

5.26.'03.

From the Library of
Professor William Henry Green
Bequeathed by him to
the Library of
Princeton Theological Seminary

SCC
2262
v. 9

Mr. Henry Green

Philadelphia

March 1851

TRACTS

OF THE

AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY.

General Series.



VOL. IX.

PRINTED BY THE
AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY,

150 NASSAU-STREET, NEW YORK.

DON'T BREAK THE SABBATH.

 BY REV. WILLIAM NEVINS, D. D.

SOME people consider that this caution is quite unnecessary; that we have no Sabbath now which we are under any particular obligation to keep, and therefore no Sabbath to break; that it is a privilege of the new dispensation over the old, that it has no day of rest, but now they are all working-days; that the Sabbath was a Jewish institution, and is *done away*.

It is very true, that the Sabbath is done away in the *practice* of many, but I know of no *precept* doing it away. The *subject* may have done it away, but the *Lawgiver* has not. Now, I very much question the right of the subject to do away a law. I can show any one, who wishes to see it, the *enactment* of the law of the Sabbath. I can tell him *when* it was enacted, under what circumstances, and in what language. But can any one point me to the *repeal* of the law? *When* was it repealed? *Where* is the account of it?

If a law is enacted, and is not repealed, it of course continues in force, unless it expires by its own limitation, or there is something in the reason of the law which restricts its obligation to a limited period. Can this be said of the law of the Sabbath? Does it expire by its own limitation? Or is the reason of the law applicable to only one nation, or one age of the world? Hear the reason: "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 was a reason why the Jewish people should keep a seventh part of their time holy, is it not equally a reason why every Gentile nation should also? Are not all mankind equally interested in the creation of the world? Do not all alike

need a memorial of it? Or, if that was a reason why the Sabbath should be in force 4,000 years, is it not equally a reason why it should be in force 6,000 years? Should the creation of the world be forgotten, and cease to be commemorated, at the end of 4,000 years? It is strange that since the *reason* of the Sabbath is not exclusively Jewish, the *obligation* of it should be supposed to be. It seems surprising that God should derive the reason of a *particular* law from a *general* event—an event in which the whole race are equally interested, and which it is equally important all should remember.

I am aware that another reason is given, Deuteronomy 5 : 15, why the Jews should observe the Sabbath, which does not apply to all people. But that does not nullify the force of the first and main reason. It was, manifestly, a secondary and subordinate reason; and if one looks at the passage, he will find that it was rather a reason for a particular requirement in the law, than the general ground of it. It was a reason why *servants*, as well as others, should be allowed to *rest* on that day.

The Sabbath is also spoken of as a *sign* between God and his chosen people; but this was only putting a general law to a particular use; just as in the case of the rainbow, God used a natural phenomenon as a token of a particular covenant.

But why need we spend time in showing that the Sabbath was not exclusively a Jewish institution? Our Saviour, it seems to me, settles that point. He says, "*The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath.*" Now, he would not be the Lord of it, if there was to be no Sabbath under his dispensation, unless some one will say that he was the Lord of it just to do it away, in opposition to his own declaration that he came not to destroy any part of the law; and in defect of any precept repealing it; and in contrariety to his own practice, which was a strict observance of it. What did the Lord of the Sabbath do or allow on that day, which the most scrupulous Sabbath-keeper can object to? Oh,

that men, who plead the example and declarations of the Lord of the Sabbath for a relaxation of that law, would keep it as he did. He *healed* on the Sabbath: he did that work of *mercy*. It is true the Jews were angry with him for it, but did any Christian ever complain of such work as that being done on the Sabbath? So, also, he justified his disciples in taking measures to satisfy their hunger on the Sabbath. He justified affording relief to suffering animals on the Sabbath. This is the extent of his permissions and performances. But see how men can reason when they have a favorite point to carry: because our Saviour performed and authorized works of mercy on the Sabbath, they conclude that they may do any works whatever. Because he healed, they may *visit* or *travel*. Because he pronounces it lawful to do well on the Sabbath, they infer that they may do any thing they please. Because they may lift a poor animal out of a pit, therefore they may use the same, or other animals, in journeys of business, or excursions of pleasure. Does any one suppose this is good reasoning?

