it is at least presumable that the historic transactions by which this question is to be determined will be ample in number, and of a nature to meet and explain all the phases of the subject. That is, the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles—covering, as their history does, a period of about thirty years—will afford numerous and conclusive evidences that both Christ and the apostles did actually dishonor the old, and invest with peculiar dignity and authority the new, Sabbath. First, we inquire then, Is there, in all the New Testament, the record of a single instance in which Jesus or his followers transacted, upon the seventh day of the week, matters incompatible with the notion of its original and continued sanctity? The answer is, of necessity, in the negative. The most careful and protracted search has failed to produce a single case in which the son of Joseph and Mary departed in this particular from the usages of his nation, or in which his immediate representatives, during the period of their canonical history, failed to follow, in the most scrupulous manner, the example of Him of whom it is said that, "as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and stood up for to read." (Luke 4:16.) Nor is this all; it is a remarkable fact, and one well calculated to stag-

ger the investigator at the very threshold of his researches into the data for the modern view, that, whereas the Sabbath is mentioned fifty-six times in the New Testament, it is in every instance, save one (where it refers to the annual sabbaths of the Jews), applied to the last day of the week. So far, therefore, as the negative argument is concerned, which was based upon the presumption that the claims of the old day were constructively annulled by the appointment of a new one, its force is entirely broken by the record, which, as we have seen, instead of proving such an abolition, is rather suggestive of the perpetuity of the old order of things. Hence, we turn to the positive side of the subject.

How do we know that Christ ever designed that his example should produce in our minds the conviction that he had withdrawn his regard from the day of his Father's rest, and placed it upon that of his own resurrection? Did he, in laying the foundation for the new institution—as in the case of the Lord's supper—inaugurate the same by his own action, and then say to his disciples, As oft as ye do this, do it in remembrance of me? Did he ever explain to any individual that his especial object in meeting with his followers on the evenings of the first and second Sundays (?) after his return from the dead was designed to inspire in the minds of future believers the conviction that those hours, from that time forward, had been consecrated to a religious use? If so, the record is very imperfect, in that it failed to hand down to us a most significant fact. I say significant, because, without such a declaration, the minds of common men, such as made up the rank and file of the

immediate followers of Christ, were hardly competent to the subtle task of drawing, unaided, such nice distinctions. How natural, how easy, by a single word, to have put all doubt to rest, and to have given to future ages a foundation, broad and deep, upon which to ground the argument for the change.

But this, as we have already seen, was not done! and after the lapse of eighteen hundred years, men—in the stress of a situation which renders it necessary that they should obtain divine sanction, in order to the perpetuity of a favored institution—are ringing the changes of an endless variety of conjectures drawn from transactions, which, in the record itself, were mentioned as possessing no peculiar characteristics, which should in any way affect the *mere time* upon which they occurred.

Let us, therefore, with a proper sense of the modesty with which we should ever enter upon the task of deciding upon the institutions of the church, when there is no divine precept for the guidance of our judgment, examine for ourselves. As we do this, it will be well, also, to bear in mind the fact that our prejudices will be very likely to lie entirely upon the side of life-long practice and traditionary inheritance. In fact, nearly every consideration, political, financial, and social, will be found, if not guarded with the strictest care, wooing us to a decision which—though it might dishonor God, and do violence to the principles of a clear, natural logic—would exempt us, individually, from personal sacrifice and pecuniary loss.

ARTICLE IV.

First, then, we suggest that it would be well to collate all the texts in the New Testament in which the first day of the week is mentioned. They are as follows: "In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulcher." Matt. 28:1.

"And when the Sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, had bought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint Him. And very early in the morning, the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulcher at the rising of the sun." Mark 16:1, 2.

"Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils." Mark 16:9.

"And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment. Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulcher, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them." Luke 23:56, and 24:1.

"The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early, when it was yet dark, unto the sepulcher, and seeth the stone taken away from the sepulcher." John 20:1.

"Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut

where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you." John 20:19.

"Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come." 1 Cor. 16:2.

"And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight." Acts 20:7.

Doubtless the reader is not a little surprised, provided he has never given his attention to the subject before, at discovering the meagerness, so far as numbers at least are concerned, of the passages alluded to above. Nevertheless, let us take the data thus furnished, and from them endeavor to derive all the information which they can legitimately be made to afford. At first glance, it will be discovered that six of the passages of Scripture under consideration relate to one and the same day, which was that of the resurrection. Written as they were from five to sixty-two years this side of that occurrence, and penned by men who were profoundly interested in everything which was calculated to throw light upon matters of duty and doctrine, we would naturally expect that they would seize these most favorable opportunities for instructing those whom they were endeavoring to enlighten in regard to the time of, and circumstances connected with, the change of the Sabbath. Let us observe, therefore, how they discharge this most important responsibility. It will not be urged

by any that John 20:1, and Mark 16:9, furnish anything which in any way strengthens the Sunday argument. The statements which they contain are merely to the effect that Mary Magdalene was the one to whom Christ first presented himself, and that she visited the tomb very early in the morning. Neither will it be insisted that the declaration found in Matt. 28:1, and Mark 16:1, 2, and Luke 23:56, and 24:1, afford any positive testimony for the sanctity of the first day of the week. On the contrary, we think that every candid person will concede that the bearing which they have upon the subject is rather against, than favorable to, the case which our friends are so anxious to make out. To illustrate: In Matt. 28:1, we read that "in the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene, and the other Mary, to see the sepulcher." Again, in Mark 16:1, 2, the same general fact is stated, with the simple variation that, instead of the expression, in the end of the Sabbath, are substituted the words, "when the Sabbath was passed," while in Luke 23:56, and 24:1, it is declared that these things transpired on the first day of the week, the context carefully setting forth the fact that the women had "rested upon the Sabbath, according to the commandment," and that it being past, they came to the sepulcher, bringing with them the spices which they had prepared.

Now, putting all these things together, what have we learned? Manifestly, the following facts: First; when the events transpired which are set forth in these scriptures, there was a Sabbath; since it is stated, by way of locating them

in point of time, that the Sabbath had ended before the affairs spoken of were transacted. Secondly; that the Sabbath, to which reference was made, was the seventh day of the week, since it preceded the first, and was that of the commandment. Thirdly; that, if the first day of the week was a Sabbath, as is now claimed, the women were ignorant of it, since it is clear that they did not go to the tomb on the seventh day to embalm the body, because of its being holy time; whereas, upon the first day of the week their scruples were gone, and they came to the sepulcher, bearing their spices with them, to accomplish a work which they would not have regarded as legitimate on the Sabbath. Fourthly; that the seventh day was not only the Sabbath at the time mentioned, but also that, according to the convictions of the historians, it was the Sabbath at the time of their writing—since they apply to it the definite article "*the*;" whereas, if there had been a change of Sabbaths, it would have been natural to have distinguished between them in the use of explanatory words and phrases, such as are now applied, as, for instance, "the Jewish Sabbath," "the Christian Sabbath," &c., &c. Fifthly; that, while Matthew, Mark, and Luke do, in every instance cited above, honor the seventh day of the week in the most scrupulous manner, by applying to it the Bible title of the Sabbath, they do, nevertheless, make mention of the day of the resurrection in each case, in the same connection, in the use of its secular name, "the first day of the week." A slight which is utterly inexplicable, provided the latter had really put on a sacred character; since, that being true, it was much more important that its new claims should

be recognized and inculcated by those who could speak with authority, than it was that they should perpetuate the distinction of a day whose honors had become obsolete. Having now examined five of the six texts under consideration, there remains but one more to occupy our attention. This reads as follows: "Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you." John 20:19. Here, again, we are struck with the manifest disposition on the part of John, in common with the other evangelists, to avoid the application of any sacred title to the first day of the week. Twice, in this chapter, he makes mention of that which is now regarded as the "Queen of days," but in both instances, he avoids, as if with studied care, attaching to it any denomination by which its superiority over other days should be indicated. How perfectly in keeping, for instance, it would have been with the facts as they are now claimed to have existed—as well as with the interests and desires of millions who have since lived—had he in the text before us so varied the phraseology of the first clause that it would read as follows: "And the same day at evening, being the *Christian Sabbath*, when the disciples were assembled," &c. This, however, he did not do, and we inquire of the reader, right here, concerning his *motive* in omitting that which now appears to us so desirable, and which would have been perfectly legitimate were the views of our friends correct. Did he intentionally omit an important fact? Was it left out because of an oversight on his

part? Or, would it be safer to conclude that perhaps, after all, the difficulty lies, not with the apostle, or with the Holy Spirit, which dictated his language, but with the theory, which seems to be out of joint with his utterances?