There is another remark of Christ which, it seems to me, decides, beyond all question, that the Sabbath was not exclusively a Jewish institution. He says, "The Sabbath was made for MAN," employing the most unrestricted and universal term he could select. It was made, not for this or that man—the Jewish man, the man of past centuries—but for *man* in all his universality and perpetuity—in all his generations and dispersions. It is a law for the whole race, and for all time; an institution adapted to human nature, and intended for the human family. The Sabbath was made for *man*. I stand upon this passage, and proclaim the institution universal and perpetual, and challenge confutation. It belongs as much to the American of the 19th century, as it did to the Jew before the Christian era.

This is the interpretation I put on the Saviour's declaration, "The Sabbath was made for man." It moreover corrects an error into which some fall, of supposing that

the Sabbath was made for *God*, in contradistinction to the other days which were made for man. Now, the whole seven were made for man—*six* for labor, and *one* for rest. All were made for him, though to be used by him for different purposes. All were designed to be for his advantage. No one of them was intended to be a tax on him, or an onerous tribute exacted from him. Should man complain that God allows and appoints him one day of rest, as well as six of labor? Is not rest after toil a merciful appointment? Is it not a privilege? I have sometimes thought what an ado would have been made about it, had there been a precept in the New Testament repealing the law of the Sabbath—a statute taking away from man his day of rest. What a handle would have been made of it. *Now* men regard the Sabbath as a sort of exaction—a task; and they complain that it is in force. But take it from them, and they would presently discover it to be a privilege, and would complain that it was *not* in force. It was never intended to be a mere *duty*, but mainly a privilege. It was made *for* man, not *against* him; and it was commanded, rather than simply recommended, perhaps because God saw its *utility* to be so great that it was meet its observance should be made a matter of binding obligation. It is a merciful arrangement, that converts privileges into duties, and makes that imperative on us which is seen to be highly beneficial to us. The Sabbath was made for man as truly as the Saviour was provided for man; and no Christian would break the Sabbath—*any* Sabbath, or *any part* of any Sabbath, by any work not called for by rigorous necessity or imploring mercy—but would do all his work, of every kind, in the six days, and would keep the whole of every Sabbath holy, if he knew or considered what he was about. They know not what they do, who, by toil, or travel, or pleasure, disturb the day of rest. They violate a law of love; they not only disregard a duty, but forego a privilege. They injure themselves; depriving themselves of the whole, or a part, of that which a wise and benevolent God,

knowing their wants and caring for their happiness, mercifully made for them. It can never be expedient for them so to do.

I am aware that some persons are not entirely satisfied when we show them that there is no repeal of the law of the Sabbath in the New Testament. They would have had it reënacted: they wonder why it was not. But do laws require to be reënacted in order to remain in force? Who ever heard of such a thing as reënacting unrepealed laws? Do human legislatures so? and should the divine Lawgiver resort to that novelty, that trifling?

I do not at all like some of the CONSEQUENCES which follow from the doctrine that the Sabbath is done away. Then we have but *nine* commandments left us: only nine of the ten written by the finger of God on the tables of stone are in force. We do as bad as some others; they erase the *second*, and we the fourth. Now, the second was not reënacted by Christ any more than was the fourth; he left them all just as he found them.

Another consequence of this doctrine is, that we have no day now which is a *memorial* of the great works of God. There used to be a day to remind men of the work of creation; but, according to this doctrine, there is none now. It lasted only 4,000 years—and there used to be a day called by St. John “*the Lord’s day*,” which was considered by Christians as a memorial of the new creation—of redemption; but even that some will not leave us. There is no *pledge* of heaven now, according to them. The Jews had one; but we, in this respect, are worse off than they, though our dispensation is regarded as far surpassing theirs in privileges. We have no portion of time that is a memento and pledge of the everlasting rest. We have a rest; “there remaineth a rest to the people of God;” but we have no pledge, no earnest of it. Yes, we have a rest; and in speaking of it the Apostle uses not the word *katapausis*, which expresses simply a rest, but *sabbatismos*, which designates a rest of the nature of a Sabbath. A *sabbatismos*

(an eternal Sabbath of rest) we have, but no *Sabbaton*, (Sabbath.) What Christian will admit this? Reader, it must be that we have a Sabbath—a consecrated seventh of time. Yes, we have a Sabbath: the *ten* commandments are all obligatory. We have a memorial of the creation of God, and a pledge of the heavenly rest. There is something to break, and the caution with which this Tract commences is not superfluous.