Nevertheless, as it is still urged that, in the absence of a positive declaration, this, the only remaining text, does furnish abundant evidence of the sacred regard in which the day of the resurrection was held—since it gives an account of a religious meeting held upon it, manifestly for the purpose of recognizing its heavenly character—let us examine more critically into the nature of the claims which are based upon its record. That those with whom we differ should be tenacious in their efforts to rest their cause very largely upon the account found in John 20:19, is not at all surprising. It is the only chance, as we have seen, which is left them of basing their argument upon a passage of Scripture which relates to the day of the resurrection. So far as 1 Cor. 16:2, and Acts 20:7, are concerned, it will not be disputed by any that their testimony is merely collateral evidence. If Sunday has become the Sabbath, it was by virtue of transactions which occurred immediately in connection with the rising of Christ. In other words, it was on the third day after the crucifixion that Christ, if at all, began to impress upon the minds of his disciples the Sabbatic character which had already attached to, and was henceforth to continue in, the day which saw him a conqueror over death and the grave.

Nay, more; if the change occurred at all, it must have dated from the very moment that the angel descended, the guard was stricken down,

and the Son of God, glorified, came forth. This being the case, from that time forward it would naturally be the effort of Christ to produce in the minds of his followers the conviction of this most momentous fact. Every action of his would necessarily be—if not directly for the purpose of imprinting the peculiar sacredness of the hours upon those by whom he was surrounded—at least of a character such as to impart no sanction either to a deliberate, or even an unintentional disregard, on the part of any, of their hallowed nature. Hence, our friends, seizing upon the fact that he met with them while assembled together in the after part of the day, have endeavored to clothe the incident with great interest, and have largely elaborated their arguments to show that this was not an accidental occurrence, but rather partook of the nature of a religious meeting, Christ himself honoring these instinctive efforts on the part of the disciples to act in harmony with the spirit of the hour, by his own personal presence.

Before we sanction this view of the subject, however, let us give our attention for a moment to the manner in which the previous portion of the day, then closing, had up to that point been spent. Certain it is, that Jesus had not, during its declining hours, been suddenly moved by a newly created impulse for the accomplishment of an object which had been just as desirable for twelve hours as it was at that moment. Sunday sanctity had already become a fixed fact, and its knowledge as essential to the well-being of the disciples in the morning, as at the evening. We naturally conclude, therefore, that the very first opportunity for its disclosure would have been

the one which Christ would embrace. This was afforded in his conversation with Mary. But, while there is no evidence that it was imparted, it is at least presumable that she was left entirely ignorant of it.

The second occasion was presented in that of the journey of the two disciples from Jerusalem to Emmaus, a distance of seven and a half miles. Jesus walked with them and talked with them by the way, reasoned with them about the resurrection, made as though he would have gone farther, discovered himself to them in the breaking of bread, and disappeared, leaving them to retrace the seven and a half miles to the city, with no word of caution against it on his part. Nay, more; his marked approval of the propriety of the act might properly have been inferred from the fact that he himself accompanied them in the first instance, in the garb of a wayfaring man; at the same time acting the part of one who was so far convinced of the rectitude of his own and of their action, that he was ready to continue his journey until night should render it impracticable. (Luke 24:28.) Following these men now, as they retrace their steps to the city from which they had departed, and to which they were now returning—manifestly all unconscious that they were trespassing upon time which had been rescued from that which might properly be devoted to secular pursuits—let us observe them, as they mingle once more with their former companions in grief. How does it happen that they are congregated at this precise point of time? Is it because they have at last discovered the fact that it has been made in the special sense a proper day for religious assemblies? If so, whence have

they derived their conviction? Certainly not from Mary, or the two disciples just returning from Emmaus. Assuredly, also, not from Christ himself.

But, again, is it not really from an induction on their own part, by which they have themselves discovered the fitness of making the day of resurrection also that of worship? Listen a moment. Hear their excited remarks as, at this juncture, they are joined by the two. Do you catch these words, "The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon"? (Luke 24:34.) Does not this establish the fact of their confidence in the previous report? Unfortunately, the historian adds, "Neither believed they them." Here they are, then, manifestly still doubting the very fact which some have thought they were convened to celebrate.

But, again, what is the *place* of their convocation? Unquestionably, neither the temple nor the synagogue. The record states that where they were assembled, "the doors were closed for fear of the Jews." Evidently, they were in some place of retirement and comparative safety, hiding away from the fury of a people who, in their madness and cruel hate, had crucified even the Lord of glory. We ask again, Where were they? Let Mark explain. Certainly he is competent to the task. When describing the very transaction we are considering, he says: "Afterward he appeared to the eleven as they sat at meat, and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen." Mark 16:14. Here, then, is the clue to the whole matter. It was not a religious meeting, because they were

in a frame of mind to be censured, rather than applauded, because of unbelief. It was merely the body of the apostles, gathered in their own quarters for the purpose of partaking of an evening meal, where they were in the habit of eating, and drinking, and sleeping—and where, at this time, they kept particularly close, because of the perils which surrounded them on every hand. That this is true is further sustained by two additional considerations.

First; it was a place where Christ expected to find meat, and where he requested such for his own use, and was supplied from their bounty with broiled fish and an honeycomb, which, the record states, "he took and did eat before them." (Luke 24:41-43.)

Secondly; that they were in possession of just such a rendezvous, is clearly stated in John 20:10, where, speaking of Peter and John when going from the sepulcher, it says, "They went away unto their own home." A few days later, Luke declares (Acts 1:13,) that when they came in from the ascension, they "went up into an upper room, where abode both Peter, and James, and John, and Andrew, Philip, and Thomas; Bartholomew, and Matthew, James the son of Alphaeus, and Simon Zelotes, and Judas the brother of James."

Thus, by a natural and easy combination of the facts brought to view by the inspired penman, the whole matter has been reduced to a simple transaction, such as might have been repeated many times during the forty days, and such as—in and of itself—fails to disclose any evidence that the occurrences narrated, either necessarily or presumptively, afford the slightest

justification for the supposition that Christ himself either designed, or that the apostles might legitimately conclude that he intended, by joining them under these familiar circumstances, to authorize one of the mightiest innovations upon the practice of ages which the world has ever seen.

ARTICLE V.

Nor is this matter at all relieved by the statement found in John 20:26, that after eight days, Thomas being present, he appeared unto them a second time under similar circumstances. For even should we grant that this was on the next Sunday evening—a matter in which there is, at least, room for a difference of opinion—the subject is merely complicated the more, so far as the view of our friends is concerned, since here a second opportunity, and that a most excellent one, for calling the attention of the disciples to the new character which a once secular day had assumed, was entirely neglected. In this also, as in the first instance, the conversation was of a nature to show that the object of the interview was to give additional evidence (because of the presence of Thomas) of the re-animation of the body of Christ, without any reference to its effect upon the character of the day upon which it occurred. But such silence, under *such* circumstances, in regard to so important a matter, is in itself conclusive evidence that the change claimed had not really taken place. Furthermore, it will not be urged

that more than two out of the five first-days which occurred between the resurrection and the ascension were days of assembly. Had they been—as it had been decided, according to the view of those urging the transition, that the Sunday should not be hallowed by positive declaration, but simply inaugurated by quiet precedent, then the presumption is, that this precedent, instead of being left upon the insufficient support of two Sabbaths out of five, would have been carefully placed upon the whole number. Nor would the precaution have ended here. In a matter vital in its nature, certain it is that the honest seeker after truth would not be left to grope his way through a metaphysical labyrinth of philosophic speculation in regard to the effect of certain transactions upon the character of the time upon which they occurred; or the bearing of certain meetings of Christ and the apostles upon the question as to whether Sunday had assumed a sacred character, when at the same time his perplexity was rendered insupportable by the fact, that the historian states, that like meetings occurred on days for which no one will claim any particular honor.

Take, for instance, the meeting of Jesus with the apostles at the sea of Galilee (John 21), while they were engaged in a fishing excursion. Assuredly, this did not take place on Sunday; else, according to the view of our friends, they would not have been engaged in such an employment. Just what day it was no one is able to decide; but all agree that its character was in no way affected by the profoundly interesting interview which occurred upon it between the Master and his disciples. If it were, then there is at least

one holy day in the week which we cannot place in the calendar, since no one can decide whether it was the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, or sixth.

If, however, you would have a still more forcible illustration of the fact that religious meetings, were they never so solemn, can in nowise alter the nature of the hours on which they occur, let me call your attention to the day of the ascension (Acts 1). Here is an occasion of transcendent glory. If the statements in the sacred narrative of events, which transpired during its hours, could only be predicated of either one or the other of the first-day meetings of Christ with his disciples, it would at least be with an increased show of reason that they could be woven into the tissue of a Sabbath argument. Here are found many of the elements essential to the idea of religious services, of which the instances in question are so remarkably destitute.

In the first place, those who followed our Lord to the place of meeting were intelligent believers in the fact of his resurrection.

In the second place, the assembly was not confined to a mere handful of individuals, seeking for retiracy within an upper room where they were in the habit of eating, drinking, and sleeping; but it transpired in the open air, where Jesus was in the habit of meeting with his followers.

In the third place, the congregation was made up of persons whom the Holy Spirit had thus brought together for the purpose of becoming the honored witnesses of the resurrection and ascension of Christ.

In the fourth place, it was graced by the visi-

ble forms of holy angels in glistening white, who participated in the services.

In the fifth place, Jesus himself addressed them at length, lifted up his hands to heaven, and brought down its benediction upon them, and in the sight of the assembled multitude, steadily and majestically rising above them, he floated upward until a cloud received him out of their sight.

In the sixth place, it is said, in so many words, that the "*people worshiped* him there."

Now, suppose, for the sake of the argument, that some modern sect should endeavor to transform our unpretending Thursday, which was really the day of the ascension, since it was the fortieth after the resurrection, into one of peculiar dignity, claiming in defense of their position, the example of Christ, and urging that the course which he pursued could only be satisfactorily explained on the ground that he was laying the foundation for its future Sabbath observance, how would our friends meet them in such an emergency? Deny the facts, they could not, for the record is ample. There would, therefore, be but one alternative left.

If transactions of this character are of a nature such that they *necessarily* exalt the days upon which they occur to the rank of holy days, then Thursday is one and should be treated as such. No line of argument, however ingenious, could evade this conclusion, so long as the premises in question were adhered to. Planting himself squarely upon them, with the consent of modern Christendom, the advocate of the newly discovered holy day, finding the record perfectly free from embarrassments in the nature of transac-

tions which would appear to be incompatible with the notion that everything which Christ and his apostles did was in harmony with his view, if possessed of that skill and ability which has marked the efforts of some modern theologians in such discussions, could weave a web of inference and conjecture almost interminable in its length.

All the facts connected with the meeting could be expanded, and turned over and over, and exhibited from innumerable stand-points, so as to yield the largest amount of evidence possible. Having dwelt at large upon everything which was said and done at Bethany, he might return with the solemn procession to the great city. Having done this, he would not fail to call our attention to the fact that they did not conduct themselves in a manner such as men might have been expected to do under the circumstances on a common day, but that, on the contrary, impressed with the sacredness of the hours which had witnessed the glorious ascension of the Son of God, they immediately repaired to a place of assembly, manifestly for the purpose of continued worship. Again, scrutinizing with polemic eye every syllable of the history, in order to extract from it all the hidden testimony which it might contain, his attention would be arrested by these words, "A Sabbath day's journey." Immediately he inquires, Why employ such an expression as this—one which occurs nowhere else in the sacred volume? Certainly it cannot be the result of accident. The Holy Spirit must have designed to signify *something* by such a use of the term in the connection under consideration. A Sabbath day's journey! What importance could be

attached to the fact that the particular point from which Christ ascended was no more than a Sabbath day's journey from Jerusalem? The expression is not sufficiently definite to designate the precise spot, and must, therefore, have been employed to express some other idea. What was it? Undeniably, it was introduced into this connection because of the *nature* of the *time* on which the journey occurred. It was a *Sabbath day*, and, as such, it was important that succeeding generations should not be left to infer from the account given, that it was a matter of indifference to the Lord how far travel should be carried on such an occasion; but, on the contrary, that he was jealous on this point, and that the expression in question was employed to show that the procession of Christ's followers, and Christ, himself, bowed reverently to the national regulation respecting the distance to which it was proper for one to depart from his home during the continuance of holy time.

But this line of argument, though plausible in itself, and superior in fact to that which is many times used to support the tottering fabric of first-day observance, would not, we fancy, persuade an intelligent public to introduce a new Sabbath into their calendar. The verdict which even those with whom we differ would be compelled to render would be that which both reason and piety would dictate; namely, that the fatal defect in the logic was the want of a thus saith the Lord.

Passing now from the first six of the eight texts which relate to the first day of the week, let us give to 1 Cor. 16:2, and Acts 20:7, a consideration of sufficient length only to enable us to assign to them the proper place which they

should occupy in this controversy. While it will be observed that they present the only mention of the first day of the week after leaving the gospels, and while it is remembered that they are separated from the occurrences there narrated by the space of twenty-six years, it is a remarkable fact that the first of them, if not in itself clearly against the conception of Sunday sanctity, at least, affords no strength for the argument in its favor. It reads as follows: "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come." 1 Cor. 16:2.

Now, bear in mind that the inference here is, that the gatherings spoken of were to be made in the assemblies of the Corinthians, the presumption following that, as they must have been in the habit of convening on the first day of the week, the apostle took advantage of this fact in order to secure the desired collections for the saints at Jerusalem. You will observe, consequently, that the postulate, or assumed point in the discussion, is that the Corinthians were at the church, or place of meeting, when the "laying by," which was ordered above, took place. If, therefore, this be not true, the whole logical superstructure which rests upon it necessarily falls to the ground.

Let us inquire after the facts. Does the apostle say, Let every one of you lay by himself at the church? or, does he command that his pro-rata donation should be placed in the contribution box of the assembly? We answer: There is not a word to this effect. Nor is this all; the very idea of the text is diametrically opposed to this notion. Before the contrary can be shown

to be true, it will be necessary to demonstrate that which is absurd in itself; namely, the proposition that what an individual has voluntarily placed beyond his own reach and control by putting it in a common fund, can, at the same time, be said to be "laid by him in store."