But why was the DAY CHANGED? Why was that liberty taken with the Sabbath? If that might be taken, why not another, and still another? But would you annihilate the Sabbath because the day of celebrating it is changed? The change is not material; the substance of the law is retained; only a circumstance of it is altered. Now, does a change in a mere circumstance of a law authorize a taking away of the entire substance of it? The Sabbath is still a seventh portion of our time. The week is no longer, and the day is as long, and it comes as the other did, a day of rest after six days of labor. Where is the very great change? It is true, we call our Sabbath the *first* day of the week, but it is the *seventh* with reference to the preceding six of labor. If any think it ought to go one day back, and that we should keep Saturday instead of Sunday, yet let them not therefore remember no day to keep it holy. We hallow the first day of the week, because the apostles observed that day, and doubtless it was by the authority of their divine Master, who being the Lord of the Sabbath, had, of course, a right to change the day on which it should be kept, and to call it after himself, “the Lord’s day.” If we have no recorded *precept*, directing us to keep our Sabbath on the first day of the week, yet we have, what is as satisfactory, the *practice* of men, who, in matters of religion, acted never without divine direction.

So, then, we have a Sabbath, or Lord’s day, call it as you will—a seventh portion of time distinguished by divine authority from the other parts of time.

But HOW ARE WE TO SPEND this seventh portion of time? How are we to distinguish by our *practice* the day which the Lord has distinguished by his *blessing*? That it is to be distinguished in some way, by us, will not be doubted. But how? Have we any rule to direct us how to observe it? It would seem as if we ought to have one. But we have none, unless the fourth commandment is that rule; and if the fourth commandment is still obligatory, it must, since it relates to the manner of observing a day, be designed to instruct how we are to keep our Sabbath, or Lord's day. The inference is irresistible.

Well, what does that precept of the decalogue command? It begins by enjoining that the day be *remembered to be kept holy*. "Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy." It is not merely to be remembered in the sense of being recognized as it comes along in course, just as Saturday or Monday is remembered; nor is it to be remembered merely as a day to be spent differently from the other days. Few fail of remembering it so far as in some manner to distinguish it from the other days of the week. But they do not remember it to *hallow* it—to *keep it holy*. Its return is recognized by them, but not its sacredness. They cease from one sort of work only to do another. They do not work in the shop or on the farm, but they are employed in just as worldly a manner as on the other days. They do not keep the Sabbath any more holy than any other day, though they do differently on that day from what they do on others. It is just as *secular* a day with them as any other, only the *manner* of their worldliness is different.

Every one knows, without the necessity of being informed, what it is for a day to be kept holy; to be hallowed; to be regarded and used as sacred. When it is said that a day is to be sanctified, or kept holy, common sense teaches how its hours should be spent, and what things should, and what should not, be done on it. The keeping a day holy manifestly implies that on it we refrain from every thing of a secular or worldly nature, which either

necessity does not require or mercy dictate. Those secular things, which necessity does require or mercy call for, do, by that very fact, become invested with a sacredness which renders them quite in keeping with the day. To do any other secular thing on the Sabbath, every one must see to be inconsistent with keeping it holy. It is, so far as the doing of those things is concerned, to use it as any other day; and to use the Lord's day as any other day, is surely not to keep it holy, for then all the days of the week would be kept holy.

No one who sincerely desires to know and do his duty, can be at any loss how to act on the Sabbath. It is easy to discriminate between sacred things and things secular. How promptly the mind decides that *travelling* on the Sabbath is not keeping it holy; and *visiting*, and reading worldly books, or secular newspapers, and conversing on every-day topics. This is no hallowing of the Sabbath, every one sees. What more secular things can one do on Monday? What is more purely secular than travelling and visiting—the things which men of business and people of fashion are most apt to do on the Sabbath? Is ploughing or sowing more so? The latter are, perhaps, more *laborious*, but they are not more *worldly*—they are not more *anti-sabbatical*.