Furthermore, Mr. J. W. Morton, a gentleman who has given the subject mature reflection and careful investigation, by a comparison of the different versions and the original, has demonstrated the fact that, if properly translated, the idea of the passage is simply that, for the purpose of uniformity of action, and to prevent confusion from secular matters when the apostle himself should arrive, each person should lay by himself *at home* the amount of his charities according to his ability. We give the following from his pen: "The whole question turns upon the meaning of the expression, 'by him;,' and I marvel greatly how you can imagine that it means, 'in the collection box of the congregation.' Greenfield, in his lexicon, translates the Greek term, 'by one's self; i. e., at home.' Two Latin versions—the Vulgate, and that of Castellio—render it, '*apud se*,' with one's self, at home. Three French translations, those of Martin, Osterwald, and De Sacy, '*chez soi*,' at his own house, at home. The German of Luther, '*bei sich selbst*,' by himself, at home. The Dutch, '*by hemselven*,' same as German. The Italian of Diodati, '*appressio di se*,' in his own presence, at home. The Spanish of Felipe Scio, '*en su casa*,' in his own house. The Portuguese of Ferrara, '*para isso*,' with himself. The Swedish, '*nær sig self*,' near himself. I know not how much this list of authorities might

be swelled, for I have not examined one translation that differs from those quoted above."—*Vindication of the True Sabbath*, p. 61.

The simple fact is, therefore, that while the text in question yields no proof that Sunday was then regarded as a day of convocation, it was one which might be encumbered with matters which would necessarily call attention to the pecuniary affairs of individual Christians, and so avoid the necessity of their giving thought to such things when Paul himself should arrive; thereby preventing delay on his part, and leaving them free to devote their whole time to the consideration of religious themes. Thus much for 1 Cor. 16:2.

ARTICLE VI.

Advancing now to the remaining scripture, which is found in Acts 20:7, we append its words as follows: "And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight." By reading that which immediately follows the above, we shall learn the following facts: First, that here is indeed a record of a religious meeting upon the first day of the week (verse 7). Second, that it was held in that portion of the day when the darkness prevailed, since it was necessary to employ many lights (verse 8). Third, that Paul preached unto them, and that, while he was speaking, Eutychus fell to the ground; and Paul, having restored him to life, returned to

his labor (verses 7-11). Fourth, that he broke bread, or administered the Lord's supper (verse 11). Fifth, that he preached until break of day (verse 11). Sixth, that Luke, and the other disciples, preceding him, sailed the vessel to Assos (verse 13). Seventh, that Paul, having preached all night until the dawning of the day, crossed the country on foot, stepped aboard of the vessel, and went on his journey toward Jerusalem (verses 13, 14). Now let it be borne in mind, that Troas was a city on the west coast of Asia, located at the base of a peninsula, on the opposite side of which lay the city of Assos; distant about nineteen and a half miles in direct line from the former place. Let it also be remembered that the promontory in question, projecting as it did into the sea for some miles, made it necessary for a vessel, passing from Troas to Assos, to traverse a much greater distance, and to consume more time than one would be compelled to do in passing from one of these points to the other by the overland route. This explains the reason why Paul, who was exceedingly anxious to spend all the time he could with the brethren, consented to perform the journey on foot; thus being enabled to spend several additional hours with them, while Luke and his associates were toiling to bring the boat around the headland to the place of the apostle's final embarkation.

Returning now to the consideration of the meeting in question, it becomes important to know just when it was entered upon. Did it answer to what we would call a Sunday-evening meeting? If so, then Paul resumed his journey on Monday morning. But, before we give an affirmative response to this question, would it not

be well to inquire in relation to the system for computing time which ought to be followed in this case? We moderns have generally adopted that of the Romans. With it, beginning the day, as it does, at midnight, we would naturally answer the interrogatory above in the affirmative. Should we do this, however, we should unquestionably fall into a grievous error. The days of the Bible commenced invariably with the setting of the sun.

That this is so, the following quotation from the American Tract Society's Bible Dictionary is sufficient to demonstrate: "The civil day is that, the beginning and end of which are determined by the custom of any nation. The Hebrews began their day in the evening (Lev. 23 : 32); the Babylonians at sunrise, and we begin at midnight." Art. Day, p. 114.

Reasoning, therefore, upon this hypothesis, the bearing of the text is immediately reversed. As the meeting was held in that portion of the first day of the week in which it was necessary that lamps should be lighted, it follows that it commenced with the setting of the sun on Saturday evening, and continued until daylight on what we call Sunday morning. It is consequently clear that we have at last found one first day in the Scriptures, the first half of which was observed in a manner compatible with the idea of its being regarded as a Sabbath. But, as a Sabbath day is twenty-four, and not merely twelve hours, long, it is indispensable that those who seek to avail themselves of the record before us, should be able to establish the point that there is nothing in it which would go to show that the remaining portion of the day was devoted to pur-

poses, and employed in a manner irreconcilable with the hypothesis of its sanctity. Can they do this? Let us see. Would it be legitimate for believers at the present time to traverse on foot a distance of nineteen and a half miles between the rising and the setting of the sun, on the first day of the week, in order to pursue a journey toward a point of destination hundreds of miles in the distance? Would it be admissible for others, prosecuting the same journey, to weigh anchor and hoist sail in a friendly port, and coast along the shore for a much greater distance?

Who, among the friends of Sunday observance at the present time, would venture to answer these questions in the affirmative, without putting on the record some qualifying or explanatory clause? We hazard the assertion that few of them, conscientious as we believe many of them are, would be willing, by such a response, to place themselves on the category of those who, to say the least, may have very lax views in regard to what may be done upon holy time. And yet this is precisely the situation in which Luke has left Paul, himself, and his associates, before the generations of Christians who were to follow them.

We ask, therefore, again, Can it be true that the great apostle to the Gentiles, standing as a representative man in the great work of transferring the religious world from the observance of the seventh, to that of the first, day of the week, and this not by positive precept, but, as it is claimed, simply by precedent and example, should have allowed himself to throw that example, as in the case before us, against the very work which he was seeking to accomplish? In other

words, is not the obvious import of the text such that the average reader, with no favorite theory to make out, and a mind unbiased by the effect of education and early training, would naturally come to the conclusion that Paul and the disciples with him, and those from whom he parted at Troas, looked upon the day of that departure as but a common one?

We believe that if any other meaning can be drawn from the history before us, it will be reached through constraint, and not through the easy process of obvious reason. It is useless to talk about inability to control the vessel, and the urgent necessity of occupying every hour in order to reach Jerusalem in time for the feast. So far as the first of these points is concerned, if it were well taken, is it not to be presumed that, for the vindication of the course pursued, and for the benefit of posterity, it would have found a place in the sacred record? And as to the matter of limited time, the question of twelve hours longer or shorter, was immaterial in a journey of the length of the one under consideration. Besides, upon following the account as given, we have from Luke himself that, before they reached their destination, they stopped at Tyre for seven days (chap. 21 : 4), and at Cesarea, many days (chap. 21 : 10), and yet had ample time to accomplish their object in reaching Jerusalem before the feast.

We say again, therefore, that these considerations, in the absence of any allusions to them in the context, are simply gratuitous, or, at least, are far-fetched. The narrative still remains. The great fact that Paul and his followers did travel upon the first day of the week is made

conspicuous, and the only legitimate conclusion to be drawn therefrom is that which alone harmonizes with the consistency of Paul's life and that of his brethren, as well as the wisdom and beneficence of the great God, namely: That he did so because of his conviction that it was a day which might properly be devoted to labor and travel. With this understanding, the story is relieved of all embarrassment, and becomes a simple and highly interesting account of a meeting convened on the first day of the week, because of the approaching departure of a beloved brother and apostle, and rendered also worthy of record by the miracle which was performed upon Euty-chus. But with such a decision, our labor is ended, and with it the whole theory in regard to the Sabbath character of Sunday is exploded; for, not only does the scripture which we have been investigating fail to yield the doctrine which it was supposed to contain, but, on the contrary, it presents Paul as standing emphatically against it. This being true, it belongs to a faith which he never proclaimed, and which, consequently, was associated in his mind with that which should not be received, though it were "preached by an angel from Heaven."

Nevertheless, that we may not appear to have overlooked the two remaining texts, which are generally quoted as affording additional proof of the distinguished regard in which the first day of the week was held, we turn our attention for a moment to Acts 2 : 1, and Rev. 1 : 10.