Therefore, if God had only commanded the day to be kept holy, no honest mind could have been at a loss to discover its duty. But he has been more explicit. The law proceeds to something more particular, and designed to be explanatory of the general direction to keep the day holy. "Six days shalt thou labor." It may seem strange, that in a law regulating the observance of the Sabbath, an injunction should be introduced directing how the six days are to be employed. But the wonder ceases with the next clause, "and do all thy work." It is not so much with a view to enjoin labor on those days that this is introduced, as to direct us to *confine* our labor to them. Now this is very plain. On the six days which precede the Sabbath, we are to labor so as to do in them *all* our work, leaving *none* of it to be

done on the seventh—no, not any of it. *All* thy work—not all, except a few small jobs to be done early on the Sabbath morning, or in the evening of the day—*all* thy work is to be done in the six days. A work begun on Saturday may not be finished on the Sabbath, neither preparation made for a work to be done on Monday. A journey may not be terminated on the morning, nor commenced on the evening of the Sabbath. That is doing a part of your work on the Sabbath.

The law proceeds: “but the seventh is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.” Sabbath means rest. The seventh is the rest of the Lord, and therefore should be ours. He did all his work on the six days; so should we. His work ran not over into the Sabbath; ours should not.

“In it thou shalt not do *any* work.” How explicit. Not *any* work is to be done on the Sabbath. But what is *work*? Some shelter themselves under that word. They understand it to mean hard labor, toil, such as brings sweat upon the brow; the work of the farmer, the mechanic, or the day-laborer. But was the law made merely for these? Some never work in the sense of labor; are they not to rest from any thing? May they do on the Sabbath as on other days? Do they keep the other days holy? Are building, sowing, selling, manufacturing, the only kind of things to be rested from? Are not all the secular things which the wealthy and fashionable do on the other days, equally to be abstained from on the Sabbath? Work means whatever of a secular nature may employ our mind or hands; and this is to be rested from on the Sabbath.

So, then, we see what *work* is, and that we are not to do *any* of it on the Sabbath—no, not on *any part* of the Sabbath, for the Sabbath includes all its parts. It was a *day* that the Lord blessed and hallowed; a *whole* day—a day of equal length with the other days. He commanded us to remember the Sabbath-*day* to keep it holy: not the Sabbath after sunrise, nor the Sabbath forenoon; not two or three hours of the Sabbath, nor twelve, but the whole twenty-four. The Sabbath is as complete a day, and as

long a day, as any other. It has a morning and an evening as well as the rest; nor is its morning all one with Saturday, and its evening with Monday. Pray, how should one part of the Sabbath be entitled to more religious respect than another part? and how is *any* part entitled to such respect, if *every* part is not? If the whole of the Sabbath was not hallowed, none of it was.

And need I say that the whole of *every* Sabbath was hallowed by God, so that not any work may be done on any part of *any* Sabbath in all the year? What is more plain than the obligation to keep holy *fifty-two* Sabbaths annually? Whatever can release us from the obligation of sanctifying one, gives us an equal liberty with respect to all. We may not forget every other Sabbath, or one a month, or one in three months. They must every one be remembered. Some persons seem to think that an *occasional* interference with the Sabbath, by a journey on it, or some other unnecessary thing, is quite excusable, provided it is not the individual's habit to desecrate the day. But may a person even occasionally break a law of God? Is it a good apology for secularizing one Sabbath, that all the rest are sanctified? Does the habit of obedience form an excuse for the act of disobedience?

I suppose there is not any way in which the Sabbath is broken more than by TRAVELLING on it. Certainly professors of religion desecrate it not so much in any other way. Travelling may, almost, be called the *Christian* mode of breaking the Sabbath. What church has not, among its members, those who, while they would not break the Sabbath in any other manner, will yet sometimes journey on that sacred day? One would suppose, to judge from the common practice, that the law had made an exception in favor of travelling, forbidding every other species of secular employment on the day of *rest*, but allowing men to journey on it. They that would not do any other labor on the Sabbath, will yet, without compunction, travel on that day. The farmer, who would not toil in his field; the merchant,

who would not sell an article out of his store ; the mechanic, who would not labor at his trade ; and the mistress of the family, who scrupulously avoids certain household occupations on the Sabbath, will yet, all of them, without any relentings, travel on the Sabbath, and that whether the object of the journey be business or pleasure. No other work, appropriate to the six days, will they do on the Sabbath—it would shock them ; but to commence, continue, or finish a journey on it, offends not their consciences in the least. There are those who would not, for the world, travel to a place on Saturday, accomplish the business, which is the object of their journey, on Sunday, and return on Monday. Oh, never. Do worldly business on the Lord's day ! Yet these same persons will, for a very little of the world, and without hesitation, go to the place on Friday, do their business on Saturday, and return on Sunday. But where is the difference ? In the judgment of God there is not the slightest. The Sabbath is as little honored in the one case as in the other. To perform the journey on the Sabbath desecrates it as truly as to accomplish on it the object of the journey.

I would ask the candid traveller, if any thing can *secularize* the Sabbath more completely—if any thing can more effectually *nullify* it, than ordinary travelling ? If a man may lawfully travel on the Sabbath, except in a case of stern necessity, such as would justify any species of work, I see not what he may *not* lawfully do on that day. Indeed, I dare affirm, and defy successful contradiction, that *there is nothing a man may not do on the Sabbath, if he may travel on the Sabbath.* What an absurdity, that it should be unlawful and improper to buy or sell, to sow or reap, to spin or weave on the Sabbath, yet perfectly lawful and proper to *journey* on the day set apart and sanctified for *rest*. Does journeying comport so well with rest ? And then the plea that travelling is not work, and therefore not included in the prohibition, when often it proves the most fatiguing work, and no greater weariness follows any thing.

But what if it be not work to the passenger, is it not work to those who are employed in conveying him? and is he not as truly responsible for the work which he renders necessary on the Sabbath, as for that which he does with his own hands? What if he can sit apart and read his good book, and have his good thoughts, or even listen to the sermon, by which some conscience-smitten clergyman on board seeks to mend the matter, do those who convey him, *the hands*, find their situation as favorable to devotion? Are they not to be taken into the account? Have they no souls? Are they under no responsibility to God? Is it no matter though they should never enjoy the privileges of a Sabbath? Was not the Sabbath made for them too? How would the traveller like to spend all his Sabbaths in a steam-boat or stage? He would not like it at all. Why, then, will he sanction and encourage a system by which others, whom he is bound to love as himself, are, in a manner, compelled to pass all their Sabbaths in these vehicles of journeying, and do actually spend them all there? *One* wants to make use of the public conveyance this Sabbath, and perhaps he does not care to use it again the whole year; another's convenience requires it on the next Sabbath; and another's on the Sabbath after; and so, to accommodate all, it must run every Sabbath, and those employed in propelling or directing it, must work every Sabbath or lose their places. And thus it comes to pass that some thousands of accountable subjects of God's government in our own country, are, for the sake of the public convenience, prevented from ever hallowing a Sabbath or hearing a sermon; and are driven, as it were, to do violence to the fourth of the precepts which the finger of God wrote on the tables of stone.

It is an abominable arrangement to make some men break every Sabbath in the year, in order that yourself may be able to break one; to compel them to work every Lord's day, that you may travel on some Lord's day when it suits you. How any one, who has a conscience at all enlightened—much more, how any one, whose heart harbors

the least love to God and his neighbor, can encourage such a system, is to me inexplicable. And yet it is done, even by members, and sometimes also by officers of the church of Christ.

It is to no purpose that they tell us the conveyance would go whether they went in it or not—for every traveller may, with equal propriety, say the same, and then none are responsible for its going—and yet it would not go unless some went in it. Does any one say, by way of excusing himself, that he uses the conveyance but rarely, perhaps not more than once in a whole year? I answer, that is all the encouragement any one individual need give it. If every man in the community travelled one Sabbath in the year, it would fill the steamboats and stages every Sabbath. The proprietors would not ask for better encouragement.

But what if no *human* being is employed to forward the traveller on his journey, does he not deprive the *beast* of his day of rest? And is it nothing to withhold from the poor animal the privilege of the Sabbath—to compel him to work on the day on which God has directed that he should be permitted to rest? According to this theory, that it is lawful to journey on the Sabbath, a man may so arrange it as never to be under obligation to keep a Sabbath. He has only to set apart that day of the week for travelling. Moreover, he who gets his living by travelling, or by the journeying of others, has, on this supposition, a manifest advantage—if such it may be called—over his neighbors. He has seven days for profit, while they have only six. The day-laborer and the poor mechanic may not use the seventh day as they do the other days of the week; *they* must make a distinction between them; but those who travel for their pleasure, or whose business calls them abroad, and those who accommodate them with conveyances, may use the seven days indiscriminately. Is this equal?