As it regards the first of these scriptures, the claim is, that the outpouring of the Spirit occurred with reference to a divine disposition to honor the day of the resurrection. To this we

reply, first, that if this were so, it is a remarkable fact that there is nothing in the connection to show it. The name of the day, even, is not so much as mentioned. The inspired annalist, were this supposition true, would most assuredly have given prominence to an idea which, it is claimed, was the governing one in the mind of the Spirit, in order to enable succeeding generations to extract from the facts narrated the true moral which they were intended to convey. But mark his words. Is the declaration, "When the first day of the week was fully come"? If so, we might say that this day was foremost in his own mind, and in that of the Spirit.

But such was not his language. On the contrary, his statement is, "When the day of Pentecost was fully come." Hence, it was the day of Pentecost, or the great Jewish feast, which is here made to stand out conspicuously upon the sacred page. If, therefore, we are to decide that the transaction in question was intended to hallow any particular twenty-four hours, undeniably they were those within which the Pentecost fell. But those did not occur regularly upon the first day of the week, nor was the institution one of weekly recurrence. It was annual in its return, transpiring one year upon the first, and perhaps the next year upon the second, and so on, through every, day of the week. To reason, consequently, that, because it happened to take place at this time upon Sunday, the fact is necessarily significant of a change in the character of the day, is altogether inconclusive.

That were a cheap logic indeed, which would argue that the Pentecost, which was mentioned expressly, and the return of which was waited

for with patience, was in no-wise affected, illustrated, or perpetuated, by the outpouring of the Spirit upon it, whereas, a septenary division of time—not thought worthy of mention by its peculiar title—was thenceforth rendered glorious. Stand together, however, they cannot; for, if it were the Pentecost which was to be handed down in this way to those who should come after, then it would, of necessity, be celebrated annually, and not each week; but, if it were the first day of the week which alone was made the object of divine favor, then why wait until the arrival of the great annual Sabbath at the end of the fifty days? Why was not some other first day taken—say one of the six which had already occurred between the resurrection and that time—in this manner avoiding the possibility of confusion as to which event was thus honored?

Should it be replied that the Spirit could not be poured out until the great antitype of the fifty-day feast had been met in Heaven, we answer: Then it was *this* event, and not the resurrection, which furnishes the occasion for the remarkable demonstrations which were manifested before the people. We repeat again, therefore, that from whatever stand-point we look at the text, it is the *Pentecost*, and not the first day of the week, to which, if to anything, it attaches special importance. This is further demonstrated by the fact that it is to this hour a matter of grave discussion between theologians whether the day of Pentecost, at the time under consideration, did really fall upon the first day of the week or upon some other. Leaving to them, therefore, the delicate and arduous task of adjusting questions of this nature—which are

neither important in themselves, nor easy of decision—we hasten to glance at Rev. 1:10. It reads as follows: "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day, and heard behind me a great voice, as of a trumpet."

Here is something which certainly has a bearing upon the subject. The language employed is of thrilling interest. Says the apostle, "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day." This being uttered about A. D. 95, determines the point that God has a day in this dispensation, and also proves that he has but one; since the language would be very indefinite were there two or more days of such a nature. But by what system of reasoning is the conclusion reached that this must of necessity be the first day of the week? Assuredly, it can only be by inference. If it can first be proved that the day of the resurrection has, by divine authority, been anywhere styled the "Lord's day," then the point is unquestionably gained. When those words were penned, more than sixty years had passed since it is claimed that Sunday had been clothed with divine honor. The whole canon of the New Testament, save the gospel of John, had been written within that time. Ample opportunity had been afforded for the work of placing upon record the sacred appellation which was to be given to that period of time, which, having been separated from everything of a secular nature, had been elevated to the dignity of a holy rest. But had this ever occurred? The facts are briefly these: The first day of the week, as we have seen, being mentioned eight times in the New Testament, is always spoken of as plain first day of the week; John himself, writing his gospel after the ap-

pearance of the Apocalypse, everywhere applies to it this unpretending title. Whenever the term Sabbath is used, on the other hand—as we have seen that it is fifty-six times in the New Testament—it is applied, with one exception, to the Sabbath of the commandment, or the seventh day of the week.

In view of these facts, take a common man, without bias or predilection, one, if you please, who has never heard of the controversy in question, place in his hands the Bible without note or comment, let him read the following texts which confessedly refer to the seventh day of the week, and we think the verdict which he would render would be decidedly in favor of the venerable Sabbath of the Lord; of which it is true, as it is of no other day, that he has again and again claimed it as his own. The italics are our own. "If thou turn away thy foot from the *Sabbath*, from doing thy pleasure on *my holy day*; and call the Sabbath a delight, the *holy of the Lord*, honorable; and shalt honor him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words; then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord." Isa. 58:13, 14.

"But the seventh day is the *Sabbath of the Lord thy God*: in it thou shalt not do any work:" "for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord *blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.*" Ex. 20:10, 11.

"And he said unto them, The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath; therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." Mark 2:27, 28.

If such a decision be a just one, however, where

are we in the matter under examination? What has become of the modern Sabbath reform for which we have been seeking justification in the word of God? First, we sought to place it upon the commandment; this, we found to be out of the question. Second, we investigated the claim of an amended law; that, we discovered to be entirely without authority, and against even the conviction and practice of the very men who urged it. Third, we turn, as a last resort, to the precedents of Bible history; these, we found, so far as they affect the question at all, to be overwhelmingly against a movement, which, while it claims to be in the interest of the God of Heaven, is confronted by the following astounding facts. First, the day whose observance it seeks to enforce by statute law is one, the keeping of which, God has never commanded. Second, Christ has never commanded it. Third, no inspired man has ever commanded it. Fourth, God himself never rested upon it. Fifth, Christ never rested upon it. Sixth, there is no record that either prophets or apostles ever rested upon it. Seventh, it is one upon which God himself worked. Eighth, it is one which, during his lifetime, Christ always treated as a day of labor. Ninth, it is one upon which, after his resurrection, he countenanced, by his own personal example, travel upon the highway. Tenth, it is one upon which the two disciples, in going to and returning from Emmaus, traveled a distance of fifteen miles. Eleventh, it was on that day that Paul walked from Troas to Assos, a distance of nineteen and one-half miles. Twelfth, it was on that day that Luke and his associates passed from one to the other of these places by a longer route, working their vessel round the promontory.

That all these things could be true, and yet our friends be right in the supposition that they are engaged in a work which commands the approval of Heaven, is too absurd to require further discussion. A movement pushed forward in the face of these facts may succeed, so far as political success and legal enactment are concerned, but when the logic for its Scriptural character is scrutinized as closely as it will be before it shall plant its banners upon the capitol of the nation, all conscientious convictions in regard to its heavenly birth will give place to an inspiration, the source of whose strength will be found in the superiority of party drill, and the overwhelming power of mere numbers. Who shall say that the God of Heaven has not permitted it to come to the surface for the very purpose of calling the attention of honest men and women, as it only could be done by the debate which will arise in controversy, to the scantiness of that Sunday wardrobe by which, as with it our friends attempt to clothe a favorite institution, we are so forcibly reminded of the bed and covering spoken of by the prophet Isaiah: The first of which was "too short to stretch one's self upon," and the last, "too narrow to wrap one's self within?" So sure as investigation is provoked upon this subject, so certain is it that, sooner or later, thinking men and women will discover—as we have already done in this article—that there is indeed a crying demand for a Sabbath reform. Not one, however, which rests merely upon the power of Congressional enactment, and Presidential sanction, but one which shall find its authority in the highest of all laws, and which shall have the approval of the King of kings and Lord of lords.

ARTICLE VII.

The conflict is finally open. The spirit of inquiry has lifted itself in the nation; and all eyes will be turned toward the Bible, as really the only source from which can be derived authority for a Sabbath reform which shall be worthy of the name.

Commencing with its opening pages, they will trace the Sabbatic narrative until they have been able to verify the following summary of history and doctrine:—

1. The Sabbath, as the last day of the week, originated in Eden, and was given to Adam, as the federal head of the race, while he yet retained his primal innocence. Proof: "And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." Gen. 2:2, 3.

2. That, though the history of the period, stretching from the creation to the exodus, is extremely brief, it is manifest, even from that period, that the good of those ages had not lost sight of it; since the children of Israel were acquainted with its existence thirty days before reaching Mount Sinai. "And He said unto them, This is that which the Lord hath said, Tomorrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord; bake that which ye will bake to-day, and seethe that ye will seethe; and that which re-

maineth over lay up for you to be kept until the morning." Ex. 16:23. "Six days ye shall gather it; but on the seventh day, which is the Sabbath, in it there shall be none." Ex. 16:26.

3. That God, unwilling to commit the interest of so important an institution to the keeping of tradition, framed a command for its perpetuity, which he spoke with his own voice and wrote with his own finger, placing it in the bosom of the great moral law of the ten precepts: "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." Ex. 20:8-11.

4. That this law has been brought over into our dispensation, and every jot and tittle of it is binding now, and will continue to be, so long as the world stands. "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever, therefore, shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of Heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of Heaven."—JESUS, Matt. 5:17-19. "Do we then make void the law through faith?"

God forbid; yea, we establish the law."—PAUL, Romans 3:31. "Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good." Romans 7:12. "If ye fulfill the royal law according to the scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, ye do well; but if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convicted of the law as transgressors. For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. For he that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law."—JAMES, Jas. 2:8-11. "Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law; for sin is the transgression of the law. And ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin. Whosoever abideth in him sinneth not; whosoever sinneth hath not seen him, neither known him."—JOHN, 1 John 3:4-6.

5. That, agreeably to this view, Christ—of whom it is said, "Thy law is within my heart"—was a habitual observer, during his lifetime, of the Sabbath of the decalogue. "And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up; and, as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and stood up for to read." Luke 4:16. "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in his love." John 15:10.

6. That the women, whose religious conceptions had been formed under his teachings, carefully regarded it. "And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the

Sabbath day, according to the commandment." Luke 23:56.

7. The Lord instructed his disciples that it would exist at least forty years after his death, since he taught them to pray continually that their flight, at the destruction of Jerusalem, which occurred A. D. 70, might not take place on that day. "But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath day." Matt. 24:20.

8. That the great apostle to the Gentiles was in the habit of making it a day of public teaching. "And Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three Sabbath days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures." Acts 27:2. "And he reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks." Acts 18:4.

9. That, in the year of our Lord 95, John still recognized its existence. "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day, and heard behind me a great voice, as of a trumpet." Rev. 1:10.

10. That God has never removed the blessing which he placed upon it in the beginning, or annulled the sanctification by which it was at that time set apart to a holy use.

11. That, in perfect keeping with the above propositions, it is, equally in the New with the Old Testament, scores of times denominated the Sabbath; and that, while God, and Christ, and prophets, and apostles, and inspired men, unite in applying to it this sacred title, they never, in any single instance, allow themselves to speak of any other day in the week in the use of this peculiar appellation.

12. That it is not only to continue during the present order of things, but that, in the new earth, clothed in all the freshness and beauty of its Edenic glory, creation, more than ever before, will be the subject of devout gratitude, and weekly commemoration on the part of the immortal and sinless beings who shall worship God therein forever. "For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I will make shall remain before me, saith the Lord, so shall your seed and your name remain. And it shall come to pass, that from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord." Isa. 66 : 22, 23.

Putting all these facts together—connected, consistent, and unanswerable as they are—men will discover that a great departure has taken place from the original practice of the church, and against the explicit command of God. Should they ask, as assuredly they will, when, and by whom, it was inaugurated, it will not be a fruitless effort on their part to obtain needed information. God has made ample provision for the instruction of those who would do his will, and for the condemnation of those who refuse so to do. Referring to prophecies given centuries ago, mapping out beforehand the history of the world, they will find the prophet Daniel—while describing the work of the "little horn," which arose among the ten horns of the great and terrible beast, and which little horn nearly all Protestant commentators agree in applying to the papal church—stating of it, by way of prediction, that it should "wear out the saints of the Most High,

and think to change times and laws," and that they should "be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time." (Dan. 7 : 25.) Consulting history, they will discover that, so far as the saints are concerned, these terrible words have been so completely fulfilled that this power has actually put to death, in one way or other, at least fifty millions of the people of God.

Again, perceiving, as they will readily, that the "laws," which this presumptuous power should blasphemously claim to be able to change, are the laws of God, what will be their astonishment at learning, from the representatives of this great oppressive system—which alone has extended through a period sufficiently long to cover the "time, times and half a time," or the 1260 years of Daniel's prophecy—that it actually boasts that it has done the very work in question. Nay, more; what limit can be put to their surprise when they find these men absolutely pointing with exultation to the practice of the Christian world in the observance of Sunday, as an evidence of the ability of the Roman Catholic church to alter and amend the commands of God! That they do this, however, in the most unequivocal terms, will be abundantly proved by the following quotations from their own publications:—

"*Question.* Is it then Saturday we should sanctify, in order to obey the ordinance of God? *Ans.* During the old law, Saturday was the day sanctified; but *the church*, instructed by Jesus Christ, and directed by the Spirit of God, has substituted Sunday for Saturday; so we now sanctify the first, not the seventh, day. Sunday

means, and now is, the day of the Lord. *Ques.* Had the church power to make such a change?

Ans. Certainly; since the Spirit of God is her guide, the change is inspired by the Holy Spirit."

—*Cath. Catechism of Christian Religion.*

"*Ques.* How prove you that the church has power to command feasts and holy days? *Ans.* By the very act of changing the Sabbath into Sunday, which Protestants allow of; and therefore they fondly contradict themselves by keeping Sunday strictly, and breaking most other feasts commanded by the same church.

"*Ques.* How prove you that? *Ans.* Because, by keeping Sunday, they acknowledge the church's power to ordain feasts, and to command them under sin; and by not keeping the rest by her commanded, they again deny, in fact, the same power."

—*Abridgement of Christian Doctrine.*

"It is worth its while to remember that this observance of the Sabbath—in which, after all, the only Protestant worship consists—not only has no foundation in the Bible, but it is in flagrant contradiction with its letter, which commands rest on the Sabbath, which is Saturday. It was the *Catholic church* which, by the authority of Jesus Christ, has transferred this rest to the Sunday in remembrance of the resurrection of our Lord. Thus the observance of Sunday by the Protestants is an homage they pay, in spite of themselves, to the authority of the church."—*Plain Talk about Protestantism of To-day*, p. 225.

Instinctively anticipating some providential mode of escape from the terrible consequences of that great apostasy, out of which the religious world has for centuries been endeavoring to work

its way, conscientious men and women will catch the notes of warning which for twenty-five years have been sounding through the land, in these words: "Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." Rev. 14:12.

Inquiring into the origin of the message which is thus being given to the world, they will find that, for a quarter of a century, God has been calling attention to the subject of his law and his Sabbath, and that a denomination of earnest men and women, but little known as yet among the learned and mighty of the land, have been devoting themselves with zeal and a spirit of self-sacrifice to the tremendous task of restoring God's down-trodden Sabbath to the hearts and judgments of the people. They will find, also, that these persons have not entered upon this labor because they anticipated an easy and speedy victory; nor, indeed, because they ever believed that the great mass of mankind would so far shake off the trammels of tradition and the fear of reproach as to be able to venture an unreserved surrender to the teachings of the Bible, but simply because they saw in it that which was at once the path of duty, and that of fulfilling prophecy.