I think I have made it evident to every unprejudiced mind, that to travel on the Sabbath is to use it as any other

day. It is to make no distinction between it and Monday or Saturday. It is to disregard the peculiarity of the day altogether. But some are so wicked or thoughtless as to travel on the Sabbath, and in some cases public conveyances still continue to run. But it is in disobedience to the command of God, and is highly injurious to men. Those who commit the sin will themselves be injured by it; and they will be the means of bringing great evil upon others. Increasing numbers, from their own experience, have become convinced of this, and have ceased to violate the holy Sabbath. They neither commence, prosecute, or close a journey on that day. And let all, even if it cost them some present sacrifice, rest according to the commandment, and they will in the end find it to be great gain. To travel on the Sabbath is an IMMORALITY, and those who do it are wicked men; men who regard themselves more than they do God or the best good of their fellow-men. And whatever they may hope to gain by it, they will find the way of transgressors to be hard.

But has the Sunday traveller NOTHING TO SAY FOR HIMSELF? Yes, much. What transgressor, from Adam down, has not had an apology at hand? It is not here that sinners are speechless; it is not until the King comes in and calls them to account.

Some tell us they are very *sorry* to travel on the Sabbath, and think that should go far towards excusing them. But why are they sorry? It must be because they regard, or at least suspect, the act to be sinful. Why, then, do they do it? It does not affect the criminality of an act that it is perpetrated with some degree of regret. Herod was sorry to put John the Baptist to death.

Some tell us it is *against their principles* to travel on the Sabbath. Why, then, do they practise in opposition to their principles? What are principles for but to regulate practice? A man's principles may as well be in favor of Sabbath-breaking as against it, if his practice is in favor of it.

One says it is not his *habit* to travel on the Sabbath. Why, then, does he allow it to be his *act*? He must be at a loss for reasons, who alleges, as an apology for travelling one Sabbath, that he does not travel other Sabbaths.

One says he would never *commence* a journey on Sunday, but he can see no harm in proceeding when once set out. But where is the difference between setting out on the Sabbath, and going on on the Sabbath? Are they not both travelling—both equally opposed to rest?

One travels on the Sabbath because it is the only day the stage runs to the place to which he wishes to go. It is no justification. Let him decline going to the place, or else procure a private conveyance on another day. What if it would be more expensive? Doing right pays so well, that one can afford to be at some expense to do it.

But another pleads, that if he had laid by on the Lord's day, he would have lost his seat in the stage, and might have had to wait on the road a whole week. That would be an inconvenience certainly; but does the obligation to obey the commands of God bind us only when it is perfectly convenient to obey them? Better, I should think, the detention of many days, than the transgression of a precept of the decalogue.

One, having been some time absent from his family, is anxious to know how it goes with them. They may require his presence; but cannot he trust the Lord to take care of them one day more without his aid?

One travels to reach an ecclesiastical meeting in season; another in order to fulfil an appointment to preach. They plead the necessity of the case; but there is no necessity in it; the business of the meeting can go on without this individual. The appointment to preach should be broken. It ought never to have been made, if a journey on the Sabbath was necessary to fulfil it.

They all endeavor to make out a case of *necessity*. But there is no real necessity in the case. It is an abuse of language to call it necessity. There is no necessity in the

sense in which that word is used, either in the dictionary or in the Bible. The merchant tells us that his business *requires* him to be at home on a certain day. It *invites*, it perhaps *solicits* him—but does it *require* him? That is a strong word to use. Suppose sickness should detain him a day on the road, and he should get home a day later on that account; is it at all likely his business would suffer? Does it occur in one case out of ten thousand that a man's business suffers in consequence of such a detention? And is a man's business likely to suffer more, when, out of regard to the law of God, he voluntarily rests on the Sabbath, than when, in involuntary submission to his providence, he is compelled to rest on it? He who said, "Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy," will take care that no man suffer loss in consequence of obedience to that command. Hear his promise: "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; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." Wherefore, "remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy." Let all thy arrangements be subservient to God's appointment; and whatever the inconvenience, or the immediate loss, hallow the day which God has blessed.

DON'T BREAK THE SABBATH.

A premium of \$50, offered by a friend, was awarded to the orphan children of the lamented author of this Tract.