Having accepted Dan. 7:25, in common with the religious world, as applying to the papacy, and learning, as the result of investigation, that the days of the great persecution were to reach from the decree of Justinian (A. D. 538,) giving authority to the Bishop of Rome to become the corrector of heretics, to A. D. 1798—when the pope was carried into captivity, having received a wound with the sword agreeably to Rev. 13:10

—these students of God's word at once perceived that the next thing in order would be the completion of the restitution, which had begun in the taking away of his ability to put the saints to death, by a work equally called for in the inspired prediction; namely, that of rescuing from his hands the "times and laws" which he thought to change. Or, in other words, that the effort of the pope to remove the Sabbath of the Lord from the seventh to the first day of the week should be made to appear in its true light; namely, as the work of a blasphemous power which had held the world in its grasp for centuries.

But, while they were clear in those convictions which led them in 1846, under the title of Seventh-day Adventists, to claim that they were fulfilling the prophecy of Rev. 14: 9-12, they discerned that the same facts which brought them to this conclusion also compelled the conviction that theirs was to be the road of persecution, hardship, and privation. They read in Rev. 12: 17, in these words, "The dragon was wroth with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ," the history of the last generation of Christians; and saw that, in God's inscrutable providence, it was to be their fortune to be the object of diabolic hate, because of the commandments of God and the testimony of Jesus Christ, to which they cling with determined perseverance.

Once more: In studying the 11th to the 18th verses inclusive of the 13th chapter of the same book, they saw that—if their view of the work which was assigned them was correct—that por-

tion of the Scriptures was applied to the United States of America, and indicated that this country was to be the theater of a mighty contest between those who "keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus," and the government under which they live, from which they could only be delivered by the coming of Christ. This view they unhesitatingly proclaimed. For twenty years, they have announced it as a part of their faith. When they first declared it to be such, they brought upon themselves ridicule and contempt, for, humanly speaking, every probability was against them. The government was ostensibly republican in form, and professedly tolerant to the very extreme, in all matters of religious opinion. The Constitution had even provided that "Congress should make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Nevertheless, so firm were they in the conviction that they had the right application of the prophecy, that they unhesitatingly walked out upon their faith; and for a fifth of a century they have talked it, and published it everywhere, notwithstanding the odium it has brought upon them. Lest we might appear to be drawing upon our own imagination in a matter of such importance, we append the following extracts from their works. The words in parentheses are our own, and serve to explain that which a larger quotation from the context would make clear of itself:

"When the 'beast' (the papacy) had the dominion, all in authority must be Catholics. The popular sentiment then was that none should hold offices in the government, except they pro-

fessed the Catholic faith. The popular religion at that period was Catholicism. They legislated upon religious subjects, and required all men to conform to the popular institutions and dogmas of the papacy, or suffer and die. The image must be made in the United States, where Protestantism is the prevailing religion. Image signifies *likeness*; therefore Protestantism and Republicanism will *unite*; or, in other words, the making of laws will go into the hands of Protestants, when all in authority will profess the popular sentiments of the day, and make laws binding certain religious institutions (*i. e.*, Sunday observance, &c.), upon all, without distinction."—*Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*, Vol. 6, No. 6, 1854.

"It seems to me, even to look at the subject in the light of reason, that a conflict must in time come between commandment-keepers and the United States. This, of course, will lead those who find that they cannot sustain their Sunday institution by argument to resort to some other means."—*Advent Review and Herald*, Vol. 10, No. 11, 1857.

"When all concur upon this question (Sunday-keeping), except a few who conscientiously observe the fourth commandment, how long before their constancy would be attributed to obstinacy and bigotry? And how long before the sentence would go forth, as it did in the days of Pliny, 'that for this, if for nothing else, they deserved to be punished.'"—*Review and Herald*, Vol. 19, No. 15. (a.)

[a] For further information upon this subject, the reader is referred to "The Three Angels' Messages" and the "United States

How changed the political sky to-day from what it was when these words began to be spoken! Now, thoughtful men are pondering whether, after all, these things may not be so. They see a powerful organization looming up in the country, which appends to the call for their conventions the names of some of the most influential men in the land. They hear them declaring in so many words, that what they are determined to do is to sweep away the constitutional barrier between them and a coerced observance of Sunday, so that all may be compelled to regard it as sacred. What we want, say they, and what we are determined to have, is such an amendment of the Constitution, 1. That it shall recognize God and Christ; 2. That it shall enable us to secure the reading of the Bible in the common schools; 3. That we may be enabled to enforce the better observance of the Christian Sabbath, *i. e.*, Sunday.

These declarations, a few years since, would have appalled every lover of constitutional liberty. Every man and woman imbued with a proper sense of the genius of our institutions would have been struck with horror at the very thought of pursuing the course in question. But a change has come over the spirit of the land. Steadily, the advocates of a day which has no authority in the word of God are drifting where all before them have done who have sought to maintain a human institution upon the claim of divine authority. It is idle for them to say at this stage of the proceedings that they propose

in Prophecy," published at the *Review and Herald* Office, Battle Creek, Mich.

to regard the rights of those who have conscientious scruples on this subject. God has said that the matter will culminate in oppression; nay, even though this were not so, reason itself would prove that this would be the case. Without questioning the sincerity of the men who at the present make these statements, we appeal to that very sincerity for the evidence that this matter will end just where the Seventh-day Adventists have claimed that it would.

They have convinced themselves that they are called of God to a mighty work. They believe that they have a noble mission. They are men of mind and nerve. But, when a few months shall have revealed the insufficiency of their logic, when Seventh-day Baptists and Seventh-day Adventists shall have confronted them with a plain "Thus saith the Lord," against their favorite scheme, they would be more than human if—refusing to yield to arguments which they cannot answer—they should continue to look with complacency upon the very men who, after all, will prove to be their most formidable antagonists in the great conflict. In fact, it would be a denial of both nature and history to say that they would not at last come to regard them in the light of enemies of God, really more worthy of condemnation and coercion than those who were simply unbelievers in any Sabbath at all, and so incapable of standing before the systematic effort which they have set in motion. (b.)

[b] Persons desiring to investigate this question still further, by addressing the author of these articles, will receive by mail, without charge, a tract in which he has discussed at length a branch of this subject merely alluded to in this communication.

But, candid reader, the facts are before you, and between us and these events there will be ample time for calm reflection, and deliberate decision. Where do you choose to stand in this final conflict between the venerable Sabbath of the Lord and its modern papistic rival? Will you keep the commandments of God, as uttered by his voice and written by his finger? or will you henceforth pay intelligent homage to the man of sin, by the observance of a day which finds its authority alone in the mutilated form of the commandments, as they come from his hand? May God help you to make a wise choice.



IMPORTANT TO THE READER.

The foregoing articles having been published in the *Christian Statesman*, the editor of that paper felt it incumbent upon him to attempt an answer to the positions that are set forth therein. This answer consisted of eleven articles, in which the subject matter of debate was discussed from the stand-point of one advocating the claims of the Sunday, and strenuous in the support of the Constitutional Amendment. Conscious of the strength of the positions taken, and gratified with the prospect of a more full and exhaustive discussion of their merits with a competent opponent, in the columns of a paper devoted, professedly, to the work of bringing out the argument on both sides of the reform in which it is ostensibly engaged, the writer of the original seven articles promptly petitioned the editor of the *Christian Statesman* to grant him the privilege of answering his strictures upon what had been written, in the same periodical in which they had been made. This petition, however, was met with an emphatic denial, and the only alternative left was that of allowing the replies of the editor of the *Statesman* to go unanswered,

or finding space for their consideration in some other paper. At this juncture, the columns of the *Advent Review and Herald of the Sabbath* were proffered for the desired work, and in them the eleven replies of the editor of the *Statesman*, accompanied by an equal number of rejoinders thereto, have since been published.

The Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, also extremely anxious to get all of the facts before the public, in order that they may decide intelligently in the coming struggle between God's commandment-keeping people and those who seek to oppress them through legal enactments, has at last decided to publish the whole debate, including original articles, Replies, and Rejoinders, in book and pamphlet form. To these works, which are now ready for sale, the attention of the candid reader is invited. Furnishing, as they do, a presentation of the arguments for and against the Sunday and the amendment from the pens of individuals who, it is believed, fairly represent the views of the respective parties to which they belong, and, placing side by side the criticisms upon, and defense of, an advocate of God's ancient Sabbath, they at least have the merit of presenting a real and living issue. While to those who have simply read the present tract they will give the other side of the views therein maintained, they will also in-

roduce them to additional phases of the same subject, which have not been discussed heretofore for the want of sufficient space, and supply them with a larger amount of evidence in support of the positions already advanced; for example, the seventh-part-of-time theory, to which allusion has not been made in what has been said hitherto, becomes in the Replies and Rejoinders a prominent point in debate, while the change of the Sabbath by the Roman Catholic church, which is a matter of the most profound interest, and which is barely touched upon in the present articles, is there elaborated more fully, and supported by additional historic and papistic authority. In fine, since it is never profitable to give to an important subject merely a partial examination, and since the real strength of doctrines is best exemplified when they are subjected to the test of a fair and manly discussion on the part of their advocates and opposers, it is believed that the individual who has had the patience to pursue the investigation of this matter thus far cannot afford to stop short of an earnest and prayerful reading of the complete discussion.

The title of the book in question is as follows: "The Constitutional Amendment, or the Sunday, the Sabbath, the Change, and the Restitution." The volume is a work of 400 pages, in muslin binding, printed on paper of good quality, with

large type, leaded, and in every respect executed typographically in a neat and workman-like manner. The price of this volume, post-paid, is one dollar.

The pamphlet contains the same subject matter, but is put up in paper covers instead of cloth, while the type is not leaded, as is the case with the bound volume. The price of the pamphlet, post-paid, to any address, is forty cents.

Individuals desiring these works will address the *Review and Herald* Office, Battle Creek, Mich. In doing so, let the superscription of their letters be plain, and let their own names, and those of the town and State in which they live, be plainly written, and little or no danger need be apprehended from miscarriage by mail.

For all amounts under two dollars, sent agreeably to the above directions, the S. D. A. Publishing Association will be responsible if lost. Larger amounts should be sent in post-office orders, or drafts.

To dealers and agents wishing to sell the work, a liberal discount will be made.

PROGRESSIVE BIBLE LESSONS FOR CHILDREN; for Sabbath Schools and Families. G. H. Bell. Bound, 35 cts., paper, 25 cts.

THE ADVENT KEEPSAKE; comprising a text of Scripture for each day of the year, on the subjects of the Second Advent, the Resurrection, &c. Plain muslin, 25 cts.; gilt, 40 cts.

A SOLEMN APPEAL relative to Solitary Vice, and the Abuses and Excesses of the Marriage Relation. Edited by Eld. James White. Muslin, 50 cts.; paper, 30 cts.

AN APPEAL to the Working Men and Women in the Ranks of Seventh-day Adventists. By James White. 172 pp., bound, 40 cts.; paper covers, 25 cts.

SERMONS ON THE SABBATH AND LAW; embracing an Outline of the Biblical and Secular History of the Sabbath for 6000 years. By J. N. Andrews. 25 cts.

THE STATE OF THE DEAD. By U. Smith. 224 pp., 25 cts.
HISTORY of the Doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul. By D. M. Canright. 25 cts.

DISCUSSION ON THE SABBATH QUESTION, between Elds. Lane and Barnaby. 25 cts.

THE ATONEMENT; an Examination of a Remedial System in the light of Nature and Revelation. By J. H. Waggoner. 20 cts.

OUR FAITH AND HOPE, Nos. 1 & 2.—Sermons on the Advent, &c. By James White. Each 20 cts.

THE NATURE AND TENDENCY OF MODERN SPIRITUALISM. By J. H. Waggoner. 20 cts.

THE BIBLE FROM HEAVEN; or, a Dissertation on the Evidences of Christianity. 20 cts.

DISCUSSION ON THE SABBATH QUESTION, between Elds. Grant and Cornell. 20 cts.

REVIEW OF OBJECTIONS TO THE VISIONS. U. Smith. 20 cts.

THE DESTINY OF THE WICKED. By U. Smith. 15 cts.

COMPLETE TESTIMONY OF THE FATHERS, concerning the Sabbath and First Day of the Week. By J. N. Andrews. 15 cts.

THE MINISTRATION OF ANGELS; and the Origin, History, and Destiny of Satan. By D. M. Canright. 15 cts.

THE MESSAGES OF REV. 14, particularly the Third Angel's Message and Two-Horned Beast. By J. N. Andrews. 15 cts.

THE RESURRECTION OF THE UNJUST; a Vindication of the Doctrine. By J. H. Waggoner. 15 cts.

THE SANCTUARY AND TWENTY-THREE HUNDRED DAYS. By J. N. Andrews. 10 cts.

THE SAINTS' INHERITANCE; or, The Earth Made New. By J. N. Loughborough. 10 cts.

THE SEVENTH PART OF TIME; a Sermon on the Sabbath Question. By W. H. Littlejohn. 10 cts.

REVIEW OF GILFILLAN, and other authors, on the Sabbath. By T. B. Brown. 10 cts.

THE DATE OF THE SEVENTY WEEKS OF DAN. 9 established. By J. N. Andrews. 10 cts.

(See last page of cover.)

Publications—Continued.

THE TRUTH FOUND; the Nature and Obligation of the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment. By J. H. Waggoner. 10 cts.

THE SEVEN TRUMPETS; an Exposition of Rev. 8 and 9. 10 cts.

VINDICATION OF THE TRUE SABBATH. By J. W. Morton. 10 cts.

SUNDAY SEVENTH-DAY EXAMINED. A Refutation of the Teachings of Mede, Jennings, Akers, and Fuller. By J. N. Andrews. 10 cts.

MATTHEW TWENTY-FOUR; a full exposition of the chapter. By James White. 10 cts.

KEY TO PROPHETIC CHART; the symbols of Daniel and John explained, and the prophetic periods determined. 10 cts.

THE POSITION AND WORK OF THE TRUE PEOPLE OF GOD under the Third Angel's Message. By W. H. Littlejohn. 10 cts.

AN APPEAL TO THE BAPTISTS, from the Seventh-day Baptists, for the Restoration of the Bible Sabbath. 10 cts.

MILTON ON THE STATE OF THE DEAD. 5 cts.

FOUR-CENT TRACTS: The Two Covenants—The Law and the Gospel—The Seventh Part of Time—Who Changed the Sabbath?—Celestial Railroad—Samuel and the Witch of Endor—The Ten Commandments not Abolished—Address to the Baptists.

THREE-CENT TRACTS: The Kingdom—Scripture References—Much in Little—The End of the Wicked—Infidel Cavils Considered—Spiritualism a Satanic Delusion—The Lost Time Question.

TWO-CENT TRACTS: The Sufferings of Christ—Seven Reasons for Sunday-Keeping Examined—Sabbath by Elihu—The Rich Man and Lazarus—The Second Advent—Definite Seventh Day—Argument on Sabbaton—Clerical Slander—Departing and Being with Christ—Fundamental Principles of S. D. Adventists—The Millennium.

ONE-CENT TRACTS: Appeal on Immortality—Brief Thoughts on Immortality—Thoughts for the Candid—Sign of the Day of God—The Two Laws—Geology and the Bible—The Perfection of the Ten Commandments—The Coming of the Lord—Without Excuse.—God's Answers, and Which Day.

CHARTS: THE PROPHETIC, AND LAW OF GOD, CHARTS, painted and mounted, such as are used by our preachers, each \$1.50. The two charts, on cloth, unpainted, by mail, with Key, without rollers, \$2.50.

Works in Other Languages.

The Association also publishes the *Advent Tidende*, Danish, monthly, at \$1.00 per year, and works on some of the above-named subjects in the German, French, Danish, and Holland languages.

Any of the foregoing works will be sent by mail to any part of the United States, post-paid, on receipt of the prices above stated.

** Address

REVIEW & HERALD,

BATTLE CREEK, MICH.